

EXECUTIVE STEERING GROUP (ESG) MEETING

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

January 20, 2022, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

ESG Members in Attendance: Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT), UMO Director Brendan Finn (ODOT) (alternate), President Lynn Peterson (Metro), Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland), Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver), Chief Public Affairs Officer Kristen Leonard (Port of Portland), Commissioner Jack Burkman (Port of Vancouver, alternate), Councilor Nolan (Metro Councilor, alternate), Director Matt Ransom (RTC), CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN), CAG Co-Chair Lynn Valenter

ESG Members not in Attendance: CEO Julianna Marler (Port of Vancouver), Director of Engineering and Construction Steve Witter (TriMet), Director Kris Strickler (ODOT), CAG Co-Chair Ed Washington

IBR Program Staff in Attendance: Administrator Greg Johnson (Program Administrator), Frank Green (Assistant Program Administrator), Ray Mabey (Assistant Program Administrator), John Willis (Assistant Program Manager), Alex Prentiss (Cross Discipline Lead), Millicent Williams (Lead Facilitator), Brad Phillips (Design Lead), Audri Bomar (Communications Manager), Jake Warr (Equity Lead), and Salomé Chimuku (Equity and Public Outreach)

Welcome, Introduction, Proposed Agenda and Updates

Millicent Williams, Lead Facilitator, welcomed the group and noted that the meeting recording had started. Millicent wished everyone a Happy New Year.

Prior to beginning the agenda, Millicent noted that they have a few alternate attendees and wanted to acknowledge everyone appropriately. Millicent then went over the meeting ground rules, technical instructions for the meeting, and allowed each ESG member to give a brief self-introduction. She then turned the meeting over to Administrator Johnson, IBR Program Administrator.

Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver)– attended the JPACT meeting with Blumenauer and how this project is a priority for him and his office. And that Senator Murray’s new assistant Amanda, in charge of transportation, sends her best and the Senator is ready to support the project and any needs they can provide.

Director Matt Ransom (RTC)– spending time unpacking the Infrastructure and Investment Job act, the new federal transportation bill and looking at the opportunities that may exist for funding components of this project and types of improvements.

President Lynn Peterson (Metro) – Metro Council considered the Values, Outcome, and Action document for the I-5 Bridge Replacement Program was released and it is a reflection of what the Metro Council expects and

requests from the Program. President Peterson provided a brief overview of the overlapping values they would like advanced with this project: Racial equity, resiliency, and economic prosperity, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving air quality, and engaging stakeholders through a transparent and inclusionary decision-making process. Very proud that they pulled it together and appreciate the work the project will be doing to help us answer these questions.

CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN)– building off what Mayor McEnery-Ogle expressed – praise was recently shared at JPACT for the Bus on Shoulder Project that is being run by SMART. Appreciate having another regional partner that runs an amazing bus on shoulder program. This speaks volumes of the success it could have in conjunction with other modes of other transportation on the I-5 bridge. Big thanks to the team and thankful for the work being done there.

Commissioner Jack Burkman (Port of Vancouver)– Appreciate the work that is going on, the commitment to community engagement and the commitment to engaging the freight community and the transparent data driven approach. They are looking forward to seeing the full results and analysis especially as they relate to freight movement.

CAG Co-Chair Lynn Valenter – noted to the group that the Community Advisory Group (CAG) remains fully engaged. Excellent attendance and sustained interest. Had the opportunity to route the community survey links both for the participates as well as to their communities and they feel that it was an extremely effective approach that allowed for voices to be heard both from the CAG itself, as well as the communities that they are representing. She also noted that the CAG is super excited to be able to look at specific design options and to be able to understand and weigh in on what the choices are and how they can help influence decision making.

Administrator Johnson (IBR Program Administrator) noted that they have been meeting for 14 months and they have come a long way and accomplished a lot from the beginning which will be reviewed later in the presentation. Administrator Johnson also wanted the opportunity to thank the Metro Council and Lynn Peterson for successfully approving use of funding for the Program. The Program is committed to getting the answers and coming back to Metro Council with will all the values that have been put on the table for the IBR Team. It was a very confirming vote and outlined what questions the Program needs to answer.

He then shared that the IBR Program team worked hard over the holidays and are getting ready for the upcoming Bi-State Legislative Committee meeting next Monday. They requested that the Program invite different members from the different groups to attend so that they can ask project specific questions. For this first round, Matt Ransom and President Peterson will be attending to address questions or share concerns. In the future, a number of ESG members will have their voices heard in the Bi-State setting.

Since the last ESG meeting, the Program heard from the federal partners regarding our submitted NEPA reevaluation with guidance on next steps. Over the next 5-6 months, it is critical that ESG members and community members provide feedback. The Program will seek endorsements from ESG and Bi-State members. This step must be completed to proceed into the supplemental environmental NEPA process. It is

the most stringent of requirements and addresses questions of impacts and ensures the public and partners have had their say.

Administrator Johnson relayed that the IBR team is working tremendously hard running models, sorting the data and incorporating it into the models. Over the next two months, the team will take the results of these models and put the Draft LPA on the table for this group and the advisory groups to review. Iteratively, the feedback will be incorporated so that the Draft Modified LPA can be ready to go before boards and councils starting in April and running through May and early June. Once complete, the Program will be ready for ESG to provide the endorsement to move forward.

Administrator Johnson highlighted that President Biden mentioned this project specifically in his message on infrastructure as one of national priority. This recognition at the national level, especially as they put together federal grant applications, is well timed, as a critical meeting with our federal partners (FTA and FHWA) is coming up in a week. The Program will give them the latest updates and confirm that they are comfortable with the current direction. In addition, the Program has been conducting meetings around the region. Administrator Johnson indicated that he had participated in three community meetings in SW Washington and hopes to have the same type of informational meetings in Oregon in the near future. Administrator Johnson stated that it is important that the program be viewed as a local, regional and statewide program that impacts a lot of different lives and communities.

Administrator Johnson then opened the floor to questions or comments. Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle noted that the Program has been working on some high-level 3-D graphics with the city of Vancouver. She asked that we share these images with the ESG because she feels it is important that they have the opportunity to start looking at and getting a feel for how these designs integrate with our landscape and community.

In response, Brad Phillips (IBR Civil Design Lead) shared 3-D renderings on the screen and described the images to the ESG. The two design options shown focused on the Vancouver side. The first image demonstrated a two-bridge option where the vehicle lanes are on the top level of the structure. Southbound is on the right and northbound on the left and transit is shown underneath the structure and on the far side of the bridge is labeled shared use path ramp. This particular view from a transit perspective shows one option adjacent to I-5 and there is another option that is not being shown in this view that goes towards Washington Street into downtown Vancouver and as one takes more time to study you can see the different ramp configurations accessing the corridor between SR-14 and I-5 and into downtown Vancouver.

The other example is a one bridge option with a narrower corridor over the river except vehicles lanes have southbound lanes on the top and the northbound lanes on the bottom. Again, showing the transit lane adjacent to I-5 with the option of transit going to downtown. The ramp configurations are similar in this option to the two-lane bridge and again shows the shared-use path connection between the bridge and downtown waterfront. Brad closed by stating that the team is currently working on similar visuals for the remainder of the project, specifically Hayden Island and Marine Drive area for the different bridge configurations as well as the interchange options.

Administrator Johnson thanked Brad for the overview and noted that these visuals are still draft and do not identify specific property impacts but wants to start sharing the visualizations of this program.

Mayor McEnery-Ogle asked if the program had anything that shows more transit. Brad shared that they have modeled the options on the Vancouver area the versions that were shown are slightly outdated. They do have some versions that show the different transit options that he was trying to describe towards downtown versus transit adjacent to I-5, but the models that they have now cover between approximately Evergreen and the waterfront of Vancouver. The Mayor asked if group could see these other options.

Commissioner Hardesty had a question about a much earlier conversation regarding the meetings with federal partners that are coming up in a week. She wanted to know if elected officials would be going to meetings? Administrator Johnson noted that these are technical meetings with FHWA and FTA so at this time we do not have any elected officials participating at this point.

Commissioner Hardesty voiced her concern that they continue to have these meetings and developing options and doing it in isolation of the decision makers who will have to make the decision about the design. She asked how the program would engage the elected leaders who have to lead this effort through their elected bodies? Administrator Johnson responded by saying that the upcoming meeting is not one that would address developing alternatives but rather to update them on all of the activities that have been happening with the ESG, bistrate legislature, community advisory groups, etc. He added that he does not have any concerns about having elected officials interacting with our federal partners but most of this is technical looking at timelines and schedules to make sure the Program does not put itself outside of the window for meeting certain federal guidelines and funding windows. Administrator Johnson noted that they can create this type of opportunity at the pleasure of the ESG with FHWA and FTA.

Administrator Johnson added that the input that they are taking to them is the input that they have done with staff members from each of the partner agencies. Staff from City of Portland and City of Vancouver have been involved in these conversations and they are not seeing anything new. He added that they could talk more about opportunities for that interaction.

The floor was handed back to Brad where an additional graphic was presented showing an updated version of design options. The two different transit alignments showing the Washington Street option and the I-5 Adjacent option that continues down the I-5 corridor heading north. This gives you a better perspective of the vertical that would be required to get underneath the structure down to the waterfront connecting to the Renaissance Trail. He toggled between the two-bridge option and stacked one-bridge. A two-bridge option was advanced as the previous LPA.

Anne McEnery-Ogle recommended that on every graphic have a date and a compass for direction. She noted the graphics will be picked up on by newspapers and social media and they should know this is high level and conceptual, affirming that the graphics do not represent any decision. She thanked the team for providing the graphics to help others visualize the project. Commissioner Hardesty requested that graphics of the previous LPA be shown in concert with new graphics. She feels this will help allay fears that "the decision has already

been made.” Administrator Johnson responded that they would work together to show where they have been and where they are going. Commissioner Burkman requested a disclaimer be included as well, these are draft, so that even as a standalone document it is clear of their intention.

Millicent concluded this comment by thanking him and that the communication team is working on directing the narrative now that these images are out, the Program is making direct contact with the different media outlets to ensure that they have the accurate information, and they have asked that disclaimers, drafts watermarks, etc. have been placed on them to ensure that the viewers know this is not final, this is a concept. She added that she is happy that the team was able to meet the requests of the ESG and is looking forward to seeing what is developed for the Oregon side.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM WORK PLAN

John Willis (IBR Deputy Project Manager) and Alex Prentis (Cross Discipline Lead) gave the overview on the Program work plan.

John shared that as the IBR team closed out 2021, they completed the development of the screening criteria, desired outcomes, the equity and climate frameworks, and the design options; these factors reflect the environmental, political, and contextual changes since the prior work efforts. Starting now in 2022, the team is in the evaluation phase of these options and working on redefining the modified LPA. This is the work they are going to describe between now and July. As Administrator Johnson promised a data-driven approach, they are now at the ready to provide a lot of data over the next few months. Mr. Willis showed a slide with the workplan schedule, describing the steps leading to the draft modified LPA that will advance to NEPA and ultimately design and construction. They are continuously working with the ESG’s staff as well as their project managers and leaders within their agencies to make sure they are addressing their priorities, existing infrastructure, policy and future development plans. John noted this effort includes connecting with equity and community advisory groups with the goal of getting to the modified LPA.

John turned the floor to Alex to give an overview of the upcoming work products coming out. The team has shared design options for Vancouver and is preparing to share design options for Hayden Island/Marine Drive in March. Transit solutions will be shared separately as well. This technical work uses the desired outcomes, including those for equity and climate, and the ESG’s values and priorities to develop the screening criteria which are now going to be used to evaluate each of the design options and assessing impacts. This will allow the ESG’s and IBR staff to make a data-driven recommendation.

Ms. Prentiss reinforced that the design team has a lot to put together to get to this holistic modified LPA and asked the ESG to help in making decisions along the way to achieve a final recommendation by the end of July. This is really important work and is going to be an iterative process between now and July. There is going to be a lot of back and forth between aspects of the design and looking at impacts, priorities, and values. Looking at future development of land use, equity, and climate goals and making sure that the choices that they are marking for each of these components and looking at the holistic program as that goes forward meets all of those priorities and values.

John Willis (IBR Deputy Project Manager) was handed the floor and wanted to highlight a few components that will be detailed after the staff recommendation during the refinement of the final design. The technical teams are conducting sensitivity tests with some of the design options for two components. The first item is auxiliary lanes. Mr. Willis explained that “aux” lanes are a safety component and separate from the number of lanes needed for capacity.

The second item is tolling. Presently, both Oregon and Washington have constitutional verbiage about tolling and how revenue is used. A thorough discussion by IBR Program staff and partners took place. The Program summarized that, in this case, tolling is viewed as a cost-recovery and maintenance tool, a travel demand management tool, a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and provides an incentive to use transit. The Program is looking at tolling scenarios in modeling to understand the impact on travel demand and mode share. This sensitivity analysis will inform the regional conversation. At this stage, the exact prices of toll rates are unknown as a traffic and revenue study will not be complete until end of 2023.

Commissioner Hardesty raised concerns about the program only looking at tolling in traditional ways where it only pays for freeways and encouraged the program to consider thinking about how tolls can pay for multimodal improvements and push on the legislatures to make that possible.

Secretary Millar responded by sharing that tolling is used to both generate revenue and manage demand. This program doesn't have ability to modify the constitutional realities in each state. But tolling is a financial tool and incentive to encourage travelers to use a different mode of transportation including high capacity transit.

John Willis (IBR Deputy Project Manager) wrapped up his portion of the presentation by highlighting the circles on the graphic that will take us to the modified LPA and the bi-state legislature. He thanked Millicent for helping guide the team on how they get to a decision. The three goals to help the group get to consensus are:

1. Recommendations are incremental; there is agreement in principle on the issues that matter most. Feedback will inform adjustments.
2. The Program demonstrates that this time the project is different and represents a negotiation that benefits stakeholders on both sides of the river.
3. As the data comes in, get concurrence on eliminating options that are unreasonable so they can focus on the ones that are practical, constructable, and fundable.

Alex Prentiss (Cross Discipline Lead) noted that IBR staff will provide a technical recommendation in Feb/March. Several groups are scheduled to provide input, including CAG, EAG, and boards/councils/commissions from stakeholder jurisdictions. The groups will review the data collected from the screening matrix, the IBR equity index, 3D visualizations, and community engagement efforts. This ongoing effort of providing information and gathering feedback will run through May, where staff will synthesize into a recommendation for a modified LPA and present to ESG.

FALL 2021 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

Millicent introduced the next group of presenters: Audri Bomar, Jake Warr and Salomé Chimuku and asked that they be mindful of the time to allow for the opportunity for the public comment. Millicent noted that this presentation is building off of what was presented in December [2021] and hopes that they can focus on the content that is new, different, and what really helps to inform those outcomes from the survey that was provided to the community last fall.

Audri Bomar who leads the Program's communication and community engagement team began the presentation. She affirmed the Program's mission around community engagement and provided a recap of the last three months of effort. The engagement report is scheduled to be posted publicly by the end of this month goes in depth into the feedback received with detailed analysis, cross-tabbing of the data and in-depth findings. It summarizes public input received from more than 9,600 survey responses and 1,700 survey comments, community briefings, listening sessions, advisory groups, and written and email comments. All of this will be used to inform the design option analysis and recommendation for a modified LPA. The Program will provide a link to the completed report.

Audri reviewed the key highlights of the outreach. She noted that social media received the highest participation. The survey was structured around the respondents travel behaviors and transportation design attributes, rather than specific designs themselves. The feedback confirms a preference for design options that improve travel times, relieve congestion, improve safety, and mitigate negative impacts to people and the environment. A key take away was, "Find a solution and build it."

The presentation continued with information on engagement tactics such as partnerships with community-based organizations, four listening sessions with BIPOC communities, and extension of the survey deadline. The team gathered input from people living with disabilities, young people, and people living with lower income, limited English proficiency, immigrants, and refugees.

The survey gathered demographic information. There was a high percentage of participants within the top income bracket and who identify as white/Caucasian. Extending the survey deadline allowed for a larger spread of ages and increased efforts to reach underrepresented communities. Many survey questions were also asked at listening sessions.

Jake took over the presentation by discussing the survey reach. Slide 21 shows a heat map showing what cities the survey responders live with the majority living in Portland and Vancouver. Jake noted that one thing that really came out through this survey is that when asked how often do you travel across the bridge they found a higher percentage of people who identified with a race or ethnicity in addition to white/Caucasian; the non-white respondents really reported more frequently traveling across the bridge which is shown on slide 23. This really drives home of what they have suspected that those of color are being pushed to further areas of the region to find more affordable housing but still relying on jobs and services within the Portland and Vancouver areas. They are realized that BIPOC tend to work on-location and not from at home during this pandemic.

Slide 24 shows the results of the question, why people take transit. The responses were relatively even between white and non-white participants. However, responses to “getting to work or school” revealed the non-white response was almost 10% higher than non-white.

Audri provided key takeaways regarding the river crossing and alignment. When considering a replacement crossing, I care most about . . . ? On the survey there were 10 priorities and most responded with improving travel times for vehicles and freight. (Slide 26)

1. Regarding active transportation, more than half of respondents did not have a preference. For the remainder (those who did have a preference), the respondents most favored an open path with river views at a different level than vehicle traffic.

Slides 29 and 30 provided the key takeaways regarding the Hayden Island/Marine Drive Interchange. The Program only offered the opportunity to provide specific feedback on the design options in the community working group process and more specifically through a live pulse poll in the meeting at Hayden Island/Marine Drive community working group. With the format of these meetings, they were able to spend the additional time with IBR technical and partner agency staff reviewing the designs and going into detail for a deeper understanding. During the pulse poll they did get a request for more detailed maps for the interchange options but overall supported a full interchange.

The team also heard feedback from the freight leadership meeting on the Hayden Island/Marine Drive Interchange and in general there was support for improvements to the interchanges and did request for more data and traffic projections for the wider freight community.

Regarding access to Hayden Island, there were a differing in preferences between Oregon and Washington. Washington respondents preferred a direct access to and from Hayden Island regardless of the direction they were traveling versus Oregon respondents accessing the Island via Marine Drive and a new arterial bridge that connects Hayden Island to North Portland.

Salomé Chimuku provided updates on the High-Capacity Transit key takeaways (Slides 31-33). Salomé noted that most of the support for transit came from the equity priority centered communities which makes sense based on the data since they are ones using the bridge most often. There was more support for high-capacity transit for the purpose of travel time reliability. Respondents were interested knowing where the stops would be located and what kind of transit would go where. Salomé closed by providing a quick overview of next steps (slide 34).

CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) appreciates the amount of energy that was put into the data gathering for the survey. There are two comments on page 31 that don't have any associated metrics to them and curious to know, the second bullet, “those who express support for high-capacity transit generally prefer light rail and overall community working groups were supportive of high-capacity transit with many preferring light rail or combined BRT LRT options.”

This was not specifically asked as a question as a function of the 9600 responses on the survey so what constitutes generally and what constitutes many? Shawn noted this is something that can be addressed offline but would like to know the percentage of what you deem generally is and what percentage do you deem many as. He concluded that he appreciated everyone's hard work that went in this.

Audri responded as part of the survey, they did have an open-ended comment section at the very end, and they received 1700 comments via the survey through that question. They also received a number of comments via email through the online comment portal on the website. All of those were tagged and coded and of the 1700 comments, more than half of them were regarding transit and then they broke it down further regarding positive or negative feelings towards transit.

Commissioner Hardesty asked the group about how moving forward they can make these meetings more meaningful. Since the materials are provided in advance, she would like to move away from reading the slides and engage in a more meaningful discussion. She would have appreciated a conversation around the survey information and the interviews; if they are talking about building a transportation system for the future and 90% of the people, they speak to actually drive most of the places then they are not having a robust conversation that will inform them as the Program builds a system that is climate resilient for the future.

She also noted that she was concerned about how overrepresented some populations were as compared to others and wanted to ask, how is the team making sure that they going to communities and getting them versus the traditional governmental process which is having stakeholder/community meetings. She concluded that all that has been done by the community engagement team is great work and does not what was just provided as a negative.

Administrator Johnson offered to any ESG members one-on-one discussions about this survey and what they found. He also noted they there is a public audience that is listening to this and that is why they sometimes go into more in-depth conversations about what they are finding. Commissioner Hardesty agreed and just trying to find the right balance.

Millicent Williams (Lead Facilitator) thanked Commissioner Hardesty for her feedback and the Program will take it under advisement and will work to ensure that the future management of these meetings reflects the need to both be concise in the way that they message the information but that it also provides the opportunity for the interface and exchange of ideas, thoughts, and opinions, that are critical to help us move forward.

COMMENT INPUT

Dave Rowe [2:02:45] I live in Battleground and work in Lake Oswego. It is a mistake not to include regional passenger rail and freight rail improvements to the IBR Program study, in 30 years the citizens will see and feel this mistake. ODOT made the same mistake in 1960s, millions of taxpayer dollars were wasted on the failed four and half mile Mt. Hood freeway project. The 16-mile-long max rail line was built for one quarter of the cost of the four and half mile Mt. Hood freeway.

Please include rail in the IBR Study, this solution must be multi-transit development. Thank you

Joseph Cortright [2:03:54] I am with No More Freeways. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I just want to suggest that we look back on the reasons why the Columbian River Crossing Project failed. It failed because in the word of the day, there were no robust conversations about how much the project would cost and who would pay for it and what the level of tolls would be and what we are seeing from the IBR Project is essentially a scene for scene remake of the epic failure of the Columbia River Crossing.

I am going to touch on three things: traffic projections, financial plan, and tolls. First, traffic projections, the project has still not released any new traffic projections. The projections from the Columbia River Crossing Project are not based on data that is more than 15 years old and you don't plan to see any projections until April, so essentially, they are moving forward on this project with extremely outdated information, and they specifically disobeyed Governor Brown's order more than two years ago, that the first step in this project would be developing new projections.

Second, in none of your ESG meetings have you discussed the financial plan for this project. The project released a very preliminary financial plan saying it could cost as much as \$4.8 billion that's almost \$5 billion and that there was a two- or three-billion-dollar hole in that financial plan, and they haven't discussed how they are going to close that. You need to have a serious discussion of financing you can't talk about that without talking about tolls.

The CRC project said that the tolls would be \$5.00 to \$6.50 on a round-trip basis, a minimum \$5.00 toll for a round-trip. You need to be talking in your public outreach material about whether people are interested in paying upwards of a \$140.00 a month to cross the bridge each way on a commuting basis.

Then finally you have put off doing the investment grade analysis and that is important because between the FEIS and the investment grade analysis the minimum toll level was doubled from a \$1.30 to \$2.60. So, stop using the word robust and start being robust by being honest with how much this project will cost, how it will be paid for, and what the level of tolls will be,

Ukiah Howard Steiner [2:06:46] I am speaking on behalf of Sunrise PDX. I am 16 years old, and I am afraid to grow up. In the past few years, I have seen my home burn around me. Climate change is here, and the destruction of our planet is speeding towards me and towards us. Fires ravaged through agricultural lands, forests, and towns. Floods and storms wrecked homes and here in Oregon people died in the heatwave this summer. If you have read the news at all in the past six months, I think you have an idea of what I'm referring to and we cannot keep doing what we have always done. From the plans that I have seen on your website, I have only seen options with an addition of lanes for cars and if we are truly going to meet our carbon emission goals, this bridge cannot be an expansion, addition, or widening of lanes and I am here to ask you all to open your eyes.

Forty percent of Oregon's counted emissions come from transportation majorly worsening the climate crisis; with all that we know about induced demand and lane additions how on earth could you propose a project

that increases capacity for more cars. No, we are not going to make every car emission free in the next eight years so cars pollute.

I am sure you are all familiar with Sunrise PDX's youth vs. ODOT campaign. The idea is every other week for the past nine months we have been rallying outside ODOT asking out leaders which side are you on? Will you choose to fund, support, and fight for the youth or will you choose ODOT and we actually asked Program Administrator Johnson if you would attend one of those rallies he declined and by declining it is clear which side he and this project are on, so I'll ask you all today which side are you on? Will you come to one of your rallies? I will note that this invitation is still open Mr. Johnson, you are always welcome to take us up on the offer and will you listen to the youth so that we can learn together, will you support us as we fight for a livable future or are you going to expand this freeway and this bridge? Which side are you on, we'll be watching? Thank you

Bob Ortblad [2:09:00] I am a Washington resident and 50 years of civil engineer. I teach the history of infrastructure at the University of Washington. In the last eighteen months the IBR has spent \$30 million to manufacture consent for unsafe bridge options. The extremely steep four percent grades combined with the Columbia's wind, rain, and black ice will make this bridge the most dangerous interstate bridge in the country.

The IBR has also assured us the new bridge will be earthquake proof but at what cost? The San Francisco Bay Bridge cost \$6.5 billion, \$5 billion over budget and ten years late. Like the Lake Washington floating bridges, buoyancy gives an immersed tunnel almost earthquake immunity. Unfortunately, the bridge engineers at the IBR have spent over a \$100,000 for an immersed tunnel assessment prepared by WSP. This report is worthless because it evaluated an immersed tunnel under the wrong barge channel. This report should be retracted, and the fees refunded. The IBR has recently posted three lies about an immersed tunnel on both its Twitter and Facebook account.

Lie number one, a tunnel will eliminate connections to Hayden Island and Vancouver. At the riverbank a tunnel made it much easier to come up from minus twenty feet at the riverbank for tunnel than to come down one hundred feet for a bridge. I have been to the world's most beautiful cities, Hong Kong, Sydney, Gutenberg, all protected their waterfronts by building multiple immersed tunnels.

Lie number two, the tunnel will cost more than a bridge. Both British Columbia and Denmark have recently evaluated immerse tunnels vs. bridges and both have found a tunnel to be cheaper and greener.

Lie number three, a tunnel comes with significantly more environmental impacts, cut to come down one hundred feet from the bridge will require a massive interchange on both sides of Hayden Island and Vancouver, both costing about a half a billion dollars. A tunnel can connect to the existing interchanges.

Shawn Philbrook [2:11:27] Good afternoon and thanks for your time, I'll be brief. VP of Programs for the Business Leaders Group Identity, Clark County. Today I'm here to present for the record the 2022 Clark County Transportation Alliance policy statement, this document brings together disparate regional agendas and advances, a unified voice for critical transportation and infrastructure priorities. I'm please to share that the

2022 statement has a record 60 plus endorsing organization including key cities, ports, school districts, labor groups, healthcare organization, and local and statewide business associations in Oregon and Washington.

Identified as the top transportation priority for the metro area on this document, these 60 plus organizations offer their undivided support for the I-5 bridge. The Transportation Alliance applauds the work done thus far to restart and advance conversations through a bipartisan, bicameral, and bi-state approach. I hope you each receive this testimony as an encouragement to keep up the good work as we endeavor to make necessary facility improvements to the west coast's economic backbone and one of our region's most significant freight commerce and commuter corridors. You should each receive an electronic copy of that policy statement for your reference shortly.

CONFIRM UPCOMING MEETING TOPICS, NEXT STEPS AND SUMMARY

Millicent concluded the meeting by thanking the public commenters. Millicent thanked everyone and noted that moving forward the Program can commit to you that they will provide ample opportunity for engagement on each of the issues and will bring, as it relates specifically to the community engagement survey and the data that was presented, that it would be time well spent at the beginning of next months, on February 17th, to spend some time having the opportunity to dig deeply and to ask some additional questions and get additional feedback insights.

For next month's agenda, something that was supposed to be on this meeting's agenda, was the equity in transit conversation. They are going to be prepared to have that conversation in February and look forward to providing you information in advance, so we are ready to have a more robust conversation. In addition, they will have the economic impact assessment conversation and an update on the schedule, and possibly introduce a second meeting to allow for more time to begin make decisions. Millicent notes that they will be putting out asks about possible additional times, acknowledging that this may be challenging. Please start looking for an extra hour to hour and half in February and March to discuss critical pieces of the potential IBR solution.

The meeting adjourned at 12:16 p.m.

MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A4S7boS7-20>

January 20, 2022



Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/esg-january-20-2022-meeting/>