

EXECUTIVE STEERING GROUP (ESG) MEETING

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

April 7, 2022, 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ESG Members in Attendance: Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT), Director Kris Strickler (ODOT), UMO Director Brendan Finn (ODOT) (alternate), President Lynn Peterson (Metro), Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland), Executive Director Curtis Robinhold (Port of Portland), Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver), CEO Julianna Marler (Port of Vancouver), General Manager Sam Desue (TriMet), Director Matt Ransom (RTC), CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN), CAG Co-Chair Lynn Valenter, CAG Co-Chair Ed Washington

IBR Program Staff in Attendance: Administrator Greg Johnson (Program Administrator), John Willis (Program Manager), Millicent Williams (Lead Facilitator), Ray Mabey (Assistant Program Administrator), Chris Regan (Environmental Team), Shilpa Mallem (Design Team), Brad Phillips (Civil Design), Ryan LeProwse (Modeling Team), Mara Krinke (Climate Team)

WELCOME, INTRODUCTION, PROPOSED AGENDA AND UPDATES

Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver) requested the floor prior to advancing the discussion listed in the agenda. She delivered a message about the demographics in SW Washington and City of Vancouver, how it relates to equity and who needs to cross this bridge to access opportunities to jobs and services. She stressed the importance of this project as the growth within the region has increased significantly within the past 10 years and continues to do so. She noted that with this population increase the BIPOC population increased by 59,000 which is 76%. She honed in on the notion that much of the increase has come from Portland to allow accessing affordable housing. In closing, she stated that it is very important that the ESG get to an LPA to update this critically needed infrastructure.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE

Program Administrator Greg Johnson offered words of welcome. He thanked Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver) for her statement. He noted that we have a full agenda and would like to dive in quickly. He would like to make sure that there is plenty of time to address any of their questions.

One Bi-State Legislative Committee question that came up their meeting; the program made a statement that there will be substantial demand for transit services. They were challenged with answering, “what does

substantial demand mean?” Right now, we have 3,400 transit trips per day across the bridge and based on the model, that demand will grow to 26,000-33,000 average weekday trips on high-capacity transit.

Administrator Johnson noted that the material that is being shown may be the first time the ESG is seeing this information, but it is not the first time their staffs have seen the work given that they work closely with Program staff as it is developed. Greg noted that the goal is having a final product that the region can be proud of. The program is not only looking at present day but also the future needs for the region.

Commissioner Hardesty noted that she appreciated Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle statement and hopes that they all share the sense of urgency but added that what she needs from the program is to see something to respond to instead of just words.

President Peterson supports the one region conversation as we are trying to achieve placemaking and repairing damage that has been done with previous regional projects.

LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE, SDEIS ALTERNATIVE, AND OTHER STUDIES

Chris Regan, IBR Program Environmental Manager, gave a brief presentation on the LPA and noted that this material will be provided on the webpage so that all viewers can review in deeper detail. See slides 10-27.

CEO Julianna Marler (Port of Vancouver) understands that once we make a determination on the considerations/scenarios for the bridge that they will be moved forward and studied in NEPA. What if you determine a fatal flaw in one of scenarios, what would the next steps look like?

Chris responded that the intent is not to change them but barring any environmental impacts, public comment or fatal flaws, there is room in the NEPA process to make sure that the data that is coming through the analysis supports our decision going forward. If there is a fatal flaw, that would require the time to dive deeper into the issue and determine what is the best way to bring the program forward and ensure that we are meeting the needs of the program.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) is wanting to understand what can and can't change following the LPA? What does the LPA look like? What are the options the ESG will be considering, because at this time we have only been talking about process and haven't had a chance to "see" anything? Chris responded that the details for the LPA are coming out very soon, the point of the presentation was process-based. The NEPA process is to ensure we get it right and allow for public comment. The specific elements will be brought into the LPA.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) asked if she was going to see models and technical information to help inform the decision making. Millicent noted that the program will begin sharing the elements of the LPA so that the ESG and their boards and councils can make a decision moving forward. This presentation was to be sure that all parties understand the process and are speaking the same language on the path moving ahead.

Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT) appreciated the presentation and reminded the ESG that NEPA is a decision-making process, and that the LPA is not something you go and build. The LPA is something you study. We are at the beginning of the decision-making process. If you find something in the NEPA process you change accordingly, and depending on the scale of the adjustment, you continue to move forward or you move backwards and that is fine.

Director Matt Ransom (RTC) thanked the program as it has supported him with a presentation to his board. There has been a lot of work done over the past few months and this work has been options assessment. The ESG has and will see presentation on options regarding transit and Hayden Island/ Marine Drive and what is incumbent on his team at RTC, along with the partners, is the need to be paying attention as things get compressed. It moves into an assembly of these components (transit, bridge, interchanges) into an LPA that meets the goals for all partners. Millicent confirmed his statement and appreciated what was stated.

Prior to moving to the next slide deck, Millicent introduced TriMet's representative and new member of the ESG General Manager Sam Desue. He followed by thanking the partners and the program for all their hard work. He closed by saying that TriMet is committed to find a strong transit solution.

TECHNICAL OVERVIEW

Shilpa Mallem – Deputy Design Manager, Brad Phillips – Civil Design Lead, and Ryan LeProwse – Planning Lead led a presentation that covered:

- Hayden Island/Marine Drive Draft Screening Summary Review
- Overview of Modeling Efforts and Path Forward
- Overview of 3-D Renderings

Hayden Island/Marine Drive (HI/MD)

Shilpa Mallem began the presentation by discussing the changes for HI/MD since 2013. She moved on by covering the assumptions the program has made as they advance the design considerations. See slides 31-33.

These include replacement of the North Portland Harbor bridge; local auto access between north Portland and Hayden Island; pedestrian/bicycle connections with a shared use path; and high-capacity transit station on Hayden Island.

She briefly reviewed the six interchange options studied and the narrowing of those options that were unable to serve the traffic volumes and achieve critical design requirements. This resulted in two interchange options on Hayden Island (Option 1 is a full interchange; Option 5 is a partial interchange), each connecting to a full interchange on Marine Drive; all options include access to/from north and south I-5. See slides 34-35.

She then handed the presentation over to Brad who spoke to slides 36 and 37 covering Option 1 - Full Interchange Design and Option 5 - Partial Interchange.

President Lynn Peterson (Metro) asked, "In regard to the cross-section at the full interchange option, how many lanes will there be and how does it relate to bike and pedestrians?" Brad noted that at this time, we have not identified the number of the lanes. The bike and pedestrian flow has been an important conversation with the program and City of Portland. There will be a shared-use path, connecting the 40-Mile Loop east/west across Marine Drive; the team believes it would be the most beneficial to get as many people as possible to use this shared use path system but recognize users will still use the interchange and need to navigate through safely. Right now, it is still early, but it is a design issue that will get a lot of focus moving forward.

Executive Director Curtis Robinhold (Port of Portland) clarified the importance of Marine Drive and its connectivity to Terminal 6 and the Port, but the impact is much more than that. It affects the entire Rivergate District which has 65,000-70,000 jobs and indeed 1,500-2,000 of them are for the Port of Portland. He wants everyone to understand why connectivity here is so important.

Brad wanted to note that this graphic shows MLK terminating very close to I-5 and it is not representative of designs that incorporate planning further east of I-5 to enhance the neighborhood connectivity and business access. The program is really trying to understand the freight movements and the difference between connectivity between I-5 and the extensive businesses in that area.

Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT) added that there are significant traffic volumes and economic resources both east and west of the interchange and the shared use path down on Pier 99 Street and Vancouver Way is a much more attractive and safer connection.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) would like to have copies of these mockups. Millicent noted they were included in the presentation packet but will provide the graphics post meeting.

Brad then presented Option 5 - Partial Interchange, slide 37. The difference in the Marine Drive area is that there are two additional ramps that connect to and from the south portion of I-5 that terminate on Pier 99 Street. This is essentially the replacement of Hayden Island access instead of the two ramps being on Hayden Island they are on the Marine Drive vicinity.

Comparing the differences, Option 5 is smaller/narrower and less complex with ramps weaving on top of each other on Hayden Island. However, that complexity is shifted to the Marine Drive area adjacent to Delta Park.

President Lynn Peterson (Metro) asked if there a way to do a side by side and explain the reasoning behind the arterial bridge location that shifts between Option 1 and 5? Brad noted that the complexity of transit crossing Pier 99 Street as well as intersections and ramp terminals coming down to Pier 99 Street was too much complexity in a small area and would cause operational issues and safety concerns.

President Peterson followed up with a clarification question on the bike/pedestrian crossing in the full interchange. Brad responded that the 40-Mile Loop goes under I-5, adjacent to Pier 99 Street and connects with the intersection of the west arterial bridge which includes transit and the shared use path going north. The shared path continues on Hayden Island where there would be ramp connections to access the station that would be on Hayden Island and local street networks. The program is still working on details of how the path connects to North Portland. This level of detail still requires a lot of work and will happen as design continues to be developed.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) asked if Option 1 and 5 are the only two options up for consideration? Yes. She continued by saying she noticed that there is high-capacity transit stops and others just note transit stations. Is there a difference in this mockup between high-capacity transit stops and other mode of transit that has yet been named?

Brad clarified that high-capacity transit is a generic term for whether this is light rail technology or bus rapid transit. The program has been studying both options. The stations would be at similar locations. Understanding that they are different vehicles, in either case there would be a new station on Hayden Island. The program will study modifications to the existing Expo Station.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) followed by asking if TriMet is at the same table about whether or not there is a plan to expand capacity in this area and hopes those conversations are happening somewhere as they are not being discussed within the ESG. She is concerned about the difference in cost between option 1 and 5 and asked if any financial analysis has been completed?

Brad suggested moving forward with the presentation would allow him to better address Commissioner Hardesty's question. Brad reviewed slides 38-41 covering a screening summary which allowed the team to

reduce to these two options. What is being shown is the major differences between the options. This includes looking at these options through the equity and climate lens as well. Regarding cost, while there is a slight difference between option 1 and 5 and both are slightly more expensive than in 2013, there is not a significant difference between the two.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) noted that there is a big difference in both the climate and the equity lens for Option 5 compared to Option 1. What are you basing your statement that there's not a lot of difference? Brad clarified that he was addressing her first question that was specific to cost.

Brad noted there are differences between Option 1 and 5 for many other measures, as noted, most are related to the complexity and width on Hayden Island. He added that to really dive into the differences of the two they should be looked at side by side so the reader has the full picture.

Director Matt Ransom (RTC) noted the rating graphics are effective summaries. Is it the intent of the program to provide these types of summaries to get to the modified LPA? Yes, the program is trying to do this across the board but with transit it might be slightly modified.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) asked a question is around funding packages. She acknowledged that it may be premature, but she is concerned that we are talking about freeway interchange options without talking about low-income individuals. Ms. Hardesty asked that any documentation that is created continues the theme about sharing multimodal options as we go through this process. She understands that this is a highway project, but it is connected to other multimodal options, and it should be reflected in all documentation. She added that she really appreciates the one-page graphics.

The floor was handed over to Ryan LeProwse who gave a brief update on the transportation modeling. The team has been producing year 2045 volumes for comparing the options. Similarly, to support the transit options the team has been running travel demand models which will be covered later in the presentations; tolling and auxiliary lane analysis which will be covered in the next meeting.

Millicent followed that Ryan and his team have been working very hard to be sure that all requests have been addressed by the partners. With requests coming in daily, we as a program need to make sure that we are talking about what we need to do now versus what can be done later in the NEPA process.

TRANSIT PARTNER UPDATE

John Willis, IBR Program Project Manager, General Manager Sam Desue (TriMet), and CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) presented the next slide deck.

John Willis opened the conversation by reminding everyone that at the last meeting, the program walked the ESG through a range of transit investment opportunities. Today's meeting covers the broad goals for transit work and feedback from the transit partners. See slides 43-45 for details on the focused list of representative transit investment goals along with next steps.

CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) appreciates the technical work that has occurred to date. He echoed what was stated by Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver) regarding the significant population changes within the region and specifically Clack County. C-TRAN, with the absence of the CRC project, has bet its future of putting transit in underserved neighborhoods.

Looking forward to the opportunity of bringing different transit modes together, one thing that has been heard from the leaders of our respective agencies are that there are a lot of things C-TRAN does really well to serve the community, extending into Portland, and TriMet does the same on their end and wants to marry those in real time.

You will see through the winnowing process, C-TRAN has been open about the fact that, while primarily they may be talking about a singular mode that gets a fair amount of attention as a function of the bridge project, the project itself has been very open to include all modes that currently exist in the system. C-TRAN thinks this is the best way to do transit. The bus rapid transit system continues to see increased ridership.

One of the things that C-TRAN continues to look at, especially when talking about park and rides or other peripheral items that are a part of these options is how specifically they will displace residents within all areas that are impacted by the bridge itself. He noted that equity in and of itself is bigger than data and bigger than a map. It is about the actions that the agencies are required to take as a function of outcomes with the bridge. Whatever option is chosen to move forward they have an opportunity to make sure that their communities have access to those modes. One item that C-TRAN is needing answers on in the future is tolling, as it does impact the formula of funding that both agencies will receive from the federal government and the need to find ways to mitigate. The other is that C-TRAN provides service within Oregon that is paid for by Clark County and if they were to introduce a new mode, they would want to keep those operating expenses within the jurisdictions or within the agencies. Mr. Donaghy concluded that a lot of great work has been done. Big thanks to TriMet and their staff.

General Manager Sam Desue (TriMet) agrees with Shawn Donaghy and shares his thoughts. He added that I-5 and the bridge provides a critical connection between Oregon and Washington. It supports jobs and families and is a vital link in connecting the region. He noted how impressed he has been with the Program's work. He hopes to continue to elevate the voices of equity with community outreach; TriMet is committed to working and finding a solution to improve our system and support our partners. He noted that TriMet is having conversations about cost to operate and have continued discussions with FTA as the program moves forward.

Millicent noted that at the upcoming April 21st meeting, the Program will be sharing the data that supports the discussions that have been had to date.

President Lynn Peterson (Metro) provided support to the partners on both sides of the river regarding the advancements of both transit systems.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) noted that she is very grateful to the transportation administrations and their commitment to the project and how to add value to our communities, specifically tying transit to affordable housing.

CLIMATE PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Mara Krinke, IBR Climate Program Lead, presented the next slide deck by providing an overview of climate for the program, see slides 47-50. She began by sharing how the program has been listening and engaging with agencies around climate issues and the program's goals and objectives. She also discussed the program elements and how each one can influence climate outcomes and provide a review of what measurements and metrics will be used.

Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle (City of Vancouver) was hoping for more detail and explanation of the methodology. The City of Vancouver has set a very aggressive regional goal of carbon neutrality by 2040 and would like to know how this program is going to contribute to them meeting this goal.

Mara noted at the last Climate Technical Working Group was around targets and how the program can accelerate the reduction to zero. Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle continued asking if the power and vehicle companies are going to do their part to help get us to the end goal. Mara noted that, with our program, we can further accelerate mode shift and demand management.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) added that City of Portland also has aggressive goals surrounding this topic wants to make sure that the program is considering multiple measures towards reducing climate impact. She requested that we list out all measures in detail as much as possible to get a better outcome.

CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) asked if the program was taking into account any federal and/or state mandates to be in electrical vehicles by a certain time. He feels that we have traded the idea of VMT for road user fee access for a function to be more climate-friendly. He appreciates wanting to move people to other mode options but in the climate sphere what are we really having a conversation about, He asked, "what does the data show about the significant introduction of electric vehicles to our highway system and how will that have an impact on our climate versus just moving people to another mode of transportation?"

Mara noted that the Program will be modeling for the 2045 build year and will make assumptions about electric vehicles. This will be the same for the No Build, so credit for electric vehicles will occur with or without the project. The remaining difference will be what the project is bringing in terms of change and traffic dynamics. This is a forward-looking effort working with both states to make assumptions about what goes into that model. These include: what are the types of vehicles on the road, what is their fuel use, what is their electricity use and source.

Shawn followed up by encouraging the program to differentiate between desire to reduce congestion as a vehicle mode and congestion as a function of climate because they are two different things.

President Lynn Peterson (Metro) acknowledged that they have two amazing sides of the river doing a wonderful job at long-range planning and are working hard at the 60% of the GHG related to technology and 40% related to land use transportation decision-making. She said that it is not too early to start thinking about how the program mitigates congestion during construction, not only the I-5 Bridge project but also the Rose Quarter. She reflected upon a project in Washington State that put energy into making sure that the transit through the corridor was bumped up in operations. We are going to have two significant overlapping projects in construction which will equal a significant amount of congestion.

Director Matt Ransom (RTC) added that he appreciated the way Mara categorized the different actions. Collectively, it is action among many (global, national, state, local, etc.) and oftentimes around the table, it is difficult to look at it through the different lenses. For this purpose we are trying to hone into the actions that this project can commit to and execute and collectively try to pursue together. This effort is helpful for his policymakers.

Before moving onto the public comment period, Administrator Johnson noted that we have a very heavy lift over the next three months. The program has asked for more dates to meet and discuss scenarios and recommendations from the IBR team. This will allow the ESG to work with their boards and councils through June to land the LPA. In July, the Program will be coming back to ESG to ask for an endorsement to bring recommendations into the SEIS. The program is currently on-track to meet deadlines agreed upon not only by the ESG, but also bi-state and elected government officials, which will allow us to get to construction in 2025.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) wanted to thank all presenters today and knows how hard the program has been working. She noted it would be very helpful for her to receive, in writing, those decisions that cannot be changed in the LPA after this group votes this summer and what is open for further community engagement.

She added they have asked to see the reporting on how the modified LPA or the options perform against the desired outcome and how the EAG equity framework fits in and indicated that the transportation presenters

did a great job of being able to show very clearly where there was equity and where there was more work to be done around issues of equity. I would like for the rest of it [the Program] to do the same. I also wanted to think bigger about transit and not just added light rail or adding high-speed bus, because the reality is those are not the only two tools in our toolbox. If we are thinking transit, we should have a mindset of no transit rider left behind and what will it take to make sure that people get to where they need to go and my fear is we're just talking light rail and high speed bus and talking about an imaginary future of electric automobiles and, if you want to talk about creating more inequity, there would be a lot of time before black, indigenous, Latino and other people of color will be able to enjoy the privilege of electric automobiles. She doesn't want to reinforce the inequities that already exist by focusing limited resources on things that will only benefit a small group.

Commissioner Hardesty added a final comment on the Hayden Island interchange: Option 5 is the preferred option for the City of Portland. They think this is has the best impacts and has the highest equity and climate scores. This is a no-brainer for the City of Portland.

CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) wanted to echo one of the comments Commissioner Hardesty made, where collectively, as stakeholders on the IBR we need to be more thoughtful and intentional about telling stories that a lot of communities may not know about the respective transit systems. Through C-TRAN, they have implemented an Uber-type dial-a-ride service called *The Current* that connects people to their main line, higher speed, bus routes, high-frequency bus routes. He noted that TriMet has implemented similar programs, like BRT on Division, trying to provide the equitable transit option. We need to continue to tell the story of what our respective transit agencies do outside of the bridge area that impacts all of our communities and what this responsibility really is long-term for wherever the terminus lands.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dave Roe [2:19:] I submitted the commonsense alternative three times to the equity executive board and the advisory, but I don't see it has been posted as any of the public comments. The commonsense alternative is advocating that you save the bridge, which would save \$100 million of taxpayers' money, and you spend \$2 million a year for maintenance for 50 years. So, I think you should save the bridge and build an alternative bridge that would be less costly, and it would save a lot of concrete. Concrete is very carbon-intensive for the environment, so just making a smaller bridge and saving the bridge would help save the cost. The IBR program survey showed the majority of people moving to Clark County were people of color, nonwhite, lower-income citizens. How will it be equitable for these folks to pay \$5 to \$8 toll each day? Most low-income citizens do not have flexible work hours and work day-shifts. So, if they could use the current bridge, that would be very equitable. There's a 25% chance the current bridge will be damaged by a seismic event, but there's also a 75% chance it will remain for another 75 years. So, save the bridge and look at the commonsense alternative,

I've submitted a slide show put together by a transit-oriented group in Oregon. I live in Battle Ground, and I travel every day across that bridge, and I'd like to have something better. Thank you.

CONFIRM UPCOMING MEETING TOPICS, NEXT STEPS AND SUMMARY

The next ESG meeting will be on Thursday, April 21st at the regularly schedule time where they will discuss auxiliary lanes, transit options, and scenarios. The program anticipates that they will need to extend the meeting an hour to allow for a meaningful and robust conversation.

The program is also proposing an ESG meeting on Thursday, May 5th where they will get an introduction of the program recommendation for the modified LPA.

Administrator Johnson closed the meeting by thanking everyone for their flexibility with extended and additional meetings. All questions have been taken down and will be shared with the team.

MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aool0npRzj0>

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/esg-april-7-2022-meeting/>