

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #13

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #13 Summary

Date and Time: February 24, 2022, 4:00-6:00pm

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Livestream

WELCOME

ED Washington, CAG co-chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked everyone for taking the time to be here on such a hectic day. Johnell Bell, CAG Co-Facilitator, then reviewed the technical instructions for the meeting. Lisa Keohokalole Schauer reviewed the CAG member commitments and operating norms.

PROGRAM UPDATE

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, welcomed everyone and thanked them for being here today. He shared that the program has been running traffic models, getting data and are preparing to have some answers to key questions, such as:

1. What the interchange on Hayden Island will look like
2. What mode of high-capacity transit will cross the bridge
3. How many auxiliary lanes will there be

The program is having conversations with federal partners and have determined we will be completing a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Once we get the endorsement from the bi-state legislative committee, we will know what's needed to take us into 2023, what will move forward and what will be built. This will be a very public process moving forward.

We are having conversations with federal and local partners about what federal funds will be available. Next week folks will visit with US DOT and congressional offices to update them on the status of IBR and what needs to move forward. The program is also having ongoing conversations with tribal partners.

Question and Answer

CAG Member: I wanted to raise my concern the way Washington is advancing payment of this bridge using an export tax specifically targeting Oregon. The question of taxing Oregon is iffy on the legal front but also sets a precedent against inter-state cooperation. Getting into the weeds of taxes and how we pay for things, but it is

extremely important as this would have serious consequences for Oregonians. So, I ask my friends and colleagues on the other side of the river to please act, and I ask Greg how that conversation is happening with the bi-state legislative committee and how we are going to find the revenue to support this.

Greg: We have not had a bi-state legislative meeting since the Washington Legislature put this on the table. Our program has no position on how the legislature in either state chooses to move forward as this is a discussion between policy makers. So, we cannot comment on how either state chooses to move forward with their share.

CAG Member: this is more than just the question of how the export tax allows Oregonians to pay both sides of the bridge, but this type of legislation would violate the US Commerce clause and tie this up in legislation preventing the bridge from moving forward - that's the larger issue. It risks all the work we have done to date and that ought to be recognized by anyone on this committee.

CAG Member: As an industry lobbyist and representative of a trade group, there was no collaboration on this legislation. We found out about this effort at a Tuesday press conference. The trucking community is very much opposed to this idea, as an industry dependent on roads, it promises to cost WA taxpayers millions in litigation and delays the bridge project. It does not acknowledge the goodwill between Washington and Oregon moving forward on this bridge project.

Greg: The IBR team has no voice in this conversation. We are neutral. We don't tell either legislature how to go about their business. There are other revenue sources that are part of this. We are watching this very carefully, but we remain neutral on how this moves forward.

CAG Member: I'm not connected to the Washington legislature, but when I saw this in the papers my first thought was that this is payback for Oregon trying to toll Washington state residents who must drive the bridge every day for work. I understand that there are things going on outside of that but from an individual perspective that's what I think.

CAG Member: I think we need to respect Greg's position here. I understand the Portland Business Alliance and the trucking and all, but I truly think you need to do this through your association and not the CAG as we won't be speaking with one voice on this.

CAG Member: I respectfully disagree, as we are part of the committee and part of the joint committee are legislators from both states so therefore, they need to know the feelings of some members. Greg, you don't have to take a position, but you can report that these are some of the feelings of CAG members. That kind of message needs to go back to the legislatures, and I think you have a responsibility to report on what has been discussed.

Greg: I understand, and we will report back that we have heard different voices on this issue to the Bi-State Legislative Committee, but the CAG nor IBR is speaking to this issue. The purpose of the CAG is to advise on the bridge itself.

CAG Member: thank you Greg, that's what I wanted to echo. We all have different stakes in this topic.

Cag Member: I want to clarify that I wasn't looking for anyone's support or opposition, simply that the issue is out there, and we should be aware, and if this goes forward and gets tied up in litigation it will delay the progress on the bridge. Thank you.

IBR/CAG WORKPLAN UPDATE

John Willis, Deputy Program Manager, discussed how the program is getting to the modified LPA.

CAG DESIGN COMPONENTS AND COMMUNITY VALUES

Johnell Bell reviewed the result of the CAG polls from the January 6th meeting. He then reviewed the upcoming CAG meeting dates.

January 6th CAG Meeting Poll Results

Design options ranked in order of importance by CAG

1. Transit mode
2. Number of auxiliary lanes
3. Bridge crossing and alignment
4. Interchanges – Hayden Island & Marine Drive
5. Interchanges – Vancouver

January 6th CAG Meeting Values Poll Results

▶ Top six voted Values

1. All modes of transportation to increase capacity of river crossing is essential to effectively & safely move more people, goods, & services (88%)
2. Congestion (83%)
3. Informed, data-driven decision-making (71%)
4. Bi-State cooperation (67%)
5. Economic Empowerment (54%)
6. Transportation facilities must reflect the needs of all ages and abilities, and remove barriers, including language, to access and ensure availability to transportation choices (50%)



CAG Member: Last meeting, a CAG member brought up a concern that within the poll the areas defined as Hayden Island/Marine Drive and downtown Vancouver are too small. Now it seems to be concrete on the slide, I think this should be looked at or eliminated.

Lisa: Just to be clear, is your suggestion that the interchanges – Hayden Island and Marine Drive being combined with downtown Vancouver as one may not reflect the importance or the ability of enough folks to weigh in?

CAG Member: I would like to refer that to the CAG member who made the original point last time.

CAG Member: My concern currently is that because we were voting on sort of local issues that we were getting a deluded sense of importance. From what I can tell on the slide, the fact that Hayden Island and Marine Drive are getting some attention and our meeting in two weeks is focused on those things, they seem to be getting the focus they need. So, I don't see this as a problem right now if they remain on the table.

Lisa: Great, I think the intent of showing the values was deciding what technical information to put in front of the CAG.

TRANSIT TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

Kelly Betteridge, IBR transit design team, shared the work the transit team has been doing on transit investments. She reviewed the overview of the investment process to date, the draft findings from transit measures, and next steps for the program.

Question and Answer

CAG Member: One thing that I didn't see represented is if you're initial research included trip times from Clark County. From the perspective of the rider, how quickly I can get somewhere is most important. When you spoke about light rail use being higher, are you talking about overall? Or is it more tailored? The last question, was safety a consideration on any of these modes?

Kelly: Regarding travel time, that is one of the inputs we have. Each of the 11 build options evaluated has an assumed travel time. Since they all tie into the expo center it's all kind of from the terminus to the expo center. Your second question on light rail ridership, when we compare the same sort of option, there tends to be higher ridership when you compare BRT vs LRT. There are a couple of options for that, one is that if you are on BRT, you would have an additional transfer to make. Safety is always top of mind and factored into all conversations, especially as we talk about the design and process of the project.

CAG Member: Thank you, one last question: is the express services from C-TRAN across downtown considered BRT or not?

Kelly: That would operate as bus on shoulder and then would operate as mixed traffic as it makes its way to downtown.

Lynn Valenter, CAG Co-Chair: I just want to offer that we have a huge slide deck, so a lot of the data is inter-related. So, the things we are talking about now will be covered in the community engagement and Jake's equity presentation.

CAG Member: I understand about the time, but I believe this is important. In the slide you said 78% of the growth in Vancouver was from People of Color yet I look at the 2020 census to 2010 census that shows that Vancouver is 80% white and 3% Black and that's not a change so how did 78% of growth come from that.

Kelly: this is one of the pieces Jake will dive into more in a little more detail.

Jake Warr, IBR Equity Lead: The growth across the country as well as here regionally, has largely been communities of color and 20% is low for Vancouver for communities of color, I think it's closer to 30% and that is a significant change from 2010. If you have numbers and are seeing discrepancies, I'm happy to discuss that with you offline. But yes, that's what we found from the census.

Lynn: I just want to comment again that while it is good for us to have questions and I want people to ask questions I just want people to be aware that we may not get to everything. Are there any other questions?

Lisa: My other thought is, Michael, it seemed like you had a ton of questions so if folks could even write down their questions and we can touch base after the meeting, we want to make sure we are answering the questions and create space for those questions.

FALL COMMUNITY ENAGAGEMENT TRANSIT OPTIONS REPORT

Nicole Sherbert, IBR Community Engagement Lead, provided a high-level summary of the fall community engagement report. She let the group know that a more in-depth review is available on the website and if anyone wants to see the very detailed view that can be provided.

CAG Member: I'm curious on your point that half of all participants elected to skip questions related to transit, does that indicate that transit was unimportant or less important? How do you analyze that?

Nicole: At the end of the survey, we had open ended questions which were all coded and of the 1700 open ended survey comments, 750 of them were about transit. So, what I think it says is that while it is a smaller group of people who are interested, those who are interested are very interested and it's very important to them so we will need to do some transit specific engagement.

Lynn: As a reminder we all received that report if you want to dig in further. I want to call out that in the previous presentation we added two options of different stops in Clark County, and it was reflective of this data.

CAG Member: Nicole, how would we get ahold of you?

Nicole: Jason can send out my email address.

TRANSIT EQUITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

Jake presented the findings of the equity analysis that was done on the different transit investment scenarios.

CAG Member: what hours are being looked at mid-day and why is that the time frame for this?

Jake: Mid-day I believe is 10:00am to 2:00pm and I would have to confirm, but the reason I'm showing midday, and we've also looked at the morning peak, but midday tends to be disproportionately lower income, transit dependent, as opposed to peak period riders. Certainly, these populations ride at all times, but many of these populations may have jobs outside the typical 9-5.

CAG Member: I see that on both this page and the last one, there's a really big difference between B and H when they're both going to the same place. So why is there such a big difference between BRT and LRT?

Jake: It has to do with transfers, in the model and how that operates and essentially where and how they happen. There's a time penalty with BRT and the assumptions with how frequently they run.

CAG Member: Since these are increases, I understand you are trying to show by economic and BIPOC communities, but since they're all increases, it seems to me that J in this situation gives you the 150,000 more jobs so why doesn't that beat the heck out of H that only gives 60,000.

Jake: Just to clarify, the numbers show additional jobs but yes that is what the numbers are saying.

CAG Member: Wouldn't you look at that and say 88% vs 116% is not as beneficial as the others, but if we look at it and say 150,000 vs 27,000 in G that seems like a no brainer.

Jake: The analysis is certainly trying to get to a degree of impact, the degree of benefit. Those numbers are a pretty stark difference, and there are other considerations of course but there are some pretty huge differences in how they perform.

Greg: There are a lot of other factors that will go into the final decision such as cost. There are tradeoffs with each of the decisions, this is just one of the lenses we are looking at this through.

Lynn Valenter: The 45-minute travel time is from the time you get on the bus/LRT to when you get on the transit to your destination or just until you get off?

Jake: It includes walk time, both from your home or where you start, and to your destination.

CAG Member: I just wanted to clarify, I was looking at the map that was shown, on the Washington side one of the largest job creators is Ilani casino so I am wondering if that is part of the area that was evaluated.

Jake: Ilani was not in the area that was analyzed.

WRAP UP AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Lisa reviewed what is coming up in future CAG meetings. The topics include transit mode discussion and questions, community engagement feedback on Hayden Island/Marine Drive, a review of Hayden Island/Marine Drive design options, and community working group feedback from the Hayden/Island Marine Drive working group.

CAG Member: As both states are reducing or eliminating their masking requirements, are you anticipating us meeting in person any time soon?

Lisa: I would love for us to meet in person but for now we really need to respect and honor where both of our DOTs are in terms of their guidance and to the best of my knowledge that guidance has not changed. The virtual space also allows for a lot of access to gather community members to be able to participate and be a part of the conversation.

Lynn: I want to give a huge shout out to all the community advisory group members being willing to essentially double up on meetings, its essential to us being able to do the job asked off us when we joined the CAG but it’s also a huge ask. So, I just want to say that each of you have been very generous and thank you for that. And I want to acknowledge the work of the staff. I’ve seen almost 24/7 work from them to develop thoughtful materials for this presentation. The work of everyone on this call has really made a difference.

CAG Member: I want to echo what Martha and Lynn said. First of all, as we go to a twice a month meeting cadence, I think there will be a greater chance of 100% meeting participation if we have some sort of hybrid event after this pandemic becomes an endemic and we don’t have to social distance or wear masks or get vaccinated anymore. I’ll continue to be cautious, so I would vote for a hybrid approach if at all possible. I want to echo what Lynn said about the staff I feel like this was tremendous work. And just because we’re asking questions about the data is not a reflection of the staff it is more of us wanting to understand since there is so much information to absorb. I really appreciate going through this in detail, it’s not to challenge but rather to understand.

Greg: I’ve been working large complex projects with a lot of public input, and it has been such a treat for me to see how engaged you all are and the great questions that are asked so I just want to make sure you know how appreciated you are in this process. As Lisa said I can’t wait until we can all sit down together in the same room, some of you may know we are building out our office in downtown Vancouver which will have meeting space for us to have hybrid meetings. I look forward to the day we can sit in the same room safely and have these types of intimate conversations. I do want to thank everybody; this is tough work and it’s been over a year that we’ve all been meeting and thank you.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

CAG Co-Chair, Ed Washington, thanked CAG members for their continued engagement and authentic perspectives as the program continues to move forward. The meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

CAG Members or Alternatives

Attendees	Organization
Andrew Hoan	Portland Business Alliance
Ashton Simpson	Oregon Walks
Bill Prows	Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs
Dena Horton	Pacific Northwest Waterways Association
Ed Washington	Co-Chair
Irina Phillips	At-Large Community Member

Jana Jarvis	OR Trucking Association
Jasmine Tolbert	Vancouver NAACP
Javier Navarro	At-Large Community Member
Jeffery Temple	Fred Meyer
Lynn Valenter	Co-Chair
Mark Riker	Washington builder and Trades
Martha Wiley	WA Transit Representative
Michael Kelly	Human Services Council
Michael A. Martin Tellis	Vancouver Neighborhood Association
Robert Camarillo	Oregon Builder and Trades
Ryan Webb	The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Sam Kim	At-Large Community Member
Sarah Hall	At-Large Community member
Sheri Call	WA Trucking Association
Thomas W. Gentry	At-Large Community member
Tom Hickey	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Whitney Mosback	Cowlitz Indian Tribe

Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Organization
Jason Hagen	IBR Program Staff
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
John Willis	IBR Deputy Project Manager
Kelly Betteridge	IBR Transit Design Team
Nicole Sherbert	IBR Community Engagement Lead
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator

Additional Participants

23 members of the public, partner agency staff, and the IBR Team viewed the meeting via the Zoom webinar and the YouTube livestream during the meeting.

MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AyfSDjYMsDA>

February 24, 2022



Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here: <https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/cag-february-24-2022-meeting/>