

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG) MEETING #26

Date and Time: Thursday, June 8th, 2023, 4:00pm – 6:00pm

Location: Zoom Meeting and YouTube Livestream

Number of concurrent YouTube viewers: 66

OUTCOMES

- CAG members gain a better understanding of the program area investments.
- CAG members gain information on the overall design context for Bridge Architecture and discuss what aspects of bridge architecture are important to them as an individual and to the organizations they represent.
- CAG members begin to develop Urban Design Principles
- CAG members receive an update on future meeting topics

WELCOME

- Johnell Bell, CAG Co-Facilitator, welcomed CAG members to the meeting and introduced Ed Washington, CAG Co-Chair, and reminded members to center the space, welcomed members, and previewed the agenda. Members were then encouraged to introduce themselves and share their first job.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE

Ray Mabey, Assistant Program Administrator, shared several updates on the program. Mabey provided updates on the following:

- Neighborhood Forums took place in Vancouver 5/31 and Portland 6/6. They both were successful and had rollout maps, fact sheets, and plenty of staff to answer questions from the community.
- Federal Grant Update: There are three grants being pursued by the project equaling to about \$1.5 billion. We have received funding from Washington, and we are waiting for a funding commitment from Oregon.
- Permitting Update: Environmental policy work is being pursued that leads into the supplemental and environmental impact study. This study will help with understanding the potential impacts of the program and how we might avoid or minimize impacts.
- Presentations
 - Professional Engineers of Oregon
 - ODOT/ACEC Partnering Conference
 - ODOT Surveyors Conference
 - The Columbian Economic Forecast Breakfast
 - Heritage Study Group

- Society of American Military Engineers

Questions:

“Just curious if given some of the changes that were recently passed regarding the NEPA process, if you anticipate that shortening your timeline at all since this was started prior to the passage of that, will this stay on the same timeline that you previously predicted?”

We expect our work to conclude at the end of next year.

“We are in the year 2023 so I imagine we can get a sense and a feel for what these different bridge designs will look and feel like from different vantage points. I guess I feel a little handcuffed at just one spot. I think there’s four angles. But I’m visualizing like being a sim on the computer game and walking across the bridge and seeing what that would look like”

We actually have from each of those types of previous visualizations simulations. We’ll make sure that we are putting that towards the ones that are narrowed down to. We’ve had request for views, like under the bridge, from the bank, and some other viewpoints. As the options are narrowed down, the next step will be how they look and feel. The models are not complete, and work is still underway.

“I have two sets of questions. One has to do with the lift alternative, and you have those big towers how do the new towers affect the height limit that the FAA has? Because to me they look taller than the existing ones. Will the new lifts affect the FAA approval? And, in regard to that, you have shifted the lift from close to Vancouver over one set. So, will that affect the Corps of Engineers and their dredging work there? Will they be able to get through in this new location? If we are trying to manage the coast guard and the FAA surely a thin bridge would be better than a thick one right because then you can have the bottom be higher and the top lower.”

The towers will lift and the complex with FAA and it’s tied to your second question. Yes indeed, we are moving the primary channel a bit south to align with the peak of the bridge across the river. So that’s work we have to do with the Army Corps to switch the barge channel and the primary channel from where they are today. That is part of the permitting process. Shifting it to the south and having those towers does alleviate a lot of those conflicts. The river naturally scours out about 17 feet and that’s what they manage it to. The Corps have the ability to dredge up to 27 feet, but they maintain it to 17 feet. When the old bridge is taken down, we have to remove the existing piers below where they would dredge below and work around those. As you look at the moveable span, we are looking at a lift span for the single level option, not the stacked option, because the very thing you mentioned is that you have that whole superstructure moving up and down. It’s better to have that moveable span on the single level, not only just mechanically but also for the dimension said and the depth clearance.

“My questions were related to the elevation of the bridge. Most of the designs you have is 116 feet is that correct?”

Yes, 116 feet clearance to the bottom of the bridge.

“So, the design that has the lift in it, is that bridge at a lower elevation going across the river?”

Yes, it will be a little lower. We anticipate it could be around 90 and 100 feet. That is still being refined. That allows us to lower that to about the lower deck level of the stacked version where the transit might be. So, we are able to bring that down. That does a couple things for us it reduces the approach rate for

trucks and cars and rail a little bit. It also keeps it high enough that we don't have a lot of bridge lifts. We want to give enough bridge clearance, so we don't have to get through without a lift span.

"My question is around capacity can you confirm if all of the various designs offer the same amount of vehicle capacity?"

We are studying the three through lanes and one auxiliary lane and shoulders. The team wants to make sure we maintain our schedule.

"What's the process and how are you going to decide on a final design? When will you anticipate on having a final design?"

We've heard from the community and our partners, and nobody wants to put a stop sign back on the bridge, but we are studying this in good faith and need to work through the steps to evaluate it. Through the NEPA process it will help determine the bridge type.

URBAN DESIGN

Casey Liles, Laura Langridge, and Rob Turton, IBR Urban Design, provided an update on the design and went into great detail on the roll maps that were used in both neighborhood forums in Vancouver and Portland. The roll map gives you orientation of the program area showing you all the investments that are being studied. The map that is presented talks about the Marine Drive? interchanges and transportation lines. We want to make sure the freeway isn't a barrier to crossing but actually connects neighborhoods. The program is studying from zero to three park and rides in Vancouver.

Question:

"One of the things that I've been questioning in all of this discussion is if there's been some consideration to all of the oversized loads that move from the ports of Vancouver and Longview across the bridge and into routes in Oregon. So, I'm just wondering if this will restrict any of the kind of movement."

We have been working with the port of Vancouver on the existing and any proposed super load type both height, width, and length. One of the constraints running into this program is just getting loads to I-5 for instance. We are looking at all aspects of travel through the corridor, especially from those known elements to the program area. As we design these, we don't have a hard design requirement.

"Is this the same exact footprint as the bridge currently. Are they going to be building and traffic going to continue to flow as they are building a new bridge."

Our goal and commitment are to keep three through-lanes of traffic in each direction moving through the program. There will be times when we impact the traffic.

NEXT PROGRAM MEETINGS:

- Equity Advisory Group – June 26, 2023
- Community Advisory Group – July 13, 2023
- Equity Advisory Group – July 17, 2023
- Equity Advisory Group – August 21, 2023

PUBLIC COMMENT

No comment

ATTENDEES

CAG Members

Attendees	Organization
Ed Washington	CAG Co-Chair
Irina Phillips	At-large community member
Sam Kim	At-large community member
Tom Hickey	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Jeffery Temple	Fred Meyers Kroger
Andrew Hoan	Portland Business Alliance
Bill Prows	Oregon Association of Entrepreneurs
Robin Richardson	At-large community member
Zachary Lauritzen	Oregon Walks
Tom Sandhwar	Clark College
Yolanda Fraser	Vancouver NAACP
Julie Doumbia	At-large community member

Attendees	Organization
Marcus Mundy	Coalition of Communities of Color
Jana Jarvis	President / CEO – Oregon Trucking Association
Martha Wiley	Public transit representative – Washington
Sherri Call	Executive Vice President – Washington Trucking Association
Gerina Hatch	At-large community member
Dena Horton	Government Relations Manager – Pacific Northwest Waterways Association

Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Organization
Ray Mabey	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Casey Liles,	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Rob Turton	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Laura Langridge	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Tom Osborne	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator

Additional Participants

97 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.

June 8, 2023

MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

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

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here: <https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/cag-june-8-2023-meeting/>