

## MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting #32

Date and Time: Thursday, January 11th, 2024 / 4:00 – 6:00pm

Location: Zoom Meeting and YouTube Livestream

Number of concurrent YouTube viewers: 23

## OUTCOMES

- Receive an update on recent program activities.
- Collectively review the takeaways of the community benefits visioning discussion from the December CAG meeting.
- Provide input for the design team on the Vancouver Waterfront Transit Station to help ensure community perspectives are taken into consideration as station details are developed.

## WELCOME & PROGRAM UPDATE

Lisa Keohokalole Schauer, Community Advisory Group (CAG) co-facilitator, opened the first meeting of 2024 and invited Johnell Bell, CAG co-facilitator, to provide introductory comments. Keohokalole Schauer reviewed instructions to access closed captioning, meeting participation tips, ASL interpretation reminders, public input instructions, and CAG meeting space reminders. Keohokalole Schauer continued by reviewing an agenda for the meeting and asked Ed Washington and Lynn Valenter, CAG co-chairs, to further welcome the group and invited CAG members to introduce themselves by answering a prompt: *If the Interstate Bridge had a theme song, what do you think it would be?*

Ray Mabey, Interstate Bridge Replacement (IBR) Assistant Program Administrator, began by sharing ways the program has been active and highlighted a roundtable and bridge tour with the state of Washington's U.S. Senators Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell as a celebration for the \$600 million Mega Grant. Mabey emphasized the significant role the CAG and other community partnerships played in helping secure the grant, in addition to the technical work. Mabey continued by sharing that Greg Johnson, IBR Program Administrator, and Frank Green, IBR Assistant Program Administrator, could not join the CAG meeting because they were in Olympia, Washington, meeting with the Washington's Senate Transportation Committee during the state legislative work session. He shared that they would be presenting and discussing the program, funding and the Mega Grant award, as well as the program's schedule.

Mabey reported that the program met with the Yakama Nation Tribal Council in Eastern Washington last week, along with federal partners such as the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration. During this meeting, Mabey presented progress on the program's Section 106 Historic

Resources and Cultural Resources work. Describing the session as positive, Mabey highlighted valuable feedback and active participation from the general counsel and staff. Approximately 15 tribal general counsel and staff members were in attendance.

Mabey went on to share details of the program's third Bi-State Legislative Committee meeting held within a month. There was a focus on addressing ongoing inquiries from the committee and ensuring that the program attended to matters raised in previous meetings and to deliver comprehensive updates on the program's ongoing initiatives. Mabey underscored that there was a deliberate effort to concentrate on the program's endeavors in preparing the community to provide feedback on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), anticipated for release in the spring. Despite having three closely scheduled Bi-State Legislative Committee meetings, they proved to be highly successful, with meaningful dialogues.

Mabey reported on recent community presentations, including one to the East Portland Rotary and listening sessions with community-based organizations. These interactions reached groups typically underrepresented in projects — individuals living with disabilities, Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC), those with low income, and youth. Mabey emphasized the value of these meetings and the program's continued efforts to leverage connections for broader community outreach.

Mabey also provided an update on the program's funding status. He shared that the \$6 billion estimated program cost is based on comprehensive estimates considering escalation, inflation, and risk mitigation. To address this estimated total cost, the program relies on diverse funding sources, including local and federal funds, alongside tolling. Tolling is intended to address congestion but primarily to finance the bridge improvements, emphasizing them as a "bridge toll," since funds will be dedicated to the bridge replacement. The U.S. Department of Transportation Mega Program granted \$600 million, offering flexibility beyond traditional highway use funds. An application for a \$1.5 billion Bridge Investment Program Grant is pending, with expectations for a spring announcement. Additionally, a billion-dollar grant is being sought from the Federal Transit Administration for transit costs. Mabey mentioned the funding pie chart includes state contributions, toll funding, and a significant amount of federal grant funding, marking a departure from past efforts.

Mabey paused for questions.

CAG member question: What happens when the bonding that is being paid for by the tolling is paid off? Is that in five, ten, thirty, fifty years? What happens to tolling rates and where does that revenue go?

- Mabey response: The toll revenue will be used to sell bonds, accelerating payment for the program. The typical payback period for these bonds is around 35 years. After that, decisions regarding tolling will be made by future state commissions and legislatures.

CAG member question: Adding up the numbers you just showed, they come out to about \$5.9 or \$6 billion. And I believe we've seen slides in the past where the estimate is about \$5.5 to \$7 billion. If the cost does get closer to \$7 billion, what does the \$1 billion difference account for?

- Mabey response: The estimated range is between \$5.5 and \$7.5 billion, with the most likely being about \$6 billion. We'll be providing annual updates that will include risk-based estimates and inflation monitoring. We know things will change, but we are carefully considering ways to minimize cost increases including efficient project management, contracting approaches, constructability reviews, and value engineering workshops to make efficient and cost-effective design approaches. The program will continue to explore other funding sources, including federal grants to address any potential cost increases.

CAG member question: The range you just quoted is the estimate that has been shared previously, not the new 2024 estimate, is that correct?

- Mabey response: Correct. We are currently producing a cost estimate and evaluating different construction approaches to understand cash flow and details over time. The program plans to revisit and validate the estimate in late spring and early summer, considering factors like economic trends and potential risks. We are working under the assumption that we will see an increase of around 3.5% over the next three years, but that might change, and we account for that in our estimates.

CAG member question: What plans do we have in 2024 to increase political visibility in Oregon?

- Mabey response: We appreciate the attention and input from the Oregon congressional delegation and influence they have. We actively keep their offices informed, offering program area tours to their staff over the past year and maintaining regular communication. The recent involvement of Senator Cantwell and Senator Murray was in response to Washington's role in securing the Mega Grant, given that the Washington Department of Transportation submitted the grant on behalf of both states. The Bridge Investment Program Grant is being submitted by Oregon on behalf of both states. If we are fortunate enough to come out with a win, I would anticipate similar activities happening on the Oregon side. We engage with both congressional delegations.

Keohokalole Schauer introduced the next agenda item and shared Mabey would be staying with the group through the meeting, in case members have additional questions.

## VISIONING EXERCISE RECAP

Bell began by expressing gratitude for the participation in the community benefits exercise during December's CAG meeting. Bell shared highlights and key points from the group's discussion, covering categories aligned with equity objectives. He shared the highlights that were discussed under "Avoid Further Harm," included discussions on the impact of tolling implementation and its economic implications, urging data collection on traffic, congestion, and emissions, the importance of avoiding harm to marginalized groups, clear communication for businesses, proper signage reflecting historical information, comprehensive details beyond pavement, and ongoing education on public transportation. The "Community Benefits" category sparked discussions on parks, economic growth, river access and LGBTQ+ community inclusion, framing the

program as a bridge connecting communities. He reported under “Mobility and Accessibility,” talks centered on smart infrastructure, safety, congestion solutions, LGBTQ+ accessibility, bridging opportunities for diverse communities, enhancing freight capacity and promoting environmental benefits. Bell concluded with a mention of ongoing work and sharing there will be updates at the next CAG meeting. Bell thanked members for contributing to the program's overarching community benefits vision. Bell then transitioned to the next section focusing on Vancouver Waterfront Transit Station.

## VANCOUVER WATERFRONT TRANSIT STATION

Matt Deml, IBR Design Team, began by expressing his excitement about discussing design concepts for the Vancouver waterfront transit station as the program and community anticipated the release of the Draft SEIS. Describing the Draft SEIS as defining the program's "sandbox," Deml explained the team will be introducing concepts applicable within the range of alternatives discussed in the draft SEIS. The Vancouver Waterfront Station presentation marks the beginning of a series of meetings dedicated to discussing transit stations along the corridor. The team will share design concepts and encourage feedback on how these concepts meet CAG values, needs, general likes and dislikes. Deml then handed it over to Nolan Lienhart and Mahlon Clements for further discussion on the draft concepts.

Nolan Lienhart, IBR Design Team, began by emphasizing the need for preferences or concerns about the presented concepts, as well as the importance of hearing questions from the community. Some questions may be answered immediately, while others will be considered during the design development. The current focus is on the Vancouver Waterfront Station, with plans to discuss other stations in subsequent meetings. Lienhart acknowledged the significance of community values and priorities, which form the foundation of their design work. He mentioned while not all values may apply to every design conversation, the team encourages community input on how the concepts align with these values.

Lienhart continued by briefly explaining that the program corridor is broken up into seven focus areas. The presentation is set within the context of focus area E, covering Vancouver Waterfront Station and lower downtown. Focus areas include spaces around stations, interchanges, or cohesive neighborhoods, acknowledging some boundaries have natural overlaps. Lienhart then shifted to the Vancouver Waterfront Station area, highlighting its diverse urban characteristics. Previous discussions included photographs illustrating some differences and proposed program elements, such as the extension of Main Street. He recalled that his team collected community input on how the program can enhance and respond to distinct characteristics of that area. Lienhart concluded and introduced Mahlon Clements to walk through the Vancouver Waterfront station design concepts.

Mahlon Clements, IBR Design Team, began his presentation by highlighting the uniqueness of the four stations within the program. Of the four stations, the Vancouver Waterfront Station is anticipated to be one of the most unique within the program corridor, and possibly within North America due to elevation needs. He emphasized that the presented diagrams are still high-level and cautioned that it's too early for detailed form and character discussions. The team has explored various options to narrow down factors impacting the

station. He shared the team has identified three main configurations (Concept A, Concept B and Concept C) and are working toward identifying a preferred configuration. Concept A depicts the station located north of the South-bound I-5 lane, with the right side of the diagram-oriented North and the left side of the diagram oriented towards the Columbia River. He explained that while the context of streets would need to be modified, the basic orientation of the streets would remain the same. The team is considering two options for the transit platform. One would straddle the Burlington Northern Railroad, the other would stay entirely south of it. He shared the proposed platform locations were identified by considering proximity to the next station, the bridge, and Waterfront Development, as well as constraints related to the different bridge design options.

Clements provided further explanation of the diagram. The platform area is indicated in orange, circulation area in lighter orange or yellow, and blue is used for elevators and stairs. Given the station's height, two elevators at each entrance are suggested for accessibility and redundancy.

Next, Clements showcased a diagram view of the station from the ground, which is oriented similarly to the previous diagram. The elevators are situated in an area commonly referred to as the station plaza. The future plaza area is not intended for fare enforcement, however individuals in this area are expected to be either using the station or meeting someone there.

Clements stated a vital aspect of the program is the mobility connections, so there's more work to be done to determine precise locations and requirements of those connections. As a starting point, three types of buses are being considered. The first are local buses, represented by a small bus icon. Discussions with C-Tran are underway to understand the desired future service for this location. The second are paratransit vans, represented by a 'C'. The third is the BRT system, represented by a 'V'. The Vine requires a separate location due to operational differences, including platform level, sidewalk, and shelters. While there's flexibility in their placement, it's crucial to include them in the discussions.

Additionally, Clements notes passenger pickup and drop-off locations are indicated by a blue car icon. Currently, the icon encompasses various transportation modes, like taxis and Uber. Next steps involve figuring out the required space which appears to be available in this location. It's important to note that much of the information just described applies to concepts B and C with minor differences. From many perspectives, these three options can be considered essentially the same, especially regarding crucial elements like connections and mobility.

Clements continued sharing noteworthy elements of the station. The north-side entrance is situated along Phil-Arnold Way, and will continue on and become the on ramp for HWY 514. The station location also includes a program component calling for a park and ride facility. Specific locations are under consideration, including one on the south end represented by a red dash line. Another option involves placing the park and ride facility under the bridge, necessitating a reconfiguration of southeast Columbia Way. While this program component hasn't been confirmed, it's crucial to be aware of it as a possibility. Therefore, all considerations for station locations focus on ensuring a safe and comfortable connection to that park and ride facility. Clements paused for CAG member questions.

CAG member question: Is the parking garage elevated, underground, or at grade?

- Design Team response: The parking garage would be above grade, that is what is being considered.

CAG member question: Will the area in green be open to public access, or is that fenced off? How does the railroad interact with the public right there?

- Design Team response: It is currently undetermined what this space will be. Right now, there's a building on this side of the railroad, and there's fencing on the other side. We've been assuming that the fencing will remain.
- CAG member: So, you're not considering a public space between the two elevator shafts?
- Design Team response: No, there would not be any connection between the two spaces between the elevators. Someone would have to walk around, following the streets. That's one of the reasons we felt it's important to have two elevators at each entrance. Because unlike a station location where you can see both elevator entrances easily, it may be a hardship to go between them.
- CAG member: I recommend that the drawings convey a different color background for those because they read as park spaces and that could be confusing.

Mabey interjected with a brief clarification about right-of-way considerations. Since designs are currently in draft, the program does not currently have definitive plans for acquisition. The program is actively exploring opportunities to avoid and minimize right-of-way impacts.

CAG member question: I really appreciate the multiple elevators for pedestrian access and accessibility in general. Note that there are often cases where one elevator gets out and it becomes completely inaccessible. Looking at the map, does it show the new Hurley building, on the north side of the tracks?

- Mabey response: I believe that's the building in that location or near it. As I stated earlier, we are looking at design options and refinements to understand and document impacts in the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, which is due out in spring. So, we've got work underway that will document that and our findings.
- CAG member question: So, we'll hear more specifics about the location and impacts on buildings later?
- Mabey response: Yes.

CAG member comment: I would like to see the railroad right of way by the fence shown in a different color. Right now, it looks like it's part of the surrounding green space. It's not accessible as shown.

- Design Team response: Yes, noted.
- Mabey response: Yes. Railroad has safety and security concerns. So, I think that's a really good comment.

CAG member question: Can you get from the northbound platform to the southbound platform in all three of these scenarios without going back down?

- Design Team response: Yes. There is a symbol at each of the platforms to indicate a ramp, a very gentle slope ramp, because the platform must be higher than the tracks. If you come out of the elevators and you're going southbound into Portland, you would go to the south-bound platform and catch your train. If you are going towards Evergreen, you'd cross the tracks to the northbound platform. If you're coming from Portland and miss your stop at Hayden Island and need to go back south, you would get off on the northbound platform, crossover, and catch the train back south.

CAG member question: In an earlier meeting, I recall that we weren't supportive of a park and ride in central Vancouver, because of land use and economic development reasons. Has that changed?

- Design Team response: Right now, we are showing the range of alternatives, and that discussion is pertinent and still very valid. This is to ensure that we are showing the range of what is being studied in the Draft SEIS.

Clements continued his presentation describing Concept B, which positions the station in the same general location, aligned with the passenger platform and across from Burlington Northern. However, it features a center platform, requiring the tracks to split and come back together. At ground level, this design limits flexibility for entrance placement, but it ensures that passengers never have to cross the tracks. The entrances include two elevators and stairs at each end, along with a plaza space. Various other structures like signals and communication facilities, as well as a traction power substation, are also depicted for comprehensive planning.

Option C, the third and most distinct choice, relocates the entire station south of Burlington Northern's right-of-way. Despite concerns about building over the railroad, this option was evaluated. Due to a 10-foot clearance requirement for regular maintenance, the design alters the northbound platform. While it's not ideal, considering the limited waiting in that area, it remains a valid consideration. Similar to Option A, it features a side platform. However, there's insufficient space for a center platform. Notably, there's also limited room for an additional entrance at the south end due to ongoing site development.

For this option, as presented by Clements, the main entrance, likely common across all options, is expected at the corner of Columbia Street and Southeast Columbia Way. Emergency exits are considered, featuring stairways for emergency use only. As the structure descends to ground level, the primary entrance remains at the designated corner. There won't be an entrance south of Southeast Columbia Way, requiring waterfront visitors to walk along the route to access the station.

Clements continued by highlighting the view in this section, providing a view through the structure. Earlier, someone mentioned Burlington Northern, and it's evident in this illustration that the tracks are elevated. When walking along the street, pedestrians pass under a bridge. The image depicts the south entrance area and the north entrance area, highlighting the platform's elevation compared to the street level. The stairs offer access, although it's a significant climb. Despite the inclusion of a public staircase serving as an emergency egress, we anticipate most people will opt for the elevators.

In Concept C, the entire station is located south of the Burlington Northern railroad tracks, features two separate platforms, similar to Concept A, and locates both elevators on the north-side of the platforms. At the ground level, the platform entrance would be located at the corner of SE Columbia Way and Columbia Street.

Next, Clements described two diagrams of the three concepts from a different perspective. He highlighted the height of the platform in relation to the ground and how pedestrians would move around the station. While weather protection details are not shown, it's worth noting that, given the station's height and proximity to the bridge, extensive weather protection is recommended, especially over passenger areas. Clements then moved to questions.

CAG member comment and question: I feel like Concept C is well suited for access to the Vancouver Waterfront but less well suited for access to downtown Vancouver. It may cause a psychological barrier related to having the access point on the far south side of the railroad tracks, and whether that feels less usable to people coming in from the north (at a street-level). But that's a subtlety of psychological management of the clientele. A question I had is: is there room for public lavatories in these buildings?

- Design Team response: We had initially thought there was probably greater value in having an entrance on both sides, which seems intuitive. However, because of the location of freeway on and off ramps, there won't be direct public access to get to the north side platform entrance from downtown. Pedestrians will be able to walk down Main Street and cross, but there isn't a lot of catchment area there. If most people approach the station along Columbia Street from downtown, they would get to the corner of Columbia and Phill Arnold Way. From there, it's almost the same distance to either entrance. Now, the north-side entrance would be more visible. And so, it would probably feel more accessible. But in general, the actual distance wouldn't be that much greater. But that's certainly an observation that we're considering as we look at these options and evaluate. Bathrooms are not currently part of any of our fixed programs.
- Design Team response: TriMet stations usually do not have public restrooms. If restrooms are not part of the standard transit package, it could be something that the City of Vancouver or the City of Portland potentially decides to add nearby.
- CAG member comment: I would suggest that it be a topic of conversation that not be put aside.
- Design Team response: Definitely.



CAG member question: On the concept diagrams, there are little green dots that are not shown in the legend. What are those?

- Design Team response: Those are indicating bike facilities, which will be part of all the transit stations. How many are needed is not yet decided. So generally, space is provided for additions. We recognize the need to have some sort of secure storage. At a minimum, a rack to lock your bike onto. At the other end of the spectrum some transit stations have a full facility that even has space for bicycle maintenance. This should be an ongoing conversation as the program develops.

CAG member question: Again, looking at concept diagrams, there is a gray band at the top. Is that the bridge?

- Design Team response: Yes. What is being depicted here is the stacked bridge. The highway bridge is at a higher elevation. These concepts are applicable to the other design options. So, in the single level bridge option, the guideway structure would be very close in elevation to the highway structure.
- CAG member question: Max lines go reasonably close to the bridge and to the freeway. Can you explain the relationship between the road and the Max?
- Design Team response: What I'm hearing is a great suggestion, in addition to showing the side elevation, we could show a cut through from different perspectives to show how much protection would be needed on the platform.

CAG member question: Would you be willing to mock-up bicycle or pedestrian ramps to get to those stations?

- Design Team response: We have considered how to bring the shared use path onto the platform level and how many people would be riding northbound on their bikes to get on the light rail to go southbound. In general, there would need to be rather extensive ramping to get up there. And we may not actually have space. There is a planned shared use path that comes off the east side of the bridge, but it needs to make a big loop to come down and meet the ground. A different approach might be to maintain a shared use path at the same height as the platform. It's important to note that accessibility ramps haven't been shown at this location. While it's a consideration at Hayden Island station, issues arise when dealing with a 75-foot elevation, making it impractical to have ramping that ascends 75 feet due to the one-to-12 slope requirement.
- Design Team question: Could you say more about your thoughts on bikes using the platforms?
- CAG member: I'm thinking about bikes and the barrier that's created when elevators are out. So having alternatives for people is always highly valuable. I appreciate the redundancy in the elevators and I'm curious what that would look like. Given the substantial investment in this project, I'm enthusiastic about ensuring that our active transportation community always has access. It would be great to see what that might look like from your team, facilitating a discussion on whether it's worth it.

- Design Team response: It's important to note that, as previously mentioned, no decisions have been made yet. However, the elevators we're using are large enough to accommodate bikes. There might be a question about exceptionally large cargo bikes, but generally, it's been discussed. We're depicting two generic elevators, but the larger size is intentional. At least one elevator needs to be large enough for emergencies.

CAG member question: It was mentioned that two areas were possibly designated for drop-offs and/or pickups. Considering that traffic could be coming from Columbia Street to downtown Vancouver, as well as Third and West, I'm wondering if the area will be spacious enough. I can envision potential traffic jams in both directions, with people dropping off or picking others up. It reminds me of scenes at the airport, where individuals disembark from the train after work or prepare to go to work, navigating the course of cars picking up pedestrians. While they can use elevators or stairs, I'm curious if there's adequate space for cars to enter, stop and drop off or pick up someone. Is this aspect being taken into consideration?

- Design Team response: We haven't delved into the details of how much curb space we'll need for this, but it will certainly be addressed at some point. Typically, there's a hierarchy in mobility priorities, with paratransit taking precedence, followed by bus service and then individual auto drop-offs. In general, it seems there's a significant amount of curb space available. The most desirable curb space, naturally, is curbside space where people don't need to cross the street. However, there will be safe crossings provided. As the program progresses, there will be further engagement and collaboration with the City of Vancouver to determine the allocation and extent of space designated for drop-offs.
- CAG member comment: It's important because I've had experiences in Portland. For example, the Hollywood transit station gets quite congested with traffic, especially with the businesses around there. As well as in the Lloyd Center area. It can really cause issues. Thank you.
- Design Team response: That's a good comment to capture.

Bell introduced the discussion questions:

What questions do you have? What design elements from each concept align with the community values and priorities? The ones that you all have created in the program has been using? Are there changes to each station concept you would like to see consider beyond some that you've already indicated, which has been terrific feedback. And what would you like to hear from other IBR advisory groups, for example, the Equity Advisory Group (EAG) and the Community Benefits Advisory Group (CBAG).

Bell then opened the conversation up for additional questions:

CAG member question: I would like to focus more on the fourth point, the Equity Advisory Group. I think many of the questions we had overlapped with some of the concerns that group might have. I would be interested in hearing their perspective on the connections for pedestrians and bicycles to the station directly. More specifically, there must be a plan for how you get down the bridge if you're going on foot or by bicycle. And

then the Community Benefits Advisory group (CBAG) – I would anticipate the CBAG would be weighing in significantly on those elements of the public plaza and some of the amenities and connections there.

CAG member comment: We've been waiting for this type of presentation. I take my hat off to Mabey and his team because, to the average person, it looks very simple. They say, "Well, just do this or just do that." But when you look at the amount of space that they have to work in, one problem or one opportunity creates another issue. The issue of bathrooms, the issue of elevators. So, I appreciate the team's challenges.

CAG member question: My concern is the height of the platform. Especially in the fall and winter, it's very windy. So, what will people feel on the platform waiting for the train that high up? After this presentation, I do not feel comfortable. I am not sure how welcoming this setup is going to be for the people who are using transit.

- Design Team response: We have included wind screens. Once we get to a higher level of design, we will be able to think about exactly what the form of those wind screens are. But it's certainly been a focus of our thinking. Additionally, we have the technology to do modeling to understand how best to deflect wind so that people waiting on the platform are not feeling the full brunt of the Columbia River winds.

CAG member comment: The team had mentioned earlier about making a presentation to the disabilities group. I would be interested to hear what their comments are on these concepts.

- Bell response: That's excellent feedback and something we can work on with our Community Engagement team.
- Mabey comment: I just wanted to say thank you, to all the great comments. I sincerely appreciate everything that's been shared by everyone here. Thank you.

CAG member question: Are there any opportunities outside of providing public comment at this meeting, or setting up a one-on-one with the IBR staff? Are there any opportunities for the business community, specifically in the downtown area in this program area in Vancouver, to connect with you all, similar to the focus groups and listening sessions that you've done for other priority populations?

- Mabey response: As we think of development in North Portland and Vancouver, we will continue to communicate and engage with communities. As we get your feedback, engagement with the business community and partners will be key as well. One thing that will help trigger that will be the release of the Draft SEIS. We are always open to office hours or requests by different community and business organizations to present and share information. I'm not sure where we are on the docket with the downtown businesses right now. But we can make sure we provide an opportunity.

Bell transitioned to provide dates for upcoming advisory group meetings and gratitude to the design team for their presentation. Next, he shared public comment instructions. No public comment provided. Bell invited the co-chairs to give closing remarks.

Valenter shared words of gratitude for everyone’s participation. She additionally shared reminders to review the slides that were shared in advance and encouraged members to provide their feedback or any comments and questions they may have.

Washington expressed his gratitude for everyone’s input and appreciated the presentation, highlighting its role in meeting people’s expectations to see the program’s details. He acknowledged the opportunity it provides to understand the challenges faced by planners in such a substantial program, thanking everyone for their patience and insightful questions.

Keohokalole Schauer reflected on the advisory group orientation held three years ago that included both the Equity Advisory Group and the Community Advisory Group. She expressed gratitude for CAG members’ continued participation. Anticipating a significant year, Lisa highlighted the CAG's crucial role in engaging with the public during the forthcoming Draft SEIS process.

Mabey agreed with Keohokalole Schauer, praising the dedication and contributions of the CAG members, acknowledging the effective leadership and coordination within the group. He anticipated more detailed discussions ahead, encouraging active involvement from all members. Mabey concluded by wishing everyone a Happy New Year and expressing optimism about the upcoming year.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was provided.

## ATTENDEES

### CAG Member Participants

Participants	Organization
Bill Prows	Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs
Darcy Hoffman	Workforce SW WA
Dena Horton	PNWA
Ed Washington	CAG Co-Chair
Gerina Hatch	Community in Motion

Participants	Organization
Irina Phillips	At-large Community Member
Julie Doumbia	At-large Community Member
Lynn Valenter	CAG Co-Chair
Martha Wiley	Public Transit Representative - WA
Robert Camarillo	Oregon State Building and Construction Trade Council
Robin Richardson	At-large Community Member
Sam Kim	At-large Community Member
Sheri Call	Executive Vice President – Washington Trucking Association
Tom Hickey	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Tom Sandhwar	At-large Community Member
Zachary Lauritzen	Oregon Walks

### Facilitators and Presenters

Staff Name	Role
Ray Mabey	IBR Assistant Program Administrator
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Mahlon Clements	IBR Design Team
Matt Deml	IBR Design Team
Nolan Lienhart	IBR Design Team

## Additional Attendees

- Fabian Hidalgo Guerrero, IBR CAG Lead
- Mara Enciu Garrett, IBR staff, tech support
- ASL interpreters: Abel and Tara
- Close Captioner: Emily

## MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

### Meeting Recording

<https://www.youtube.com/live/IOaJhxtY4W8?si=a8lwF524-XzWqxzc>

### Meeting Materials

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/cag-january-11-2024-meeting/>