

MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Joint Community Advisory Group (CAG) and Equity Advisory Group (EAG)

Date and Time: Monday, April 21, 2025, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

Location: Zoom Meeting and YouTube Livestream

Number of Concurrent YouTube viewers: 21

OUTCOMES

- Welcome and set foundation for joint CAG & EAG meetings.
- Receive an update on recent program activities.
- Receive information about the Section 106 online open house and public comment period.
- Review the Oregon and Washington Departments of Health findings and recommendations from the health analysis they submitted as a public comment on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).

WELCOME & ORIENTATION

Johnell Bell, CAG co-facilitator, opened the meeting with introductory comments. He welcomed Ed Washington and Lynn Valenter, CAG co-chairs. Valenter then welcomed everyone and invited members of the group to introduce themselves.

Washington and Valenter, CAG Co-Chairs, welcomed CAG and EAG members and shared the purpose of holding joint meetings, emphasizing the opportunity to cover shared program topics, support resource sharing and collaboration, and promote shared learning across both advisory groups. Following the welcome, Dr. Hunte, EAG Facilitator, led an advisory group sharing activity that included introductions from CAG and EAG members — sharing names, organizational affiliations or at-large status and pronouns — followed by an icebreaker where participants named one thing they couldn't go a week without.

Lisa Keohokalole Schauer, CAG Co-Facilitator, provided an overview of advisory group roles and foundational priorities. She explained that advisory group members support the program by asking thoughtful questions, requesting information and providing input to guide outcomes. She noted that the EAG focuses on addressing impacts to historically underserved communities, while the Community Advisory Group (CAG) brings voices from Portland and Vancouver to help ensure the program reflects public needs. She also shared CAG priorities, such as expanding river crossing options for all types of travel, supporting informed and cost-effective decisions, promoting economic opportunity, improving climate resilience and reducing congestion. Key community values identified by the CAG included transportation access, protecting natural and cultural resources, honoring local history, encouraging regional collaboration and engaging all affected communities in meaningful ways.

Dr. Hunte, EAG Facilitator, introduced the Results-Based Accountability framework that guides the Equity Advisory Group's work. She emphasized that from the outset, the EAG has prioritized a results-driven approach focused on accountability and meaningful outcomes for impacted communities. This includes defining desired

Apr. 21, 2025

outcomes, identifying metrics for measuring success and aligning strategies with available resources. She highlighted the importance of ensuring that transportation systems serve everyone fairly and noted that infrastructure projects have the potential to reshape communities — making it essential to ensure access to project benefits.

Valenter, shared upcoming summer meeting topics, noting that while spring topics are still being finalized, summer meetings will focus on developing Guidance for Architectural Elements. The design team will introduce this task, review past work, present initial ideas on corridor design character and gather feedback from advisory group members to inform them about the next design phase. Valenter also introduced a Mentimeter poll to gather input on preferred meeting days, times and potential scheduling constraints for future joint meetings.

PROGRAM UPDATE

Greg Johnson, IBR Program Administrator, provided an update on the progress of the IBR Program. He highlighted recent outreach activities, including tours for middle school students, youth events and presentations to groups like Oregon Business and Industry and the Construction Management Association. He emphasized the program's focus on workforce development, including potential partnerships for pre-apprenticeship programs and career pathways in transportation and construction. Johnson also shared the latest timeline, with construction expected to begin in 2026. He noted ongoing efforts to secure federal grants, including a potential \$1 billion grant for light rail extension.

During the discussion, advisory group members asked questions about toll rates, the light rail extension, increased vehicle miles traveled and cost estimates. Program staff explained that toll rates are still being considered, with current estimates ranging from \$1.55 to \$4.70, but no decisions have been made. Staff reaffirmed the program's commitment to the modified locally preferred alternative for light rail, while noting some opposition in Clark County. In response to concerns about increased vehicle miles traveled, staff highlighted the program's goal to reduce solo driving by providing options like light rail and improved bike and pedestrian connections. When a member representing the trucking industry asked about cost estimate impacts related to tariffs, staff noted that a cost estimate validation process will be underway soon to account for economic changes, with updated estimates expected later this year.

SECTION 106 UPDATE

Hayli Reff, IBR Cultural Resources Manager, provided an overview of the Section 106 process. This process is a key requirement of the National Historic Preservation Act and runs alongside NEPA. It focuses on identifying and addressing adverse effects to historic properties and cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects. Hayli outlined the four steps of the Section 106 process: initiating the process, identifying historic properties, assessing effects and reaching a resolution. She also shared upcoming milestones related to the Programmatic Agreement (PA), including the recent completion of a draft PA, an upcoming public comment period expected to begin in early May through an online open house and preparation of the final PA. The final PA will be executed before the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is released and will be included as an appendix. Reff highlighted the importance of continuing coordination with PA signatories and consulting parties to carry out the commitments in the agreement.

Apr. 21, 2025

During the discussion, an advisory group member asked for a specific date for the public comment period. Reff responded that the team was aiming for the first week of May but could not confirm an exact date yet.

INTRODUCTION TO HEALTH ANALYSIS

Chris Regan, IBR Environmental Manager, introduced the health analysis that was conducted independently from the program as a response to community requests for a health review. He highlighted that the program requested an independent review from Oregon and Washington local counties serving the IBR Program area. Regan noted the community's previous concerns, including impacts on commuters, freight transporters, air and water quality, noise pollution and limited air quality data.

HEALTH ANALYSIS

Alyssa Shaw, MSW, Environmental Health Assessment Team Lead and Anna Caudill, MPH, Environmental Health Evaluations Specialist, presented the health analysis. They examined six key topic areas: air quality, transportation, noise, climate and health, social determinants of health and water quality. The team emphasized their focus on health equity and environmental justice throughout their analysis. The health analysis team identified several findings. They projected a 33% increase in vehicle miles traveled by 2045 regionally and highlighted potential negative health impacts, including air quality concerns and community displacement. Their top recommendation was to "keep health at the table" and take a "health in all policies" approach, which means considering how the built environment shapes community health. They recommended involving public health partners, community representatives and decision-makers throughout the project. The team suggested prioritizing sustainability, transparency and communication. Potential positive impacts included improved nonmotorized transportation and increased green spaces. They also noted areas requiring more information, such as detailed air quality modeling and understanding potential demolition impacts. The analysis aimed to bridge the gap between environmental impact assessment and specific health consequences.

During the discussion, advisory group members raised several questions. A member expressed concern about the 33% increase in vehicle miles traveled and its implications for air quality. Another member asked about transit access disparities. Program staff responded that the program aims to provide alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle trips. Another question was asked about air quality receptor locations, the presenters acknowledged the need for more localized air quality monitoring. The health analysis team emphasized that their findings were based on the Draft SEIS and were meant to provide constructive recommendations for improving health outcomes throughout the program.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A Hayden Island resident shared concerns about the potential economic impact of tolling on his low-income neighborhood and expressed fears that businesses could close and the area could become a "food desert." He also asked how to become more involved in the community collaboration process and how his neighborhood could be better represented. Another commenter emphasized the importance of in-person meetings and expressed dissatisfaction with IBR's current engagement approach. She noted the absence of community forums and neighborhood association meetings. The commenter suggested a third bridge corridor as an alternative.

Apr. 21, 2025

CAG and EAG Member Participants

Participants	Organization
Aidan Gronauer	WSDOT
Brenda Martin	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Chandra Washington	C-TRAN
Ed Washington	CAG Co-Chair
Hayley Watson	Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council
Irina Phillips	At-large Community Member
Jay Clark	Portland Metro Chamber
Jennifer Campos	SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
Jonathan Eder	Port of Vancouver
John Gardner	TriMet
Julie Doumbia	At-large Community Member
June Reyes	Port of Portland
Lynn Valenter	CAG Co-Chair
Martha Wiley	Public transit representative – Washington
Nikki Chen	City of Vancouver
Robin Richardson	At-large Community Member
Sam Kim	At-large Community Member
Sebrina Owens-Wilson	Metro
Sheri Call	Washington Trucking Association
Shona Carter	At-large Community Member
Sokho Eath	IRCO

Apr. 21, 2025

Participants	Organization
Tom Hickey	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Tom Sandhwar	Clark College
Vicki Nakashima	At-large Community Member
Zachary Lauritzen	Oregon Walks

Facilitators and Presenters

Staff Name	Role
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Meghan Hodges	IBR Community and Government Relations Manager
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Co-facilitator
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-facilitator
Dr. Roberta Hunte	IBR EAG Facilitator
Hayli Reff	IBR Cultural Resources Manager
Alyssa Shaw	MSW, Environmental Health Assessment Team Lead
Anna Caudill	MPH, Environmental Health Evaluations Specialist
Chris Regan	IBR Environmental Manager
Daryl Wendle	Deputy Program manager
Hannah Williams	IBR Community Engagement Team

Additional Attendees

- Fabian Hidalgo Guerrero, CAG Lead
- Fabiola Casa, EAG Lead
- Amanda Hart, IBR staff, tech support
- ASL interpreters: Andrea Medlock & Amanda Wilkes
- Close Captioner: Lauren Shirley

Apr. 21, 2025

MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

<https://www.youtube.com/live/QipWltHBiC0?si=veGzByHUAVZk7th1>

Meeting Materials

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/cag-plus-eag-april-21-2025/>