

COMMUNITY BENEFITS ADVISORY GROUP (CBAG)

MEETING SUMMARY #13

Date and Time: Thursday, September 26, 2024 / 9:30 – 11:30 am

Location: Hybrid (In-person and Zoom Meeting) and [YouTube livestream](#)

Number of concurrent YouTube viewers: 17

OUTCOMES

- CBAG members reviewed and refined potential community benefits recommendations in the Avoid Further Harm category.

WELCOME

Emilee Thomas-Peralta, Equity Team and Co-facilitator, opened the September 2024 CBAG meeting. She then reviewed instructions to access closed captioning, meeting participation tips, ASL interpretation reminders, public input instructions, and group agreements.

Shannon Singleton, Community Benefits Lead, provided instructions on the IBR office emergency procedures.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, welcomed attendees and thanked them for their participation.

City of Vancouver Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle and City of Portland Bureau of Transportation Director Millicent Williams extended a warm welcome to everyone.

Singleton and Thomas-Peralta led a round of introductions by asking members to share their names, organizational affiliation or at-large status, and pronouns if they wished. Members also answered a check-in question, “What do you pack first when going on a trip?” as part of their introductions.

Thomas-Peralta then provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Thomas-Peralta explained how to provide public comments, as well as how to submit comments after the meeting. One written public comment was submitted prior to the meeting and was included in the CBAG member’s meeting packet.

Singleton moderated the public comments.

There were three members of the public present to provide public comments.

When asked if he joined to make a public comment, Michael Campbell responded that he found the Zoom meeting link on YouTube and decided to join to see what was being discussed.

September 26, 2024

Bob Ortblad, who identified himself as a Washington resident and civil engineer expressed concerns about the omission of realistic graphics for the proposed bridge approaches in the Draft Supplemental Environment Impact Statement (DSEIS). He suggested an independent evaluation of an immersed tunnel alternative, citing its benefits over the current bridge proposal.

Karen Gibson, a resident living near the Interstate 5 freeway, provided in person public comment and urged the group to consider harm reduction measures, as the proposed sound wall construction would be very close to her home, potentially causing significant disruption.

PROGRAM UPDATES

Program Administrator Johnson shared the following program updates:

- **Publication of the Draft SEIS:** The 60-day public comment period runs from September 20 to November 18, 2024. The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement was released last Friday, and thousands of public comments are expected during this period.
- **Upcoming Section 106 Online Open House:** A 30-day public comment period will be held from October 18 to November 18, 2024.
- **Bridge Tour:** Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Administrator Veronica Vanterpool visited for a bridge tour while in town for the Better Red project opening. She was impressed with the progress made and acknowledged the critical support her staff provided in publishing the Draft SEIS document. The visit was an opportunity to express mutual appreciation for the hard work of both teams.
- **Community Engagement:** The program engaged with the community through presentations and summer events to inform the public, gather feedback, and raise awareness. These activities aimed to keep the community updated on the program's progress and provided opportunities for direct interaction and information sharing. Engagement activities included:
 - **Equity Roundtable (Sept. 10):** A recent equity roundtable was held to discuss the importance of community input in the Draft SEIS public comment period. The conversation was productive and provided valuable insights on community interaction with the program.
 - **Virtual Public Briefing Pre-Draft SEIS Publication — (Aug. 24):** A virtual public briefing was held to explain the contents of the Draft SEIS and how the public can provide feedback. Comments can be submitted via email, written mail, the website, or at public hearings with court reporters available to record statements verbatim.
 - **Recent Presentations:**
 - American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Design Committee
 - Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, Government & Public Affairs Committee – Washington Aggregates & Concrete Association
 - Oregon Concrete & Aggregate Producers Association
 - **Summer Tabling Events:**

- Portland Summer Concert Series: Celebrating Black Arts & Culture
- Vietnamese Community of Clark County Moon Festival
- Joint Oregon and Washington Transportation Commission Meeting (Oct. 1): The joint meeting will be the first comprehensive session involving the entire commissions. They will review recommendations for the Level 3 traffic revenue analysis, which includes various toll rate scenarios and potential revenue outcomes. The meeting will take place in person in Vancouver.

Johnson continued his updates with information on the publication of the Draft SEIS and encouraged members and the public to submit comments. The Executive Summary has been translated into multiple languages to ensure accessibility and is available on the [IBR website](#). Community members can view the Draft SEIS, Executive Summary, and technical reports online. Hard copies are also available for in-person review at the IBR office and several locations in Vancouver and Portland.

The public comment period is open from Sept. 20 to Nov. 18, 2024. Comments can be submitted through a web-based form, via email, mail, or phone, and at both virtual and in-person public hearings. Johnson emphasized that comments are welcome in any language. In-person public hearings will be held on October 15 at Clark College in Vancouver and on Oct. 17 at the Portland Expo Center, both from 5:30 to 8:30 p.m. Virtual public hearings are scheduled for Oct. 26 at 12:00 p.m. and October 30 at 6:00 p.m. For a full list of events and information about attending briefings, open houses, public hearings, and other engagement opportunities, please visit the [IBR calendar](#).

Questions and comments from CBAG Members:

CBAG Member: You're going to get thousands of comments. Will a comment from a neighborhood group carry more weight than one from an individual, or will they all be tabulated the same way?

Johnson: It will be tabulated as one comment. If a group wants to make a similar comment, I recommend having each person submit their comments individually.

CBAG Member: So, you would prefer to have 20 identical comments from a neighborhood association rather than one comment with 20 signatures?

Johnson: If you want the impact of 20 voices rather than one, I would have them submit individual comments.

CBAG Member: If a comment includes both text and a graphic, what's the best way to submit it? Should it be combined into a one-page PDF, with the text and an illustrated graphic, like an arrow pointing to the relevant area, or is there another preferred format?

Johnson: We'll have someone reach out to you to provide the correct guidance on how to submit that type of comment.

CBAG Member: I'm thinking about communities that don't typically engage in public comment. I know there's a lot of outreach being done, but how will you address the fact that some communities participate more in public commentary, while others do not, even though they may be impacted?

Johnson: We're aware of this challenge and have created micro-grants to support community organizations in reaching those who don't typically engage. While we can't force participation, we're making it as easy as possible by providing outreach and presentations. It's ultimately up to individuals to choose to have their voices heard.

CBAG Member: Where can I find a list of the Clark County and Vancouver-based organizations that received the micro-grants? I'd like to reach out, see what they're doing, and ask how we can support them.

Singleton: There have been two rounds of mini grants over time, so we can compile a list of all the CBO partners.

CBAG Member: You mentioned that hard copies of the reports are available at certain locations. Is there a version available in braille?

Johnson: Let me check with the IBR team to see how we've accommodated that request. I know the program has screen reader options available for those who are visually impaired. I'll double-check and get back to you with a more complete answer.

CBAG Member: Most of the outreach about the Draft SEIS seems to have been through virtual sources. For neighborhoods adjacent to the freeway on both sides of the river, attaching flyers to phone poles could be a good way to let people know about the project and the decisions being made. I'm not sure if that's being done.

Johnson: We've sent out flyers and mailers, and I'll work with our team to expand efforts in areas like Rose Village and Meadow Homes. Our outreach has been extensive, but we still need your input to identify gaps and improve engagement.

Singleton: We also didn't mention our advertising efforts in culturally specific media, including newspapers and websites. These outlets are being actively engaged. We'll gather that information and include it in our follow-up.

REVIEW/REFINE POTENTIAL BENEFITS ON THE AVOID FURTHER HARM CATEGORY

Thomas-Peralta transitioned the meeting to the next segment to review/refine potential benefits for the Avoid Further Harm category. She shared excitement about reaching this phase and explained that the CBAG's potential recommendations brainstormed in their first phase of work were reviewed by the program's technical experts, resulting in the language being shared in today's presentation. She encouraged everyone to use the September community benefits review/refine chart handout.

Singleton explained that additional columns were added to the chart to address requests to identify potential funding sources, responding to the group's interest in funding feasibility. Thomas-Peralta will review each

column's purpose. Some recommendations have been combined as requested by CBAG members. If any potential community benefits are unable to be moved forward, the team will provide explanations based on expert input.

Questions and comments from CBAG Members:

CBAG Member: Are we not allowed to add anything to this chart?

Singleton: We're not looking to add new potential benefits right now but want to refine the existing ones. If you have new areas or concerns related to avoiding further harm, it might depend on what they are, as they could already be addressed elsewhere.

Thomas-Peralta screenshared the chart for a large group discussion. Below is the discussion on the review/refine of potential benefits in the Avoid Further Harm category.

Avoid Further Harm (AFH)-13: Coordinate with local landowners on maintenance of access to the river for native communities throughout construction.

Thomas-Peralta: Funding could come from the IBR program or be included in construction costs. Our technical team noted the need to consider safety if access is under the bridge during construction. Any thoughts or feedback?

CBAG Member: I found the phrase "maintenance of access" a bit confusing. I think "maintaining access" would be clearer grammatically.

CBAG Member: We should ensure we're not just coordinating with local landowners, but also communicating with tribal representatives to understand and address their needs, not just what's available.

CBAG Member: Will access along the waterfront, like from Terminal One to the east side, be closed during bridge construction? It's a popular area for those who walk and cycle, especially for those who can't afford a gym. Clear information would help the public provide better feedback.

Johnson: Some details depend on the contractor's plan. During certain phases, there may be closures with signed detours for walkers, bikers, and rollers. We'll work to minimize disruptions and aim to prevent prolonged closures using contract incentives or disincentives.

CBAG Member: On the north side, only two landowners allow river access. Are we coordinating with them to maintain this access?

CBAG Member: I'm curious about what existing access we're trying to preserve, as it seems quite limited. It felt unclear because no other local landowners, aside from those mentioned, allow access to the river.

CBAG Member: There's no public access on the south side, except for one city park on Hayden Island. Are we talking about walking paths like Discovery Trail, or actual access to the water? What exactly does 'access to the river' mean here?

CBAG Member: There needs to be clear coordination with Indigenous communities. If any current access points are unavailable, there should be a plan in place to ensure alternative access and that it can be enforced.

CBAG Member: Both properties with river access are far enough from the bridge construction to likely be unaffected, but we should keep this in mind since there's currently no access to the river in the immediate construction area.

Johnson: This could be a good opportunity for resource mapping to identify areas within our program that currently have access. If any are impacted, we'll develop a plan for communication and signage.

Thomas-Peralta: This suggestion came from our small group, focused on ensuring that access for native communities and Indigenous groups is maintained, especially for cultural events and ceremonies. The intent is to prevent disruptions to culturally significant activities. We also have other benefits addressing river access points, but this one specifically focuses on the cultural aspect.

CBAG Member: In addition to identifying access points, can we clarify what type of access we mean—
toe in the water, boat access, or something else?

CBAG Member: We shouldn't define access ourselves; the community should. It's crucial to frame this as a collaborative effort, not just IBR deciding. Community benefits should reflect collective input, and this needs to be clearly stated to build trust and clarity.

Singleton: If there are language changes needed, that's what this session is for. You'll review the edits before any decisions are made, so today is just for discussion.

CBAG Member: I'm curious if treaty rights or negotiations with sovereign nations might influence access, or if future litigation could become relevant.

CBAG Member: The focus is on maintaining access to existing properties during construction. A survey of these properties would be helpful. While creating waterfront access is an aspirational goal, there's extensive coordination with tribes through government-to-government consultations that isn't always visible here.

Johnson: We regularly consult with the Grand Ronde and the other 10 federally recognized tribes in both states. We'll make sure to address this question in those discussions.

Singleton: Steve Barnett, Tribal Council Chairman and representative for the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, is on the committee. We'll make sure this is discussed at our monthly meeting, and I can also bring it to the IBR tribal liaison.

CBAG Member: The language needs to clearly state that this is a collaborative process with First Nations, showing that tribal input is part of the decision-making. It should be clear to the public that due diligence has been done.

CBAG Member: We can remove the word 'local'— it's just landowners, wherever they are.

AFH-14: Require contractors to perform foundation inspections/videos on specific properties prior to construction to establish baseline conditions for determining whether any subsequent impacts are caused by IBR construction

Thomas-Peralta: We revised this based on technical team feedback. Instead of providing a list of inspectors, it now is written to require contractors to conduct pre-construction foundation inspections on specific properties to establish baseline conditions. This is standard practice and is noted as potentially being included in construction costs.

Johnson: It's standard practice to proactively engage property owners, although some may not allow us to document their property. We always try to make this option available.

CBAG Member: This is about proactive planning to avoid harm. If we know tree removal will happen, can we replant in advance? How can the public ensure these considerations are made early?

Johnson: If we're taking a portion of someone's property, tree planting can be negotiated during right-of-way discussions. For trees removed from Department of Transportation (DOT) property, the DOTs will replant multiple trees to replace those removed.

CBAG Member: Planting trees early, before removal, is a good idea, but the challenge is finding land that won't be disturbed later in construction.

CBAG Member: Are we asking these questions to proactively avoid further harm?

Johnson: That's a valid question, but it requires flexibility from DOTs and contractors.

CBAG Members: The DOTs will be working within the existing right-of-way, so identifying any remnant areas for temporary planting may be challenging, but it's something worth considering.

Singleton: This group's recommendations can address your question, and doing due diligence on it could be considered a potential benefit.

CBAG Member: It's important to recognize what's being lost, like the trees, which are valuable and tracked as part of the city's plan.

CBAG Member: This is just half of what we wanted for the 40 plus properties. Before selecting a contractor, we need a list of options that property owners can choose from to evaluate and inspect their properties.

Johnson: If we don't go through the contractor, we could face liability issues.

CBAG Member: You can provide a list of approved contractors within the contract but give property owners options. For example, offer two or three choices for them to select from for inspections.

CBAG Member: Integrity between the property owner and inspector is crucial, but the contractor also needs trust in the process. The challenge is ensuring both parties have confidence to address issues like foundation damage.

CBAG Member: The contractor or IBR can provide an approved list of inspectors for property owners to choose from. If you want the inspection done, select from this list.

Singleton: We'll discuss this with the procurement team to see what opportunities exist. When we revisit this category, we'll share what we learn from our technical experts who work with contractors.

CBAG Member: The city has approved inspectors for tasks like electrical work. Can't we offer property owners similar choices instead of assigning someone without options?

CBAG Member: Procurement rules require a fair process. We can't cherry-pick or exclude contractors based on perceived qualities. If there's an issue with an inspector, they can be excluded after an investigation, but this must be handled during contract setup.

CBAG Member: Do we have to wait for the contractor to be selected for the evaluation? We've already identified the properties.

Johnson: If another party does the work and there's a damage claim, the program wouldn't have verified it. The responsible party needs verifiable records to avoid liability issues.

CBAG Member: The concern is that it might seem like the fox is guarding the henhouse. Is there a way to build integrity and trust in the process?

Johnson: In my experience, DOT personnel walk with the contractor, and videos are shared with the DOT and the property owner, who has the right to view them. This ensures transparency, covering inside and basement areas. Inspections and videos occur before construction begins

CBAG Member: Property owners should be encouraged to include interior inspections, not just outside with trees and sound walls.

CBAG Member: Are the properties in the Draft SEIS only those adjacent to the program area, or will others be included based on construction activities?

Johnson: It depends on the work activity. For tasks like pile driving, there are standards for how far vibrations travel based on soil type. Contractors will use vibration monitors to assess the impact.

AFH-15: Develop a communication plan for before and during construction to keep the public informed of potential impacts such as noise, route closures, other mobility impacts, etc.

-To include a hotline or point of contact like an "Ask the Bridge" line, drawing inspiration from ODOT's "Ask ODOT" system, and the use of permanent electronic billboards at key neighborhood locations to announce upcoming bridge activities and road closures

Thomas-Peralta: This is standard practice and included in the Draft SEIS as a potential mitigation plan. The IBR program would be the funding source, and various agencies would be responsible for implementation.

Johnson: We're considering community navigators or advocates to provide daily updates, answer questions, and inform residents about construction activities. Given the project's scope, this might require dedicated full-time staff.

CBAG Member: To make our language explicit, I'd add something about ensuring language access and culturally responsive as priority considerations.

Thomas-Peralta: AFH-17 is similar and addresses community members' ability to voice concerns and get help. AFH-15 is separate, as it's part of typical mitigation plans. If you have thoughts on the community liaison or navigator role, AFH-17 would be the best place to discuss that.

Johnson: We can combine AFH-15 and AFH-17.

Singleton: It seems to cover both proactive communication and responsive action.

CBAG Member: There's a big difference between actively knocking on doors versus waiting for calls to come in. If proactive communication is our intent, we should include that language, so people understand our approach.

AFH-16: Increase public transport services and explore alternative routes to mitigate transportation impacts during construction, including the implementation of shuttle buses and additional bus routes.

Thomas-Peralta: Our technical teams have confirmed that this is standard mitigation, in scope for transit agencies, and included as a potential mitigation in the Draft SEIS.

Johnson: That should read "public transit" instead of "public transport".

CBAG Member: We should ensure communication extends beyond the impacted geographic area. Also, consider cultural factors and increasing public transit services in both Vancouver and Portland.

Johnson: Construction will disrupt walkers, bikers, and rollers. We've considered a bus bridge, but we need ideas on how to inform and encourage impacted community members to use it.

CBAG Member: Administrator Johnson emphasized the importance of clear communication about construction schedules and disruptions. We should include details on timing and methods, like signs, updates, or a notification list.

CBAG Member: We could partner with the City of Vancouver’s Homeless Assistance & Resources Team (HART), Share, Council for the Homeless, and Columbia River Mental Health. Some rural Oregon communities have a bus service for transporting cans and bottles collectors to and from drop-off sites. It’s worth considering, especially with new bottle bills in the upcoming legislative session.

CBAG Member: People take bags and cans on TriMet buses, but walkers and bikers rely on the free option. A shuttle could help, but we shouldn’t remove a service many depend on.

CBAG Member: We could consider a bottle collection site on either side as an option.

CBAG Member: Put a poster at the access point with information on changes and options. Let’s not forget those using large mobility scooters—they’re a growing group, and we need to design with them in mind.

Singleton: I agree. We need to work with street outreach teams and communicate with homeless service providers, so people are informed ahead of time.

AFH – 17: Establish a process for community members to voice concerns and report negative impacts, potentially including an online platform and/or hotline where community members can report issues and receive timely responses, ensuring a commitment to responsiveness and resolution. Consider exploring the use of AI.

Thomas-Peralta: We added this last piece about exploring the use of AI in these efforts. Administrator Johnson mentioned the program is considering community liaison or navigator roles to assist with any emerging community needs.

CBAG Member: We need to be intentional in our responsiveness. Not every issue will be seen as a problem by the program, and sometimes the answer may need to be “No”. We should balance addressing concerns with protecting the process and our teams.

Thomas-Peralta: The vision behind this approach is not for the program to solve every issue but to help connect people with the appropriate resources, whether within DOTs or partner agencies.

CBAG Member: We need to anticipate potential issues and solutions early, before contracts are awarded. For example, Portland has added a person of color with expertise to contract review panels to bring an equity perspective. This may not solve every problem, but it helps ensure input in the process and prevents issues from becoming bigger later.

Johnson: The Community Advisory Group (CAG) will be a lasting feature of the IBR program. Other groups will likely merge into it, taking on roles like proactive planning and tracking community

benefits. We envision one advisory group responsible for community benefits, equity, and proactive outreach.

Singleton: I noted the idea of including equity priority communities in the review panels for RFPs. We can bring back more on how we set up our review bodies and ensure these communities are represented.

Johnson: We need to be cautious. DOTs have strict procurement rules about selection and panel members. We can request flexibility, but ultimately, contracts are between one of four entities—DOTs, TriMet, C-Tran, and the contractor. Changing their procurement processes may be challenging.

CBAG Member: I'm concerned about how we'll capture feedback from those who don't visit the IBR website. With 71 neighborhoods and many people bringing concerns to meetings, city council, and forums, what's the process for gathering all that communication?

Johnson: I'm hoping community navigators or advocates can attend neighborhood meetings alongside city representatives to hear directly from the community. They'll be there to address construction concerns and receive feedback, whether it's complaints or praise.

Singleton: The community engagement team has strong ties with neighborhood associations, even beyond the program area. Administrator Johnson's emphasis on "one or more" reflects the need for more coverage.

CBAG Member: How can IBR use its position to influence partners like the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and City of Vancouver? The city's comprehensive plan and the bridge program intersect, so we should advocate for anti-displacement policies beyond IBR's scope. The bridge impacts everyone, and we should suggest strategies to incorporate anti-displacement efforts community wide.

CBAG Member: We need to be realistic about available contractors. Setting goals is important, but if there aren't enough minority contractors, we should focus on supporting businesses to get certified and ready. Our DBE outreach should continue offering events and one-on-one support to help businesses prepare for contracts.

CBAG Member: When can we update this group on the advocate positions and resource center we developed? There have been a lot of questions about them.

Singleton: We're discussing it next Thursday, and we should be able to bring it back at the October meeting.

AFH – 20: Develop comprehensive strategies and funding options with the program and other partners that can be implemented to address the relocation and housing needs of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness affected by the program.

September 26, 2024

CBAG Member: Use surplus land for housing, but not near the freeway. Consider land swaps to place housing elsewhere and use freeway-adjacent land for commercial purposes.

Thomas-Peralta: We have elements related to housing in our Community Benefits category, and we'll bring those back to this group for further discussion.

Johnson: DOTs don't handle housing. We're willing to collaborate on excess property and are working with the FTA for flexibility, but DOTs should not be involved in housing.

Singleton: We'll cover this in the community benefits category and discuss housing and transit-oriented development with our partners at Metro and TriMet.

CBAG Member: WSDOT has partnered with Vancouver, providing land for the state's first Safe Stay Village, while there are currently seven small camps on their property.

CBAG Member: The DOTs have provided space, but local agencies should consider using existing resources for housing and homeless services, especially for those displaced by this program. We don't want to be in the housing services business, but we can support it with space and coordination.

Singleton: We did asset mapping with partners and included Multnomah County for the Oregon side, as they manage the homeless service dollars. We'll keep exploring this for asset development.

AFH – 18: The eminent domain process and outreach must include considerations for language access and culturally specific and relevant services.

Johnson: DOTs and transit agencies follow the [Uniform Relocation Act](#) for property acquisition, ensuring culturally appropriate interactions. Adherence is crucial to avoid lawsuits.

CLOSING REMARKS

Johnson commended the members for their hard work and dedication to community benefits.

ATTENDEES

Attendees	Organization
CBAG Members	
Greg Johnson	IBR
Ray Mabey	Oregon State Department of Transportation
Millicent Williams	City of Portland
Anne McEnery-Ogle	City of Vancouver
Marcus Mundy	Coalition of Communities of Color
Scott McCallum	Washington School for the Blind
Peter Fels	Alliance for Community Engagement
Jaynee Haygood	Vancouver Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission

September 26, 2024

Vicki Nakashima	Equity Advisory Group (EAG) Representative
Walter Valenta	At-large Community Member
Holly Williams	At-large Community Member
Michael Strahs	Kimco Realty
Farleigh Winters	LSW Architects
Carley Francis	Washington State Department of Transportation
Darcy Hoffman	Workforce Southwest Washington
Javier Navarro	SW WA Chapter of Lulac

Attendees	Role
IBR Staff	
Paige Schlupp	Assistant Program Administrator
Shannon Singleton	Community Benefits Lead
Emilee Thomas-Peralta	Equity Team
Eric Trinh	Equity Team
Aidan Gronauer	Assistant Director of Civil Rights & Equity
Brenda Siragusa	Equity Team
Steve Witter	Transit Team
Bree Nicoello	Community Engagement Team
Lucy Hamer	Equity Team
Amanda Hart	Technical Support

Other Attendees	Organization/Agency
Serena Stoudamire-Wesley	Oregon State Department of Transportation
Lon Pluckhahn	City of Vancouver
Katherine Kelly	City of Vancouver
Caitlin Reff	City of Portland
Shawnea Posey	City of Portland

Additional Participants

Online viewing is open to the public, partner agency staff, and IBR team members. Seventeen participants viewed the meeting via the YouTube livestream during the meeting. Additionally, one member of the public attended the meeting in person.

September 26, 2024



MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

[Community Benefits Advisory Group \(CBAG\) September 26th, 2024, 9:30AM PST \(youtube.com\)](#)

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here: [CBAG Meeting September 26, 2024 | Interstate Bridge Replacement Program](#)