

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #15

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #15 Summary

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

Location: Zoom Webinar and [YouTube Livestream](#)

WELCOME AND OUTCOMES

Ed Washington, CAG co-chair, welcomed the group to the meeting. Lisa Keohokalole Schauer, CAG co-facilitator, reviewed the technical instructions for the meeting and the agenda.

PROGRAM UPDATE

Greg Johnson, IBR Program Administrator, provided the program update. The IBR program has been very busy and apologized for the number of upcoming meetings the CAG has scheduled. He reiterated how important the meetings are, ensuring the CAG voices are present. Last week, the Executive Steering Group (ESG) met and discussed the transit analysis, presented to the CAG two meetings ago. The group did not have time to discuss Hayden Island/Marine Drive due to a large discussion on which agency, WSDOT or ODOT, would administer the tolls for the Interstate Bridge. This was an urgent decision so that the contracts could be developed. Greg clarified that this was not a decision on tolling operations or pricing, just establishing what agency would be responsible for the contracts and construction. It was decided that ODOT would be the lead agency. The next ESG meeting will cover Hayden Island/Marine Drive and auxiliary lanes design options.

The Bi-State Legislative Committee expressed concerns about the tolling discussion. They also discussed the transit analysis that had been presented to the CAG. Greg assured the group that there has not been a technical recommendation yet and hopes for one by the end of April for the number of auxiliary lanes, the configuration of Marine Drive/Hayden Island interchanges, and the mode of high-capacity transit, transit termini and station locations. The Bi-State Legislative Committee will receive the same presentation as the CAG. Greg shared the IBR's process for coming to the technical recommendations. The recommendation will not be the end of community engagement but helps get the program to the next phase of NEPA. The CAG, EAG, ESG and Bi-State will continue to meet and advise the program.

Question and Answer

CAG Member: Is there a reason Governor Inslee hasn't signed the funding package that has the Interstate Bridge program included yet and when do you expect him too?

Greg: We believe his signature is imminent. We have not heard of any concerns, so we think it's coming in the very near future.

Lisa: Greg, before you leave, we wanted to ask if the CAG would be willing to meet for three hours for the two meetings we have scheduled in April. We know this is a big lift, but we really want to be able to provide enough space to share and process the information and receive meaningful feedback. Our plan at this point is for the 14th of April to be focused on auxiliary lanes and the winnowed down transit options. After the CAG meeting on the 14th, the other groups will meet and see what the packaged technical recommendation is. At the meeting on the 28th, the CAG will get to see the recommendation. So, it's really important we have enough time to provide you with information and to receive your feedback. Greg, do you have anything to add relative to this schedule we are asking of the CAG?

Greg: No, I think you phrased it well. I know there's a tremendous amount of information coming, and we really just want to make sure there is enough time to have a full conversation with you. That's what we're looking for and if we finish early, we will let everyone go, but right now this is a critical time to get your comments so that Lynn and Ed can take your comments back to the ESG.

CAG Member: I support the three hours; my only request is that we have a break in the middle.

Greg: Yes, we can do that.

CAG Member: I was thinking along the same lines of having a break. My question is if the extra hour would be tagged on at the end or the beginning? Could we get some bold, very clear bullet points on what information you really want us to weigh in on ahead of the meeting.

Greg: Yes, we can try and actualize information and create those important bullets and make that a coversheet to the other information.

Lisa: As far as the logistics, at this point we would be open to hearing what this group may prefer. Given that much of this group works 8-5 we we're leaning towards going into the 7 o'clock hour but we are open to hearing your thoughts.

CAG Member: Personally, I have a meeting following this one that I agreed today to take the chairmanship of, so I would find it very hard to attend a meeting past 6 o'clock.

Lisa: at this point I think what we will do is reach out to CAG Members and maybe we can go a little bit earlier and a little bit later to make this work for as many people as possible.

Greg: I think we can offer if folks can't stay, is if they have the information and read it, they can submit questions for us to then respond to later.

FEBRUARY 24TH CAG TRANSIT FEEDBACK

Lisa shared a presentation on the common themes that were heard from the breakout groups on transit investment at the last meeting.

CAG Member: We have had several conversations in the Work Groups I have been a part of where we need to recognize that I-5 is a major freight corridor. I see in the comments of the considerations we need to make nothing on the economic impacts and the necessity for that as a freight corridor.

Lisa: really great comment, we will add that.

HAYDEN ISLAND/MARINE DRIVE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Nicole Sherbert, IBR Community Engagement Team, presented on the Hayden Island/Marine Drive community engagement, focusing on the results from the fall engagement survey.

CAG Member: The question of equity, regarding the residents of Hayden Island, was my chief concern which you've half addressed. Slide 15, talks a lot about what people think about getting on and off the freeway without the distinction of if they live on the island or not. It seems to me that the equity lens is to prioritize the needs most impacted by the decision being made which would be the people living on the island. If 70% people don't care what the exit is, that doesn't speak to the importance of that decision. In fact, which tends to sabotage the decision making to a certain degree because it doesn't distinguish if residents are impacted by the choice or not. So, as you said in slide 16, you mitigated that to a degree but it's not at all clear in terms of project documentation that the equity lens has been applied.

CAG Member: I think we also must consider that there is a lot of economic activity at Hayden Island and, representing the freight community, how we get on and off that island is very important. So, we may not be residents of that island, but it is very important.

HAYDEN ISLAND/MARINE DRIVE TECHNICAL PRESENTATION

Casey Liles, IBR Design Manager, shared the design options for Hayden Island/Marine Drive. Brad Phillips, IBR Design Engineer reviewed the screening and comparison process used for the different design options.

CAG Member: My first concern is we've had three speakers tell us that, in the interest in time, we're going to shorten this. I think this is pretty important information and shouldn't be rushed. The second, is you continue to talk about Oregon and Hayden Island, and I understand the geographic and political things, but Hayden Island identifies a lot with Vancouver and to think that there's a split is a bad assumption. Lastly, I realize we have the five-mile limitation, but I don't understand how we can come to a good solution without looking at Delta Park and all the merges that happen there. If you drive that, as I'm sure you have, you know that traffic is backed up very far and I realize that you have limitations, but I think that could prevent us from reaching a good solution.

Brad: I think we want to get to breakout groups so that we can continue these conversations. As far as Oregon and Washington, I am using those distinctions to help describe these options only. We clearly understand the relationship of Vancouver to Hayden Island. Thirdly, I think you make a good point about the delta park area. The graphics shown here do not represent the entire project limits, only focusing on the major differences. The project does extend further south to Victory Boulevard and further south to MLK. There are some differences there I didn't describe but our analysis certainly goes that far.

CAG Member: This is not expressing a preference particularly, but what are the imperatives you consider when looking at if the arterial bridge should be on the east or west side?

Brad: Functionality, for one. For example, on option 5, we started out with this on the west side but the functionality of transit crossing pier 99 and expo road, we felt made it extremely challenging to design all the crossings and activity due to the added transit.

CAG Member Response: I'll have to take your word for it, because at a glance I don't see how there would be any particular difference in function. But no doubt you've dug into it deeper than I have. My second question is in the other package of drawings showing the Vancouver view you included the stacked bridge option, but the stacked bridge isn't shown from the Vancouver view. Why is that?

Brad: It is on the table; the graphics are still in production and are not yet available to share. The program is still considering both side by side and stacked.

Casey: I just wanted to add, that if the arterial bridge was on the west side in this scenario, it would be very close to the ramp terminal so there is some added complexity with high-capacity transit coming through this area and the ramp terminal.

CAG Member: Looking at the freight question, and being clear Bridgeton wants to be supportive of the freight community as we live in the middle of it and we want to be good neighbors, when you say that freight operates acceptably with minimal delays, what are your metrics and does the freight community agree that it's effective?

Brad: We've been working with Ryan, our transportation planning specialist, on doing a volume intersection analysis at all the different ramps and roadways. The two options, 1 and 5, are nearly identical.

CAG Member: I get that they're nearly identical. There was long ago a conversation of a fly over, which I have heard from the Columbia Corridor Business Association that they would like to see that pushed as a need. So, I am concerned that the fly over seems to have been taken out of consideration. Personally, I am neutral on this, but I want to be sure we are hearing from the freight industry.

CAG Member: I appreciate the question and I'm not sure if I have the answer at this time. I'm still trying to understand the schematics. I think we have another freight advisory sub-committee group, is that correct? In any event I think we need to get those folks together and look at the details of this.

Ryan LeProwse, IBR Transportation Planning Manager: We did present these options to the freight group, and it does meet their standards set by ODOT and the City of Portland through the 2045 time period which is why we say its performing acceptably.

CAG Member: Who did you present that too?

Ryan: We presented it at the freight group at their last meeting, we have that information and can resend it to you.

CAG Member: I would appreciate that. I chair that group and I don't recall the level of detail that we are seeing here. I will take this offline and promise to give you all an answer once I understand better.

Lisa: There are multiple dynamics here as there are several stakeholder groups, we are seeking feedback from. I believe Greg may have mentioned that this is on deck to be presented to the ESG and they didn't have time for it. We are now in the process of ensuring each stakeholder groups sees it. Gathering the insight and information from groups like this is where we are right now.

Casey: I think the question was on target about if a fly over ramp that was previously looked at. In this concept trade off discussion, I don't think that would help us distinguish. It is not something we have looked at and I don't think it would create a difference in tradeoffs.

CAG HAYDEN ISLAND/MARINE DRIVE BREAKOUT SESSION

CAG members were separated into four different breakout groups, having been asked the question “of the two remaining options, which one most closely aligns with the CAG Values & Priorities?”

Group 1 Debrief

Audri Bomar, IBR Communications Lead, shared from her group. A key takeaway was that there was not much of a difference between the two options in terms of community values, except for equity and footprint and how that impacts the Hayden Island community. There was a desire to have more time to digest this information as there is a lot to dig through and would like to share with the communities they serve. The program will be making a commitment to take this out to communities, specifically to freight, and then to bring that back to CAG. There was also a request for more data, specifically to understand travel time and congestion differences, whether one made for a quicker trip through the area, to and from Hayden Island, and through Marine Drive.

Group 2 Debrief

Sarah Hall, CAG Member, reported that option 5 was the more preferred option of the group. There was a lot of discussion on freight capacity and commerce. The group felt that Option 5 seemed to best reflect community values. They felt the design still needed to be further refined and additional data gathered. The group also felt there was a lot of data to digest in the slides. Freight, congestion relief and data driven decision making are all very important. The group really wanted to see data to support freight, traffic volumes, and modeling of the different scenarios.

Group 3 Debrief

Jasmine Tolbert, CAG Member, shared that her group discussed the info they felt they needed to be better equipped for these discussions. The group wants to hear more from trucking and freight representatives while also realizing there may be unexpected impacts from tolls that would impact how they use the bridge. So really, we just want to get a complete picture and understanding of how freight interacts so we can decide what best impacts them while also ensuring we make a decision based on their needs. We then discussed

some very personal experiences. One example was how someone who lives in the Kenton area interacts with Hayden Island, how the on ramps interact and the benefit of a straight line shot onto Hayden Island. Another piece was a more generalized understanding of how the “curly” bridge interacts compared to the other bridge, how the different on ramps will impact traffic and a clearer understanding of how Option 5 separates traffic to keep folks in their distinct area and preventing everyone from coming in at once. Finally, the group discussed how active transport will interact with the bridge and how both options provide relief from the current options at marine drive.

Group 4 Debrief

Jason Hagen, IBR CAG Administrator, reported that his group discussed similar topics. His group felt that there was a lot of information shared and maybe not enough data to support a decision on how these options relate to the CAG values and priorities. Some of the top priorities are cost effectiveness and congestion relief and there wasn't quite enough data to weigh against those. So really a desire to spend more time with this and see some more data. We also had great comments around the footprint of the bridge, both along the banks and over the river. This related to other values of being mindful of our cultural historical and natural resources. The program is trying to find the balance between being too detailed and providing enough detail, but these static images are hard to read so we can find a better way to illustrate how the different options impact traffic. The group also discussed freight movement. Casey added that the group did look at the tradeoffs and how the Harvey Balls differ.

WHAT'S NEXT, PUBLIC COMMENT

Lisa reviewed the upcoming topics for the CAG and the upcoming meetings for all groups, including the EAG on April 4th from 5:30-7:30 p.m. and the ESG on April 7th from 2:00-5:00 p.m.

Public Comment

Dan Packard: This is Dan Packard. Thank you, I had a heck of a time getting phoned in here, but I think you can hear me. I have a comment about the options I saw earlier. The footprint looks massive, like there would be an additional 7-8 lanes of concrete. And that concerns me with the climate impact and if this will displace any existing businesses on Hayden Island. I was looking at Option 5, and it says the active transportation component has a more direct north-south route with the shared use path, but it looks like once you get over the Marine Drive Area you have to turn west towards the Expo Center in order to continue south which is quite a detour. That's more of a detour than what's there now. I'd like to find out if the drawings of the five different options are available online at interstatebridge.org.

Lisa: Thank you Dan, are there any other comments you want to make?

Dan: yes, are those options available to see online?

Lisa: they will be online if not already as part of this particular meeting and we can make sure to send the link to you. They would be under the community advisory group materials.

Dan: Okay. And if there would be some way to make it easier for the public to chime in like over zoom as of right now, I am on a very long delay over the telephone, and it was really difficult to get in in the first place. It would be nice to make that accommodation a lot easier for the public.

Lisa: I appreciate that comment, it is a lot of numbers to be reading out that makes it challenging for folks to call in. We will have a conversation about if there is an easier way to provide that access.

WRAP UP AND THANK YOU

Ed thanked everyone for taking the time to be present and actively participate today. He also thanked Lynn for her good work on this committee. He felt tonight’s meeting was very eye opening. The Program is getting to the point where the rubber meets the road, and he wants to encourage everyone to speak out about the issues.

The meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

CAG Members or Alternatives

Attendees	Organization
Andrew Hoan	Portland Business Alliance
Dena Horton	Pacific Northwest Waterways Association
Tom Sandhwar Dr. Karin Edwards’ representative	Clark College
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

Attendees	Organization
Lynn Valenter	Co-Chair
Martha Wiley	WA Transit Representative
Michael A. Martin-Tellis	Vancouver Neighborhood Association
Michael Kelly	Human Services Council
Mikaela Williams	At-Large Community Member
Robin Richardson	At-Large Community Member
Ryan Webb	The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Sam Kim	At-Large Community Member
Sheri Call	WA Trucking Association
Thomas W. Gentry	At-Large Community member
Tom Hickey	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Victor Cesar	Public Transit Representative, Oregon
Whitney Mosback	Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Miriam Halliday	Workforce SW WA

Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Organization
Jason Hagen	IBR Program Staff
Brad Phillips	IBR Design Engineer
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Ryan LeProwse	IBR Transportation Planning Manager
Casey Lilles	IBR Deputy Design Manager
Audri Bomar	IBR Communications Lead
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator

Additional Participants

22 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.

March 24, 2022

MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NRy5dcUhjeE>

Meeting Materials

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