



**Community and Environmental Justice Group
November Monthly Meeting**

November 30, 2006
6:00 p.m.-8:30 p.m.
Kenton Firehouse
2209 N. Schofield St.
Portland, OR 97217

Agenda

Meeting Objectives:

- Getting to know each other more and understanding members' stakes in the project
- Clarifying roles and responsibilities of group and project staff
- Identify key issues and concerns for CEJG members
- Create a schedule of activities that improves future outcomes for all
- Community members feel they are making a difference and feel excited to continue through July 2008
- Community members better understand their role and how to impact this project
- Finalize plans for project area bus tour

I. Dinner	6:00 p.m.
II. Welcome	6:30 p.m.
III. Review Meeting Purpose and Draft Agenda	6:35 p.m.
IV. Introductions and Team Building Activity	6:40 p.m.
V. Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities	7:05 p.m.
Community and Environmental Justice Group	
CRC Project Team	
VI. Creating Future Agendas	7:40 p.m.
Brainstorming Activities	
Review project timeline and milestones	
VII. Bus Tour Planning	8:10 p.m.
VIII. Review Action Items & Next Steps	8:20 p.m.
IX. Closing and Next Meeting Reminder	8:30 p.m.

Meeting: Community and Environmental Justice Group

Date: Thursday, October 19, 2006

Location: Kenton Firehouse, 2209 N. Schofield St., Portland

Members Present

Dave Skagen

Ed Garren

Kris Long

Connie Sherrard

Jeri Sundvall-Williams

Echo Leighton

Nikki Williams

Marcia Ward

Dave Frei

Anne McEnery-Ogle

Michelle Tworoger

Absent Members

Diana Avalos

Keith Edwards

Jonath Colón-Montesi

Lawrence Russell

Guests Present

Barbara Nelson- Jantzen Beach Moorage Inc.

Marshall Grow (?)- Jantzen Beach Moorage Inc.

Staff Present

Doug Ficco

Ron Anderson

Lynette Shaw

Danielle Cogan

Rangineh Azimzadeh- Facilitator's assistant

Aisha Hollins- Facilitator's assistant

Kris Strickler

Tom Markgraf

Heather Gundersen

Barbara MacKay- Facilitator

Gloria Bryen- Facilitator's assistant

Note: The meeting notes have been divided into two sections. The first section deals with the discussion we had about the group- its structure, roles, function and future. The second section relates questions and comments from the Welcome, Old Business and Evaluation Criteria portions of the meeting's agenda.

Section One: Group Discussion

Members expressed their thoughts, ideas and suggestions about the way the Community and Environmental Justice Group could and should address EJ issues and community concerns.

- CEJG should be the place to have discussions that are not happening elsewhere. We have to be the ones asking the uncomfortable questions because they won't be brought up otherwise.
- Shift the approach to asking, "What does everyone need?" especially in regards to traditionally marginalized groups. Less emphasis should be placed on

individual purposes and perspectives. Need to get good at “putting on different hats”

- Acknowledge that several people were prompted to join because of personal impacts to their local community. No unwillingness to also think about other impacts was implied, however.
 - *Clarify to each other what groups/neighborhoods/etc. each member feels they are speaking from (though not necessarily for).*
- More self-determination within the group
 - Have the meeting agendas steered by CEJG members, not CRC Staff (though they can and should support the effort)
 - *Danielle will email the group and work out the one for November that way.*
 - Consider developing an internal organizational structure
- Have to be looking at this from an interconnected point of view. Can't think of these different projects in a “we'll think about it later” mindset – community is being harmed by that way of doing things. Group needs to think outside of the Bridge Influence Area and advocate for “doing things differently.”
- Tired of just duplicating the Task Force's work. Need to be working on the things they aren't.
- Familiarity with EJ issues needs to be expanded beyond those in the group who have already been involved with it. There is a big problem when decision makers in the CRC project are uncomfortable even saying certain words pertaining to traditionally underrepresented groups. Staff and Task Force members especially need to become familiar.
- Doug expressed openness to getting this to happen for staff. Acknowledges that this needs to happen not just for communications, but for environmental planners and other engineers too.
- EJ training was brought up as a way to help address this. Jeri expressed a willingness to help train and arrange for other experts to come in as well. Mentioned that she had been offered this before, but had not been taken up on it.
- Address the fact that CRC project information is coming off as a “done deal.” Within that context, EJ issues just go out the window and many voices of people who would be impacted are shut down.
 - Makes it much harder to get others involved, especially when unsure about it yourself.
- Develop common understandings and language amongst members about the group and even of EJ itself. Many people have been operating under assumptions of “this is just how it is supposed to go” or “people had already talked about EJ.” There has to be more clarification of what each person is expecting the group to be, and what the group as a whole wants to see happen.

- Help by developing stronger relationships between people – start with getting nametags back.
- Get an understanding of this group in a historical context. This CEJG was the result of a long hard fight.
 - It was assumed (promised?) that the Delta Park group would transition into one for the CRC, but that did not happen. That creates a sticking point, especially since so many decisions were made before this group was reinstated.
 - Having a point of reference for what the past group did can help give this current one a lot of direction and sense of purpose that it seems to be having trouble with now. More experienced voices in this CEJG can help provide that.
- Staff needs to get direction from CEJG too. There is much support for EJ work within CRC staff from the heads of the project. They are very willing to do whatever needs to be done to move this process forward, but need to hear from CEJG. No one is an EJ expert here, but they are very concerned about it.
- Move on past the first phase of EJ into the second part. Need to be finding out the impact data and finding out more about the communities that will be affected.
- Keep valuing outreach too. There is a lot that still is not understood about the communities out there.
- Move past just finding out about project information. Still value it in the context of letting members understand what is happening and what and who could possibly be impacted, but needs to be the background now instead of the focus.
- Reassess what has been done so far, and define what can and cannot be taken on by the group in order to establish clearer goals for the near future.
- Possibly develop value and mission statements. Also, could set specifically aside each meeting for exclusively EJ discussions.

Section One: Questions for Clarification

- What is the purpose and role of *this* CEJG?
 - In relation to EJ principles and ethics
 - In relation to the CRC project
- What can and cannot be done by the CEJG within the context of the CRC project at this moment in time?
 - Many feel that this is “late in the game” – there are a many decisions that have already been made that will have an EJ impact.
 - There are restrictions on the project itself. For instance, it can’t be moved outside of the I-5 corridor.
 - This is part of a “political process” and the group needs to operate within respect to how these work and acknowledge what will have the most impact through them right here and now.

- What perspectives do members need to be bringing to the table?
 - There was confusion expressed over whether people should be representing individual viewpoints, those of their local neighborhoods, groups they were affiliated with, or trying to think about all the underrepresented communities that might be impacted, regardless of member's immediate connections with them.
- What should be the focus of these meetings?
 - Technical data has gotten the most attention - when does EJ start? Has all this information presented so far just been for background knowledge – if so, when is it time to do something with it?
- What can be done to make this process more authentic and empowered?
 - As compared to Delta Park people's experience, this is a much less "important" group in the context of the project. Nobody wants to feel like a token
 - CEJG Group needs to focus more on and be more knowledgeable about environmental justice related impacts – *Jeri*
- What is the multi-modal answer to EJ? – *Jeri*
- What additional training needs to occur? – *Dave*
- Why isn't this mandatory (EJ training)? – *Nikki*
- What are the group's parameters? – *Danielle*
- When is EJ going to start? – *Anne*
- Where is EJ on the evaluation? – *Anne*
- Can we discuss why we are here in the beginning of the meetings? – *Kris L*
- How can we think about the community and not as individuals? *Kris L*
- What are we talking about when addressing the transit issues? – *Kris L*
- How less transit impact low income communities north of the river?
- What is it that everyone needs who are not at the table? – *Kris L*
- Where are we in this process when people on the Task Force don't want to use these words (people of color, with disabilities, etc.)? – *Nikki*
- Rich, poor, businesses- what are the impacts? – *Echo*
- What is the purpose of this group? – *Echo*
- I need to know what am I looking at- the acronyms as well as the issues – *Echo*
- Where is the magic line between CRC and Delta Park project? – *Kris L*
- What impact or voice do we really have as a small committee? – *Kris L*
- Who are we representing? – *Anne*
- Regarding trainings, are we doing things properly? – *Doug*
- How do we build relationships, trust, and understanding with other members in this room? *Connie*
- Can we form committee chairs within this group? (organizational structures, for us to set the agenda) – *Ed*
- I was expecting to pick up where we left off (EJ) – what happened? -*Anne*
- What are the community impacts for each alternative? We need to study this.
- Can we have something that says this is why we are here? – *Marcia*
- How soon do comments need to be in about Alternative Package evaluation (criteria)?
- Knowing the community – *Anne, Dave F.*

start by asking:

- What do you know about the community?
 - What is the nature of the community? How is it defined?
 - What are the demographics of this community?
 - Is there additional community information and/or other demographic indicators (i.e. children or elderly) that are important to consider?
 - What do these communities want and need?
 - What does this region look like?
 - What are the affected areas?
 - We need to learn about the communities. What do the communities look like?
- Who is benefiting outside the impact area? Who is bearing the brunt? –*Dave F*

Section One: Comments

- Most among CEJG members *and* staff expressed that they felt that this was a very engaging, good, necessary, and productive meeting. Several seemed reenergized about their involvement.
- People liked the authenticity and the fact that it was honest without turning “ugly.”
- The general feeling was that this meeting represented a definite and large step forward for the group.
- Breath of fresh air
- Good to be back on track
- Productive
- Thanks to Jeri
- Exactly what we needed to do
- Glad I didn’t make a presentation (Ron)
- Great – appreciate honesty
- Encouraged, thanks for Jeri’s honesty
- Feels good
- Conversation would not have happened if it was not a safe place
- We need to know the Washington people better
- Hope everyone stays engaged
- Need our nametags back (Dave S.)
- We need to move forward. – *Kris*
- Why am I here and what difference can I make from an EJ point of view? - *Barbara*
- I got involved because they are looking to eliminate 60% of my island. Feels like a done deal. -*Michelle*
- It is hard to feel important when we are such a small group.-*Kris*
- If this is where we really are, if the ball was dropped, what happened in the absence? -*Nikki*
- I thought it was not being discussed because we were already on board. What does the staff think? –*Nikki*
- Our work on this committee doesn’t feel important.-*Kris L*
- EJ work group process was told their work would not go forward to the CRC group. We had to fight to reconstitute this group. -*Jeri*
- We are not saying we are experts. We need to hear from each of you. I am from here- both sides of the river. We need help from you to get this message out. I apologize if we started out on the wrong foot. -*Doug*

- How will I know I am successful? *Barbara's question*
- This was a good discussion. Let's start seeing what this region looks like. -*Dave*
- Welling up of things is not a bad thing to happen. We will be successful when we have a strong common language. -*Connie*
- Group elected its own leadership staff supported them. We might be more valid if we set our own agenda instead of staff. -*Ed*
- If I can help my five blocks of neighbors, I would feel successful. My apologies for not knowing what Jeri was talking about. -*Dave*
- You are lacking history – not your fault. I have offered to train in EJ and to bring experts. Answer has been “No”. Victory if I can tell my community this is a valid process.- *Jeri*
- We are the agenda! It feels like something is being pushed on us.-*Ed*
- CEJG forms an organizational structure and sets its own agenda – *Ed*
- Community research and outreach results not getting reported back to the group. -*Kris L.*

Section One: Action Items

- Have specific issues we're looking at (look @ issues from different perspectives) – Business owner, poverty, home owner, etc. – *Echo*
- Regular reminders about purpose of meeting/CEJG (to be brought up at each meeting) – *Marcia*
- Follow our “we believe” statements. -*Nikki*
- Staff needs proper training in EJ – bad planning on scheduling these trainings (*Jeri, reemphasized by Nikki*)
- Have more trainings on EJ -*Jeri*
- Have more input on what this group can and cannot do.- *Jeri*
- Define the impact we want to have (& have had so far)
- Learn more about the impacted/affected region – *Dave F*
- * Get bus tour back on agenda * - *Dave F, Nikki*
- Get everyone name tags for CEJG meetings – *Connie*
- Need a statement of purpose for CEJG – *Echo*
- Increased EJ training needs to happen/be provided for staff and CEJG - *Danielle*
- Community outreach needs to be reported back to CEJG group – communication needs to be better clarified. – *Kris L*

Section Two: Remaining Agenda Items- Welcome, Old Business and Evaluation Criteria

Welcome

- Agenda overview by Barbara
- Discussion over suggestion by Anne to have members' affiliations indicated on the meeting minutes – organization, constituency, community, or individual
 - Danielle asked groups willingness to do this – 7 yeses and 1 ambivalent.
 - Some confusion over why this was important was expressed.
 - The request was made that it be clearly indicated that the member was “from” a group, but was not speaking “for” it. The title of “At

Large” was suggested for those not wanting to indicate being a representative.

- Brief review of last meeting. Highlights included resource mapping and brief update on Communications plan.
 - Specific responses included:
 - Comment on the impact of option 10, the relative impacts on businesses vs. housing in reference to evaluating different options, and the comment that Hayden Island planning would be helpful in resolving some of the conflicts.
 - Comment that 2/3 of smaller maps do not detail the depicted transit alignments along Main St. in Vancouver.
 - Staff responded that the alignments are not decided yet, and that the ones being depicted now are just representative. When alignment choices start being considered, public opinion will be actively solicited for it.
 - Anne emphasize that they during the screening process, consulting the “city” and the mayor’s office would not be equivalent to finding out from residents what they want.

Old Business

- Severity of accidents displays were made available to look at.
- Draft notes from last meeting
- “What are the Problems” fact sheet was provided.
- EJ newsletter proposal
 - *Review and let Danielle know if you’d like changes*
 - Cross-section views supplied and presented by Kris. Displays between areas were shown; emphasized again that these are very preliminary and will inevitably change somewhat.
- Discussion on cross-sections
 - Has the decision been made to carry transit toward the East?
 - Not at all, this is all still very preliminary. Have done a preliminary look at available land, possible park and ride locations, but this is all still just very representational. Can assume that almost everything will change.
- Clarifications were made about Hayden Island display.
- Questions about Split SPUI
- Clarified Tomahawk and elevation questions.
- Talked about the ranges in size of possible footprints on the island, from 100 ft to 100 yds. on either side. Effort is being put in to containing as much as possible in current interchange while fulfilling modern design standards.
- Doug reiterated that this would all change. A lot more specific information will come in spring w/DEIS. This is mostly discussions of themes and alternatives right now.
- Anne pointed out that finding out the specific ideas now though does help give an idea of what types of potential EJ impacts to be thinking about.

Questions

- Why isn’t transit system shown on handout on larger maps being discussed? (related to alternative #10) – *Anne*
- When are we going to start seeing alternative alignments? – *Anne*

- How many lanes will be on the first cross section map on supplemental & replacement bridged? – *Anne*
- Can we move light rail/buses to the east side? – *Anne*
- Has the decision been made to carry it to the east? (4th Plain SR 500 option)- *Anne*
- Is this the split SPUI? (Hayden Island option) – *Ed*
- How does the lane width compare to the existing footprint? – *Ed*
- The levels of the actual land, how high are the light rails going to be in footage? – *Dave S*
- What am I going to see when I look out my windows? – *Dave S*
- How tall is the wall going to be? – *Dave S*
- How do you want to be identified on the meeting minutes? State where people are from or if they represent a constituency.
- Imagine a videotape w/out sound of last meeting- looked at maps; identified places/resources in the neighborhood – what, where, why important
- Good points about last meeting: caught up on terminology - SPUI for instance- *Kris L.*
- What was not helpful?
- One concern – bridge on east side, Alt. 10, would wipe out grocery stores, pharmacy for Island residents- *Dave S.*
- No place to relocate homes on HI; businesses can move-*Michelle. 2/3 of alternative packages maps not showing the high capacity transit alignment- Dave, Anne.*
- Better to look at those as just representational alignment; are hot ticket and will be looked at *Chris*
- Mayor and transportation committee asked for light rail downtown – not the public *Anne*

Evaluation Criteria

- The evaluation criteria sheet was handed out and introduced by Kris as an attempt to quantify the evaluation criteria the Task Force and previously determined.
- Dave Frei made some comments from the perspective of a Task Force member.
 - Talked about the blue column representing criteria that the TF had already worked out and the white representing proposed means of quantifying and evaluating certain criteria.
 - Mentioned that the TF will be discussing on how well these meet their intent. Encouraged CEJG members to comment on these standards and send suggestions to Danielle on what else could be used to measure. Also encouraged them to find out what their neighbors thought.
- Kris reiterated that the question they were asking is how we measure these criteria in the short or long term, or if they can at all.
- Michelle asked about if there was a measure of how many homes destroyed there were.
 - Answer was that the preliminary standard was under 1.4.1

- Anne asked about the measure dealing with area percentages of the neighborhoods affected and expressed concern about using it as a measure.
- Staff responded that the neighborhood areas were determined with GIS mapping and were based on city government determined boundaries.
- Mentioned that one concern will likely be addressed multiple times through different criteria. So just because something looks ok in one instance does not guarantee it will look good if it does very poorly on another criteria.
- Qualitative measures will be used in this process as well. This will not be a case in which something is assigned a “score” and then a decision is made just based on that.
- Dave S. expressed an interest in the definition between “encroached upon” and “significantly” impacted.
 - Kris will follow up with him on it.
- Anne asked about the way in which EJ issues were represented.
- They are mostly represented in number 7, but are also represented in other portions as well.
- Dave brought up that these do not currently measure benefits to people outside the BIA either. Emphasized the need to highlight who is benefiting and who is paying for any given decision.

Questions

- Why wouldn't there be a measure or count to identify how many homes would be eliminated? – *Michele*
- Can you explain performance measure 1.22? Are you calculating neighborhood total area (%)? – *Anne*
- Why a total area of neighborhoods an important issue? – *Anne*
- How did you define neighborhood and area? – *Ed*
- Questioning value of area and neighborhood- we want you to understand the area- not linear. – *Ann*
- What is the difference between “significant impact” and “encroached” upon? – *Dave S*
- Do any of these columns represent EJ issues? – *Anne*
- How do we measure benefits to the outside area? – *Dave F*
- Who's benefiting and who's paying for it? – *Dave F*

Action Items

- Meeting minutes should indicate the community organization and/or constituency group that each community member represents – *Danielle*
- CEJG need to review the performance measures on the Alternative Package Evaluation document to see if they are the most valuable to evaluate. – *Dave F*
- Kris will get back to Dave Skagen about difference between “significantly impacted” and “encroached upon”

- CEJG Group – take home alternative package evaluation, review, and email/send comments to Danielle
- Focus more on what everybody needs that are not ant the table/meeting(s) – *Jeri*
- Present comments about Alt. Package Evaluation in public comment section - *Jeri*
- Start with learning about your community - *Anne*

Parking Lot

- Taller wall for Dave Skagen's property
- Next Wednesday Task Force will meet to determine if this meets the criteria of the task force (Referring to alternative package evaluation criteria) *DF*

***These meeting notes were reviewed and approved by the Community and Environmental Justice Group.**



Community and Environmental Justice Group Bus Tour Proposal

Objective

Build understanding within the Community and Environmental Justice Group and CRC staff of areas potentially affected by the project

Logistics

Date: Saturday in January 2007 to be determined by CEJG members

Time commitment: 5-6 hours

Segment # 1: Downtown Vancouver

Duration: 30 minutes

Location: Esther Short Park

- Proposed Topics:
 - Downtown redevelopment
 - Transit

- Proposed Speakers:
 - City of Vancouver staff

Travel time: Introduction of next segment

Segment # 2: Vancouver neighborhoods

Duration: One hour

Locations: Neighborhoods directly adjacent to I-5: Arnada, Shumway, Rose Village, Central Park and Hudson's Bay. Additional areas of interest to be determined by CEJG members with assistance from CRC staff.

Proposed Topics:

- I-5 Impacts:
 - Traffic
 - Congestion
 - Environmental Justice issues
 - Other

- Proposed Speakers:
 - CEJG members from Vancouver neighborhoods
 - City of Vancouver, Office of Neighborhood Services staff

Travel time: Introduction of next segment

Segment # 3: Port of Vancouver

Duration: 45 minutes

Location: Consult Port of Vancouver staff for best viewing area of port activity

Note: Valid identification is required to enter the Port of Vancouver.

- Proposed Topics:
 - The costs of congestion
 - The business of the Port of Vancouver

- Proposed Speakers:
 - Port of Vancouver staff

Travel time: Introduction of next segment

Lunch:

Duration: 45 minutes

Location: To be determined

Segment # 4: Hayden Island

Duration: 45 minutes

Locations: General tour of the island with stops at manufactured home community on the west side and floating home community directly below I-5. Additional areas of interest to be determined by CEJG members with assistance from CRC staff.

- Proposed Topics:
 - Access issues
 - Neighborhoods: floating homes and manufactured homes communities
 - Seniors

- Proposed Speakers:
 - CEJG members who live on Hayden Island

Travel time: Introduction of next segment

Segment # 5: North Portland neighborhoods

Duration: 45 minutes

Locations: Neighborhoods directly adjacent to I-5 in the project area: Kenton and Bridgeton. Additional areas of interest to be determined by CEJG members with assistance from CRC staff.

- Proposed Topics:
 - I-5 Impacts:
 - Congestion
 - Traffic
 - Environmental Justice concerns

- Proposed Speakers:
 - CEJG members from North Portland neighborhoods in project area
 - CRC staff

Travel time: Introduction of next segment

Segment # 6: Swan Island

Duration: 45 minutes

Location: General tour of Swan Island

- Proposed Topics:
 - The cost of congestion
 - Freight movement in the corridor

- Proposed Speakers:
 - CRC Staff
 - Port of Portland staff
 - Lenny Anderson, Swan Island Transportation Management Association

Travel time: Return to Vancouver



700 WASHINGTON STREET
SUITE 300
VANCOUVER, WA 98660
360-737-2726 | 503-256-2726

COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE GROUP

2007 CALENDAR- PROPOSED

Location: Kenton Firehouse, 2209 N. Schofield at Brandon, Portland, Oregon

Time: 6:00 p.m.-8:30 p.m.

January*

Tuesday, January 9

Thursday, January 18

February*

Thursday, February 1

Thursday, February 15

March

Thursday, March 15

April

Thursday, April 19

May

Thursday, May 17

June

Thursday, June 21

July

Thursday, July 19

August

Thursday, August 16

September

Thursday, September 20

October

Thursday, October 18

November

Thursday, November 15

December

Thursday, December 13 or 20

*Additional meetings may be proposed for these months

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOUR ROLE IS NOW?

COMMUNITY	STAFF
Outline clear info to combat rumors/misinformation on this project	Assist both staff & the group in reaching clarity in how the group can provide timely and meaningful input
Provide neighbors & coworkers with clear objective info on alternatives/project	Creation of a new kind of project that serves the whole of the community via a process of healthy, honest consensus building.
Learn from/listen to diverse viewpoints	Healthy understanding of everyone's concerns and that everyone contribute
A viable community enhancement fund	Provide support to the meeting so that group can concentrate on priorities. Take back what I hear to the Communications Team in a way that makes it useful to the staff.
Take alternatives back to Piedmont/A.L. NHS	Green bridge habitat, riparian improvements, tribal sites identified, better collaboration between Task Force and agencies.
Define my role	Learn what the communities are thinking and help CEJG with staff. Learn environmental impacts. Benzene?
Community update for my neighbors. Make them feel like they're being heard, having a good feeling that this could go well.	Want a long-term positive affect on community – not just “a project.”
Feel the community voice heard	Provide money to do everything everyone wants
Provide updated info to my community. Provide feedback to CRC. Provide concerns to CRC	Work with all groups: Needs, concerns, mid-ground of groups, project with “best fit” to meet needs, where “most” can see benefits of one project.
Great communicator, talk to people, get feedback, create solutions, more activity	Research (collect info from my area, neighborhood, residents/businesses) the direct and indirect economic, social, cultural, environments, and health benefits/burdens or impacts on the stakeholders.
Keep the staff honest. Hold them to their obligation/accountability to communities.	Form a closer and personal relationship with EJG.
Ask my questions and speak my truth.	Do a better job demonstrating how to present to neighborhood groups more effectively & engaging.

I come for food	Make sure that the communities on both sides of the bridge would not be hurt & would make the bridge mass-transit friendly.
Still unclear what my roll is. I need a task. Time is running out.	
Empathy and understanding of communities affected	
Define community needs	
Listen & react to various/diverse info/opinions of this group	
Represent and protect the interests of students in the VSD	
Who are we in this process	
Understand why some from org. are not here tonight, officials, higher ups should be representing groups here	
Listen more closely, follow process more closely	
Ways to mitigate project impacts: air quality, noise, health, more ways to minimize project's impact on those next to I-5. Communicate with those folks moved and those remaining newly adjacent to I-5	
Provide info. About project to people	
All information is factual from the project	
Enable a democratic process	
Educate community – CEJG – Project	
Bring beauty to project. Is CRC listening? Everyone happy?	
Keeping everything in check. Follow up on what CRC is saying.	

Community and Environmental Justice Group (CEJG)
Columbia River Crossing Project

GROUP OPERATING GUIDELINES

MEMBERSHIP

The CEJG is comprised of invited members from neighborhoods in the project area including: Environmental Justice communities (low-income, African American, Latino, Vietnamese and Russian speaking), two liaisons from the Columbia River Crossing Task Force and up to five (5) at-large members. Membership shall seek to represent a broad cross-section of the community including seniors, commuters, people with disabilities and youth. A member desiring to resign shall submit a written resignation to the Project Team. The Project Team may appoint new members or alternates as positions become vacant.

Neighborhoods in the Project Area:

Lincoln	Hudson's Bay
West Minnehaha	Esther Short
Shumway	Kenton
Rosemere	Hayden Island
Rose Village	Bridgeton
Arnada	
Central Park	

ATTENDANCE

Members make every effort to attend every scheduled meeting for its full duration. If unable to attend, member should notify CRC staff as soon as possible, preferably giving staff 48 hours notice. If unable to attend, members may arrange for an alternate (with Project approval) to serve on her/his behalf. Member has the responsibility to keep the alternate informed and up-to-date on CEJG issues so he/she is able to participate in discussions in a meaningful way. Only appointed members can weigh in on recommendations to the Columbia River Crossing Project Team.

SCHEDULE

Meetings will be scheduled on a monthly basis until June 2007 or until a Locally Preferred Alternative is selected. Additional meetings will also be scheduled as needed. Meetings will be held from 6:30 p.m.-8:30 p.m., unless otherwise noted. Dinner for the group will be served at 6:00 p.m. Two Saturday meetings are scheduled from 9:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. Additional Saturday meetings may also be scheduled as needed.

LOCATION

Meetings will take place at this location:
Kenton Firehouse
2209 N. Schofield St.
Portland, OR 97217

In times of off-peak traffic, meetings may be held on Hayden Island or in Vancouver. Other locations may be used as deemed necessary by the group. Meeting locations will be ADA and transit accessible. It is the intention of the group that gathering at different locations will meet two needs: 1) for different communities in the project area to have access to the meetings and 2) to encourage CEJG members to become familiar with other neighborhoods and communities in the project area.

OPEN MEETINGS

- Each meeting will allow for comment from the public.
- CRC staff will produce meeting summaries for each meeting.
- The previous meeting's summary shall be reviewed and adopted at the start of the current meeting.
- Formal recommendations will be made in writing and delivered to the Project Team at key milestones.
- Information on the CEJG and meeting summaries, once approved, will be posted on the project website (www.columbiarivercrossing.org)

DIALOGUE PRINCIPLES

“How we communicate is often as important as what we communicate. Depending partially on cultural variables such as nationality, ethnicity, gender, and race (among others), individuals may have a reference for both sending and receiving messages in styles that are linear or circular, direct or indirect, attached or detached, procedural or personal, and more confrontational in either intellectual or relational terms.”*

- The way we communicate passes on cultural values. To keep communication open, we pledge to recognize and respect each other's cultural values in group dialogue and efforts to increase public awareness about the project.
- We need everyone's wisdom for the greatest results.
- We commit to treat each other with respect.
- We shall seek to replace judgment with curiosity.
- We agree that learning and productivity are proportional to the positive emotional state of participants.
- We deserve to have our successes celebrated and affirmed.

* *According to Culture and Learning: Educational Research Services (2003)*

RECOMMENDATION PROCEDURE

The policy of the Community and Environmental Justice Group shall be to work towards consensus and forward recommendations that are supported by the full group. If consensus is not reached, a report reflecting the range of perspectives and divergent interests will be submitted.

Building Consensus**

When working in a group it is important that all members of the group play a role. Consensus is a strategy that involves everyone playing a role in the decision making process of a group. In order for this process to be successful it is important to be open to compromise.

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, consensus is defined as:

1. a: general agreement; b: the judgment arrived at by most or all of those concerned.
2. group solidarity in sentiment and belief

Guidelines

- Trust and respect each other. This is not a competition. Don't be afraid to express your ideas and opinions.
- While building a consensus make sure everyone is following, listening to, and understanding each other.
- All members should contribute their ideas and knowledge to the subject.
- Stay on task.
- Disagreement is healthy. Be flexible to reach an agreement. We can also agree to disagree.
- Identify common ground as well as levels of agreement on the way to consensus.
- Allow each person to fully contemplate their thought or idea. No interrupting or side conversations, please.
- Separate the issues from the personalities. This is not a time to disagree just because you don't like someone.
- Spend more time on this process. Being quick is not a sign of quality. The thought process needs to be drawn out some.

Procedure

1. Agree on your objectives for the task/project, expectations, and rules (see guidelines above).
2. Define the problem or decision to be reached by consensus.
3. Figure out what must be done to reach a solution.
4. Brainstorm possible solutions.
5. Discuss pros and cons of the narrowed down list of ideas/solutions.
6. Adjust, compromise, and fine tune the agreed upon idea/solution so all group members are satisfied with the result.
7. Make your decision. Repeat the decision so everyone is clear on what has been decided.
8. If a consensus isn't reached, review and/or repeat steps one through six.
9. If there is difficulty in reaching consensus, there are several ways to express objection:
 - a. Non-support ("I don't see a need for this, but I'll go along.")
 - b. Reservations ("I think this may be a mistake, but I can live with it.")
 - c. Standing aside ("I personally can't do this, but I won't stop others from doing it.")
 - d. Blocking ("I cannot support this or allow the group to support this.")
10. Once the decision has been made, act upon what you decided.

*(**Adapted from the Triton and Patterns Project of San Diego Unified School District.)*

2007 Task Force Meeting Date (4 th Tues. of each month)	Location	Co-Chair Meeting Date (Tues.-Thurs. of the second week of each month)
January 23 rd	WA	Jan. 9 – 11
February 27 th	OR	Feb. 13 -15
March 27 th	WA	March 13 -15
April 24 th	OR	April 10 -12
May 22 nd	WA	May 8 -10
June 26 th	OR	June 12 -14
July 24 th	WA	July 10 -12
August 28 th	OR	Aug. 14 – 16
September 25 th	WA	Sept. 11 - 13
October 23 rd	OR	Oct. 9 – 11
November 27 th	WA	Nov. 13 -15
December 11 th	OR	November 27--29