



## Community and Environmental Justice Group

February 15, 2007  
5:30 p.m.-8:30 p.m.

Kenton Firehouse  
2209 N. Schofield St.  
Portland, OR 97217

### *Agenda*

#### Meeting Objectives:

- Review public comment from community meetings and open houses
- Discuss and finalize CEJG response to staff recommendation
- Discuss and finalize CEJG process for reporting response
- Review and comment on agenda for next meeting
- Celebrate accomplishment for reaching key project milestone

Dinner	5:30 p.m.
Welcome	6:00 p.m.
Review meeting purpose and draft agenda	6:05 p.m.
Report on public comments from community meetings/open houses	6:10 p.m.
Discuss and finalize CEJG response and process to present response	6:30 p.m.
Review and comment on agenda for next meeting	8:00 p.m.
Public Comment	8:10 p.m.
Review Action Items & Next Steps	8:15 p.m.
Celebrate milestone accomplishment!!	8:20 p.m.
Closing and Next Meeting Reminder	8:30 p.m.



## Meeting Summary

February 1, 2007

**Meeting:** Community and Environmental Justice Group

**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2007

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

### Members Present

John Benson

Ed Garren

Dave Frei

Anne McEnery-Ogle

Connie Sherrard

Dave Skagen

Michelle Tworoger

Marcia Ward

### Members Absent

Diana Avalos

Desiree Carter

Jonath Colón-Montesi

Keith Edwards

Kris Long

Lawrence Russell

Jeri Sundvall-Williams

Nikki Williams

### CRC Staff Present

Doug Ficco

Kris Strickler

Heather Gunderson

Danielle Cogan

Tom Markgraf

Nanci Luna Jiménez

Barbara Mac Kay\*

Rangineh Azimzadeh\*

\*Facilitator's Assistants

### Guests Present

Daniel Sherrard (Connie's son)

Cameron Owen

Mia Waters

*Air Quality, Acoustic & Energy Programs Manager*

*Environmental Services Office*

*Washington Department of Transportation*

### Introductions and Team Building Activity

The meeting started out by having each participant state their name, where they live and one thing they learned from attending either the bus tour or Open Houses.

Heather Gunderson – CRC Project Staff (NW Portland);

- Enjoyed the bus tour and appreciated it.

Rangineh Azimzadeh –Facilitation Team (SW Portland)

- Felt the bus tour was extremely enlightening; learned more about Environmental Justice.

Mia Waters – Washington State Department of Transportation (Seattle)

- Seattle; Didn't attend the bus tour or Open Houses.

Danielle Cogan – CRC Project Staff (SE Portland)

- Thanks for attending the bus tour and thanks to all of the planners for their help in making it happen.

Anne McEnerney-Ogle – (Vancouver)

- Didn't go on the bus tour.

Kris Strickler – CRC Project Staff (Camas, WA)

- Thanks to everyone for their hard work. With regards to the Open House, I learned that people provide their input (i.e. personal perspective people provide about the project).

Dave Skagen – (Vancouver)

- I noticed on the bus tour that the staff vs. CEJG members were outnumbered.

Ed Garren – (Hayden Island)

- Pleasure hosting lunch for the bus tour and to see Dave Skagen's back yard; Open House at Hayden Island was well attended.

Cameron Owen – Senior at Hudson's Bay High School (Vancouver)

- Interesting to see how the Open House started from the beginning of the project until where we are now. This was helpful for those that haven't been following the project from the beginning.

Marcia Ward – (Vancouver)

- I was surprised at how well attended the Open House at Lincoln was.

Daniel Sherrard – (Vancouver)

- Didn't attend the bus tour or Open House.

Michelle Tworoger – (Janzen Beach Floating Home Community)

- The bus tour opened my eyes to the houses impacted on the Vancouver side; it was a bonding experience.

Connie Sherrard – (Vancouver)

- It was great to see Hayden Island up close during the bus tour.

Doug Ficco – CRC Project Staff (Ridgefield)

- The bus tour was better than watching the history channel; I visited streets I didn't know about and appreciated the people who planned it--we have to do this again.

John Benson – (Piedmont)

- The bus tour was a really an eye opening experience to see potential impacts on communities-Ed's hospitality and Michelle's perspective. Potential impacts are perhaps bigger than anticipated. Open House was well attended; heard people say that it feels like decisions have been made already.

Dave Frei – (Vancouver)

- The bus tour was great; it created a picture and feel for the community. The Open House was well attended.

Barbara MacKay – (Beaverton)

- With regards to the bus tour, Ed's food! With regards to the Open House, the thing that stood out was how well attended it was.

Nanci Luna Jiménez – (North Portland)

- The Open Houses had so much energy. One thing that stood out was all the different ways people were able to enter and provide comments.

### **Opening Comments and Discussion**

- Review of meeting objectives
- ACTION: Request to approve meeting minutes via email

### **Bus Tour and Open House Debrief**

- Ed – This tour was the residential tour and didn't touch the industrial aspect which deals with traffic and congestion. Need to do Port of Vancouver and industrial/commercial area as a separate tour; it's what feeds the impact.

- Connie – It was an EJ tour and that’s why the industrial and commercial areas weren’t included.
- Danielle – The industrial and commercial areas were originally included but per people’s request they were taken out.
- Doug – Should probably look at interchanges.
- Michelle – We should have blown-up maps available at meetings in order to help us understand the interchanges.
- Dave S. – At the Open Houses there were a lot of people who didn’t know construction on 39<sup>th</sup> street was even happening.
- Anne – I-5 is one of 6 major projects happening and having info from different projects at the Open Houses may not have been the appropriate place to display info about them.
- Kris – We have had requests from other community members to have info from all projects to be brought to the Open Houses.
- Dave S. – People didn’t know everything that was included in the project.
- Dave F. – Bringing in staff working on the other projects is helpful in understanding the true impact.
- Doug – It’s not uncommon to have multiple projects represented similar to what you see at the Open Houses.
- Anne – None of the info that was presented at the Open House was ever shared with any of the other neighborhoods; if this is to continue all of the info should be sent to all of the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Danielle – Will find out if WSDOT can forward what they talked about at the Open Houses to the other neighborhoods

### **Public Outreach: Recruiting new CEJG members**

- Dave S. – Word of mouth; I talked with several people that were interested but I didn’t feel like it was my place to invite them to the meetings.
- Danielle – It’s a public meeting, but we should discuss protocol about how to do this and make sure people in the impact areas are still getting heard. We also need to get underrepresented neighborhoods proper representation.
- Michelle – Get someone involved from Hayden Island mall.
- Dave F. – Hayden Island mall has a representative on the Task Force.

### **Air Quality and Noise Presentation**

**Mia Waters** - Washington Dept. of Transportation (WDOT)

A significant amount of the questions asked centered around modeling vs. monitoring. There was a general consensus from the group that many of their questions had not been adequately answered and that they would like to have other speakers address the issue of air quality and noise during future meetings.

*Handouts Included:* “Reducing Diesel Emissions in WA State: Progress to Date, Future Needs and Efforts” and “Reducing Diesel Emissions in WA State: Understanding Diesel Emissions”.

- Mia – In regards to noise, WA has a specific methodology for identifying impacted homes
- Anne – What is the new CA study about air quality affecting children in regards to air emission levels?
- Mia – There tends to be a spike from the edge of the roadway that creates a zone where the highest levels of emissions accumulate.
- Anne – In looking at monitoring vs. modeling, if you are using formulas developed elsewhere, how will you adapt them to this area?

- Mia – We will be looking at the 6 types of emission (referred to in the handout) in aggregate. For each alternative we ask, “What are the major differences in terms of emissions?” Tools to evaluate the type of pollution we will face haven’t yet been developed. The way to deal with this is to look at a Burden Analysis, which tells us within an accuracy of 30-50% what the tons of emissions will be with each alternative. We look at the total emissions but to layer on additional factors makes it inaccurate.
- Dave S. – Why don’t you put your tools in my backyard to find out what’s going on?
- Mia – Monitoring is a different analysis.
- Ed – The explanation about new technology in the handout is poor; I find it extremely crazy that monitoring tools cannot be provided to homes in the impacted areas.
- Mia – We don’t have these tools; they are spread out and expensive. Plus the info they collect doesn’t necessarily get to the particulates we’re looking for.
- Anne – Can you talk about benzene?
- Mia – Higher rates in WA and OR, which comes mostly from gasoline.
- Anne – Can you address air quality during construction? Construction vehicles idling for 4-5 hrs, how will you address this? We want to make ensure air quality is taken into account during the project-on low income areas that are 50 ft from construction areas.
- Mia – We will be looking to coordinate construction between OR and WA in order to implement best practices such as:
  - Having provisions around automatic shut-off from idling
  - Dust provisions
  - Watering roads
  - Rock aprons
- Ed – You should require [in the contract] that they use on-road ultra-low sulfur retro-fitted equipment. If our group makes this recommendation then doesn’t that affect federal funding that is received?
- Anne – If a precedent has been set elsewhere, it can be set here as well.
- Ed – Switching to retro-fitted equipment is a tangible option.
- Anne – We are looking at air quality during construction, not just after. We want retro-fitted equipment on all the equipment being used on this project.
- Dave S. – What height is required for a sound wall in terms of air quality?
- Mia – Noise wall is small enough that it will not significantly keep pollution inside the roadway.
- John – Are there other projects we can use where modeling was done?

### **Group Activity (reflection on the presentation):**

- Dave S. – Don’t go through theories, just come to my house and get the data.
- Nanci – Strong opinion about air quality and a want to have air quality measured in these communities.
- Ed – I learned that WDOT doesn’t have any monitoring equipment; this is a passionate issue.
- Doug – Putting a monitor out now is only telling us what’s happening today, we need to look at the change-what’s going to happen to add or take away lanes.
- Anne- We want to know what it is today. Why can’t we find out that answer? We have asked for baseline data for the past 4 years.
- Dave S. – I don’t care what it costs, you going to ruin neighborhoods so we want to have the data in front of us.
- Danielle – There are some questions we need to address as a group such as:
  - Why modeling and not monitoring?
  - Who is “they”?
 Being clear on these will make the discussion about air quality clearer
- Ed – Passion and concern around why people don’t have any data and why no one is willing to collect this data.

- Heather – It would be helpful to have someone come in and explain how monitoring will or will not help.
- Anne – Purpose of EJ meetings is to have info explained and communicated to us in a way that it makes sense so we can communicate it to others.

### **Task Force Meeting Report**

Discussed 3 agenda items:

- Options: discussed whether enough options exist (spent about an hour or so discussing the staff recommendation).
- Public comment: refreshing to see new public comment; it helps
- Presentation about transportation: What I took away was learning that regions that have only invested in highways are now staggering

### **Public Comment Summary**

After announcing the first Open House was rescheduled for Monday, February 5<sup>th</sup>, Danielle Cogan provided the group with a brief summary of the public comment that has been collected from the Open Houses thus far.

- Announcement – 1<sup>st</sup> Open House rescheduled for Monday, February 5<sup>th</sup>
- Between all of the Open Houses about 300 people attended
- We received a 60% response rate to feedback forms that were handed out
- There was a court recorder at each event
- The big topics were:
  - Transit (found more support for light rail vs. BRT)
  - Tunnel
- Over 50% of the people we talked to supported the staff recommendation as-is

### **Public Comment Summary- Questions and Comments**

- Nanci - What is the target date to have the public comment summary in writing?
  - February 16<sup>th</sup>, I can send a sample to the group if it will help with writing their response. (Danielle)
- John – I would like to see what else is being said in the public
- Kris – We can get the group a sample, but the group needs to know that additional comments will be collected after February 16<sup>th</sup>, which may reflect a totally different opinion than what the sample we provide now might say.
- Danielle – We will get a hard copy sample to the group in the mail by Monday, February 5<sup>th</sup>.

### **Response to Staff Recommendation Refresher**

- Ed – Navigation
- Michelle – My understanding is that Clark County voted down light rail once already-how can the staff recommendation still include this option when tax payers voted it down?
- Anne – How much are people willing to pay for light rail that they will not use?
- Kris – There is a large population that won't vote for it because people won't use it; is it a worthwhile investment?

### **Group Activity (writing exercise):**

The group was asked to write down what they would like to see captured in their response to the staff recommendation.

- Dave F. – It's important to have a picture of the community; to have them accurately described.

- Anne – From the 2000 census, we know the social demographics of the impacted areas. Who is receiving this letter? Will we have another opportunity to add more comments as staff bring us more info?
- Danielle – Yes, you can provide feedback at each milestone.
- Dave F. – Can other alternatives be added down the line?
- Doug – Yes, you can submit additional alternatives to DEIS.
- Dave F. – The question for the group on the 16<sup>th</sup> is do we want to go forward with the staff recommendation or not and why.
- Michelle – Are we looking to write a response to the staff recommendation noting these additional questions?
- Kris – We're not asking 2 important questions:
  - Do we have transit adequately represented?
  - Do we have a river crossing adequately represented?
  - Do you want to come in with a group or individual response or both?
- Anne – Concern in looking at the agenda that the group was supposed to vote for or against supporting the staff recommendation. There are a ton of issues that impact us that we don't have enough info about.
- Ed – Sounds like we need to write a letter saying "this" is what we agree on; I think generally we have more power as a group.

#### **What does the group think/feel about the staff recommendation?**

- Anne – I don't have enough info to agree with the staff recommendation. The impact of building a replacement bridge could be so devastating that "no build" might be the best option.
- Doug – What is the other data you are looking for (air quality aside)?
- Anne – Total amount of displaced homes. If this group can go forward with saying "no build" is included in staff recommendation, I can move forward.
- Dave F. – If we go through this and a "no build" happens then this project failed; the region wants a solution and "no build" is not the solution it wants.

#### **Action Items**

- Danielle – To send public comments, or a representative sample, by US mail to CEJG members before CEJG response is finalized by Monday, Feb. 5<sup>th</sup>.
- Ed – To draft response
- Anne, Dave F., Michelle – To edit response
- LJS to send Ed versions of other EJ reports
- LJS and Associates will email preamble and table of "headings" to Ed and cc editors by Friday, Feb. 2<sup>nd</sup>
- Ed – Will get 1<sup>st</sup> draft of response to editorial team by Monday, Feb. 5<sup>th</sup> (Any newly added categories not created by the group to be marked in red or in italics).
- Draft to whole group by February 7<sup>th</sup>

#### **Parking Lot**

- Need to see different folks from the public make comments at the Task Force meetings (Dave Frei)
- May need a separate bus tour of Delta Park-and other industrial/commercial areas (Ed) when we get into design-appropriate time to look at interchanges also (Doug)
- Have maps available of existing interchanges and how they might be changed (Michelle)
- Separate (other I-5) projects shown at Open Houses may have detracted (i.e. rail crossing 39<sup>th</sup> street projects) (Anne)
- We need to know in advance that that is happening (i.e. put it in newsletters) (Anne/Dave)

- And have separate people from CRC project to take comments on these other projects at Open Houses (Dave F.)
- None of the other neighborhood officers knew about it-send to all offices of all neighborhoods
- Require all contractors to retrofit (coming into effect anyway in five years) diesel trucks and use on-road low sulfur fuel (Ed)
- Tangible thing to reduce emissions (Ed)
- Have a whole topic at another meeting regarding sound and air quality walls (i.e. mitigation measures) (Anne)
- Pass onto key people that we have some passionate people around air quality
- Bring in regulatory partner (i.e. Dept. of Ecology and Environmental Quality) to explain what monitoring does or does not do for you. Need to decide what specifically this person would talk about (Heather)

We, the community members of the Community Environmental Justice Group (CEJG) have been meeting monthly since August of 2006. We are a collection of neighborhood activists within the Influence Area of the Columbia River Crossings project (CRC). We represent the communities which will be most significantly affected by the CRC project because we live and/or work in the immediate impact area of the construction project on Hayden Island and in Vancouver. Many of our communities contain low income and minority individuals.

On January 9, 2007 the CRC staff presented their recommendation for the Range of Alternatives to advance for further analysis in the Columbia River Crossing Draft Environmental Impact Statement to us.

After much deliberation and discussion, it is the consensus of this group that we cannot Accept or Decline the Staff Recommendation because we believe there are too many unanswered issues regarding the impacts facing the communities we represent.

While we acknowledge the need for a new bridge, and that the mass transit inclusion offers significant benefit to the project and the region, the following categories of issues have yet to be addressed to our satisfaction.

- I. Significant Health and Environmental Issues
- II. Mitigation of Issues Relating to Homes and Quality of Life.
- III. Length of Time and Costs of Project.
- IV. Study of Alternatives for Corridor Placement and the Impact Area.

A specific chart of the details of the issues raised is attached. A summation is below.

- I. Health and Environmental issues include, but are not limited to:

Air quality and Noise

The CEJG members are concerned about current and future air quality and noise issues, particularly within 1500 feet of the I-5 corridor.

We would like to know the current level of emissions (including diesel emissions) and noise levels to establish a base line for data collection.

We would like to know what air quality and noise standards will be negotiated for construction equipment and related project vehicles.

We would like to know how the air quality and noise standards will be monitored and how they will be mitigated during and after the project is completed.

## II. Displacement of Community Resources, Homes and Neighborhoods.

After completing a bus tour of the BIA, the CEJG members calculate the possibility of having 61 homes in Vancouver, 36 floating homes on Hayden Island and 19-21 businesses along both sides of the bridge being removed, destroyed or heavily impacted.

We would like to know what compensations and mitigation measures will be made for those home owners and renters.

Hayden Island will lose virtually all of the neighborhood shopping resources (grocery, pharmacy, liquor store, restaurants and fuel stations).

What will be done to provide small business space on Hayden Island and in Vancouver, to replace the businesses displaced by the project?

## III. Length of Time and Costs of project.

How will the project be scheduled and executed? What are the time lines and construction deadlines for specific phases of the project? How will access to communities be affected during construction?

## IV. Alternatives and Corridor

Many believe the current corridor is already extended to its maximum and should not be expanded further. Have other options for location of the corridor, been fully explored? Community members in Vancouver and Hayden Island have strong concerns about the significant deterioration of their quality of life; both during construction and after the project is completed.

The group also expressed concern that while the initial development plans have been presented to the community, too few home owners, renters and businesses in the BIA are aware of the actual impacts.

Although the group believes that many, if not most of these issues can be mitigated as specific plans unfold, it is unwilling to offer endorsement of the “Build” option until more specific and detailed planning and solutions are offered to deal with the issues described above.

Therefore, at this time, the group cannot accept or decline the Staff Recommendation of “Build” or “Not Build.”