

**Community and Environmental Justice Group
Meeting #13**

June 21, 2007
5:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

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

Agenda

Meeting Objectives:

- Update on actions items from May CEJG meeting
- Review and confirm election process
- Elect two CEJG co-chairs (Oregon and Washington)
- Clarify expectations and new roles
- Determine and prioritize future agenda topics
- Celebrate and express appreciations

Dinner	5:30 p.m.
Welcome, introductions and announcements	6:00 p.m.
Review meeting purpose and draft agenda	6:05 p.m.
Update on May meeting action items	6:10 p.m.
Review CEJG proposed new structure and election process	6:15 p.m.
Elections and ballot count for co-chairs	6:25 p.m.
Clarifying expectations and new roles	6:40 p.m.
Report back and discussion on individual CEJG member and staff meetings	7:00 p.m.
Brainstorm key topics and prioritize for remainder of 2007	7:10 p.m.
Public Comment	8:10 p.m.
Reflection from new co-chairs/appreciations	8:15 p.m.
Closing and next meeting reminder	8:30 p.m.



Draft Meeting Notes
May 17, 2007

Meeting: Community and Environmental Justice Group

Date: Thursday, May 17, 2007

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

Members Present

John Benson

Jonath Colón-Montesi

Ed Garren

Dave Frei

Anne McEnery-Ogle

Dave Skagen

Michelle Tworoger

Marcia Ward

Members Absent

Diana Avalos

Kris Long

Nikki Williams

Connie Sherrard

Matt Whitney

CRC Staff Present

Rangineh Azimzadeh

Danielle Cogan

Doug Ficco

Jeff Heilman

Nanci Luna Jiménez

Barbara MacKay

Carolyn Sharp

Gregg Snyder

Kris Strickler

Rex Wong

CRC Staff Absent

Heather Gundersen

Guests Present

Stephanie Caftheart

Portland State University

Gwen

Introductions

CEJG members were asked to give their name, which neighborhood(s) they represent and to name one thing that is going good for them.

Caroline Sharp – CRC project staff

- “My broken arm is getting better everyday.”

Marcia Ward – (Vancouver)

- “My dogs got groomed today.”

Kris Strickler – CRC project staff

- “Weather is getting better so I can go out on the boat.”

Rangineh Azimzadeh – Facilitation team

- “Had a great Lebanese lunch. “

Michelle Tworoger – (Jantzen Beach)

- “Fighting breast cancer.”

Rex Wong – CRC project staff

- “This summer my wife and I will have all of the kids home.”

Jeff Heilman – CRC project staff

- “My daughter has one day of high school left, her excitement is contagious.”

Doug Ficco – CRC project staff

- “Here instead of Seattle.”

John Benson – (Piedmont Neighborhood)

- “Along with the weather, my golf game.”

Stephanie Caftheart – Portland State University (looking at alt forms of transportation)

- “Something good is the weather.”

Gregg Snyder – CRC project staff

“Just signed my two kids up for summer camp.”

Dave Frei – (Vancouver)

- “Sam & I are looking forward Doser Days.”

Anne McEnery-Ogle – (Vancouver)

- “Cooking for 100 people tomorrow.”

Ed Garren – (Hayden Island)

- “Had a lot of drama in the past 2 months around Hayden Island shopping center with regards to a renovation project. We were able to come to a solution that was a win-win for everyone. The other thing is that I decided to open up a private practice for individual and family therapy.”

Danielle Cogan – CRC project staff

- “Good to be alive.”

Barb MacKay – Facilitation team

- “My kids are visiting each other in Montreal and their getting along and the other thing is that I have a massive amount of Iris’ in my garden.”

Nanci Luna Jiménez – Facilitation team

- “Just signed up for my first triathlon in 3 years.”

Review of Objectives

After introductions, Nanci reviewed the meeting objectives and Danielle followed by addressing April action items. She began by addressing Michelle Tworoger's concern about a traffic signal that appeared on one of the maps during the last meeting. Danielle said the map is only looking at traffic improvements and it doesn't necessarily mean that a traffic signal or parking lot would be placed there. During the last meeting Dave S. also heard that the CRC Project had surveyors going out into the neighborhoods and Danielle confirmed that the project does not have anyone out at this time but will have people going out to do noise monitoring. Michelle & Dave S. will have noise monitors put next to their homes. She concluded by saying that project staff doesn't know exactly what right-of-way impacts will look like, but that they believe at this point that everyone who's home might be impacted by the project will be contacted and a meeting will be set up.

- *Michelle* – “What is the 4th alternative? What happened to keeping existing bridge and adding a supplemental bridge? With the replacement bridge option, does the existing bridge go away?”
- *Ed* – “How do you define impact? Is that defined by either of the states DOT or the federal governments? I'm going to offer a suggestion that the group may or may not want to agree with: It might be helpful for this group to notify anyone that is within 30-40 feet of an impact property.”
- *John B.* – “Contacting not only the property owners, but also tenants of the property.”
- *Michelle* – “In that same conversation about acquisition, we need to have conversation about where people might be moved to.”
- *Doug* – “I like what Michelle said, we need to define process.”
- *Michelle* – “Two things: 1.) I'd like to know that the homes by the bridge won't be living under the new bridge and 2.) I would like to see on paper considerations of going east of the bridge, especially on the slope.”
- *Ed* – “The easiest thing would be for staff to consider the idea about notifying people and to make sure impacted people will be part of the process as it unfolds.”
- *Dave F.* – “All people should be notified about potential impacts and timing and sensitivity are important. Timing with regards to letting the person with the impacted property know and then maybe a week later the neighbors.”
- *Dave F.* – “Danielle has an ongoing action item that has to do with the website.”
- *Danielle* – “The website is in the fine tuning process and once the site is complete, everyone will receive an email letting them know it's up (should be up Wednesday, May 23rd).”

Following the discussion, the meeting transitioned to the reviewing the NEPA Process. CEJG members were asked what they remembered in terms of key steps in the NEPA Process. Michelle Tworoger read one of the key steps from one of the NEPA handouts.

CEJG Group Process, Structure and Functioning

Danielle announced to the CEJG members that the project is suggesting that the group transition from a facilitative format to a co-chair structure. She emphasized that the staff would like the group's suggestions about how to make the transition most effective. Danielle mentioned (via the handout description) that the new format will allow the group to influence the project development process through engaging other CEJG and

community members as well as work closely with the CRC project staff. She concluded by asking if the group had any questions. The general response by the group reflected initial interest and curiosity.

Following questions, the group was asked to name key phrases that they heard Danielle say. Only a few people responded stating they heard the words “chair led” and that the new process would help the group weigh in effectively on the project. They were also asked what they thought was appealing about the new structure as well as suggestions as to things they might offer or change about the proposal. The group responded with a generally positive tone and appeared to be pleased with the opportunity to have the meetings run by fellow CEJG members. Finally, they were asked what about the proposal made them nervous and how they could maximize success with regards to the transition. The most common concern about the new proposal appeared to be centered around staying on track with regards to the process and the two comments that were made in terms of suggestions for maximizing success were about connecting with the new co-chairs and allowing each member to be truly heard.

Ed – “I think we as a group have talked about this before, I haven’t read all the details but I’m interested in the concept.”

John – “Would the meeting with the CRC staff be during the business day in Vancouver?”

What are some key phrases you heard Danielle say?

- *Ed* – “Chair led.”
- *Michelle* – “Help guide the groups work to effectively weigh in on the project.”

What about this concept is appealing?

- *Michelle* – “Developing these co-chair positions would be a good opportunity to get more involved, it would be more productive.”

What are some suggestions you might offer or change about the proposal?

- *John* – “Would the co-chair stand up with you while you lead and they help?”
- *Ed* – “So the down side is you won’t be at the meetings? It would seem to me that it would be in everyone’s best interest for there not to be any external facilitating when we go through the DEIS process.”
- *Michelle* – “It’s an excellent opportunity to stimulate feedback from the communities; it just adds another layer of involvement.”

What if anything makes you nervous?

- *Marcia* – “How will we know whether or not we are on track? What we do is really going to be driven by DEIS right?”
- *Dave F.* – “It would be our responsibility to follow the charter but it also puts it on us to decide what it looks like; it puts it on us which I think is the right choice.”

What are some ways to maximize success as you make this transition?

- *Dave S.* – “Wanting the group to connect with the co-chairs and having that input in advance; want to make sure that we as a group are going in the right direction.”
- *Michelle* – “Being felt like we are heard. There are some issues that haven’t been addressed like why do they have to rip through low-income neighborhoods? I see the co-chair process as helping this.”
- *Kris S.* – “I see this as an opportunity for us to work together with the group so that we can have a two way conversation. There shouldn’t be any nervousness about getting off track because we’re going to help each other through the process and make sure we each stay on track.”

Group Activity

Each group member was asked to pair up and talk for one minute about why they would make a great co-chair.

Election Process

Danielle followed the group activity by explaining the process in which the co-chairs would be elected. She explained that one co-chair from Oregon and one co-chair from Washington would be elected and that any interested members should contact her by June 1st. The staff will notify all nominated candidates and send the CEJG members the list of candidates by June 14th. Danielle concluded by saying that the election will take place at the next meeting on June 21st and that votes would be tallied by Rangineh and Barb during the meeting. The results will be announced toward the end of the meeting.

- *Anne* – “Over the last several months we’ve had a lot of people come to the meetings; how do we know that an individual is qualified to vote just because they’ve attended 75% of the meetings?”
- *Ed* – “It would be helpful if you could send out a roster of who makes the 75% cut and also if a group member could also audit the final vote in addition to Barb & Rangineh.”
- *John* – “Do we have such a thing as an absentee ballot?”
- *Danielle* – “We don’t have one but we can institute one for this process.”
- *Ed* – “If we’re going to use 75% attendance as a qualification, then we should consider this in the absentee ballot.”

2007 Calendar

Danielle presented the group with a list of proposed meeting dates through May 2008 because that is when the public comment period is going to take place. She mentioned that the group will need to make effective comments about the DEIS at that time so the Project Staff will need a list of topics that the group feels are important to cover. She also emphasized the importance of making sure the group is prepared to discuss the DEIS as well as other people within the communities. Finally, she underlined the need to figure out what topics the group wants to cover between now and December.

- *Dave F.* – “I look to the newly elected co-chairs to help determine what some of these topics will be.”
- *Kris* – “It just occurred to me that maybe this group hasn’t seen a technical report from a DEIS and it might be worth bringing back to give the group an idea of what the headings look like for future reference.”

Following the calendar discussion, Danielle asked the group how they felt about meeting over the summer. The group agreed it was fine to meet over the summer and Ed suggested finding an air conditioned place, possibly in July or August, to accommodate a potential heat wave.

DEIS Alternative PowerPoint Presentation

Gregg Snyder, Columbia River Crossing project

Gregg began his presentation with by stating that the goal of the presentation was to introduce where the project is now in terms alternatives, what is being studied, and why it's being studied, etc. He went on to say the project started out by providing basic education during the summer at fairs and festivals and getting the information out. He mentioned that the September workshops are an opportunity for public comment and echoed Danielle's earlier sentiments that if the project expects people to comment, they need to know what to share in terms of information to that they can gain thoughtful feedback in the fall.

Over 5,000 public comments were received and a significant amount pertained to transit. Gregg stated that the project is currently in the process of narrowing down alternatives for detailed evaluation. In 2008 an alternative will be chosen and in 2009 a Record of Decision will be made. He went on to list the current alternatives:

- No build (this option is what the other alternatives are compared against)
- Replacement Bridge with Bus Rapid Transit
- Replacement Bridge with Light Rail Transit
- Supplemental Bridge with Bus Rapid Transit
- Supplemental Bridge with Light Rail Transit

Gregg discussed the possible implications and changes in terms of public transportation that would be put into place to accommodate Alternatives 2 and 3. He then reviewed each of the alternatives via maps and explained the possible routes and what they would look like at a street level. He was able to provide a detailed explanation and show the group exactly what the new routes would look like and where they would be located. Gregg took a moment to answer a few questions from the group before moving on with his presentation.

- *Ed* – “I suggest you start dialogue early with the Jantzen Beach Super Center if you are thinking seriously about this alternative.”
- *Anne* – “Is a guide way a dedicated lane?”
- *Anne* – “So you would have a dedicated guide lane on 4th plain?”
- *Ed* – “Only the guide lane is the dedicated lane?”
- *Anne* – “What are the specifications of a trunk?”
- *Gregg* – “We define them as articulated buses, mostly a marketing and frequency improvement on those lines.”

Gregg continued his presentation and went on to discuss Alternatives 4 and 5. He highlighted the key components of the alternatives, which included information about freight mobility, bicycle/pedestrians, seismic capabilities, and railroad swing span. Gregg also touched a bit on the amendments made by the Task Force with regards to the Fourth Alternative. He concluded by asking the group if they had any questions. *For

more detailed information regarding the presentation please see the “DEIS Alternatives 1-5” PowerPoint handout.

- *Ed* – “Is DEIS going to look at all 4 alternatives or just a chosen one?”
- *Dave S.* – “How will they determine the impacts of moving the opening on the railroad bridge? So if they got the new alignment, will there be a guarantee that there won’t be a bridge lift?”
- *Anne* – “Is Broadway handling both North and South bound traffic?”
- *Marcia* – “What happens to automobile traffic? Do you widen the street to include or exclude it?”
- *Anne* – “How much width do you need for 2 lanes of traffic and 2 lanes of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)? If we wanted a car lane going north and south including Bus Rapid Transit is 51 feet our limit? With regards to the 39th Street Park-n-ride is it possible to take less space?”
- *Dave S.* – “Your saying right of way, are you talking about taking out sidewalks?”
- *Anne* – “We have a terminology piece we need to work out.”

Following the question and answer period, the group was asked to circle around an enlarged map of the project area and to identify any questions, comments or points of confusions. The group engaged in discussion around the map until the end of the meeting.

- *Marcia* – “Who are the anticipated users of Park-n-rides in Vancouver?”
- *Dave S.* – “How many parking places?”
- *Marcia* – “Where do you anticipate putting displaced auto traffic?”
- *Anne* – “39th Street gets brunt end of traffic now.”
- *Anne* – “Where will usual traffic go if LR on F-Street. I suggest a potential diversion on ‘F’ Street.”
- *Dave S.* – “Will anyone be encroached upon in area of 500?”
- *Anne* – “Would part of the hospital, nursing home or church be taken out?”
- *Anne* – “We care about the Heritage trees in downtown and others that live further away may not. If everyone gets input, even when they are not impacted, how will you weigh public input from different areas?”
- *Dave S.* – “Guy in Battleground should not drive decision in someone else’s area.”
- *Dave S.* – “Facilities impacts, make sure those folks have most input (i.e. we don’t want to get trumped by people outside the area).”
- *Anne* – “Know where comments are coming from and ‘disqualify’ those who make suggestions about areas that are not their own.”
- *Danielle* – “Should we only have meetings for those folks impacted?”
- *Dave S.* – “With regards to 29th & 33rd, do you have to widen it?”
- *Dave S.* – “In the bridge example, it shows cross sections on Main street and I-5 showing guideway and travel lanes.”
- *Anne* – “Did you get clarification on zoning? Don’t want transit on Main Street. Businesses and families behind it get affected too.”
- *Anne* – “If you cut 2 lanes off Main Street, car will go into residential neighborhoods. Crime increases with increased commerce and then homeowners sell or renters come in. Trucks diverting down Main Street to 14th is an issue.”

- *Dave S.* – “5,000 people live in Rose Village area.”
- *Anne* – “It needs to be clear that if people want bike lanes, then this will impact sidewalks.”
- *Dave S.* – “What affect will adding light rail have on people living in Rose Village?”

Action Items

- Absentee ballot process
- *Danielle* – Send group a roster of those who have attended 75% of meetings
- *CEJG Members* – Review topic list and come back to June meeting with suggestions for other topics
- *Jeff* – Technical report list for next meeting
- *Danielle* – Explore Vancouver sites for summer meetings (with air conditioning preferred for July - September)
- *Gregg* – Send electronic maps to *CEJG* members so *CEJG* members can go to neighbors with them
- *Michelle* needs paper copies of maps to post around Hayden Island
- *Gregg* – Bring cross sections on Main Street & I-5 showing High Capacity Transit (HCT) guideway and travel lanes



**Community and Environmental Justice Group
Co-Chair Ballots**

June 21, 2007

Please vote for one candidate from each state.

Oregon

Ed Garren

Michelle Tworoger

Washington

Dave Frei