

EQUITY ADVISORY GROUP (EAG) MEETING #12

Date and Time: Monday, April 4th, 2021 5:30pm to 7:30pm

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Livestream

Number of concurrent YouTube viewers: 9

WELCOME

Johnell Bell, EAG Facilitator, welcomed EAG members to the meeting, explained how to view closed captions, gave instructions for public input, and previewed the meeting agenda.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR UPDATES

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, gave an update to the group. He began by discussing what will happen after the modified Locally preferred Alternative (LPA) is released at the end of July. The modified LPA will be the result of all the analysis and work that has happened so far. All work up to this point will be boiled down to a recommendation that will be shown to boards and councils in May and June to then become a recommendation to the ESG and Bi-State Legislative in July. This recommendation will be what the program wants to test in the supplemental EIS. Communities and individuals will still have opportunities to comment and impact the final choices, it is just boiling down what the program is looking at in order to get to the next step with the Federal Partners and so they can grant an amended Record of Decision in Late 2023. There will be another year and a half where we are still deciding on what we are doing and there will be a very public process we will be going through as we go through the supplemental EIS process.

Q&A

EAG Member: From my understanding there are two ESG meetings this month. Could you elaborate on what the decision points they will be discussing this month are?

Greg: The next ESG meeting is [April 7th, this Thursday](#), we will be walking them through the Hayden Island/Marine Drive materials as we didn't have a chance to go over that at the last meeting. We will also be going over the analysis that we have done on auxiliary lanes. We have three hours scheduled with them. The next meeting with ESG is scheduled for the [21st of April](#), where we will be laying out different scenarios for how this program will go forward and having them react to scenarios with the intent of narrowing the scenarios down. In early May we want to be able to bring them a) what we want to move forward to the supplemental EIS and b) what the process for moving forward will look like. It's a lot but

that's what we have scheduled, and you will be following along with them in sequence and will be getting what our recommendation is so that you can react in real time with the other groups.

UPDATE ON EQUITY FRAMEWORK ACCOUNTABILITY TOOL

Emilee Thomas Peralta, IBR equity team, gave a presentation updating the group on the IBR Equity Framework Accountability tool and what the next steps are for implementation. The plan is to have the various IBR teams, communications, design, etc., complete the worksheet on a quarterly basis. The results will then be shared with the EAG. Emilee then walked the group through the changes made to the worksheet since the last meeting.

Jake Warr, IBR equity team lead, reiterated that the program will be asking the teams to complete the worksheet quarterly and it is being piloted with the communications team first.

EAG Member: This is set up in a qualitative way, so how will the answers be assessed against the previous quarter and against other groups? Also, what groups will be completing this?

Jake: It's the various program area teams. So, there is communications, transit, environmental, traffic/roadway, so it's very clear what the teams are by the task area of the program. As far as comparison or progress, I certainly want to see what ideas you have there and if you have thoughts on what that may look like please share.

EAG Member: I don't have any ideas unfortunately, just trying to figure out how long it takes to form the narrative and unless you are reviewing the questions period to period, I am not understanding how you can track it.

Jake: Part of the answer here is that this is a part of the puzzle, but the biggest part of the puzzle are the performance measures we will be developing with this group. We have been wanting to create these performance measures for a while, but they have continued being pushed off as we work on this supplemental EIS but once that is submitted the performance measures are the next big bucket for us to work on. So, the performance measures piece will be more quantitative and a way for us to track over time while this is more of an internal report out or progress check in.

EAG Member: I would like to see a stronger tie from the form to the different components of the framework. So, there is the equity lens that has the list of questions and process we want to see folks utilize, the equity index and how that is being incorporated. I would like the chance to spend a little more time, after this meeting, to provide some feedback on this form so that we can ensure the form is speaking to what we want to see folks utilizing process wise.

Dr. Roberta Hunte, EAG facilitator: When do we get to look at this again collectively?

Jake: the first iteration will hopefully be at our next meeting after piloting it with the communications team. However, after saying that and thinking about the feedback it seems like we may make some updates before we do that to ensure it is more in line with the equity framework. What we didn't include here, was the accompanying one-pager for folks to use that outlines the equity objectives and more detailed instructions on how to use this tool.

Emilee: I think we visualized this iterative process of bringing results back to the EAG as a way to track progress as well. As we continue to report this and get your feedback, that will help us get your feedback on how we're doing and how we can improve.

TRANSIT EQUITY ANALYSIS

Jake shared a presentation on the transit equity analysis focusing on how the transit investments options differ in access for people with disabilities. All the potential investments would increase job access for people with disabilities, but the greatest increase is in investments for B, J, and L. Jake reminded the group that equitable access does not necessarily translate to equitable outcomes.

EAG Member: Where does this analysis go now? How does it meet the decision-making process?

Jake: A couple of things. It is a part of the broader analysis that will go into the transit decision. It will inform our partners and our internal discussions.

Greg: This is a data point amongst a number of data points that will help drive the recommendation. It is an important analysis done by Jake and his team but there are a number of other data points that have to be looked at as we move forward.

HAYDEN ISLAND/MARINE DRIVE TECHNICAL PRESENTATION

Brad Phillips, IBR design lead, shared an overview of Hayden Island/Marine Drive design options, the changes since 2013, and assumptions made in each design option. Jake summarized the equity lens that was applied to each design option.

EAG Member: For the equity lens, was it taking a look at the 10 different portions that are listed here, climate impacts/adaptation, natural environment, and so on, was it displacement and construction, was it use after its completed, or all of the above when it comes to the analysis on equity?

Jake: There were criteria scattered throughout most of the categories that were identified as equity screening criteria a few months ago.

Brad: in the screening, under the equity lens you will see “Avoids Harm (AH)”, “Community Benefit (CB)”, and “Mobility/Accessibility (MA)” and then in the notes you can go through and find what relates to that. So, for example “least floating homes displacement” has an AH.

EAG Member: I think this was very helpful to walkthrough. I think when I’m asking questions on “how does the equity analysis roll into the decision making” this is what I’m talking about, so it feels really good to see the framework being utilized. So going back to the worksheet, I think really making sure it is setting folks up to talk about the good work that is happening. For example, would the worksheet help folks talk about the analysis that was done on Hayden Island because it shows up very strongly, so I want to be sure they speak to each other.

Jake: Absolutely on the same page. As an example that has happened recently, screening is a great example of how equity objectives were considered and a part of the process.

HAYDEN ISLAND/MARINE DRIVE BREAKOUT SESSION

Dr. Hunte prepared the group for small group discussions, using the following prompts:

- Do the screening results align with your understanding of the ties between the Hayden Island/Marine Drive decision and our equity objectives?
- What strategies should the IBR program explore to complement the design and construction of these interchanges?

Report Out

Dr. Hunte led the group in the report out, beginning with the first question.

Jake shared that his group felt that this did demonstrate that we have been incorporating equity into the analysis process. One member made the tie between the framework accountability tool and being sure this sort of work gets reflected in that. The group also talked through the technical understandings of the options and what impacts on the ground would be. The initial feedback he felt was that the program has done their due diligence.

Dr. Hunte's group felt that some more time was needed around some of the bullet points as there is so much to digest so a bit more time with the options would be beneficial. Dr. Hunte confirmed that we will be talking about them at the next meeting. Jake confirmed that it seems like the group should particularly as folks are missing the meeting tonight. Dr. Hunte then moved onto the second question. Within her group they posed the question of if any of the options provide for more construction opportunities that would lead to economic or community benefits for small businesses. Additionally, all options provide economic and community benefit, but it has not been teased out if any options provide more benefit.

Jake then shared what his group discussed on question two. They discussed the complexities of navigating the area and how important the signage and wayfinding will be, particularly for pedestrians and bicyclists. One EAG member brought up continuing to think about the human scale of things and the human impact of the design.

Dr. Hunte raised the question of if bridge replacement creates more incentives for development on Hayden Island and how that impacts designs?

Jake: When looking at the designs, there is some that is outside the influence of the program, but we do incorporate land use planning and modeling and how traffic changes would impact those and be impacted.

Shilpa Mallem, IBR: you got it. We are working with Metro and City of Portland, so we get information on land use, and we create traffic forecasts from that. IBR, the program itself, does not influence any land use changes though.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Hunte reviewed the instructions on how to make a public comment.

- 6422: This is David Rowe; did everyone receive the comment sense alternative slideshow I sent out earlier? I hope you did. At the last meeting, the IBR program survey showed that the majority of people moving to Clark County are POC, nonwhite, lower income, citizens, how will it be equitable for those folks to pay a \$5-\$8 toll each day. Most lower income citizens don't have flexible hours and work a day shift. It is projected, that there is a 25% chance the current bridge will be damaged by a seismic event. Meaning there is a 75% chance the current bridge will remain for another 50 years. It is projected to cost over \$100 million to remove the I-5 bridge. It costs less than \$2 million a year to maintain the bridge. And the project cost is over \$100 million. Meaning maintenance cost for another

50 years is about the same as demolishing the bridge. So, I'm saying the most equitable solution is to repurpose the current bridge for transit, local traffic, and Hayden Island access and build a new bridge that will be tolled. I have attached that commonsense alternative that I hope you can access. But I am saying keep the bridge to be used by less fortunate citizens.

WRAP UP

Dr. Hunte wrapped up the meeting by asking members to share three takeaways via poll. An EAG member, shared that her take away was that when the process began, the goal was to provide an equity analysis at the same level of rigor as other forms of analysis, and she felt like she began to see that in action tonight. Dr. Hunte shared that she really appreciated seeing the climate and equity weighting on the same page and seeing what a difference 15 minutes makes in increasing opportunity and job access.

ADJOURN

Dr. Roberta Hunte announced the next EAG meetings and what members can expect in the next session.

- Next EAG meeting: April 18th, 2022, 5:30pm-7:30pm
- Following EAG meeting: May 16th, 2022, 5:30pm-7:30pm

The meeting was adjourned at 7:23 pm.

ATTENDEES

Attendees	Organization
EAG Members	
Aidan Gronauer	Washington State Department of Transportation
Lily Copenagle	NAACP Portland
Lee Helfend	Community member
Obie Ford III	WSU Vancouver

Attendees	Organization
Monica Tellez-Fowler	C-TRAN
Alicia Sojourner	City of Vancouver
Shona Carter	Community Foundation of SW Washington
Albert Lee	NAACP Portland
Mark Harrington	SW Washington RTC
Karyn Kameroff	Community member
Sebrina Owens-Wilson	Metro
IBR Staff	
Greg Johnson	Program Administrator
Jake Warr	Equity Lead
Emilee Thomas Peralta	Equity Team
Johnell Bell	Principal Equity Officer
Brent Hamlin	Tech support
Dr. Roberta Hunte	Facilitator
Schilpa Mallem	Deputy Design Manager
Rob Turton	Task Lead, Major Structures
Brad Phillips	Design Lead
Ryan LeProwse	Transportation/Planning Manager
Sharon Daleo	PBOT

Attendees	Organization
Tanya Adams	WSP
Millicent Williams	Communications Team

MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

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

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here: <https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/eag-april-4-meeting/>