

MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Equity Advisory Group (EAG) Meeting Summary

Date and Time: 3/14/2022 – 5:30 pm PST

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Live

Concurrent YouTube viewers: 10

ATTENDEES

Attendees	Organization
IBR Staff	
Brent Hamlin	IBR Technical Support
Emilee Thomas Peralta	IBR Equity Team
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Jake Warr	IBR Equity Lead
Dr. Roberta Hunte	IBR EAG Facilitator
Johnell Bell	IBR Principal Equity Officer
Salomé Chimuku	IBR Equity/Community Engagement
Millicent Williams	IBR Communications Team
EAG Members	
John Gardner	TriMet
Matt Serres	Disability Rights Oregon
Megan Marie Johnson	Community member

Attendees	Organization
Monica Tellez-Fowler	C-Tran
Matt Hines	Community Member
Shane Valle	City of Portland
Lee Helfend	Community Member
Mark Harrington	SW WA Regional Transportation Council
Albert Lee	NAACP Portland
Jonathan Eder	Port of Vancouver
Lily Copenhagle	NAACP Portland
Alicia Soujourner	City of Vancouver
Aidan Gronauer	WSDOT
Sebrina Owens Wilson	Metro

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome & Outcomes

Dr. Roberta Hunte, EAG Meeting Facilitator

Dr. Hunte welcomed the group, reviewed the technical instructions for the meeting, and stated the agenda.

Reintroductions

EAG Members and IBR Team went one-by-one and shared their name and one thing they have learned about IBR.

What is a Draft Modified LPA?

Greg Johnson, IBR Program Administrator

- Key milestone this summer is arriving at a draft modified Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)
 - The draft modified LPA consists of three major components:
 - Hayden Island/Marine Dr interchanged
 - Number of Auxiliary lanes
 - Transit mode
 - These three components will modify the existing 2013 LPA and be used as a starting point for the program to make more specific recommendation and decisions on the overall bridge design
 - The Draft Modified LPA is a starting point for more specific decisions and recommendations in the future
- What is EAG's role in the Modified LPA?
 - The EAG will have a chance to provide feedback on major components with the goal to make a recommendation by consensus on key components of the modified LPA on April 28th
 - IBR program draft will be shared
 - Program will summarize the outcome
 - The consensus will be presented to the Bi-State Legislative Committee
- Questions:
 - EAG Member: Just to make sure – All of the groups you're reporting to, and the committees, have they all been informed of where we are at currently? Are they going to be surprised by what we've brought up so far?
 - Greg: We do not want surprises for this program. We meet with all these groups on a regular basis

- EAG Member: If and where does the report out on the equity framework we developed fit into this timeline? We're speeding to a decision point and one of the things we wanted to see is the report back to this group on the implementation
 - Greg: The equity framework has many uses. It will be a lens through which we look at equity. We have a budget and differing opinions within the program. We are looking at whether our actions give us a better equity situation than currently exists and compared to other options on the table. We will be using the equity framework to help evaluate choices in front of us. The equity framework will be used throughout this program. We know once we get to the part where we start design, the equity and climate frameworks will be a guideline for the specifications and help to inform us on how we can be better partners to DBE minority/women contractors going forward.
 - Jake: The accountability tool that we are developing will be used as we partner with staff to track how they are incorporating the framework into decisions and actions.
 - EAG Member: The work is long, and we want (the equity framework) to serve the whole trajectory. This seems like an important milestone.
 - Greg: We have done a presentation to other groups on what the Equity Framework and what it looks like. It's gone before the Bi-State Legislative Committee. This is how we move forward.
 - Johnell: Point well taken. We recognize there is a need for reporting out data on how the framework is being used. As we look at options that will be considered as part of the modified LPA, it should involve making sure we point out how priority communities will fare amongst the options.
- EAG Member: I want to follow up on (the previous) question a little bit. I want to call out that I get confused when we say "we" use the equity framework. Who is "we?" Is the EAG the only group using the equity framework, or will the bi-state groups be using it as they make their decisions? Please be more specific.
 - Greg: The IBR team – me and some of the folks on this call, we will be taking the framework and using it to help make our recommendation. Our team (the IBR team) will be making a recommendation based on EAG, CAG, all our surveys and other inputs, and the data analysis. The IBR team will take those in and looking at what are the tradeoffs and what can we get built. As someone earlier

said – the best bridge project is a project that can be built. The equity framework is embedded into decisions being looked at.

- EAG Member: Has the IBR team considered the equity framework in agreements moving forward? For the IBR agreements with other 3rd parties, can we include the equity framework?
 - Greg: That is definitely a consideration as we look at community benefits agreement. At foundation they will have equity and climate goals identified by this EAG team.
- Greg: We have heard from folks that we are going too fast. I was in DC talking to US Dept of transportation and they realize the urgency of what we are trying to get done here. There has been an investment in infrastructure that we haven't seen in several lifetimes. We are moving quickly but not skipping any steps.

Transit Breakout Discussion

- How can the IBR program ensure that the high-capacity transit investment helps us make progress towards our equity objectives, in terms of:
 - HCT mode (light Rail vs Bus Rapid Transit)
 - Potential strategies to complement the HCT investment
- As a reminder, our equity objectives include: mobility and accessibility; physical design; community benefits; economic opportunity; decision making processes; avoiding further harm

Transit Breakout Report Out

- Johnell: We had a lot of conversation to set the stage to make sure that as the program is selecting a mode that we pay close attention to demographic data. Making sure we understand who we will be potentially transferring relative to LRT or BRT. Understand in terms of race and persons with disabilities, understand trip scenarios. Making sure the investment does not further displacement and reduces further harm. Robust conversations around what policies are needed with the partners. Making sure we are hiring locally and employing new opportunities that exist with USDOT being able to hire by zip code by low-income populations

- EAG Member: Highlight considering universal design when it comes to all the development to make sure we are including everyone.
- Dr. Hunte: Design that considers multiple perspectives. Accessibility and interconnectivity were key topics discussed in our group. The utilization of screening criteria. Anti-displacement (if there is a huge boom in building in Vancouver, how do we keep folks in their communities, and not push them out). To make infrastructure equitable is an ongoing process. We need advocacy to keep things equitable around non-displacement policies, etc. Thinking about both the creation of the bridge and the operation of the bridge in equity in hiring and creation of opportunities for both. On potential strategies to compliment HCT to achieve equitable outcomes. Avoid harm by unpacking and understanding how communities use transit and understanding demographic information and the data. And seeing HCT as advancing priority communities and how to set new watermarks for people with disabilities and women.
- EAG Member: Interconnectedness of the transit agencies that would be involved in any type of HCT and make sure they are talking and working together. Partners have same customers and interconnectedness is desired once HCT option is chosen.
- EAG Member: Finding ways that partners can think of equity framework and objectives can lead to equitable results.
- Dr. Hunte: Noted an idea around fare-less transit as we think of rising inflation and costs of living especially in our region, there is room for thinking about this idea.
- EAG Member: We want more information to evaluate options; we needed a more detailed investigation of the potential pros, risks, and the things that may be uncertain. We envision a matrix where six categories, and rapid transit options are informed by a variety of voices (ex: economist, city planner, etc.). How to look at downsides and options. Opportunities for communities to provide input. How to avoid harm included in the matrix.

Public Comment:

- No public comment.

Announcements:

- EAG would like to have an additional meeting on 4/4. A poll was sent confirming an additional meeting.

Wrap Up:

- Three Takeaways & Meeting Evaluation Poll:
 - Takeaways:
 - Appreciate the opportunity to do reintroductions. These are long projects and people cycle in and out. It's good to pause and meet and make space for new folks at the table.
 - Pleasant to have a wide range of discussion in the breakout
 - The small group activity is pretty good. Opportunity to weigh in, bounce, and riff off each other. Encourage more breakouts.
 - Continue to appreciate the conversation around something we care a lot about and that people need.

Dr. Hunte announced the next meeting on April 4 and 18, 2022 thanked the members, and closed the meeting.

Meeting Adjourn time: 7:30pm