

# COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #5

## HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #5 Summary

Date and Time: March 24, 2021 4:00 to 6:00 P.M.

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Livestream

## WELCOME

CAG co-chair Ed Washington welcomed the group.

CAG co-facilitator Lisa Keohokalole Schauer explained how to view closed captions, and provided general webinar participation tips. Lisa explained how to submit public comments. She went over the CAG charter and meeting agreements.

Lisa reviewed the meeting agenda for the meeting and opened the floor for Program Administrator Greg Johnson to share.

Greg shared updates from the Executive Steering Group (ESG) meeting last week. The ESG spoke about where we are with the Purpose & Need and community Vision & Values. Greg told the CAG that we are not finalizing the wording of the Purpose & Need and Vision & Values yet but taking a snapshot of wordage to the Bi-State legislative committee in the next month. That way the Bi-State can understand where we are at and some of the challenges we are facing.

Lisa shared updates from the Equity Advisory Group (EAG) and ESG meetings that took place between the last 3/10 CAG meeting and today. She shared graphics created from the meetings that reflect the conversations that took place. The EAG is also working on defining what equity means. The next EAG meeting is 3/29 5:30pm -7:30pm. The ESG meeting 3/17 is available to watch on YouTube and their next meeting is scheduled for 4/29 from 8:00am – 10:00am.

Jason Hagen, IBR program staff, provided an update on CAG membership. Jimmy Rotharmel has resigned effective immediately due to a family issue. We wish him well and thank him for his service to our group. He was an at-large member and we are looking to replace him before our next meeting 4/28. Jason also gave an update on the individual member meetings taking place in between our CAG meetings. Some themes so far include members enjoy the breakout group, members would like materials in advance of the meetings, desire to know how the CAG voices will be included in the program moving forward, and members are happy with the mix of perspectives from CAG members. Jason let the CAG know that we are going to move into the next phase of the process soon where we can start to discuss solutions. Quick reminder to the CAG to fill out the survey that was sent out earlier this week.

## CHARTERING & PROCESS

CAG co-chair Lynn Valenter thanked program staff for reaching out individually to CAG members. Lynn gave an overview of the CAG Charter. She also showed a diagram of all the groups advising the program that outlines the respective roles and responsibilities of each.

Lynn then introduced the questions for the breakout sessions:

- Does the “Our Shared Commitment” section accurately represent the values of the CAG?
- Is there anything missing in our charter?

### Small Group Report Out

Johnell welcomed group back to the main meeting and asked for one person from each breakout group to report out on their discussions.

- Group 1
  - The second bullet about sharing a common goal can be expanded to include purpose of the CAG with the program
  - Expand on other vulnerable populations that need to be listened to, not just racially biased
  - Not to use titles so we breakdown the power dynamic and make sure everyone is equal
- Group 2
  - Very supportive of what is in the charter
  - Should be able to cycle-out to our stakeholder groups
  - Define what consensus looks like. When do we use our green, yellow and red cards? We agreed that all green would be consensus
  - How we “vote people off the island” if they are not living up to these values - Reach out to leaders of the CAG with any issues
  - Be courageous to share out what is on your mind
- Group 3

- There is not a common goal that specifically references the purpose of the CAG
- Should have something in our shared commitment that speaks to the broader goal of being an advisory group
- Really needs to include something about the program not just the guidelines
- Group 4
  - Group was in agreement with all the values
  - Add how to hold other CAG members accountable
  - Important to add how CAG members are responsible to seek out community input
  - Add listening to the multiple perspectives value of the commitments

After the groups reported back, Johnell thanked the CAG for the feedback. He assured the group that we will take the feedback into account for the next iteration of the charter.

## UPDATE ON PURPOSE & NEED / VISION & VALUES

Johnell gave an update on the listening sessions that took place since the 3/10 CAG meeting. Johnell introduced Salome to give a quick report out on the Elevating the voice of Equity listening sessions.

Salome shared that many of the participants had not been engaged with the program yet. She summarized that the groups had very similar concerns and comments as the CAG along with some new ideas. The main theme was the level of importance the bridge plays in people's lives both for social reasons as well as work related reasons.

Johnell thanked Salome for sharing and asked Lisa to share about the youth listening sessions. CAG members, Randali Desantos and Mikaela Williams joined those sessions.

Mikaela summarized the listening session that she participated in. The important themes were sustainability, equity, and a desire for different transportation options. Randali summarized the session she joined. In addition to the themes from Mikaela's session, her group also highlighted the social engagement impacts due to congestion.

Johnell explained the importance of these listening sessions and how they really help to put faces to the stories behind the bridge. He then transitioned to Lynn for the Purpose & Need and community Vision & Values agenda topic.

Lynn went over the feedback from the CAG and EAG from their survey responses. She summarized the key themes from both groups. The main themes from both were equity, congestion, funding and cost effectiveness, quality of life, modal choice, regional economy, safety, and bi-state and local cooperation.

Lynn thanked Lisa for the graphic illustrations that have been created for the meetings discussing the Purpose & Need and community Vision & Values. She shared the graphics from 3/10 CAG meeting and 2/24 CAG meeting that summarized the main themes from those meetings.

Lynn introduced Angela Findley, IBR Environmental Manager, to go over the draft community Vision & Values and how the program team is taking into account the CAG's input.

Angela showed the CAG how the community Vision & Values statement has changed based on the feedback from the advisory groups, CAG and EAG. She showed that the most changes were made to equity and to mobility, travel reliability, and congestion reduction. Angela also showed some updates made to modal choice, safety, funding and cost-effectiveness, Bi-state and local cooperation, community engagement, and how their suggestions changed the title of one category from "regional economy" to "economic empowerment".

Angela set up the CAG with the following questions for breakout sessions:

- Does the draft vision & values statement reflect the community's values?
- Is there anything missing?

## Small Group Report Out

Johnell welcomed group back to the main meeting and asked for one person from each breakout group to report out on their discussions.

- Group 1
  - Introduce a whole new category that is fundamental to vision and values – innovation, technology, future, climate change protection, and culture
  - Distinction between critical objectives vs. community values – clarify hierarchy
  - Youth outreach – building a bridge that makes a statement about the future and climate change/sustainability. Supporting that comment and resonating with it.
  - Inclusive when it comes to safety in all modes of transportation
  - More specific about bi-state collaboration and accountability

- Group 2
  - Looking forward to moving onto alternatives/solutions
  - Talked about public comment process – public comments are not held to same level of accountability as the program.
  - Those taking time to get involved through public comment are also communicating via other modes and being heard and responded to
  - Cultural aspects as it related to Cowlitz Tribe
  - Traffic, including freight, has increased - congestion
- Group 3
  - Adding equity in addition to efficiency for transportation across the bridge
  - Concern on toll pricing and distribution - Vancouver vs. Portland congestion pricing
  - Safety navigation not only across the bridge but also under the bridge
  - Fair funding – ideally the toll would stay after the cost of the bridge is recovered to pay towards future regional investments
- Group 4
  - Not much consideration of the impact during the construction – issues it may cause and how it impacts the immediate and surrounding areas
  - Attention to inclusivity was great – it would be important to include the “why”
  - Concerns about the east and west access
  - Economic empowerment – need to be more specific and use words like “ensure” instead of “support”
  - Economic empowerment when it comes to freight specifically during construction and after
  - Bridge distraction from social engagements and this should be included in vision & values
  - Planning for the future really needs to be included in the vision and values (i.e., driverless vehicles)

After the groups reported back, Johnell thanked the CAG for the feedback.

## Question & Answer

CAG Member: What is the distinction between critical objectives vs community values when we look at the community Vision & Values?

- Response: Critical objectives are action items and a commitment to certain actions going forward. The community vision and values are on a higher-level and the critical objectives come from them as actual actionable and measurable items. For example, one of the community values is treatment of small minority business and we put action behind that through critical objectives we will create some training efforts for small businesses to prepare to work on this program. That is how a value can be transformed into an actionable item.

CAG Member: That brings me to the question of hierarchy of these ideas. Are we working at one hierarchy or are we working at the other? They feel like they are getting entangled. I'd like to see those hierarchies made more distinct.

- Response: You are working on community Vision & Values, the big picture, so program staff are going to take what you tell us and create actionable items that will fall under critical objectives that are actionable and comes from the high-level values that you told us are important to this program.
- Response: Critical objectives also go through a pass/fail screening criteria for design options and alternatives. Similar to the Purpose & Need statements where reasonable alternatives to consider must at minimum meet the needs of the project. This means at a minimum they must provide solutions to the problems that are out there today. We will take your comment about the hierarchy and clarify.

## UPCOMING

Lisa let the CAG know that we are planning 4 more listening sessions to take place in April and May. They will include multimodal commuter, Hayden Island, downtown Vancouver and active transportation. If any CAG members are interested in participating, please reach out to Lauren Shimer to be included.

Our next meeting will take place 4/28 where we hope to get consensus on the CAG charter. We will also review final Purpose & Need and community Vision & Values. The next phase of the program will be introduced in the 4/28 meeting. Reminder to please complete the survey that went out earlier this week so we can find the best time for almost all to attend.

## PUBLIC COMMENT (5:46)

- *Joe Cortwright [1:52:42]:* I am Joe Cortwright. I've emailed in a statement on purpose and need. The standard on climate change has to be reducing carbon emissions, greenhouse gas emissions below other alternatives, not just before today and not take credit for unrelated changes in policy. I wanted to comment on a claim that was made by Sheri, that people who call in are not held to the same standards. You'll see in the materials I've submitted that I've documented everything that I said to you in my last meeting. And it was also said that we are not held to the same standard, we're not given the same opportunity to present information. We're forced to these one-minute intervals and not given the opportunity to present our information. I can assure you; we have solid, factual, scientific information behind everything we say. Your staff is creating a process where you're being provided with only one side of the story. I'd be happy to defend any of the statements that we've made and provided the time to do so would be happy to come in or participate. Also, as I said last time, being forced to be a disembodied voice on a telephone as opposed to participating in person, i.e., through the Zoom meeting, denies us the opportunity to participate on an equal footing and allows your staff and members of the commission, members of the group, to make disparaging and unfounded comments about the reliability of the information that we provide. So, if this is really an advisory process that's designed to allow the community to have input and to truly gather facts, it shouldn't be a one-sided process that's rigged in a way that precludes the presentation of factual information from other perspectives.

## WRAP UP

Lisa thanked Mr. Cortwright for his comment and clarified the public comment process. We want to make sure we allow each member of the community 2 minutes to provide feedback. We also send members of the CAG all information that we have received 48 hours prior to our meetings. We make sure all materials submitted to the committee be posted online for the public once it has been submitted.

CAG member asked who Mr. Cortwright represents and Mr. Cortwright responded with *No More Freeways*.

Greg addressed the public comment by stating we have taken an enormous amount of time answering questions on our website and it isn't appropriate to create a back-and-forth with members of the public during the CAG meeting. The public comment section of this meeting is just that, a time for the public to comment. We take those comments and if we have not answered them already then, we put them in our FAQs on the website to address those concerns. We are not ignoring any point of view on this.

Ed thanked the public for attending and CAG members for their participation in the breakout rooms. He appreciated the comments and engagement throughout the breakouts. Ed let the members know that he and Lynn will reach out to CAG members to check-in. The next CAG meeting is scheduled for April 28.

## ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 6:00pm.

## MEETING PARTICIPANTS

### CAG Members or Alternatives

Attendees	Organization
Whitney Mosback	Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Bill Prows	Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs
Dena Horton	Pacific Northwest Waterways Association
Diana Nuñez	Oregon Environmental Council
Dr. Karin Edwards	Clark College
Irina Phillips	Community member
Jana Jarvis	OR Trucking Association
Jasmine Tolbert	Vancouver NAACP
Javier Navarro	League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
Kevin Perkey	Workforce SW WA
Martha Wiley	Public Transit Representative, Washington
Michael A. Martin-Tellis	Vancouver Neighborhood Association
Michael Kelly	Human Services Council
Michelle Brewer	Columbia River Economic Development Council
Mikaela Williams	Community member
Randali Desantos-Benromdhane	Community Member

Attendees	Organization
Robert Camarillo	Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council
Robin Richardson	Community member
Ryan Webb	The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Sam Kim	Community member
Sarah Hall	Community member
Sheri Call	WA Trucking Association
Thomas W. Gentry	Community member
Tom Hickey	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Victor Cesar	Public Transit Representative, Oregon
Lynn Valenter	Co-Chair
Ed Washington	Co-Chair

### Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Organization
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Angela Findley	IBR Environmental Manager
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Jason Hagen	IBR Program Staff
Salome Chimuku	IBR Program Staff
Alex Prentiss	IBR Program Staff

March 24, 2021

## Additional Participants

40 members of the public, partner agency staff, and the IBR program team viewed the meeting via the Zoom webinar and the YouTube livestream during the meeting.

## MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

### Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here:

<https://youtu.be/hF4i4NiBorA>

### Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/cag-march-24-meeting/>