

**Community and Environmental Justice Group
Meeting**

April 17, 2008
5:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Kenton Fire House
2209 N. Schofield St.
Portland, OR 97217

Draft Agenda

Meeting Objectives:

- Staff update on DEIS and community outreach plans
- Continue discussing future role of CEJG

Dinner	5:30 p.m.
Welcome, introductions and announcements	6:00 p.m.
Review meeting purpose and draft agenda	6:05 p.m.
Staff update on Draft EIS and outreach plans	6:10 p.m.
Discuss CEJG role after Draft EIS	6:45 p.m.
Identify presentation topics for upcoming meetings	7:30 p.m.
Public comment	7:55 p.m.
Close meeting	8:00 p.m.

Meeting: Community and Environmental Justice Group

Date: March 20, 2008

Location: Kenton Firehouse

Members Present

John Benson
Dave Frei
Peg Johnson
Steve Kayfes
Connie Sherrard
Marcia Ward
Matt Whitney

CRC Staff Present

Carley Francis
Margi Lifsey
Peter Markgraf

Guests Present

Jim Karlock
Mara Grunbaum, Portland Sentinel

Participants are identified by their full name in the first instance and by first name thereafter.

Dave Frei went over the objectives for the meeting:

- Collect additional information on the DEIS, though there is not much new to report;
- Discuss the role of CEJG after the DEIS comment period.

Participants and guests introduced themselves.

DEIS Update

Carley Francis gave an update on the status of the DEIS. The DEIS is being finalized, and there are many stakeholders who must be satisfied. Carley said that the DEIS is projected to be released in the Spring.

At the next CEJG meeting, there may or may not be more information about outreach.

John Benson stated that the 60 day public comment period is a tight timeframe for outreach. Dave agreed, and said that they should plan about how to give information to neighborhood associations, and communicating early and often about the window for comments is important.

Peg Johnson asked if the bike/ped facilities are on the transit alignment. Carley explained that the bike/ped facilities are planned for different places based on the bridge design option. Dave added that there are also multiple options on the shore on either side of the bridge crossing.

Peg said that they do not have time to wait for planning the workshops given the constraints of a 60 day comment period. Carley said that the federal requirement is that the open houses occur no sooner than 15 days into the comment period, so they cannot be moved. Peg suggested that they should happen as soon as possible on day 15. Carley added that the formal comment period events will be scheduled in addition to the other open houses which could occur at different times during the DEIS comment period.

Dave asked Margi Lifsey when they will know that the DEIS is coming out. Margi answered that they will have at least a week of foreknowledge.

Carley updated the group on the Transit Roundtable which occurred in the last week at the Luepke Center.

Carley said regarding the CRC providing a short newsletter article, there is an unknown about the release date. Michelle Tworoger commented that there is an education component to stimulate comments on the DEIS. John Benson added that an education component is a good idea. Dave agreed and said it might be worthwhile to tell the neighborhood associations that the DEIS is coming.

Michelle suggested a flier for a bulletin board in addition to articles.

Carley said that there may be an article in the Portland Observer about the Columbia River Crossing.

Carley asked the group for suggestions of people who might be asked to be involved in CEJG. Dave suggested that this could dovetail into the discussion of what the CEJGs purpose is after the LPA.

Outreach Documents

Dave asked for comments on the documents.

Carley said that very little has changed from the last meeting. There were some acronyms that are written out.

Peg said that received is spelled incorrectly on the second page of the comment guide.

Margi presented the caveat that chapter 5 might not be included in the DEIS. Fortunately, chapter 5 is a summary and does not take anything significant out of the document. Peg asked where the evaluation of alternatives would take place. Margi answered that the evaluation would come through the comments and staff work and be in the LPA. Peg contended that chapter 5 is a significant piece of the DEIS in her experience. Carley answered that it is a federal document, and it is not our choice as to what is included and excluded.

Carley said that in the table of contents, Chapter 6, section 4(f) contains language which cannot be simplified any further.

Peg and Michelle suggested putting appendices on the back of the index.

Carley said that the index may be used as a portal on the web for accessing the DEIS.

Outreach Events

The DEIS findings workshops could coincide with the CEJG meeting time and happen on Hayden Island. This could happen in May, but the schedule is open. Also, is it acceptable to dedicate a CEJG meeting to that workshop?

Michelle suggested dedicating two CEJG meetings to workshops. She further suggested that there should be two workshops in Oregon and two in Washington rather than having two total. John agreed and said that one meeting in each state is too limiting.

Margi asked if the workshops in Oregon and Washington should have the same or different topics. Matt Whitney said that the topics should be the same.

Matt asked what would be done with comments from the meetings. Dave answered that comments are dealt with by the CRC Task Force and the cooperating agencies. Margi added that they go on the administrative record.

Peg said that one of the workshops should be at the Hayden Island Neighborhood Association monthly meeting.

Dave suggested that the associations should be having the CRC at their meetings regularly, but these workshops should go above and beyond the neighborhood associations so that it reaches people not connected to the formal organization.

Carley said that the CRC is actively in contact with neighborhood associations to make connections when the DEIS is released. The meeting dates have been pushed back as the release date for the DEIS has slipped.

Carley suggested that the meetings should be publicized in a manner which is not typical of previous publications so that they reach different people.

Dave commented that the list of topics is large, and he wondered if there is a way to shrink the discussion topics. Carley suggested that the meeting topics could be different based on the location of the workshop because different areas have different concerns.

Dave said that all topics should be discussed in all locations, and it may require more workshops.

Margi added that the public hearings/open houses will be the same on both sides of the river. Michelle said that the workshops will be a chance for people to talk one-on-one with project staff and the public hearings/open houses will be overwhelming.

Carley and Margi explained that the public hearings/open houses will have sponsoring agencies taking public comments and an adjoining room with staffed open house information.

Peg commented that having divided stations with information is a huge logistic problem, and people do not get the thread of it all together; they get little bits and pieces.

Michelle suggested that sponsoring agencies might not be approachable one-on-one at the public hearings/open houses. Carley answered that on the public hearings side, the agency representatives there will be listening rather than interacting. On the other side of the house, CRC staff will be available one-on-one. Also, some of the sponsoring agencies will have their own hearings during the comment period. Michelle asked if there will be a venue where all the partners will be accessible one-on-one. Margi suggested that individuals have every right to ask for one-on-one time with representatives.

Matt said that the one-on-one is an education, but the public hearing is about commenting. Margi added that education and commenting go hand in hand.

Matt asked if the groups will have input after the DEIS. Margie said that during the design phase, committees can have a lot of input on the design. Dave agreed, saying that a lot of adjustment occurs after the broad decisions have been made. There will be localization of the design on a small level. It is difficult to have a discussion with 200 people, so bringing in a dozen people to look at small portions in the design phase is valuable. There must be cross fertilization of ideas between different groups, neighborhoods, businesses, etc.

Peg suggested that Hayden Island and Vancouver transit people should talk to each other, but they are isolated from each other, and it is frustrating.

There was general discussion that information should be finalized and publicized, and the additional findings workshops should be expanded, and possibly the meetings would separate on topics. There was disagreement and discussion regarding the topics at findings workshops.

Connie Sherrard suggested having smaller break-out groups at workshops.

Michelle invited CRC to her board meetings.

Dave said that the two CEJG meetings after the DEIS is released should be given up to additional findings workshops.

Marcia Ward suggested targeting the unemployment department. She expressed concern that there are populations who are not hearing about the project. Carley agreed and listed several innovative outreach efforts.

Role of the CEJG after the DEIS

Dave proposed that the CEJG, once there is an LPA, must shift its role to design. One option for the CEJG is to give ideas of how to pull people into the conversation. Dave suggested that members could get people to come to focused meetings to discuss specific design issues on a localized level.

Michelle suggested that the design phase would be a separate group within the CRC. Carley said that a good time for people to be involved in the design phase is before 30% design, currently the project is at about 5% for all alternatives. Past that is refining little details. Margi added that the permitting and regulatory side, there are many laws which are analyzed in the DEIS, but the input from the regulatory agencies runs concurrently with the design.

Peg said that her understanding is that the CRC team is there to take us through the ROD. Then ODOT and WSDOT decide design-build, and the project may change structurally. At that point, she asked if the CEJG would continue. Margi said that the same people would be making policy decisions, but the consulting firms may change. The CEJG-like role would continue – CRC wants CEJG-like input to continue through construction.

Michelle said that she is personally not convinced that CEJG is having an impact on the project, and she is waiting to see. Peg asked Michelle to define having an impact on the project. Michelle said that the impact to the moorage being mitigated would be an example of the CEJG having an impact on the project.

Dave said that he wanted to start the conversation today and continue next month after thinking about it. Based on the input, the project team needs to connect with the community differently in the design phase. He asked how they can help, and who else should be in the group to make that happen. Also, CEJG has a secondary role of getting an enhancement fund. The project intends to

go above and beyond in its mitigation, and CEJG can be a monitor of that mitigation and make sure that they create something good for the community. Margi said that project supports that – there will be enhancements – but it might not be a specific fund. Margi said Doug would say that there will be more money if enhancements are incorporated into the project rather than in a separate fund.

John said that the benefit of Delta Park's enhancement fund was once all the alternatives had been discussed, the committee could focus on getting ideas from the community and making a decision as to what were the best transportation enhancements outside the project. The disadvantage is that it is one more thing to put on the table while we are trying to figure out. Margi said that, as an example, the lid in Vancouver could be part of the design of the project rather than as part of an enhancement fund. Dave added that there are some concerns about east to west connectivity, and they could be solved in good or great ways. He wonders what the CEJGs role in deciding is.

Peg suggested that CEJG should meet with the urban design advisory group.

Connie added that if enhancements are part of the bigger project, they are the first thing to get slashed, so you worry about losing the enhancements if they are not part of a separate fund. Peg said that there is a value to the community and project in having something very exciting proposed.

Topics for Next Meeting

The following ideas were posited for the April meeting:

- Role of CEJG
- DEIS update
- Open house topic update
- Updates on scheduled workshops

The next meeting is April 17, 2008.

Michelle asked what contact the project has had with corporate entities. Carley answered that they are open to meeting with anyone who is interested, including corporate entities.

Public Comments

Jim Karlock asked if the letters which went out to people included the words eminent domain. Peg answered that people are engaged in the project, and eminent domain is a scare tactic. Jim asked if the same people were attending the meetings time after time. Carley answered that they have engaged 11,000 people at more than 350 events, but they do not know if the same people have attended more than one meeting.

Jim requested that when the DEIS is put online, the entire document should be put online in a single large document.

Mara asked if when there is an LPA, how that factors into the larger process. Margi answered that the LPA will be the building block for the design that moves forward. The LPA is based on the major decisions, and it provides the outline for when the engineering design team completes the project. The LPA is also the template for when the project goes to the federal government for money. The LPA must be adopted before the project asks for federal funds.

The meeting was adjourned.