

COMMUNITY BENEFITS ADVISORY GROUP (CBAG)

MEETING #5

Date and Time: Thursday, January 25, 2024 / 9:30 – 11:30am

Location: Hybrid (In-person and Zoom Meeting) and [YouTube livestream](#)

Number of concurrent YouTube viewers: 28

OUTCOMES

- CBAG members will review and confirm the first round of community benefit recommendations for program consideration.

WELCOME

Shannon Singleton, Community Benefits Lead and co-facilitator, initiated the first Community Benefits Advisory Group (CBAG) meeting of 2024 by extending a warm welcome to all attendees.

Singleton reviewed instructions to access closed captioning, meeting participation tips, ASL interpretation reminders, public input instructions, and CBAG agreements. She also noted that the regular interpreters were sick, but there might be a possibility of another interpreter joining mid-meeting.

Additionally, Singleton encouraged active participation and inclusivity. Advisory group members were asked to turn on their cameras to foster a sense of community, and virtual participants were encouraged to engage actively through written notes and the “raise hand” and “speak” features. She acknowledged the value of diverse perspectives and the normalcy of disagreements, urging participants to balance their talking and listening.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, greeted everyone and expressed gratitude to the group for their participation, emphasizing the importance of the work ahead and appreciating their help in shaping the program.

City of Portland Commissioner Mingus Mapps and City of Vancouver Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle also welcomed the group and provided opening remarks.

Singleton proceeded by providing an overview of the meeting's agenda. The session was set to begin with introductions, followed by a brief overview of the topics at hand. After this, there would be a segment for public comment then a program update. Next would be a discussion and decision-making on the first round of CBAG recommendations for the program. Finally, the CBAG would receive a presentation on potential community benefits in the workforce equity and economic opportunity category, followed by small group

January 25, 2024

discussions and then a large group report out. The meeting was planned to conclude with closing remarks and a discussion of the next steps, ensuring clarity on future actions and meetings.

Singleton asked CBAG members to share their name, organizational affiliation or at-large status, and pronouns if they wished. She also added a check-in question by asking each participant to share a recent positive experience, whether personal or professional, with the group.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Singleton guided the group on how to proceed with public comments. She provided specific instructions for making verbal comments via phone, detailing the numbers to dial, meeting ID, passcode, and the process to raise hands and unmute. She also noted that participants should provide their name and affiliation when commenting. A ten-minute timeframe was set for these comments, to be divided among the speakers. If time ran out, additional comments could be submitted after the meeting.

Singleton confirmed that no comments had been received before the meeting. One possible commenter had been identified, but after they did not come off mute, the meeting proceeded to the next agenda item as there were no other identified public commenters.

Singleton then explained the options for submitting comments post-meeting.

PROGRAM UPDATE

Administrator Johnson began by greeting everyone and providing an update on the program's recent activities and developments. He mentioned that the team had been extremely busy since the last CBAG meeting. Highlighting a significant achievement, Johnson shared that Senators Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell, along with their staff, visited the bridge for a tour and roundtable. This visit was to celebrate the program was awarded \$600 million in federal Mega grant funding.

Johnson mentioned his and Assistant Program Administrator Frank Green's involvement in legislative activities. They testified before the Washington Senate Transportation Commission, where their work and the region's efforts in moving the program forward were well-received. Additionally, a bi-state legislative committee meeting was held, which Johnson described as very productive, and plans are underway to meet with the bi-state soon after the legislative sessions end in both states.

The program's outreach and community engagement efforts were also highlighted. Johnson talked about conducting community presentations, including engaging with the East Portland Rotary Club, conducting community-based organization listening sessions that focused on engagement with people living with disabilities, BIPOC, persons with lower income, and youth to foster public understanding of the program's status and the upcoming Draft Supplemental Impact Statement (SEIS) anticipated to be released in the spring. Additionally, a recent workshop with small businesses and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs) was mentioned.

January 25, 2024

Johnson went on to explain the status and the anticipated funding structure for the program. He noted the commitments made by each state's legislature and the recent positive development with the Washington State Transportation Commission and Oregon Transportation Commission forming a subcommittee to determine tolling rates and policies in the Interstate 5 bridge. He pointed out the light blue box in slide 14, indicating the expected federal contributions, of which \$600 million had already been secured. A grant application for \$1.5 billion from the Bridge Investment Program (BIP) was submitted, and the final piece of federal funding the program is anticipating is \$1 billion from the Federal Transit Administration Capital Investment Grant (CIG) program. Johnson concluded by expressing optimism that these funding sources would collectively enable the program to proceed and invited any questions or concerns from the CBAG members.

Questions and comments from CBAG members:

- A member raised a question about the significance of the recent \$600 million federal contribution to the program. He inquired whether this funding meant something more than just the financial aspect.
 - Johnson acknowledged the broader implications of this federal support. He highlighted the program staff's 25-year history of engagement with federal agencies and their robust advocacy in Washington, D.C. This long-term involvement and advocacy had made federal agencies acutely aware of the program's importance. He interpreted the \$600 million as not just financial assistance but as an endorsement of the region's unity and efforts. It symbolized the federal government's commitment to play its part in the program's success.
 - Another member referenced Senator Cantwell's remarks, which suggested a deeper level of commitment from the federal government, indicating that once they decide to support a program, they are fully committed.

DISCUSSION/CONFIRMATION ON FIRST SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Singleton prepared the group to delve into a focused discussion on the first set of recommendations. Before proceeding, she provided some context and clarifications about these recommendations. The potential community benefits being presented were derived from initial brainstorming in the CBAG meeting in October, which was then refined in small group discussions in the December meeting.

Singleton emphasized that the list of recommendations being shared was not exhaustive. It included time-sensitive items that required immediate attention from the IBR environmental and design teams. This focus resulted in a shorter list than what was discussed over the previous three months. Additionally, she noted that certain recommendations common to Department of Transportation (DOT) projects were not included in the list. These are standard practices in such projects and therefore do not require special recommendations. She acknowledged that these common elements had not been shared with the group yet but assured them they would be sent out post-meeting.

Singleton then outlined the primary objective of the day's meeting: to confirm the initial set of recommendations, particularly those that extend beyond standard mitigations. She emphasized the importance of distinguishing between standard mitigations and those considered above and beyond. She further explained that the meeting's current focus was on time-sensitive issues. She reminded the CBAG members that community benefits will be captured in environmental documents, contract specifications,

third-party agreements, or might become part of a Community Workforce Agreement (CWA) or Project Labor Agreement (PLA) but the focus for this first set of recommendations is those that could be included in environmental documents.

Questions and comments from members:

- A member inquired about how to identify common DOT practices for mitigations.
 - Singleton confirmed the intention to share this information after the meeting.
- A member sought clarification regarding the decision-making process for community benefits recommendations.
 - Administrator Johnson clarified that the decision-making authority primarily rests with the program. He explained that some recommendations might require further input and consideration by the Executive Steering Group (ESG), not all recommendations would need to be brought here. Those that may require additional input from the ESG will be brought back to the group for further discussion or feedback.
- A member asked where they could find information on non-time-sensitive recommendations that were not covered in this current meeting.
 - Singleton responded by assuring that all such recommendations were documented in the meeting summaries. She also said that this information would be compiled and included in follow-up communications to ensure that every suggestion is accounted for and accessible to all group members.

Singleton reminded members that they were using a modified consensus decision-making model, known as the “Fist to Five”. This model involves a five-point scale to gauge participants' agreement or reservations about each recommendation. The scale ranges from 1, representing a strong disagreement or a need for further discussion, to 5, indicating enthusiastic agreement. The points on the scale are:

- Fist - Strong disagreement or a 'no-win' feeling.
- One finger – Hold on, we need to talk about this.
- Two fingers – I have reservation, but I could be convinced.
- Three fingers – I guess I'm okay with it.
- Four fingers – Sounds good.
- Five fingers – Love it.

Singleton planned to apply this decision-making model in group settings to streamline the process. Following this explanation, she requested Emilee Thomas-Peralta, IBR Equity team member, present the contents of the next slides.

Mobility and accessibility

Thomas-Peralta presented a slide titled "Mobility and Accessibility," which included the following recommendations:

- Create pedestrian safety measures, such as speed bumps and signs.

January 25, 2024

- Provide adequate bicycle signage, both during construction and after the program for safety enhancement in local communities.
- Create accessible trails and networks with lighting for safety, balanced with considerations for ecosystem health.
- Create bicycle amenities (repair kiosks, etc.).
- Connect to transit service improvements.
- Design active transportation facilities to create a comfortable, low-stress experience, prioritizing the safety of vulnerable users and providing convenient access from the local network to new facilities.
- Create efficient public transit to key locations, integrating design elements to improve user experience.

Questions and comments from CBAG members:

- A member asked if the items being discussed were time sensitive.
 - Singleton confirmed that the meeting's focus was indeed on time-sensitive items.
 - A member added that the time sensitivity stemmed from the necessity to incorporate these recommendations into the program's design work.
- Mayor McEnery-Ogle posed a question about the geographical scope of the proposed community benefits. She inquired if the proposed benefits were intended for areas highly impacted by construction, less impacted areas, or non-impacted areas, seeking clarity on the boundaries for implementing measures like bicycle amenities and repair kiosks.
 - Singleton mentioned that the discussion had been centered around the program area.
 - Johnson emphasized the aim to connect with existing community systems, like bike amenities in Vancouver, to fill gaps and align with the program. He mentioned that specific guidelines exist for mitigation measures like noise but that for amenities, the goal is to enhance the overall connected system rather than focusing narrowly. A further example was given about connecting sidewalks on Hayden Island, illustrating how improvements could extend to areas within a broader impact zone.
- A member acknowledged the need for detailed design work in response to Mayor McEnery-Ogle's question about specific recommendations. He asked for guidance on how members can direct design practices to exceed standard requirements.
 - Johnson suggested that members view proposals through the perspective of the urban design work, emphasizing the importance of understanding the broader picture before delving into specifics about community improvements or enhancements.
 - Subsequently, he outlined specific guidelines for the design team: ensuring all aspects of mobility, accessibility, and physical design align with the highest practices in community amenities, connectivity, and local context and standards.
 - Aidan Gronauer, IBR Civil Rights Manager, recommended incorporating terms such as “enhancing wayfinding”, “universal design”, and “radically inclusive” into the recommendations.

- Subsequently, this member outlined specific guidelines for the design team: ensuring all aspects of mobility, accessibility, and physical design align with the highest practices in community amenities, connectivity, and local context and standards.
- A member proposed consulting with experts from Disability Rights Oregon and The Street Trust for advice on inclusive and multimodal strategies, aiming to enhance specific aspects of the project. She also shared her past involvement in a community benefits initiative where specialized subgroups, such as housing experts, contributed to respective chapters, highlighting a potentially effective approach for this program.
 - Singleton responded that while forming entire subgroups may not be feasible, the team can engage in discussions with relevant individuals and organizations. She acknowledged that this idea had been previously suggested by a member. She emphasized the importance of consulting with additional experts and incorporating their insights into the recommendations. She also noted that the team is considering the use of subgroups in some scenarios as part of the asset mapping work. She highlighted the wealth of expertise available, such as housing experts at the City of Portland's Housing Bureau, transit-oriented development specialists at TriMet and Metro, and climate experts.
- A member, referencing the earlier discussion on cost estimates, expressed appreciation for the approach of starting with a broad overview before focusing on a detailed community impact analysis. However, he raised concerns about the financial implications of the decisions being made. He questioned how and when the financial feasibility of the recommendations would be assessed, emphasizing his reluctance to endorse proposals without a clear understanding of their funding sources, including grants, federal allocations, or other means. He requested further elaboration on how the financial aspects of these initiatives are planned to be addressed.
 - Singleton explained that cost analysis for these recommendations will be part of the refinement process with technical and design teams. Cost estimates for other benefits are already in progress and will be shared as they become available. The finance team has identified potential resources and grants for some benefits. While detailed cost estimates may not be available at this stage due to ongoing refinement, this information will be available as the CBAG work progresses.
 - Johnson mentioned that the two DOTs will address specific items arising from the discussion and expressed interest in forming partnerships with individuals or groups to identify additional resources needed for other recommendations.
 - Another member echoed the sentiment, recommending the inclusion of language expressing the aspiration to incorporate the best culturally or regionally specific design elements into the program. He also proposed adding a sentence to address the previous point about striking the right balance between cost and design options.
 - Another member emphasized the importance of the connection to transportation in the discussion, focusing on how closely related certain aspects are to transportation. She mentioned the need to integrate these aspects effectively, emphasizing that such integration would align with the program's scope. She acknowledged that some ideas are catalysts for the program but depend heavily on partnerships, distinguishing between what naturally fits within the scope and what requires collaboration. She underscored the significance of clarity in the partnership aspect.

January 25, 2024

- Commissioner Mapps mentioned the importance of creating a transportation network in Portland that offers people alternative options. He expressed excitement about the transportation options and the ongoing work in that regard. The focus is on providing choices beyond using private vehicles and improving the overall transportation infrastructure.
- Another member mentioned that the Street Trust has already assembled a small working group consisting of various transportation-related organizations and communities, including Oregon Walks, Street Trust, the biking community, and the disability community. They are preparing a letter to the IBR program to offer early engagement in the environmental process. This coordinated effort involves both Oregon and Washington members and aims to gather valuable input from non-car users to provide feedback as soon as possible.

CBAG members discussed this list and, before moving to the first to five votes, Singleton recapped the additional recommendations from members as the following:

Mobility and Accessibility — all elements below will reflect leading and best practices and accommodate any local context and standards

- Create pedestrian safety measures, such as speed bumps and signs
- Provide adequate bicycle signage and enhance wayfinding, both during construction and after program for safety enhancement in local communities
- Use universal design and be radically inclusive
- Create accessible trails and networks with lighting for safety, balanced with considerations for ecosystem health
 - The program will explore accessibility needs with people with disabilities and groups serving them and non-car using groups
- Create bicycle amenities (repair kiosks, etc.)
- Connect to transit service improvements
- Design active transportation facilities to create a comfortable, low-stress experience, prioritizing the safety of vulnerable users and providing convenient access from the local network to new facilities
- Create efficient public transit to key locations, integrating design elements to improve user experience
- Consider cost analysis for financial and feasible implementation
- Communicate/follow up with the group about the design choices and the rationale behind those

Singleton asked if there were any additional points needed before seeking approval. She conducted a voting round and confirmed that most of the member votes were 3 and 4, with some voting 5. She affirmed that they would proceed with moving those recommendations forward based on the voting results.

Physical Design

Thomas-Peralta confirmed with Singleton that she would show two slides of physical design recommendations. The first slide includes the following recommendations:

- Create designs that prioritize preservation and enhancement of natural features, focusing on the views both from and towards the bridge.
 - Include viewpoints or designated areas for cyclists and pedestrians on the bridge to enhance their experience and safety.
- Use anti-spray coating and designs to deter unwanted graffiti activity on the bridge.
- Explore mitigation strategies to reduce highway noise for nearby residents.
- Use material options that are sustainable and environmentally friendly, incorporating local elements (such as ash and shells) as alternative materials into the program design.
- Coordinate/salvage existing bridge elements for public display.

Questions and comments from members:

- Administrator Johnson proposed an amendment to the second sub-bullet point, suggesting the addition of "use anti-graffiti designs." This amendment aims to address the issue of wall coatings wearing off over time.
 - Mayor McEnery-Ogle added to the discussion by emphasizing that the anti-graffiti designs should not be limited to just the bridge itself. She pointed out that it should also apply to the entire structure, including the pillars and other elements related to the bridge's influence.
- A member expressed the need for a more specific definition of what "sustainable and environmentally friendly" means within the group's context. She mentioned various aspects to consider, including embodied carbon, habitat impacts, ecosystem effects, and human health. She emphasized the importance of defining sustainability clearly and mentioned that simply using sustainable language might not suffice. She suggested metrics like embodied carbon, emissions, and the use of local materials as considerations for sustainability. Additionally, she mentioned the importance of not limiting the options to specific materials like ash and shells, but rather allowing the design team to explore various sustainable options.
 - Johnson responded by emphasizing the need to strike a balance when considering sustainable materials and practices. He mentioned that while some materials may have a low carbon footprint, it's essential to factor in their life cycle cost. The decision should involve weighing whether it's better to use materials that offer 40 years of uninterrupted, maintenance-free life or materials that require more frequent maintenance. He also expressed interest in exploring concretes with lower-carbon cement replacements. Native plants for interchange areas were mentioned as well, with the goal of sustaining growth during various weather conditions. Johnson stressed the importance of considering maintenance and longevity when evaluating sustainable choices.
 - Another member added to the discussion by suggesting that the same bullet point should also include the mitigation of other emissions from the bridge project, such as diesel fumes and soot. He highlighted the importance of addressing these emissions, which can be of equal

- Explore mitigation strategies to reduce highway noise for pedestrians, cyclists, local businesses, residents, and all bridge users
- Use material options that are sustainable and environmentally friendly (balancing decisions to use low carbon materials, costs, and life of materials) into the program design, including local elements (examples include ash and shells)
 - Consider other emissions as well
- Create greenspaces throughout the program area and use native plants to enhance ecological benefits
- Coordinate/salvage existing bridge elements for public display

Singleton proceeded to conduct the fist to five vote and acknowledged members mostly voted threes and fours. This confirmed members' agreement to move forward with the above recommendations. The second slide includes the following recommendations:

- Define community connectors near Evergreen Blvd. and the waterfront, incorporating both active transportation facilities and greenspace, and implement east/west connectivity and accessibility.
- Incorporate art and local history and culture into the bridge design to enhance its aesthetic appeal and connection to the community.
- Create a combined welcome center/ODOT truck inspection facility that will have a curated display of the history of the region, approved cultural materials, photo documentation of the existing bridge, and salvaged plaques from the existing bridge.

Questions and comments from members:

- Mayor McEnery-Ogle asked a question regarding the standards for trucking in Oregon and Washington and whether a new truck inspection facility is being built in a specific area, potentially referring to an area within Vancouver jurisdiction.
 - Commissioner Mapps expressed a desire to learn more about the location of the trucking facility mentioned in the discussion and suggested the need for further discussion on how the proposal aligns with Portland's land use recommendations. He acknowledged that this proposal is controversial and emphasized the need for open and thorough discussions to address the issues surrounding it. He expressed his intention to push back on the matter and emphasized the need for a comprehensive and thorough discussion on the topic at hand.
 - Johnson explained that currently, there is a truck inspection facility on Hayden Island, and there is another one managed by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) that is in the process of shutting down. The need for a future facility will be determined based on these factors. He emphasized that they are not planning anything that would run counter to the city's existing plans or objectives.
- Commissioner Mapps supported the suggestion to break out the visitor center and the truck inspection facility as two separate items.
 - Johnson brought up another aspect of the discussion, mentioning that they have been having conversation with Expo Center management about their vision for the future and the possibility of incorporating a welcome center or visitors center rather than just a truck

- inspection facility. This center would include cultural materials and documentation related to the bridge.
- A member suggested that making the proposal less specific might be more helpful. She proposed the idea of considering the location of a welcome center and truck support facilities in a broader sense, incorporating historic and artistic elements that align with the community's preferences and opportunities. This approach would allow for more flexibility and adaptability in the decision-making process.
 - Mayor McEnerny-Ogle from Vancouver expressed the willingness to build a welcome center in Washington. She was open to the idea of a welcome center that doesn't involve the elements related to truck support facilities. She also mentioned being willing to collaborate on truck parking areas in unincorporated parts of Clark County if needed.
 - Singleton proposed breaking the recommendation into two separate bullet points. The first would focus on considering opportunities to explore a welcome center which may include preserving and displaying the history of the region and cultural materials as part of the design. The second bullet point would be dedicated to exploring options for locating a truck inspection facility.
- A member expressed concerns about the integration of art and local history into the bridge design. He mentioned that in the past, some bridges had art added as an afterthought to meet budget requirements, and he wanted to ensure that the aesthetic aspect of the bridge is considered from the beginning and embedded into the architecture. He suggested modifying the bullet point to be more prescriptive in how art and architecture can be consistently applied to the program. He preferred the term "integrate" over "incorporate" and emphasized the importance of maintaining the aesthetic integrity of the program throughout its design.
 - A member emphasized that the bridge itself should be a work of art, rather than just having art added as an overlay or plaques. He stressed the importance of the bridge being distinctive, iconic, and respectful of the great river of the West, with the aim of inspiring the entire region.
 - Johnson mentioned that the program has experts from London with experience in bridge aesthetics, architecture, and engineering. He emphasized the comprehensive nature of the program, which encompasses more than just the bridge itself, including sound walls and various elements that need to be thoughtfully integrated into the overall design. The goal is to avoid a disjointed or uncoordinated approach to the project's aesthetics.
 - A member emphasized treating the program as an art installation where both form and function are considered from the start. He recommended separating the truck inspection facility and welcome center as distinct elements, especially due to the cultural aspects of the welcome center. Lastly, he hoped that the program's aspirations, such as radically inclusive design, would be carried forward just like the cost control measures.
 - Singleton confirmed that the recommendations and considerations brought up during the discussion will be included in the program. Any associated costs related to these recommendations will also be reflected and brought back to the group for discussion and decision-making.
 - A member echoed the agreement in the room regarding the inclusion of art, local history, and cultural elements in the program. She supported the use of the term "integrate" and

suggested emphasizing the expression of these elements at various scales. This would involve incorporating them as both larger sculptural elements and smaller, pedestrian-friendly, human-scale elements throughout the program, ensuring a holistic and inclusive approach to their integration.

- A member stressed the importance of not only acknowledging history but also looking towards the future. He emphasized the need to recognize and celebrate the individuals and companies involved in building the new bridge, particularly those who come from underrepresented communities. He pointed out that this forward-thinking approach should be a consideration alongside the historical aspect, as it can provide inspiration and motivation for future generations. He suggested that including information about the design firms and construction companies involved in building the program could be valuable for this purpose.
- A member sought clarification on what "community connectors" mean and whether it includes trails that connect to the trail system. She also expressed concerns about climate change and the expectation that it will worsen in the years ahead. She inquired about measures to mitigate the impact of ice and black ice on the bridge's design, considering her experiences with black ice on bridges in the past. She emphasized the importance of preparing for future climate challenges.
 - Johnson clarified that the term "connectors" in this context refers to specific infrastructure elements like the Community Connector at Evergreen and the connection of the community on Hayden Island with the extension of Tomahawk Drive. He suggested rewriting the bullet point to be more inclusive and specific at the same time.
 - A member suggested rephrasing the recommendation to remove specific locations replacing them with a more general goal, and then listing various connectors like Evergreen, the waterfront, Hayden Island, Marine Drive, and other areas that are connected.
 - Johnson expressed a realistic view, stating that the program cannot chase connections beyond program limits and will need other entities to bring resources to the table for such initiatives.
- A member appreciated the program's focus on bridge aesthetics and stressed that a bridge's beauty often lies in its structural elements, emphasizing that it can be beautiful without being a cable-stayed bridge. He emphasized the importance of preserving the iconic nature of the bridge through its structural design.
- A member expressed the desire for specific acknowledgment and inclusion of Indigenous communities and tribes in the project, both in terms of culture and land use. She highlighted the importance of recognizing the longer history of the region and suggested that the program should reference Indigenous communities and prioritize their involvement and contributions. She sought clarity on whether this section was the appropriate place for such references and considerations.
 - Singleton indicated that it makes sense to add a reference to the engagement of tribes and their leadership in the program. She mentioned that the program will continue to engage with tribes, with their leadership guiding the process. There will be a presentation in a future CBAG meeting to share more about the work of the tribal consultation and Section 106.
- Singleton acknowledged that there might not be enough time today to cover the second portion of the planned presentation in this meeting but emphasized the importance of the advisory group's

discussion and decision-making and said we will make space for this discussion to continue and move the other item to next month's meeting.

- Mayor McEnery-Ogle sought clarification on whether the discussion was focused solely on the bridge or if it encompassed the physical design of the entire program, indicating the need for clarity regarding the scope of the discussion.
 - Singleton responded that the scope of the discussion and the recommendation would depend on the committee's preferences and input.
 - A member hoped the discussion was addressing the program area of the new bridge.
 - A member mentioned that the aesthetic design should be consistent.
 - Commissioner Mapps expressed his agreement with Mayor McEnery-Ogle and another member.
- Commissioner Mapps emphasized the importance of ensuring that transportation networks, including roads, bike lanes, and other infrastructure, connect with the neighborhoods in Northeast Portland and other areas. He expressed the need for language that reflects this connectivity and integration of transportation networks with the surrounding communities.
 - Mayor McEnery-Ogle questioned whether the language regarding community connectors, active transportation facilities, and green space should be included in the first bullet point to emphasize their importance throughout the program area.
 - Commissioner Mapps asked for recommendations on the language related to community connectors and active transportation facilities from Cynthia Castro, his Deputy Chief of Staff.
 - Castro recommended using the phrase "active transportation connection, like bike lanes, to our northeast Portland neighborhoods" in the language.
- Mayor McEnery-Ogle inquired about the existence of high-risk and low-risk boundaries and whether these areas have been delineated. She also requested further clarification on which areas and streets fall under the responsibility of the City of Vancouver versus the program.
 - A member expressed understanding of the complexity in defining the area impacted by the IBR program and the challenge of creating a single map for it. She emphasized the need for clarity and suggested a dynamic and flexible approach to address the various impacts on transportation and mobility in the neighborhood.
 - Johnson provided an example of a situation where they could collaborate with the City of Vancouver to modify road lanes at Clark College for better traffic flow during construction.
- A member suggested breaking down the discussion into two separate bullet points. One would focus on east-west connections, and the other on connectors such as roads and bike paths. This approach would allow for a more detailed examination of each type of connector and how it integrates with the surrounding community.
- Commissioner Mapps expressed broad support for the direction of refining recommendations. He indicated he would initially vote "fist" for these recommendations, not in opposition but due to the extensive discussions and numerous revisions. He emphasized the need for confidence that the recommendations fully capture the needs of Portland and Vancouver communities and wants to review the revisions in detail before giving his final approval.

- Singleton clarified that the recommendations, including revisions, would move forward as the advisory group is using a modified consensus decision-making model which does not require full consensus. She assured that the team would collaborate with Commissioner Mapps, showing him the specific additions to ensure all revisions are accurately captured.

Singleton shared that the second physical design slide will include the recommendations and revisions:

- Physical Design
 - Define community connectors (freeway lid) near Evergreen and the waterfront
 - Connect to the local community within the program area including Evergreen Blvd, Hayden Island, Marine Drive, and Waterfront
 - Incorporate both active transportation facilities and greenspace throughout the program area
 - Implement east/west connectivity and accessibility within the program area
 - Integrate art and local history and culture into the bridges and program area designs, at various scales, to enhance its aesthetic appeal and connection to the community, creating a distinct and iconic bridge
 - Consider design with an eye toward ice and other severe weather conditions
 - Include designs that honor the contributors to the program and the bridge construction, including designers and builders
 - Include accountability to ensure that various contractors are adhering to the aesthetic and design specifications to create consistent design throughout the program area
 - Consider where there is an opportunity for a Welcome Center that will include a curated display of the history of the region, approved materials, photo documentation of the existing bridge, and salvaged plaques from the existing bridge
 - Consider where there is an opportunity to explore a truck inspection facility

Singleton asked for any final revisions to the physical design recommendations but received no further input. She proceeded with the Fist to five voting, where the recommendations garnered support, mainly receiving fours and threes. With this, the recommendations were confirmed to move forward.

Community benefits

Thomas-Peralta presented a slide titled "Community Benefits," which includes the following recommendations:

- Create riverfront public access points where feasible.
- Provide recreation opportunities on Hayden Island.
- Create additional communal and open spaces, including areas suitable for fishing and kayaking.
- Create parks on both sides of the river.
- Prioritize innovative developments on the land adjacent to the bridge, with a focus on projects that promote accessible and affordable housing.

- Explore the potential use of the Expo Center as a construction yard and fabrication site.

Questions and comments from members:

- A member expressed concerns about the redundancy in the first four bullet points and questioned whether they essentially conveyed the same idea multiple times. Additionally, they raised a question about the specificity of the bullet point regarding recreation opportunities on Hayden Island, suggesting that recreation opportunities should be considered for the entire program area, not just one specific location.
 - Bell clarified that the bullet point about recreation opportunities on Hayden Island was not intended to prioritize it but rather to acknowledge discussions members had in previous CBAG meetings.
 - A member suggested consolidating the bullet points related to recreation opportunities and public access into a single statement that emphasizes the need for access to the water and new park opportunities throughout the program area, without specifying locations like Hayden Island.
 - Mayor McEnery-Ogle expressed agreement with the suggestion to consolidate the bullet points into a more general statement regarding water access and new park opportunities throughout the program area.
- Commissioner Mapps raised concerns about the qualification of turning the Expo Center into a construction yard and fabrication site as a community benefit and suggested that this issue needs to be addressed, despite time constraints.
 - Singleton noted that these recommendations come from the group and should be discussed further to determine if they should be included in the list of community benefits.
 - Johnson mentioned that there was a previous discussion about potentially using the Expo Center for future needs, but since it's a detail that has been overlooked, he suggested striking it altogether from the recommendations.
 - A member mentioned that National Association Minority Contractors (NAMC) has been in conversations with Metro about the Expo Center to make it attractive for job creation related to the bridge and other projects. He agreed that it shouldn't be seen as just a construction yard but rather a catalyst for economic opportunities in the community.
 - Singleton suggested adding a bullet point to generalize the idea as "explore partnership options with Metro" and further the explanation.
 - A member recommended striking the idea of using the Expo Center parking lot for construction and fabrication and mentioned ongoing planning efforts related to the site's cultural significance. She also expressed discomfort with the revised bullet point about exploring partnership options with Metro regarding the Expo Center.
- A member suggested adding connectivity or multimodal connectivity to other uses in the vicinity when considering the amenities and land use options.
 - A member pointed out that the first several bullets reflect connections to existing systems and mentioned the importance of considering the Inner Willamette Trail and other regional trail systems when planning these amenities.
- A member suggested that the section should be renamed and better defined, as the topics discussed within it, such as inner connectivity and design suggestions, could be considered community benefits.

January 25, 2024

She proposed a clearer categorization of these suggestions, possibly under "parks and public open space" or another more specific title related to land use.

- Singleton clarified that not all items within the community benefits category fit the current discussion. She reminded the group that the categorization is based on the program’s equity framework, and also recognized the need for a more precise definition of “community benefits” in this specific, narrower context.
- In response to suggestions for consolidating recommendations, a member recommended doing so with caution to retain clarity and specificity. He specifically recommended keeping a separate point for Hayden Island, highlighting its unique issue of limited public water access. This suggestion stems from past discussions where this issue was a significant concern for the island's residents.

Singleton noted that the meeting was concluding, and members were expected to vote via email. However, a member inquired about the advisory group's voting on the current set of recommendations. In response, Singleton recapped the proposed revisions (shown below). This confirmed the group’s agreement to move forward with the recommendations with revisions.

- Community Benefits — all elements below will reflect leading and best practices and accommodate any local context and standards
 - Create riverfront public access points and provide recreational opportunities, communal and open space including areas for fishing and hiking on both sides of the river, where feasible (while this should be explored across the program area, there should be extra effort to provide access to the river on Hayden Island)
 - This should include multimodal access points and connect to existing amenities.
 - Prioritize innovative developments on the land adjacent to the bridge, with a focus on projects that promote accessible and affordable housing.
 - Explore partnership options with Metro regarding the Expo Center. Be sure to acknowledge, understand, and honor the significance of this location and honor the work already done to develop plans for this site.

CLOSING REMARKS

In conclusion, Administrator Johnson acknowledged the excellence of the recommendations and commended the members for their hard work and dedication to community benefits.

ATTENDEES

Attendees	Organization
CBAG Members	
Mingus Mapps	City of Portland Commissioner
Anne McEnery-Ogle	City of Vancouver Mayor
Darcy Hoffman	Workforce SW Washington
Scott McCallum	WA School for the Blind

January 25, 2024

Peter Fels	Alliance for Community Engagement
Vicki Nakashima	Equity Advisory Group Representative
Michael Strahs	Kimco Realty
Corky Collier	Columbia Corridor Association
Marcus Mundy	Coalition for Communities of Color
Carley Francis	WSDOT
Rian Windsheimer	ODOT
Tom Hickey	Community Advisory Group Representative
Walter Valenta	Community at large
Jasmine Tolbert	YWCA Clark County
Farleigh Winters	LSW Architects
Kelly Haines	Worksystems, Inc.
Jessica Green	Portland Parks Foundation
Ben Jacobsen	Jane's Forum
Jayne Haygood	Vancouver's Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission

Attendees	Organization
IBR Staff	
Greg Johnson	Program Administrator
Raymond Mabey	Assistant Program Administrator
Frank Green	Assistant Program Administrator
Aidan Gronauer	Civil Rights Manager
Johnell Bell	Principal Equity Officer
Shannon Singleton	Community Benefits Lead
Erika McCalpine	Equity Team
Emilee Thomas-Peralta	Equity Team
Bree Nicoletto	Equity Team
Lucy Hamer	Equity Team
Eric Trinh	Equity Team
Yemaya Hall-Ruiz	Equity Team
Jeannet Santiago	CE Team
Fabiola Casas	Equity Team
Fabián Hidalgo Guerrero	CE Team
Brenda Siragusa	IBR Staff
Paris Moore	CE Team
Kaz Zaidi	Government Relations Lead
Shanrika McClain	Procurement Team

January 25, 2024

Zander Arnold	Technical Support
---------------	-------------------

Additional Participants

28 members of the public, partner agency staff, and the IBR team viewed the meeting via the YouTube livestream during the meeting.

MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JhtF4lt42iY?v=JhtF4lt42iY>

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here: <https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/cbag-meeting-january-25-2024/>