COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP & EQUITY ADVISORY GROUP ORIENTATION: MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Community Advisory Group & Equity Advisory Group Orientation

Date and Time: January 30, 2021, 10:00am – 3:00pm

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Livestream

WELCOME INTRODUCTIONS

Interstate Bridge Replacement (IBR) program Community Advisory Group (CAG) Facilitator Lisa Keohokalole Schauer welcomed attendees and outlined the meeting format, including the use of breakout sessions and the jamboard. Attendees were asked to use the chat function for conversations regarding logistics and the Zoom hand raising function to ask questions and provide input.

Lisa introduced EAG co-facilitator Dr. Roberta Hunte, CAG co-facilitator and Chief Equity Officer Johnell Bell, Program Administrator Greg Johnson, CAG co-chair Lynn Valenter and CAG co-chair Ed Washington.

Greg welcomed Advisory Group members and emphasized the importance of community engagement to shaping the program. Lynn welcomed participants and encouraged everyone to honor different learning styles. Ed Washington thanked everyone for being part of the program and reminded participants that this program and the Advisory Groups' role are about the entire region and state.

Each Advisory Group attendee introduced themselves, sharing their name, the advisory group they serve on (CAG or EAG), and their connection to the Interstate Bridge.

CENTERING EQUITY

Greg shared a childhood story about his moving at a young age because the Michigan State Highway Department had moved his family out of their home for a roadway widening project. Greg brings this reality and experience to how he does business at a Department of Transportation. For his 38 years working in transportation, Greg has worked on including those who have not had a voice in infrastructure decisions. Departments of Transportation (DOTs) have done a great disservice over the years, but they have also done a number of good things. Greg is trying to put the IBR program in a category of good things.

Greg went on to emphasize that community engagement and the Advisory Groups are not a box-checking activity. Rather, they are something that the team believes in and will hold themselves accountable to. Greg concluded that the IBR program is of key national and regional importance and it is time to get to work.

Johnell introduced the presentation topic, centering equity, and provided an overview of the presentation agenda. He shared that some attendees might be familiar with the information presented, while others might be learning new concepts and terms. Johnell asked that attendees lean into the material and discomfort.

What does equity mean to the IBR program?

Johnell began the presentation by noting that some community members have a trust deficit because of past experiences. He then defined diversity and colorblindness for the Advisory Groups. He shared that diversity includes all the ways in which people differ, and it encompasses all the different characteristics that make one individual or group different from one another. Colorblindness ignores the history, politics, and economics of racism; it negates the need to understand diversity, equity, and inclusion and leads to more problems.

What is equity?

Johnell conveyed that the IBR program team will be working with the EAG to define equity for the program and develop an equity definition and framework. The basic definition is, when one's identity cannot predict the outcome. Equity is both an outcome and a process; the latter referring to community engagement and intentionally including perspectives from those who have been traditionally left behind.

Johnell shared that to understand equity, we must understand inequity. There are three types: systemic, institutionalized, and individual. Systemic is the interplay of policies, practices, and programs of different institutions that leads to adverse outcomes and conditions experienced by historically marginalized communities. Institutional is the policies, practices, and procedures that work to benefit some and the expense of others, typically historically marginalized communities. Individual is about ourselves: the prejudgment, stereotypes, or generalizations about an individual or group. By talking about the interplay of power and race, we are able to see that – although we all have a role – it is critical that those in positions of authority are vigilant about addressing inequity.

What is inclusion?

Johnell shared the definition of inclusion, which is eliminating the barriers that prevent the full participation of all people. Johnell encouraged Advisory Group members to raise a red flag when the IBR program is not being inclusive.

He then showed a video on micro aggressions and reminded Advisory Group members to keep in mind their language and hold one another accountable. Explicit bias are attitudes and beliefs we have about a person or group on a conscious level. Implicit bias is unconscious attitudes that lie below the surface but may influence our behaviors. By and large, we more frequently experience implicit bias. The work that lies ahead is for the IBR team and Advisory Group members to be mindful of our own biases as they relate to the context of gender, race, and ability.

Recipe for being a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Champion

Johnell walked the participants through the recipe for being a DEI champion:

- Looking for ways to make things work
- Inclusive problem solving
- Transparency
- Creating peer relationships with national partners in same positions
- Never start with "no" or "we don't do things that way" or other ways of weighing down efforts
- Look for aspirational goals and future directions
- Continuous learner of DEI in practice in local government

Understanding Our History

Johnell provided a brief history of the program area. He noted that his presentation was not meant to be exhaustive and there are additional examples.

A Brief History of the Program Area

Chinook villages (1800 – 1850): Indigenous peoples inhabited the shores of the Columbia River for millennia. By the early 1800s, Chinookan tribes had established ~30 villages near the confluence of the Willamette and the Columbia. Disease (likely smallpox) kills nearly all of them. By the 1850s all villages were abandoned and the U.S. government removed all Indigenous people to the Grand Ronde and Yakima reservations.

Japanese castaways at Fort Vancouver (1832): Three Japanese sailors survived a shipwreck and drifted ashore in northern Washington. They were held captive, brought to For Vancouver, then shipped to London to be used as potential leverage in trade negotiations with Japan. They are thought to be the first Japanese persons to have arrived in the Pacific Northwest.

Oregon becomes a state (February 14, 1859): Oregon became the only state admitted to the union with an exclusion law written into its state constitution. It bans any "free negro, mulatto, not residing in this State at the time" from living, holding real estate, and making any contracts within the state. The 1860 census shows 124 Black people living in the state. The law is repealed in 1926. The language however is not removed from the constitution until 2001. As historian Egbert Oliver writes in Oregon Historical Society Quarterly, "African Americans were essentially illegal aliens in Oregon."

Buffalo Soldiers (1899): Army places an all-Black regiment at Fort Vancouver, who became known as the Buffalo Soldiers. While much of their history has been erased, they had a significant impact spreading Black culture in the Pacific Northwest.

Redlining in Portland (1919): The Portland Real Estate Board's Code of Ethics mandates that real estate agents not sell to individuals whose race would "greatly depreciate, in the public mind, surrounding property values."

Detention of Japanese-Americans (1942): 3,676 Japanese-Americans were detained for five months at the North Portland Stockyards (now the Expo Center) before being transferred to internment camps in Idaho and California.

Vanport destroyed (May 30, 1948): The Columbia River floods and the dike protecting Vanport breaks. Because Vanport was built on reclaimed lowlands along the Columbia River, the city was vulnerable to flooding. In addition, it was built quickly with temporary housing. During the flood, fifteen people are killed, the entire city is underwater, and nearly eighteen thousand people, many of them Black, are left homeless.

Albina displaced (1956): Voters approve the construction of Memorial Coliseum in the Elliot neighborhood, resulting in the teardown of more than 450 Albina homes and businesses. At the time, four out of five people in this thriving, close-knit community are Black. Many are former inhabitants of Vanport because redlining policies limited where they could live. This same year, federal officials also approve highway construction funds that would pave Interstate 5 and 99 through South Albina, destroying more than eleven hundred homes.

Displacement in North Portland (1970s): The Black community protests the expansion of Emanuel Hospital, funded by federal money earmarked for urban renewal. The expansion demolishes nearly three hundred homes in North Portland. Residents are given ninety days to move. Homeowners are compensated with a maximum $15,000 payment, and renters receive $4,000. The federal construction funds run out after the homes are demolished but before construction is finished. The expansion takes decades to complete.

Demographic Overview

Jake Warr provided an overview of the demographics in our region and the Interstate Bridge's corridor. Demographic data was presented for five geographies: program area (as defined for the purposes of demographic data), City of Vancouver, Clark County, City of Portland, and Multnomah County.

Why is this important?

- Understanding our community is key to engaging out community
- Helps take us out of our personal bubbles
- Centering equity includes evaluation of distribution of benefits and burdens. Demographic data is one important tool to support this.

General Population

The program area is growing but not as much relative to other geographies. The City of Portland has grown about 22 percent since 2000, while Clark County has grown 37 percent since 2000. This speaks to how people are moving across the river to Clark County.

Race, Ethnicity, and Language

In the region, Jake shared that the population is about 30 percent Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC) and 70 percent white. Clark County is the whitest, relatively. In the program area, about 28 percent of the population is BIPOC. Of the BIPOC community in the program area, the Hispanic/Latino population is about 35 percent, the Black population is about 28 percent, and the Asian community is about 11 percent.

Question: How is the program area defined?

- Response: The immediate program area was defined for the purpose of gathering demographic data. It includes the I-5 corridor from N Killingsworth St in Portland to SR 500 in Washington.

Over time, the concentration of people of color disperses and moves towards the suburbs. Johnell noted that gentrification and income inequality are some of the causes of this dispersal.

Looking to the future, the community expected to grow the most is the Hispanic/Latino population. The Asian population is also expected to grow. Others remain fairly flat. Specifically, in Albina the Black population has decreased from about 16,400 in 1970 to about 7,000 today. Meanwhile, in Clark County there were about 660 Black people in 1970 and today there are about 7,800.

Of those who identify as having Limited English Proficiency (LEP), Vietnamese speakers have a high percentage (about 60 to 80 percent of people who speak Vietnamese identify as having LEP).

Income

Jake shared that the median income in Clark County is higher relative to other geographies. The program area has a medium income lower than other geographies.

About one in three (30 percent) of households in the identified geographies are low-income, except Clark County where the percent is about one in four (25 percent).

Question: What is a household defined as?

- Response: Household is a census-defined term; the size of the household is not included.

Older Adults

Jake presented that the City of Vancouver and Clark County have a slightly larger size of older adults (about 15 percent). In our region, the percent is about 13. There are large concentrations of older adults along the Interstate 5 corridor.

People with Disabilities

The region has about 10 percent people with disabilities. In Portland and Vancouver, hat number is 10 percent 12 percent, respectively.

Housing

The program area has about half owners and half renters. Homeowners tend to be more engaged in civic processes, but we want to make sure we are reaching renters as well.

How do we operationalize equity?

Jake concluded by explaining how we operationalize equity and apply this data to the program.

Transportation Equity

Is about more than just compliance with federal requirements, it's about access:

- To the system itself (i.e. physical, financial)
- To the services & opportunities (e.g. jobs) that the system connects users to (e.g. transit service levels & coverage)
- For all users, with a particular focus on those most historically transportation disadvantaged

Environmental Justice in Transportation

DOT Guiding Principles:

- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process;
- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority or low-income populations; and
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority or low-income populations.

Johnell concluded with reminding the Advisory Groups that they will have time over the next few years to explore equity and the information presented.

Changing the Frame

Johnell posed the following questions for attendees to consider:

- How might a project look if…
    - It disproportionately benefited historically marginalized communities?
    - It centered the voices of historically marginalized communities?
    - The processes (planning, engagement, etc.) were considered concrete outcomes?

BREAK & LUNCH

Johnell and Lisa transitioned the attendees to a lunch break and overviewed the upcoming agenda items.

DECISION MAKING

Johnell introduced the next agenda item: consensus decision making.

Discussion & Consensus Cards

Red, yellow and green cards will be used to aid consensus decision making. During discussions, the cards will be used as follows:

- The green card indicates that the individual can provide clarification by providing information that is pertinent to a question raised.
- The yellow card indicates that the individual has a question or needs clarification.
- The red card indicates that the individual has a process observation (e.g., discussion is off-topic).

The facilitators will be monitoring the cards in addition to the Zoom hand raising function. Lisa noted there was a comment about the visually impaired; Johnell responded by asking the visually impaired to verbally state that they have a green, yellow or red card issue.

During a call for consensus, the cards will be used as follows:
- The green card indicates the individual agrees with the proposal.
- The yellow card indicates the individual has a question that must be answered before they decide.
- The red card indicates the individual opposes the proposal but commits to work with the group to find a solution that works for all. When a member uses a red card, it becomes their responsibility to work with the group to come up with a solution that works for everyone. A red card indicates that the individual should stick with the process and work with the group to have their issues resolved.

Lisa noted there was a question about how to indicate members are undecided; Johnell answered that yellow cards indicate "undecided."

Small Group Discussions

Johnell and Lisa transitioned the group for a small group discussion on consensus. Two questions were posed to the group:
1. What does consensus mean to you?
2. How will we create an inclusive climate in our work together?

Lisa explained the structure of the breakout sessions and the function of the jam board which will provide a summary to ensure the public is privy to the small group discussions that occurred in the breakout rooms.

Breakout Groups

Attendees joined the breakout groups for 15 minutes.

Jam Board Overview

Upon conclusion of the small group discussions, Johnell read key points from the jamboard:

What does consensus mean to you?
- I don't have to agree 100 percent with an actual outcome
- We will support the decision for the greater good of the project
- Starts with a clear understanding of the desired outcome
- Shared understanding of value and goals
- Integrity in the process

How will we create an inclusive climate in our work together?
- Being bold and comfortable
- Step up if you aren't someone who speaks frequently, step back if you are used to being heard
- Identify missing voices
- Return to our core values
- Document discussion and reflect in outcomes
- Be mindful of the group size
- Always share the room
- Be willing to listen

Facilitator Reports

Roberta's group talked about the importance of people sharing what they want and need so the Advisory Groups are pushing ideas for the benefit of the collective. In addition, seeking to understand each other before making decisions. Roberta emphasized the idea around guiding assumptions and how we cultivate a culture that can lean into each other when things get difficult.

Jake shared that his group talked about stating names before talking to be inclusive for the visually impaired.

Katy Belokonny's group discussed an inclusive climate being part of the norm. In addition, everyone might not be used to an equitable approach and the members need to get comfortable being uncomfortable.

Alex Prentiss's group discussed how community engagement needs to be driving decision making. In addition, the importance of determining why a decision is being made as part of the transparency process.

Cadie Dye's group discussed creating space and determining how all voices can be heard. In addition, ensuring dissenting voices are considered. The community representatives must represent their community, not just themselves, while also recognizing they can't speak for everyone.

An Advisory Group member shared that dissenting voices can provide options and alternatives, not to derail the discussion but to provide alternatives.

Greg agreed that dissenting voices are critical to making the outcome better.

Another member suggested translating materials. Lisa shared that the IBR program team is translating materials into eight languages: Korean, Russian, Simplified Chinese, Somali, Spanish, Traditional Chinese, Vietnamese, and Ukrainian.

Creating our Consensus Model

Greg emphasized that the power in the Advisory Groups is coming to a consensus and finding common ground so that everyone can agree they see themselves in the decision. If consensus does not get reached, the Advisory Groups is ceding to others to reach consensus for them.

Greg noted that some have mentioned concerns about time. The IBR program team must meet legislatively mandated deadlines; however, the team will be aware of time, but not handcuffed by it.

Greg's made the final point that empathy is critical to reaching consensus.

IBR: A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

Johnell introduced IBR Environmental Manager Chris Regan and asked that Advisory Group members use their discussion cards and the Zoom hand raising function to ask questions.

Chris further introduced himself, encouraged attendees to ask questions, and provided an overview of the environmental presentation.

Program Timeline

Chris presented that from 2004 to 2014, there were a number of planning efforts for how to replace the Interstate Bridge across the Columbia River, including defining a program area and determining the transportation problems. This process fell under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and ended with a Record of Decision (ROD) identifying a Locally Preferred Alternative and how best to solve the identified issues.

About a year and a half ago, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and governors and legislatures from both states began to relook at how to fund replacing the Interstate Bridge. This initiated the IBR program. Now, the agencies are determining what components of those past planning efforts are relevant, what has changed, and how to bring that forward to a final decision for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transportation Agency (FTA).

The Advisory Groups will help sculpt the Purpose & Need and Vision & Values and provide perspectives to determine the Locally Preferred Alternative.

NEPA Overview

Two Pillars of NEPA

Chris shared that NEPA was signed into law in 1970 in response to a number of revolts against building highways. The NEPA process was created to ensure that, for any given project, the public has a voice and the environmental impacts are studied. The two pillars of NEPA are: community engagement and environmental impact.

NEPA Umbrella

The NEPA umbrella includes:

- Federal permits/authorizations
- Tribal consultation/coordination
- State permits/authorizations
- Other permits/authorizations

NEPA Strategy

It was shared that before we can start NEPA for IBR, we need to:
- Evaluate the current context for the IBR program:
  o New regulations
  o Funding and transit considerations
  o Contextual analysis
  o Long-lead permitting restart
- Seek input from the CAG and EAG as we work with ESG to:
  o Update Purpose & Need and establish community Vision & Values
  o Establish screening criteria and a range of alternatives
  o Formally begin community engagement
- Begin mitigation planning
- Begin resource agency and tribal coordination efforts

Alternatives Development

Spring 2021: Define and recommend Purpose & Need and community Vision & Values; develop screening criteria for alternative concepts based on P&N and V&V.

Summer 2021: Evaluate alternative concepts using screening criteria.

Fall 2021: Finalize range of alternatives that will go through environmental review process.

2021 – 2024: Narrow range of alternatives into a Locally Preferred Alternative during the environmental process.

2024 – 2025: Advance and finalize design of the Locally Preferred Alternative.

2025: Construction begins

Question and Answer

Question: I've been told they are going to fill-in the area on the Oregon side of the Columbia near the bridge. Is that true?

- Response: I don't have information on that. We will circle back with the Army Core of Engineers and get that question answered.

Question: Are the Advisory Groups developing the alternative concepts or are they being presented to us? Second, do we start with a large number of alternatives and then pull out those that will be analyzed further in the environmental process?

- Response: The IBR team is starting to develop the alternatives. As the IBR team is establishing the initial alternative concepts, they are identifying constraints, impacts, and benefits. They will then apply the screening criteria and the Vision & Values group the Advisory Groups are going to help with to provide a list of alternatives to narrow to the Range of Alternatives.

Question: What is a Locally Preferred Alternative?

- Response: The NEPA process is to develop foundational documents, analyze a range of alternatives, determine the impacts of each alternative, and analyze public comments. This result is a draft or final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that defines the preferred option, which becomes the Locally Preferred Alternative.

Question: I'm confused about the use of the word "locally."

- Response: The typical NEPA phrase is "preferred alternative." However, during the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) project, they used the FTA term "Locally Preferred Alternative."

Question: How much of the work that was done previously is being used as a baseline for the current program?

- Response: The Legislature directed the IBR program to consider the prior work, reevaluate how much of the prior work is relevant, understand how the context has changed, and determine how the program can meet today's needs. There will be some upfront work determining the Purpose and Need and Vision and Values, and there is great opportunity for the Advisory Groups to help shape this work.

An Advisory Group member commented that so much work was previously completed (e.g. aviation impacts) and that it's not all perfect – now the work is to reevaluate and update that work.

Shaping the Program

Purpose & Need, Vision & Values

Chris then showed a graphic on gathering feedback to update the Purpose & Need and establishing the community Vision & Values. The process includes evaluating prior planning, determining what has changed, and seeking feedback and recommendations.

Chris then summarized the Purpose and Need from prior planning work. He explained the Vision & Values, summarized the values identified in previous planning and read the previous Vision Statement.

The Role of the Advisory Groups

Chris initiated this topic by defining a few key terms:

- Alternative is an option; what can we replace the bridge with? All alternatives try to address the needs and encapsulate the values.
- The Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) will move into design and construction.
- Screening criteria will be developed with the Advisory Groups and used to evaluate preliminary bridge replacement alternatives.

Chris provided a program decision-making framework graphic to help describe the role of the CAG and EAG:
- The Program Administrator is responsible for decision making informed by all of the parties and constraints.
- The Executive Steering Group (ESG) consists of transportation partners and the CAG co-chairs.
- The Advisory Groups help report to the ESG and Program Administrator.
- The Bi-state Legislative Committee provides guidance and oversight on program development work.
- A number of other decision makers and jurisdictional authorities exist to review and approve various pieces of the program.

The role of the CAG and EAG with regards to the Purpose & Need and Vision & Values:
- 2021: Reevaluate prior planning efforts' Purpose & Need and Vision & Values and finalize IBR program definition.
- 2022 – 2024: Ensure that we incorporate Purpose & Need and Vision & Values into IBR program planning, environmental review, and design.

The role of the CAG and EAG with regards to screening criteria for bridge replacement alternatives:
2021:
- Reevaluate prior planning efforts' screening criteria

- Develop screening criteria for IBR program
- Use screening criteria to provide input on project elements for multiple alternatives

2022 – 2024:
- Continue to use screening criteria to evaluate alternatives as they are advanced through the planning and environmental process.

The role of the CAG and EAG with regards to bridge replacement alternatives development:

2021:
- Provide input on preliminary concepts for river crossing alternatives, including location and operational configuration
- Start thinking about multimodal elements such as vehicles, freight, transit, micro-mobility, and active transportation options
- Start thinking about freeway access and local roads access

2022 – 2024:
- Provide input on the development of guidelines for river crossing configuration, type, and aesthetics
- Provide input on aesthetics, design, transit, local road, and highway design elements, as well as surrounding environment

Chris then presented a series of example images to help describe Alternatives Development, including images for each of the following:
- The preliminary range of bridge replacement alternatives
- Locally Preferred Alternative for bridge replacement
- 30 percent design of the Locally Preferred Alternative

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Lisa introduced the community engagement portion of the IBR program, which includes five key elements: equity, diversity, accessibility, transparency and inclusion.

- Equity: An important part of the IBR program is centering equity. In a commitment to centering equity, the program has a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) team helping apply an equity lens to every element of the program.

- Diversity: Committed to minimizing barriers to participate and engaging with communities in ways that are safe and comfortable.

- Accessibility: Making it easy for community members to communicate with the IBR team, such as through phone, email, and social media.

- Transparency: Although we are leveraging existing planning work, a lot of decisions have not been made. The program will be clear about why input is needed and how it will be used. The Advisory Groups will not be making engineering decisions but will influence and impact the program.

- Inclusion: Engaging in a two-way dialogue and meeting communities where they are. Part of this effort, for example, is translating materials and providing translation services. The program is looking for input from the Advisory Group on how best to engage.

Lisa then walked through the key community engagement goals:

- Seek feedback from a diverse range of stakeholders
- Include underrepresented and/or underserved populations
- Embrace innovation
- Minimize barriers to engagement
- Demonstrate accountability through transparency and feedback
- Establish credibility and trust with stakeholders and the community
- Provide opportunities to meaningfully shape program work

She then detailed the 2021 outreach and engagement:

- Multi-cultural outreach liaisons: The program team is directly working with six multicultural liaisons who are fluent in other languages and deeply connected within their local communities to help spread the word about the program directly.
- Community conversations: Community conversations will allow the program to provide detailed program information and collect live feedback from participants.
- Community briefings: Community briefings will occur throughout 2021. Please contact the program to schedule for your organization or community group.
- Community input survey: Surveys will seek public input to inform program decisions at key milestones.
- Digital and print advertising: Advertising will be used to promote program events and engagement opportunities.
- Media outreach: The program will use proactive media outreach to keep local and regional media sources informed on key program activities and events.
- Podcast series: Lisa extended the invite to Advisory Group attendees to participate.

Community engagement will occur throughout the program, but there will be an increase in community engagement activities for month-long periods in spring, summer/fall, and fall/winter of 2021.

Question and Answer

Question: Is the program using minority and women-owned firms for the outreach work?

- Response: Yes. The firm leading communications is a women-owned firm, and the program is using Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) firms for the engagement efforts and DBE vendors for activities like printing, mailing, catering, etc.

Question: Will focus groups be used?

- Response: We do want to utilize focus groups and will also engage and work with Community-Based Organizations.

Question: Can Advisory Group members share the materials they're given with their communities?

- Response: Yes, absolutely. We also have flyers we are hoping you can help distribute.

Question: What is the format of the Open House?

- Response: The Online Open House will be held from February 16 through March 1, 2021. The format will be online through the IBR program website.

Question: Will there be additional translation and translated materials for those who don't have access to the internet?

- Response: Yes, we want to identify additional translation and will have printed materials in all languages.

WRAP UP

Ed Washington thanked the IBR program team for planning and coordinating the orientation. Lynn explained that she wanted to be part of the IBR program because Vancouver and Portland are one community, even though there is a river between the two cities. She thanked the Advisory Group attendees. Greg echoed Ed and Lynn's thanks.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 2:56 pm.

ATTENDEES

Facilitators and Presenters

Attendee	Title
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Facilitator and Communications Lead
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Facilitator and Chief Equity Officer
Dr. Roberta Hunte	IBR EAG Facilitator
Lynn Valenter	IBR CAG Co-Chair
Ed Washington	IBR CAG Co-Chair
Jake Warr	IBR Equity Lead
Chris Regan	IBR Environmental Manager
Katy Belokonny	IBR Small Group Facilitator
Alex Prentiss	IBR Small Group Facilitator
Cadie Dye	IBR Small Group Facilitator

CAG and EAG Members or Alternates

Attendee	Advisory Group	Affiliation
Kevin Perkey	CAG	Workforce Southwest Washington
Javier Navarro	CAG	League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
Martha Wiley	CAG	Community member
Lily Copenagle	EAG	Portland National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
Jimmy Rotharmel	CAG	Community member
Bill Iyall	CAG	Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Hai Ton	EAG	Community member
Bill Prows	CAG	Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs (OAME)
Michael Kelly	CAG	Human Services Council
Tom Gentry	CAG	Community member

Attendee	Advisory Group	Affiliation
Dena Horton	CAG	Pacific Northwest Waterways Association
Michael Martin-Tellis	CAG	Vancouver Neighborhood Association/Neighborhood Traffic Safety Alliance
Sam Kim	CAG	Community member
Fernando Martinez	EAG	Northwest Mountain Minority Supplier Development Council
Nikotris Perkins	EAG	Oregon Department of Transportation
Obie Ford III	EAG	Washington State University (WSU) Vancouver
Karyn Kameroff	EAG	Community member
Wayne Chow	CAG	Oregon State Building Trades Council (OSBTC)
Mikaela Williams	CAG	Community member
Mark Riker	CAG	Washington State Building and Construction Trades Council (WSBCTC)
Andrew Hoan	CAG	Portland Business Alliance
Steve Nakana	EAG	Port of Portland
Mark Harrington	EAG	Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC)
Irina Phillips	CAG	Community member
Tom Hickey	CAG	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Sebrina Owens-Wilson	EAG	Metro
Jeffery Temple	CAG	Fred Meyer
Jana Jarvis	CAG	Oregon Trucking Association
Rebecca Kennedy	EAG	City of Vancouver
Matt Hines	EAG	School of the Blind
Shona Carter	EAG	Community Foundation for Southwest Washington
Monica Tellez-Fowler	EAG	C-TRAN
Meg Johnson	EAG	Community member
Ana Muñoz	EAG	Latino Network
Sheri Call	CAG	Washington Trucking Association
Ashton Simpson	CAG	Oregon Walks

Attendee	Advisory Group	Affiliation
Karin Edwards	CAG	Clark College
John Gardner	EAG	TriMet
Jasmine Tolbert	CAG	Vancouver National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
Sydney Johnson	EAG	Fourth Plain Forward
Caitlin Reff	EAG	City of Portland
Elona J Wilson	EAG	Community member

Additional Participants

11 members of the public, partner agency staff, and the IBR 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://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qi1gr7ItHro

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/eag-cag-orientation/