

## COMMUNITY BENEFITS ADVISORY GROUP (CBAG)

### MEETING SUMMARY #14

Date and Time: Thursday, Oct. 24, 2024 / 9:30 – 11:30 am

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

Number of concurrent YouTube viewers: 15

### OUTCOMES

- CBAG members reviewed and refined potential community benefits recommendations in the Avoid Further Harm and Mobility & Accessibility categories.

### WELCOME

Emilee Thomas-Peralta, Equity Team and Co-facilitator, opened the October 2024 CBAG meeting. She then reviewed instructions to access closed captioning, meeting participation tips, sign language interpretation reminders, public input instructions and group agreements.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, welcomed attendees and thanked them for their participation.

Shannon Singleton, Community Benefits Lead and Thomas-Peralta led a round of introductions by asking members to share their names, organizational affiliation or at-large status and pronouns if they wished. Members also answered a check-in question, "If you could get tickets to any event in the world (past, present, or future), what would it be?" as part of their introductions.

Thomas-Peralta then provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

Thomas-Peralta outlined the process for submitting public comments during and after the meeting. No written comments were submitted prior to the meeting and no members of the public provided comments during the meeting.

### PROGRAM UPDATES

Program Administrator Johnson shared the following program updates:

- Section 106 public comment period: The 30-day public comment period for Section 106 findings, related to historical resources, runs from Oct. 18 to Nov. 18, 2024. Information can be accessed through the online open house at the [IBR Cultural Resources and Section 106 webpage](#).

October 24, 2024

---

- Draft SEIS public hearings and open houses: Two public hearings were recently held to gather feedback on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).
  - Vancouver (Oct. 15): This event had over 130 attendees, with the most popular booth being the visualization flyovers and interest in every table to understand more about the program.
  - Portland (Oct. 17): The second event had approximately 65 attendees and also had great interactions with attendees.
  - Upcoming virtual public hearings are scheduled for [October 28](#) and [October 30](#).
- Bi-State Legislative Committee Meeting: The team provided updates to the Bi-State Legislative Committee, covering key topics such as tolling, transit and congestion. A follow-up meeting to further address questions and concerns is planned for before the end of the year.
- Joint Oregon and Washington Transportation Commission Meeting: A joint session was held where a subcommittee presented tolling options for the Interstate Bridge, with toll rates ranging from \$1.55 to \$4.70. The subcommittee aims to finalize policies by late 2025 for pre-completion tolling in 2026.
- Community event tabling: The team participated in multiple community engagement events to raise awareness and gather feedback, including local farmers markets, neighborhood meetings, and cultural celebrations.
- Recent presentations: The program delivered presentations to various community organizations and industry groups across the region, such as local chambers of commerce, transportation boards, advisory councils, and professional associations.

Johnson continued his updates on how to access Draft SEIS. The Executive Summary has been translated into multiple languages to ensure accessibility and is available on the [IBR website](#). Physical copies are available at several locations including Vancouver City Hall, Vancouver Community Library, Charles Jordan Community Center and the Portland Building. The document is also available online, with comments accepted through the website, email, regular mail or by phone at (866) 427-7347. Johnson emphasized the importance of submitting official comments through approved channels, such as the website or email, and noted that comments must directly reference the Draft SEIS content to be included in the public record. Social media posts or comments containing hyperlinks will not be considered.

## Questions and comments from CBAG Members:

CBAG Member: I hope we'll learn what our next steps are by the end of today. Should you address that now, or save it for your closing remarks?

Johnson: Once the public comment period closes on Nov. 18th, the IBR team will categorize and review all the feedback. We'll work with our partners to move toward the preferred alternative for the Final SEIS. We aim to complete this by the end of 2024 to stay on track to finish the Final SEIS by late summer of 2025 and securing a record of decision by late summer or early fall of 2025. This will allow

October 24, 2024

us to start construction. We'll come back to the program partners with what we've heard and put forward a recommendation on the best solution to move forward.

CBAG Member: How many comments have we received so far?

Johnson: We've received over a thousand comments so far. For a program of this size and complexity, we generally expect between 5,000 and 10,000 comments, so we might see a surge toward the end. The attendance at public hearings and open houses has been strong, with people asking detailed questions, particularly about design. The public is clearly engaged and eager to see progress, and our team is ready to respond to all the feedback.

## REVIEW/REFINE POTENTIAL BENEFITS IN THE AVOID FURTHER HARM CATEGORY

Thomas-Peralta transitioned to the next agenda item to review and refine potential community benefits recommendations in the Avoid Further Harm and Mobility & Accessibility categories. She noted that input from the previous meeting had led to refinements, which were also shared with the [Community Advisory Group \(CAG\)](#) as well as the [Equity Advisory Group \(EAG\)](#) for feedback. She explained the recommendations are organized into batches or "tranches." Tranche 2, currently under review, contains time-sensitive items that could land or have implication on the Final SEIS, with the goal of bringing them to CBAG in November for their modified consensus decision making to move final recommendation language forward to ESG and IBR program leadership.

Singleton reminded the group of the categories for community benefits, explaining that some, like those related to environmental documents, have earlier deadlines. Benefits involving Workforce Equity and Economic Opportunity are being shared with teams working on labor agreements, DBE efforts and contract specifications. Other benefits, tied to third-party agreements or program-specific initiatives, will be addressed later. All decisions will align with the [Equity Framework](#) but follow different timelines based on scheduling needs.

### Questions and comments from CBAG Members:

CBAG Member: We're getting many questions from labor unions about Project Labor Agreements (PLAs). At our next opportunity, could we get an overview of who is involved, what contracts are affected and an update on the timing and process?

Singleton: I'll bring that request back to the team working on it, and we'll see what we can provide in terms of an update.

CBAG Member: I've had community members ask about the community benefits we're discussing. I've looked around the website, but I'm having trouble finding where those are posted.

Singleton: The community benefits aren't posted as a standalone document on the website. They're included in your meeting summaries with small group notes at the bottom and in the presentation slides from those earlier meetings. Since this is still a working document, it's not available separately.

Thomas-Peralta screenshared the chart for a large group discussion. Below is the discussion on the review/refine of potential benefits in the Avoid Further Harm category.

### **Avoid Further Harm (AFH)-18: Identify funds for direct impact mitigations resulting from construction.**

Thomas-Peralta: Some context to share is that contractors are usually responsible for direct impacts, such as any damage caused by construction. What we want to hear from you is whether you're thinking of mitigations more broadly for construction impacts, or if this is specific to direct damage caused by contractors or construction?

CBAG Member: As we discuss construction, if we're moving a sound wall and need to bolt it under a home's foundation, we mentioned offering the homeowner a pre- and post-construction evaluation. If the foundation is damaged, are those the funds we're referring to?

CBAG Member: That seems like a direct impact, and with pre- and post-construction analysis, it would usually be compensable. Is the question about specific damage like this or something broader?

CBAG Member: A general fund is hard to navigate without clear ties to specific impacts. Physical damage is straightforward, but mitigation can cover broader areas like air quality. We need to clarify if we're focusing on concrete, physical harm or broader impacts, so the team can determine what's compensable.

CBAG Member: This isn't the first time. We've dealt with this in previous construction projects, so there's no need to reinvent the process.

CBAG Member: We're trying to clarify whether certain things are, like inspections and direct impacts, are already covered by DOTs as standard practice. If they are, can we take them off the table? Or are we talking about something more specific? There's also some confusion, both publicly and within this group, about what DOTs typically handle, which might explain the disconnect between public expectations and actual processes. This discussion helps clarify those points.

CBAG Member: I'd leave this in and see where it fits. The more we have it in writing, the easier it is for people to reference and avoid miscommunication. If it's listed, people can always go back and find it electronically.

Johnson: In a situation like that, contractors have insurance to cover damage caused by construction. So, if drilling near a home cracks a foundation, those funds would come from the contractor to the homeowner. The DOT's role would be to ensure the contractor responds promptly in such cases.

CBAG Member: But everything you mentioned needs to be in writing, because once the contractor starts, it'll be hard to track you down. Having it in writing will help us address any questions that come up.

Johnson: Yes, that's standard in construction contracts. Contractors must carry liability insurance. We'll highlight this for the Community Benefits Advisory Group so everyone knows it's covered.

CBAG Member: Would it be possible to send out a full list of the current community benefits? I understand it might not be online since it's a working document.

Singleton: We can send out an updated list. We've consolidated from around 140 to 50 due to the combining we've done in the background.

CBAG Member: I'm concerned about mitigating traffic impacts during construction. We should prioritize transit, active transportation and freight, as slowing them down could hurt the economy. Let's focus on keeping buses and trucks moving, even if it makes things tougher for cars.

Thomas-Peralta: We have benefits where this is already represented, both in the first batch that was voted on and a few others currently on the table. They are included in our list.

CBAG Member: From a park's perspective, I know some locations will be impacted, which could affect sports or events. There are two options to mitigate this: offset the costs of finding alternative locations or time the construction to minimize the impact, such as during the winter when fields aren't used as much. One of the affected fields is Marshall Park, where a long section will have a big wall built nearby. Another location was mentioned, but it seemed like a much smaller impact.

CBAG Member: Are there parks on the Portland side that will be impacted by bridge construction over the slough, like the soccer fields or transportation to that large area?

City of Portland Staff: I'll look into Delta Park since it's heavily used. There's some buffer between I-5 and the fields, but the main concern is access and traffic flow, especially around the MLK intersection. We're also coordinating with the parks team to address potential truck routes and graffiti.

CBAG Member: There's also Heron Lakes Golf Course and Portland International Raceway, both owned by Parks and Recreation.

Singleton: We'll work with our technical team to review these areas and gather specifics to share with you when we reconvene.

## **AFH-20: Minimize impacts on small businesses during construction to avoid extended closures**

Thomas-Peralta: These responsibilities are usually part of contractor requirements, and we can add specific language to the contract documents. While the Draft SEIS includes general mitigations for

issues like road closures and congestion, it doesn't specifically address small businesses. We'd like to hear any specific concerns or suggestions regarding minimizing impacts on small businesses.

CBAG Member: I have a question about the structure of the table (chart) for this item. What does 'responsible party' mean? Does it refer to the contractors?

Singleton: The "responsible party" typically refers to the contractors as outlined in the contract specifications, especially regarding road closures. Today, we want to explore this further to understand that there may be multiple responsible parties for certain benefits, as everyone may have a role to play.

CBAG Member: The DOTs are responsible for holding contractors accountable, which is why we have inspectors on site to monitor activities. Complaints typically go to the DOTs, who enforce contract compliance.

CBAG Member: This needs to be clear to the public. If I own a small business affected by construction, should I contact the contractor with my complaint?

Singleton: The program is exploring navigators or liaisons as point persons for both businesses and the community. These individuals would engage with homeowners and attend events to build recognition, ensuring proactive communication. Promoting these roles would be beneficial.

Johnson: We're considering three categories for navigators or advocates, though the name isn't finalized. One would focus on boots on the ground for the community and businesses, one on workforce concerns and one to support small contractors and DBEs by monitoring payments. We're still in the conceptual stage but aim to adapt successful models from Puget Sound.

CBAG Member: I like the term "Ombudsman." Can these individuals start early? With over 400 small businesses in the bridge influence area, we should ask about their concerns now. For instance, businesses with wine cellars are sensitive to vibrations, and without engaging them, we risk significant losses.

Johnson: We aim to finalize the concept in the coming weeks and have it ready for review by this team and the broader group. I'm open to bringing on multiple individuals to engage with the community, attend events, and understand the issues raised.

### **AFH-21: Explore opportunities for planting mature trees, in line with landscaping plan and permitting.**

Thomas-Peralta: This is something you raised at the last meeting, and we wanted to let you know we've incorporated it after discussing it with our technical teams. The focus is on planting mature trees in line with landscaping plans and permitting. We'll include this in the decision-making batch. The RFPs require replacing removed trees and providing ongoing maintenance to ensure they thrive. We've also heard suggestions about sourcing trees from nurseries for maturation before planting,

which TriMet has successfully done on another project. I'll open it up for any additional thoughts before moving on to the Mobility & Accessibility category.

CBAG Member: I recommend collaborating with urban forestry departments to prioritize tree planting along the bridge and its surrounding communities earlier rather than later. This would serve as a preventative measure and support long-term growth opportunities for air quality and other benefits.

CBAG Member: I've received many positive comments about being proactive instead of waiting until all the work is done to take action. There's significant community interest in this approach.

Singleton: We have some examples to draw from, and I'm learning a lot from your input. We'll keep exploring these ideas and build on them.

CBAG Member: I want to stress the importance of tree maintenance, which is a long-term obligation. In Portland, we often see failures in multi-year maintenance plans, leading to dead trees that frustrate the public. Contractors sometimes neglect watering during heatwaves, causing trees to die. This needs to be planned from the start so contractors can effectively fulfill their responsibilities and avoid future issues.

Singleton: We'll continue to dig into this and ensure its addressed.

Johnson: When trees are part of a construction contract, there's usually an establishment period and warranties can be included. This can be extended if you're willing to pay the contractor for maintenance during that time.

CBAG Member: Everything you just said needs to be in writing. We might not be present when the final contract is signed, and that's been a source of frustration in past projects. We need clear documentation to refer back to when issues arise.

Singleton: Your comments will be captured. The Community Benefits Plan will include these points along with a narrative on implementation. The future advisory group for the IBR will be responsible for monitoring implementation as recommended.

CBAG Member: I suggest we emphasize the placement of trees for air quality and acoustic mitigation. The specific locations are crucial, so including that language would be beneficial.

**AFH – 22: In line with existing procurement policies, ensure there are opportunities for representation of equity priority communities in the RFP review process and on the review panel to avoid and address potential biases**

CBAG Member: I suggest involving the National Association of Minority Contractors (NAMC). Two key points: hold work sessions to train minority contractors before RFPs, and help large contractors prioritize minority subcontractors. This might already be in another section but is worth highlighting.

October 24, 2024

CBAG Member: Are we in contact with any mentoring programs in this space? Additionally, as we encourage people to apply, I hope we can focus on educating them on how to apply for these opportunities.

Singleton: For the RFP, we want to include owner representatives that are also from equity priority communities in the review process, not just random community members. We've noted feedback on the DBE and workforce outreach programs. While the full list is helpful, we won't discuss funding mechanisms today, as that's handled by the agreements team and procurement. Mentoring programs are part of that discussion.

Thomas-Peralta informed members that the group would now proceed to review and refine community benefits recommendations in the Mobility and Accessibility category.

**Mobility & Accessibility (MA) – 11: Conduct a comparative analysis of program areas to optimize traffic flow and accessibility.**

Thomas-Peralta: This analysis is part of the Draft SEIS, comparing existing and future traffic operations using the no-build scenario against the Modified LPA and design options. Traffic flows are measured using standard metrics like intersection operations and travel times. Accessibility optimization may be addressed through active transportation improvements in the MLPA and public transit access. We believe this is covered in the DSEIS, but we'd like to hear any additional thoughts from the group.

CBAG Member: What does the word "comparative" mean in this context? What exactly are we comparing?

Thomas-Peralta: The notes I have indicate that the traffic analysis involves comparing existing conditions to future anticipated traffic conditions, as well as the no-build option to the Modified LPA and design options.

**MA – 12: Design team to consider providing adequate shelter for all weather conditions at transit stations.**

Thomas-Peralta: The program intends to follow TriMet and C-TRAN standards for transit stations. TriMet's criteria state that shelters should provide comfort and protection from weather conditions like rain, wind and sun, including windscreens when necessary. We want to know if this meets expectations for adequate shelter or if there are additional considerations for all-weather protection.

CBAG Member: There are concerns about the elevated platforms in Vancouver, as they are more exposed to the weather than typical TriMet stops. Extra attention may be needed to address this exposure, which might be part of the normal process given the area's conditions. It's important to ensure that adequate protection is provided.



CBAG Member: We'll be designing several elements, not just the elevated platform, but the entire transit hub. We need to consider snow, ice and wind in the Columbia Gorge. However, I'm unclear about what you're specifically asking for here.

Singleton: There are standard definitions. I understand that "all weather" means all weather, but what exactly does "adequate" mean? I invite others with more technical expertise to chime in on this.

CBAG Member: Are we seeking more than the standard at TriMet and C-TRAN stations, or is current provision sufficient? I haven't seen a station like this [elevated] in Portland, so I'm unsure what 'adequate' means when it's hundreds of feet in the air; it likely needs to exceed current standards. The design team should consider providing unique sheltering, as 'adequate' seems like a minimum standard. There's nothing like this in the entire region.

Singleton: I appreciate the specificity. While our regular bus stops are fine, this elevated one is new, and we need to clarify what that means for sheltering from the weather.

CBAG Member: We need to consider access to the elevated shelter and protect it from the elements. The staircase shouldn't be exposed to weather, as no one will clear snow and ice. 'Adequate' seems too minimal for something so unique.

Assistant Program Administrator Paige Schlupp: TriMet's Committee on Accessible Transportation (CAT) ensures that designs meet specific criteria, so it won't be inadequate. It will meet those standards. The concern seems to imply it might be less than adequate, but that's not possible. We have a public process and safety certification, along with various filters, that govern our building standards.

Singleton: Maybe we should explicitly highlight the differences with this elevated station and ensure it receives specific attention. It's important that it goes through the necessary processes to guarantee safety.

CBAG Member: Our goal is to encourage more people to use transit and active transportation, which should be integrated into bridge design. 'Adequate' is not sufficient if we want to promote public transportation, and we can address active transportation separately.

CBAG Member: I'd add ice and snow to the definition with rain, wind and sun. For the sun, I recommend changing it to 'heat' to reflect the need for protection from heat, especially with concrete surfaces.

### **MA – 13: Consider safety when determining locations for public restrooms near transit stations.**

Thomas-Peralta: Our technical team noted that public restrooms are not included in the program plans or the MLPA, so building and maintenance fall to jurisdictions or program partners. For example,

restrooms cannot be on transit platforms. We might consider editing the language to offer guidance on safety when determining locations for these facilities. I'll now open the floor for thoughts.

City of Portland Staff noted that in addition to safety, there should be considerations for design features that promote inclusivity.

Singleton: What I'm hearing is that while we can still make this a recommendation, there are no plans for installing public restrooms as part of the program. This is an important aspect of the discussion we should be having.

CBAG Member: I appreciate the focus on restroom accessibility, but we must prioritize safety to encourage multimodal transportation. Many avoid public transit due to safety concerns, and TriMet is planning to install call boxes at some stops. We need a safety-focused approach, including crime prevention through environmental design, to ensure the project's success and help people feel comfortable using these options.

Singleton: I'll incorporate that language into the Physical Design category. It will include a broad statement about safety, along with some of the specifics you've mentioned.

CBAG Member: Where do TriMet's drivers use the restroom?

IBR Staff: TriMet offers restroom facilities for operators at designated locations, not at every stop. One of these will serve both C-TRAN and TriMet, but they are for agency use only due to safety and security, so they're not open to the public.

CBAG Member: There will be a restroom at Evergreen for drivers, but it won't be accessible to the public. Is that in writing?

Singleton: Yes.

Schlupp: TriMet does have design criteria that establish all of this, so it is in writing as part of our guidelines.

CBAG Member: Maybe it's too late to add but I'm distressed to learn that public restrooms aren't part of the program. They are a significant community benefit, and I'd like to see them included along the route.

Singleton: While it may not be too late to add public restrooms, the answer could be no. Transit agencies typically design restrooms for drivers, not the public. If public restrooms are included, we need to consider ownership and maintenance, which haven't been fully addressed. I'm also unsure if the cities will support public restrooms in the corridor.

CBAG Member: The Department of Transportation maintains rest areas along the freeways, which could be a good place for public restrooms. There used to be one entering Vancouver and having them would benefit cyclists and pedestrians.

CBAG Member: Are we focusing too much on the IBR program and the DOT contracts? Is it possible for the city to explore public restrooms? I'm not saying it will happen, but when we assign a responsible party to explore opportunities, it might come after the program.

CBAG Member: Where do public restrooms fit in? The library doesn't want transit users to use their facilities. We need to discuss this at the city, and it will be our responsibility to purchase the property and design the restrooms.

CBAG Member: I'm not an expert on bathrooms, but I've received TriMet alerts for five years. Elevators at stops are sometimes used as bathrooms, leading to service interruptions for cleaning, which impacts accessibility for individuals with disabilities. I often get emails about MAX service stopping due to elevator issues.

CBAG Member: At a practical level, will there be bathrooms at the waterfront station where you access it at the waterfront level, like at Terminal One?

CBAG Member: [nods head yes]

Schlupp: One thing TriMet has learned over the years is that most older stations had only one elevator. In contrast, newer constructions, like the Bybee station, include two elevators. This ensures that if one is down, there's always an alternative, improving reliability for accessibility.

#### **MA – 14: Design team to consider incorporation of green spaces at public transit locations**

Thomas-Peralta: Our technical team notes that this is an existing best practice, and code requirements for transit stations cover this. However, it applies to at-grade stations, so it may not be relevant for the elevated station. I want to open it up for any comments on this.

CBAG Member: In the context of Portland, there are concerns about how some parks, particularly Delta Park, are impacted, especially regarding Native American events held there. I'll hand this over to staff, as I'm not sure I understand all the dynamics.

City of Portland Staff: Delta Park will be significantly affected, hosting events like Native American powwows and gatherings for South American groups. We need to discuss the impact on these activities, how the project will mitigate those effects, and ensure the green space remains after completion.

CBAG Member: I'm confused by the terms "green spaces", "landscaping" and "hardscaping" which all suggest drought-resistant native planting. We need clarification on how these areas will be maintained and who is responsible for that.

Singleton: We've discussed drought-resistant and native plants, so we can be more specific here. This section is about the transit station, so we should avoid vague terms like "green spaces." We might also want to consider what the normal operations for landscaping are for transit stations.

IBR Transit Team Staff: The landscaping will depend on the location. There won't be any greenery on platforms for safety reasons, but in the station area, the type of landscaping and maintenance will depend on whose land it is on.

Thomas-Peralta: Regarding native plants, we have a recommendation in our first tranche that emphasizes prioritizing native plants throughout the program area. I just wanted to mention that this is already included in our list.

CBAG Member: I will also bring this to urban forestry. What was once native in our area is no longer surviving. We may need to adopt new terminology, as we're now planting what is thriving in Southern Oregon, so that could represent a change in language.

Thomas-Peralta: Yes, we can incorporate that feedback into the language for the first tranche.

CBAG Member: I recommend using the term "naturalized," as I've heard landscape architects and designers refer to specific vegetation in that way.

### **MA – 15: Consider maintenance, safety and active management in the design aspects of the multi-use paths.**

Thomas-Peralta: Some notes from the technical team indicate that the MLPA designs include two-way shared use paths optimized for user experience, safety, comfort and directness. To prevent conflicts between users traveling at different speeds, there will be separate spaces for pedestrians and cyclists, along with buffers from vehicle traffic, noise, and street debris to ensure a comfortable environment.

CBAG Member: The Draft SEIS outlines 10-foot\* paths for pedestrians and wheeled vehicles, which is insufficient separation for varying speeds and doesn't future-proof the design. We need to consider the goal of getting more people out of their cars, as scooters and mobility devices can exceed 25 miles per hour. A 10-foot corkscrew path is unsafe. Is the IBR aiming to encourage this shift away from cars?

*\*Note: the shared use path studied in the Draft SEIS would be approximately 25 feet wide in total for a two-way path across the new Columbia River bridge.*

CBAG Member: The goal is to provide options that help navigate future vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and traffic volumes. I see opportunities to decrease single-occupancy vehicle usage through incentives.

CBAG Member: To reduce single-occupancy vehicle usage, we need to act, as not everyone will use public transportation. We should include futureproofing in the design since we don't yet know all the transportation modes the bridge will need to accommodate.

CBAG Member: My concerns relate to MA-15 and 27 about the bridge, particularly regarding a topic we haven't discussed. We're currently facing the tragic suicide of a 16-year-old at Glenn Jackson Bridge. Can we include design elements in this bridge to help mitigate and prevent such incidents for safety?

Thomas-Peralta: We have a community benefit addressing this issue, which we'll cover in our next meeting as part of Tranche 3. I appreciate you bringing it up.

CBAG Member: As a bike rider, motorized vehicles encroaching on bike lanes are dangerous. We need regulations to accommodate various types of transportation, with separation or limitations on scooters and e-bikes in bike and pedestrian lanes. Keeping these lanes separate is crucial to prevent accidents, especially with distracted pedestrians.

Thomas-Peralta: Separation is included in the MLPA design options. We want to emphasize language regarding motorized versus non-motorized transit, which we can incorporate here.

CBAG Member: I would caution against specifying modes of transportation and suggest using speed limits instead. As someone who isn't as proficient as a bike rider anymore and uses an e-bike, I try to obey sensible speed limits.

### **MA – 16: Develop robust trail systems that surpass federal requirements, leveraging creative solutions to increase functionality and community value.**

Thomas-Peralta: This is included in the MLPA and will align with city standards and road improvements, including sidewalks. The program has engaged with groups representing various transportation modes, including non-motorized options. The design team will respond to community input. For more details, Chapter 3.1 on Transportation in the Draft SEIS has useful information.

CBAG Member: I want to emphasize the importance of access to the bridge from both Portland and Vancouver. At 80 feet high, the corkscrew design is 0.4 miles with a grade of 3.5-4% grade, raising concerns among community members. We need to improve access to enhance usage. While it meets ADA standards, those assume a shorter ramp, and the design could pose safety issues due to varying speeds. It's essential to understand how this impacts our goals.

\*Note: The grades may drop to 1.5% for short, flat landings.

Johnson: We're not in the final design phase for getting cyclists and walkers down from the bridge to the waterfront in Vancouver, and we recognize the challenge. We've asked the community to use their networks to identify similar situations elsewhere to help us explore design options. What we have now

is a placeholder indicating our intention to get people to the waterfront, but the specifics are still to be determined.

CBAG Member: I'd like to suggest adding "wayfinding" to the section on developing robust trail systems to ensure we have proper signage.

Singleton: Are there specific individuals or groups the program should engage with? We can share that with the design team. Additionally, we should discuss the plan for reaching the final design to inform the community and active transit users about how they can engage.

CBAG Member: This may belong in the next bucket, but it's important to note that the bridge will be high, making access challenging for many. There's a strong desire for an elevator for both transit users and active transportation, which is crucial for communities with disabilities.

Singleton: I'm going to add that the elevator should accommodate active transportation users.

Thomas-Peralta: I believe we have a point addressing this in the Mobility & Accessibility category for a future tranche. I appreciate that note, and if it's not included, we'll make sure to capture it.

## **MA – 20: Incorporate innovative solutions to exceed ADA requirements, enhancing accessibility and mobility thoughtfully.**

Thomas-Peralta: The ADA standards applied throughout the program will meet or exceed those for other pedestrian facilities in the right-of-way. Our goal is to surpass these standards to address unique challenges like navigating bridges and interchanges. This may include longer ramps, gradual grades, wider facilities for separation and options for a diverse range of users, especially those with disabilities. The shared-use path design will ensure safe and accessible connections for those who cannot or choose not to use other modes for short trips, encouraging more walking, biking and rolling.

CBAG Member: We should prioritize universal design. In my experience as a PBOT Commissioner and Environmental Services Commissioner in Portland, meeting even the minimum ADA requirements has been a challenge. I hope we stay mindful of potential difficulties, especially with retrofitting existing infrastructure, as we've faced legal issues and are still years away from full compliance.

CBAG Member: We should involve disability groups early in the planning process to explore creative solutions. Designs need to exceed minimum standards for accessibility. For instance, closed captioning often obscures important content and ASL interpretation can be compromised by design elements. Bringing in a review group could identify simple fixes. Lastly, I suggest setting a short timeline for these recommendations to stay focused.

Singleton: I appreciate the suggestion to consult early with disability groups. We can discuss this with the design team and identify any missing voices. Additionally, I propose combining MA-27 with the one discussed earlier, as they relate to safety for active transportation on the bridge. It seems there's

October 24, 2024

agreement on this, so we'll skip item 27 for today, but the language will still be included in future discussions.

## CLOSING REMARKS

Thomas-Peralta transitioned to the next agenda item, informing members about upcoming CBAG and program meetings.

Johnson commended the members for their hard work and dedication to community benefits.

## ATTENDEES

Attendees	Organization
<b>CBAG Members</b>	
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Rian Windsheimer	Oregon Department of Transportation
Mingus Mapps	City of Portland
Anne McEnerney-Ogle	City of Vancouver
Lon Pluckhahn	City of Vancouver City Manager
Priya Dhanapal	Deputy City Administrator, City of Portland
Steve Barnett	Representative for the Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Scott McCallum	Washington State School for the Blind
Peter Fels	Alliance for Community Engagement
Jayne Haygood	Vancouver Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission
Vicki Nakashima	Equity Advisory Group (EAG) Representative
Walter Valenta	At-large Community Member
Holly Williams	At-large Community Member
Michael Strahs	Kimco Realty
Farleigh Winters	LSW Architects
Carley Francis	Washington State Department of Transportation
Darcy Hoffman	Workforce Southwest Washington
Javier Navarro	SW WA Chapter of Lulac
Siobhana R. McEwen	Southwest Washington Equity Coalition (SWEC)
Nate McCoy	National Association of Minority Contractors (NAMC) Oregon

Attendees	Role
<b>IBR Staff</b>	
Paige Schlupp	Assistant Program Administrator

October 24, 2024

Christina Martinez	Program Manager
Aidan Gronauer	Assistant Director of Civil Rights & Equity
Shannon Singleton	Community Benefits Lead
Emilee Thomas-Peralta	Equity Team
Eric Trinh	Equity Team
Demarcus Peters	Equity Team
Caryn Urata	Transit Team
Brenda Siragusa	Equity Team
Amanda Hart	Technical Support

Other Attendees	Organization/Agency
Serena Stoudamire-Wesley	Assistant Director for Equity and Civil Rights, Oregon Department of Transportation
Katherine Kelly	City of Vancouver
Cynthia Castro	Commissioner Mapps Chief of Staff
Shawnea Posey	City of Portland
James Cador	National Association of Minority Contractors (NAMC) Oregon

## Additional Participants

Online viewing is open to the public, partner agency staff and IBR team members. Fifteen participants viewed the meeting via the YouTube livestream during the meeting.

## MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

### Meeting Recording

[Community Benefits Advisory Group \(CBAG\) October 24, 2024, 9:30AM PST \(youtube.com\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...)

### Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here: [CBAG Meeting October 24, 2024 | Interstate Bridge Replacement Program](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...)