



I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Historic Albina Advisory Board

Meeting #6 Summary

MEETING DATE: June 1, 2021

MEETING TIME: 4:00 – 6:30PM

LOCATION: Zoom online meeting

This document is a summary of the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Historic Albina Advisory Board meeting. The [meeting presentation](#) and [recording](#) provide additional documentation of this meeting.

Historic Albina Advisory Board Members in Attendance

- Sprinavasa Brown
- Andrew Campbell
- Andrew Clarke
- Sharon Gary Smith
- Leslie Goodlow
- Estelle Love Lavespere
- Kevin Modica
- Pastor Richard Probasco
- John Washington

Historic Albina Advisory Board Members Not in Attendance

- Keith Edwards
- Dr. Carlos Richard
- Serena Stoudamire-Wesley
- Carl Talton

Staff Members

- Ericka Warren, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Historic Albina Advisory Board Facilitator
- Dr. Steven Holt, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Executive Steering Committee Facilitator
- Megan Channell, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Director
- April deLeon-Galloway, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Communications and Public Involvement Manager
- Mike Baker, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Manager
- Alex Cousins, Board support, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Owner's Representative Team
- Natalie Warren, technical support, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Owner's Representative Team

HAAB Meeting Summary

- Erin Kielhorn, technical support, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Owner's Representative Team
- Emily Wolff, notetaker, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Owner's Representative Team

Guest Presenters

- Jeana Wooley, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Facilitator
- Nolan Lienhart, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team
- Olivia Moss, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team
- Kate Brooks, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team
- Kate White, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team
- Steven Lewis, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team
- Charles Kelley, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team

Agenda

- Welcome, Introduction, Agenda Review
- Public Comment
- Cover Recommendation Next Steps
- Independent Highway Cover Assessment: Workshop #3
- Next Steps

Welcome, Introduction, Agenda Review

Ericka Warren, Board facilitator, welcomed participants and provided an overview of the meeting. Dr. Steven Holt gave a tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Tulsa-Greenwood massacre that occurred in Tulsa, Oklahoma in 1921.

Public Comment

- David Bennick commented about working with the community on a solution for restoring the neighborhoods before figuring out how to fix the highway problem. *See I-5 Rose Quarter Project – Historic Albina Advisory Board Meeting (June 1, 2021), [video], 13:55*

Highway Cover Recommendation Next Steps

Megan Channell, Project Director, committed to continuing to work with the board and the community to find a design approach for the Project that maximizes land available for development (having heard priorities for ownership of homes and businesses) and to provide economic opportunities to the Black community. She expressed her excitement about continuing work with the board, building from the work of the Independent Cover Assessment team, to maximize community opportunity and benefits. ODOT wants the community to be in the driver's seat to ensure that transportation investments support community development. .

HAAB Meeting Summary

- Leslie Goodlow made a proposal that the board pursue a hybrid approach to getting the project done while also achieving restorative justice goals.
- Pastor Probasco asked that the board spend more talking about how the land improvements will be funded. While beautiful designs have been presented, the mechanisms for paying for those and making them a reality have not been given as much attention. The key questions for the Board to consider are: 1) how are we going to use this land that is available? and 2) how are we going to fund it?
- Sprinavasa Brown noted that this project alone won't create generational wealth for the whole community. She noted that she is still not clear about the outcomes of environmental impacts of the Independent Cover Assessment team's design concepts. She urged the Board to consider the potential for what the project could do for the Black community if it is done well and it is not expected to solve all harms to the community by itself.

Independent Highway Cover Assessment: Workshop #3

Jeana Woolley, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team Facilitator, provided an overview of their presentation and introduced members of the team.

Steven Lewis, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team, talked about how the highway cover design is moving forward in ways that best serve the local Black community. Olivia Moss, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team, discussed the approach to governance for the highway cover land in the future:

1. Involvement in planning that would be independent of the technical ODOT teams and ensure decision making power to Black community leaders.
2. Long term ownership and stewardship that will be established in the conceptualization phases.
3. Community-focused vision that will last long into the future that the historic Albina community can be proud of.
4. Ongoing programming of the new space to ensure our efforts today continue and restorative justice spreads throughout our region.

Kate Brooks, Independent Highway Cover Assessment Team, reviewed the updated scenarios, their elements, cost and schedule impacts, and how each rank in the development assessment framework.

- Leslie Goodlow asked why we are looking at a new governance structure when others already exist within this area.
- Leslie Goodlow asked for clarification as to how we could build the covers and ramps in Cover Concept 4 for less money than Cover Concept 1.
 - Kate noted that the costs are preliminary and still being compared and vetted. However, since the ramps are either built or rebuilt in either concept, it is not much more expensive to build elsewhere than rebuild.

HAAB Meeting Summary

- Nolan noted that the I-5 SB on-ramp is also moving in the current project design.
- Leslie followed up with an example of costs, to note that it is much more expensive to tear out a deck and build one in a new location rather than repair one and requested the Independent Cover Assessment team be more clear about the costs and tradeoffs.
- John Washington noted that Albina Vision Trust was originally interested in a cover that was buildable and asked how we got to more elaborate designs.
 - Nolan described the scope for the three scenarios that guided development of the concepts presented, which were also informed by community outreach and project advisory committees: 1) one that meets community outcomes within the framework of existing environmental analysis, 2) one that may go beyond that to include additional elements to achieve restorative justice, 3) and another that incorporates additional elements as needed to fully realize the community vision.
 - John then asked the Independent Cover Assessment team for the total number of people that have participated in the cover concept design process. John also asked whether Albina Vision Trust has been included and about Nolan's relationship with the organization.
 - Nolan noted that he sits on Albina Vision Trust's advisory committee. The organization is not formally part of the process but is making their voice heard in community conversations.
- In response to the presentation, Megan Channell, Project Director, noted that the purpose and need for the project have not changed as analyzed in environmental review and as established by the legislature in House Bill 2017. This point is important because while restorative justice is a critical project outcome, it is not outlined in the purpose and need that provide the basis for environmental review.
 - Charles noted Megan is correct and apologized for the confusion.
- Estelle Love Lavespere asked for clarification on how much influence Albina Vision Trust has over this project and why they are being referenced in the process. She also asked for more information about impacts to transit, particularly access for people returning to the area from outer east Portland.
 - Kate White noted the team is analyzing impacts to transit and the goal for the cover concepts is accessible transit stations and transit priority.
- Members asked for more information to understand the concepts better and the questions being asked in order to more fully respond.
- Members expressed their preference for ownership of highway cover land rather than leasing agreements for the best outcomes for Black community health and wealth. Members also expressed concern about eminent domain.
- Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty thanked the board for allowing her to listen in on the meeting. She noted that ODOT cannot sell city land and commented on the

HAAB Meeting Summary

separation between the team and Albina Vision Trust. She requested more information about the acquisition and sale of land as part of the project.

- Megan clarified that ODOT has no plan to purchase and then sell city land.

Irene Kim, Independent Cover Assessment Team, directed participants to participate in a poll to rank their preference for the highway cover concepts. Then Jeana Wooley, Independent Cover Assessment Facilitator, described upcoming community events and future presentations to the board by the team.

Next Steps

Ericka invited board members to participate in the Independent Highway Cover Assessment [Online Open House #3](#) and reminded them of the date of the next meeting. Dr. Holt thanked board members for their participation and continued engagement in this project and adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Adjourn

Note: The meeting was hosted as a Zoom Meeting format that enabled Historic Albina Advisory Board members to unmute their microphones and use web-cameras to participate in the meeting. Attendees, or public observers, remained in “listen-only” mode and without access to video-sharing functions (attendees were able to view the presentation slides).

Historic Albina Advisory Board Response Matrix

ODOT is committed to being held accountable to the community, in particular the historic Albina community, for actions we take in response to the feedback we've heard. This matrix is a living document that will be updated following every meeting of the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project Historic Albina Advisory Board. The matrix lists specific information requests, action items, and project recommendations and ideas ODOT has received, and did not address directly as part of the meeting, from the board and documents how ODOT is responding. For a complete record of the discussions from each meeting, see the summary for each past meeting posted on the [events page](#).

Timing Key

Near Term: Zero to six months

Long Term: Six months to one year

During Construction: Activities to take place during or specific to construction

Out of Scope: Beyond ODOT purview, or requires times or resources from other community or agency partners

| Date | Source | Comment | Response | Timing | Responsible Party | Status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|--|------------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---|-----------------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 6/1/2021 | Leslie Goodlow | <p>Could the Board hear more information about the tradeoffs and costs/benefit analysis behind the cover concept scenarios, particularly the cost calculations?</p> <p>Could the team provide more detail as to how cover concept 4 costs less than cover concept 1 (even with the ramp relocation)?</p> | <p>The Independent Cover Assessment Team now has final cost calculations for each of the scenarios. The costs are for the central portion of the project related to the highway cover area only and not the project in full (the Independent Cover Assessment Team's cost to not include costs for I-5 modifications north and south of the highway covers). The Independent Cover Assessment Team's final total cost estimates have changed slightly since the Board last viewed them in the June 1 workshop. Scenario 5 is now the highest in cost with Scenario 4 following and Scenario 1 being the lowest in cost. However, Scenario 5 and Scenario 1 are still within a 10 percent variance of each other. The Independent Cover Assessment Team has been asked by ODOT to present total scenario costs in the same manner as ODOT's Cost to Complete Report is presented for comparison.</p> <p>The Independent Cover Assessment Team used the Cost to Complete report as a basis (as an estimated cost for the 20 percent design scenario is not yet available). Below are the final total cost estimates for ICA's Scenarios 1, 4 and 5.</p> <p>Scenario 1. Flint and Broadway Boulevards Concept Cost Range</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>PROJECT FEATURES</th> <th>Cost Range</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mainline</td> <td>\$147M - \$165M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highway Cover</td> <td>\$509M - \$569M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local Streets Improvement</td> <td>\$71M - \$79M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Utilities</td> <td>\$92M - \$103M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Project Cost</td> <td>\$819M - \$916M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover</td> <td>\$179M - \$201M</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | PROJECT FEATURES | Cost Range | Mainline | \$147M - \$165M | Highway Cover | \$509M - \$569M | Local Streets Improvement | \$71M - \$79M | Utilities | \$92M - \$103M | Total Project Cost | \$819M - \$916M | Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover | \$179M - \$201M | Short-term | Independent Cover Assessment Team | In Progress |
| PROJECT FEATURES | Cost Range | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mainline | \$147M - \$165M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Highway Cover | \$509M - \$569M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Streets Improvement | \$71M - \$79M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Utilities | \$92M - \$103M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Project Cost | \$819M - \$916M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover | \$179M - \$201M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Date | Source | Comment | Response | Timing | Responsible Party | Status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---|-----------------|------------------|------------|----------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---|-----------------|------------|-----------------------------------|----------|
| 6/1/2021 | Leslie Goodlow | <p>(...continued)</p> <p>Could the Board hear more information about the tradeoffs and costs/benefit analysis behind the cover concept scenarios, particularly the cost calculations?</p> <p>Could the team provide more detail as to how cover concept 4 costs less than cover concept 1 (even with the ramp relocation)?</p> | <p>Scenario 4. Center of the Cover Concept Cost Range</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="882 385 1846 647"> <thead> <tr> <th>PROJECT FEATURES</th> <th>Cost Range</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mainline</td> <td>\$144M - \$161M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highway Cover</td> <td>\$500M - \$559M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local Streets Improvement</td> <td>\$88M - \$98M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Utilities</td> <td>\$90M - \$101M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Project Cost</td> <td>\$822M - \$919M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover</td> <td>\$172M - \$192M</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Scenario 5. Restore the Grid Concept Cost Range</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="882 723 1846 985"> <thead> <tr> <th>PROJECT FEATURES</th> <th>Cost Range</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mainline</td> <td>\$143M - \$160M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highway Cover</td> <td>\$563M - \$629M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local Streets Improvement</td> <td>\$89M - \$99M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Utilities</td> <td>\$99M - \$110M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Project Cost</td> <td>\$894M - \$998M</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover</td> <td>\$172M - \$192M</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Independent Cover Assessment team has developed independent costs estimates for these concepts using a Work Breakdown Structure to capture all elements of the construction and project costs. The Independent Cover Assessment team's costing methodology uses the outline of elements from the ODOT Cost Estimating Manual and the team states that their cost estimates are consistent with the Association for Advancement of Cost Engineering International recommended practices. The cost estimation level that is appropriate for this stage is a rough order of magnitude estimate, which is commensurate with the early-stage, concept level of design such as the scenarios.</p> <p>The Independent Cover Assessment Team estimates Scenario 4 to be slightly less in cost because it has a shorter cover on the north end since Flint Street is not fully reconnected (as in Scenarios 1 and 5).</p> | PROJECT FEATURES | Cost Range | Mainline | \$144M - \$161M | Highway Cover | \$500M - \$559M | Local Streets Improvement | \$88M - \$98M | Utilities | \$90M - \$101M | Total Project Cost | \$822M - \$919M | Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover | \$172M - \$192M | PROJECT FEATURES | Cost Range | Mainline | \$143M - \$160M | Highway Cover | \$563M - \$629M | Local Streets Improvement | \$89M - \$99M | Utilities | \$99M - \$110M | Total Project Cost | \$894M - \$998M | Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover | \$172M - \$192M | Short-term | Independent Cover Assessment Team | Complete |
| PROJECT FEATURES | Cost Range | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mainline | \$144M - \$161M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Highway Cover | \$500M - \$559M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Streets Improvement | \$88M - \$98M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Utilities | \$90M - \$101M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Project Cost | \$822M - \$919M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover | \$172M - \$192M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROJECT FEATURES | Cost Range | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mainline | \$143M - \$160M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Highway Cover | \$563M - \$629M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Streets Improvement | \$89M - \$99M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Utilities | \$99M - \$110M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Project Cost | \$894M - \$998M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Added cost for 5 story buildings on the cover | \$172M - \$192M | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6/1/2021 | John Washington Estelle Love Lavespere | <p>What is the Independent Cover Assessment team's relationship to Albina Vision Trust?</p> <p>Has Albina Vision Trust been involved in the process and how much influence has they had over the highway cover</p> | <p>As stated at the HAAB meeting by the Independent Cover Assessment Team, the Independent Cover Assessment Team has had no working relationship with Albina Vision Trust (AVT) during their assessment process and AVT has not influenced the development of ICA's cover design options. Given that AVT is a major Black Historic Albina stakeholder in the community and focused on doing redevelopment work in the Rose Quarter area, ICA has had two informational meetings with the AVT staff/consulting team. The first meeting occurred after the concept scenarios were developed to share ICA's design scenarios with AVT and answer their questions about them. During the second meeting, ICA heard from AVT's consultants about the feasibility work they are in the process of doing that might inform our understanding of their future plans in the area. We made it clear that any formal suggestions that AVT might have about our work would have to be provided through the public comment process. As was already mentioned in your last meeting when this same question was asked, the only other connection between ICA and the Albina Vision Trust is that Nolan Lienhart, one of the ZGF principals and a member of the ICA team, sits on the Albina Vision Trust's Leadership Council.</p> | Short-term | Independent Cover Assessment Team | Complete | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Date | Source | Comment | Response | Timing | Responsible Party | Status |
|----------|-----------------|---|--|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 6/1/2021 | John Washington | concept design process? If Albina Vision Trust was originally interested in a cover that is buildable, why are the current cover concept designs more elaborate? | <p>As indicated in the HAAB June 1, 2021 workshop, the Independent Cover Assessment Team was contracted to develop up to three alternative cover design scenarios that better reflected the Black Historic Community's vision of what they wanted to see happen on and around the covers to provide greater benefits and restorative justice to the community. The team was charged with developing at least one scenario that fell within the Environmental Assessment design parameters, while the other two scenarios could fall outside those parameters.</p> <p>At the direction of the Executive Steering Committee, the Independent Cover Assessment Team developed its scenarios based on feedback received from Black Historic Albina community workshop participants; recruited specifically to represent a wide variety of perspectives. The process for recruiting community workshop attendees and soliciting feedback from other community stakeholders was approved by the Executive Steering Committee in December 2020. The team solicited feedback on how best to recreate a cultural neighborhood on and around the covers that was healthy, safe for all modes of travelers, cohesive, and provided wealth creation opportunities for the Black Historic Albina community residents and businesses from community workshop participants, online open house participants and in meetings with the project advisory committees and Highway Cover Coordinating Committee. All of this feedback informed the development of the design scenarios. The team also received direction from the Executive Steering Committee on the evaluation criteria used to evaluate the concept scenarios. They did not receive any feedback from the Albina Vision Trust on the development of the scenarios. The team has made a good faith effort to incorporate the advice and direction provided by all stakeholders through the public process, keeping in mind the independent charge.</p> | Short-term | Independent Cover Assessment Team | In Progress |
| 6/1/2021 | John Washington | How many people have participated in the Independent Cover Assessment team's engagement around the highway covers and who was involved? | <p>The Independent Cover Assessment Team developed its scenarios based on feedback from the Black Historic Albina community workshop participants, specifically recruited to represent a broad spectrum of community perspectives. The team has also used feedback from engagement with the project's advisory committees and online open house participants through a series of three work sessions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 53 community members participated in a series of three <u>targeted community workshops in February, April and June 2021</u>. 45 of these participants were Black individuals who were members of the Black historic Albina community or have family members who were. The participants represented Black residents, businesses, churches, and community non-profits including affordable housing, health, education, youth and advocacy organizations. • 1,218 individuals visited the three online open houses, of which 288 have filled out the online surveys. In the first two work sessions 14 percent of the survey takers were Black and another 11 percent were other communities of color. <u>Online Open House #3 was live</u> through midnight Sunday, June 20, so a demographic breakdown of who has participated is not yet available. • The team has held a series of three workshops with the Historic Albina Advisory Board (consisting of 13 members), all of whom are Black; and with the 13-member Executive Steering Committee which has representation from various public partners, stakeholders and community organizations. The team also presented Workshop #1 to the Community Oversight Advisory Committee (consisting of 12 | Short-term | Independent Cover Assessment Team | In Progress |

| Date | Source | Comment | Response | Timing | Responsible Party | Status |
|----------|------------------------|--|--|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 6/1/2021 | Estelle Love Lavespere | Could the Independent Cover Assessment team provide more information about the impacts to transit for each cover concept, particularly access for people returning to the area from outer east Portland? | <p>members), 10 of whom are Black or community members of color representing the contracting, workforce and labor advocacy groups. Generally, about 9 to 10 advisory committee members have participated in each of the advisory committee workshops.</p> <p>The Independent Cover Assessment Team has done a preliminary analysis of transit impacts for each of the scenarios. Their analysis did not show delays with East/West connections, but there were a few potential transit delays estimated that may occur with some of the north/south travel patterns.</p> <p>The Independent Cover Assessment Team’s analysis was shared with TriMet and the following comments were provided in response as ways to possibly mitigate some of the delays estimated could occur under each of the scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario Concept 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explore bus lane and/or queue jump signal at Hancock to avoid signal delays. ○ Explore prioritization of Vancouver and Broadway signals over the I-5 off-ramp to decrease transit delays from existing conditions. • Scenario Concept 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify whether ramp relocation will require stop relocation and ensure accessible and safe connections with sufficient space for amenities for riders. ○ Explore a bus lane and/or queue jump signal on Williams south of Weidler to mitigate additional traffic delays. ○ Estimate additional travel time with out-of-direction travel and additional turns with realignment of Vancouver. ○ Explore a bus lane and/or queue jump signal on Vancouver/Wheeler to avoid additional traffic delays. • Scenario Concept 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify whether ramp relocation will require stop relocation and ensure accessible and safe connections with sufficient space for amenities for riders. ○ Explore a bus lane and/or queue jump signal on Williams south of Weidler to mitigate additional traffic delays. <p>The Independent Cover Assessment Team’s transit analysis charts can be shared with the Board if members are interested in reviewing them in more detail.</p> <p>Additional technical analysis will be required to determine more specific transit impacts. The Project design team will work with the HAAB to provide this detail.</p> | Short-term | Independent Cover Assessment Team | In Progress |
| 6/1/2021 | Kevin Modica | How does the first right of refusal for the Portland School District property impact the project, as well as the community call to move and rebuild Harriet | <p>It doesn’t. While the project team is working closely with Portland Public Schools around potential air quality and noise impacts to and a sound wall and plant buffers for Harriet Tubman Middle School, the project would not result in other land impacts for the property as a result of this project. Future uses of the school site, as well as future relocation of the school, are within the purview of Portland Public Schools and would not be impacted by or affect the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project.</p> | Short-term | ODOT/Portland Public Schools | Complete |

HAAB Meeting Summary

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | Tubman Middle School? | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|

| Date | Source | Comment | Response | Timing | Responsible Party | Status |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 6/1/2021 | Andrew Campbell Sharon Gary-Smith | <p>Could the Independent Cover Assessment team provide more details on information on the cover concepts in order to understand them better (e.g., property ownership and impacts presently and in the future, as well as opportunities for Black ownership)?</p> <p>Could the Independent Cover Assessment team provide more clarity around the questions being asked in order to more holistically provide feedback?</p> | <p>The Independent Cover Assessment Team is proposing that all the cover land and remnant parcels that were studied and approved in the Environmental Assessment process for either transportation or non-transportation use for the project long-term ground leased or conveyed to a Black non-profit governance/ownership entity that would specifically be formed to own and develop this land in the future once the construction of the highway project is complete. ODOT has to follow certain procedures for land acquisition and disposal. These procedures will need to be clarified and explored to determine how this transfer of land can be structured to allow it to occur or whether it needs special legislation or administrative action.</p> <p>The new land created on the cover will have to continue to be owned by ODOT and leased in perpetuity to the new Black governance/ownership entity. The Independent Cover Assessment Team is proposing that ODOT and the other government partners (through intergovernmental agreements) have long-term responsibility for maintaining the cover structure, utilities and roads on top of the cover but that the development parcels be conveyed to the new governance/ownership entity through a 99-year ground lease arrangement that has automatic and perpetual renewals for a nominal fee. This type of structure will allow the new Black governance/ownership entity to decide how to redevelop the cover land and whether they want to provide ownership opportunities in the structures built on the cover land to residents, small businesses, and other community developer partners.</p> <p>This is a typical real estate development structure, especially in areas where land is valuable, and is often used in urban cores for a variety of development projects. This type of hybrid ownership structure is also currently used to provide home ownership opportunities for low-income families in Portland through both the Habitat for Humanity and Proud Ground affordable home ownership program models, and by Portland Housing Bureau for its affordable rental projects developed and owned by community development corporations. The land off the cover should be conveyed to the new Black non-profit governance/ownership entity once construction is completed for a nominal price. There will have to be a written agreement and a legal process set-up between ODOT and other government partners that commits them to purposely work together to accomplish this goal and to determine the best legal process for making this happen. The Independent Cover Assessment Team's recommendation is that all of the land parcels off and on the cover be directly conveyed or 99 year ground leased to the new Black governance/ownership entity so this entity can plan and decide the type of programming and development structures that are appropriate to implement to redevelop this land in a manner that allows it to truly deliver economic benefits for the broader Black community and its members.</p> | Short-term | Independent Cover Assessment Team | In Progress |

| Date | Source | Comment | Response | Timing | Responsible Party | Status |
|----------|--|---|--|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 6/1/2021 | Sprinavasa Brown Leslie Goodlow Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty | <p>Could ODOT provide more information about the acquisition and sale of any land involved in the project?</p> <p>Is it possible for the highway cover land to be owned by community members (rather than just the housing units or buildings)?</p> <p>Who owns the off-cover land now and who will own that land and the cover land in the future?</p> | <p>There are at least five private owners that currently own four key off-cover sites adjacent to the highway that have been studied in the Environmental Assessment and can be purchased and/or used by ODOT for transportation or non-transportation purposes for the project. The total amount of land that ODOT purchases and uses, or lease and uses, depends on the design of the project. The current 20% Design assumes that ODOT will use all of these key sites during construction but will only purchase two of the sites for its transportation purposes.</p> <p>However, there are two of these privately owned sites will only be leased for construction staging through the construction period of the project, but ultimately won't be purchased. Independent Cover Assessment Team is proposing that these properties also be purchased as well as part of the project. These parcels are included in the Independent Cover Assessment Team's proposed scenarios and it is their recommendation that these parcels become part of the land that is conveyed to the Black governance/ownership entity proposed to be responsible for the long- term development of the cover land and remnant parcels that come out of the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project.</p> <p>When ODOT acquires land for project construction from private owners, ODOT will also own that land in the beginning. The standard practice for transfer ownership of that land from ODOT ownership would include selling the land at fair market value with right of first refusal for the sale provided to other State and local agencies and non-profit organizations.</p> <p>The project team is working with the Independent Cover Assessment team to understand the best practice alternatives that have been used for other projects to transfer land ownership to the community, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 99-year leases, • Negotiating sale of land below fair market value, • Easements for use of the land, • Intergovernmental Agreements or other contracts with more flexibility to outline these or other terms. <p>All of these best practices would be explored with the community commission that will be established to govern the land available for redevelopment from the project. These solutions will require strong support from project partners to develop and execute (e.g., the City of Portland, Prosper Portland, Multnomah County, Metro, Albina Vision Trust). The Independent Cover Assessment team will be providing more detail about governance strategy in future meetings (Joint Committee Meeting May 24, Historic Albina Advisory Board June 1, and Executive Steering Committee June 7).</p> | Short Term/ Long-term | ODOT/ Independent Cover Assessment Team | In Progress |

| Date | Source | Comment | Response | Timing | Responsible Party | Status |
|----------|--------------|---|--|------------|-------------------|----------|
| 6/1/2021 | Kevin Modica | What is the connection of the project to the Columbia River Crossing project? | <p>The I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project and the Interstate Bridge Replacement Project (previously referred to as the Columbia River Crossing Project) are two separate and distinct projects. While they are along the same I-5 corridor, the two projects are not connected and can be done independently from one another.</p> <p>However, ODOT recognizes that the two improvements are part of a broader system. ODOT's Comprehensive Congestion Management and Mobility Plan includes the Interstate Bridge Replacement Program and the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project, as well as the Oregon Toll Program and I-205 Improvements. These projects are considered together and coordinated as part of a comprehensive strategy to improve safety for all modes, repair and upgrade bridges to ensure they can survive an earthquake and modernize the transportation system to manage demand and increase reliability. ODOT's Office of Urban Mobility oversees implementation of both projects.</p> | Short-Term | ODOT | Complete |