



28th Street/Little Portugal Community Working Group Meeting

Date of Meeting: May 18th, 2021 (4:00 p.m. to 5:40 p.m.)

Location: Zoom

Attendees:

Members in Attendance: Bella Ferreira (on behalf of Ricardo Agredano), Chris Patterson-Simmons, Danny Garza, Helen Masamori, Justin Triano, Marcos Manriquez (on behalf of Cobán López), Terry Christensen

Members not in Attendance: Bill Rankin, Carlos Dias, Cobán López, Connie Alvarez, Davide Vieira, Dee Barragan, Ed Berger, Elma Arrendondo, Matthew Gustafson, Ricardo Agredano

Other Speaker Attendees: Bernice Alaniz (VTA), Doug Moody (VTA), Erica Roecks (VTA), Lucas Perez (VTA)

Project Team in Attendance: Marissa Sanchez (VTA), Kristen Mei (VTA)

Project Team not in Attendance:

Meeting Agenda:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Focused Follow-up Items
- CWG Chairs & 2022 CWG Workplan/Survey Discussion
- Phase II Updates: May Board Recap
- Contract Specific Construction Transportation Management Plan Process
- CWG Member Input & Report Out
- Next Steps

Follow-Up Items:

Comment, Issues, and Questions	Response
Focused Follow-Up Items	
No questions	
CWG Chairs & 2022 CWG Workplan/Survey Discussion	
It seems like this is about what we can do for VTA, but not the other way around. Our role is to represent the community. I think we need to think more broadly about why the other CWG representatives aren't participating.	We want to ensure that the engaged members feel they're making a worthwhile contribution. We can work on providing further opportunities for input. In what ways do you feel that VTA could further support you?
I think it needs to be clear that our job is to represent the community. I think that returning to in-person when possible will help increase participation.	Comment noted.
VTA is not listening to the community, and BRT is a perfect example. We need community protection – once this project starts and construction begins, we need protection at every intersection. We need crosswalks and crossing guards. It's going to be really unsafe when contractors have no oversight.	Comment noted.
I objected to this Chair selection process initially, but I accept that it's moving forward. I respect the candidates, but I don't think self-nomination is a very democratic process. I think in the future we need to do this together in a meeting	Comment noted. I think this is actually what we'll be addressing today for future nomination processes.
What's wrong with bringing Eileen back?	Have to check her availability. Her skillset is higher than just facilitation. We need to examine exactly what we want from a facilitator for our meetings.
Thank you for hearing us out about bringing in a 3 rd party facilitator. Should a bullet be included about working with the CWG Chair?	Sure. We did talk about that in yesterday's meeting. The facilitator would play a role in engaging with the Chair.
Do we have other facilitators in mind who know what we've been doing here for so many years? (i.e., familiar with the project)	Another consideration we can take might be engaging with SBE/DBE firms. We're encouraged to look at consultants/contractors with those certifications.

<p>The response to these surveys is pathetic, and it's not a random public survey. This is another indication of the disengagement of our community representatives. I think in the future we should do this kind of questioning at a meeting so we can hear each others' thoughts</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>I want people to hear my opinions before and during the project, but me talking to one person at a job site doesn't work. Everyone needs to learn the details, including OSHA and construction safety.</p>	<p>We're trying to reserve enough time for discussion and feedback right now if the group wants it, or we can wait. We can go back and discuss those questions again.</p>
<p>Maybe we can have a separate meeting dealing with construction safety, which I've mentioned before. There are too many things that can go wrong. People don't want diesel trucks on certain streets. The streets won't take the load of heavy diesel trucks.</p>	<p>We are going to be talking about the Contract Specific Construction Transportation Management Plan process in a couple of agenda items.</p>
<p>Little Portugal East doesn't have a rep. I'm the rep – whatever you send out, please send to me (Danny).</p>	<p>We're doing all of the properties that will be in close proximity to the construction. There may be different actions taking place for different properties/buildings. We will also be doing general outreach, but this postcard is to get info from those particular individuals that live within 1000 feet of the alignment. We're building a database right now.</p>
<p>A lot of these people don't even know there's a project coming. As community leader for Little Portugal East, I'd appreciate if you send notices to me as well.</p>	<p>Lucas will be going through the database and coding individuals based on location and the activities happening, so we can determine what materials need to be sent to each group of people.</p>
<p>Phase II Updates: May Board Recap</p>	
<p>Are we looking at a minority contractor?</p>	<p>There's an overall project goal for engagement, so we will work to engage with them.</p>
<p>Are there financial penalties for not meeting these goals? Because people lie – it happens at the state level, and it can happen at the local level.</p>	<p>Comment noted. There isn't a financial penalty, but they do have to demonstrate their good-faith effort.</p>
<p>Are we still moving forward with a single-bore project?</p>	<p>The currently scoped project is a single-bore tunnel. The tracks are side-by-side, then stacked, then side-by-side. We've</p>

	been asked just to do a third party peer review to compare it to twin-bore.
Contract Specific CTMP Process	
When you're meeting with VTA, the City, and the contractors, why don't you meet with the community?	We have these meetings with you, the community, and actively bring the information that you've share back to the City and the contractors. As mentioned, there will be meetings with stakeholders during the development of the contract specific CTMPs and there will be an opportunity for the community to provide input also.
VTA and the City don't care about anything but the bottom line of BRT, which leads to people getting hurt.	Comment noted.

CWG Member Report Back	
I love this, because I report to my neighborhood and various others. I appreciate these meetings	Comment noted. We appreciate you expressing your opinions and your continued engagement.
We've gone back and watched some of the BART VTA meeting recordings, but as a note, some seem to be unavailable (Jun 12, 2020; BART opening day). There's a lot going on around Santa Clara St. We lost 6 businesses in the last 2 months, but new businesses are opening up. I'm hoping to get more new people.	We'll look into the video recording issues.
Good news—multiple housing projects moving thru the City approval process, a couple about to break ground (urban villages). But there's been rampant cynicism about cost estimates.	Comment noted.
Regarding the language of the CWG role—maybe people aren't feeling like it's been impactful. Is there anything on VTA's end as to why the participation is going down? Is there a level of participation that's required before things can move forward?	It's worthwhile for us to reach out to the members and find out their reasoning. I don't believe we've ever gotten so little participation that a meeting wasn't worthwhile. We can ask if these individuals would like a new rep. People are experiencing online meeting fatigue too. There's a lot more value to being able to meet in person.

Are any other groups experiencing a drop in participation? Or is this specific to our group?	Evident from the survey results (15 of 39 responses) that it's widespread.
--	--

Next CWG Meeting: August 17, 2022, 4:00 PM, Zoom

Prepared by: Kristen Mei (VTA)
Concurred by: Erica Roecks (VTA)
Distribution: CWG Members
Project Team
City & Public Agency Staff
Distribution List