



METRO Blue Line Extension Community Advisory (CAC) & Business Advisory (BAC) Committees Meeting Minutes

Date & Time	December 3, 2025 6:00 – 8:00 PM
Location	Virtual via Microsoft Teams
CAC/BAC Members, Project Staff	Jonathan Hansen, Jeff Guertin, Kathy Fraser, Mia Brown, John Barobs, KB Brown, Ken Rodgers, Ryan Johnson, Heather Rand, Madel Mouta, Menno Schukking, Christopher Jao, Alicia Vap, Nkongo Cigolo, Kaja Vang, Pa Nhue Vue, Amada Marquez Simula, Emilee Roschen

1. Welcome and Approval of October Meeting Summary

Jonathan Hansen, Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

Co-Chair Hansen asked for a motion to approve the October 8, 2025, joint BAC/CAC meeting, April 8, 2025, BAC meeting, and April 9, 2025, CAC meeting minutes.

Kathy Fraser moved to approve the minutes, and it was seconded by John Barobs. The minutes were officially approved.

2. CAC/BAC Next Steps

Mr. Cigolo shared that from the last meeting, they heard that members would like to continue to participate on the BLE engagement and to continue to work with the project office to share comments heard from the community. There were suggestions to increase participation and concern from members, feeling like they were receiving information and not having a chance to react and provide input.

Mr. Cigolo noted that attendance has been a challenge and there have been members who have dropped from the committees which made meetings not well attended as hoped. Project office staff talked with both BAC and CAC co-chairs on November 21, 2025, to get a sense of how participation could be increased. Project office staff and the co-chairs developed a proposal for what these groups. Combining the BAC and CAC could help increase meeting attendance and participation. Mr. Cigolo shared that the proposed idea is to advance the BAC and CAC groups as one working group.

Co-Chair Hansen commented that was a good overview and added that the desire to continue these groups came through the last meeting. Co-Chair Hansen agreed that combining into one

working group and having focused topics was a thoughtful plan.

3. Review CAC/BAC Working Group Proposal

Mr. Cigolo began by reviewing the Working Group Proposal which was emailed to members ahead of the meeting for review.

Mr. Cigolo noted that a big change would be focus on community and business aspects along the corridor. The proposed plan is to collect input on potential topics that the group would like to discuss and then schedule the topics for upcoming meetings. Depending on input and participation, a workshop format would be proposed. The meeting cadence is proposed to be quarterly – meet once a quarter and members or the project office or committee members may request additional meetings.

Mr. Cigolo walked through potential topics for the working group discussions – Mitigation Engagement and Implementation, Station Area Planning, Cultural Place keeping, Construction Communication, Discussion with the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee, Business Relations, and Community Relations.

Mr. Cigolo noted that there could be brainstorming sessions during the workshops based on geography, topics, and interest, then share with the larger group and draft a recommendation which would be shared with the project office and Corridor Management Committee. The working group could have a page on the project website so things can be posted and shared.

Co-Chair Hansen noted that Cultural Place keeping had a discussion board and thought this was a novel way to submit ideas and have discussions between meetings – is this something that could be done for this working group? Mr. Cigolo added that elements and materials from the Cultural Place keeping meetings were uploaded to the site and members were able to review and provide input on materials. Mr. Cigolo said they would need to think about how that could work for this group's purpose.

Ms. Fraser commented that if this group has quarterly meetings, then having a forum to engage with each other would be helpful. Co-Chair Hansen agreed with Ms. Fraser's comment.

Co-Chair Hansen asked if members liked the idea of switching to quarterly meetings and potential additional meetings. Members gave positive support for this.

Mr. Brown asked about the purpose of switching to quarterly meetings. Mr. Cigolo said the proposal is to set a quarterly meeting cadence with the opportunity to request additional meetings.

4. Review CAC/BAC Schedule & Activities

Mr. Cigolo reviewed the proposed 2026 schedule and activities for the working group. Mr. Cigolo mentioned that in person meetings could be hosted at the North Loop Garage; a meeting location that has easy access from transit and ample parking available. Other community locations along the corridor that are close to transit can be considered as well.

In the meeting chat, Mr. Brown asked if this information would be sent. Mr. Cigolo confirmed that it would be.

Ms. Fraser asked if the Anti-Displacement group is going to continue and what sort of collaboration between that group and this working group the project office envisioned. Mr. Cigolo said that as the Anti-Displacement Community Prosperity Program (ACPP) board advances their work and start making grants available, the key interaction between the ACPP and this working group would be information sharing. The project office could help organize a time for the ACPP and this working group to meet for a discussion and get input.

5. Review Draft CAC/BAC Working Group Charter

Mr. Cigolo reviewed the charter. The purpose is to continue these groups as one working group to increase participation. Project office staff heard that a workshop format would be best fit for these meetings and would provide more hands-on experience for members to provide input and recommendations. The new working group would provide summaries to the CMC of their work, which would be provided for the CMC members ahead of their meetings to review.

Mr. Cigolo noted that membership is elective and is open to individuals who were previously on the committees. The project office would also look for the working group members to suggest other members. Formal nominations from city and project partners will not be required, but the project office will ask for support to increase participation.

Mr. Cigolo mentioned that the first meeting would ideally occur in January, meaning recruitment would need to kick off almost immediately and have it open until early/mid-January because of the holidays. The project office would share this information through the newsletter and with this group's assistance to share out with interested people. Mr. Cigolo added that the project office would connect with the Blue Line Coalition as they've been interested in participating.

Mr. Guertin asked in the chat who the Blue Line Coalition is. Mr. Cigolo responded that the Blue Line Coalition has community members who represent various communities along the corridor and are a collaborative group who have been instrumental in the BLE engagement and development.

Mr. Rodgers commented that he's not making the connection between the BAC/CAC and the working group's new structure and is curious as to what led to the need to look into closing the current structure with the charter. Mr. Cigolo responded that the existing charter stipulates that the BAC and CAC would be in effect through the environmental process, which has been concluded. Based on input from the last joint BAC/CAC meeting, members would like to continue to participate in the BLE project and provide input for various aspects of the project development as it moves toward construction. The thought is that this working group is a way to continue to work with the community until a new group gets established for construction. Ms. Vap added that they were struggling with trying to make sure the project office was providing genuine opportunities for the community to provide input that's tangible, but . would like to hear what ideas that different members might have to make this work well.

Mr. Rodgers mentioned that during BLE 1.0, there were many presentations and the opportunity to provide comments to tweak what's being put on the table as the project moves

forward. Mr. Rodgers suggested that more important aspects of the project development are coming, for example, platform design and accessing platforms.

Mr. Cigolo addressed proposed topics for meetings and added that additional topics would be welcomed. Mr. Cigolo added that as the project goes through construction and if working group members would like to continue to share information with the community, that door can remain open.

Ms. Vap added that the proposal can be tweaked, and it can evolve into something that the working group will find valuable and meaningful as the project continues. The project office is interested in keeping the synergy going for those interested in continuing the work. The working group is proposing to do more in person engagement with the members.

Mr. Rodgers mentioned that the meetings used to be in person, but it moved to online because of COVID and it never moved back. Mr. Rodgers commented that the work they need to do moving forward is work that requires in person understanding and the ability to work in a room together. Co-Chair Hansen agreed that it's more engaging to meet in person.

Ms. Vap mentioned that they will need to talk with the design team but think that meeting more frequently in Quarter 1 would be good so input can impact the design. Co-Chair Hansen agreed with this suggestion.

6. CAC/BAC Working Group Membership

Mr. Cigolo acknowledged the concern of adding additional members and suggested that the project office reach out to all the members to determine who would like to remain on the working group. This project office work through next steps.

Mr. Rodgers mentioned that on Central Corridor and BLE 1.0, the in-person meeting attendance grew during construction. There were many members of the public who attended the meetings, more than official BAC and CAC members. Mr. Rodgers added that the meeting locations for Central Corridor would move to accommodate the larger crowds, so limiting members may not be necessary. It would be helpful to get agendas out in advance so people can decide ahead of time if they need to participate. Mr. Guertin agreed with Mr. Rodger's comments.

Co-Chair Hansen commented that he appreciated seeing the proposed planned topics and suggested that if there will be quarterly meetings, having the agendas a month in advance would help to have time to connect with the community and have discussions.

Co-Chair Hansen asked if there would be a cap of working group members. Mr. Cigolo mentioned that this was a question the project office had and added that they would like to set a number of seats.

Mr. Guertin commented that the members likely don't have the experience of working in large groups and asked for insight into how that may work. Mr. Cigolo suggested having smaller breakout groups to focus on specific topics or subtopics, instead of having one large group.

Ms. Fraser agreed to the action of reaching out to existing members to get a sense of existing member interest. Ms. Fraser suggested a 30-member cap for a start and added that it's

important to recognize that the group could start with this approach, see what works and modify as needed. Ms. Fraser added that it's important not to look at this as a fixed group.

7. Discussion and Feedback

Mr. Cigolo suggested that the next step is to connect with the design team to look into elements that are being worked on for 90% and to potentially add meetings for Quarter 1. The project office will provide a clean version of activities that would require additional conversations. Following this, the project office will reach out to current BAC and CAC members and poll who are interested in continuing participation as a working group so there's a better sense of how many members there will be and will aim to cap it at 30 and continue to make adjustments.

Co-Chair Hansen asked if anyone already knew that they would like to move to the working group or wait to get feedback. Mr. Guertin suggested waiting to tally to make it easier for the project office. Mr. Cigolo said they would poll the members electronically.

Ms. Fraser asked about the meeting time and whether they will stick to the first Wednesday of the month. Mr. Cigolo said there could be some flexibility but understands that most members are leaning toward meeting after work. Ms. Fraser, Mr. Guertin and Co-Chair Hansen all favored continuing to meet the first Wednesday of the month after work hours 6-8pm. Mr. Cigolo noted that the January meeting may be a challenge and Co-Chair Hansen suggested to meet early February.

Co-Chair Hansen asked when 90% design is. Ms. Vap noted that it's end of March/early April timeframe and that the timing of the submittals is staggered based on each city.

Mr. Cigolo noted that the first meetings could be the first Wednesday of February and March. Co-Chair Hansen and Mr. Guertin voiced support for this schedule.

8. Adjourn

Co-Chair Hansen concluded the meeting and adjourned it at 7:49 pm.

Recording Secretary: Emilee Roschen

Teams Chat:

Today

 5:56 PM Meeting started

Mia Brown (External) 6:45 PM



Will this be sent to us?

Thanks

Jeff Guertin (Unverified) 7:02 PM



Who is the Blue Line Coalition?

Last read

Jeff Guertin (Unverified) 7:04 PM



Thank

s!

Vue, Pa Nhue 7:04 PM



This is the Blue Line Coalition's website: bluelinecoalition.org