



**Airport Way Interchange Project
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting #3 May 7th, 2008**

SAC Members in Attendance:

Arch Miller
Pia Welch
Steve Sieber
Randall Thayer
Paul Norum
Lee Johnson
Bill Barber
Marcy Emerson Peters

SAC Members Absent:

Raye Miles
Bryan Ableidinger

Project Staff:

Brian Baker (HDR)
James Gregory (HDR)
Rick Kuehn (CH2M)
Robin McCaffrey (Port of Portland)
Shannon Huggins (Port of Portland)
Leslie Howell (Howell Consulting)
Lois Cohen (Zetlin)
Matt Freitag (ODOT Region 1)
Stacy Thomas (ODOT Region 1)
Christine Egan (JLA)
Shareen Rawlings (JLA)

Welcome and Introductions – Christine Egan (JLA)

Christine welcomed the group and outlined the meeting goals, including:

- Elicit comments from the SAC on Draft Goals and Objectives
- Receive feedback/answer questions about Previous Alternatives
- Provide an overview of the Value Planning Workshop scheduled for July 15th

As part of the introduction, Arch Miller mentioned a recent report that suggested that traffic on the I-5 Bridges has decreased by 3.3% due to gas prices. He mentioned that this report also suggested that transit ridership is up.

Following this discussion, Christine asked the group if there were any comments or edits to the SAC Meeting Summary from the SAC Meeting #2. Arch had several comments and edits to the meeting summary, which he submitted to the project team.

Report on Action Items – Christine Egan (JLA), Group

Christine walked through the four action items that were recorded in the previous SAC meeting #2.

- Request for Project Glossary (Arch) – Christine explained that the project team had compiled a project glossary including terms and phrases commonly used in Transportation System Planning Projects. This glossary was sent out the SAC on April 21st.
- Use of Passenger Trip Charges (Arch) – Robin McCaffrey included this item as an on-going action item, and explained that the Port would continue to pursue this question with FAA.
- Forecast traffic data (Group) – Brian Baker explained that the project team was still waiting for the Metro traffic forecast model, which should be available in late June. He explained that after the project team received this model, they would be able to take the project area traffic analysis and feed it into the regional projections. He mentioned that if the Metro

model was delayed, that the project team would work off of the 2030 model and extrapolate the information that they needed.

- Traffic data outlining commuter trips to the airport (destination) as a percentage of traffic study area trips (Bryan/Steve) – Brian explained that the project team had set up 20-30 cameras throughout the project site to determine the percent of commuter trips that travel to the airport. He explained that these cameras took pictures of license plates in order to better understand commuter travel patterns. He mentioned several preliminary findings, and explained that the SAC would be able to review a final report outlining origin and destination findings at a later meeting. SAC group members had several questions for Brian regarding the origin destination counts. Paul Norum and Pia Welch both emphasized the impact that different days and/or hours had on traffic backups. Pia suggested that the best study time slot would be from 3 p.m. until 6 p.m. Rick Kuehn explained that this project would also look at detailed traffic counts that would be far more inclusive than the data that Brian briefly highlighted. Bill Barber suggested that the project team look into a select link analysis to help determine origin and destination trips. Paul also reiterated his point that any source of stress associated with the I-205 Glenn Jackson Bridge really impacts local traffic.
- SAC request for information regarding Cascade Station Environmental Assessment and Mitigation - Bryan Ableidinger requested information outside of the SAC meetings regarding what mitigations were recently committed to for the Cascade Station development. Robin explained that Bryan had asked her to notify the SAC that they would receive a map outlining the locations of the mitigation projects associated with the NEPA process for the entire PIC development, of which Cascade Station constitutes a portion in the SAC's meeting packet for SAC meeting #4.

Review and Comment on Draft Goals and Objectives - James Gregory (HDR)

James passed out a draft set of the project goals and objectives. He explained that the next step in the process would be to develop evaluation criteria as required by the NEPA process. He explained that the draft goals and objectives were developed out of the issue/concern statements pulled from the SAC, online survey responses, stakeholder interviews, and the public open house. These goals and objectives address thematic elements that describe the desirable outcomes of the project. Translating the goals and objectives statements into evaluation criteria will help the project team and project committees discern between project solution alternatives.

He asked the group to look over the document, and provide comments and feedback. Christine mentioned that the issues and concerns identified in the previous SAC meeting were recorded, and would be referenced throughout the alternative development process. Christine asked the SAC to frame their feedback by thinking about the pros of the document, and any goals/objectives that the project team may have missed.

Pros - What worked Well

- Goal 1 and Goal 2: Steve Sieber and Randall Thayer both mentioned that Goal 1 and Goal 2 really summarized the purpose of the project.
- Paul mentioned that the objectives are broad, which is great. He mentioned that the consultant team did a great job consolidating the issues and concerns.

Suggestions/Concerns

- Goal 1 Objective #2 – Paul expressed a concern that the second objective under Goal 1 was very inclusive, and was concerned that signals, signage and other concerns mentioned in the previous meeting would get lost in this broadly stated objective.
- Goal 3 - Steve suggested edits to Goal 3, suggesting that the project seemed to be more focused on encouraging travel demand, as opposed to reducing travel demand (as the goal states). The group recommended that the project team change the language in Goal 3 to state “manage travel demand.” Rick mentioned that Goal 3 was really focused on looking at alternative methods of transportation. The group suggested that the goal state “encourage alternative travel modes.”
- Goal 5 – Bill mentioned that the goal seemed very focused on the Oregon side, in terms of economic development and asked that the goal extend to Washington as well. Christine responded, reiterating that the revised scope of the project emphasized the problem to be northbound traffic on Airport Way. She explained that the project’s goals and objectives cannot state that the project will encourage something else. Economic activity in this sense is focused on business impacts, freight mobility and congestion.
- Goal 6 - Steve mentioned that he saw Goal 6 as an inherent goal of the process, but not necessarily a goal worth stating in the project goals and objectives. He worried that this goal seemed very broad and may blur the focus of the project. Marcy asked that Goal 6 stay. She mentioned a concern that other projects in the area have bypassed environmental standards in the past. James responded to these questions – explaining that later in the process evaluation criteria relating to the project goals would be weighted. Rick also explained that the purpose and need focused on transportation, so the goals and objectives could take a broader focus. Bill mentioned that they felt that Goal 6 was very important from the neighborhood perspective.
- Lee asked for a goal that focused on improving the flow of traffic volumes on I-205. Matt explained that this study is looking at I-205 and other Airport Way corridor solutions, but larger/broad solutions are not included in this project. He explained that the goal of the project was not to preclude other improvements to I-205 in the future.
- Pia expressed a concern about how the project relates to other projects in the area (CRC specifically). She asked if the goals and objectives fold into other projects like the Portland Plan and Airport Futures.
- The group discussed the objective to “provide for long-term airport growth” under Goal 5 as being too broad and agreed that the “will not preclude” replace “provide for” airport growth.
- Arch asked if there was data available that showed the impact that light rail extension to Clackamas would have had on traffic demand. Brian recommended that the project team look to see if the data was available.
- Pia asked if the model would include construction and development that is occurring now i.e.: Port Headquarters and new parking structures. She will follow up with Scott King outside of the SAC meeting regarding Airport Futures.

James explained that the project team would revise the goals and objective statements according to the SAC recommendations/comments and mentioned that the SAC would receive a revised copy at their next meeting.

Review and Discuss Previous Alternatives – Rick Kuehn (CH2MHill)

Rick walked through a brief description of previous studies and research that looked at transportation alternatives relating to the study area. He explained that studies date back to the mid-late 80's and suggested a variety of interchange options and transportation alternatives. Previous research suggests that this project look at a larger project area than the interchange.

Lee Johnson asked if traffic counts are planned for this phase of research. Rick explained that traffic counts will be a large part of this project and mentioned that the project team had already begun to develop a database of traffic count data. Rick went on to mention that traffic counts would include all major intersections within the project area. The group was interested in seeing a five day traffic count report. Lee suggests that the project team work from the traffic data obtained through the CRC process.

Randall asked if the project team would suggest solutions and the costs associated with each of the solution options. Rick and Robin both explained that this information would be discussed at the Value Planning Workshop (VPW).

Value Planning Workshop (VPW) for July 15-17 – Brian Baker (HDR) and Christine Egan (JLA)

Brian briefly described the purpose of the VPW. He mentioned that the VPW would be held July 15th through July 17th. The SAC meeting schedule has shifted in order to ensure that the SAC can participate in these conversations. Brian explained that the first day of the workshop would start with an introduction to interchanges and then move into a discussion of solution options and alternatives. The second day would run through an evaluation matrix. He explained that the SAC would be a part of the VWP on the 1st day – to participate in the interchange short course and also to provide comments and feedback on possible solution options and other transportation related concerns/issues. Arch would represent the SAC for the rest of the VPW.

Christine explained that an online survey would be launched in conjunction with the VPW in order to invite feedback from the larger community of possible solution options and elements.

Randall asked if the project team had a model that could look at the speed and efficiency of I-205 if access points along Airport Way were removed. Brian and Rick explained that type of modeling was available. Rick explained that a detailed modeling of this sort would come later in the process, after the alternatives have been narrowed.

Share Online Survey results – Shareen Rawlings (JLA)

Shareen shared a summary of the community online survey with the SAC. She walked through key findings and highlighted overall responses. The online survey was launched in February in conjunction with the first community open house on March 5th and closed on May 1st. More than 90 people shared their observations and opinions about the project. She explained that the majority of respondents thought that it was very important to alleviate congestion on Airport Way, decrease travel time to and from the airport and improve access to I-205 northbound. Over all, respondents mentioned that the current traffic situation on Airport Way creates longer commutes, reduces the patronage of area businesses, impacts freight mobility, and leads to unsafe and aggressive driving. Traffic impacts and congestion caused by the merging from two lanes to one lane onto I-205 was consistently mentioned by online survey participants.

Next steps – Christine Egan (JLA)

Christine discussed next steps at SAC Meeting #4, scheduled on June 23rd, from 2 p.m. – 4 p.m. She explained that at this meeting the SAC would discuss the draft evaluation criteria developed out of the project goals and objectives. She explained that the group would also discuss, in greater detail, the origin and destination traffic analysis and the VPW.

Action items

The following materials and decisions require follow-up and/or action.

No.	Action Item	Responsible
1	Portland International Center/Cascade Station EA Mitigation Projects Map (include in SAC packet #4)	Robin McCaffrey, Port of Portland
2	Update: forecast traffic data (Metro Model)	John Bosket, DKS
3	Existing traffic counts, including Origin/Destination Study (provide overview and distribute)	John Bosket, DKS
4	Revised goals and objective statements (distribute)	James Gregory, HDR
5	Previous Alternatives Memo (email)	Christine Egan/Rick Kuehn
6	Transit Data – Extension of the light rail (Clackamas Line) impact on traffic demand	John Bosket, DKS