



**Airport Way Interchange Project
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting #8, October 1, 2008**

SAC Members in Attendance:

Arch Miller
Pia Welch
Lee Johnson
Bill Barber
Bryan Ableidinger
Raye Miles
Randall Thayer

Project Staff:

Matt Freitag, (ODOT Region 1)
Andy Johnson (ODOT Region 1)
Mike Mason (ODOT Region 1)
Scott King (Port of Portland)
Brian Baker (HDR)
James Gregory (HDR)
Rick Kuehn (CH2M)
Christine Egan (JLA)
Sam Beresky (JLA)

SAC Members Absent:

Paul Norum
Marcy Emerson Peters
Steve Sieber

Welcome & Introductions – Christine Egan (JLA)

Christine welcomed the group, reviewed the meeting agenda and outlined the meeting goals:

- Project timeline: 8th SAC meeting, goal of the meeting is to confirm selection of alternatives
- Confirmation of receiving of past meeting minutes and approval. Lee confirmed that he is not receiving meeting, notices, agendas and summaries via email. Sam will follow up with both SAC members following the meeting.
- Review Agenda

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

1. Gateway greenway project information: confirmation of study of feasibility of Gateway Greenway study moving forward. AWI will not adversely impact the proposed project area.
2. Reevaluate Project goals and objectives in reference to possible negative impacts to residential areas: Brian reviewed new criteria for the alternatives that may negatively impact residential areas, i.e. Sumner neighborhood.
3. Ramp metering and traffic volumes: Andy responded directly to Marcy via email regarding her inquiry.
4. Project team reviewed feasibility of an alternative package comprised of the lowest cost options (A through F). As a result, the team confirmed the benefits of developing a new alternative referred to as the "Minor Improvement" Alternative (MI). More discussion below.

Review Public Feedback (Christine)

Online Survey #2

Based on the two online surveys conducted as a component of the public involvement plan for the AWI project, this online tool has the best response rate of all. With one week left before the survey closes, we have received 81 responses. Christine reviewed the preliminary responses from the online survey, which were shared in a handout with SAC members.

SAC members initiated a general discussion about addressing issues at SR14. Randall mentioned the slow downs and dangerous merging and backups at SR 14. Arch said that most of the traffic is going eastbound on SR14. Rick reminded everyone that the project purpose is not to resolve issues with SR14 but to fix the lane balance from the Airport Way interchange. Arch said that he thought that we were supposed to find a short-term and a long-term solution and that the long-term solution might be a third bridge. Brian said that a number of the high cost alternatives are certainly still on the table as long-term solutions but are not feasible in the short-term and do not meet the timetable for this project.

Open House #2

Christine reviewed details about the Open House held on September 24 at the Multnomah Educational Service District on the eastside of I-205. Nineteen people signed in, four guests didn't sign in but took away information. Three people completed the online survey at the event. Two media representatives attended the event, Channel 8 on camera and David Ashton, East Portland News. Prior to the event, Dylan Rivera, reporter with *The Oregonian* ran an online article the day before and Channel 8 aired the story on the evening news the night of the event.

Christine summarized the informal feedback received by project staff during the event. Most of the comments were "predictions" regarding drivers' reactions and responses to the various alternatives. A few guests noted that alternatives 2 and 3 (Diverging Diamond and CFI respectively) would be confusing for drivers using the interchange. Others thought that alternative 4 (EB to NB Flyover) might cause drivers to cut off of Airport Way to backtrack to the Killingsworth interchange if it looked like the flyover was lined with cars. Some mentioned the issues at the intersection of Glen Widing Road and Holman on the eastside of I-205 preventing turning onto Airport Way.

Stakeholder Briefings

Six briefings have been conducted so far with five remaining. Christine said that, in general, they are spending most of the allotted time familiarizing the groups about the project purpose, area and timeline. Lack of presentation time on agendas, often only 10 to 15 minutes, have limited our ability to receive feedback during these presentations. However, groups have expressed interest in the project, and presenters provided information to the groups regarding open house events and online survey as other input opportunities.

Bill highlighted the need to meet with the Sumner neighborhood association. Christine explained that JLA/Sam had followed up with the Vice Chair of the Neighborhood Association to set up a meeting, immediately following the last SAC meeting, where the issue was originally raised. At that time, the neighborhood representative declined our request and instead suggested we “work through” Bill on the issue. With this response in mind, Bill offered to intervene with Sumner neighborhood leaders to set schedule a presentation, most likely in mid-November.

Lee explained the benefits of presenting to the East Metro Economic Alliance last month. He recommended that we set up a follow-up presentation later this year or early 2009 as we narrow down the alternatives, especially considering that there are four mayors that sit on EMEA’s board. Christine will follow up with EMEA representative.

Brian summarized the Bicycle Transportation Alliance bike tour, noting safety concerns for bicycles and different perspectives when traveling through the project area on bike.

James summarized the Columbia Slough Watershed Council briefing conducted on September 29, 2008.

Confirm Selection of Alternative Packages for Quantitative Evaluation (Brian Baker)

Brian reviewed the summary of the project process from the Value Planning Workshop to current phase; a handout was provided. The Project Management Team recommended at its last meeting to not move forward with alternatives 7, 8, 9 and 10 primarily due to cost and performance issues. They would like to further evaluate alternatives 1 through 6 plus a new “Minor Improvements” alternative(MI), which is a combination of low-cost options A through F. The evaluation scoring for this alternative was almost identical to the other alternatives -- it performed well.

Rick mentioned there have been conversations about possible changes to alternative #5 that would include the addition of lanes. Several SAC members responded to this point discussing some of the challenges regarding alternative 5. Andy said that there might be an enforcement edge to this alternative due to people running lights at Glen Widing and Holman roads. Brian explained that the project team is planning to redraw alternative 5, although the changes most likely won’t change the operation of the alternative. Brian said that the team would like to move forward with alternatives 1 through 6 plus the new MI alternative to the Level Two quantitative screening process to see how the alternatives perform operationally. He explained that alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are probably the best so far from a cost perspective. Randall said that the general public will most likely have issues with any alternative that includes a braid because they will struggle with navigation.

Andy thanked Bill for proposing the alternative because it fits in with ODOT policy of looking at the most inexpensive alternatives first.

Lee mentioned signage in Los Angeles, California, that directs drivers to the correct lane miles before the exits. He suggested that better signage on I-205 might address some of the identified issues. Andy responded that ODOT is looking at improved signage on I-205 as it crosses the Columbia River.

Christine emphasized that one of the goals of today's meeting was to have the SAC confirm the alternatives to move forward to the next level of screening.

Randall said that alternatives 2 and 3 are not feasible from a public's perspective due to the braiding and confusion it would cause for drivers. He recommended that the SAC not advance these alternatives. Bill pointed out that those alternatives also affect the residential areas in Sumner. Rick offered that there was negative feedback to these options at the Parkrose Neighborhood Association briefing.

Bryan felt that they should be advanced to show that the SAC and project team analyzed a range of options. He also suggested there could be the phasing of alternatives 1 and 5 as a way of looking at short and long-term solutions.

In response to a SAC member's question, Rick explained that the reason changes to Killingsworth were included in alternatives 2 and 3 but not alternative 1 is due to the reconfiguration of the southbound on-ramp from Airport Way, which results in impacts to the Killingsworth ramps.

Randall recommended that all of the alternatives should include improvements to the Washington side of the river, specifically around the SR14 interchange.

Pia acknowledged the complexities of alternatives 2 and 3, noting that the more complicated it is -- the more problems we will have as people use the interchange.

Raye said that alternatives 2 and 3 are intimidating in their complexity, but does not think that warrants them being tossed out at this level of evaluation.

Arch recommended that we acknowledge that alternatives 1 through 6 are short-term not long-term solutions, and that any alternative chosen has to be in place by 2014.

Rick agreed with Arch, that there should be a three-tiered time period: short-term, medium-term and long-term.

Randall said that alternatives 8, 9, and 10 should still move forward under the heading of long-term solutions.

Bill brought up Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) process, noting that they are probably modeling long-term solutions such as a third river crossing.

Pia suggested that the project team include a statement in the report acknowledging that these are short-term solutions.

Andy agreed with Pia, and recommended that a letter be drafted and sent to Metro outlining the long-term alternatives that were vetted in the AWI evaluation process and suggest that these be considered in the next RTP update. Andy committed to checking the last RTP about wording for bridges.

Randall said that he wants a barrier or line to prevent drivers from merging off of the northbound on-ramp until they are up to speed.

Arch asked if the new alternative (MI) could be phase one of a combined alternative 1 and Alternative 5, as suggested by Bryan.

Lee asked how this project would be funded. Andy Johnson responded that ODOT will seek a federal earmark for the project. They will also work with state legislators on a future state transportation-funding package, but that is an unpredictable option. In addition, the Port of Portland has general aviation funds, however, it is unlikely that the Port can use those funds for this project.

Christine summarized the group's general discussion and proposed a recommendation for the SAC to vote on:

- Advance alternatives 1 through 6 and the MI alternative
- Encourage the project team to review the feasibility of a phased approach by combining the "Minor Improvements alternative as phase one, alternative 1 as phase 2 and alternative 5 as phase 3.
- Acknowledge in the final report that project sponsors and project team are considering short, medium and long-term solutions and that alternatives 8, 9 and 10 should be considered as part of Metro's RTP planning process.
- Express concern regarding alternatives 2 and 3 due to the confusing braid, less intuitive layout for drivers, and the possible impacts to residential areas.

The SAC unanimously voted to approve the above recommendation and forward it to the Project Management Team and Project Development Team.

Discuss Quantitative Evaluation Process (Rick Kuehn, James Gregory)

Rick explained the quantitative evaluation process and provided examples of more detailed drawings of the alternatives that will be produced in the next step. In this next screening process, the team will be able to provide more accurate cost estimates and environmental impacts for each of the alternatives.

James gave of a brief explanation of traffic modeling and sensitivity analysis.

Randall asked for a more complete explanation of Level of Service (LOS) standards and the difference between state LOS and PDOT's LOS rankings. Rick explained that ODOT uses the "Volume to Capacity" ratio while PDOT uses the A through F scale. Randall asked that in this project, both ranking systems be used.

Next Steps

SAC Meeting #9 is November 19, 2008 from 2 to 4pm in the same meeting room.

AWI project team will host information tables at the Airport Futures Open Houses scheduled for October 8 and October 13.

Pia has confirmed that AWI will have an information table at the Transportation Fair scheduled for November 12. This event is co hosted by the Columbia Corridor Association and the Portland Air Cargo Association (PACA).

The Project Team's next step will be to narrow the alternatives to one or two preferred alternatives.

In response to a SAC member's question regarding cost estimates for alternatives, Brian and Andy explained that the cost estimates are very rough and conservative, and could be as much as plus or minus 50 percent.

Action items

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

No.	Action Item	Responsible
1	Check RTP for third crossing language	Andy Johnson, ODOT
2	Schedule follow up briefing with East Metro Economic Alliance and Columbia Slough Watershed Council	Christine Egan, JLA Brian Baker, HDR
3	Check Lee Johnsons' email	Sam Beresky, JLA
4	Sumner Neighborhood Association Briefing Schedule	Bill Barber, SAC
5	Email notification to SAC following initial traffic modeling for alternatives #2 and #3, specifically findings for southbound on ramp loading. Notice to be sent prior to next SAC meeting in mid-November	Brian Baker, HDR