Airport Way Interchange Project
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting #4 June 23, 2008

SAC Members in Attendance:
Arch Miller
Pia Welch
Steve Sieber
Randall Thayer
Paul Norum
Lee Johnson
Bill Barber
Marcy Emerson Peters
Raye Miles
Bryan Ableidinger

SAC Members Absent:
Paul Norum

Project Staff:
Brian Baker (HDR)
James Gregory (HDR)
John Bosket (DKS)
Rick Kuehn (CH2M)
Scott King (Port of Portland)
Shannon Huggins (Port of Portland)
Matt Freitag (ODOT Region 1)
Andy Johnson (ODOT Region 1)
Stacy Thomas (ODOT Region 1)
Christine Egan (JLA)
Shareen Rawlings (JLA)
Jeanne Lawson (JLA)

Welcome and Introductions – *Christine Egan (JLA)*
Christine welcomed the group, reviewed the meeting agenda and outlined the meeting goals, including:

- SAC Input on Draft Evaluation Criteria
- Review Value Planning Workshop materials and instructions

Christine and Brian Baker reviewed the project schedule and key project milestones.

Report on Action Items – Christine Egan (JLA), Group
Christine walked through the four action items that were recorded in the previous SAC meeting.

- Portland International Center/Cascade Station Environmental Assessment Mitigation Map (Christine/Port of Portland) - Christine explained that a map outlining proposed and ongoing mitigations had been emailed out to the SAC. She recommended that SAC members forward additional questions to the Port of Portland (Scott King and/or Robin McCaffrey)
- Update: Forecast traffic data (John Bosket) - John Bosket explained that the technical team was still waiting for the Metro's forecast model, and believed that the model would be available mid to late July. John explained that the traffic team would be looking at traffic volumes inside the study area as impacted by the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) and other tolling processes.
- Existing Traffic counts (John Bosket) - John Bosket provided a brief overview of the ongoing data collection process. He explained that traffic counts were pulled from 30 study intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. In addition, the traffic counts also pulled from on-going data collection systems that the Port of Portland and ODOT have in operation. Lee Johnson asked for clarification regarding traffic data key findings and base information.
- Previous Alternatives Memo (Rick Kuehn) - Rick summarized the previous alternatives memo that was emailed to the SAC. He highlighted the list of previous alternatives, explaining that

the alternatives are grouped by project location. He walked through the list of projects located within the study area. The group discussed the Holman/Airport Way intersection and traffic flow visibility. Improvements to this intersection are included in the previous alternatives studied as well as Port and City projects currently underway.

Adopt Goals and Objectives – *James Gregory (HDR)*
James explained that Andy with ODOT received several comments from NEPA experts with Metro. These comments were then included in a revised copy of the project goals and objectives. James provided an update on the goal and objective process, explaining that the document was reviewed by a CETAS team and by the project PDT. He then referred the group to the revised goals and objectives, and reviewed any significant changes.

Jeanne Lawson revisited the decision making structure and project process. She reminded the group of the role of goals and objectives and the adoption process. Jeanne emphasized the SAC's role in crafting the goals and objectives and evaluation criteria.

Christine Egan asked the group to start to think about which goals and objectives are the most important.

Bryan Ableidinger mentioned that it seemed that there was duplication and at times contradictions between each of the goals and objectives. Marcy asked for clarification regarding the evaluation criteria under Goal 2, specifically the difference between "small" versus "large" diversion of traffic on to local roadways. The group discussed this topic. Rick Kuehn and James Gregory explained that evaluation criteria are largely designed to compare alternatives against each other.

Pia Welch requested that additional information regarding currently diversion trends be included. Bryan mentioned that there are many elements that the SAC will not be able to know and/or measure. The project team explains that many of these criterions indicate topics to be considered. Christine explained that the project technical team would be evaluating each of the alternatives based upon the approved goals and objective statements. The SAC would not be required to make decisions without a solid understanding of the technical information and data. Raye Mills asked if TriMet had a representative on any of the project committees. Andy Johnson with ODOT explained that TriMet expressed an interest in remaining informed about the project, but chose not to participate to that level of detail.

Lee Johnson mentioned a concern regarding on-road bicycle safety training. The group discussed safe routes to school and other bicycle safety training courses.

Christine asked for a pulse check on the group's comfort with adopting the goals and objectives. She asked the group to formally adopt the goals and objective statements including the changes from CETAS and the PDT. Eight members in attendance agreed to move the goals and objectives forward into the next stage.

Christine then passed out six green dot stickers and asked the group to prioritize the objectives according to their preference. The top three objectives included:

- Goal 1: Objective 1 – Minimize delay from Airport Way to northbound I-205

- Goal 5: Objective 1 – Minimize traffic congestion impacts to businesses in the Airport Way corridor and surrounding corridors such as Sandy Boulevard.
- Goal 5: Objective 3 – Maintain freight mobility in the Airport Way corridor.

James explained that this activity would help the project team to differentiate between the alternatives since their will be no weighing process associated with the evaluation criteria.

Review and Discuss Origin and Destination Report – *John Bosket (DKS)*
John referred the group to a PowerPoint presentation and handout that highlighted key findings from the origin and destination traffic assessment. He described the origin and destination survey, mentioning that route identification was accomplished by tracking vehicle license plates within the project area. This study was completed on April 1st, 2008 between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. using 25 cameras strategically placed at locations throughout the project area. These cameras were able to capture over 10,000 license plates. John went on to describe the camera locations.

John walked through a discussion of the key findings.

Origin:
- Trips from the Airport area – 75% traveled through the I-205 interchange
- Trips from 82nd avenue – Approximately 75% travel through the I-205 interchange
- Trips from Airport Way east of I-205 – 85% of cars are accessing I-205
- Trips from I-205 Southbound – Relatively even distribution (45% west/ 55% east); 15% left the same way within 1 hour
- Trips from I-205 Northbound fly-over – 70% destined for the Airport area; 15% left the same way within 1 hour

Destination:
- Trips to I-25 Northbound – 55% arrive from the east; from the west, 82nd Avenue is the largest contributor
- Trips to Airport Way east of I-205 – 50% arrive from I-205 Southbound; other origins are evenly distributed
- Trips to I-205 Southbound from the west – Land uses in the Airport Area are the largest contributors; 65% start at the airport

Randall Thayer mentioned that the percentage of trips destined for retail surrounding the airport will increase as development increases at Cascade Station and surrounding areas. Marcy asked about the impact of light rail on these traffic counts. Pia Welch asked why the project team did not look at travel patterns after 5 p.m. John Bosket explained that he referenced previous traffic studies, which described peak hours of congestion occurring between 3 and 6 pm on weekdays, to identify the 4-5 pm travel period for the O/D Study. Lee Johnson asked if there would be a summary of the origin and destination traffic analysis. Andy Johnson with ODOT mentioned that he was currently working on a memo that would outline the key findings from this study. He mentioned that he would distribute this memo to the SAC.

Raye Miles suggested that maybe the project team could compare origin and destination findings to non-peak hours. Randall mentioned a desire to see incentives for trucks and freight to modify schedules depending upon peak hours. John described the variance in truck volumes

throughout the project area – mentioning that freight peaks occur at the same time as passenger/commuter peak times.

Value Planning Workshop (VPW) for July 15-17 – *Brian Baker (HDR) and Christine Egan (JLA)*
Christine reviewed workshop goals and outcomes, emphasizing the SAC's role in the process. Brian Baker explained the basic overall schedule, and mentioned that this workshop would kick off the alternative development process.

Christine mentioned that the project team would like to provide SAC members with materials to bring back to their constituent groups. She mentioned that several documents would be sent out via email, providing information so SAC members can share with other stakeholders before the Value Planning Workshop.

Pia asked if the SAC would be reviewing proposals. Christine explained that the VPW would be a facilitated brainstorming session to come up with alternative proposals. The SAC would be directly involved in the development of project alternatives.

Next steps – *Christine Egan (JLA)*
Christine asked the group how they felt about the structure of the meetings. She asked group members to reflect on what they liked, and things they felt could be improved upon. Randall mentioned that he liked the data discussions, and hoped for less emphasis upon process. Arch Miller asked that dates be included on all AWI materials. Pia Welch suggested that a large picture of the project area be posted at each meeting for reference. Marcy suggested that the aerial map be expanded to include Cornfoot, Killingsworth, and Marine Drive.

In closing, Christine reminded the group that the next SAC meeting would correspond with the Value Planning Workshop (VPW) scheduled for July 15th. She encouraged SAC members to bring ideas from their stakeholder groups to the VPW. She also reminded the group that an online survey would be posed following the workshop process in order to invite greater community input on the project alternatives.

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

No.	Action Item	Responsible
1	Provide an expanded project map handout and display for SAC and SAC meetings	Christine Egan, JLA Brian Baker, HDR
2	Traffic Origin and Destination Memo distributed to SAC	Andy Johnson, ODOT
3	Arch Millers request for SAC revised Goals and Objective Statements	James Gregory, HDR
4	Transit Data – Extension of the light rail (Clackamas Line) impact on traffic demand	John Bosket, DKS
5	Update: forecast traffic data (Metro Model)	John Bosket, DKS