

HAYDEN ISLAND/MARINE DRIVE COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP (CWG) MEETING #1

Subject: Active Transportation Community Working Group Meeting #1 Summary

Dates and Times: September 27, 2021, 4:30 to 7:00 P.M.

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Livestream

WELCOME REMARKS, MEETING AGREEMENTS, AND GOALS

Sam Imperati, facilitator for the Hayden Island and Marine Drive (HIMD) Community Working Group (CWG), welcomed everyone to the meeting at 4:31 and began by providing an overview of accessible participation options including closed captions and ASL interpretation. Sam then introduced Greg Johnson, IBR Program Administrator, who provided opening remarks. Sam reviewed the meeting agenda, meeting agreements, and led participants in an introductory exercise where each Community Working Group participant introduced themselves, organizations they represent, and shared one word that summarizes their hopes for the program. Sam then introduced two IBR staff presenters for the meeting, technical leads Brad Phillips and Tom Bennett, as well as IBR program partners C-TRAN, TriMet, City of Vancouver, City of Portland, RTC, Metro, Port of Portland, and Port of Vancouver.

COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP FRAMEWORK AND ROLES REVIEW

Sam then provided an overview of the CWG framework, and shared that one HIMD CWG participant, Tom Hickey, is also a Community Advisory Group (CAG) member who will provide direct linkage to the IBR CAG. This CWG will meet two times, with additional engagement opportunities throughout the process as needed. Feedback from these meetings on specific highway, interchange, and local street design concepts for Hayden Island and Marine Drive will be presented to stakeholders and decision makers, specifically informing advisory groups and program partners. Sam shared the program timeline through the development of the IBR multimodal design solution in 2022, and then turned the conversation over to IBR technical leads Brad Philips and Tom Bennett, to present Hayden Island and Marine Drive design concepts.

October 7, 2021

HAYDEN ISLAND AND MARINE DRIVE: PREVIOUS PLANNING, WHAT'S CHANGED, AND DESIGN CONCEPTS

Brad began the technical presentation with an overview of the current context of Hayden Island and Marine Drive areas, including several maps for reference. Brad shared a map that showed the region with depictions of transit lines and land use zoning information. The next map showed work from previous planning efforts along with notes on changes in the design since 2013, common design assumptions, and community values and priorities. Brad then shared an overview of the meeting's three main topics for discussion and feedback: interchange options on Hayden Island; on- and off- ramp locations; and potential local access bridge locations.

Interchange Options on Hayden Island

Interchange options for Hayden Island include “no interchange,” “full interchange” and “half interchange”. For the no interchange option, all access to Hayden Island would be provided by local bridges from North Portland to the island. Key elements of this design concept are two local access bridges leading to the center of the island, a smaller interchange footprint, and a consequence of likely insufficient support for anticipated traffic volumes. The full interchange would allow regional access to continue in its current capacity with four ramps allowing north and south-bound access to Hayden Island from I-5, plus the possibility of new access via a local bridge. Key elements of this design concept are I-5 access to the island from both the north and the south, four ramps with traffic circulation on multiple streets, and a larger interchange footprint (when compared to the no and half interchange option). The half interchange option would allow I-5 traffic to access Hayden Island via southbound lanes only and exit Hayden Island via northbound lanes. Traffic traveling north from Portland would access Hayden Island via a local bridge instead of I-5. Key elements of this design concept are direct access to and from the island from only the north with southerly access via local access bridge to Marine Drive, two ramps with traffic circulation on a single street, and a smaller footprint than the full interchange concept.

On- and Off- Ramp Locations

Tom then shared information about potential I-5 on/off ramp locations for Hayden Island. Potential ramp locations include Jantzen Street, Tomahawk Island Drive, and Hayden Island Drive (if the full interchange option is selected). Streets that connect to ramps will have increased traffic volume and a more direct connection to I-5, while streets that do not connect to a ramp will provide local connectivity for pedestrians, bicycles, and automobiles.

In a scenario where ramps connect to Jantzen Drive, Hayden Island would have a higher volume of regional traffic on the south side of the island, while local traffic would travel mostly on Tomahawk Island Drive and

October 7, 2021

Hayden Island Drive located to the north of the interchange area. In a scenario where ramps connect to an extended Tomahawk Island Drive under I-5, Hayden Island would have a higher volume of regional traffic circulating through the center of the island, while local traffic would travel mostly on Jantzen Drive and Hayden Island Drive. Finally, in a scenario where ramps connect a full interchange design concept to Jantzen Drive and Hayden Island Drive, two streets would connect a total of four ramps to access I-5, while local traffic would travel mostly on Tomahawk Island Drive.

Local Access Bridge Locations

A local access bridge connecting Hayden Island to North Portland could be located either to the west or east of I-5. If located west of I-5, there are two possible connections to North Portland: a Marine Drive underpass with connections to Expo Road and Pier 99 Street, or a Marine Drive intersection which would require a new traffic signal. In the scenario where a local access bridge connects on the east side of I-5, Hayden Island would connect to the Bridgeton neighborhood via Vancouver Way and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

Sam then opened the discussion to participants and proceeded to shared clarifying questions that had been asked in the meeting chat log.

Community Working Group Participant: Wondering if there have been traffic impact models of these different choices, example...where would potential backups occur with each choice?

- Brad: The team needs to be able to clearly define what each option looks like and where every connection is placed before traffic analysis can take place. This analysis is anticipated in the next few months.

Community Working Group Participant: How do the various options affect the elevation of the throughway?

- Brad: Tomahawk Island Drive needs to have sufficient vertical clearance for freight trucks to pass under the interstate and be elevated above the water table to avoid water drainage concerns, which would require that the interstate be at a higher elevation than the current state.

Community Working Group Participant: What about the possibility of a local bridge to Vancouver?

- Brad: To my knowledge, this is not an option that has been studied due to possible seismic safety concerns.

Community Working Group Participant: Will there be further detail provided at the November meeting?

- Brad: Yes.

Community Working Group Participant: What about a Collector / Distributor double decker bridge?

October 7, 2021

- Brad: That this is something the team could investigate. Some of the challenges associated with this design are the proximity of the interchanges as well as access to the interstate from various locations.

Community Working Group Participant: Does full interchange mean no local access bridge to HI?

- Brad: A local access bridge would still be a possibility with a full interchange on Hayden Island.

Community Working Group Participant: When saying "access to Bridgeton", would this be a direct connection, or would Bridgeton Rd remain a turn off of Marine Drive via Gantenbein?

- Brad: That level of detail needs to be more clearly defined and is part of what the team is still working on.

Community Working Group Participant: Do those interchanges include a way for bikes and walkers to travel?

- Brad: Yes. Common design assumptions include a shared use path crossing the corridor as well as bike and pedestrian connections on the local streets.

Sam thanked participants for their questions and invited participants to report back to the meeting after a 10-minute break.

BREAKOUT SESSION: TELL US ABOUT YOUR CURRENT EXPERIENCE

Sam welcomed participants back from their break, and shared three questions with the group to consider during a breakout session: How do the current conditions allow you to get where you need/want to go? Can you point out any specific areas that currently cause significant traffic flow, access, efficiency, or safety issues? Are there places you currently can't access or want better access to?

Sam then moved the working group into two separate breakout rooms.

Breakout Room 1

This small group conversation was led by Tom Bennett, with IBR support staff Katy Belokonny and Natalie Owen. After the conversation concluded, Katy presented the feedback to the bigger group, noting that the group had a free-flowing conversation, and that not all comments recorded reflect a direct response to the question above it.

Question 1: "How do the current conditions allow you to get where you need/want to go?"

- Dissatisfaction with current Marine Drive interchange accessing Hayden Island.

October 7, 2021

- Question about tradeoffs for the full interchange option; answer included that bridge width and overall structure impact are factors to consider.
- Dissatisfaction with current Interstate Avenue being the best access point to Hayden Island, and is still not good.
- Dissatisfaction with current heavy traffic at Marine Drive.
- Dissatisfaction with current traffic flow for interchanges on Hayden Island and Marine Drive.
- Interest in efficiency and direct access to and from Hayden Island.
- Concern for heavy traffic impacting safety west of the interstate coming from the Port of Portland.
- Concern that local access on the west of the interstate would result in a greater residential impact.
- Desire for an interchange on Hayden Island to best facilitate access to small and large businesses.

Question 2: “Can you point out any specific areas that currently cause significant traffic flow, access, efficiency, or safety issues?”

- Dissatisfaction with circuitous traffic path from Bridgeton to Hayden Island or Vancouver through Marine Drive interchange.
- Concern that feedback regarding these questions is anecdotal without official traffic analysis.
- Dissatisfaction with heavy traffic on Marine Drive.
- Desire for direct access to the west side of Hayden Island to access development areas and businesses.
- Concern that Marine Drive is overburdened with freight traffic through residential areas east of the interstate and is dangerous for pedestrians.
- Concern that some drivers travel through the Bridgeton Neighborhood to access I-205.
- Desire for design concepts that divert freight traffic from Marine Drive to Lombard Street and main freight routes.
- Concern that a local access bridge to the west of the interstate would increase already existing heavy traffic conditions accessing I-5 from Marine Drive.
- Concern that Marine Drive east of I-5 is dysfunctional and in disrepair and is not able to function as a neighborhood collector as currently intended.

Question 3: “Are there places you currently can’t access or want better access to?”

- Desire to maintain current state of quick and efficient access to shopping center.
- Desire for design to prevent using Marine Drive to access I-205 during peak traffic times.
- Desire for data and analysis to inform opinions.
- Desire for the arterial bridge to be located close to the existing bridge.
- Concern that too many local access points to the interstate are too close together.
- Observation that the current interchange on Hayden Island is a full interchange, and that other interchange options may increase traffic congestion.

October 7, 2021

- Observation that half and no interchange options would be reducing access to the interstate, and that more data would be needed to argue otherwise.
- Observation that transit is a large piece of the solution to improve access to Hayden Island.
- Observation that participants seem to support a full interchange over no interchange.
- Concern about interstate bridge elevation adversely impacting slope gradient for bike access.
- Desire for the Marine Drive interchange to be simplified while also reducing traffic.
- Recognition that a no interchange option on Hayden Island would add traffic burden to the already overburdened Marine Drive.
- Observation that there are too many ramps providing access for local and freight traffic to the interstate which cause congestion.
- Observation that those that want a no interchange option are not dependent upon interstate access, and that function should remain a top priority.

Breakout Room 2

Conversation in breakout room 2 was led by Brad Phillips, with IBR support staff Lisa Keohokalole Schauer and facilitator Sam Imperati. After the breakout room session concluded, Lisa presented the feedback to the broader group, noting that the group had a free-flowing conversation and that not all comments recorded reflect a direct response to the question above it.

Question 1: “How do the current conditions allow you to get where you need/want to go?”

- Observation that the Portland Bureau of Transportation is anticipating more traffic in the future, which will pose a significant concern.
- Observation that northbound traffic in the afternoon is gridlocked.
- Observation that southbound traffic in the morning moves smoothly.
- Observation that traveling to and from Vancouver is not a typical concern.
- Observation that traveling to Vancouver’s Farmer’s Market is effective.
- Observation that access to SR-14 from I-5 works well.
- Desire to design to avoid cut-through traffic.
- Consideration for a charge to discourage cut-through traffic with exemptions for area residents.
- Desire to keep local access between Hayden Island and Jantzen Beach.
- Concern about traffic congestion, particularly northbound traffic off of Hayden Island.
- Desire to separate traffic flow.
- Desire to separate local and interstate traffic.
- Observation that traffic congestion is highly dependent on time of day.
- Observation that a well-timed trip south from the island can be enjoyable but going north can be scary.

October 7, 2021

- Desire to separate traffic to and from Hayden Island from both Portland and Vancouver as much as possible.

Question 2: “Can you point out any specific areas that currently cause significant traffic flow, access, efficiency, or safety issues?”

- Concern that local access connection may end up being congested.
- Observation that safety is not a problem when traffic is moving very slowly.
- Observation that on- and off- ramps are too short and present a safety concern when getting up to speed to enter the interstate.
- Observation that a commute to downtown Portland could take two hours before COVID.
- Observation that interstate congestion is time dependent, getting worse after 1:00 PM.
- Observation that the ramp heading north is too short.
- Concern that all traffic on one bridge leads to a disruptive traffic flow.
- Concern that a double-loop design is problematic, and desire to avoid this design style.
- Desire for parks located under bridgeways to be safe.
- Desire to improve safety for bike traffic under ramps and bridges by creating greater pathway visibility.
- Observation of major traffic congestion on Hayden Island.

Question 3: “Are there places you currently can’t access or want better access to?”

- Difficulty accessing Hayden Island by foot.
- Concern that pedestrian traffic is not convenient, and that crime has increased.
- Desire to avoid turning Bridgeton Neighborhood into a peninsula.
- Desire for a public beach.
- Concern that a fly-over is missing for trucks to get on I-5.
- Desire for access to the river.

GROUP POLL

Sam explained that the group would participate in a series of pulse polls to get a sense of the group’s impressions of the general design concepts shared during the working group. Sam broke down the pulse polls into the three broad categories based on the technical presentation led by Brad and Tom: interchange options on Hayden Island; on- and off- ramp locations; and potential local access bridge locations.

The first pulse poll covering interchange options asked, “In the moment, which concept do you lean toward, a full, half, or no interchange?” with eight categories for response: No interchange; Full interchange; Half

October 7, 2021

interchange; No interchange or Full interchange; No interchange or Half interchange; Full interchange or Half interchange; Open to all three options (No, Full, or Half interchanges); Currently Unsure.

- 4 participants selected “Currently Unsure” (29%)
- 4 participants selected “Full interchange” (29%)
- 3 participants selected “Full interchange or Half interchange” (21%)
- 2 participants selected “Half interchange” (14%)
- 1 participant selected “No interchange” (7%)

The second pulse poll covering on- and off- ramp locations asked, “In the moment, which interchange landing point concept do you lean toward?” with eight categories for response: Tomahawk Drive; Jantzen Drive; Hayden Island Drive; Tomahawk Drive or Jantzen Drive; Tomahawk Drive or Hayden Island Drive; Jantzen Drive or Hayden Island Drive; Open to all three options (Tomahawk, Jantzen and Hayden Island Dr.); Currently Unsure.

- 4 participants selected “Currently Unsure” (29%)
- 3 participants selected “Open to all three options (Tomahawk, Jantzen and Hayden Island Dr.)” (21%)
- 2 participants selected “Jantzen Drive” (14%)
- 2 participants selected “Tomahawk Drive” (14%)
- 2 participants selected “Tomahawk Drive or Hayden Island Drive” (14%)
- 1 participant selected “Tomahawk Drive or Jantzen Drive” (7%)

The third pulse poll covering potential local access bridge locations asked, “In the moment, which local access bridge concept do you lean towards?” with four categories for response: East of I-5; West of I-5; Open to either option; Currently Unsure.

- 5 participants selected “Currently Unsure” (36%)
- 4 participants selected “West of I-5” (29%)
- 3 participants selected “East of I-5” (21%)
- 2 participants selected “Open to either option” (14%)

Sam then invited participants to provide feedback in the chat log on what combinations of design concepts presented were most attractive to them. One participant shared that more data and traffic analysis would be the most valuable for making an informed design decision. Another participant stated a desire for a northbound ramp to Columbia Boulevard.

WRAP UP

Sam then shared additional engagement opportunities with the group including upcoming advisory group meetings, social media, and the program newsletter, as well as links to the recording of this meeting and

October 7, 2021

materials presented, and the program information library. Sam reminded participants about the date and time of the next HIMD meeting on Thursday, October 20th, 2021, from 4:30-7:00 PM.

[NOTE: The second meeting date has since been updated to November 8th, 2021, from 4:30-7:00 PM.]

Sam thanked the participants for their time and adjourned the meeting at 6:55 PM.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Attendees	Role/Organization
Amy Cooney	East Columbia Neighborhood Association
Corky Collier	Columbia Corridor Association
Ellen Churchill	Hayden Island Neighborhood Network
Eric Engstrom	City of Portland
Erik Molander	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Fred Jubitz	Jubitz
Jeb Doran	TriMet
Joey Smith	At-Large Community Participant
Joseph "Dave" Jannuzzi	At-Large Community Participant
Kathryn Wheeler	Jantzen Beach Moorage
Kurt Redd	Diversified Marine
Michael Strahs	Kimco Realty
Robin Smith	At-Large Community Member
Ryan Webb	Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Terry Glenn	Columbia Way West LLC

October 7, 2021

Attendees	Role/Organization
Tom Dana	Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community
Tom Hickey	CAG Member
Tom O'Connor	At-Large Community Participant

Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Role/Organization
Brad Phillips	IBR Technical Lead/Presenter
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Sam Imperati	Facilitator
Tom Bennett	IBR Technical Lead/Presenter

Additional Participants

Members of the public viewed the meeting via the YouTube livestream during the meeting.

MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

The recording of the meeting is available here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kpqb0rS7e8>

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/hayden-island-marine-drive-working-group-1/>

October 7, 2021