

Planning Advisory Group Meeting #20
Tuesday, January 19, 2010 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Port of Portland, 121 NW Everett, Portland, OR

DRAFT NOTES

Announcements – Bill Blosser and Steve Schreiber

Bill Blosser welcomed everyone and requested PAG approval of two sets of meeting notes, for October 20, 2009 and November 17, 2009. Each was approved, as written.

Bill noted that Steve Schreiber, the Port Director of Aviation, and Deborah Stein from the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, are with us tonight.

Steve Schreiber had two announcements for the PAG concerning two different lease renewal negotiations in which the Port is currently involved. The first is with the Oregon Air National Guard (ORANG). They have requested to continue use of their current space as a fighter base. ORANG would like a longer lease term for certainty and long range planning. With the departure of the Air Force Reserve, the Port will be interested in “rightsizing” the base, which from the Port’s perspective means shrinking their footprint, and amending other lease language, including incorporation of environmental provisions. The Port has had a great partnership with Guard on environmental issues, but the language is not in the lease. The Port is also interested in a provision requiring the Guard to pay relocation costs in the future, should that situation arise. The new lease will largely be a continuation of existing operations and practices. These are not easy negotiations, but the Port is working with Stuart Mathew and others to find the right balance in the new agreement.

Stuart Mathew is pleased to note that they are as far along in the negotiation process as they have been in ten years. He agrees in principal with much of what Steve said, but has a different perspective. For example, on the “rightsizing” issue, ORANG would rather return land that the Port is not as interested in. There are significant issues to continue to work on, and discussions are on the right track.

John Weigant: wondered if in the new lease terms, will the Port still be contractually bound for thirty years and Guard bound for thirty days?

Steve Schreiber: this is still under discussion.

Andy Cotugno: will sustainability principles for the overall Master Plan as discussed by the PAG going to be in the new agreement?

Steve Schreiber: we are not there yet, but ORANG has been cooperative historically. We are having those discussions and drafting language.

Bill Blosser: his experience is that Air Force is way ahead of other sectors on sustainability practices.

Steve continued with his announcements, noting that the second lease renegotiation is with the airline carriers who use PDX. They are working on issues such as landing fees, terminal rent, capital projects, and other fees. They expect to reach a new five-year agreement with the twenty-four carriers who are signatories. As we are all aware, cost is a huge issue for carriers. The Port is advocating for stronger environmental language in the agreements. They expect it will go to the Port Commission in May 2010 for approval.

Hector Roche: do the carriers negotiate as a group or individually?

Steve Schreiber: they formed a negotiating committee, led by the largest, Alaska Airlines. A little bit of both going on.

Fred Stovel: are they being encouraged to cooperate with the Fly Quiet Program?

Steve Schreiber: that is something we can talk about.

Members	Affiliation	Present
Erwin Bergman	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill Blosser	Chair	√
Mark Clark	E. County	
Andy Cotugno	Metro	√
Bruce Fisher	FAA	√
John Frevola	Flightcraft	√
Gene Hahn	Horizon Airlines (replaced Tom Gerharter)	√
Cam Gilmour	Clackamas County	
Alan Hargrave	Port of Camas/Washougal	
Chris Hathaway	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership	
Laura Hudson	City of Vancouver	√
Maryhelen Kincaid	N. Portland Neighborhood Services)	√
Lt. Col. Stuart Mathew	ORANG	√
Patrick Metzger	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	√
John Mohlis	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	
Dennis Mulvihill	Washington County	
Brian Nelson	Intel	
Mary Olson	Port Commissioner	√
Lai-Lani Ovalles	Planning Commissioner	
Alesia Reese	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Veronica Rinard	Travel Portland	√
Hector Roche	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	√
Lawrence Russell	Environmental Justice	√
Bob Sallinger	Audubon Society of Portland	√
Michael Sloan	Vancouver Neighborhoods	
Dave Smith	Vice Chair	
Denny Stoecklin	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred Stovel	Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Vicki Thompson	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John Weigant	Airport Issues Roundtable	√

Staff & Consultants	Affiliation	Present
Debbie Bishop	Port – Noise and Long Range Planning	√
C.F. Booth	Port’s Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
Mindy Brooks	City Planning Bureau	
Jacob Brostoff	City Planning Bureau	
Chris Corich	Port’s Project Manager	√
Renee Dowlin	Port – PDX Environmental	
Melissa Egan	Assistant to Facilitator (Kearns & West)	√

Jason Gately	Port – Long Range Planning	√
John Gray	City Office of Transportation	√
Lise Glancy	Port – Government Relations	√
Dave Helzer	City Bureau of Environmental Services	√
Nancy Hendrickson	City Bureau of Environmental Services	
Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Tom Imeson	Port – Public Affairs Director	√
Jamie Jeffrey	City Transportation	
Misti Johnson	Port – Legal	√
Steve Johnson	Port – Media Relations	
Scott King	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Sean Loughran	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Chris Madsen	Port – Business and Properties	√
Cameron Modjeski	Jacobs Consultancy	√
Phil Ralston	Port – Aviation Environmental	√
Steve Schreiber	Port – Aviation Director	√
Alan Snook	DKS Associates	
Deborah Stein	Planning and Sustainability Bureau	√
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√
Chris White	Port – Community Affairs	√

Other members of the public present: Bob Eaton, Roland Haertel, and Lee Perlman.

Agenda Review – Sam Imperati

Sam Imperati reviewed the agenda and introduced Sean Loughran. Sean said that on December 9, 2009, a Port administrative policy on Sustainable Natural Resources was shared with the Port Commission. This policy was shared with the Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee and the Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee by email on December 4. If others on the PAG would like a copy of this, please let us know.

This policy was developed by Port directors and senior Port staff. The Port's Sustainable Natural Resources Policy, defines "sustainability" for the Port, puts it in the context of our broader mission and statutory mandate, and acknowledges that environmental is one of the three legs of the stool that needs to be integrated as we make business decisions (i.e., it must be considered along with the social and economic legs). It actually encompasses the environmental policy, as well as EMS policies, and refocuses it from a broader perspective.

Port staff noted in presenting this policy to the Port Commission that this policy was informed by the Airport Futures sustainability work. It is a good example of how our Airport Futures work continues to have broader influence at the Port and how the adaptive management/systems approach to sustainability is evolving.

This policy will be used by Port staff to develop future guidance and programs that allow a more robust approach in integration of the environment (as a resource) into the Port's processes.

On December 15, 2009, staff had an open invitation "last call" PAG member meeting to: 1) Review Assumptions Updates, and Draft PAG Recommendations; 2) Make Recommendations to PAG on above; and 3) Identify potential additional recommendations at a high level. It was a good meeting, with at least twelve PAG members in attendance, and there is more work to be done. No major changes to the Assumptions or scheduled topics for future PAG discussion were made. There will be a report to the PAG in February or March.

Lise Glancy provided a Public Involvement update, including outreach and upcoming meetings. The recent focus has been on business outreach, but they will move back to neighborhood outreach once the draft Land Use Plan is available for review. Check the website for updates as the subcommittee meetings have been known to change.

Slide 2: Public Outreach

11/23	Parkrose School Board
12/2	Joint Land Use Transportation/Master Plan Sustainability Subcommittees
12/10	Noise Work Group stakeholders
12/15	PAG Report Writing Group/Final PAG Recommendations
1/12	Portland Business Alliance Transportation Committee
1/13	Westside Economic Alliance Transportation Committee

Slide 3: Public Outreach Comments (69 contacts – 3 meetings/events)

- International and cargo activity questions
- Future of ORANG fighter wing
- I-205/Airport Way congestion at peak times
- Impact of loss of crosswind long term
- Incentives for parking v. drop off/pick up
- Why master plan update if slow growth and limited development
- Commercial development desired to support schools and other services
- Potential partnership opportunities with school district
- Business representation on PDX Community Advisory Committee

Slides 4 and 5: Upcoming Public Meetings

February 3 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.	Joint Land Use Transportation/Master Plan Sustainability Subcommittee, Port of Portland, Commission Room
February 10 Noon- 1:00 p.m.	Portland Air Cargo Association PDX Sheraton
February 16 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.	Airport Futures Planning Advisory Meeting #21 Port of Portland, Commission Room
February 19 7:00 – 8:30 a.m.	Columbia Corridor Association Board meeting
March 1 7:00 – 8:30 p.m.	Central Northeast Neighbors
March 3 6:00 – 8:30 p.m.	Report Writing Group Port of Portland, 1 South
March 10 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.	East Portland Neighborhood Office
March 15 7:00 – 8:30 p.m.	North Portland Neighborhood Services

March 16 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.	Airport Futures Planning Advisory Meeting #22
March 18 7:00 – 9:00 a.m.	Columbia River Economic Development Council
March 29 5:00 – 7:30 p.m.	Columbia Slough Watershed Council
April 20 5:30-8:30 p.m.	Airport Futures Planning Advisory Meeting #23 TBD

Maryhelen Kincaid: wondered if Lise is working with the Citywide Land Use Chairs.

Lise Glancy: yes, we are working with them.

Maryhelen Kincaid: Asked if PAG member liaisons to coalitions would be copied on meeting dates and newsletter updates.

Lise Glancy: yes, some of these meetings were just scheduled.

- 5:45 – 6:00 pm** **Beyond 65 DNL Noise Work Group Work Scope Report – Sean Loughran (Attachment #2)**
- Process Review
 - PAG Discussion and Action – Approval of Work Scope
 - Next Steps – Report back to PAG and/or PDX Community Advisory Committee

Sean continued with a quick update on the current process to update the PDX Noise Exposure Maps (NEM), before getting into the Beyond 65 DNL Noise Work Group scope of work. He explained that the NEM update was related to work completed for the north runway extension and rehabilitation project. The Environmental Assessment completed for that project, showed a reduction in the noise contours. The reduction of the contours, resulting largely from less aircraft operations and a more modern, quieter fleet, required an update of the noise contours maps under FAA regulations. The NEM update is consistent with both the base year and 2017 out years used developed for the Airport Futures Noise Analysis. The Port held a public hearing on January 14, 2010 concerning public noise exposure. The public comment period is open until February 15, 2010. This should have no impact on the City's noise overlay recommendation or work group recommendation.

Sean presented a PowerPoint overview of the Beyond 65 DNL Noise Work Group Work Scope Report, "Noise Work Group Scope Information & Action," which is an overview of PAG actions taken in the past, the group that was assembled, and the work that remains to be done. He noted that he had a conversation with Erwin before the meeting tonight on an issue Erwin had hoped would be included, namely that health effects are part of defining impacts of noise. He appreciates Erwin bringing this up and it will be added.

Slide 2: Noise: BACKGROUND: PAG ACTION – OCTOBER 20, 2009

- Keep current City Noise Overlay provisions for 65 DNL and above
- Expand City Noise Overlay for purposes of disclosure out to the 55DNL for the 2035 50th Percentile Forecast
- **Convene a work group to further address noise outside the 65 DNL**

Slide 3: Noise, Beyond the 65 DNL: PROCESS PROPOSAL: APPROVED BY PAG

- **Timeframe:** 6 months to one year, starting now
- **Core team:**
 - City & Port noise offices
 - City & Port Planning
 - City of Vancouver
- **Membership:**
 - CNAC members
 - OPIS/PAG members
 - Agencies (FAA, ORANG, etc.)
 - Other cities and counties

Slide 4: Noise, PAG Assignment

- Form group of PAG/CNAC membership to work with staff Core Team
- Develop a work scope recommendation for PAG and CNAC endorsement
- Meeting December 10, 2010
 - Unanimous work group recommendation on work scope for Beyond 65 DNL Airport Futures Follow-on Study

Slide 5: Noise, PAG Action

- Does PAG approve the work group's recommendation on work scope for Beyond 65 DNL Airport Futures Follow-on Study?

Slide 6: Noise, Beyond the 65 DNL: Next Steps

- Noise work group background packets – January 2010
- Work Group meeting #1 – February 2010

Erwin Bergman: appreciates Sean's inclusion of his concerns. The guiding principal of the group is to do some good and positively impact neighbors. Under that rule, we established a hierarchy, which is to avoid, reduce, or mitigate. The rational approach is to address the avoidance issue. It is irrational to exclude flight operations in this context. He does not believe that flight routes can be adjusted outside Part 150. Unless you strike this, he sees no way of avoiding this irrational hierarchy.

Sam Imperati: wants to be sure he understands Erwin's concerns, the first of which is that the concept of health should be explicitly noted in the document.

Sean Loughran: that is something we can and will include in the defining impacts section.

Erwin Bergman: when he worked for BPA, he did the 1990 EIS, but it was about acute exposure. Between that and Electro Magnetic Field from power lines, they are touchy subjects, not simple, but need to be addressed.

Sam Imperati: Erwin's second concern has to do with the sixth bullet from the Work Group Assumptions and Scope Boundaries: "Flight operations, airspace, and Part 150 are **not the focus** of this Work Group but may be discussed," noting that the language was discussed in depth in the subcommittee. Sean, comments?

Sean Loughran: no.

Maryhelen Kincaid: spent a lot of time on this, feels they captured it with this text.

Alesia Reese: will the report include minority report?

Sean Loughran: it could.

Sam took a vote on the following question, with the text about health impacts added: Does PAG approve the work group's recommendation on work scope for Beyond 65 DNL Airport Futures Follow-on Study.

All PAG members present voted 1, except Erwin Bergman, who voted 3.

Erwin Bergman: the other thing he did not mention is the use of metrics. The DNL is the regulatory metric being used. The DNL is a very poor representative. It lumps everything on a daily or yearly basis. When noise events occur, such factors as intensity, frequency, time of day, and respite time have a significant impact. These need to be discussed.

Sean Loughran: we are not constrained to any particular metric.

Sam Imperati: we are going to have a Noise Work Group meeting in February, date to be determined, at which this will be discussed.

6:00 – 7:00 pm

Land Use Plan Natural Resources – Stovel/Sugnet/Brooks (125 min.)

- Land Use / Transportation Subcommittee Report – 12/2 and 1/13 joint meeting with MP/Sust.SC
- Natural Resources
 - Context for the City's Natural Resource Program Update
 - Review of the PAG's natural resources Vision and Values, draft guiding principles and draft goals
 - Review of the Natural Resource Inventory
 - Explore the Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy consequences of protecting natural resources

Land Use / Transportation Subcommittee Report - Fred Stovel

Fred Stovel gave a report on the Land Use/Transportation subcommittee. The subcommittee has met monthly since September to pull together the City's Land Use Plan. They reviewed the whole package and are ready to make a recommendation to the PAG in February. However, the natural resources work is taking longer than they thought and so they decided to address natural resources before the Land Use package is brought to the PAG for consideration. Tonight Jay will provide an overview of the natural resources work, to date, and start a conversation about what the various options are to address resource protection. If anyone wants to get into more details or have strong opinions, please attend the February 3rd LUTSC meeting.

Natural Resources – Jay Sugnet and Sam Imperati

Sam Imperati introduced the next presentation, saying that the goal of the work has been to holistically address natural resources. Staff does not yet have a full recommendation for the PAG to consider. Tonight is the beginning of the conversation; feedback will be taken to the subcommittee, then back to PAG. Sam referred the group to the ESEE Analysis Worksheet. They attempted to put the information in a broader framework that can help us consider what is going in other processes. It provides feedback on what staff has heard so far and where there is agreement with the City's preliminary recommendation. We want PAG feedback on this, and we have made the meeting evaluation larger for notes and

questions that may occur during the presentation. Jay would like to get through the whole presentation and take comments in round-robin style, going around the room taking all PAG member comments.

Bob Sallinger: concerning feedback staff has heard, he wondered from what forums it has come.

Jay Sugnet: PAG meetings, written communications, subcommittees, and other forms of public outreach. They still need to go talk to property owners and are still doing outreach.

Sam Imperati: noted that some information came from the natural resources inventory process.

Beginning the presentation, Jay noted that it is more geared toward people who may not have a lot of expertise in natural resources. He will be going over the ESEE Analysis Worksheet and explaining it to the PAG, seeking comments at the end. In this presentation, he is not talking about Step 1 “inventory” or step 4 “final program,” but focus on Steps 2 and 3 of where we currently are in the process. He said the City has made a policy decision to not wait until a species is listed for federal protection before acting, our goal is to avoid the listing in the first place.

Stuart Mathew: you mention federal regulations, what are they?

Jay Sugnet: the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, and others.

Jay referred the group to the Vision and Values Statement, which discusses “fairly, realistically, and optimally” balancing social, environmental, and economic factors. One example of how this could work is in balancing the economy and natural resources. The City’s original recommendation is that the airfield is so important, that in that case, the economy trumps the environment. Alternatively, along the Slough, the environment trumps the economy.

Bob Sallinger: sees it differently. He thinks we should not trade one for the other, letting one value trump another. He is concerned that the approach Jay just stated may be too traditional.

Jay Sugnet: agrees; the Goal 5 program is as simplistic as his example. For the moment, in the ESEE process, we are exploring what are the consequences to this.

Erwin Bergman: what value is attached to a local resource that may have tons of redundancy somewhere else, but may have considerable importance for us locally? How do you rate and compare this.

Jay Sugnet: that is an excellent point; we will discuss this more, later in the worksheet.

John Weigant: is pleased to see that an energy column has been added. He would like Jay to mention energy as it is relevant to the presentation.

Jay continued the presentation, noting that when they started this process, staff thought it was pretty straightforward. They did not anticipate the large portions of upland grasslands and the habitats for the species they contain would be considered Special Habitat Areas. In September when the PAG discussed the LUTSC recommendations, the feedback they heard was 1) you are not considering economics sufficiently and 2) you have already compromised wildlife habitat with a recommendation to allow development on the airfield and Portland International Center. In response to this, they convened a technical advisory team to look at the various species; Bob Sallinger and Dave Helzer from Portland’s BES were part of this group that reviewed the natural resources inventory.

Bob Sallinger: commented that the situation on the ground was not quite as shocking to anyone who tracks wildlife. The airfield is one of the last open spaces. A lot of the information we already had, it was just a matter of putting it all together for a more complete picture.

Jay referred the group to the ESEE Analysis Worksheet. After incorporating the feedback gathered today, they are hoping for a PAG recommendation in February.

Andy Cotugno: after the ESEE analysis, you have program recommendations, some of which go beyond regulatory framework. Will there be more pro-active recommendations? He is trying to get at what Bob said, about enhancing habitat, not just, not negatively impacting habitat.

Jay Sugnet: we are following Goal 5; the City is not in the position to regulate for enhancement. Once you decide to allow-limit-strictly limit-or prohibit, there is room to figure out how to implement.

Jay continued to go over the ESEE Analysis Worksheet.

Bob Sallinger: is curious, if we get to the programmatic piece, is it a baseline that we build upon?

Jay Sugnet: yes. Yes, but tonight we really want you to focus on the ESEE recommendations.

John Weigant: does it focus on mitigation?

Jay Sugnet: yes.

John Weigant: then I have a problem with it. It seems to indicate there would be no mitigation for noise.

Jay Sugnet: this deals with natural resources.

John Weigant: questions whether natural resources will allow for mitigation; if you allow everything, then economics trump everything.

Bill Blosser: Jay explained that this is just natural resources, and wants to point out that we can disagree.

Jay continued with the presentation. They have recognized that certain areas call for special consideration. He pointed out those areas on the map. We will talk about the general inventory and then the specific areas. Jay noted the factors included in the inventory and analysis, page 3 of the presentation, ESEE Topics Analyzed. All these were considered and from that, we have these recommendations.

Hector Roche: what is the difference between strictly limit or prohibit?

Jay Sugnet: the City does not prohibit; that was a policy decision by the City Council. If the City prohibited development on a property, this would be considered a "taking." The City allows development if there is no practicable alternative.

Alesia Reese: a policy just for this process?

Jay Sugnet: no, it is a general City policy.

Break.

Jay resumed his presentation, by showing how the chart is displayed on the map. The site-specific initial recommendation for the airfield is to allow development in recognition of the important economics of the site and secondarily the social aspect of needing the intensely manage wildlife on the airfield.

Chris Corich: the Port and City are generally in agreement.

Jay resumed his presentation, by showing the site-specific recommendation for Portland International Center. The site-specific recommendation is to allow development in recognition of the existing City policies to encourage industrial and commercial development associated with Cascade Station. Other important factors are that development is approved and shovel ready, since the majority of infrastructure is in place, including light rail.

Bob Sallinger: the Portland International Center, the recommendation is a deviation from standard City policy.

Jay Sugnet: correct; all these noted in site-specific areas are deviations from standard City policy.

Chris Corich: this is part of the balancing we do; habitat is not totally being lost, there will always be a lot of grass on the airfield.

Jay continued discussing various site-specific aspects of the ESEE Analysis Worksheet, including the Street Horned Lark, which is a candidate for ESA listing and is prominent in Southwest Quadrant. It is now extinct in B.C. They are not the sole focus, there are many species. The Southwest Quadrant is unique, both for natural resources and the economy. There are very few west coast airports with a huge chunk of land next to their runways. From the City's perspective, the site-specific recommendation is no change for that area.

Stuart Mathew: wondered what is the Port's position?

Chris Corich: certainly recognizes that this is a City process, but the Port would probably balance it a little differently. They would have hoped to see an "allow" on that the SW Quad, making it a viable airport site, especially considering the substantial investments we've made, such as filling wetlands, putting in a road, other mitigation activities. If you look at other sites that have been made ready for development, such as Fed Ex, we would like to do the same for here.

Bob Sallinger: no one is saying you cannot develop. What they are asking you to do is mitigate for the impacts to the high value resource. One of the things that is going to make PDX the most sustainable airport in the world is that we are going to mitigate. That is the balancing part of this.

Chris Corich: we are in the process of reconciling this. Historically we have not been a resource agency; we have been a transportation agency. As Jay said, when we started on this process, the furthest thing from his mind was that the whole upland grasslands would be designated as a habitat. They are trying to figure out how to proceed with the options before them.

Bob Sallinger: if there is an alternative strategy that is compatible with this, it would be no net loss.

Chris Corich: this has been a process, we have not landed yet.

Jay finished with a few additional comments. Sam referred the PAG to their meeting evaluation form, which can be used for questions or comment, in addition to what folks say now. The PAG went around the room, asking questions, or offering comments and reactions to Jay's presentation.

Gene Hahn: pass.

Fred Stovel: has concerns about mitigation requirements off site; it would seem that since you are not creating new land, the mitigation may destroy the natural habitat somewhere else. How do you weigh those costs and benefits?

Jay Sugnet: great question; he offered to give an example after the full PAG has a chance to comment.

Vicky Thompson: her concerns are about mitigation also. Government Island is not developed, can it be used to mitigate?

Maryhelen Kincaid: with this plan, will it be tied into neighborhood resource management plans? We have 60 acres of undeveloped open space that could be preserved as a mitigation site. Also, in the presentation you lumped together residential and open space – is this going to be a new concept in the City code? Finally, the private developers are looking at Marine Drive for a lot of development; is that being considered in this overall plan?

Lawrence Russell: concerning the Portland International Center; is there anything display-wise that could be related to preservation that could be inside the airport?

Laura Hudson: similar to Maryhelen's comments; it would help her to know how this fits into the overall habitat in the region/area.

Stuart Mathews: thinks it's a great product. Thanks!

Alesia Reese: pass.

Denny Stoecklin: in the presentation, two things struck him: 1) you had said there was no answer; and 2) what is going to be the criteria that guide us to next step, which tells us the decisions you have listed in here are at least close.

Veronica Rinard: echoes Fred's questions about the cost of mitigations. She has no idea what that really means. Also, she echoes what Laura said and would like to know how this fits into the overall habitat in the region/area. For offsite mitigation, how much control is there and over what period of time? There is significant economic and public relations value to being proactive around protection and being the most sustainable airport in the world. Is this something the airlines might be willing to pay for a little?

John Weigant: have we missed the forest for the trees? If this is the capstone of the process, he thinks it is unbalanced. The incremental cost of mitigation could be a significant. Also, what follows the Natural Resources Inventory?

Andy Cotugno: good piece of work, almost there. He still has quarrel with airfield recommendations, feels handcuffed by not linking the enhancement program to this conversation. It is not on the table yet, so he does not know the details yet. What program applies when permitting development occurs? What limits or mitigation requirements apply? He thinks we can get to a "limit" to a general recommendation on the airfield. On PIC, the recommendation makes sense, particularly since you have already gone through permitting; you are well down the path. The airfield is different. A limit designation would trigger mitigation. He concurs with all rest of it.

Erwin Bergman: is still concerned about where migration efforts might occur if they are far removed from the site. Thinks it is critical that whatever development occurs that effects are mitigated on site, or as close as possible. Also, agrees with John that to calculate for only development is an outdated concept.

Hector Roche: in Step 2 in the General Study Area, you noted that you looked at cultural and social impacts, but he does not see that it was done for any of the site-specific recommendations.

John Frevola: another mitigation question. How do you know if the mitigation will address the issue? How do you know if the species you are mitigating for will go to the new site?

Bruce Fisher: nothing to add

Patrick Metzger: if something is “highly ranked” here, do you match that with another high ranking?

Bob Sallinger: thinks the City has done a good job. There are a lot of opportunities for mitigation, where money can be well spent, that will be legally protected over time. He questions whether PIC should be included, it is “high value” habitat, but sees Andy’s point. Encourages Port to truly be the most sustainable in the world and mitigate even if it is expensive. There is huge value for public relations. He is all for flexibility, but thinks this is an absolutely critical piece of the PAG recommendation.

Mary Olson: agrees with Bob, that we want to protect natural resources as best we can, but she struggles with the cost factor. The Port is a business; we have to raise the money. It is easy to have a wish list, but we have to also understand the practical aspect. Wonders how we will use the money we have to make this happen and implement all these idea. She is interested in putting some numbers to the mitigation.

Bill Blosser: concerning mitigation, it seems to him that we need to calculate the cost. Is it a 5% premium or 50% premium on development costs? This could answer a lot of the questions we have heard tonight.

Andy Cotugno: Also, if the Port’s program is at a 10% premium, then that is a better deal.

Bill Blosser: good point. We need to have some idea of what these numbers are.

Public Comment

Bob Eaton: Executive Director for the Multnomah County Greens District

1. 50-foot setback on waterways; is that from the center of waterway or edge of the bank?
2. Does that same setback pertain to Columbia River Slough versus secondary ditches?
3. The proposal might be that there should be C-zone over all the sloughs. How is the district going to do flood management?

Sam thanked everyone for their comments and questions, and asked Jay or Chris to respond.

Jay Sugnet: noted that most questions were on Step 4 which was not the focus of tonight’s conversation, but said that is to be expected. To answer just a few questions, he said that the City requires that you mitigate for the type of habitat, not for the species. For mitigation, there is a way you can measure, a formula, to make sure the Port gets credit for improving at a higher level at the mitigation site. As far as cost goes, they do have some preliminary numbers; they can tell you how much has been spent and rough estimates on what it might cost for improvements and development; they will provide these numbers at the subcommittee meeting on February 3. He thanked the PAG for their comments, saying this has been very helpful conversation.

Chris Corich: they have done some playing around with mitigation numbers, which may be a little different from the City, but the Port estimates \$10K per acre.

Jay Sugnet: regarding Hector's concern; it is additive; everything in general gets carried over to the site specific. He also said that Bob had some great questions, and they were supposed to have a meeting today, but had to reschedule due to Mindy being sick. It will be rescheduled and the questions will be discussed.

Hector Roche: Would like to see social issues developed in more in detail.

Fred Stovel: commented about the golf courses and the 50-foot setback requirement from water, it could impact them a lot. Is the requirement retroactive?

Maryhelen Kincaid: reiterated the importance of knowing costs. Need regulations in place, not just good intentions in place. Note that there are some private parcels as well as some parcels already owned. How do you balance natural with neighborhood.

John Weigant: the Port is a government that behaves like a business. It's *customers* are businesses. He has concerns about focusing too much on development. Its purpose should be to serve the needs of citizens this generation and the future and why the goal of being most sustainable is really worth achieving.

Bob Sallinger: this Airport Futures planning process costs \$4.5 million, which puts \$10,000 per acre in perspective.

Please see pages 13 – 14 for summary of the ESEE written comments.

8:25 – 8:30 pm **Next Meeting Agenda (Feb. 16, 5:30 to 8:30 pm),
Process Review and Other Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation Form,
and Adjournment – Blosser/Imperati (5 min.)**

Bill commented that he has been in a lot of these processes over the years, and to be coming to the end of a three year process with this many people still hanging in there is very impressive. The process has benefited from everyone's commitment and he thanked everyone. We are working to bring this to a close in the spring 2010.

The next meeting is February 16. The focus of this meeting will be the entire Land Use Package and Sustainability Goals and Guiding Principles with a goal of adoption. Also, hope to have Master Plan Phasing and Financial Plan.

Sam asked everyone to please complete and leave the ESEE input and Meeting Evaluation forms.

JANUARY 19, 2010 PAG NATURAL RESOURCES FEEDBACK FORM COMMENTS

- A few members use the term "most sustainable airport in the world." I'll check the vision/values/goals (don't see it on the placemat) but don't recall that statement in our charter.
- Almost no benefits/impacts in site specific analysis notes
- Are there properties near with the same natural resource values?
- Deep concern that Airfield gets to develop as it wishes without limit. Limits need to be in the language
- Does this analysis account for "cumulative effects?"

- Draft Inventory – whose assumptions? Audubon or the Port? How does the inventory interact with the broader natural area? Upland grasslands – how does it “work” on a wider area – are there predators?
- Economic/PR value of being very proactive on protection – increasing corporate responsibility – how quantify.
- ESEE – “protect” – are there any enhancement activities? Policy choice between whom?
- ESEE Worksheet – Study Area: Cost saving/natural benefits e.g. storm water – money versus intangible – different measures. Will measurement be equitable?
- Goal 5 – “Protecting” is there any language regarding enhancement?
- Golf course – would staff recommendations be different if Port owned?
- Great product: lays out pros/cons of the issues
- Have there been conversations with private developers re: Marine Drive (west of 33rd)?
- Health issues – measure impacts to health based on density, traffic, stress of economic choices.
- How can Residential and Open Space be combined? They seem (or are) separate distinctions in current City code.
- Human intervention has degraded natural areas
- I still don’t see how this piece fits together with everything else
- Is a high rank area that is developed mitigated to high (SW Quad)?
- Is all the hatching potential for development?
- Is development based on measurable factors?
- Measuring impacts – will new analysis be able to assess the past inventory with new analyses?
- Mitigation can be done in neighboring areas
- Mitigation off site
- Need further flowchart/diagram to inter-relate all the decision factors (including this) at some point to provide example of development proposed or lack thereof.
- PAG Vision/values – “tied” thru process/regulations or simply policy? Balance is “all” or can issues swing from one side to another? Mitigation at what expense – City often mitigates its own actions without intense scrutiny.
- Page 2 Analysis: Green is economic (money) and prohibit is red (stop). Odd color-coding.
- Portland International Center: will there be any environmental information related to endangered animals/birds?
- What about neighborhoods? (ECNA) included/bordering being included in overall plan
- What baseline info will be available to judge our level? What criteria for decisions will be used to create a balance?
- What is the cost to replace R10 land in light of City’s no net loss of housing (if it were to be mitigated)?
- What is the importance of the grasslands relative to other grasslands in the region?
- What is the risk of double jeopardy and courts overturning “limit?” (Is it even legal?)

- What measurement tools can we use assess the benefits/impacts? Do they meet the sustainability goals?
- What would be the time limit – how long and under what conditions might decisions be changed and amended?
- What would potential mitigations be? What have previous ones been? Cost? Control over offsite mitigations? (i.e., CRC/Expo?)
- Will any former rules/regulations grandfather in specific activities?
- Will there be efforts to tie this work to parallel studies/plans of adjacent neighborhood plans?

JANUARY 19, 2010 PAG MEETING EVALUATION

1. Overall Meeting Quality	Poor 1	2	3 (5)	4 (5)	Excellent 5 (1)
2. Pacing	Too Slow	2 (2)	Just Right (5)	4 (1)	Too Fast (1)
3. Balancing “Product, Process & Relationship” Meeting Goals	Poor 1	2 (1)	3 (5)	4 (4)	Excellent 5 (1)
4. Presentations	1	2	3 (6)	4 (5)	5
5. Comprehension of Presentations	1	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (6)	5
6. Materials/Documents	1	2	3 (4)	4 (7)	5
7. Discussion	1	2 (2)	3 (1)	4 (7)	5
8. Comments and Suggestions for Items 1 – 7, Above:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sean is a wonderful person (per the fortune cookie) • Specific airport area chart was more understandable than general ESEE – would have helped to flip those in presentation • We “continue” per Bill because of Sam’s skills and fact that staff is always well prepared and responsive. (Oral comment asked to be shared) 					
9. Least Useful:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jousting between Bob Sallinger and Port staff 					
10. Most Useful:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Resources grid • Condensed version of the presentation, overhead; frame up of discussion 					
11. Questions:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more chocolate 					