

**Planning Advisory Group Meeting #12**  
**Tuesday, February 17, 2009 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm**  
Port of Portland, Commission Room, 121 NW Everett, Portland, OR

**FINAL DRAFT NOTES**

**Announcements, Approval of Meeting Notes, Agenda Review and PAG Action Items – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati (Attachment 3)**

Bill Blosser welcomed everyone to the PAG meeting. He pointed out that behind him on the large screen was a looping video of 24 hours of air travel in the world. <http://video.aol.com/video-detail/world-air-traffic-24-hours/288230382437528865/?icid=VIDURVTRV05>

Absent from tonight's meeting are Alan Hargrave, Dennis Mulvihill, Dave Smith, and Tom Gerharter. Gene Hahn joins us in Tom's place.

- A comment made in the Process evaluation about how to assist new PAG members get up to speed with the group. To this end, staff met with four new PAG members on 2/12 to provide an overview of the process, to date, as well as a tour of the airport. This is a procedure which staff has followed from the start of the process and will continue as new members join.
- On your table is a one-page letter from the Port's "Be A Hero" campaign, which is intended to help retain the region's nonstop international service during these tough economic times.
- Need one Business representative to join the Public Involvement Subcommittee to balance the representation per our Collaboration Principles.

**Approval of Meeting Notes – Bill Blosser**

No changes were requested. The Meeting Notes from 1/20/09 were approved (PAG Attachment #2).

**Announcements and Agenda Review – Sam Imperati**

Sam continued with additional announcements and agenda review.

Tonight's agenda is full, as usual. There are no action items, just information and discussion.

**PAG and Public Involvement Evaluation – Sam Imperati**

Sam briefly went over the results of the Process Evaluation (PAG Attachment #3). The responses were mostly excellent, very good and good. Ratings were consistent with 2008, but comments reflect improvements. The Coordinating Committee reviewed comments in detail and will use these to help guide process forward.

One responsive measure: a repeated comment was the challenge PAG members have had in reporting to your constituencies. Staff will continue a monthly update to send onto your interest groups.

On the Public Involvement side, more very good and good ratings. With positives about website electronic updates and strong positives on the website generally. There is a desire for more summarization of key points to help PAG members report back to groups. The Public Involvement Subcommittee will review these evaluations and those from the web survey to help guide future public engagement work.

Members	Affiliation	Present
Erwin <b>Bergman</b>	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill <b>Blosser</b>	Chair	√
Mark <b>Clark</b>	E. County <i>(officially replacing Lisa Barton-Mullins)</i>	√
Andy <b>Cotugno</b>	Metro	√
Bruce <b>Fisher</b>	FAA	√
John <b>Frevola</b>	Flightcraft	√
Tom <b>Gerharter</b>	Horizon Airlines <b>Alternate Gene Hahn in attendance</b>	√
Cam <b>Gilmour</b>	Clackamas County	√
Alan <b>Hargrave</b>	Port of Camas/Washougal	
Chris <b>Hathaway</b>	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership	√
Laura <b>Hudson</b>	City of Vancouver	√
Maryhelen <b>Kincaid</b>	N. Portland Neighborhood Services	√
Lt Col. <b>Stuart Mathew</b>	ORANG	√
Patrick <b>Metzger</b>	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	√
John <b>Mohlis</b>	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	√
Dennis <b>Mulvihill</b>	Washington County	
Brian <b>Nelson</b>	Intel	√
Mary <b>Olson</b>	Port Commissioner	√
Lai-Lani <b>Ovales</b>	Planning Commissioner	√
Alesia <b>Reese</b>	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Veronica <b>Rinard</b>	Portland OR Visitors Association	√
Hector <b>Roche</b>	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	√
Lawrence <b>Russell</b>	Environmental Justice	√
Bob <b>Sallinger</b>	Audubon Society of Portland	√
Michael <b>Sloan</b>	Vancouver Neighborhoods	√
Dave <b>Smith</b>	Vice Chair	
Denny <b>Stoecklin</b>	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred <b>Stovel</b>	Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Vicki <b>Thompson</b>	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John <b>Weigant</b>	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	√
Bronwyn Buckle	City Planning Bureau	√
Chris Corich	Port's Project Manager	√
Renee Dowlin	Port – PDX Environmental	√
Melissa Egan	Assistant to Facilitator, ICM	√
Jason Gately	Port – Long Range Planning	√
John Gray	City Office of Transportation	√
Lise Glancy	Port – Government Relations	√
Nancy Hendrickson	City Bureau of Environmental Services	√
Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Stan Jones	Port – PDX Environmental Compliance	√
Scott King	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Sean Loughran	Port – Long Range Planning	√

Melissa McCluney	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Phil Ralston	Port – PDX Environmental	√
Kelly Rodgers	David Evans and Assoc.	√
Dennis Sandstrom	Port Community Affairs	
Kama Simonds	Port Media Relations	√
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√
Rachel Wray	Port Community Affairs	√

**Public Present:** Saiid Behboodi of Kleinfelder, Steve Burdick of Killian Pacific, Jesse Evans (student), Daniel Gormley of Mead Hunt, Frank Howatt (Hayden Island resident), and Kelly Sweeney (CNN resident).

### 10 Step Timeline – Jay Sugnet

Jay highlighted the accomplishments of the PAG to date (15 months and 12 meetings into the process). The PAG has come together and displayed a strong appreciation for differing points of view within the group. This attribute is not on the list of accomplishments, but Jay sees it as one of the greatest accomplishments, examples of which include:

- Collaboration Principles
- Vision and Values
- Inventory of Existing Conditions
- Project Sideboards
- Forecast
- City Land Use Structure
- Preliminary Sustainability Policy Statements
- Public Involvement Initiatives
- Facilities Requirements
- Alternatives: New Direction
- Mid-Term Review and Updated Work Plan

This is where we have been, what we have accomplished to date. Each of these products reflects the work of the PAG and subcommittees, and input of the public. We appreciate your efforts!

Jay then referred the PAG to Attachment #4 (Ten Step Process Work Plan). This is the work plan to get us through the Ten Step process. Lise and staff created this to give us a roadmap of the work ahead. The yellow highlights tie in directly with the 10-step process, for easy cross-reference.

- Across the top, you can see each of the upcoming PAG meetings through the fall 2009.
- Down the left hand column you can see the core pieces of work we will be engaged in as well as General Business of the PAG: Master Plan, Land Use Plan, Sustainability, and Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy.
- In each of the columns below the PAG meeting dates, you can see the tentative agendas for these PAG meetings. The timing is dependent on the ability of the consultants and staff to turn the work around and the pace that the subcommittees and PAG are able to react to that work. If we push out any of these items, we will need to add additional PAG meetings. Our goal is to stay on schedule.
- Across the bottom, there are three arrows, indicating our public outreach efforts. Hector will discuss some of this in his report later, but briefly, we are talking to our key stakeholders now about scheduling meetings in May/June to review our draft work products: Land Use Plan, Master Plan, OPIS and Sustainability Benchmarks.

- On the back, you can see the subcommittee work that is needed to bring items to the PAG. We are working to schedule regular meetings of these subcommittees for more predictability. We are also planning joint meetings of subcommittees where issues overlap – and they do.
- If agenda items are delayed, this will add meetings to the process (2 have been added to date) and push the end date for the process into spring 2010. We have tried to not schedule meetings in the month of August. As you can see, there is tentatively a July PAG meeting. We will need your feedback as our work proceeds.
- The ten step process is listed on the back page. Yellow highlighted notations on the front show where each of the steps begin.

### **Land Use Subcommittee Report - Fred Stovel**

Fred gave the PAG a report on the Subcommittee's work to date. They met on January 29 to discuss the topics that Jay and Mindy will present tonight. They also got a quick update on the transportation work. DKS was awarded the contract for the Traffic Impact Analysis and that work is now underway. The Natural Resources work that Mindy will present is informational at this point. The subcommittee felt it is important for the full PAG to understand the scope and depth of the natural resources work.

The Project List and Review types are where the Plan District starts to get real. The subcommittee discussed the list, made some improvements, and is presenting it to the full PAG for consideration. Relying on your expertise and areas of interest, we will want to know if there are projects missing, if some projects should get more review, or less review. Keep in mind this is a starting point for discussion. Jay will explain in more detail.

Most importantly, the pieces are starting to come together and the subcommittee is starting to see how the Plan District relates to the OPIS and vice versa.

We cancelled our February meeting, but some of our members will attend the Public Involvement Subcommittee. Please come to our next meeting on April 1, 6 – 8 pm; anyone invested inland use is strongly encouraged to come. We will review the economic development and transportation analysis at this meeting.

### **Land Use Plan – Jay Sugnet**

Before Jay's PowerPoint on components of the City Plan District, Airport Development Projects and City Review Procedure Types, Jay mentioned SB 169, which would amend ORS 836.616 to include towered airports (10 statewide – PDX, Hillsboro, Troutdale, Redmond, Pendleton, Medford, Eugene, Coos Bay/North Bend, Salem, and Klamath Falls). This rule acknowledges the importance of airports to the state's transportation system and requires cities now with towered airports to include them in their next periodic update. This is our intent through the Airport Futures process.

SB 169 is currently being considered by the Oregon Legislature. Port and City staff is reviewing the potential implications for Airport Futures planning process. This is a head's up, not sure about timelines or impacts; they are being studied. We will provide more information on this legislation and perhaps have more discussion in the Land Use/ Transportation Subcommittee.

*Mary Olson:* would like a little more info, please.

*Jay Sugnet:* When this legislation was first enacted many years ago, the Port asked for an exemption for towered airports. Language has been cleaned up since then. The Oregon Department of Aviation has

recommended it now apply to all airports; it really is meant for those jurisdictions that are not covered by Airport Planning Rule and other regulations. Staff is trying to figure out if we are for it or against it.

Next, Jay referred the PAG to Attachments 5A & 5B (Draft Airport Development Project and City Review Procedures and Natural Resource Inventory PowerPoint). He wanted to update the PAG about the Plan District. The Subcommittee made some minor tweaks to the draft project review procedures and thought it was important to bring it to the PAG. The Plan District will include development standards, review procedures, and specify which uses are allowed, prohibited or conditioned. Tonight, we will focus on the review procedures. On Attachment 5A is a list of projects that might fit into each City review type, such as the 3<sup>rd</sup> parallel runway. In this case, per the Plan District protocols, the Port would come to the City, likely during a concurrent Master Plan review; the Port would have to make an argument to the City Council of why a 3<sup>rd</sup> runway is necessary. The Plan District could also specify what type of review would be required to address any significant change to the Master Plan.

The following memo explains the different types of review processes, including illustrative examples of their applicability.

**AIRPORT FUTURES – CITY LAND USE PLAN**  
**Airport Development Projects and City Review Procedure Types**  
**(on-airport development only)**  
**DISCUSSION DRAFT 02.09.09**

The Airport Futures planning process will create a Plan District for PDX. The Plan District will address the unique circumstances of operating a commercial airport within the City. One function of the Plan District is to establish regulatory processes to review future aviation related development projects, along with tailored review criteria.

Below is a list of review types within the City's regulatory structure and examples of airport development projects that could fit into each review type. This is a starting point for the discussion of how to structure public input into airport planning and development decision-making.

The type of review for a given development project will depend on the role of the Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS). One function of the OPIS is to supplement, or possibly replace, some aspects of City regulatory review of airport development projects.<sup>1</sup>

**Legislative Plan Amendment – decision by City Council**

A Legislative Plan Amendment is the highest possible local review procedure. Legislative reviews require an in-depth public processes, a hearing before the Planning Commission, and a final hearing and decision by City Council. Legislative Plan Amendments are heard and decided by elected officials, not City staff or the City's Hearing Officer.

**EXAMPLES**

- Third Parallel Runway
  - Timing with City Approval, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, Master Plan Update needs consideration
  - Specifically address noise, height, transportation, and natural resource issues
- Decentralized Terminal
  - Must be identified as needed within 20 years in a future PDX Master Plan
  - Specifically address transportation impacts
- Fundamental Shift From New Master Plan
  - Moving or deleting a Runway
  - Other fundamental change in airport layout and associated operation
- Add Land into Plan District

**Type III Quasi-judicial review with Notice - decision by City Hearings Officer**

With the exception of Legislative Plan Amendments, Type III procedures receive the highest level of review by the City. Type III procedures involve applicants proposing a specific project that is conditionally allowed by the Zoning Code. City staff reviews

<sup>1</sup> At this time, it is anticipated that OPIS will focus on 4 general areas in addition to the City's land use review process, including: tracking airport sustainability benchmarks, tracking community agreements, and providing a community engagement function. See meeting notes for the Public Involvement Subcommittee for more details.

the proposal against specific approval criteria. Adjacent neighborhoods and property owners are notified of the proposal and given an opportunity to identify issues or concerns. Planning staff then review all materials and typically make a recommendation to the City Hearings Officer as part of a formal public hearing. The Hearings Officer then makes a decision, based on criteria established in the Zoning Code, to do one of three things: approve the project, approve the project with conditions, or deny the project. The decision can typically be appealed to City Council. The current Conditional Use Master Plan process is a Type III.

**EXAMPLES**

- SW Quadrant Development - fill and infrastructure improvements
- NW Quadrant Redevelopment
  - Major shift of airport activities (cargo, military, general aviation)
- Environmental Review (as required)

**Type II Administrative Review with Notice – decision by City staff**

Type II reviews are mid level reviews that involve a staff decision based on approval criteria in the Zoning Code. This review may require some discretion by staff. Adjacent neighborhoods and property owners are notified of the proposal and given the opportunity to identify issues or concerns. Staff reviews all the material and makes the final decision. The decision can typically be appealed to the City Hearings Officer.

- Centralized Terminal
  - If identified as needed within 20 years in a future PDX Master Plan
- Non-Aviation Development
  - In excess of any prior city approvals
  - Regional facility (throwing center, recycling center, etc.)
- Aviation Tenant Development > 60,000 s.f. (size negotiable)
  - In excess of any prior city approvals
  - Hotels
  - Does not include aircraft storage
- E-Zone review (as required)
- Phased Traffic Analysis
  - Draft a specific set of approval criteria
- Add land within Plan District into Port-owned/airport-related Sub-district

**Type I Administrative – decision by City staff**

Type I reviews are the lowest level of City review. They involve a non-discretionary review and are approved by City staff if the applicant can meet a list of standards. In this case staff is charged with simply checking that all required criteria are met.

- Tree Removal/Trimming

**By Right – no review**

Some development projects are allowed by right and do not require property owners to submit an application of any kind to the City - with the exception of building permits.

Usual and Customary Airport Development

Other Related Airport Development

- Airfield Projects (except as specified above)
- Airfield Fence Adjustments
- Auxiliary Structure /Use – NEW
  - e.g. fire station, aircraft storage
- Auxiliary Structure Expansions
  - E.g. Central Utility Plant, fuel farm, parking toll plaza, maintenance compound, etc.
- Aviation Tenant Development - < 60,000 s.f. (size negotiable)
  - In excess of any prior city approvals
- Terminal/Concourse Expansions
  - In excess of any prior city approvals
- Equipment Storage
- Federal Facilities Related to Airport Operations (FAA, TSA, CBP)
- Federally Mandated Security & Safety Projects
- Interior Remodels

- Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) fueling station
- Multnomah County Drainage District (MCDD) Projects
- Grading/Stockpiling
- Landscaping Projects (with special standards)
- Light Rail Improvements/realignments
- Property Acquisitions
- Transportation System Management Projects
- Port of Portland Office Expansions
- Utility Facility
  - E.g. solar farm, wind farm, deicing, etc.

- Operation and Maintenance Projects
- Parking Expansions (within traffic analysis caps)
- People Mover Systems
- Port Roadway Projects
- Rental Car Expansions (within traffic analysis caps)
- Technology Projects

Staff will come back to the PAG in April with an economic development assessment and a transportation impact update; in May, with noise contours and final transportation impacts; and in June, with our draft plan.

*Sam Imperati:* Jay's memo is a draft; it will come to you again. In the Master Plan, you will have to make decisions on what types of projects deserve what level of City review. Things of near biblical proportions will likely require a legislative process similar to Airport Futures. The goal is to fit the forum to the fust, to create balance between what the City is going to do and what the Port wants to do.

*Stuart Mathew:* does the public involvement mirror the level of review?

*Jay Sugnet:* the goal is to have them well integrated.

*Sam Imperati:* when we are done, you will be able to see clearly the relationship between the level of public involvement and the type of review for any project.

*Hector Roche:* we have not decided what the triggers are for each type of review, but clearly there are connections and implications.

*Jay Sugnet:* for example, say a four-story building is being built in an old, established neighborhood. We have now built in our process, a neighborhood contact requirement. The developer must go to the neighborhood and present the proposal. The developers permit application must describe the input from the neighborhoods and what changes were made, if any.

*John Weigant:* the Planning Commission is only involved at the legislative level?

*Jay Sugnet:* correct.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* so we can ignore the current code and say that that is not going to apply here? How tied are we to current code and legislative process?

*Jay Sugnet:* we can modify in certain cases.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* only Port projects or all projects within the Plan District?

*Jay Sugnet:* all projects within the Plan District.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* that could empower or disempower neighborhood groups, depending upon how we write it.

*Jay Sugnet:* yes, supposes that is true. His goal is to strengthen it.

*Denny Stoecklin:* how do you get particular projects into places where they now may not fit?

*Jay Sugnet:* that is why we are doing a legislative option; plan district is higher on the hierarchy; so when there is conflict among rules, plan district usually wins out.

*Erwin Bergman:* question about boundaries.

*Jay Sugnet:* concerning study area boundaries, the Land Use Subcommittee will get into the details on what is an appropriate a boundary, considering all the necessary pieces (height overlay, landscaping, development standards, etc.).

*Erwin Bergman:* so it could go beyond airport boundary (Port owned property)?

*Jay Sugnet:* he thinks in many cases it is wise to go beyond the airport boundary when defining the plan district.

*Sam Imperati:* (to the PAG) are there any issues you see missing from the list?

*Bob Sallinger:* landscaping requirement; landscaping without review is a concern.

*Jay Sugnet:* that has been part of our discussion; it is not that there is no review; there would be defined standards in the Plan District.

*Scott King:* just FYI, this list was drafted not considering land beyond the boundary.

*Andy Cotugno:* what about deicing?

*Scott King:* currently that is considered a utility facility in City code which is an allowed use in an industrial zone. This type of project requires a National Environmental Policy Act review.

*Sam Imperati:* we are just trying to generate ideas for the subcommittees to vet; does anyone want to add anything else?

*Alesia Reese:* what about assessing the cumulative impact? For example, if the post office moves to the airport, such a move will be compounded outside the airport by affiliated businesses, how do we accommodate that?

*Jay Sugnet:* with the 2035 Master Plan, we are going to have a very good sense of projects and standards; the list is intended for what is beyond what we have already planned for in the City Plan District and Master Plan.

*Chris Corich:* the post office moving was a good example of the types of issues we are addressing.

*Alesia Reese:* it is all the supporting industries that she is referring to, the bulk mail business, etc., that would create increased traffic in the surrounding neighborhoods.

*Fred Stovel:* would like to add uses that are not allowed. We have not really thought about that very much yet (schools, childcare, residential, etc.).

*Sam Imperati:* this could be an additional list/topic for the subcommittee.

*Chris Corich:* for clarification, you cannot build a school immediately near the airport, but can build them in the extended area.

*Jay Sugnet:* in a future meeting, we will discuss this more in depth. The area around the airport is zoned industrial and it does not allow many incompatible uses for PDX.

## Natural Resources Inventory - Mindy Brooks

Mindy Brooks of the City of Portland presented a PowerPoint to highlight some of the work done around PDX to update the City's natural resources inventory, as well as to meet new regional, state and federal requirements.

### Slide 9: City's Existing Environmental Program

- Environmental Overlay Zones
- Stormwater Management Manual
- Erosion Control Manual
- Landscaping Standards
- Plan District Codes (e.g., Columbia South Shore)
- Willing Seller Acquisition Program
- BES Revegetation Program

Why update elements of the Environmental Program? To be in compliance with:

Slide 11: City's Environmental Overlay Zones

Slide 12: Federal Requirements

***Clean Water Act*** – Total Maximum Daily Loads

***Endangered Species Act*** – Recovery of listed species

***Superfund*** – Cleaning up contamination

***Wildlife Hazard Management Plan*** – Reducing risk at PDX

Slide 13: Metro Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods

Slide 14: Recent City Watershed Health Policies and Goals

***River Renaissance Vision (2001); Strategy (2004)*** - Meet multiple objectives

***Portland Watershed Management Plan (2005)*** - Applies ecological principles to urban watersheds; set priorities for protection and enhancement of watershed functions

Slide 15: How to update the City's Environmental Program

**Step 1:** Update Natural Resources Inventory

**Step 2:** Evaluate Environmental Program Elements

**Step 3:** Update Program Elements as Necessary

Slide 16: Step 1: Update Natural Resources Inventory

***PURPOSE:*** *Identify and evaluate the relative quantity and quality of existing natural resources to inform program evaluation and decision making*

Slide 17: Natural Resources Inventory (NRI)

1. Feature data (type of vegetation, water features, etc.)
2. Habitat and biologic communities information
3. Riparian corridor and wildlife habitat functions

Slide 23: Step 1: Update Natural Resources Inventory

Draft Report Available in summer 2009

## Subcommittee Review – April and May with PAG Review – June

### Slide 24: Step 2: Evaluate Environmental Program Elements

Natural Resources Inventory: information, data and maps of existing natural resource features and functions; NRI informs multiple efforts, including:

#### Environmental Overlay Zone Updates

- Location of overlay boundaries
- Level of protection

#### Plan District

- Landscaping standards
- Restoration opportunities

#### Other City Projects

- Stormwater Management Manual Updates
- Parks' Acquisition Priorities
- City-wide Tree Project

#### Community Efforts

- Watershed Councils
- Neighborhood Plans

*Sam Imperati:* this is the background information that will come to the subcommittees. Similar updates on traffic and other items will be presented to the PAG in April.

*Jay Sugnet:* in June, we hope to have the 75% land use plan completed. Some things may go quicker, a lot is coming up.

### **Public Comment**

No members of the public present wished to make any comments.

### **Break.**

### **Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee Report - Sean Loughran and Cam Gilmour**

Cam reminded folks that the Master Plan and Sustainability Joint Subcommittee joined together last fall. They have not met since November when they participated in the Mid-Term Review and development of the Ten-Step Process for completing the Airport Futures project. As we proceed with the development of plans to 25%, we will begin assessing the flexibility of the centralized alternative to address the range of growth described in the forecast (10%-90%), begin applying and testing the facility requirement assumptions, and lay the foundation for the more detailed planning work that will be based on the 50th percentile forecast.

The next meeting of the Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee is scheduled for February 24, 2009, 6:00-8:00 pm at the Port of Portland Building. This meeting will focus on the central terminal core area. We will be assessing the viability of that area at 90th percentile forecast levels of demand. The subcommittee is looking at this with the flexibility needed, considering the dramatic changes we have experienced since the forecast.

*Sam Imperati:* our next PAG meeting will involve an in-depth presentation from C.F. and the next subcommittee will set the stage for that. Everyone is strongly encouraged to attend this meeting so we can have maximum input and comprehension of the material.

## **Erwin Bergman Presentation**

Erwin read the following memo to the PAG.

### **Challenges to our Forecast**

I want to challenge the widespread belief that with ever increasing fuel efficiency of jet aircraft and an immensely expanding worldwide aircraft fleet there combined CO<sup>2</sup> emission will remain insignificant and of no concern. There has been more and more talk about more biofriendly alternative fuel stocks that had a much smaller carbon footprint or were in fact carbon neutral. Some of these fuels could also be produced in the US and thus help us to become more fuel independent. Other fuel sources from inorganic base constituents like coal and natural gas went public and suggested a rather smooth transition away from petroleum based imported fuel stocks, a welcome solution.

I believe that PAG with its consultant and PDX have done a remarkable job at looking at the forecast issues and deserve credit for it. It does however in my opinion need some serious updating especially with the US and worldwide economic downturn which will be with us for much longer and much deeper than we like to acknowledge now and care to think about, with consequences for aviation.

Hyman Rickover before Congress in 1972 identified the continuous power output of a strong man at 35 Watts. Today in our kitchens alone we are masters of many kilowatts of power. And essentially every human activity is enabled by the use of energy in some form or other and often lots of it. This defines and enables our present living standard. When we e.g. travel in a Boeing 767-ER powered by 2 GE CF6-80 turbofan engines at 58100 lbs of thrust each equivalent to some hp rating at 375 mph our aircraft burns 100 gallons /minute at full power. And the CF6-80 engine is one of the most penurious new fuel misers. Now consider this in light of the national goal proposing a 15% CO<sup>2</sup> reduction by 2020 and 50% reduction by 2050 – this by the way is on somebody else's watch. An obvious question is how will this effect aviation fuel use, energy independence and carbon neutral fuel sources to minimize CO<sup>2</sup> generation and still keep aircraft flying as evidence seems to be mounting that global climate change will have rather dire consequences.

Thus the search is on for green aviation fuels with the greenest ones erroneously called carbon neutral. Contributing no CO<sup>2</sup> when viewed over its entire lifecycle. Hydrogen appeared to be a good candidate – with problems of being 4.5 times as bulky as jet fuel, requiring cryogenic fuel tanks with super insulation so as not to frost aircraft wings, also require continuous venting and being highly explosive, colloquially referred to as "Boomgas" in Germany. Major hydrogen production is from methane gas producing CO<sup>2</sup> as a byproduct thus not very green. Aviation fuels from plant material which when growing absorbs CO<sup>2</sup> from the air, to release it again when burned as a processed fuel and then recycled again: plant-fuel-plant-fuel-etc. Ignored however in this is the process energy to convert plant material to fuel which is typically identified as somewhere between 75% - 85% of the ultimate fuel value of the end product. Not very green. Biofuels from corn, rape, sunflower, etc. also compete with as a source of human food, driving up food prices, use up energy for processing, use of available land, water, etc. thus making them a questionable ethic fuel source. Biofuels from non-food material/crops e.g. jatropha, camelina, babassa, palm, castor bean may look good on a small scale but to till up one Boeing 747-400 with 57245 gas tank capacity is a different story making these fuel stocks highly questionable. Algae as a fuel source explored by the Boeing Co suggests that to satisfy US aviation fuel needs would require a land area of approximately 360 square miles, the size of Belgium. Another fuel process in the news is the Fischer-Tropsch producing paraffinic fuel used in WWII to supply the German military machine. Its drawback is that as a by-product it produces 7 tons of CO<sup>2</sup> for every ton of fuel. We will capture this CO<sup>2</sup> and pump it into the ground referred to as the best known sequestering methodology. Drawbacks are the significant energy requirement to first compress the CO<sup>2</sup> to liquefy it and then pump it into the ground, providing a suitable site to store it there forever. You form your own conclusions – Obviously one way out of this dilemma is to improve the fuel mileage of aircraft in addition to operational fine-tuning.

Efforts over a number of years focused on airframe and engine improvements. Reducing the mass/weight by the use of carbon fiber composites such as the 787 is a great step forward. High aspect, laminar and blended wings are being locked as improvements. Engine modifications, geared turbofan, higher bypass ratios to 35:1 from the more typical 9:1, higher compression rates to 15:1 and higher turbine temperatures, open rotor engines are all measures being explored or already in production. Regardless though one cannot circumvent laws of chemistry and physics to lift massive aircraft between 100-500 tons to 30,000 ft and a speed of 500 mph. New on the scene however is the extremely weak US and worldwide economy that now will take many more years to see all these improved aircraft come on line in significant quantity. Economic stimulus to be implemented will take a long time to work themselves through the system and they may not even be adequate. Servicing the resulting debts will be a very prolonged retardant in effect.

In a nutshell my recommendation is for a realistic review of our forecasting elements most likely resulting in scaling back our assumptions.

I would like to leave you with what you may call an admonition by H. Rickover before Congress in 1972: "to sum it up, what need to be generally understood is that nature is completely unconcerned and impervious to human demands and to assertions that we have a right to live in the style we have been accustomed since the fossil age began."

Solution: Diesel Powered Aircraft – 200 mph vs. 500 mph – would US buy in? Time is money.

## **Sustainability Context and Current PDX Efforts – Sean Loughran, Phil Ralston and Renee Dowlin**

Sean introduced Phil Ralston and Renee Dowlin from PDX Environmental Division, saying Erwin set the stage for this presentation nicely. We all agree that sustainability is important and Sean feels we dealt with it effectively in the forecast. It will clearly be part of the Master Plan and Plan District. It was an important part of mid-term process review, the PAG Process Vision and Values, and the discussion over the policy statement. It's an important part of the 10-step process.

Tonight, we will hear a presentation on an information item requested by the Sustainability Subcommittee. The presentation by Port Environmental staff will define what the Port is currently doing with regard to sustainability, what has worked well, what has not worked well, and what staff sees as some of the most promising opportunities. This presentation as well as ongoing staff work related to mapping sustainability will serve as an important foundation for our ongoing discussion of sustainability in Airport Futures.

Next, Phil Ralston began the PowerPoint presentation (handout to the PAG) with some opening remarks, saying that every day; they try to apply the principles of sustainability on the ground in the management of the airport. They try to integrate the mission throughout all business processes, such as business plans and individual goals and objectives. Phil said his division does four things:

- wildlife hazard management
- deicing collection system
- maintenance of undeveloped properties
- hazardous material storage facilities

He wants the PAG to understand there are things that airport operators directly control and budget for (purchasing electricity); things we guide (legal aspects); and things we influence (political realm). The Port is dedicated to measuring performance and being held accountable. Transparency helps drive continuous improvement. We do not have all the answers and are not perfect, but the Port and their employees are always striving to do better.

Slide 6: Port of Portland's Environmental Policy

“The Port of Portland will achieve its mission through responsible environmental stewardship and the implementation of proactive environmental programs. The Port will integrate environmental consideration into all aspects of its strategic planning and business decision making...”

It is the Port’s goal to be financially viable and responsive to community – these are some key points in the Port’s Mission and guide the work of his division. Also, the Port’s strategic plan that directs in any contract renegotiation, that sustainability must be incorporated; they try to guide their contractors on how to operationalize sustainability into their processes.

Renee Dowlin continued the presentation, elaborating on specific projects and outcomes that have been achieved in the area of sustainability at PDX. She is passionate about this topic and has had a successful career developing creative solutions to environmental problems in Oakland, and now in Portland.

Slide 9: Waste Minimization at PDX

- PDX terminal generates about nine tons of waste every day
- About two tons of the total waste is recycled
- The recycling rate has remained flat during recent years despite efforts
  
- Historically waste costs were partially offset by rebates
- Recent collapse in recyclables market severely impacted rebates
- Recycling is still more cost effective than landfilling

Slide 10: Waste Minimization at PDX - Generation

Regular waste audits are performed to understand the waste streams

Waste is generated in four main areas

- Airlines (40%)
- Concessions (20%)
- Administration (20%)
- Public Areas (20%)

Slide 11: Waste Minimization at PDX - Recyclables

PDX has a comprehensive recycling program

- Mixed paper, plastic bottles, aluminum and steel cans
- Cardboard
- Glass
- Food Waste
  
- Batteries
- Electronics
- Mixed Plastics
- Pallets
- Buckets

Slide 12: Waste Minimization at PDX – Deplaned Waste

The Port has been a national leader helping airlines establish on-board recycling programs

Delta and Horizon have been model partners in this effort.

Slide 13: Waste Minimization at PDX – Food Waste

PDX has only known airport with public area food waste collection.

They have the goal of 100% participation of all vendors. The Port works with Cedar Grove on composting the food waste.

Slide 14: Waste Minimization at PDX – Liquid Collection

Pre-security liquid collection stations

They were getting about \$30,000 in extra fees due to the weight of so many full bottles of liquid being thrown away; now they have instituted a system to dump out the liquid before recycling the bottle.

Slide 26: Air Quality Improvement Projects

- Quick Pay-Pay on foot
- Parking lot guidance system
- Cell phone waiting area
- Light Rail to Airport
- Compressed Natural Gas Parking lot shuttles
- Port maintenance fleet & Port cars - alternative fuel
- Pre-conditioned air units at loading bridges
- Construction equipment on Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel
- Employee Transportation Options (Pass Port, Bike facilities)

Slide 32: Projects/Ideas for Future

- Electrify Ground Support Equipment
- Install Pre-Conditioned Air units at all loading bridges
- Work with city to encourage/require alternative fuel taxis
- Consolidated Hotel Shuttle buses (alternative fuel)
- Electric charging stations in parking lots

Slide 36: Energy Program, Solar Projects

- Nike, Northwest Airlines and the Port of Portland joined forces last year to install solar panels on the airport's canopy.
- Currently, the panels are supplying about 75 percent of the Nike Store's needs.

Slide 39: Port Environmental Water Resource Policy

“The Port will strive to conserve and protect water resources impacted by its operations and activities. The Port will employ a watershed approach to water resource management in consideration of the linkages between clean water, human health, and a healthy environment....”

Slide 41: Monitoring of Slough

- Surface runoff carries pollutants into the storm drains
- PDX storm drains discharge directly to the Columbia Slough

Slide 42: Best Management Practices

Structural controls and practices used at PDX which are intended to prevent or reduce pollutants in storm water:

- Awareness Training
- Secondary containment
- Erosion Control
- Good Housekeeping
- Proper Chemical Storage and Disposal
- Debris control
- Storm Water Diversion
- Covering Activities
- BMP Inspection and Maintenance

Slide 43: Aviation Environmental Tenant Awards

The 2007 Tenant Environmental Excellence Award winners were Horizon Air, Delta Airlines and Sandoval's Fresh Mexican Grill.

Horizon and Delta were recognized for their recycling programs, where flight attendants collect waste onboard and then ground crews deliver the recyclables to port containers.

Sandoval's, the first PDX restaurant to offer compostable take-out containers, was singled out for its food waste diversion program.

Slide 44: Past Winners

- **Southwest Airlines** (Fuel use and CO2 emissions reduction)
- **Global Aviation** (Energy Conservation)
- **Caper's café** (Post-consumer Food Waste Diversion)
- **Lufthansa Airlines** ( Periodicals Reuse for Education Program)
- **Wendy's** (Post-consumer Food Waste Diversion)
- **Rose City café** (Post-consumer Food Waste Diversion)
- **Sheraton Hotel** (Sustainable business practices)
- **United Airlines** (Waste reduction and recycling)
- **American Airlines** (Environmental Management)
- **Centers for Airway Science** (Energy conservation)

Slide 48: Enhanced Deicing System – Key Operational Elements

- **Increase amount of BOD (biochemical oxygen demand) treated**
  - ✓ Treat about 84% of available BOD with system enhancements versus 61% with current system
- **Heat on-site treatment system with methane generated by treatment process**
- **Ensure operational flexibility**
  - ✓ Discharge to Slough consistent with permit limits, then to River
  - ✓ Increase storage to better manage severe storms

Slide 49: Natural Resource Program

**Natural Resources Program Objective:** Minimize impacts, and seek opportunities to enhance natural resources. Avoid/Minimize/ Mitigate

**PDX Land Base:**

Approximately 5,500\* acres:

- 3,300 acres at PDX
  - 1,700 acres of airfield at PDX
  - 1,600 acres of adjoining land
- 2,200 acres on Government Island

Slide 50: Natural Resources

- **Avoid Impacts: integrated project planning**
  - Baseline data [Natural Resources Inventory, Wetlands, City e-zones, Cultural Resources surveys]
  - Provide environmental constraint mapping
  - Inform project location and design when possible to avoid regulatory impacts
- **Minimize Unavoidable Impacts**
  - Smart design, cost effective
  - Minimizes mitigation needs
- **Mitigate Unavoidable Impacts**
  - Off site mitigation to avoid conflicts with Aviation safety

Slide 54: Natural Resources & Wildlife Management

- PDX Wildlife Hazard Management Plan is a risk management program based on 4 pillars:
  1. **Operational support:** daily dawn-to-dusk hazing and risk management.
  2. **Long-term habitat management:** discourage wildlife presence on the airfield and in the critical air space through habitat management.
  3. **Research & Development:** field trials of new techniques and technologies; increased knowledge of species of concern and their requirements.
  4. **Information & Education:** aviation industry, local community, stakeholders.

Slide 60: Partnerships – Some Examples

**Local:**

- Cities, Counties & State Aviation Board
- Industry Assns; small business mentoring
- Citizens Noise Advisory Committee, Wildlife Hazard Management Plan Advisory Committee, Hillsboro Airport Issues Roundtable
- Boeing & other tenants
- Friends of Trees, Adopt a School

**Regional:**

- West Coast Governors Climate Initiative

**National:**

- Transportation Research Board- Airport Cooperative Research Program
- Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Aviation Association, Airport Transport Association, Airport Council International

**International:**

- Global Reporting Initiative- Airport Sustainability Metrics
- Airports Council International World- Wildlife and Recycling
- SAE – Deicing Specifications Development- one of 2 airports worldwide

*Andy Cotugno:* question re: slide 25 on page 13. Where does the 80% figure come from regarding Aircraft emissions?

*Phil Ralston:* there is no consistent emissions inventory for airports; there is a gap since we do not calculate the whole flight.

*Andy Cotugno:* I am just trying to understand what is in the number.

*Phil Ralston:* fuel use up to 3000 ft, departing and arriving flights; to be transparent, it is a poor surrogate for what aircraft actually emit throughout the whole flight.

*Alesia Reese:* do you have any provisions in your leases to encourage sustainable practices.

*Stan Jones (PDX Environmental Compliance):* yes, to a certain extent we do. Some leases are thirty years long, and when we have one come up, we definitely address these issues.

*Phil Ralston:* Starbucks is a great example. HMS Host owns the Starbucks in airports. Starbucks used to use local bakeries now, the majority of them use two bakeries for the whole country. The Port held them to their publicized commitment to sustainability and use of local products, and they flipped and continue to use a local bakery in Vancouver.

*Phil Ralston:* please feel free to call him or Renee with questions.

Phil Ralston, Aviation Environmental & Safety Manager  
503-460-4331  
Philip.ralston@portofportland.com

Renee Dowlin, Aviation Environmental Planning Program Manager  
503-460-4566  
Renee.dowlin@portofportland.com

## **Questions/Discussion – All**

*Sam Imperati:* please direct questions to what is being done now or improvements, but not the broader policy level issues, which will come later in the process.

*Erwin Bergman:* the use of land; his recommendation is that some of the land outside airport that it would be allowed for community gardens. He has presented this proposal to Commissioner Nick Fish and he was in support of it.

*John Weigant:* have you displayed any of this before the public so they know what you are doing?

*Phil Ralston:* a bit.

*Renee Dowlin:* Rachel Wray has worked on the internet site; it is a great idea to let the public know about what the airport is doing in this area.

*Sam Imperati:* please take a look at the documents after the PowerPoint in your handouts. It will be helpful for you all to take a look at 2007-08 Environmental Objectives and Targets. For future discussion, those will be a good starting point for our sustainability discussion.

## **Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy – Hector Roche**

Hector gave a brief Public Involvement Subcommittee Report, a quick overview with emphasis on PAG's participation in these meetings. As always, he reminds the PAG to get us on your various agendas with your groups. Provided handout summarizing key points.

*Sam Imperati:* reminder to the PAG that we need business members to please join the OPIS.

## **Next Meeting Agenda, Process Review and Other Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation Form and Adjournment – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati**

Next meeting: Tues., March 17 (St. Patrick's Day – apologies to Sean Loughran and Melissa Egan for this). The agenda includes:

- 90 Percentile Forecast Centralized Terminal Viability Assessment – C.F. Booth
- Work session to get PAG input on the Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy

Evaluations were distributed and filled out.

Meeting adjourned.



## **8. Comments and Suggestions for Items 1 – 7, Above:**

A lot of info to process

Extremely long presentations are excessive

Fewer speakers, more discussion/questions

Good meeting – as always, so much to talk about!

Maps were hard to read – both overhead and in print

More discussion, time for questions, clarifications on all the technicalities

Re: 3 (balance), ok to do just info sometimes

Re: 4 (presentations), especially sustainability

Re: 7 (discussion), very staff dominated meeting; by filling agenda with presentations, staff is discouraging PAG input on topics.

There was not much time for questions/discussion – felt rushed

Too much presentation/not enough discussion

## **9. Least Useful:**

Dog & Pony shows were good, but almost no deep PAG consideration was invited.

Erwin's presentation X 3

Listening to people present materials we could read ahead of time and use our time to ask questions

Not sure why the City of Portland's land use discussion framework was discussed tonight.

PDX sustainability presentation spent too long on policy framework & rushed through substance

## **10. Most Useful:**

Airport presentation

Having a facilitator

Overview of Land Use Plan District guidelines

Pace allowed all agenda items to be covered

Really appreciate the background on current sustainability efforts

The sustainability presentation

Tools used by PDX on Environmental "BAT"

## **11. Questions:**

Why do we let individuals pontificate?