

Planning Advisory Group Meeting #15
Tuesday, May 19, 2009 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Port of Portland, Commission Room, 121 NW Everett, Portland, OR

DRAFT NOTES

Announcements, Approval of Meeting Notes, Public Involvement Update, and Agenda Review – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati

Bill welcomed everyone to the meeting. He drew everyone's attention to the slide projected on the screen showing upcoming events for Airport Futures continuing public outreach, as well as to a flyer for the two public meetings on June 4 and 10. Additional flyers are available from Melissa McCluney to share with stakeholders.

In addition, PAG members were given an article from the May 14, 2009 issue of the *Portland Tribune* on the new Port PDX office building, highlighting its green features.

On a related note, there is a postcard on the City and County Sustainability Commission's Climate Change document. They are looking for comments on this draft document. Please see the postcard passed out by Jay for dates and locations of the meetings.

Upcoming Sustainability SIM, June 1, on the Climate Action Plan. Susan Anderson, the new director of the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, will be on hand to discuss this initiative at length. It is a great opportunity to learn more and PAG members were encouraged to attend. The second part of the meeting will be a regular Sustainability Subcommittee meeting.

Lastly, Stuart Mathew, Ton Gerharter, Alan Hargrave, John Mohlis, Dennis Mulvihill, and Erwin Bergman were unable to attend tonight.

Approval of Meeting Notes – Bill Blosser

Bill asked if there any changes to the April 21 draft meeting notes. There was none. The notes were approved as written.

Agenda Review – Sam Imperati

This meeting will focus on the review and conditional approval of three draft products for review and comment at the June 4 and 10 public meetings. These products include:

- 1) Master Plan concept drawings at the 50% level of completion,
- 2) Draft outline of the City Land Use Plan, and
- 3) Draft framework for an ongoing public involvement committee for future input into airport planning and development.

We will also hear from Alan Snook on his preliminary findings about airport growth impacts to study area intersections in and around the study area, and review the refined Sustainability Guiding Principles.

One Agenda change: Jay Sugnet will do the Land Use Plan Outline first to set the context for the transportation intersection analysis and OPIS agenda items, which follow.

Due to schedule challenges with the noise contours and transportation impact work, discussion of the policy questions will occur at the June and July PAG meetings.

Members	Affiliation	Present
Erwin Bergman	Central NE Neighborhoods	
Bill Blosser	Chair	√
Mark Clark	E. County	
Andy Cotugno	Metro	√
Bruce Fisher	FAA	√
John Frevola	Flightcraft	√
Tom Gerharter	Horizon Airlines	
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 Alternate Willy Williamson in attendance	√
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	√
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)	√

Misti Johnson	Port Legal	√
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.	√
Alan Snook	Consultant on Transportation	√
Deborah Stein	Planning and Sustainability Bureau	
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√

Public Present: Steve Burdick, Duane Decker, and Lee Perlman

Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee Report – Fred Stovel

The Subcommittee met on May 6 and reviewed the following:

- Noise modeling scenarios – under what conditions will noise be modeled; the Subcommittee will ideally bring the results of that to the PAG by July
- Natural Resources Inventory, which describes habitats and provided information on programs, but does not make suggestions or recommendations
- Transportation modeling update – this will not be presented tonight because we are not quite at the stage we need to be for presentation
- Jay's Land Use Plan outline and Draft Plan District – he has created a 15 page draft memo
- Finalized list of "Planning and Development" projects for insertion into the OPIS Scope / Purview.

Tonight Jay will outline the draft Land Use Plan and then Alan will provide an update on what has been done thus far on the Transportation Intersection Analysis.

Land Use Plan Outline – Jay Sugnet, Scott King, and Alan Snook

Jay will provide an overview on the Land Use Plan, major policy questions, and the next steps. Although we are making significant progress, the major policy questions are not ready to be addressed. The presentation tonight is largely informational, but staff wants to know if the PAG approves bringing these to the public.

The noise and transportation modeling must be completed to properly inform the discussion, and this work will not be complete until June/July.

This information along with the existing economic development inventory, transportation, and natural resource inventory will help inform both the City's Land Use Plan and Port's Master Plan, as they progress through to September.

One reason we want to publically present the Natural Resources Inventory is for the property owners. It is a good opportunity for them to come, review what we are doing, and give their input and feedback.

Slide 4: Land Use Plan Outline

A. Project Process and Overview

Project Summary ■ Existing Conditions Summary ■ Relationship to Port Master Plan ■ Public Policy Framework

B. Special Features of the Plan

Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy ■ Airport Urban Design Concept ■ Natural Resource Program Update ■ Economic Development Inventory ■ Transportation Impact Analysis ■ Noise

- C. **Sustainability**
Vision & Values ■ Guiding Principles ■ Goals ■ City Actions
- D. **Comprehensive Plan Amendments**
- E. **Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendments**
Environmental Overlays ('c' and 'p') ■ Height ('h') Overlay ■ Noise ('x') Overlay
- F. **City Title 33 Zoning Code Amendments and Commentary**
Plan District ■ Height ('h') Overlay ■ Noise ('x') Overlay
- G. **Appendices**
Ordinance ■ Intergovernmental Agreement ■ Natural Resources Inventory

Slide 5: Plan District Draft Outline

- I. **General**
 - A. Purpose
 - B. Where These Regulations Apply
 - C. Relationship to Other Regulations
- II. **Use Regulations**
 - A. Purpose
 - B. Additional Allowed, Prohibited, and Conditional Uses
- III. **Development Standards**
 - A. Purpose
 - B. Landscaping
- IV. **Environmental Zones**
 - A. Purpose
- V. **Parking**
- VI. **Ongoing Public Involvement Committee Contact Requirement**
- VII. **Archaeological Resource Protection**
- VIII. **Maps**
 - A. Airport Plan District Boundary and possible Subdistricts

Slide 6: Major Land Use Policy Questions (10-step process)

- What are the Plan District boundaries?
- What is the appropriate building envelope?
- What are the review procedures, mitigation requirements, and possible approval criteria for airport projects?
- How does the City address necessary amendments?
- What landscape standards are needed?
- Should the City expand the height overlay to include a potential 3rd parallel runway?
- Should the City expand the noise overlay to include a potential 3rd parallel runway?

Slide 7: Next Steps

June - September	Plan District draft Final Transportation Impact Analysis Noise Analysis Environmental, Height and Noise Overlay Recommendations Mitigation/Enhancement
------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Transportation Intersection Analysis – Scott King and Alan Snook

Scott reminded the PAG that we discussed the initial results last time. Tonight, we will address some of the assumptions and methodology used to conduct a traffic analysis at the intersection level. Alan Snook, with DKS Associates, will provide an overview of preliminary findings about potential impacts to study area intersections from the 2035 50th percentile forecast. As noted, the final transportation impact analysis will be available at the June PAG meeting.

Alan Snook then went over his PowerPoint, Transportation Impact Analysis: Assumptions and Initial Future Results. He said the goal is to determine if significant land use or zoning changes would worsen the intersection performance in the study area in the future. The current information based on trip analysis is that the proposed zoning would have less of an impact than if the land was left for industrial development.

Slide 2: Applicable Policies

- Transportation Planning Rule
 - ✓ What is it?
 - ✓ “Significant Effect”
- City of Portland
 - ✓ Goal 6
 - ✓ Goal 11
- Oregon Department of Transportation
 - ✓ Oregon Highway Plan (OHP)
 - ✓ Ramps vs. Roads

Slide 3: Land Uses

Sub-Area	CUMP (2003) Approved Land Use Maximums/Assumptions	AF 2035 Proposed Additional Land Use Maximums/Assumptions
PDX Terminal	18.6 million annual passengers 300,000 sq. ft. office space	26.8 million annual passengers
AirTrans Center	151,500 sq. ft. air cargo	+ 175,000 sq. ft. air cargo
Alderwood Area	26,500 sq. ft. light industrial 9,500 sq. ft. maintenance	-
North Frontage Road	103,000 sq. ft. business aviation 264,000 sq. ft. office/hotel 140,000 sq. ft. airside/air support	+ 15,000 sq. ft. commercial
Southwest Quadrant	103,000 sq. ft. business aviation 981,000 sq. ft. cargo facilities	-
Military/National Guard	-	-
South Airport Way	-	Compressed Natural Gas fueling facility
Northwest Quadrant	-	New general aviation

Slide 5: Trip Generation

Sub Area	2013 Forecasted Trips (CUMP)	2035 Forecasted Trips (Airport Futures)
PDX Terminal	4,320	6,480
AirTrans Center	820	1,070
Alderwood Area	170	170
North Frontage Road	720	980
Southwest Quadrant	1,390	1,390
South Airport Way	-	190
Military/National Guard	360	360
Northwest Quadrant	-	220
Airport Subtotal	7,780	10,860

PAG Questions and Discussion

Maryhelen Kincaid: question on the NW quadrant and General Aviation? What is that in reference to?

Scott King: from facilities point of view, it is part of what they need to do for analysis; it is just a matter of putting something there in the model to see its impact.

Maryhelen Kincaid: will there be noise modeling?

Chris Corich: yes.

Maryhelen Kincaid: is this going to be a building similar to Fed Ex or a place where they will put planes?

Chris Corich: could be similar to another Flightcraft.

Sam Imperati: important to remember this is a hypothetical.

Bill Blosser: when this came up during the Land Use Subcommittee, we all jumped in with the same questions. The FAA wants master plans to show a competitor, to show there is room for a competitor. We said go ahead and show it.

Bruce Fisher: agrees, that is his understanding of the FAA guidelines around master plans.

Denny Stoecklin: question about Transportation Planning Rule's (TPR) definition of "significant effect." To clarify, if you just let the area develop as it is today, it would generate many more trips (26,000), but with the proposed plan as an airport, it is 10,000 trips.

Alan Snook: yes. The proposed zoning would have less of an impact than if the land was left for industrial development.

Sam Imperati: what is the interplay between the increase in Million Annual Passengers (MAP) and your projections?

Alan Snook: by 2035, 27,800 trips, under proposed zoning, only 10,900 trips – about 2/3 less trips. Based on these numbers, that is why we determined it to be not a “significant effect.”

John Weigant: if it develops as industrial zone, that would be in conflict with airport use.

Scott King: this is the standard way the TPR is applied. Your point is, is it reasonable to expect the airport goes away? No. However, if you look at it that way, the reasonable worst case under the existing zoning is continued growth of PDX under the Conditional Use Master Plan (CUMP) process. The reasonable worst case under the current proposal is continued growth of PDX. Therefore, Airport Futures does not make things any worse. They are equal.

Alesia Reese: have we looked at a more regional approach to transportation?

Alan Snook: we are not taking a regional perspective in this study. For example, we are not looking at what if things are moved to Hillsboro.

Scott King: however, there is an assumption for industrial growth in the region, which is incorporated in the model.

Alesia Reese: going back to Brian Nelson’s question from last month, how are we going to mitigate their travel in 2035?

Scott King: regional freight issues are being addressed at the regional level, but not with Airport Futures.

Alesia Reese: is there anything this group can do to bring this issue into more focus on a regional level?

Andy Cotugno: Metro has a plan for regional transportation projects; our ability to fund it is about half. Thus, it is not going to get better, it is going to get worse.

Sam Imperati: if PAG, as a part of its overall recommendations, wants to make recommendations on this issue to the region, that is acceptable. However, we will not be studying that as part of the Airport Futures process.

Bill Blosser: Does using the PM Peak make sense for an airport, when your peak is a.m.?

Alan Snook: for every hour we count how many vehicle trips are on the roadway; what you find is that the peak is a typical commuter peak. One caveat is that the road that goes directly to the terminal has a mid-day peak (the peak of the peak).

Andy Cotugno: current zoning is not your conditional use permit; it is your airport permitted level of development. What is the change from 2013 CUMP to 2035? You have a lot more happening, and I would suggest, that when you are doing that plan, to include that conclusion as part of your analysis. Include it as one way to look at the TPR.

Scott King: we have discussed that with Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Portland Department of Transportation (PDOT).

Brian Nelson: question re: 10,860 trips. What is assumed about industrial development?

Alan Snook: other growth is assumed, including retail, industrial, and commercial, and how all are related to airport uses.

Hector Roche: in terms of what Andy just stated, does using the baseline practically affect the “significant effect” analysis.

Scott King: if there is no significant effect, you do not have to deal with those elements to bring it back to “insignificant,” meaning to correct it back to a “no-build” situation. If we had to do both, we are not sure how it would work out.

Sam Imperati: if you did the analysis based on what Andy hypothesized, would you have more red dots?

Scott King: no.

Sam Imperati: different intersections with red dots?

Scott King: no.

Sam Imperati: so, in either case, you will still go to mitigation or a fix, either way.

Sam Imperati: moving on to our Action Item, looking at the economic development inventory materials, and appreciating that the subcommittee has looked at natural resources:

- Does the PAG conditionally approve the three DRAFT Land Use Plan background studies (economic development inventory, transportation analysis, and natural resource inventory) for review and discussion at June 4 and 10 Public Meetings?

All PAG members present voted 1, with two exceptions noted below.

John Weigant: voted 2. He has a concern about the economic development inventory and thinks there is language in it that is quite biased toward growth. For example, “underutilized land.” He wonders why agricultural land is considered underutilized.

Vicki Thompson: voted 3. She has too many years of transportation experience, and does not have enough information to support it.

Draft Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy Framework – Lise Glancy and Hector Roche

Lise thanked the Public Involvement Subcommittee members, especially Hector, the Chair, and Sam for coming to facilitate the April 29 Public Involvement Subcommittee’s meeting. Tonight, she will provide an overview on the Subcommittee’s consensus recommendation on the draft Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS) framework and discuss next steps.

Slide 6: Background

- Consensus recommendation from April 29 Subcommittee
 - 16 elements of OPIS framework
 - Extended discussion on a number of items
- Iterative process
- Product of:
 - Research of other ongoing committees, both nationally and regionally
 - Guidance from public involvement experts
 - Six months of subcommittee discussion (& homework)
 - PAG’s feedback at the March 17 meeting

Slide 7: Overview of Draft OPIS Framework: Consensus Recommendation

- Ongoing public advisory committee to follow Airport Futures Planning Advisory Group to:
 - Raise public knowledge about airport issues
 - Support meaningful public engagement
 - Provide opportunity to inform Port and City decision-making
- Sponsored by Port of Portland and City of Portland
 - Value/interest of additional Sponsors to be explored during summer
- 30 member body
 - Bi-state, regional, diverse interests

Slide 8, 9, and 10: Ongoing Public Involvement Committee: Draft Recommendation

- Broad scope/purview
 - Planning and development projects within Plan District/Master Plan
 - Sustainability efforts (economic, environmental, and social),
 - Other City-Port agreements
 - Community engagement on other issues that affect the community
- Chairs selected first year by sponsors
 - Membership selects thereafter
- Staffing by Port and City
 - Recognition limited administrative staffing
 - Facilitator for first year if budget allows
- Meeting frequency determined by annual work plan
 - Est. 4-8 meetings/year
- Annual Report/Evaluation to Sponsors
 - Other reports as needed
 - Staff assistance on annual reports
- Collaboration with City/Port ongoing committees
 - Citizen Noise Advisory Committee (CNAC), Wildlife, Sustainability, etc.
 - Representative from CNAC to have seat in recognition of crossover issues
 - Annual evaluation of relationships
- Forum for input from other Port project committees
- Involvement in design of future master plan committees
- 30 Members – bi-state, regional, diverse representation
 - 20 Voting Members
 - 10 Ex Officio Members
- 2-3 year staggered terms
 - 2 year terms after first term
- Appointments by Jurisdictions/Interests
- Confirmation by Sponsors
- Member commitment to two-way regular communication with appointing organizations

Slide 11: Ongoing Public Involvement Committee: 20 Voting Members

- 4 Portland neighborhood coalitions (East Portland Neighborhood Office, Central Northeast Neighbors, North Portland Neighborhood Services, and Northeast Coalition of Neighbors)
- 1 Citywide Land Use Committee representative
- 1 East Multnomah County neighborhood rep (City of Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale, and Wood Village)
- 1 Vancouver neighborhood
- 1 Clark County neighborhood representative (Camas/Washougal area)

- 1 Multi-modal transportation representative
- 1 Airport Noise interest (PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee)
- 1 Environment/Wildlife/Natural Resources
- 1 Environmental Justice (communities of color, low income)
- 1 Multnomah County/Portland Sustainability Commission
- 1 Columbia Slough Watershed Council
- 1 Business organization (Columbia Corridor Association, Portland Business Alliance, Westside Economic Alliance, Travel Oregon, large cargo or passenger business user)
- 1 Passenger airline
- 1 Cargo airline
- 1 General Aviation
- 1 Military
- 1 Airport employee (represented or unrepresented labor)

Slide 12: Ongoing Public Involvement Committee: 10 Ex Officio Members

- 1 Port Aviation Director
- 1 Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Director (or designee)
- 1 Metro staff
- 1 City of Vancouver staff
- 4 county staff (Clackamas, Clark, Multnomah, and Washington)
- 1 Federal Aviation Administration
- 1 Port Wildlife Committee member (e.g. environmental interest)

Slide 13: Technical Advisory Pool

- Available to the OPIS on an as needed basis as issues arise
- Includes:
 - Agencies, organizations, or individuals with specialized expertise related to the regulatory and operating responsibilities of airports as well as land use, environmental, sustainability, and livability issues

Slide 16: Next Steps

June 4 & 10	Review and comments from public on draft OPIS recommendation
June 16	PAG Meeting #16 – review of OPIS stakeholder/public comments and direction to subcommittee
June 24	Public Involvement Subcommittee - refinement of draft OPIS and direction to staff
Summer	Staff works on work plan, charter, and intergovernmental agreement
Sept. 15	PAG Meeting #18 – review of final OPIS recommendation

PAG Questions and Discussion

Lawrence Russell: has been on subcommittees before, and has felt like everything is usually just handed to the committee, presented as a finished product. He feels that we are really trying to have the

public involved and that the public's voice is truly listened to. He is very impressed with and excited about this process.

Alesia Reese: has never seen such effort on outreach in her life – and she is on many groups.

Fred Stovel: thinks everyone was comfortable with this recommendation, also feels the way OPIS has been designed has flexibility to move in one direction or another

Andy Cotugno: has a concern about OPIS' relationship to other standing committees. He thinks there ought to be more definition on how the overlap will be handled. What is the line between these groups, and how do they work together. It may be a good thing for the committee to define it, but that we can develop the questions they may want to consider.

Hector Roche: that is exactly how we see it and have discussed going forward on the subcommittee. The details of how they work together still need to be sorted out.

Alesia Reese: it is a unique opportunity to recognize these other groups, but we thought it was very important to recognize these standing groups exist.

Lise Glancy: there will be a charter for this group, like the other groups (CNAC, Noise, etc.). With respect to the relationship pieces, we do expect that as part of the annual evaluation, we will be able to refine how this group is operating. The charter and agreements may be very skeletal at first. Every year we will have an evaluation and refine our processes as needed.

John Weigant: staff did an outstanding job of listening, evaluating, and integrating information!

Bill Blosser: wants to especially recognize Hector's leadership; it was outstanding. He thanks Hector's employer for letting him spend so much time on this very important project.

Next, Sam asked the PAG for their vote on conditional approval to forward this draft to the public for review and comment at the June 4 & 10 public meetings.

- Does the PAG give conditional approval of the Public Involvement Subcommittee's consensus recommendation on a draft OPIS framework for review and comment at the June public meetings?
- Does the PAG agree that the staff/subcommittee work should proceed to 75% level of completion?

All PAG members present voted 1, with one exception noted below.

Andy Cotugno: voted 2. There are appropriate minor corrections to this draft that would make it even better before it goes out to the public as noted by his above comments.

Break

Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee – Cam Gilmour

On April 30, the Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee met on to review the emerging Master Plan concepts at the 50% level of completion. The focus of the meeting was alternative concepts for meeting facility requirements consistent with the 50th percentile activity forecast, including for parking, rental cars, and curbside. The subcommittee reviewed the facility requirements and alternative concepts at a

considerable level of detail and participated in an exercise aimed at identifying preferences. The results of the exercise indicated that subcommittee preferences and staff/consultant recommendations were generally consistent. It was a thorough process, and the subcommittee felt we had sufficient information to bring back to the PAG. The 10 guiding principles took quite a lot of thinking – not just wordsmithing. Several committee members made significant and meaningful contributions.

The general recommendation of the subcommittee and coordinating committee was to present a higher-level summary to PAG, identifying the most promising concepts, and clarify how sustainability was incorporated into the facility planning criteria used by the staff/consultant team.

Overview/Facility Planning Criteria/Airport Facility Concepts – Sean Loughran and CF Booth

CF Booth will provide an overview of the facility planning criteria used to development the preliminary airport facility concepts. He will summarize conclusions since the 25% analysis and will focus his remarks on planning concepts that are emerging. He presented a PowerPoint titled “Overview of Master Plan at 50% Level of Completion: Informational with Conditional PAG Action.”

Slide 2: Today’s Discussion: Focus is on emerging concepts for seven functional areas

- Terminal
- Parking
- Rental Car
- Curbside
- Remain overnight aircraft parking
- Cargo
- General aviation

Slide 3: Today’s Discussion (continued): Concepts are based on 50th percentile activity forecasts, centralized development and planning criteria reflecting PAG vision and values

- **Planning criteria**
 - Preserve future development options
 - Minimize environmental impacts
 - Use land resources efficiently
 - Maximize operational efficiency
 - Ensure development can be effectively phased
 - Comply with FAA airport design criteria
- **PAG action**
 - Does the PAG give conditional approval of the 50% master plan concept drawings for review and comment at the June public meetings?
 - Does the PAG agree that the staff/consultant team should proceed to the 75% level of plan completion based on proposed planning criteria?

Slide 4 - 6: Terminal – Concepts Beyond 2035

Concept 4 – supplemental terminal east with parallel concourses; rejected
Concept 3 – replacement terminal east; rejected
Concept 2 – terminal expansion central; rejected

Slide 7: Terminal – Concepts Beyond 2035

Concept 1 – terminal expansion east (TEE); the preferred concept

CF remarked that when developing and analyzing these concepts, the team asked not was it the best, but rather would it work? They felt the TEE concept was the best, but they had to assure themselves that it was through an analytical process. Concepts were rejected for a number of reasons, such as cost, inefficiency, environmentally insensitive, or unable to phase effectively. The process confirmed that TEE is the most promising concept for future terminal development.

Slide 8: Terminal – Planning Period Concepts: Concepts for maintaining terminal effectiveness will evolve following the master plan based on six key opportunities

- Technology and ticketing/check in procedures
- Ticketing lobby space currently occupied by x-ray equipment
- Underutilized office space behind the ticket counter
- Passenger security screening equipment and procedures
- Concessions
- Soon to be vacated Port office space

Slide 10: Parking - Planning Period Concepts: Emerging concept is structured parking located at P3 and P4 sites

Veronica Rinard: re: Slide 10, are these considering existing conditions?

CF Booth: yes. We are trying to project the right amount of land, for the right amount of service, given the projected level of activity.

Slide 13: Rental Cars - Planning Period Concepts: Five Concepts were considered

CF gave a brief description of each of the five concepts, noting some of the positive and negative aspects of each.

Concept 1 & 2 - excellent way finding

Trade off – better service for rental cars than for locals who need to park

Concept 3 – access will not be quite as good, way finding ok

Trade off – it is “beachfront” property for the airport, as it grows larger, it could spill over into cargo area. Highly valuable property, must be very cautious and considerate about how it is used

Concept 4 – excellent way finding

Trade off – do not have ability to link with MAX light rail

Concept 5 – manageable way finding, not the easiest

As a planning team, we have no emerging concept. He has a personal opinions about which are the best options, but for now, they have agreed to leave rental cars as is for as long as possible.

Chris Hathaway: would folks buy a ticket for MAX?

CF Booth: no, his assumption is they would not. It would likely be a separate line, with frequent service.

Vicki Thompson: will it be connected to other lines? She does not want to see decreased service elsewhere on the system.

CF Booth: we have not talked to TriMet, but the idea would be to serve the airport grounds and not negatively impact any other MAX lines.

Vicki Thompson: so, a MAX line within the airport?

CF Booth: yes, exactly.

Alesia Reese: wonders what the rental car companies think?

CF Booth: they will say that “way finding” is important and that being as close as possible to the terminal is important. Are there some innovations out there to increase efficiencies coming from the rental car companies? He honestly does not think so. It is up to us.

Vicki Thompson: refers to Sacramento and their set up, it is very easy, quick, and accessible.

CF Booth: shuttle buses are very common, but thinking in sustainable terms, it is less sustainable to have all those buses on the roadway. Also thinks a MAX line would be cheaper, but does not have the numbers to back it up.

Mary Olson: also familiar with Sacramento, they have a service station, which would be very convenient for PDX to have.

Bill Blosser: we got rid of it. The rental car companies could make more money on gas without it.

Chris Corich: it was a contentious issue.

Sean Loughran: with light rail and everything else, the gas station did not fit in that concept.

Sean Loughran: when we do our surveys at the airport, people love how close the rental facilities are. Rental cars near the terminal provide the highest level of service.

Veronica Rinard: she hears that same feedback at Travel Portland, too.

Slides 15, 16, 18: Curbside – Planning Period Concepts: Emerging concept is to increase efficiency of existing facilities in two steps

Step 1 – reconfigure existing commercial vehicle area

Step 2 – create new curbside on level 3 of P1 parking garage

Slide 20: Remain Overnight Aircraft Parking - Planning Period Concepts: Emerging concept – minimize construction by fully utilizing existing areas

Slide 21 and 24: Cargo - Planning Period Concepts

- The requirements for belly-cargo and all-cargo are different
- Emerging concept – better utilize belly-cargo areas; delay development of SW Quad by completing AirTrans Center development

Slide 25: General Aviation - Planning Period Concepts: Emerging concept – delay relocation with effective interim land use

Sam opened the floor for questions and comments.

Vicki Thompson: potential parking structure just west of 82nd? Would there be a height restriction?

CF Booth: insightful question. Part 77 guides this, as well as other regulations. This location is bounded on all sides, so we have this in mind. So, yes, there would be a height restriction.

Laura Hudson: what would change in the market to make PDX capture 100% of the rental car market?

CF Booth: two companies have their cars off site, but if there space were available, they would prefer to be on site.

Sean Loughran: the issue today is that there is not enough space for 100%. We have 80% today, creating competition among the companies. If all companies could have parking on site, they would. Competition is good because it helps us further our sustainability goals.

Andy Cotugno: cannot tell how much of this concourse expansion is needed, and when it will be needed. Concourse A looks like it conflicts with your rental car scenarios.

CF Booth: good observation, it does. For now, we are going to make due with 67 aircraft gates. Those gates today are not used as much as they could be. In 2035, we will boost the productivity by two turns a day. We just want to make sure we do not make a plan that precludes the possibility for any necessary future building.

Andy Cotugno: so you are comfortable with current structures?

CF Booth: yes. Unless we went with Concept 1 or 2. Then, we would have to find a way to provide service without conflicting with Concourse A.

Alesia Reese: is a little confused. These slides are great as they stand alone, but confused about how they work together.

CF Booth: we believe we only have so many places on the airport to build parking structures.

Alesia Reese: let me interrupt you, you are making policy decisions to prioritize parking rather than MAX or other transit, putting your eggs in the parking basket, so to speak.

CF Booth: he is here to help the Port identify physical alternatives, not make the policy decisions.

Alesia Reese: do you have a way to work with these all together?

CF Booth: yes, we do. The easy way to think about it is there will be a garage in P3 and P4 locations. If you agree that is what is going to happen with public parking, then you look at what to do with rental cars.

Chris Corich: will the 75% address this?

CF Booth: we want to make as many decisions as we can with the current data and modeling scenarios, but there will have to be a lot of further study. They will be able to provide a list of recommended follow-on studies.

Sam Imperati: when will you be able to “mush” options together, using the highly technical term, and present them to PAG?

CF Booth: the mushing begins tomorrow. We will work as fast as we can, to bring back as many consolidated recommendations to this groups.

John Frevola: question concerning 2035, terminal expansion east as the top emerging concept.

CF Booth: this would be beyond 2035 when TEE is needed.

Dave Smith: does not see many bottlenecks yet, but when we get to 75%, that is when we will have to make the decisions.

Sam asked the PAG the following questions:

- Does the PAG give conditional approval of the 50% master plan concept drawings for review and comment at the June public meetings?
- Does the PAG agree that the staff/consultant team should proceed to the 75% level of plan completion based on proposed planning criteria?

All PAG members present voted 1.

Public Comment – Sam Imperati

None.

Sustainability Guiding Principles – Sean Loughran

Sean will review the Sustainability Guiding Principles included in the PAG packet, highlighting the additional changes based on comments from Cam, Erwin, and John. Sean noted that in each of our presentations tonight, the PAG heard about sustainability. We are dealing with it in every part of this Master Plan.

Sean referred the PAG to Attachment 5, the draft Sustainability Guiding Principles. He went over the hand out and what was covered during the last meeting, with the pyramid, how it corresponds to PAG Vision and Values, and the on-going adaptive management component. What follows is the most current draft of the document.

May 15, 2009 DRAFT

1. **Generational Fairness and the Triple Bottom Line:** Sustainability is not a choice because our resources are finite. The essence of sustainability is to find a balance between the economic, environmental, and social needs of current and future generations. As we shift our emphasis from quantity to quality growth, we need to ensure the resources we consume and the pollution we generate are understood, considered, and balanced with future quality of life needs when making community planning, development, and governance decisions.
2. **Community:** Engage and involve our entire community and encourage our citizens to take responsibility for their individual actions to reduce resource use, production of pollution and waste. This requires collaboratively developing solutions that remove barriers and build upon existing private and public efforts to ensure efficient, timely, and complementary results.

3. **Measure Progress:** Establish and track clear, measurable goals, both short and long term, that are linked to those of our governmental partners, do not default to regulatory minimums, and take responsibility for our proportional share of the problems and solutions without regulatory prompting.
4. **Stay Ahead of the Curve:** Supplement traditional regulatory approaches by taking voluntary actions with incentive-based and performance-oriented systems.
5. **Balance:** Explore alternative strategies to achieve objectives when current goals cannot be reconciled with future needs. Decisions should be made in consideration of their individual and cumulative economic, environmental, and social impacts, and whether they substantially benefit or harm the health of the region for future generations.
6. **Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle:** Use resources (e.g. fossil fuel-derived energy) efficiently and reduce demand, rather than first looking to expand capacity. Commit to the maximum the use of existing facilities. Consider alternative methods of managing demand, including the application of emerging technologies, before building new facilities. Prefer options that reduce pollution and waste.
7. **Continuous Learning and Education:** Emphasize on-going learning and adaptive management to inform and improve the process continually, consider future generations, and educate the public about goals and what was learned.
8. **Equity:** Ensure commitment to equity so impacts and the costs of protecting our resources do not burden unfairly any one geographic, socioeconomic, or generational group, particularly those that are disadvantaged.
9. **Leadership Now:** Accelerate, support, and implement innovative programs, projects, and initiatives to maintain and increase our collective leadership in sustainability.
10. **Accountability:** Using a project management approach, report annually on our results, lessons learned, plan adjustments, and future endeavors to our stakeholders, including OPIS, at least annually.

Sam opened the floor for questions and comments.

Maryhelen Kincaid: “we” and “our,” is that referring to OPIS (ongoing PDX advisory committee) or who?

Sean Loughran: we the Port, we the City, we the larger community. It means it will take everyone’s participation to implement.

Sam Imperati: this is a PAG recommendation to the City and the Port. The preamble indicates “The Port and the City.” Almost universally, “we” refers to the Port and City. However, you read it correctly; it is also intended to be a broader community effort.

Maryhelen Kincaid: if it is part of OPIS, they have the authority to hold the Port and City accountable, but obviously not the larger community. If these are going to guide OPIS then it is really far reaching.

Bill Blosser: you make a wonderful point, and we could change some of the “ours’ and “we.” and we will work on that.

Alesia Reese: in my homework, I think I took all the “we” and “our” references out, the way it stands now; you have lost who the author is. I was concerned that it was very far reaching, and who was going to take the “we” and “our” responsibility?

John Weigant: “we” is broad, and it should be, and as he reads it, it even included future generations as part of the “we.”

Sam took a vote on the following question:

- Does the PAG conditionally approve these draft concepts for review and discussion at June 4 and 10 Public Meetings?

All PAG members present voted 1, with two exceptions noted below.

Maryhelen Kincaid: voted 2. When “we” and “our” are more clearly defined, she is fine with it.

Vicki Thompson: voted 2, agrees with Maryhelen.

Hector Roche: thinks its ok for the community to weight in on who “we” is and that the document could be left as is until after the public meeting.

Sam Imperati: the 2 votes do not mean we have to do a new draft; it is feedback we will consider.

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

Bill announced that our next meeting would be held at the Native American Youth and Family Services Center (NAYA) on 5300 NE Columbia Boulevard on June 16th (Note: July 14 PAG meeting will be held at NAYA, The June 16 PAG meeting will be held at the Port of Portland offices downtown). Folks are encouraged to arrive early for a tour of the facility by Executive Director, Nichole Mayer. Thanks to Lai-Lani Ovalles for offering this facility for our next PAG meeting.

The focus of the meeting will be:

- 1) Debrief from the June public meetings, Planning Commission and Port Commission information briefings.
- 2) On the land use side, we will review noise contours, natural resource inventory, and final transportation impacts.
- 3) Begin considering policy questions and mitigation strategies.
- 4) Review proposed sustainability goals.

Sam asked folks to fill out their meeting evaluation, and if scores of poor or fair are marked, to please provide specifics to help us improve meeting process.

Meeting adjourned.

10. Most Useful:

#5 – Comprehensions of presentations – good flow
All were good
Excellent presentations!
Materials seemed easier to follow than the past
Presentations showed great detail

11. Questions: (None)