

Planning Advisory Group Meeting #17

Tuesday, July 14, 2009

5:30 pm – 8:30 pm

Native American Youth and Family Center (NAYA), 5135 NE Columbia Blvd, Portland, OR 97218

DRAFT NOTES

Announcements, NAYA Welcome, Approval of Meeting Notes, Public Outreach, and Agenda Review – Bill Blosser, Nichole Maher, and Sam Imperati

Bill Blosser welcomed everyone to this special PAG meeting, thanking Nichole Maher and Lai Lani Ovalles for hosting our group. The pre-PAG tour and briefing was amazing and informative. NAYA's work on behalf of the Native American community is impressive. During the tour, we learned that NAYA is in the process of acquiring the building for their permanent home, and we congratulate them.

For those of you unable to join the tour, Nichole will provide a brief overview on NAYA. For more information, see brochure and article in PAG mailing.

Nichole Maher, Executive Director, Native American Youth and Family Center

Nichole Maher welcomed the PAG in her native language. She shared some history and culture about Native American people in this region. Portland is home to one of the largest and most thriving Native communities in the United States. She appreciates that Airport Futures recognizes NAYA as a community partner in our planning efforts by having a meeting here.

Bill Blosser announced that one of the businesses NAYA has started is a catering company, and they made the delicious dinner that we are enjoying tonight.

Bill asked if there are any changes to propose to the June 16 PAG meeting notes. There were none; the June 16 notes were approved as written.

Sam Imperati reminded everyone that folks could still sign up for the tour of the Slough this weekend. In addition, he mentioned that Brian Nelson is getting married this weekend, which the PAG approved unanimously!

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 (Alternate Debbie Deetz-Silva also attended)	√
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	√
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)	√
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	√
Melissa McCluney	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Cameron Modjeski	Jacobs Consultancy	√
Phil Ralston	Port – Aviation Environmental	√
Kelly Rodgers	David Evans and Assoc.	
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	

Public Present: Anne Holbert (CNAC), Steve Johnson (Port), Koto Kishida (CNAC), Paul Speer (CNAC), Kelly Sweeney (CNAC), Jeri Williams (ONI)

Public Meeting and Public Involvement Subcommittee – Lise Glancy

Lise gave the PAG a brief update on public involvement activities. They have had three outreach meetings and two subcommittee meetings since our last PAG meeting. The key comments from the public meeting outreach focused on the Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS) and Land Use Plan. See Slides 3 and 4 below. This feedback will be considered as part of our refinement of OPIS and the Land Use Plan. Four meetings are scheduled over the next two months. Staff is working with the Mayor's office to schedule a Portland City Council staff briefing on Airport Futures, which will hopefully include Bill Blosser. Between now and our next PAG meeting, the Public involvement Subcommittee will work on outreach to those interests proposed to be included in the OPIS and the OPIS work plan. Lise also mentioned that the Planning Commission meeting will likely be pushed out, which we will hear more about that later in this meeting.

Slide 2: Public Outreach Since Last PAG Meeting

June 20	Explorando el Columbia Slough
June 21	Sunday Parkways
June 23	Master Plan Alternatives/Sustainability Subcommittee #5
June 29	Citywide Land Use Group
July 8	Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee #10

Slides 3 and 4: Key Comments from Outreach

Land Use Plan

- Clarify approach to land use plan so can share more easily with stakeholders
- Clearer comparison of noise contours
- Consider supplemental noise measures and triggers with land use policy discussion
- How will City-Port conflicts be resolved? Can others trigger master plan update?
- How will you define significant community impact?
- Consider possible 10 year moratorium on 3rd runway
- Public review timeframe? Reconsider timing of Planning Commission review – Jan. 2010

Ongoing Public Advisory Committee

- Will help find representation from all coalitions
- Why no AIR?
- Consider representation by the City's Office of Healthy Working Rivers and Bureau of Environmental Services Watershed Office

Master Plan

- Did we consider peak oil and high-speed rail in the forecast?
- Consider strategic shuttles to reduce parking
- Encourage local businesses in district

Natural Resource Inventory

- Clarify inventory work and impacts

Slide 5: Upcoming Meetings and Outreach

July 21	7-8 pm	Maywood Park City Council Briefing
August	TBD	<i>Portland Council Staff briefing</i>
August 17	4-5 pm	Vancouver City Council Update
Sept. 1	6-9 pm	Public Involvement Subcommittee #15
Sept. 2	6-9 pm	Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee #11
Sept. 15	5:30-8:30 pm	PAG #18

Next, Sam updated the PAG on tonight's agenda and the overall Airport Futures schedule. There will be a slight adjustment to the agenda based on staff analysis of the data, feedback from the Land Use Transportation Subcommittee, and Coordinating Committee. We will do a "where we have been" and "where we are now" look before we delve into the data related to the land use policy questions.

Lise and staff will be looking at the Airport Futures schedule, most likely recommending that we will have November and December meetings. The Land Use Subcommittee will continue and they may have more frequent meetings to assist with the volume of work. Our goal is to do the technical work in the Land Use Subcommittee and develop recommendations for the PAG – just as we did for OPIS.

As we get closer to the end, we will seek PAG's input to see if there will be a final report and decide what documents that, in some form or other, will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council. We may also want to convene an Airport Futures Final Report subcommittee to assist with putting our recommendations together.

Staff and the Coordinating Committee are reviewing the schedule for completion of Airport Futures work and will make a recommendation to you and ask for your feedback by email.

Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee Report – Cam Gilmour

Cam reported that a lot of progress has been made as we are nearing the end of year two. At the last meeting, from his perspective, the details really came together and the Sustainability Guiding Principles are gelling. We are going to postpone bringing anything definitive back to the PAG until September. Port and City staff need to work on them, and then we will bring it back to the larger group.

Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee last met on June 23. Meeting was split between an update on the Master Plan at 75% level of completion and discussion of Sustainability Guiding Principles and Goals. Concerning the Master Plan, our focus is on refinement of the alternatives not new concepts.

The subcommittee discussed a few minor changes to the Sustainability Guiding Principles based on PAG comments and agreed they are ready for PAG approval. The subcommittee continued to review the example goals. In general, the group agreed the Principles were the most important and that the goals represented a starting point for a discussion that would require additional work by City and Port staff and the involvement of OPIS in the future. To allow focus on the Land Use Plan, we recommend deferring adoption of Principles to the September PAG meeting.

In September, also report out on a few key Sustainability Goals for future work by the Port, City, and OPIS.

75% Master Plan: Master Plan Refinements – CF Booth

CF will share with the PAG the refinements that have been made to the Master Plan; he will not introduce anything new tonight. He went over his PowerPoint, called "Master Plan Update, 75% Level of Completion: Informational Briefing with No Action Required." CF explained that the focus of the master plan at the 75% development is on the current footprint area. In some of the slides, at 100%, there will be a dotted line for a potential 3rd runway preservation area. Consistent with the previously approved project sideboards, the intention is that the Port's Airport Layout Plan includes this area for planning purposes even though the third runway is projected to be well outside the 2035 master plan timeframe. This issue will be discussed in the fall.

Slide 2: Today’s Discussion: Focus is on key refinements to existing concepts

- Emerging concepts—overview
- Passenger terminal—vision
- Cross field taxiways—potential benefits of new location
- Public parking—increased options closer to terminal
- Rental cars—options for transporting customers to/from terminal

Slide 4: Passenger Terminal: Concept 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 8: Public Parking: Planning criteria reflecting PAG vision and values have been carefully considered

- Preserve future flexibility and development options
- Minimize environmental impacts
- Maximize land use efficiency
- Maximize operational efficiency
- Maximize effective phasing
- Comply with FAA airport design criteria

Slide 9: Public Parking: Comparison of options for locating next Public Parking Garage (2017)

Planning Criteria	P3 Site	P4 Site
Preserve future flexibility and development options	Meet parking & RAC needs through 2035 Allows incremental development Retains P4 site longer as air side property Synergy with extended Concourse E	Committing to both garages in both P3 and P4 locations
Minimize environmental impact	Energy for transporting passengers to and from terminal: better	Energy for transporting passengers to and from terminal: good
Maximize land use efficiency	Clusters dependent functions (TEE, roadways and P3 garage) in compact location	Loss of convenient construction staging and lay down area
Maximize operational efficiency	Time to terminal 1-3 min (MAX-bus) Wayfinding: Better	Time to terminal 5-6 min (MAX-bus) Wayfinding: Good
Maximize effective phasing	Design coordination: TEE Early relocations, NE Airport Way, MAX light rail, post office (?), and Flightcraft (?)	Design coordination: grade separated interchange at 82 nd Ave and NE Airport Way

CF noted that as time goes on, they will have to decide which to proceed with, P3 or P4. They will use these criteria to help make that decision. As of now, they are not recommending either option, the issue is still in the exploration phase.

Slide 13: Next Steps: We plan to complete the plan by September

- **Refinement of master plan**

July – September, 2009

- Continued application of sustainability criteria
- Completion of physical plan
- Cost estimates
- Phasing
- Initiate financial planning
- Initiate documentation

- **PAG briefing on master plan**

September 15, 2009

NOTE: Timeframe for next steps may be adjusted based on revised schedule.

Fred Stovel: referring to Slide 5, why is the cross-field taxiway slated for after 2035?

CF Booth: our facility requirements work indicated that the existing airfield meets our needs for the planning period at the 50th percentile forecast level of activity. The cross-field taxiway is associated with an activity level beyond the 50th percentile forecast; at the same time, CF thinks it is worthwhile to look at and could be considered earlier for other reasons such as sustainability.

Fred Stovel: the reason he asks is noise; in the Part 150 it was discovered that if the runway traffic were more balanced, it would have positive impact on noise level.

Stuart Mathew: in the previous MP, do you know why it was put where it was?

CF Booth: no, I am sorry, I do not.

Chris Hathaway: hears repeated reference to the post office re-locating – is there space reserved and are they planning on moving?

Steve Schreiber, Director of Aviation, from the audience: we do have land available for it in Portland International Center and there have been discussions about a possible move. We can accommodate them if they are interested.

Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee Report – Fred Stovel

Fred reported that the subcommittee met July 8 to discuss transportation and implications of possible third runway on Land Use Plan. At this meeting, we had several presentations. Randy McCourt of DKS presented final conclusions of the Transportation Impact Analysis for 2022 and 2035. We will hear more on that in a moment from Alan Snook. Scott King presented the initial results of sensitivity analysis designed to answer two questions:

- 1) What would be required to double the share of people taking transit to PDX?
- 2) What happens if you limit the amount of parking available at PDX (i.e., increase cost)? Scott will present some interesting findings, and additional analysis will be presented in September.

Jay presented elements of the City's Land Use Plan related to the 3rd parallel runway (height, natural resources, noise, and traffic). We spent the majority of time talking about the noise modeling results and helping staff understand the implications of all the information now available. Cameron Modjeski, CF's associate, was very available for questions and the subcommittee appreciated that.

The intent of the meeting was to test the 90th percentile forecast (i.e., third parallel runway) and ask the question - should we do anything now to address the possibility of future 3rd parallel runway? The conclusion of the subcommittee was that more information was needed on each of the elements. The issues are fairly complicated, that is one of the main reasons we are going to need more time and more meetings.

Since then, staff has recommended that we do not need to make substantial changes to the City Land Use Plan to address the possible third parallel runway. The Coordinating Committee agrees. As a result, tonight's presentation is significantly different that just one week ago. The subcommittee does not have a recommendation tonight. We will focus on sharing information and PAG discussion.

The subcommittee will meet next on September 2, 6 – 9 pm. We will continue to discuss these issues and return to the PAG with specific recommendations.

Next, Sam introduced Alan Snook, who will provide the transportation analysis. Sam said that due to agenda constraints, we ask the PAG to write down all questions. These questions will be addressed at the Land Use Subcommittee and brought to the September 15 PAG meeting.

Final Transportation Impacts/Mode Split Sensitivity Analysis/Mitigation – Alan Snook, DKS

Alan reviewed his PowerPoint titled, “Transportation Impact Analysis: Future Transportation Findings.”

Slide 2: Topics for Discussion

- Final Transportation Impact Analysis Results
- Potential Mitigations
- Sensitivity Analysis
- Next Steps

Slide 3: Future Scenarios

	2022 PM Peak	2035 PM Peak
No-Build	18.6 MAP Background Growth (at 53%)	18.6 MAP Full Background Growth
Build	21.0 MAP 53% of Additional Land Uses 53% of Background Growth	26.8 MAP Full Build of Additional Land Uses Full Build of Background Growth

Slide 6: 2022 Conceptual Mitigation Strategies (for Build/2022 PM Peak Scenario)

- NE Columbia Blvd/NE 82nd Ave Northbound Potential Mitigation
 - Signalize intersection
- NE Columbia Blvd/NE Cully Blvd Northbound Potential Mitigation
 - Signalize intersection and add turn lanes
- Share of “Airport” related traffic
 - 16% NE Columbia Blvd/NE 82nd Ave Northbound
 - 20% NE Columbia Blvd/NE Cully Blvd

Slides 9 and 10: 2035 Conceptual Mitigation Strategies (for Build/2035 PM Peak Scenario)

- NE Marine Drive/NE 33rd Ave
 - Signalize intersection, **OR**
 - Relocate FBO

- NE Airport Way/NE 122nd Avenue
 - Eastbound left, overlap right turns, **OR**
 - Westbound right, overlap right turns
- NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road
 - Eastbound right, overlap right turns
- NE Airport Way/I-205 Northbound
 - “Phase 2” improvement

Share of Airport related trips at intersections

- 38% Airport Way/I-205 Northbound
- 20% Airport Way/122nd Avenue
- 31% 82nd Avenue/Alderwood Road
- 1% Marine Drive/33rd Drive

Slide 11: Sensitivity Test for Airport Passenger Mode Choice

Existing Airport Passenger Mode Choice

Drive and Park	34%
Pick-up/Drop-off	33%
Taxi/Limo/Town Car	6%
Rental Car	17%
Shuttle	4%
Transit	6%

- Desktop air passenger demand model
- Existing year data
- Results are preliminary
 - Limited to airport mode choice
 - Have not looked into how the results:
 - Translate into needs
 - Effect the regional system
- Drive and park mode choice includes those who park to pick-up/drop-off passengers.
- Final results in September

Slide 12: Sensitivity Test: Airport Passenger Choice & Mode Shift with Condition/Policy Changes

Mode	Existing	Condition / Policy Change					
		Double Parking Cost	Motor Vehicle Congestion (Double Travel Time)	Double Auto Operating Costs (Fuel, etc.)	Double Taxi Fare	Frequent Service Transit (Halve Wait Time)	Free Transit
Drive and Park	34%	-19%	+3%	+1%	+1%	-1%	0%
Pick-up/Drop-off	33%	-17%	-8%	-3%	+1%	0%	0%
Taxi/Limo/Town Car	6%	+1%	0%	0%	-3%	0%	0%
Rental Car	17%	0%	0%	+1%	+1%	0%	0%
Shuttle	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Transit	6%	+2%	+5%	0%	0%	+1%	+1%

Results

- Doubling travel times shifts 8% from pick up/drop off to drive and park (5%) and transit (3%).
- Doubling of auto operating costs (e.g. gas) impact is minor (3%). Shift occurs from pick up/drop off to all other modes.
- Transit frequency impacts (via reduced wait times) are minor (0 to 2% shift from motor vehicles). Transit fare impacts are even smaller (~1% shift with free fare).
- Taxi charge increase impact is minor (0-3% shift). Shift occurs to all other modes.

Slide 13: Sensitivity Test for Airport Passenger Mode Choice: Airport Passenger Mode Shift with Constrained Parking

Mode	Existing	Parking Charge Increase				
		10%	25%	50%	Double	Triple
Drive and Park	34%	-3%	-7%	-13%	+19%	-25%
Pick-up/Drop-off	33%	+3%	+6%	+11%	+17%	+21%
Taxi/Limo/Town Car	6%	0%	0%	+1%	+1%	+1%
Rental Car	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Shuttle	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Transit	6%	0%	+1%	+1%	+2%	+2%

Results

- Constrained parking (via uniform increases to parking costs) results in a shift from drive and park (up to 25%) primarily to the pick up/drop off mode.
- Some transit increase (up to 2%)

The above data show that increasing parking charges do not appear to lead to significantly more people choosing public transportation. In trying to achieve the goal of more balanced transit mode share, Alan noted that some things the Port can impact or control (e.g., parking costs), and some, it cannot (e.g., motor vehicle operating costs or the ease and convenience of public transportation). Now, at least, we have this modeling tool in place to see how best we can make progress on this goal.

Slide 14: Sensitivity Test for Airport Passenger Mode Choice: Airport Passenger Mode Share with Transit Scenario

- Goal was to get the Transit mode share at 12%-15%.
- 13% transit mode share achieved by:
 - Increasing motor vehicle congestion and operating costs each by 20%.
 - Doubling parking costs.
 - Providing free and frequent transit service

Mode	Existing	Transit Scenario
Drive and Park	34%	15%
Pick-up/Drop-off	33%	44%
Taxi/Limo/Town Car	6%	6%
Rental Car	17%	17%
Shuttle	4%	4%
Transit	6%	13%

Scott King thanked Alan for his presentation and summarized the next steps. He said PDX explored the goal of to have the highest transit split of any airport in the nation by 2035. We now have a tool to help us evaluate and work toward that goal, which we find to be very exciting. We will be working on this and report back in September.

Slide 15: Subcommittee Discussion & Next Steps

- Next Steps (Sept 2nd LUT Subcommittee)
 - Determine mitigation strategy and triggers
 - Finalize sensitivity analysis
 - Evaluate policy implications of mode shift in sustainability discussions

Veronica Rinard: notices that the sensitively tests also resulted in increased drop off/pick up.

Scott King: yes, that is correct. There are trade-offs and we are looking at how it will all balance out. We could look at light rail to Vancouver but that would take time.

Mary Olson: you said we need to develop a trigger to determine signaling an intersection. Doesn't the City have a trigger for mitigation?

Scott King: yes, in a traditional mode, the standard application of City permitting, a trigger would be, for example, someone is building an office building and gets a building permit. PDX grows with our passenger growth. The Port is a different animal and so the triggers are different. PDX may not get building permit.

Alan Snook: we can test the triggers that Scott mentioned; we can back off from 2020, and look at appropriate trigger points for each intersection. Generally, development is in place. Signal would be triggered by new development. City on hook to pay.

Andy Cotugno: It is not so much of when the location needs to be fixed; you are also mainly concerned about the Port's level of responsibility.

Scott King: yes, we are concerned about both.

Vicki Thompson: cautions folks again about MAX and service to outlying communities. Adding a line for PDX can take away from Gresham and other places. 13% is unrealistic as there would be impacts to the whole system.

Alan Snook: it is a balancing act; one of the main constraints to light rail service is the Steel Bridge crossing downtown.

Vicki Thompson: there are other issues, too, like the Green line, which causes back-up on Burnside in Gresham.

Stuart Mathew: What about if you collected data differently? Drive-park-fly vs. drive-park-pick up.

Scott King: we do have that level of detail; but for this presentation, we simply combined them for ease of comprehension.

John Weigant: questions the 33rd and Marine Drive, 1% figure. There is a lot of congestion and sees more into the future. He thinks a more direct connection to PDX from Marine Drive (near Cascade overpass) is worth considering because it is currently so difficult to get from Marine Drive to the airport.

Jay Sugnet: you are onto the City's policy: we do not want people using Marine Dive to get to the airport. We can discuss in more detail at the next subcommittee meeting.

John Weigant: It's effective.

Bill Blosser: are their airports that charge people to drop off/pick up?

Chris Corich: Dallas/Ft. Worth, to get on the airport property, you are charged a toll.

Alan Snook: Can use model to evaluate.

Jay Sugnet: Let's defer this work to the Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee.

Sam wrapped up the discussion, saying there were three things to attend to, then, we would have a break. He wanted to collect the questions PAG members had written down, if any. He announced that folks should let Lise know if you want to canoe the Slough this weekend; and finally, he asked if any members of the public would like to make a comment. Their opportunity to do so will be after the break.

Break

Public Comment

No members of the public present wished to comment.

75% City Land Use Plan – Sam Imperati, Jay Sugnet, and CF Booth

Sam introduced the "Where We Have Been and Where We Are Now," portion of this presentation. After he frames the presentation, the PAG will hear the most current data on Height, Landscaping, Natural Resources, Traffic, Noise, and Plan District Boundary. After those presentations, we will have PAG discussion, but no PAG vote. He requested that while looking at the data that everyone attempt to suspend assumptions.

Slide 2: City Land Use Plan: Overview

- **Where We Have Been and Where We Are Now:** Land Use Plan Policy Questions and Testing the 90th Percentile Forecast
- **Data:** Height, Landscaping, Natural Resources, Traffic, and Noise
- **PAG Discussion:** no action
- **Next Steps:** Policy discussion continued, natural resource program, noise supplemental metrics, mitigation, plan district boundary, code and policy amendments, final sustainability check (Fall 2009)

Sam said while this Land Use plan is designed to test the 90th percentile, to remember that the MP is based on the 50%. For long-range land use planning, the 90% is a surrogate for looking out into the future.

As previously mentioned, there will be no PAG recommendations tonight, just presentations and discussion. Staffs and consultants need to do further work this summer, which also gives the PAG a chance to go to stakeholders and get feedback.

Slide 3: Where have we been? Initial Project Assumptions

3rd Parallel Runway and Decentralized Terminal

- Not Needed Before 2035

- 3rd Parallel Runway Agreements:
 - Port will not seek Portland City Council approval to build 3rd runway in City Land Use Plan
 - Do need to complete a planning level review of impacts of potential 3rd runway
 - City Land Use Plan will detail a land use review process for a potential 3rd runway

Slides 4 and 5: Where have we been? April 2008 PAG Sideboards #6 and #7

Development of a 3rd parallel runway requires:

- a) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review (alternatives analysis)
- b) City Council approval
- c) Identified funding source

Updated 2010 PDX master plan would likely include the 3rd runway in the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), just as it is in the 2000 PDX Master Plan

- ALP required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
- Acceptance of it by FAA “does not in any way constitute a commitment on the part of the United States to participate in any development depicted therein, nor does it indicate that the proposed development is environmentally acceptable in accordance with appropriate public laws”
- Does not mean the Port intends to construct it any time soon, if ever
- Simply means the Port has reserved an appropriate amount of land in case the need materializes
- At the time, it was unknown how the ALP will relate to the City’s Land Use Plan because this was the first time Port has undertaken a legislative land use process with the City
- Staff committed to studying, tracking, and reporting to the PAG
(Prior Approval by PAG: 1=23, 2=2 (Bergman, Weigant), 3=0)

Slides 6 and 7: Where have we been? January 2009 – 10 Step Process: Step 3 – Test 90th Percentile

- Should the PAG’s final report to the Port and City include policies and recommendations that preserve the options for a 3rd runway and both terminal options for future generations to decide (i.e., height overlay, noise overlay, road right-of-way, etc.)?
 - If yes, what are those recommendations (i.e. what actions and when would they take effect)? This will involve an exploration of the associated opportunities and risks
 - If yes, any such recommendation would not need to imply even tacit approval of a 3rd runway or terminal concept
 - If yes, should we recommend actions now or defer those actions for later consideration as part of the Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy?
- PAG approved staff and consultants going forward with the process
All members present voting 1, except Eric Meyer, abstaining to consult with Erwin
- Staff, consultants, and the PAG have now studied and reviewed the forecast, facilities requirements, and alternatives
- Noise, Height, Traffic, Natural Resources, and Economic Development data has emerged
- Land Use Plan outline and ongoing public involvement concepts were developed and have received PAG working draft approval

Slide 8: Where are we now RE: 3rd Runway Discussion?

- Consultants and Staff do not believe, based on emerging data, that we currently need to do anything significant to preserve the option for a 3rd runway and both terminal options for future generations to decide
- Some housekeeping recommended

Big Picture Result:

- 1) No 3rd runway/decentralized terminal allowed within plan district
- 2) Neither saying "YES" or "NO" to 3rd runway/decentralized terminal
- 3) Further study triggered by approximately 400,000 annual operations (265,000 operations in 2008)
- 4) These issues would go to OPIS
- 5) Would require a new Port master plan process / identified funding
- 6) Would require City process (i.e. Airport Futures)
- 7) Would require a NEPA process

Jay continued with an overview of the Land Use Plan, covering five key areas: Height Overlay, Landscaping Standards, Natural Resources, and Traffic, Noise Contours and, the Plan District Boundary. He told the PAG that the plan has been evolving quite a lot these past 2-3 weeks. As the data comes in, staff has been surprised by some of it.

Slide 9: Where are we now? City Land Use Plan – Needs Through 2035

- 1) Height Overlay
 - a. No change
 - b. Housekeeping
- 2) Landscaping Standards
 - a. Minor changes
- 3) Natural Resources and Traffic (more in September)
 - a. Study and mitigation
- 4) Noise Contours
 - a. No change to 65 DNL
 - b. September follow-up: 55-65 DNL, supplemental metrics, City versus Port actions (outside 3rd runway discussion)
- 5.) Plan District Boundary
 - a. Not influenced by 3rd runway

Slide 10: Where are we now? City Land Use Plan – Needs Through 2035

- Updates based on emerging data: height, noise, natural resources, traffic
- Supports conclusion for not addressing 3rd runway/decentralized terminal option
- Minor housekeeping only
- Conclusion consistent with PAG Vision & Values

Slide 12: Testing the 90th Percentile Forecast: Runway Length

- 2000 Master Plan showed a 11,925' x 200' runway
- Long runway used in analysis for City height and noise overlays, Columbia Slough, NE 33rd, and area land uses
- Subsequent analysis leans towards:
 - Width can be narrowed to 150' (current standard)
 - Length can likely be shortened to:

- 10,000', 9,000', or 8,500' (length of new SEATAC runway)
- Jacobs reviewing utility of shorter runway

Slide 13: Testing the 90th Percentile Forecast: Height Overlay

Should the City modify the existing height overlay to preserve the option for a 3rd parallel runway beyond 2035?

Staff's emerging concept: NO, but do some housekeeping

Reason: low probability of 3rd runway, limited area affected, existing height limits, and cost to retrofit height overlay

Housekeeping: apply to annexed areas of Portland

Sam Imperati: Why does it not make sense to add area for 3rd runway?

Jay Sugnet: Cross-section shows that the underlying h overlay is already high. IKEA sign in PIC. Does not mean cannot build, just must follow an FAA Part 77 review process. Need to implement a code fix by Alameda Ridge because h overlay is below ground.

Chris Hathaway: how does the height overlay apply to an un-annexed area, like West Hayden Island?

Sugnet: no, it only applies to areas within the City of Portland. It would be applied to areas as they are annexed into the City. Would hope the h overlay would apply.

Vicki Thompson: what is the maximum height you can build a hotel on the East side?

Chris Corich: the Holiday Inn is nine stories. It might protrude into the Part 77 approach surface for a possible 3rd parallel runway, but that would not be a significant problem. The runway could be made shorter with the landing point moved to the west, or obstruction lights could be put on the building.

Jay Sugnet: Height is directly proportional to cost of land. Industrial land is cheaper.

Andy Cotugno: I hear you say there is no need to change the height overlay. Is the current height overlay based on two or three runways? Will the 3rd runway show up in Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and is it in current ALP?

Chris Corich: it is in the current ALP, and we recommend that it be in the next ALP.

Andy Cotugno: so what does that mean?

Sam Imperati: I would ask to reserve that 2nd question to another meeting because it will take longer to answer.

Jay Sugnet: current height overlay is based on the current, two-runway system; the question is should we expand to incorporate 3rd runway? We are proposing that "No" be the answer.

Sam summarized the slides of what we are adding for "housekeeping" and what we are not adding for the 3rd runway. Jay continued with slide 19.

Slide 19: Testing the 90th Percentile Forecast: Landscaping Standards for New Development

Should the City modify the area where airport specific landscaping standards apply to new development or significant redevelopment beyond Port owned property for a possible 3rd parallel runway?

Current Standards

- Applied through Conditional Use Master Plan and Portland International Center Plan District
- Only Port owned property

Emerging Staff Concept:

- **NO** – for a possible 3rd runway
- **YES** – apply standards to a small area beyond Port owned property for safety and consistency with Wildlife Hazard Management Plan

John Weigant: If high enough, why do housekeeping?

Jay Sugnet: True, except for ground penetration & previous unincorporated areas. Did not know initially.

Next, there were several slides showing landscaping examples and area maps.

Slide 26: Emerging Recommendation from City/Port working group: Landscaping Standards for New Development

Should the City modify the area where airport specific landscaping standards apply to new development or significant redevelopment beyond Port owned property for a possible 3rd parallel runway?

Staff's emerging concept: NO – do not apply based on a possible 3rd runway

Reasons: Conflicts with City goals to restore and enhance natural areas with dense native plantings and does not provide significant safety benefit. Larger area to be addressed as part of opportunities/enhancements mapping exercise in September

Slide 27: Emerging Recommendation from City/Port working group: Landscaping Standards for New Development

Staff's emerging concept: BUT, apply standards to a small area *beyond Port owned property* for safety and consistency

Reasons: Does not reduce development potential, improves aircraft and wildlife safety, resolves conflict between the Port's Wildlife Hazard Management Plan and City requirements – avoids adjustment process and provides consistent standards

Slide 28: Testing the 90th Percentile Forecast: Natural Resources

What should the City/Port do now to address potential impacts from a possible future 3rd parallel runway to the Columbia Slough?

No recommendation – initial concepts – details in September:

- Policies to protect/enhance Slough
- Plan District requirement for bridge crossings of Slough
- PAG preference for length and location of 3rd runway

Slide 29: Testing the 90th Percentile Forecast: Traffic issues for Consideration Beyond 2035

What should the City/Port do now to address potential impacts of a possible future third parallel runway to the transportation system (e.g. 33rd Avenue and Cornfoot Road)?

No recommendation – initial concepts – details in September:

- Recommend future study of relocating Cornfoot and 33rd with associated mitigation requirements
- PAG Policy recommendation – address circulation issues on and off airport
- PAG preference for length and location of 3rd runway

Sam Imperati: Recommendation addresses inconsistency with landscaping.

Cameron Modjeski, Jacobs Consultancy

Cameron has been working with CF on noise modeling. He joined us to share the results of their modeling and data analysis work.

Slide 30: Testing the 90th Percentile Forecast: Noise Overlay

Should the City modify the existing noise overlay to preserve the option for a 3rd parallel runway beyond 2035?

Current Standards

- No new residential development in 68 DNL and higher
- Residential density restrictions in 65-68 DNL
- Noise insulation required
- Noise disclosure statement and noise easement required

Emerging Staff Concept: NO

- Keep current noise overlay standards
- Independent of 3rd runway:
- Explore options for actions in the 55-65 DNL (September)
- Explore alternative noise metrics (September)
- Mitigation/compensation issues (September)

Slide 31: Noise Discussion: Focus is on potential long-term noise exposure around PDX

- FAA's Integrated Noise Model
- Description of cases modeled
- Noise exposure contours
- Comparison with existing City noise overlay
- Next steps

Slide 32: FAA's Integrated Noise Model: The Integrated Noise Model (INM) is a computer model that evaluates potential noise impacts in the vicinity of airports

- **Typical applications**
 - Noise compatibility planning
 - Environmental assessments (EA)
 - Environmental impact statements (EIS)
- **Factors that can affect aircraft noise contours**
 - Number of aircraft operations
 - Type of aircraft
 - Airfield layout

- How aircraft are flying into and out of PDX
- When aircraft fly into and out of PDX

Andy Cotugno: Contours give illusion that no noise on crosswinds. Why is crosswind runway not totally within 65 DNL?

Cameron Modjeski: Fewer operations and not jets, so, smaller contour. DNL is an averaging over 24-hour period with a penalty for nighttime operations.

Fred Stovel: most complaints though.

John Weigant: wants to note that what people who live near the airport have a different perspective from what the model tells us. He is not sure who is wrong, but wants to make sure we remember that. Not necessarily a perfect model.

Sam Imperati: that is a significant point and it is one of the reasons we will be re-visiting this in September with supplemental noise metrics.

Sam opened the floor for questions.

Mary Olson: can we expect to see future improvements from aircraft companies concerning noise?

Cameron Modjeski: yes, to a certain degree. INM does account for some future but not to 2035.

Mary Olson: is a criterion for the airplane manufacturers to reduce noise in planes?

Chris Corich: yes. Boeing presentation to CNAC on aircraft engine design and noise; it is a priority for them. Also GE.

Vicki Thompson: if you go to Seattle, they have displays. They ran tests on 787s to determine what parts of the airplanes make noise. Boeing is very aware of it. The French company, at a noise conference, did not even mention the issue at all.

John Weigant: they are motivated because a noisy airframe uses a lot of fuel.

Sam thanked Cameron for his presentation; noting that we will hear more in September.

Chris Corich: when we first got these contours, the staff was blown away. At the 65 contour, he was frankly very surprised. Growth is in the 55-60. Rechecked the data. The reason is that the fleet has changed dramatically. 65 DNL is not what you hear.

Dave Smith: we have several people from CNAC here tonight. They introduced themselves: Anne Holbert, Koto Kishida, Paul Speer, and Kelly Sweeney.

Dave Smith: if folks have questions about noise, see them – they are experts.

Bill Blosser: in the slide, it appears that Stage V is hovering in the background.

Cameron Modjeski: No, that is the 85 DNL.

John Weigant: DNL model analyzes 2 streams east and west. Summer stream is most aggravating to those on the ground. The model hides this.

Slide 41: City Land Use Plan: Plan District Boundaries

Three possible sub-districts:

- Port owned property
- Landscaping areas (small area beyond Port property)
- Natural Resource Enhancement Opportunities area (include Columbia Slough between I-205 and Peninsula Canal)

Slide 42: Summary: City Land Use Plan – Needs Through 2035

- 1) **HEIGHT:** Should the City modify the existing height overlay to preserve the option for a 3rd parallel runway beyond 2035? NO, but do some housekeeping
- 2) **LANDSCAPING:** Should the City modify the area where airport specific landscaping standards apply to new development or significant redevelopment beyond Port owned property for a possible 3rd parallel runway? NO, for a possible 3rd runway YES, apply standards to a small area beyond Port owned property for safety and consistency
- 3) **NATURAL RESOURCES and TRAFFIC:** September
- 4) **NOISE:** Should the City modify the existing noise overlay to preserve the option for a 3rd parallel runway beyond 2035? Emerging Staff Concept: NO, keep current noise overlay standards

Slide 44: City Land Use Plan: Next Steps – September/October

- Noise (65 – 55 DNL) and Supplemental Metrics
- Plan District Boundary
- Draft Plan District (building envelope and triggers)
- Natural Resources Program
- Mitigation Strategies
- City Comprehensive Plan Policy Amendments
- Sustainability Final Check
- Plan district boundaries

Vicki Thompson: concerning landscaping in the neighborhoods near the airport, if it is not on Port property, the City could do these things on your own.

Jay Sugnet: correct. Port needs City to apply landscaping standards now because joint planning effort. Opportunity driven.

Andy Cotugno: so, you are not going to increase the noise contour for the 3rd runway, but are you going to shrink the current one?

Jay Sugnet: it is a possibility, but is shrinking the 65 DNL (x overlay) good policy if traffic will increase over time. There are challenges with retrofitting or expanding the overlay zone down the road. One option would be to look at the 55-60 DNL or something completely different based on the supplemental noise metrics.

Sam Imperati: we have to frame those up, get metrics, and figure out what that means on the ground. What does that mean for insulation? It could have a collateral benefit for sustainability and home utilities. It needs more work and more development. There are also FAA restrictions on funds.

Sam asked if anyone had any further questions.

John Weigant: you mentioned in a slide “the port has reserved an appropriate amount of land for the 3rd runway.” Language means a lot; perhaps we could call it the “Third Runway Reserve” as opposed to the third parallel runway. Perhaps show as a dotted line on the ALP.

Sam Imperati: 10 Step process reinforces that any decisions do not need to represent even tacit approval of the 3rd runway.

Bill Blosser: agrees; however, when our recommendations come out; we want to be sure they are not misconstrued 25 years down the line. When we talk about the “Drafting Subcommittee” this is one of the things we want to keep in mind. Your caution is well taken.

John Weigant: ALP is quite clearly defined.

Vicki Thompson: likes the word “conceptual,” just that we were forward-thinking and considering options.

Bill Blosser: The fact is that the 3rd runway is disapproved in the land use plan because not allowed without future legislative approval.

Sam Imperati: Asked for those who have other questions/issues to write them down and they will be addressed at our next meeting. The following issues were identified:

John Weigant:

- I challenge that 33rd and Marine Drive is only 1% Port. People in N. Portland, downtown Vancouver may go Marine Drive to 122nd or 33rd to 42nd and out Cornfoot Road.
- Previously the 1st half hour or so of parking was free. What sensitivity analysis to cut pick-up/drop-off? Noticed no sensitivity analysis for reduced parking costs.
- Still interested in cut-through from Marine Drive at about 102nd and Airport Way. Is the added use of motor fuel worth the sustainability costs, compared to better use of Marine Drive (Living on Marine Drive, I know I am shooting myself in the foot.)

Andy Cotugno:

- It seems like it would be useful to have an “actual” noise contour that represents the actual take-off noise you hear. Then show the DNL contours. Then explain the conversion from one to the next.
- John’s point about prevailing summer flight path being masked by overall annual average seems artificial. If there is a bigger territory that should be covered to account for the higher level of traffic, change the model assumptions to define that.
- Noise overlay zone should follow real noise contours if there is good reason to have an overlay beyond the new 65 DNL, it should apply consistently, not just because it is a remnant overlay zone. Either go to some requirement for all 55-65 zones or don’t.

Next Meeting Agenda (Sept. 15, 5:30 to 8:30 pm), Process Review and Other Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation Form, and Adjournment – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati

Sam asked everyone to please fill out an evaluation, and wished everyone a very happy and fun summer.

Chris Corich thanked Lai Lani for hosting and helping to arrange this meeting at NAYA – the food and everything was great!

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 15 from 5:30-8:30 pm at the Port’s downtown office.

We expect that the agenda for our next PAG meeting will include the following:

- Continue the focus on City land use policies and consider preliminary recommendations.
- Update on the natural resource work and recommendations by Natural Resource Working Group.

- Review the Sustainability Subcommittee's recommendations on the revised sustainability principles and draft goals for Port, City, and OPIS future work.
- Review refinements to Master Plan.

Staff and the Coordinating Committee will propose a revised overall PAG schedule by email

Enjoy August off!

Thanks!

