

Planning Advisory Group Meeting #2 Notes
Tuesday, November 20, 2007 5:00 pm – 8:30 pm
Port of Portland Commission Room

FINAL MEETING NOTES

I. Welcome – Vice Chair Dave Smith

Announcements (II. A. 1. Announcements)

Dave Smith welcomed everyone. He will be acting as Chair tonight because Bill Blosser is in Saudi Arabia on a work assignment. Tonight there are some new attendees. Each was asked to introduce themselves and share their hopes, fears and a tidbit of information.

Lawrence Russell is a new PAG member who was nominated by Coalition for a Livable Future to replace Yalonda Sinda. Lawrence will represent environmental justice issues. He hopes we are able to weigh the risks and opportunities and find a good balance. He fears that the communities most heavily impacted will not be taken care of. He is glad to be here!

John Weigant has been involved with airport issues for eight or nine years. He has a very strong conviction that this process will succeed; we have so much invested, he believes we will have a good outcome. John's fears are quite minimal because he is convinced of success. He and his wife are avid dragon boaters. He has been out of the country because his wife made the team to represent the US in Sydney, Australia. While in Sydney, he marketed an invention to help dragon boaters.

Laura Hudson is with the City of Vancouver. She hopes we finish in 3 years. Her fears are we get bogged down and do not finish. She fly fishes for relaxation.

Mitchell Berck is the alternate for Jordan Papé. He deferred his hopes and fears to those shared by Jordan. He shared that he does anything and everything to make time for golf.

PAG Member Attendance

Members and Affiliation		Present
Lisa Barton-Mullins	E. County/City of Fairview	
Erwin Bergman	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill Blosser	Chair	
Catherine Ciarlo	Planning Commissioner	√
Andy Cotugno	Metro	√
Tom Gerharter	Horizon Airlines	√
Cam Gilmour	Clackamas County	
Alan Hargrave	Port of Camas/Washougal	√
Laura Hudson	City of Vancouver	√
Gloria Ibarra	FAA	√
Maryhelen Kincaid	N. Portland Neighborhood Services	√
Lt Col. Stuart Mathew	ORANG	√
Patrick Metzger	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	√
John Mohlis	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	√
Ross Monn	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Dennis Mulvihill	Washington County	√
Brian Nelson	Intel	√
Mary Olson	Port Commissioner	√
Jordan Papé'	Flightcraft. Alternate Present: Mitch Berck	√
Veronica Rinard	Portland OR Visitors Assoc.	√
Hector Roche	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	√
Lawrence Russell	Coalition for a Livable Future	√
Bob Sallinger	Audubon Society of Portland	
Michael Sloan	Vancouver Neighborhoods	
Dave Smith	Vice Chair	√
Denny Stoecklin	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred Stovel	ONI	√
Vicki Thompson	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John Weigant	AIR	√
Travis Williams	Willamette Riverkeeper	

Other members of the public present: Lee Perlman, Toshimoru Mok, and Randy Wickers

Check-In Re: PAG Material Distribution – Lise Glancy and Sam Imperati

Lise and Sam polled everyone for their preference on how PAG materials are distributed; currently they are mailed and e-mailed to all PAG members and alternates.

Mary Olson would like Sam to invent a PAG “Dewy Decimal System,” that is to say, a clear system that indicates which version is the final copy when multiple copies are sent, and behind which tab they should go.

Sam and Lise will refine the material distribution system to take into account comments re: clarity and organization, and the current system of mail and email will remain.

Discussion of Future Meeting Locations – Dave Smith

Dave wanted everyone to know that meeting at other locations is a possibility if folks are interested. Some of the options include Port downtown offices, City of Portland Planning Bureau, PDX hotel, PDX Conference Center, Pearson Airport-Vancouver, or downtown Vancouver. A significant majority by show of hands wants to stay at the current location. The next meeting will be here. All PAG members are open to occasional changes in location for special events.

Agenda Review – Sam Imperati

We are switching order of the Collaboration Principles discussion and the Vision and Values discussion.

Additional Handouts – Sam Imperati

Sam noted that Alan Hargrave’s correct email address is alanf537@yahoo.com.

Project staff handed out two additional packets: a) updated PAG Contact List (PAG tab) and b) Future PAG Meeting Dates (Tentative Meeting Dates tab).

Approval of 9/29 and 10/9 Meeting Notes (II. A. 2. Meeting Notes Approval) – Dave Smith

The Vice Chair called for approval of both sets of meeting notes. The PAG unanimously approved them with the following change: Vicki Thompson asked that staff change her info to reflect that she was with CNAC for five years and has been with the Gresham Planning Commission for eight years. Previous changes submitted by members were already incorporated and some work will be done on the attendance lists. PAG Member Laura Hudson was not attendance at the first two PAG meetings.

Meeting Follow-up (II. A. 3. Prior Meeting Follow-Up) – Jay Sugnet and Chris Corich
Part 161 Background & Regulatory Follow-up (II. A. 3. b. Regulatory Framework)

Jay Sugnet reviewed three follow-up documents in packet. Chris Corich reviewed Part 161 response.

Discussion:

Sam Imperati: responding to a question about how all the information and discussion are synthesized, Sam said that off-line comments are included in the mix, essentially closing the loop on communication from the last meeting through today's version of the document.

Erwin Bergman: it should be spelled out what (noise) is exempt and what is not, which refers to aircraft that is in flight.

Erwin Bergman: there ought to be a segment on the rights of airport proprietors, which Erwin believes he has identified and compiled into two documents. He provided a hard copy, which Jay will scan into PDF format. Erwin proposes to add this verbiage, "NEPA is the basic national charter for protecting the natural and human environment by establishing policy, setting goals and provides means for carrying out this policy."

Subcommittee Reports – Jay Sugnet and Chris Corich

Public Involvement Subcommittee Report (II. A. 4. Public Involvement Subcommittee) – Jay Sugnet

Jay noted that they received good input on the telephone survey. The survey results will be available at the next PAG meeting. The process vastly improved the product. Unfortunately, there is no interest for a standing public involvement subcommittee. This will be revisited at the six-month check in on public involvement issues. The common response was that folks are willing to help with survey, but not willing to give a three-year commitment (business representation is missing).

Hector Roche: Hector was not available for that meeting, but thinks it's a good idea to have a subcommittee on public involvement. He would participate and would like to discuss it further.

Aviation Demand Forecasting Committee Report (II. A. 5. Forecast Subcommittee) – Chris Corich

There are two meeting dates set for the forecast subcommittee: 11/28 and 12/12 from 7-9 pm.

Other – Jay Sugnet (II. J. Other)

Jay noted that letters of invitation to the Airport Futures Technical Advisory Pool have been sent out. The Technical Advisory Pool will be a resource for PAG. These are the technical experts, who are representing at their respective organizations in relation to this process. They will be tracking the PAG discussion.

Sam passed around a list to gather more participants for subcommittees. We especially need Business/User representation on the Public Involvement Subcommittee.

II. Review of Chairs' Proposed Collaboration Principles (II. F. Collaboration Principles) - Sam Imperati

Sam provided an overview on process for those attending PAG for the first time, referring to the most recent version of the Chairs' Proposed Collaboration Principles, dated 11-8-07. There are issues, which need to be discussed due to major changes in document.

1. Document L, Page 5, section E: PAG member commitments for community
2. Page 7, C.3: what happens with no consensus? Majority-Minority issue

Before proceeding to a detailed discussion of the above, Sam took a “straw” vote on the Collaboration Principles asking members to consider the document without the above two issues. (Voting practice!) A “consensus” means that all votes are a “1” or a “2.” From the straw poll, it looked like the PAG was close to consensus on the Collaboration Principles. The outstanding issues are reflected below.

Hector Roche: concerning majority/minority issues, Hector explained his support for the chair having a role in situations where there is lack of consensus.

Andy Cotugno: gave his understanding of the process: try for consensus. If there is no consensus, have a cooling off period, during which time the chair works off-line. Then, we come back together, and if still no consensus, then go to majority-minority voting.

Sam Imperati: the issue boils down to whether you want the Chair to make a decision for the PAG or do you want to have Majority/Minority reports.

Mary Olson: so what we are eliminating is the majority report?

Hector Roche: it is incumbent on the chair to come up with a report that reflects PAG’s intent.

Stuart Matthew: it seems the only difference is that we are having the Chair come up with a majority report.

Andy Cotugno: it does not make sense that the committee would entrust the Chair to reflect the consensus of the committee, if in fact, no consensus was reached. He thinks its worth it in these situations to have the Chair take a shot at drafting something that could reach consensus and bring back to the group. This does not preclude majority and minority reports

Sam Imperati: This is what we do already.

Andy Cotugno: So, we are working on creating a good fall back.

Hector Roche: I would vote to entrust the chair to sift out what the consensus of the group is.

Mary Olson: If we agree with the document, then what we have is no consensus, cooling off, still no consensus, entrust chair to write opinion/chair’s report. For those in minority, they can submit minority report. The need for a majority report is eliminated.

Sam calls for a second vote which fails to achieve consensus. Discussion follows.

Sam asked the “threes” why they voted that way.

Erwin Bergman: he prefers to expedite process, just write majority/minority opinions, and move on.

John Weigant: we should not throw out C.3.

Sam asked what it would take the “twos” to move to the “ones.”

Fred Stovel: he would vote one if we move the proposed language to the cooling off period section.

Denny Stoecklin: agrees with Fred.

Dennis Mulvihill: ditto.

Ross Monn: leave C.3 alone and add Andy's language

Andy Cotugno: moving language to c.2 is fine.

Catherine Ciarlo: not back and forth, just a one time through.

Sam Imperati: Chairs do not want to make decisions for the PAG, but are fine with making proposals.

Sam called a new vote: moving the concept to the cooling off section. It now reads:

C.2. Cooling-Off Period

If consensus cannot be reached, the chair, vice chair, or the facilitator may table the issue for additional discussion with constituencies, the gathering of new information, or perhaps just sufficient time to consider options more carefully. The "cooling off" period recognizes we value getting as close to consensus as possible by way of dialogue, clarification, and consideration of alternatives. Absent an emerging consensus, the chair, vice chair or the facilitator may make a recommendation for the PAG to consider taking into consideration all of the available information and views. The PAG may then revisit the issue.

All voting members present voted "1." – RESULT: Consensus. See voting record, below.

FACILITATOR'S POST MEETING NOTE:

PAG did not discuss following sentence that appears on page 3, Section IV. D., "City and Port staff will assist subcommittees with meeting locations. There will be advance notice of all subcommittee meetings posted on the project website at least 48 hours or one week in advance of the meeting." After the meeting, the staff changed the section to note it would provide as much information as possible, but no less than 48 hours. This change will be noted at the 12/18/07 PAG meeting.

Issue: Section V. E. PAG Member Commitments for Community, as written					
Members	Vote				
	NP	1	2	3	A
Lisa Barton-Mullins , City of Fairview	X				
Erwin Bergman , Central NE Neighborhoods		X			
Bill Blosser , Chair Non-Voting	X				
Catherine Ciarlo , Planning Commissioner		X			
Andy Cotugno , Metro		X			
Tom Gerharter , Horizon Airlines		X			
Cam Gilmour , Clackamas County	X				
Alan Hargrave , Port of Camas/Washougal		X			
Laura Hudson , City of Vancouver		X			
Gloria Ibarra , FAA Non-Voting		X			
Maryhelen Kincaid , N. Neighborhood Services		X			
Stuart Matthew , ORANG		X			
Patrick Metzger , NE Coalition of Neighborhoods		X			
John Mohlis , Columbia Pacific Bldg. Trades		X			
Ross Monn , East Portland Neighborhood Office		X			
Dennis Mulvihill , Washington County		X			
Brian Nelson , Intel		X			
Mary Olson , Port Commissioner		X			
Jordan Papé , Flightcraft <i>(Mr. Mitch Berck in attendance for Mr. Papé)</i>		X			
Veronica Rinard , Portland OR Visitors Assoc.		X			
Hector Roche , Multnomah County		X			
Lawrence Russell , Coalition for a Livable Future		X			
Bob Sallinger , Audubon Society of Portland	X				
Michael Sloan , Vancouver Neighborhoods	X				
Dave Smith , Vice Chair Non-Voting					
Denny Stoecklin , Portland ONI		X			
Fred Stovel , Portland ONI		X			
Vicki Thompson , PDX CNAC		X			
John Weigant AIR,		X			
Travis Williams , Willamette Riverkeeper	X				
Totals:	6	22	0	0	0
Result: Consensus					

VOICE VOTE ON DOCUMENT, AS AMENDED: All voting members present voted “1.” –
RESULT: Consensus

Sam acknowledged he forgot to seek public comment, and asked if there was any. There was none. He apologized for the oversight.

III. Vision and Values Presentation, Discussion and Possible Adoption (II. G. Vision and Values) – Lise Glancy, Jay Sugnet and Sam Imperati

Overview on Stakeholder Outreach (II. H. Public Outreach) – Lise Glancy and Jay Sugnet

Lise and Jay went over the Power Point timeline of the Airport Futures stakeholder outreach on goals and issues. All information collected from outreach will be provided to the PAG to help inform their decision-making. The team has met with 325 people and 12 organizations. They noted that the results of this outreach reflect the diversity of perspectives in the region; feedback was often contradictory on issues related to PDX. On the goals, there was general support for the PAG's Draft Vision and Values statement with possible refinement in a couple of areas. More outreach is scheduled before the next PAG meeting. They particularly would like to attend more neighborhood meetings.

A summary of the comments, questions and issues that Lise and Jay have heard on the Vision and Values are as follows:

- How is livability defined?
- Is "avoid" realistic as a goal?
- Definition of economic impact doesn't reflect negative impact on property values
- Wildlife restoration/protection different off airport versus on airport
- Health and safety issues from aircraft flying over neighborhoods
- Are goals realistic/achievable?
- Solve issues in the Northwest style

Erwin Bergman: "Avoid" does not make sense as a goal.

John Weigant: how do we to add to this list?

Jay Sugnet: issues can and will be added as we continue to seek input from stakeholders and community members.

Lise Glancy: Vision and Values are a reference point.

Facilitator's Vision and Values Discussion Draft (II. G. Vision and Values) – Sam Imperati

Sam Imperati: this is the fourth or fifth iteration of the Vision and Values document, which reflects the input from the stakeholder outreach, which Jay and Lise just summarized. It has been heavily edited. The Facilitator's Draft is an attempt to synthesize all comments into one document. Sam reminded the PAG that they are not obliged to adopt until 12/18 because further outreach is planned before that meeting. If needed, he proposed that a voluntary work group meet with the Chair to develop a recommendation for the PAG for the 12/18 meeting.

Sam took a quick "straw" vote to take the pulse of the PAG on the Facilitator's Vision and Values Discussion Draft: mostly ones and twos. He asked the twos to explain their views.

Maryhelen Kincaid: pluralize "neighborhood" please.

Mary Olson: supporting "neighborhood goals" could be impossible or impractical.

Sam Imperati: true, but any such goals would be balanced and considered with all others.

Veronica Rinard: not sure about the “avoid, minimize, mitigate” language.

Sam Imperati: this is an attempt to mimic NEPA in language.

Veronica Rinard: #4, regional growth?

Sam Imperati: intent is to assess the benefit and detriments on growth; open to better language if anyone would like to suggest some.

Dave Smith: strike “regional” and perhaps try “aviation.”

John Weigant: overly precise language, footnotes, etc. are not always helpful. He is satisfied with current language.

Fred Stovel: “manage” might be the actual problem, because we do not have the authority to manage squat.

Veronica Rinard: Suggested, “consider.”

Brian Nelson: we are not just talking air traffic; we are talking social, economic and other issues.

Sam Imperati: to re-cap, the proposition is “Consider regional growth in the broader context of Oregon and Washington.”

Fred Stovel: add “within the limits agreed to with the City” at the end. He wants to see something indicating that the Port and the City are working in conjunction on this.

Jay Sugnet: sees the last section as the place where the common goals of the Port and City are expressed.

Andy Cotugno: # 3 and #4 of the Economic section need clarification for him; he would strike # 3 and leave 4, going with “integrating PDX better into the regional transport system.”

Laura Hudson: then you lose the notion of minimizing congestion.

Andy Cotugno: minimizing congestion could be its own thing.

Sam Imperati: we could make these changes now and vote; or we could wait for additional public comment that will occur between now and our next meeting, incorporate all comments off-line, then bring back for final vote next meeting. Fifteen voted for pushing through tonight.

Suggested changes were made during the break. The text below reflects the language to be voted on:

Economic

- 3) Integrate PDX better into the regional transport system
- 4) Maintain and enhance the reputation of PDX as a premier airport
- 5) Minimize congestion in and around the airport; and

Social

- 4) “Managed” changed to “consider”

Footnote added: “avoid/minimize/mitigate means: first avoid if possible; if not minimize and mitigate impacts”

Sam noted that the footnote would be refined to reflect NEPA language appropriately.

Sam asked if there was any public comment on Vision and Values (II. G. Vision and Values). There was none. The vote was taken.

Issue: Facilitator’s Discussion Draft – PAG Vision and Values, As Amended					
Members	Vote				
	NP	1	2	3	A
Lisa Barton-Mullins , City of Fairview	X				
Erwin Bergman , Central NE Neighborhoods		X			
Bill Blosser , Chair Non-Voting	X				
Catherine Ciarlo , Planning Commissioner		X			
Andy Cotugno , Metro		X			
Tom Gerharter , Horizon Airlines		X			
Cam Gilmour , Clackamas County	X				
Alan Hargrave , Port of Camas/Washougal		X			
Laura Hudson , City of Vancouver		X			
Gloria Ibarra , FAA Non-Voting					
Maryhelen Kincaid , N. Neighborhood Services		X			
Stuart Matthew , ORANG		X			
Patrick Metzger , NE Coalition of Neighborhoods		X			
John Mohlis , Columbia Pacific Bldg. Trades		X			
Ross Monn , East Portland Neighborhood Office		X			
Dennis Mulvihill , Washington County		X			
Brian Nelson , Intel		X			
Mary Olson , Port Commissioner		X			
Jordan Papé , Flightcraft <i>(Mr. Mitch Berck in attendance for Mr. Papé)</i>		X			
Veronica Rinard , Portland OR Visitors Assoc.		X			
Hector Roche , Multnomah County		X			
Lawrence Russell , Coalition for a Livable Future		X			
Bob Sallinger , Audubon Society of Portland	X				
Michael Sloan , Vancouver Neighborhoods	X				
Dave Smith , Vice Chair Non-Voting					
Denny Stoecklin , Portland ONI		X			
Fred Stovel , Portland ONI		X			
Vicki Thompson , PDX CNAC		X			
John Weigant AIR,		X			
Travis Williams , Willamette Riverkeeper	X				
Totals:	6	22	0	0	0
Result: The Facilitator’s Discussion Draft – PAG Vision and Values was adopted, as amended.					

After the meeting, the facilitator finalized the document, as noted above, and removed most of the articles, like the words “a” and “the.” He also adjusted the footnote language as promised.

IV. Overview of Existing Conditions & Study Area Boundaries (II. E. Existing Conditions/Study Area Boundaries) - Sean Loughran and Jay Sugnet

Sean and Jay reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with study area boundaries and outline for future Existing Conditions Inventory. Sean stressed the importance of remembering that the inventory will remain a draft throughout the process. It is a living document. Jay introduced the concept of study area boundaries. It is where we collect data on land use, natural resources, water and air quality, and transportation. The airport study area primarily is the airfield facility. The natural resources area is Port-owned property; secondary area is 10,000 ft beyond that. Water quality pertains to basins that drain from PDX to the Columbia Slough and Columbia River. They are trying to create useful graphics for PAG discussions. The inventory will help PAG get a grasp of aviation language and all the necessary functional and operational components.

DISCUSSION:

Laura Hudson: boundary question on one of the Study Area slides.

Sean Loughran: this is a work in progress and the map referred to (Airport Study Area Boundary) is being changed.

Erwin Bergman: DNL level should be at 50; Oregon DEQ says that annoyance levels starts at 50.

Stuart Matthew: how will this info influence PAG?

Sean Loughran: knowing where we are at is the basis for making decisions for the future.

Jay Sugnet: during summer and fall next year, the Port will be getting into a lot more detail on this.

John Weigant: neighboring airports should include all airports within 50 miles.

Andy Cotugno: in keeping with the principle of consulting with our governing bodies, he did, and one issue that came up is archaeological aspects of this land.

Jay Sugnet: thank you for that comment; he had this in mind already.

V. Planning Process Background (II. D. Project Assumptions) - Chris Corich and Jay Sugnet

Chris presented a PowerPoint presentation summarizing how some of the issues will be handled in the planning process. He also noted that the Alternatives Analysis is a big part of our work.

1) Consider high-speed rail? We will have a look at this. Chris mentioned an FAA document that indicates that they are looking at this for the east coast. So for our process, it is being considered at a certain level.

Erwin Bergman: strongly agrees that we should consider high-speed rail. It is a necessity in the future as he sees it.

2) Consider moving the military off PDX? Chris recommends providing space for military.

Andy Cotugno: so are you considering options or accommodating the military?

Chris Corich: the military will be in the mix.

Catherine Ciarlo: this brings up questions about the first issue, is it the same? Are you saying you are considering, but have already made recommendations?

Chris Corich: no.

John Weigant: if they are asking for a lease extension, it should not be renewed without recommendations from the PAG. He does not recommend breaking the lease.

Stuart Matthew: suggested that we should have a PAG meeting at the base and listen to a Mission plan to better understand what role the military plays.

3) Consider moving air cargo to another airport?

At this point Sam recommended minimizing discussion, given time constraints and deferring it to the end of the overall presentation. The rest of the slides were discussed by Chris and Jay.

- 4) Consider building a replacement or supplemental airport?
- 5) Consider shifting traffic to other airports?
- 6) Consider the possible third parallel runway?
- 7) Will City Council consider approving a third parallel runway in the land use plan? *No.*
- 8) Consider terminal alternative other than Centralized and Decentralized
- 9) Will there be a National Environmental Policy Act review of the master plan itself? *Plan does not require it, but projects that come out of the master plan do.*
- 10) Consider air quality? *Not creating new emission standards, but take into consideration those in existence.*
- 11) Consider climate change?
- 12) Consider emission standards from jet aircraft?
- 13) Consider noise impacts? *Recently completed noise study (Part 150) is a resource for this.*
- 14) Consider nighttime curfew? *Chris thinks it's a dead issue. They are working on such a proposal in California.*
- 15) Consider water quality?
- 16) Consider deicing?

Jay continued with the following points.

- 17) Neighborhood improvements not related to PDX impact considered?
- 18) Consider economic development areas adjacent to PDX?
- 19) Consider moving or piping the Columbia Slough

John Weigant: thinks these issues are so important that they deserve thorough discussion.

Sam Imperati: just FYI, it is on our next meeting agenda, so that is a To Do item.

Hector Roche: agrees with John, need lots of time to fully discuss these issues.

Sam Imperati: want an additional meeting to do prep work before the next meeting?

All: No

Sam Imperati: how about an email to triage these issues with votes on each to help prioritize our discussion?

All: Yes

VI. Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation and Adjournment (II. K. Closing Matters (Closing Comments, Next Meeting, Meeting Evaluation and Adjourn) - Dave Smith

Next Meeting is on Tuesday, December 18 5:30 to 8:30 pm at this location.

As of tonight, the next meeting agenda will consist of:

- Survey Results
- PDX/Port Financial Overview
- Discussion and Refinement of Project Sideboards
- Forecast Subcommittee Report
- Preview of Aviation Forecast Phase

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully Submitted by the ICM facilitation team.