



PAG Interview Substantive Topics Summary Results – Voting Members

I. PDX Positives/Negatives *and* Surrounding Area Positives/Negatives

PDX Positives	PDX Negatives	Area Positives	Area Negatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lucky to have close access 2. Provides Jobs 3. Freight mobility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Pollution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Businesses around PDX growing - good thing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taking away from land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Satisfies transportation needs. 2. Very nice facility 3. Becoming more aware of adverse impacts` 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Established neighborhoods - large lots 2. Good location 3. Proximity to river, slough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to interstate (transportation) 2. Columbia River corridor for noise patterns 3. Active community participation in growth issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate access to interstates n surface roads for cargo and commerce 2. Residential development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clean & modern 2. Good retail & food services 3. LRT access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commuter flight terminal is cramped 2. TSA baggage handling separate from ticketing 3. Impact on slough water quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic importance 2. Access from surrounding businesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not over capacity, friendly to use. 2. Location. 3. New, attention to noise done a lot right - FAA air & control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Costs high. 2. Fog on river but advanced technology compensated. 3. Capacity of security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Good noise control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Close to downtown Vancouver & Portland neighborhoods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Convenience 2. Accessible 3. Well done improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hasn't been involved to know the issues 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easy to navigate - clear signage & good layout. 2. Well-kept 3. Shops & services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Big box retail center - not related to Port's mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Big lots - good for industry 2. Uses mostly non-residential immediately adjacent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Low density, sprawling, poor street connectivity 3. Columbia Slough pollution, lack of flowing current



CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON
BUREAU OF
Planning

PORT OF PORTLAND
Possibility. In every direction.

AIRPORT FUTURES

CHARTING A COURSE FOR PDX

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jobs revenue to economy 2. Contribute to the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Pollution 3. Congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lots of wildlife and open spaces, parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Industrial neighborhoods 2. Access not good from the west, only from the East
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Room for development (industrial area zoned E & West.) 2. Access to interstate 3. River corridor for noise abatement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. River - flood plain 2. Residential areas south of airport (close) 3. Interstate/ Airport Way (1 way in - 1 way out)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides jobs & employment 2. Provides transportation for people and cars 3. Provides space for military - security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Safety - crashes 3. Health - particulates & exhaust 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Columbia River 2. Neighborhoods 3. Light Rail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Truck traffic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engine of economic growth 2. Good connections: vacationers & business folks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Traffic 3. Other impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share in the growth of areas, e.g. IKEA, hotels 2. Help those neighborhoods impacted 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Impacts on livability 3. Residents getting displaced 4. Impacts wildlife 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Impacts on livability 3. Residents getting displaced 4. Wildlife
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MAX goes and other good access 2. Retail food at terminal is super 3. Right sized just works, kept up well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Difficult access to small carriers especially with a disability 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Max to PDX is great 2. Quality of physical plant 3. Proximity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Long term parking has been a problem 2. Lack of direct flights 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Choice of carriers equals better service 2. User friendly: location, parking, amenities 3. Engine for state economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noisy 2. Taking up beautiful portion of river 3. Traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. River allows noise mitigation 2. Traffic access good to PDX 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heavily populated urban area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Convenience 2. Tie in with broader port. 3. Port doing a good job of managing air traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access limited by new shopping center, e.g. IKEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Great restaurants & hotels 2. Good transportation 3. Affordable neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to 205 could get limited



AIRPORT FUTURES

CHARTING A COURSE FOR PDX

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Great user experience for leaving, not so much for arriving. 2. Accessible transportation options 3. Proximity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baggage area 2. Environmental issues given location to waterways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cascade Station a good thing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No place to go with 2.5 hour layovers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PDX is a good reflection on us as a good City. 2. Beautiful, accessible. 3. Minimal impact on quality of life. 4. Port has been responsive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cargo noise. 2. Impact on natural environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whitaker Ponds slough. 2. Minimal traffic impacts on PDX 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One of the nicest airports in the country 2. Very good airport wildlife management plan 3. Very strong natural resources staff at the ground level (i.e.. not the PDX policy level) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Lack of concern of mgt. level for environmental issues 2. Misuse of airport mandates to undermine environmental protections 3. Political expansion into surrounding area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easy access to airport 2. Important natural resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proximity of neighborhoods and natural resources to airport and negative impacts PDX has on those resources 2. Blighted neighborhoods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Premature to answer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Premature to answer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Premature to answer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Premature to answer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proximity 2. Nice airport, easy to maneuver 3. Whole experience is positive, run well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Not enough non-stop services 3. Parking becoming a problem during peak, 4. Slow baggage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Great job on PDX access roads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IKEA and other development impacts getting through
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outside PAG scope 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nicest airport ever been in 2. Convenient 3. Economic Dev. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 2. Pollution, long-term health effects 3. Traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location to airport 2. Helped dev. in area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proximity to river leads to bad weather
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Freeway & rail access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Serves Vancouver and East side easier than W/SW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neighborhoods with # patterns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. River close but not very usable 2. Small airplanes - big jets
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Free travel availability 2. Goods and services to area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recreational access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jet fuel in air
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Serves critical service 2. Port has been sensitive on environmental issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Growth for sake of growth is not good 2. River is a bad location 		



II. Scoping Survey Goals – Overview

* Total Points based on:
 First = 3 pts
 Second = 2 pts
 Third = 1 pt

Total Points*	Economic
50	Ensure that PDX meets the passenger and freight transportation needs of the region
42	Support role of PDX In the regional economy
21	Maintain & increase the reputation of PDX as a premiere airport
18	Improve transportation connections between PDX and the region
Social Goals	
46	Address community impacts and concerns about PDX growth
39	Minimize aircraft noise on surrounding residential neighborhoods
22	Improve traffic flow in and around the airport
22	Provide jobs for local residents and support neighborhood goals
Environmental	
48	Minimize water quality impacts to adjacent water bodies
36	Minimize impact on local and regional air quality
31	Maintain natural resources and wildlife while protecting the flying public
29	Minimize greenhouse gas emissions and prepare to adapt to climate change



III. Scoping Survey Goals – Specifics

Economic Goals

<i>Maintain & increase the reputation of PDX as a premiere airport</i>		
First	Second	Third
4	2	5
<i>Ensure that PDX meets the passenger and freight transportation needs of the region</i>		
First	Second	Third
10	9	2
<i>Support role of PDX In the regional economy</i>		
First	Second	Third
7	7	7
<i>Improve transportation connections between PDX and the region</i>		
First	Second	Third
1	4	7

Environmental Goals

<i>Minimize impact on local and regional air quality</i>		
First	Second	Third
5	7	7
<i>Minimize greenhouse gas emissions and prepare to adapt to climate change</i>		
First	Second	Third
7	1	6
<i>Minimize water quality impacts to adjacent water bodies (Columbia River and Slough) and wetlands</i>		
First	Second	Third
7	11	5
<i>Maintain appropriate natural resources and wildlife habitat while protecting the flying public</i>		
First	Second	Third
5	5	6

Social Goals

<i>Improve traffic flow in and around the airport</i>		
First	Second	Third
2	5	6
<i>Minimize aircraft noise on surrounding residential neighborhoods</i>		
First	Second	Third
9	3	6
<i>Address community impacts and concerns about PDX growth</i>		
First	Second	Third
8	9	4
<i>Provide jobs for local residents and support neighborhood goals</i>		
First	Second	Third
3	4	5
<i>Other: Support Homeland security needs and issues</i>		



IV. Narrative Goals

Substantive Goals	Concerns About What Heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to goal-setting discussion to focus thinking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very open
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperate with neighborhoods while considering reasonable growth and implementing necessary mitigation and maintain quality of life. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable (Environmentally & Economically), • Doesn't know enough yet 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDX is targeted to Metro's mission • Economic - very important place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too high level of service expectations e.g. Parking vs. MAX vs. Airport Way vs. 205
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airport capacity - great airport but not cheap which relates to ticket price 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased operational restrictions, increased costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain accessibility and stability for PDX, e.g. Conditional use, Plan for future 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports PDX but big box retail going on is a concern. Not their business, traffic impacts • Protect 205: traffic and Light Rail Transit loop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haven't heard anything of concern
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get a land use plan that protects public and allows PDX to thrive as a business 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stability of master plan • Where going to be over next 100 years • Good relationships with Port, region, city 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passion trumps reason
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't increase flights a whole lot • Don't create a problem for someone else 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps get PDC involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over focus on status quo - no growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood access to the process, • Livability, • Decrease noise, • Displacement of residence, • Protection of wildlife 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third runway
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have WA Co. help make regional decisions • Develop local relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounting PDX's value to economic development and community as a whole; Micro impacts can't trump macro good
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent good corporate citizens, • Examine alternatives carefully 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a holistic perspective getting value from everyone's expertise over what staff/consultants could/will bring. • Wants the City designation to avoid conditional use process, waste of time, money, becomes political, inefficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving PDX. City does not endorse plan. Loose legislature's support. • Single issue debates lead to folks checking out. • Staff here open-minded and articulate, are open to the public.



CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON
Planning

PORT OF PORTLAND
 Possibility. In every direction.

AIRPORT FUTURES

CHARTING A COURSE FOR PDX

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports growth of PDX • Wants own zoning for airport so folks know when buying home. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can't myopically focus on noise to point where freight goes elsewhere
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in a place to determine goals until hear all the data and issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If flat out goal is to kill 3rd runway without planning ahead - Not OK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land use model allows ongoing public input. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New runway would be a concern from a community perspective. • Don't know enough yet.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to determine what Port works • Commitment to natural resources • Need public review, no broad exceptions • Clear understanding of raw procedures • Fully articulate the mitigation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd Runway needs to understand
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDX accessibility, • Economic Development, • Freight, • No expansion of Aurora or Mulino. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair product that considered all views. • Interest of the community impacted protected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still exploring • None jumped out
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can all be good neighbors • Not make the same mistakes as CA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Region growing so do it with least amount of impact to both sides of rivers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize services of PDX while minimizing impacts to surrounding communities. • Make as efficient as possible in order to decrease impacts. • Results that are achievable from a practical perspective. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livability issues - economic development is part of livability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Runway
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get City organized to oversee the rules on the books • Community livability • Avoid then mitigate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position that Port can't do anything bad for business • 3rd Runway
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair outcome to all, Economic Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No growth is not reasonable, Planning does not mean it will be built, EIS now
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local leaders need to decide how they want to be "unattractive" e.g. unemployment • Goal: better, OK bigger, if better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "ALP" (Airport Layout Plan) has no 3rd runway • Spreads noise to South over neighborhoods. • Can mitigate or reduce (GRE) noise, but can't eliminate it
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure any growth footprint is small if seen at all Quality of life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None yet



V. Narrative Issues

A) Political

1) Relationships:

- The competition between Oregon and Washington
- Keep Oregon "Oregon," goal to prevent growth
- City taking disproportionate share of negative impact of PDX, others only get benefits
- Hayden Island – more planes now, spread the agony
- Concordia – same parks, golf courses, don't want to lose gains just got
- Cross-jurisdictional issues – East county or Hillsboro concerns
- Vancouver actively following I-5 to see what happens here
- Port-City dissonance
- Hopes no WA-OR divide
- Economy vs. Community, Neighbors & Wildlife

2) Representation:

- Port appointed – City elected – 2x
- City Council elected by City but constituent issues
- Port = public, not private
- Identify Port with constituency
- How will the constituency respond even to the "perfect" plan
- How does Portland's vision fit
- Vancouver – ignored
- FAA serves regions
- "FAA makes us do x" is used too frequently
- Need diversity of views
- Poverty not as visible here
- Competing Neighborhood Association's interests
- Better product after listening to all sides

3) Costs:

- Vancouver pays \$0, WA, Mult. & Clackamas Counties pay \$700 million
- Balancing jobs and protecting the environment to create sustainable solutions
- Get congressmen from each state to visit

4) Information:

- Stay out of politics: keep factual
- Government – error prevention, assuming gets right first time
- Port – no front or back end process, No QA

5) Results:

- Trust
- Preemption covenant
- 15-20 years ago promised new bigger zone, didn't anticipate traffic
- Each side gambling: PDX – airport zone, Citizens – get some control (e.g. mitigation, sustainability)

6) Process:

- 30 folks with private agendas stuck spinning like Congress



- A successful process can be a step toward a better relationship
- Ultimately everyone needs to take a leap of faith
- Results of this process goes to citizens, then assess their reaction
- The City needs to make this decision after deliberative process

7) Other:

- Other issues connected
- Noise, Noise Overlay Zone
- DEQ has noise jurisdiction

B) Social:

- Noise – 13x
- Growth – 3x
- Traffic – 5x
- Transportation impacts
- Local impacts
- Livability
- Related land use
- Flights picking up over summer, particularly between 6:30 - 8:30 am
- PDX viable to region
- Whatever expansion, be fair as to how impacts are distributed
- Noise issues outside of LUAC include the need to mitigate those impacts which are cumulative in N. Portland given PIR, I-5, Hwy 30, and trucks
- Amount of noise, ala Tommy Hawk development
- We are not living with our means
- Price elasticity 1/2.6
- "Attractiveness principal"
- Elevation vs. Altitude
- Response to future growth

C) Environmental:

- Air Pollution – 4x
- Water Pollution – 3x
- Columbia Slough wildlife – 2x
- Pollution
- Fuel dumping
- Environmental
- Particulates left on decks
- Availability of quieter propellers for the cargo haulers
- FED Express planes
- Economic development vs. stopping noise
- Status of "Fly Quiet" program?

D) Involvement:

- See community being heard
- Neighborhood consensus



- OK to plan, but cannot be a forgone conclusion that the train has left the station.
- Goals
- Defining the problem
- Determining the reasonable mitigation to legitimate concerns
- Recognize can't solve everything
- Be realistic
- WMD (Weapons of Mass Destruction) argument or real facts
- No personal agendas

E) Future Airport Ideas:

- Third/New Runway – 7x
- Long-term capacity
- Centralized vs. de-centralized impacts FAA operations.
- How do we check in down the road to see if assumptions were correct?
- What will be the future triggers? Metrics?
- See PDX as part of the whole system
- Urban or rural flight patterns
- Decrease 10% at night
- Does PDX intend to meet all of the demand or are they willing to limit demand?
- Second terminal could create capacity that exceeds what two runways can do, need third runway.
- Will Port look at other scenarios?

F) Vancouver:

- Whether Vancouver gets disproportionate share of noise

G) Land Use:

- Everyone's definition of the "sweet spot" is in a different place
- Sustainability – a big picture focus is necessary
- Redevelop, minimize densities
- Should we increase or decrease densities e.g. Bridgeton
- Check in with Metro Council in context of impact on Metro's charge
- Will City be willing to tell Port that City has limits to how much it wants PDX to expand?