

**AIRPORT FUTURES  
LAND USE / TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #11  
MEETING SUMMARY**

Date and Time	Wednesday September 2, 2009 6:00 – 8:30 pm
Location	Port of Portland, Commission Room
Attendees	Erwin Bergman, CNN Andy Cotugno, Metro Laura Hudson, City of Vancouver Steve Kerman, CNAC Maryhelen Kincaid, NPNS Hector Roche, Multnomah County Dave Smith, Vancouver Joe Smith, CNAC Fred Stovel, ONI
Consultants	CF Booth, Jacobs Sam Imperati, Project Facilitator Cameron Modjeski, Jacobs
Staff	Chris Blair, Port Chris Corich, Port Lise Glancy, Port John Gray, PBOT Nancy Hendrickson, BES Misti Johnson, Port Scott King, Port Sean Loughran, Port Jason Schwartz, Port Jay Sugnet, BPS Project Manager

**1. Introductions, Agenda Review & Updates – Fred Stovel and Jay Sugnet**

Fred opened the meeting and there was a brief round of introductions. Meeting notes from the Subcommittee’s June meeting were accepted with no additional edits needed. Fred welcomed all the CNAC members and thanked them for joining us for this important meeting regarding noise. Fred then reviewed the two desired outcomes for the subcommittee’s meeting.

*Handout: LU/T Subcommittee Meeting #10 (July 8, 2009) notes*

**2. Noise – Jay Sugnet, Sean Loughran, Cameron Modjeski**

Jay presented the powerpoint and gave an overview of the night’s topics:

- Where we have been and where we are now: Land Use Plan policy questions and testing the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile forecast
- Data: DNL Contours for existing conditions and futures case scenarios, supplemental noise metrics (Time Above and Number Above)
- Subcommittee Recommendation to PAG: Action  
Staff Memo as starting point regarding:
  - City Noise overlay
  - Follow-on noise work
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> runway issues (how do we represent 3<sup>rd</sup> runway in City and Port Plans)

Jay reviewed the policy discussion from the July PAG regarding noise and indicated that significant new information is now available as requested by PAG members that Cameron will present. Jay indicated that the new information is very helpful and confirms staff's original recommendation to leave the provisions of the City noise overlay as is. The reasons are outlined in the Memo from staff.

Andy clarified his concern with keeping the noise overlay based on 1990 data. Although he believes there are strong arguments to keep it the same, the policy should be based on science, and the science shows that noise is shrinking the contours. Also, the supplemental noise metrics tell us that there are noise impacts in the neighborhoods for future conditions in 2035.

Laura pointed out that if we are not changing anything, we don't need to show the science behind it. That burden was accomplished back when it was first adopted.

Jay asked that we talk first about staff recommendation no. 2 and return to his concern.

The staff proposal acknowledges that there are noise impacts beyond the 65 DNL and that one mechanism to address this is to extend the noise disclosure requirement to the 55 DNL as identified in the 2008 noise contours for the reasons stated in the memo.

Andy suggested that there are still many areas (as identified by the supplemental noise metrics) that are impacted by noise and that the 2035 50<sup>th</sup> percentile 55 DNL noise contour may be more appropriate. Committee members and staff agreed that this is more forward thinking and that disclosure in general is a good thing.

Joe Smith mentioned that he continuously is pressing the state legislature to require a disclosure for real estate transactions at the point of offer. He would welcome any support from the PAG or individuals in this effort. There was considerable discussion on this point and the difference between disclosure and easement. Some members expressed serious concerns about an easement, but were open to disclosure at the time of construction, or any real estate transaction.

The subcommittee voted to modify the staff recommendation and use the 55 DNL from the 2035 50<sup>th</sup> percentile for disclosure only. They also agreed that the PAG should recommend to the City and Port to support Joe's efforts at a real estate transaction disclosure statement (similar to lead paint or asbestos that are in place now).

The 3<sup>rd</sup> staff recommendation is outlined in the memo. Again, acknowledging that noise impacts go beyond the 55 DNL, the subcommittee recommends that some sort of subcommittee address the issues outside of the Airport Futures process. Several members spoke eloquently about noise, CNAC, Airport Futures, and the need for getting the right people together to tackle a very difficult issue. There was general agreement that the FAA and Port are poised to think more creatively about noise than in the past and that this is a good way for the Port to continue their leadership nationwide in addressing noise.

Erwin requested and the group agreed that technical people should be added to the list.

The letter will also be modified to clarify the duration and starting point of the workplan.

*Handouts: LU/T Subcommittee #11 Powerpoint*

*11x17 Noise Contours Maps*

*9/2/09 Memo from staff to the Subcommittee titled "Staff Recommendations on Noise and 3<sup>rd</sup> Parallel Runway"*

### **3. 3<sup>rd</sup> Parallel Runway – Sean, CF, and Jay**

Jay reviewed the memo and staff's recommendation on how to address the 3<sup>rd</sup> parallel runway in both the Port's Master Plan and the City's Land Use Plan. The recommendation for the Port's piece is largely based on the July PAG meeting discussion. The City's approach is needed to comply with the State's Airport Planning Rule. There was minor discussion and the approach was supported by the members.

Jay then returned to question number 1 and again asked if the group is comfortable recommending keeping the current City noise overlay as is with the recommendation on No. 2? All members voted a One and Andy voted a Two – using the PAG method of voting. Jay indicated that staff will continue to refine the arguments to address his concerns.

### **4. Closing and Next Steps - Jay**

The next meeting will be September 15, 5:30 – 8pm. Agenda and meeting details will be sent prior to this meeting and posted on the website.