

**AIRPORT FUTURES  
LAND USE / TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #12  
MEETING SUMMARY (VERSION 3)**

Date and Time	Tuesday September 15, 2009 6:00 – 8:30 pm
Location	Port of Portland, Commission Room
Attendees	Erwin Bergman, CNN Andy Cotugno, Metro John Grey, BDOT Jim Howell, AORTA Laura Hudson, City of Vancouver Bob Salinger, Audubon Dave Smith, Vancouver Fred Stovel, ONI Vickie Thompson, CNAC John Weigant, AIR
Consultant	Sam Imperati, Project Facilitator
Staff	Chris Blair, Port Mindy Brooks, BPS Jacob Brostoff, BPS 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 Rachel Wray, Port

**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 July meeting were accepted with no additional edits needed. Fred then reviewed the three desired outcomes for the subcommittee’s meeting.

*Handout: LU/T Subcommittee Meeting #10 (September 2, 2009) notes*

**2. Transportation Impact Analysis – Scott King and Jamie Jeffrey**

Staff (Scott King and Jamie Jeffrey) presented preliminary information on transportation consultant recommendations (final product was not ready at time of meeting).

Dave Smith asked if there is a correlation between cargo and passenger growth patterns. During the high growth period when Delta had Asian operation, was there a corresponding level of cargo during that period? Can you use one as a proxy for another?

Scott responded that the patterns are similar.

Vickie stated that development and redevelopment outside the PDX boundary but near to the airport are beyond the control of the Port. She wondered if the Port is going to improve those intersections even if they didn't cause the traffic.

Jamie replied that we are looking at if for example a property owner applies for a zone change. Property growth based on allowed zoning is allowed. If density increases because properties are developing, then that should be assumed in the model. This is the best educated guess we can make. We still look at how much additional impact the airport is adding to the system, and what is proportional for the impact.

Vickie stated that the area near PDX is ripe for redevelopment.

Jamie agreed and stated that the transportation system around 205 is very congested and that can be a deterrent to development. If things improve, then it may all fill back in. But the model anticipates some growth.

Jim Howell wondered if the model assumes that Columbia Boulevard will be 4 or 5 lanes.

Jamie replied that those projects are in this section. At least one project talks about widening Columbia Boulevard to a 5 lane section. We have to figure out how to coordinate/time the project.

Scott added that we assume that the financially constrained system is the one that will get built. The region has a list of priority projects that are likely to be funded. 5-lane Columbia Boulevard is one of the projects on the constrained list.

Jamie stated that Cully is probably the area where it is narrowed back down. 82<sup>nd</sup> is established. That's when the City will have to figure out how to prioritize projects as we move along. This could include timing with airport projects. The City is continually looking at the constrained list, trying to find funding, etc.

John Weigant stated that in the 2000 PDX Master Plan, they assumed that passengers would double and that cargo would triple. The same patterns apply to declines: passengers are down and cargo is steeply down. Need to keep in mind that projections are based on 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, but performance is already below 10<sup>th</sup> percentile. Being very conservative on this to make sure that bases are covered, we need to look not just at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, but also being below the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Scott responded that we are trying to tie this to actual performance.

John Weigant agreed and added that the surrounding issues, economy etc. will be the primary drivers, not the airport.

Fred Stovel said that at some point, it was stated that there would have to be an interagency agreement. He asked how much weight does this have if there is no money. Is the interagency agreement the best way to do it or should the City be more aggressive in tying approvals to seeing the cash on the table? Or some willingness to bond or otherwise provide the money? Fred would like to see some discussion of what the two parties think of interagency agreements. The one that got us here was based on good will but either party could have withdrawn and started over. We're here with something that will affect the ability of people to get to jobs during PM peak. How are we going to try to solve it better?

Jamie responded that we expect to identify ways of establishing specific funding sources for the corridor. The difficulty with securing funding on future projects is that the law limits how long you

can hang on to the money, whereas the interagency agreement could have no sunset. Funds could expire if we're acting on our own. We've explored this with private development. If the mitigation timing on the first two projects is sooner than anticipated, we would try to get it built sooner. If another is taking longer, then we would try to postpone the timing. We are exploring options for how to ensure that the funding can work. Ideally, we get all the money up front and it's dedicated and ready to go but we're limited in how long we can hang on to the money. In addition, there is inflation. We need a mechanism that is flexible enough to deal with that. In general, IGAs stay on people's radar and can be part of the plan district. We can also require that the IGA be re-examined periodically. Document can be dynamic in order to get at providing needed mitigations.

Fred asked if the next step is having finishing touches by October 7.

Scott and Jamie said that they believed they would have the finishing touches by that time.

That way we can make a recommendation to the PAG by the next subcommittee meeting.

Scott said that we looked at two sensitivity issues: constraining parking, and trying to get transit mode split to 12%. Trying to get up to 15%, which is 1% higher than current highest mode split in the country. He hasn't seen the work yet, but the sensitivities are basically the same. If we got our transit mode split up to 12%, would the need for some of the mitigation projects go away? No, per the consultant.

John Weigant said that we are looking at peak hour studies. Did we differentiate between passengers and employees?

Jamie responded that trip generation would have been different for passengers than for employees and cargo. The three components were combined in the total but they are available separately.

*No Handout.*

## **2. Recap of Subcommittee Recommendation to PAG – Jay Sugnet**

Jay presented a quick recap of the subcommittee recommendation.

Andy Cotugno asked if we could add a column to relate housing potential to what is on the ground. That's the real question.

Jay responded that the close-in development is primarily low-density residential. He will check on doing this.

Fred asked if you could shrink the housing capacity, then there is a potential change of 800% from today's numbers. In general, people would rather keep things as they are today than change them, especially when there are potential adverse impacts.

Jay agreed and said that was the conclusion of our last discussion. If reduced, the units are in the areas that are most impacted by noise.

Fred added that compared to 1990, it isn't much. If we stick with the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, then people will be happy, but if we go to the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, people will be unhappy. Fred asked if that is fair.

Chris agreed that is fair.

Jay presented the memo that was handed out at the last meeting. We changed it from staff recommendation to a subcommittee recommendation to full PAG. Changes were based on the

subcommittee's conversation. Jay wanted to make sure that everyone understood/remembered what they voted on at last mtg.

Nancy Hendrickson stated that on items #4 and #5 there are changes. We didn't have time to talk about them. I want to know about #5. Depiction of airport facilities & land use plan. Goals 11 & 6. If we're going to make a recommendation to PAG, we would like to know which those are. Goal 8 - Environment changes in particular.

Jay stated that if you have suggestions for changes to Goal 8, please let us know. Mindy Brooks stated that Goal 8 is under discussion in the Portland Plan due to lack of depth to Goal. We might consider discussing this in the context of the Portland Plan.

*Handout: Draft Staff/Subcommittee Recommendations on Noise and 3<sup>rd</sup> parallel runway (September 15, 2009)*

#### **4. Natural Resources – Mindy Brooks**

Mindy presented some background information.

Bob Salinger asked if, given the degraded ecosystem, is staff changing the resource value based on ESEE analysis?

Mindy replied no. She clarified that the ESEE analysis will identify consequences of management choices, not change evaluation of values.

Bob Salinger asked if there would not be any mitigation required in the airfield.

Mindy replied no, under the current recommendation, there would not be any City-required mitigation in the airfield. However, there might be mitigation required by USFWS and ODFW.

Bob Salinger stated that environmental zoning does not make the airfield less safe. Instead, it could result in required mitigation. For Bob, this is related to overall sustainability. Why not avoid a net loss?

Mindy said that staff would come back to that. Staff feels that within the airfield proper, management shouldn't be impeded by e-zones.

Bob again asked, how does the application of e-zones impede air traffic safety? The result would be required mitigation elsewhere, not a change to air traffic safety.

Mindy explained that staff does not want to require process for airfield mgmt. There is a lot of on-the-ground activity to move water around and e-application would impede that. She stated that staff would come back to Bob's point.

Mindy continued by saying that the recommendation for the WHMP areas is c-zone for water bodies and p-zone for mitigation sites. Activities that disturb the ground or resources would require process. Certain activities could continue: mowing, discing, topping, tree removal. Mindy added that the hashed areas on the map do not have a staff recommendation yet.

Laura Hudson asked if the c-zone allows development. Mindy said that it does allow development.

Bob Salinger stated that mitigation can prevent economic development goals from competing with environmental protection goals, but that the cost of economic development should include environmental mitigation. He asked why the City is not proposing to require mitigation.

Mindy explained that the c-zone is the City's balancing mechanism for achieving both.

Bob Salinger asked Mindy to explain the staff rationale for this way of thinking. Was it that mitigation is too expensive, or that there are property rights issues?

Mindy explained that for the SW Quad, additional information is needed. Grassland uplands are being used by certain species. Staff is gathering getting additional information about this. The other issue is the economic goals of the City. The economic inventory is not complete. There are concerns about industrial land supply necessary to meet projected job growth. Related to this, there are concerns about putting constraints on the land, including permitting and mitigation. There are not many large areas of undeveloped industrial land left.

Bob Salinger disagreed with the use of terminology. These are not constraints on the land, but requirements for restoration/mitigation. There is a large deficit in this part of our city, but we are discussing it as constraints on the land. That terminology is not consistent with our initial discussion. Protecting the environment and mitigation are not burdens. Airport sustainability depends on being able to restore and mitigation. Mitigation should be the cost of doing business.

John Weigant stated his agreement with Bob.

Mindy stated that, like other parts of the City, staff is proposing to apply the p-zone to the water bodies within the WHMP land, and land within 50 feet of water bodies. Staff is proposing to apply c-zone to other habitat areas. She explained that the area along the Columbia River should be p-zone. The mapping shows the c-zone but this is an error.

Laura Hudson asked where the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway was in relation to the environmental zoning. Mindy indicated where the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway would be on the map.

Laura then asked if there is any long-term impact to the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway of applying e-zones. Mindy replied that it is likely that mitigation would be required if the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway were built, and in that case, the public benefit would outweigh resource values.

Sam asked staff to prepare a map that shows the proposed resource protection and the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway.

Staff will work on a map showing the e-zones in relation to the 3<sup>rd</sup> parallel runway.

Nancy Hendrickson stated that the recommendation treats the Columbia Slough much more consistent with the rest of the City. Mindy agreed and added that the p-zone is consistently applied to waterways throughout the rest of the City.

Bob Salinger read from the key sustainability goals: "No net loss." For Bob, that is the most important commitment for natural resource protection. This goal is not consistent with current maps.

Chris Corich stated that he did not think that there were 3,000 acres of airfield that would be subject to no net loss when the process started. We have a different view on SW Quad with respect to the science behind that.

Mindy added that nothing in the City staff proposal is final.

Bob said that we started with ambitious rhetoric but then we get to maps and negotiation. He wants to revisit our parking lot ideas, like a \$1 fee for every parking space for restoration of the Slough in a way that makes restoration real. He wants to have a conversation about the big picture, not about the value of grassland next to an airfield.

Mindy agreed that this is a good point, and added that staff wants to come back to that but we also want to get through the rest of the items.

Sam clarified that the goal is not to have a subcommittee recommendation, but to have an update on where staff is at. Fred stated that staff asked for input on what you are looking at and your proposal. And that Bob's input is reasonable.

Bob Salinger stated that the way we do this doesn't meet the aspirations of this plan. No net loss could be in the plan.

Mindy outlined 4 categories of activities that staff is proposing to regulate:

1. Activities that don't relate to the Zoning Code (nest intervention, raptor trap & release). These will not be discussed in the context of applying the e-zones.
2. Things that should be allowed without review. This includes mowing to keep goose habitat down and targeted rodenticide application to keep prey base down.
3. Things that should be allowed through a standards/plan check review.
4. Full e-zone review.

Laura Hudson asked if the City has other ways of regulating activities in natural areas besides zoning?

Mindy explained that we regulate stormwater outside of the Zoning Code, but that primarily, for changing natural resources, the tool is the Zoning Code.

Laura Hudson stated that in Vancouver, there is a Critical Areas Permit. This is for example for things that people do things regularly, like utility companies pruning trees. Vancouver does a programmatic permit for them, which approves the way they do the work.

Mindy clarified that the e-zone code regulates things by exemption, with standards, or with approval criteria. Vancouver uses a performance based code.

Fred stated that things that are allowed with no review just happen. He added that plan check and review items could be something that OPIS wants to look at. They are checking adherence to the plan, and that there should be some chance to look at them with that group/process.

Mindy explained that the benefit of standards is that they are non-discretionary; if you can't meet them, you go through review.

Bob Salinger stated that he is comfortable with this proposal, speaking as a member of the Airport Wildlife Advisory Group, as long as standards are in place to ensure mitigation.

Bob Salinger asked what the process is if there is reason to believe it's not associated with Part 77. For example, if someone thought it wasn't about safety but was development related?

Mindy agreed that that was a good question, and that staff will add that to the list.

Bob Salinger explained that it has been less of an issue recently but was an issue early on.

Jay clarified that this will be a list in the Plan District code, but staff wanted to show the subcommittee the commentary.

Mindy then outlined the proposed mitigation hierarchy.

Nancy Hendrickson clarified that the mitigation would be within the same watershed. For example, the Columbia Slough used to be part of the Columbia River watershed, so for example Government Island could be a mitigation site.

Andy Cotugno stated that there was a citywide program under development as part of the River Plan that is looking at other habitat types, riparian, upland grassland and creating an accounting mechanism for the habitat that exists to calculate fee. It's being coordinated with the River Plan.

Bob Salinger asked what the jurisdiction of the off-site area is. Mindy stated that we can define it, either by geographic boundary or as individual sites.

Bob Salinger suggested that the sites be the Slough, Columbia South Shore, Hayden Island, and Government Island.

Andy Cotugno stated that this is not a full wildlife/restoration management plan, it's just the Zoning Code. What role do we want that to play? Doing something to the land triggers the regulations. That's one slice of all activity. In aggregate, Bob is saying that all activities should have no net loss. If there is a complete picture, then the whole picture should result in no net loss. There must be degradation that we should be seeking improvement to. The aggregate strategy should be an improvement plan with a strategy, a list of resources that we expect to lose over time, and a list of mitigation/restoration opportunities, that results in no net loss.

Bob Salinger stated that in the past, letting go of overlay regulations has not paid off. There needs to be a commitment to do something, like \$1 on every car. He does not want to let go of the regulations until he knows the Port is really in agreement on a larger strategy.

Chris stated his discomfort with the conversation. He expressed a desire for the Natural Resources staff to be here. The Port is still having tough discussions with the City.

Mindy clarified that we are not all the way there, but that the last item gets part of the way there. We could talk about getting agreement on resources to be restored first. If the City were to apply overlay zones to upland grasslands, then there could be a strategy for mitigation. We don't have that much experience with upland grassland restoration, and there isn't much left in the City or in this part of the City. So maybe it should occur off site but be in kind, prescribed locations or geography, 1:1. There are lots of tools to get there. We could do the work ahead of time and not have to do it through overlay zones.

Chris asked Mindy to explain the recommendation to not apply the c-zone to PIC/Cascade Station.

Mindy explained that the City has made some policy decisions about that part of town, relating to commercial/industrial development, transportation, and stormwater. To meet those policies, we decided that uplands should not have e-zoning, and that waterways should. These are policy decisions; they have been made for PIC. We're making similar decisions in SW Quad.

Bob Salinger said he had been emailing with Sean on and off and asking for a conversation about the Big Picture before tonight, and it keeps getting postponed. He is making a plea that we get to it now. It is the lynchpin of taking this to another level. We need to have this worked out-if the parking lot fee is the wrong idea, then let's brainstorm what is the right idea. If not, this process will look like a lot of processes before where we argue over details. If that's not practical, then let's say that now.

Chris Corich said that now is the time for discussion.

Sam asked to check in. He heard that we have mechanisms that force us to use code, or not. If you use one code, it requires mitigation, and if you use the other, it doesn't.

Bob is asking us to put that aside for a moment, and look at creative ways to have economic development and no net loss. By way of example, \$1 fee for parking. If we can't get there, then we can look at the limited tools we have, but let's at least look at the broader conversation.

Andy Cotugno said that there is both the Plan District and the Master Plan. Some things are related to City code, other things are related to Port actions. Noise is an example. That's what we're talking about now-what's the whole objective? Code is part of this, but other things could be done as well. We are not trying to create habitat in the airfield, but the Slough habitat could be greater.

Sam asked Bob if he wanted to make sure there is actual linkage.

Bob Salinger said yes, but that it's controversial. We have been accused by the environmental community that if you let go of things and you get money, then you are selling out. And in the past, we haven't gotten the money or the regulations. We've got to find ways to pay for restoration projects over time. The code is scattershot in terms of outcomes: piecemeal and variable over time.

Mindy said that it is ambitious but it would be great if we could get there. She wants to continue the discussion.

*Handout: LU/T Subcommittee Meeting Natural Resources Memo 9/15/09  
Wildlife Hazard Management Plan Activities within Environmental Overlay Zones  
9/15/09*

## **5. Meeting Evaluation and Next Steps – Jay Sugnet**

Fred Stovel said that staff is looking for triggers on updates to Master Plan. Jay clarified that staff wants to explain this better. What are the triggers for Master Plan or Plan District updates? Laying that out will be helpful.

We will have a discussion draft of the Plan District, including finalized boundaries. We have a discussion draft this week. We will need to come back with the transportation piece and natural resources discussion and that's a lot for one meeting so we'll need to rethink the meeting schedule.

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

The next meeting will be October 7, 6 – 8:30pm. Agenda and meeting details will be sent prior to this meeting and posted on the website.