

**AIRPORT FUTURES
LAND USE / TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #13
MEETING SUMMARY**

Date and Time	Wednesday, October 7, 2009 6:00 – 8:30 pm
Location	Port of Portland, Commission Room
Attendees	Erwin Bergman, CNN Andy Cotugno, Metro John Griffiths, Tri-Met Laura Hudson, City of Vancouver Fred Stovel, ONI Vicki Thompson, CNAC John Weigant, AIR
Staff	Jacob Brostoff, BPS Chris Corich, Port John Gray, PBOT Nancy Hendrickson, BES Misti Johnson, Port Scott King, Port Sean Loughran, 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 September meeting were accepted with no additional edits needed. Fred then reviewed the three desired outcomes for the subcommittee’s meeting.

Handouts: Proposed City Zoning Code amendments, Draft transportation analysis executive summary, proposed memo from LUTSC/Jay Sugnet/Chris Corich to PAG

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.

Vicki 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. If properties grow based on their allowed zoning, that is allowed. If density increases just 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. 82nd 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 50th percentile, but performance is already below 10th percentile. Being very conservative on this to make sure that bases are covered, we need to look not just at the 90th percentile, but also being below the 50th 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 first two projects, which are certain to happen within this period, 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.

Fred said that 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.

3. 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 that was the conclusion of our last discussion. If you reduce it, then it's units in the areas that are most impacted by noise.

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

Chris agreed that 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 3rd parallel runway (September 15, 2009)

4. Meeting Evaluation and Next Steps – Jay Sugnet

We will present the subcommittee's recommendation at the next PAG meeting. The November meeting will focus on City policy amendments and hopefully the final transportation analysis.

5. Closing and Next Steps - Jay

The next meeting will be November 5, 6 – 8:00pm. Agenda and meeting details will be sent prior to this meeting and posted on the website.