

**AIRPORT FUTURES
LAND USE / TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #15
MEETING SUMMARY**

Date and Time	Wednesday, December 2, 2009 6:00 – 8:30 pm
Location	Port of Portland, Commission Room
Attendees	Erwin Bergman, CNN Bill Blosser, Airport Futures Chair Andy Cotugno, Metro Maryhelen Kincaid, NPNS Fred Stovel, ONI Vicki Thompson, CNAC John Weigant, AIR
Staff	Jacob Brostoff, BPS Chris Corich, Port Lise Glancy, Port John Gray, PBOT Nancy Hendrickson, BES Misti Johnson, Port Sam Imperati, ICM Scott King, Port Sean Loughran, Port Jay Sugnet, BPS Project Manager

1. Introductions, agenda review & updates: Fred Stovel

Fred asked for adoption of the meeting notes from 11/5/09 LUTSC meeting. Notes were adopted.

Erwin Bergman asked to review the following Comprehensive Plan policies Environment, D (noise disclosure): Questions about “acceptance”. What does it mean? “Acknowledgment” is better.

Jay Sugnet explained that this is the language that is in Comp Plan already. Accepting that you are in a noise-impacted area.

Erwin asked if there are legal implications from “accepting” the noise.

Misti Johnson and Jay indicated that there are not.

Erwin asked if this was similar to a navigation easement. Would prefer “acknowledge”.

Fred asked if City staff could consult with the City Attorney to see if “acknowledge” is acceptable. Perhaps “acceptance” is too strong for disclosure.

Jay said that he would ask the City Attorney if “acknowledge” is acceptable.

2. Upcoming Meetings: Jay Sugnet

Jay discussed upcoming meetings. 12/10/09 meeting is Noise Work Group (Beyond 65 DNL). The purpose of the meeting is for scoping: what issues to address, how to address them. Scope will be reported back to PAG and CNAC, work will begin in Jan.

Sideboards discussion is on 12/15. This is the “last call” for issues otherwise not addressed by PAG or beyond the scope of the PAG’s work. High-speed rail (HSR) is an example. Interest in City and Port participating in the regional (HSR) alignment discussion. Light rail is a similar issue/process. Once HSR alignment is decided, Port will help determine how PDX connects to HSR in future.

Erwin stated that HSR alignment is going to be highly controversial. Significant impacts.

Jay clarified that the Port is not leading the alignment discussion.

3. Sustainability Language: Sean Loughran

Goal is to review package that will go back to PAG in Jan. Sean reviewed what is in the handout: Outline of report, planning objectives, guiding principles (see language from Bob S), goals.

Bob Salinger proposed language that is better than “slowing degradation over time”. Proposal is “avoid, minimize, mitigate, restore”. Key concepts: should all impacts to natural resources be fully mitigated? Should goal be proactive restoration? Improvement over time, but accommodating Port’s required flexibility to operate PDX.

Sean stated that the two language proposals are close. He proposes to put Bob’s language in item 7.

Maryhelen Kincaid asked if Title 13 (Metro) language is appropriate here.

Sean states that the language could be consistent.

Bob stated that Title 13 leaves discretion to local jurisdictions, and in some cases gets lost in the specifics.

Fred asked for clarification on how #7 reads:

“Avoid, minimize, mitigate, restore”.

Bob proposed: “Ensure that future impacts are fully mitigated and contribute to a net improvement over time.”

Sean agreed that that was the proposal in principle.

Jay stated that the hierarchy of AMM/net improvement is important.

Sean committed to sending out a new draft with proposed changed language. He will refine the language and send out a new draft. He asked Bill Blosser if that was consistent in spirit.

Andy Cotugno proposed a new guiding principle: “Ensure that the economic importance of the airport to the region is sustained.” This is emphasizing the economic value of airport itself.

Sean committed to incorporating that, trying to re-use language that is already crafted for this purpose.

Fred expressed concern that talking about the economy could present problems. In previous discussions, no one had the ability to “prove” that the economic benefits outweigh the impacts, especially to the human community. What is being economically sustained? Is the airport the driver? Are sewers the driver of human civilization? Driver or result?

Sean stated that he wouldn’t phrase it using either concept. Just that the economy is part of the “triple bottom line”. We won’t always be able to reconcile/balance these decisions.

Erwin used the example of HSR. There might be a significant economic engine that has less impacts than air travel. We should not push the economic benefit of the airport beyond what it is. Being the driver vs. responding to what is already in Portland/Vancouver.

Sean stated that he wouldn’t argue that either way, just that the airport is an important part of the regional economy, and that it is important to preserve that role as the region grows.

Erwin agreed with this characterization.

Andy emphasized the importance of treating the economy as an equal part of the triple bottom line.

Bob S pointed out that “balance” is the hardest concept to deal with. It’s a different animal and that we should highlight that this is the process component.

Mindy Brooks stated that it is important to have the balance component when trying to manage the conflicting goals.

Bob stated that it calls into question the “most sustainable” moniker.

Sean stated that he would send out an updated draft in Jan.

Goals discussion:

First goal: carbon neutrality via coordination with City, State’s goal. Sean has added City and State goals. He is not proposing any changes to the first goal.

Erwin stated that the proposed numbers are impressive, but that it is unlikely that anyone would take them seriously. To achieve them would require a change in lifestyle.

Maryhelen discussed how a recent Portland Plan workshop raised awareness of how the public can help reduce carbon footprint.

Bill suggested that proposed additions could go in a footnote.

Sean moved onto Goal 2 (natural resources). He reviewed changes.

Bob expressed concern that there is a lot open to interpretation. He would like to see language that commits the Port to acting to contribute to keeping us “above the line”.

Mindy asked if the goals are to guide the City and Port.

Sean indicated that they were.

There was discussion about whether or not the language commits the City equally as it does the Port.

Bob clarified that the language was specifically to commit the Port to enhancement or at least 1-for-1 mitigation. He wants this to be clear to everyone. This is expensive, but it should be the goal.

Nancy Hendrickson expressed that she liked how Bob S combined the goals.

Bill reminded the group that these are the PAG's recommendations, and the Port is free to accept or reject them.

Bob proposed breaking out trees separately from habitat. Proposed language is: "Consistent with the WHMP, the Port will achieve the equivalent of the City of Portland's target of 15% canopy cover on industrial lands either by on-site tree plantings or support for compensatory offsite tree plantings where onsite planting is not practicable."

Sean reviewed the previous language. He feels that it is very close to Bob's language.

Bob referenced the City's canopy goals for industrial lands. He is trying to speak to how the Port can reach the goals off-site.

Nancy pointed out that this is calling for consistency with the City's programs/goals. We should reference Urban Forestry Management Plan.

Fred asked if it was possible to put a numerical standard in this goal.

Bob agreed that it would be.

Erwin agreed that this would be a good idea.

Sean explained that this would be the follow-on work, targets and measures.

Mindy explained that it would be easy to calculate that.

Misti said that this is for the follow-on group.

Bob stated that some targets would be easy to establish. He would like to encourage the Port to specify things as much as possible.

Nancy pointed out that some goals already had numbers.

Sean agreed that the conceptual numbers could go into the goals (percentage OK). He discussed goal 9 (ISO 14001). Footnote to explain what it is. Last goals: air and water quality. These fit into goal 13. [Get language from Sean.]

Bill proposed rewriting goal 14 to say "The PAG recognizes that other goals will also be needed. These need to be developed, such as [insert 4 examples here]." Way it is currently written seems negative. Perhaps it should be a footnote.

Bob did not want to see air and water quality left out. A generic statement about meeting regulatory minimums and improving over time would be good.

Sean proposed identifying the elements of an EMS under goal 13.

Bill pointed out that all of the goals could fall under that. Either call out the goals or state that they need to be developed, one or the other.

Fred proposed leaving the goals in.

Sean discussed goals, objectives and targets. Air and water quality as examples. Targets could go in the goals discussion.

Bob lauded the Port for having aggressive goals. [Get language from Bob.] Committing to meeting regulatory minimums would show the public the extent of the Port's commitment.

Fred proposed putting particulate goal with air quality.

Erwin discussed creation of very small particulates from jet takeoffs. He proposes to include aircraft particulates into air quality goals. He also would like to add in "where possible, choose plant species that are drought-resistant or have low water demands" for water quality goal. He is concerned about use of lawns.

Fred stated that there will be other goals that will come up over time.

Review outcome of natural resources technical review, discussion (Mindy)

Three components of City's environmental program: NRI, ESEE/zoning, NRMP.

Bill asked what SHA designation means in terms of regulations.

Mindy clarified that the SHA designation doesn't mean anything in terms of regulations yet.

Maryhelen pointed out vacant farmland being used by various bird species.

Mindy said that documentation would be needed but that new SHAs could be added.

Mindy explained the regulatory program proposal.

Bob advocated for c-zoning over all SHAs.

Fred asked if the City would make a decision, or if PAG would recommend over staff objections.

Mindy explained that this is the regulatory tool we have, but that the NRMP is the other tool which she doesn't have here tonight. It is possible to voluntarily do restoration/enhancement beyond regulatory minimums.

Maryhelen stated that compared to e-zoning, NRMPs are not as effective. For her, it makes most sense to focus on regulations. Without regulations, then there is no assurance that protection will happen.

Bill asked if Port was happy with the proposal/process.

Sean said that Port was happy with the process. Academic review was very valuable. Hard work is yet to be done; balancing work still needs to be done.

Bob said that the balance is to trade flexibility for the airfield for mitigation of impacts.

Andy said that this conversation is related to previous conversations about responsibility. It makes sense to exempt the perimeter fence in exchange for net improvement outside the fence. There will always be lots of grassland inside runways/perimeter fence, so the other option (enhancement) is preferential.

Bob agreed with Andy but said that in the past, the words have not resulted in the right outcomes, but he agrees in principle.

Erwin asked if the Runway Protection Zones (RPZs) have some natural resource value and merits additional regulation.

Mindy said that current proposal exempts RPZs and inside the perimeter fence. The City is not proposing to add additional regulations/protections inside RPZs.

Maryhelen asked about north runway extension.

Mindy B stated that the RPZs are already in place with extensions.

Bob asked about parcels outside the perimeter fence (PIC) that have natural resource value. This is why he does not like the balancing test—it's not consistent with the values and principles.

Bill said that Bob had raised a question that wasn't clear to him until just now. He was assuming that grey areas had no habitat value, but no net loss should apply across SHAs.

Bob agreed and said that no net loss means

Nancy clarified that the c-zone regulations allow for a loss of current habitat values, even with a no net loss policy in place.

Bill suggested that no net loss should include all SHAs, not just those proposed for c-zoning.

Sean stated that convening experts to discuss SHAs has helped inform the process and show that managed areas (golf courses, SW Quad) can be SHAs.

Maryhelen said that this might be a pattern that the City. Without regulations, proposals for restoration are meaningless.

Nancy H suggested another subcommittee meeting to discuss these issues.

City Land Use Plan: Jay
Jay presented the Land Use Plan.

Jim asked about the Columbia Blvd. corridor.

January PAG meeting (advice): Jay
Bob expressed his concern that the natural resource component is being left for last. He has been saying for a long time that we have waited until the last minute to deal with complex issues. He is concerned that the ESEE analysis has preceded the inventory.

Mindy explained that the draft ESEE proposal and inventory were intended to spur discussion.

Bob questioned why we haven't applied the PAG's values to the natural resource questions. He feels that the outcomes do not reflect the values.

Scott pointed out that the 10,000 foot regulation has not been pushed.

Bill summarized by saying that he understands Bob's point that all SHAs should be developed.

Fred said that there should be a starting point for the conversation.

Bob said that the standard has to be enhancement, starting with what we have now.

Bill said that the option for the PAG is to say no net loss for what's there now (or enhancement), or to write off some of the habitat.

Mindy pointed out that there are different ways (development agreements, IGA) to get to enhancement.

Bill said that short of having an agreement in place, there need to be two alternative proposals.

Bob said that if the proposal is for net loss, then he wants Council to hear that.

4. Meeting evaluation and next steps: Jay Sugnet

Meeting adjourned.