

**AIRPORT FUTURES
LAND USE / TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #5
MEETING NOTES as amended**

Date and Time:	12/10/08, 6 – 8:30 PM
Location:	Port of Portland Conference Room - 1 South
Attendees:	Nancy Hendrickson, City of Portland BES Jim Howell Laura Hudson, City of Vancouver Patrick Metzger, NECN Hector Roche, Multnomah County Fred Stovel, CNN Vicki Thompson, PAG
Staff:	Nick Atwell, Port of Portland Mindy Brooks, Planning Chris Corich, Port of Portland, Project Manager John Gray, Portland Office of Transportation Sam Imperati, Institute for Conflict Mgmt, Inc. Scott King, Port of Portland Sean Loughran, Port of Portland Melissa McCluney, Port of Portland Jay Sugnet, City of Portland, Project Manager

1. Opening and Introductions – Fred Stovel

After a brief round of introductions, Fred reviewed the agenda and meeting notes from the previous Land Use and Transportation Subcommittee meeting.

*Hand Outs: Meeting Agenda
Mid-Term Review and Planning Process Proposal, including Seven Step Process Proposal, , Port Master Plan, and the City Land Use Plan Environmental Program Update*

2. Mid-Term Review Process and Proposal – Sam Imperati

Seven steps process proposal

Two questions were presented to the Joint Subcommittee in November.

1. Should the PAG's current work be informed by the possibilities beyond the 2035 Master Plan horizon?
2. What type of recommendations should the PAG make on Post 2035 issues like the third runway and the Centralized vs. Decentralized terminals?

Based on discussions at the last PAG meeting and subsequent subcommittee meetings, staff recommends that the PAG consider levels of activity both greater and less than the 50th percentile forecast when developing the 2035 plan. To address concerns that adoption of noise and height standards to preserve future options could imply approval of a third runway, language should specifically include "without implying tacit approval of a third runway". This and other issues will be addressed directly in the proposed seven step planning process outlined by Sam.

In step 1, some assumptions must be made. To maximize utility of existing facilities and meet future needs in a sustainable way, the Centralized Terminal will be assumed as a starting point for plan development.

In step 2, at 25% of plan detail completion, check against prior work and ask if centralized working assumption still makes sense? Do we need to make a correction?

In step 3, impacts of traffic, noise, and natural resources will be analyzed using forecast 90th, 10th as well as 50th percentile growth scenarios. This will involve exploration of associated opportunities and risks. What recommendations if any, should be made to preserve terminal and runway options for future growth?

Step 4, while considering “What if’s” we will hypothesize, test data, evaluate, fine tune and reassess Land Use Plan and ongoing public involvement elements.

Step 5 will be a final check and review of the forecast. Both sides of the continuum will be tested for a full complete process.

Step 6 will be final refinement, phasing and financial analysis.

In step 7, final recommendations will be made on the Port’s Master Plan and City’s Land Use Plan.

3. Master Plan Review - Chris Corich

Chris discussed how the work plan assumptions have evolved for the 2035 Master Plan. Using the 50th percentile forecast for facility requirements, levels are significantly lower than predicted in the 2000 plan. 378,000 annual take offs and landings will easily be accommodated with the existing complex of runways and taxiways. A decision to build the 3rd parallel runway is not needed for the 2035 Master Plan. Existing terminal facilities – with some operational and technological enhancements will serve 50th percentile passenger volumes in 2035.

Moving forward, from a sustainability perspective, levels of activity both greater and less than the 50th percentile forecast level should be considered. This will ensure options are kept open for future growth. The next steps in the planning process will begin with the Centralized terminal and No third runway assumptions. The City Land Use Plan will detail a land use review process for a future potential 3rd runway and include a planning level review of noise, height, and natural resource impacts. Adoption of noise and height standards in the City Land Use Plan does not imply tacit approval of the 3rd runway.

We need to be mindful that planning for a sustainable future means not making decisions which leave future planners with no choices, or very expensive and impractical choices.

Development decisions needing consideration to address deficiencies and maximize the utility of existing facilities include:

- Intersection improvements at NE 82nd Avenue and Airport Way
- Location of future rental car facilities – growth can’t double with existing facility.
- Location of General Aviation

Considerations leading to the recommendation to start with the Centralized Terminal assumption include:

Estimated cost differential of more than \$1 billion. Decentralized Terminal phasing would require military relocation, require a long lead time for development, and require more impervious surfaces.

4. Land Use Plan Components - Jay Sugnet

The City Land Use Plan will replace the current regulatory structure – replacing the conditional use process with a land use designation that recognizes the airport as an allowed use in an industrial zone. The PAG recommended a Plan District as the best tool to examine the complex issues at PDX, provide community opportunity for involvement, and allow the Port greater flexibility in changing circumstances. Items listed in bold on the PowerPoint presentation may affect the City’s Comprehensive Plan and require amendments to reflect

the work of PAG. The Plan District will allow a certain level of airport growth provided it does not exceed certain triggers or development thresholds. What should these triggers be? OPIS will be an important sounding board.

Overlays for height, noise, and natural resources will require updating. What guidelines shall be followed? Should density or use restrictions be applied to areas beyond the 65 DNL? This affects insulation requirements in new construction as well as possible easements.

5. Natural Resource Conservation and Protection Overlay Zones

Mindy discussed a process to update the Natural Resources inventory to bring the City into compliance with the State Goal 5 and Metro Title 13 requirements. Conservation and protection overlay zones, in general, require development to avoid natural resources if practicable or to mitigate for unavoidable impacts. In addition to documenting natural resources, the process includes the completion of an economic, social, environmental and energy analysis (ESEE) resulting in recommendations of protection levels for various natural resources in the natural resources study area. The third step includes development of a program to protect and restore significant resources.

6. Transportation Update

The transportation model is expected to be complete in the end of December. The RFP for the Traffic Impact Analysis should be out the end of next week, with selection occurring in January or February.

7. Further Discussion and Questions:

It was suggested to view The Plan for Marquam Hill, as approved by the City Council.

Chris Corich posed the following question regarding the 3 documents (Master Plan Mid-Term Review, City Land Use Plan Review, and Seven Step Process Plan) presented today: Is it better to combine these 3 documents, or keep them separate? The group liked the presentation as separate sections, but thought it could be combined into one document.

Sam returned to the Seven Step Process. The process needs to be nailed down with a recommendation for us to move on beyond the process. Step 1, should read "Start with centralized terminal and no 3rd runway assumption".

Fred stated that input is needed from the Sustainability Subcommittee for more concrete elements in step one, item D. Sam pointed out that the sustainability items listed in step 5A should be moved up to step 1D.

In Step 3, Sam addressed testing "What If" scenarios. While we are using the 50th percentile forecast, should we test the 10th and 90th percentile forecasts as well, to explore associated opportunity and risks?

Vicki believes the majority oppose the 3rd runway. Most present agree that the door should remain open for future long range planning.

Fred stated the Tribune defines sustainability as not doing anything that future generations can't undo.

Perhaps the terminology here should include "preserving options for the 3rd runway without implying tacit approval of the 3rd runway." In other words, this is not about approving the 3rd runway now; it is about preserving the future option by protecting the height and noise overlays.

Laura said we should assume continued growth beyond 2035. The "what if" beyond that time should be for full PAG to discuss.

Vicki supports leaving step 3B as is, and turning this over to PAG.

What would the triggers be? Those will be determined by the committee.

Chris – Long term land use is of concern to the city. Development is platted west of the runway near Bridgeton.

The question again, if the area is landlocked, then is the urban growth boundary pushed out? To what extent are other opportunities precluded? If we say “no, don’t change the height overlay”, what is the risk? The height overlay is necessary to insure proper insulation, disclosures, and easements.

Step 4 - Fred asked Laura what Vancouver has done in regards to Land Use Overlays. Vancouver hasn’t changed their Noise Overlay. It is based on 1990 noise data. Further discussion ensued regarding new housing construction in downtown Vancouver, on the Boise site and the standards required for this land use.

Should the noise overlay be considered for 90th percentile as well as 50th, and 10th? Step 1E is designed to do just that. If it won’t fit the alternatives, what then? Step 3C allows for revisiting the Decentralized option if Centralized doesn’t work.

Step 4 – “What If” Hypothesize, test data, evaluate, make some changes, then reassess.

Step 5 – In the Final Check, we will test both sides of the continuum for a full and complete process.

Fred asked when the working draft for the conservation and protection overlays would be available. Mindy estimates March 2009.

8. Meeting Evaluation

The meeting kept moving. A lot of information was covered. Would like to see mapping tools used to show how the noise overlay has changed, and consider the associated opportunity costs. Sam asked for questions and comments to be emailed to him.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will occur in late January 2009, from 6-8 pm.

