

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

1-2-08 Updated PAG Numeric Results From Triage Voting Exercise (Added Hudson and Changed Bergman, Hargrave and Thompson)

N/A = No Answer Given. Blank = No Response

Members	1 Rail	2 Military	3 Cargo	4 Replacement Supplemental Airport	5 Traffic	6 3 rd	7 City	8 Cent/ De-	9 NEPA	10 Air	11 Climate	12 Emissions	13 Noise	14 Curfew	15 Water	16 Deice	17 Neighborhood Improvements	18 Econ Development	19 Slough
Barton-Mullins																			
Bergman	3	2	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
Ciarlo	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Cotugno																			
Gerharter	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2
Gilmour																			
Hargrave	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Hudson	3	3	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	1
Kincaid	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
Matthew	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Metzger																			
Mohlis	3	3	3	2	2	3	N/A	2	N/A	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	3
Monn	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Mulvihill	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Nelson																			
Olson	1	1	1	1	1	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
Papé																			
Rinard	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
Roche	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Russell	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	N/A
Sallinger	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	1	2
Sloan																			
Stoecklin	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Stovel	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Thompson	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Weigant	2	3	3	1/3	2	2	1	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1
Williams																			
# of 3s	3	4	3	2	2	4	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
# of 2s	6	5	3	3	5	3	0	4	5	4	8	5	4	9	4	3	8	4	3
# of 1s	10	10	13	14	12	11	11	14	12	15	10	14	15	8	15	16	10	15	13

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

1-3-08 Updated Staff and PAG Narrative Details (Blue text represents new text.)				
Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
CONSENSUS BASED ON PAG TRIAGE (#10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18)				
<p>#10. Air Quality: Will air quality be considered as part of Airport Futures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus will be on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational efficiency and comparison between alternatives Development of sustainable practices and policies to reduce emissions <i>Will not create new air quality standards</i> <i>Consider in the alternatives process</i> 	<p>1 = 15 2 = 4 3 = 0</p>	<p>1. We agree that the PAG does not have a role in setting EPA standards.</p> <p>2. In the forecasting phase, will we discover a point at which PDX operations might exceeds standards?</p> <p>3. There should be an air quality briefing by DEQ/EPA before the land use and alternatives phase.</p> <p>* Need more detail here.</p> <p>* I would like to hear from relevant environmental groups whether they think the federal standards are strong enough or if we, as an area known for environmental leadership, should/could be looking to improve on the federal standards.</p>	<p>Air quality is a national issue and a DEQ issue. Maybe the Port needs to add funding for DEQ. Air quality is a surrogate for global warming, a huge and increasing issue.</p> <p>Anything considered in the alternatives phase must also be considered in the forecasting phase. (General principle that applies to several issues.)</p>	<p>Air quality will be considered as part of the Alternatives Analysis phase and Follow-On Studies. Consistent with the commitment to complete an environmental screening and evaluate the relative sustainability of different alternatives, Airport Futures will consider the probable effects of the alternatives on airport efficiency and the resulting emissions.</p> <p>If desired by the PAG, we could request an air quality presentation by DEQ, Port/City environmental staff, and/or other environmental interests. We have many of these experts on our Technical Advisory Pool for this purpose.</p> <p>The creation of a new air quality standard is not within the scope of Airport Futures.</p>
<p>#12. Emissions from Jet Aircraft: Will Airport Futures consider emissions from jet aircraft?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus is on operational efficiency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficient circulation Ground power at gates Pre-conditioned air <i>No effort to create new emissions standards for jet aircraft engines</i> <i>Continue to support research into jet emissions</i> <i>Consider in the alternatives process</i> 	<p>1 = 15 2 = 4 3 = 0</p>	<p>1. Consider airfield layouts that may minimize emissions.</p> <p>2. Consider an east end cross-field taxiway (north - south) to prevent long taxi time to preferred runways.</p> <p>3. Sell only unleaded aviation gas at PDX (i.e., consider emissions from ALL aircraft).</p>	<p>This layout has both noise mitigation and fuel saving implications.</p> <p>A reliever airport could be constructed with sloping runways (see <i>Economist Magazine</i>) to use gravity to aid takeoffs and landings.</p>	<p>Jet aircraft emissions will be considered as part of the Alternatives Analysis phase. Whether an alternative results in more or less emissions than another will be a factor weighed in the decision-making process. Airport Futures will consider the probable effects of the alternatives on airport efficiency, including the movement of aircraft, and how those changes in efficiency may affect emissions.</p> <p>The creation of new emissions standards for jet aircraft engines is outside the scope of Airport Futures. However, the Port will continue to support research into jet emissions.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#13. Noise Impacts: Will Airport Futures consider aircraft noise impacts from aircraft?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Use the recently completed noise study (Part 150) as a source</i> • 28 recommendations, 3 year, \$million study • <i>Supplement with additional info if needed</i> • Revise noise codes –both sides of the river – consider (being done by noise office as part of 150 process) • <i>Consideration in alternatives process</i> 	<p>1 = 15 2 = 4 3 = 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brief the Part 150 study to the PAG, including future noise contours (relate to forecasts). Brief State Noise Rule to PAG. 2. Explain noise impacts and all the noise metrics that are being suggested. 3. Use noise considerations as a part of forecasting phase and land use. 4. Stop Port Noise Office discussions with affected jurisdictions on land use changes until the PAG land use subcommittee can look at the issues. 5. Consider recommending a multijurisdictional IGA to establish a Noise Committee. <p>*After spending over a million dollars on the Part 150, I do not want to reinvent the wheel - but to the extent that new noise is created, it needs to be looked at. Also, consider noise in forecasting phase.</p>	<p>The Part 150 is an FAA plan that starts with existing operations and only extends into the near future. In the last 150 plan, suggestions were made that fell outside what the consultant knew the FAA would approve. It is possible to do noise studies and make decisions outside of the FAA mandate as the State Aviation Dept. has done with State airports. Neither the Port nor FAA has land use authority. There are two ways for the city to solve the noise problem: mitigate after it happens (change zoning, ask for insulation, or have the Port buy out land) or work with the Port to prevent the factors that will cause future noise growth.</p> <p>The Port, as the airport proprietor, is not required to provide capacity that will lead to unacceptable noise impacts, either through sheer numbers or the delays that the FAA will solve through changes in flight paths.</p>	<p>To the extent that additional noise analysis is needed to fill significant gaps in the 2007 PDX Noise Plan Update (Part 150 Study), that information will be provided during the Alternatives Analysis phase. This could include changes in the aircraft fleet mix used in the noise model (fewer or more of a noisy or quiet aircraft) or numbers of flights when compared with the data in the 2007 noise plan. Implementation of the three-year Part 150 Study is ongoing and should be compatible with Airport Futures planning.</p> <p>The City's evaluation of current and potential noise regulations related to PDX would occur in the Alternatives Analysis phase, as well.</p> <p>There will be a PAG briefing on noise in the Follow-on Studies phase. This will include the Part 150 and state and local noise rules.</p> <p>There is a multi-jurisdictional noise committee for PDX in place. A recommendation for an ongoing public involvement program for PDX will be developed as part of Airport Futures.</p>
<p>#15. Water Quality: Will water quality be considered as part of Airport Futures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different alternatives will have different water quality impacts, or perhaps similar • <i>Consider water quality goals</i> • <i>Consideration in the alternatives process</i> 	<p>1 = 15 2 = 4 3 = 0</p>	<p>Same as # 10.</p> <p>* Alternatives analysis depends on forecasts, and nothing should be closed to the forecast phase.</p>		<p>Water quality impacts will be considered. The impacts of the various alternatives will be compared during the Alternatives Analysis phase and the relative impacts will be considered during their evaluation.</p>
<p>#16. Deicing: Will deicing issues be considered as part of Airport Futures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing project under way to improve current \$32 million dollar deicing system • <i>Consider in alternatives analysis process</i> 	<p>1 = 16 2 = 3 3 = 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brief de-icing system. 2. Are there a number of operations that would exceed planned system capabilities? <p>* Port staff should give an overview of the deicing system at PDX. * I'd be interested to know what the environmental PAG reps think. * Alternatives analysis depends on forecasts, and nothing should be closed to the forecast phase.</p>	<p>As the new system uses the River for waste discharge, will there be impacts that will limit system expansion?</p>	<p>The Port is currently working on enhancements to the existing deicing system. Briefings on that project and the impact of deicing will be provided to the PAG to keep them informed of progress toward a deicing "solution". How that system may be developed to serve a centralized or decentralized alternative will be considered during the Facilities Requirement and Alternatives Analysis phases.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic (Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#18. Economic Development Areas Adjacent to PDX: Will an economic development plan for areas adjacent to PDX be considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial and employment areas along Columbia South Shore Analysis of opportunity sites for airport related uses Identification of issues or deficiencies 	<p>1 = 15 2 = 4 3 = 0</p>	<p>1. Transportation infrastructure should be considered: a. Consider light rail to service east Clark County. b. Consider land use changes if impacts to neighborhoods are allowed</p> <p><i>* To the extent that airport passenger traffic compromises freight traffic, the Port should be involved in solutions/mitigations. I need more information on this one, too.</i></p> <p><i>* The background issues may have major impact in alternatives analysis.</i></p>	<p>This is a Land Use Plan focus, but needs very careful attention regarding the issues of sustainability.</p>	<p>Economic development actions will be discussed in the City Land Use Plan phase in the industrial and employment areas around the airport which includes the Columbia South Shore. This analysis will include study of opportunity sites for airport-related uses and identification of issues and deficiencies with these sites.</p>

NON-CONSENSUS BASED ON PAG TRIAGE (ordered by the fewest to the most number of 3's)				
<p>#8. Terminal Alternatives Other Than Centralized and Decentralized: Will Airport Futures consider alternatives other than the Decentralized and Centralized alternatives that came out of the 2000 PDX Master Plan Update?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuation of 2000 Master Plan IGAs say Centralized & Decentralized will be reviewed in depth Looking for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A superior alternative Looking for fatal flaws Looking for refinements or sub-alternatives If both fail – <u>may</u> consider new alternatives 	<p>1 = 14 2 = 4 3 = 1</p>	<p>1. The PAG should be able to suggest whether there is a "fatal flaw" and then consider alternatives. 2. Even if Decentralized and Centralized option is accepted, NEPA will require other alternatives to be considered, so let's do prudent option planning now. 3. Even if the Port selects an alternative, there is no requirement for the City to approve it; City has final say if option is fatal for their purposes. 4. The PAG will have to make a judgment on what constitutes "fatal."</p> <p><i>* Keep the door open for other options, but do not go back to the drawing board to develop new options. So, generally agree with staff but may "consider" 3rd option before either of the other two options do not work.</i></p> <p><i>* "If the Port determines"...THREE. The Port better get used to the idea that the City has a say in land use impacts, and it could say "No 3rd runway!" In my opinion, that would be a fatal flaw the Port would do well to recognize.</i></p>	<p>City Council rejection of an ALP with a third runway is a fatal flaw. It would be planning incompetence of the worst sort to finish a master plan with only the current alternatives and have the City reject the third runway. We all want the best alternative, but that's not likely on the table now.</p>	<p>All agreements defining the Airport Futures planning process propose beginning where the 2000 Master Plan ended. As such, the Alternatives Analysis will begin with the Decentralized and Centralized options identified in the 2000 Master Plan. The analysis will consider those alternatives in light of new information developed in Follow-On Studies, changes within the aviation industry, and the new forecasts and facility requirement projections developed for this project. A thorough analysis of each alternative's strengths and weaknesses will be completed including a sustainability evaluation each alternative. Dependent on that analysis, other potential facility and site plan configurations (alternatives or sub alternatives) to meet projected facility needs may need to be explored by staff and the PAG. A no-build alternative will be included in this analysis.</p> <p>In the 2000 PDX Master Plan, numerous alternatives were evaluated and two alternatives (Centralized and Decentralized) were identified for further study.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#11. Climate Change: Will Airport Futures consider climate change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to #10 • Seek to minimize emissions of green house gases in design and operating policy • Approach is to minimize impact while meeting demand • <i>No plan to reduce demand through mandatory taxes or fees</i> • <i>Consider in the alternatives process</i> 	<p>1 = 10 2 = 8 3 = 1</p>	<p>1. Consider in the forecasting phase: will it affect demand more, the same or less? 2. What can we do at PDX under each of these scenarios? 3. Forecast phase needs two scenarios (one Republican, one Democrat) in early forecasts.</p> <p>* I think the port needs to go further---want to see more than just aspirations....</p> <p>* Climate change is a byproduct of other issues (emissions, aviation demand, and technology). So considering climate change by itself is too nebulous.</p> <p>* It must also be considered as part of the forecasting phase.</p>	<p>Similar to 10</p> <p>“Climate Change” is a surrogate for “sustainable.” Administration change may lead to different policy forecasts after election, which could have substantial impact on federal support of domestic versus foreign policy.</p>	<p>The impact of climate change and sustainability on future aviation demand will be considered as part of the Forecast phase. Climate change has been identified as one of the Key Issues and Trends that will receive specific consideration within the Aviation Demand Forecast. To the extent climate change may result in programs to limit green house gasses (which affect the price of fuel, the price of air transportation, and the number of persons traveling by air), we will attempt to capture those concerns in the forecasts. During the Alternatives Analysis phase of the master plan, we intend to prioritize alternatives relative to sustainability principles because sustainability has been identified as on of the major themes of the planning process.</p> <p>The Port will monitor national and state policy on climate change.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#17. Neighborhood Improvements Not Related to PDX Impacts: Will neighborhood improvements not related to PDX impacts be considered in Airport Futures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required mitigation versus action items • <i>Impacts directly related to PDX will require mitigation</i> • <i>Other deficiencies will be addressed through action items in City's Plan</i> 	<p>1 = 10 2 = 8 3 = 1</p>	<p>1. The PAG should consider Community Based Agreements and other forms of compensation that may be appropriate when mitigation is not possible. 2. We should look at offsite impacts of all the alternatives.</p> <p>* I'm not sure what is included here. If the Port is considering taking off the table consideration of establishing a fund to pay for insulation for noise-affected neighborhoods, I think that is premature. * I see a more integrated MP and LUP. I also see that there are enough neighborhood impacts related to PDX that there's little need to consider those not related. What is meant? * This needs a #19 * The Columbia Slough needs to be a <u>major</u> consideration in this process. The Port's impact on nearby natural resources has been very poorly considered in past planning processes. As a result, the need for major habitat removal has too frequently been discovered after projects were completed and conflicts were discovered. * Would like to see protecting slough/water quality/riparian habitat as a stated priority. #17a., policy addressing neighborhood improvements related to PDX impacts. * A big concern with this process is that it is out in front of the city's Columbia Corridor Planning process. To me this is the elephant in the middle of the room. I think a fundamental consideration has to be how the airport interacts and affects the neighborhoods. * Not realistic. * The background says required mitigation for impacts from the airport would be the responsibility of the airport, but the recommendation only mentions attention in the City Land Use Plan. * Shouldn't this be part of the Port plan should actions come up that will require mitigation?</p>	<p>Does the language, "not related to impacts," mean, "not related to impacts for which the FAA would fund mitigation"?</p>	<p>Neighborhood improvements will be discussed in the City Land Use Plan phase.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#4. Building Replacement or Supplemental Airport: Will Airport Futures look at building a new airport at some other location?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studied in Regional Air Transportation Demand Task Force • Environmental cost, statewide land use policy, capital cost all make it not feasible • \$1 billion + invested at PDX • <i>No further study recommended</i> 	<p>1 = 14 2 = 3 3 = 2</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relook at RATDTF assumptions. 2. Look at this option as an outgrowth of #5, below. 3. Look at implications in forecast data. 4. Consider whether supplemental airport is not being done through “natural” methods, i.e., growth around Salem – Corvallis area. See #5. 5. Expand regional view to include regional solutions. <p>* This option is fairly obviously too expensive.</p>	<p>RATDTF was not given full info. Replacement airport not feasible or recommended, but suppl. airport needs major consideration. It might focus on military, GA, and freight feeder—uses that do not require major terminals/passenger facilities. The current MP budget is \$3.5 billion, in 1997 dollars and a new I-5 bridge is \$4-6 billion, so compare to current PDX investment.</p> <p><i>A supplemental airport is a must-consider option.</i></p>	<p>Existing airports - PDX, and others in the Portland/Vancouver area and around the state - have capacity to meet demand for the foreseeable future. In fact, numerous capacity enhancements are planned or under development at many of these existing airports (e.g., Hillsboro, Troutdale, Kelso/Long-View, Grove Field, Salem, Eugene, Redmond).</p> <p>While this study will not explore the development of a new airport within the region, it will consider the statewide airport systems for Oregon and Washington and strive to capture how that extended system of airports may influence aviation demand (Key Issues and Trends) during the Forecast phase.</p> <p>Beyond the Master Plan Port staff will continue to coordinate with Oregon and Washington State Aviation Departments and other commercial airport operators to better understand and coordinate air service.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#5. Shifting Traffic to Other Airports: Will Airport Futures consider shifting traffic to other airports?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passenger shifting occurs with natural growth • PDX – Seattle • Redmond – LAX and Salt Lake • Salem – Salt Lake City • Medford – San Francisco • Connect Oregon Investments • No regulatory mechanism to “require” traffic to move • General Aviation reliever airports attract some GA traffic • <i>Consider during forecast element</i> 	<p>1 = 12 2 = 5 3 = 2</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the forecasts for other airports in Oregon? 2. Consider their growth factors within the forecast and if it pencils out, consider in alternative phase. 3. No request to “move” traffic, but no regulatory requirement to make them come here rather than fly out of their local area. 4. Landing fees could be adjusted to make GA service pay its pro rata share. 5. What government/private incentives are/could increase service in other local areas such as Salem, Eugene-Springfield, and north coast cities? <p>* Should be considered in other phases other than just forecasting, e.g. alternatives development and analysis. * Anything considered in the forecast phase may move forward in the process, depending on recommendations of the forecast phase. This carefully worded answer needs to be opened a bit. PDX is the central part of a regional plan, and considering the pieces separately is not wise.</p>	<p>Let the market handle passenger shifting, but GA and military can be more easily shifted as a matter of policy and price setting. <i>Anything considered during forecast phase implies results will be used at subsequent phases.</i></p>	<p>Existing and future service at other airports has been identified as part of the Key Issues and Trends that will receive further study in the Forecast phase of Airport Futures. The Forecast phase will consider the degree to which market forces may result in shifting of traffic away from or bypassing Portland International Airport (leakage). This will include considering the potential shifting of general aviation (private planes) to other airports in the Portland/Vancouver metro area as well as passengers and cargo shifting to other commercial service airports within Oregon or Washington (e.g., Salem, Redmond, Eugene).</p> <p>Forced shifting of traffic, whether general aviation private planes, or passenger and cargo, will not be considered because at the present time, there is no legal mechanism to accomplish this.</p> <p>Staff will track and report to the PAG, the development of concepts of demand management and congestion pricing as they develop at other airports, and report to the PAG as this process unfolds.</p> <p>Connect Oregon is one example of a government incentive program to increase capacity in other local areas. The Port will continue to monitor these investments and participate in state and regional discussions regarding system capacity.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#7. City Council Consideration of 3rd Parallel Runway in Land Use Plan: Will the Portland City Council consider approval to construct a third parallel runway in the City's 2010 land use plan for PDX?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Port will not be asking for approval</i> 	<p>1 = 11 2 = 0 3 = 2</p>	<p>1. The City Land Use plan should consider the impacts of 500,000 plus operations. 2. Make a decision on whether or how land use rules could accommodate the growth.</p> <p>* Staff Recommendation is nondescript, but ONE. Background: THREE. Whatever the ALP says is what will be the heart of the Land Use Plan. The Port may not be requesting immediate permission to build a third runway, but if it is on the ALP, they will be requesting eventual permission, and the City needs to know.</p>	<p>The Port will ask the City to approve its land use plan, which includes the Airport Layout Plan. If the ALP has a third runway, shouldn't the City consider the issue?</p>	<p>While the Port will not request approval for a third parallel runway in the 2010 City Land Use Plan, the planning process will evaluate the potential impacts, including noise, natural resources, and surface transportation if a third parallel runway is built. If the planning horizon does not anticipate the need for the runway, the City's Land Use Plan will detail a land use review process for a future third parallel runway. These issues will be evaluated during the City Land Use phase of this process. The form this will take will be the subject of extensive discussion by the PAG, the City, and the Port. In an effort to maintain flexibility and keep options open well into the planning horizon and beyond, Airport Futures will consider, in the Alternatives Analysis phase, how and where PDX could accommodate a third runway, if such a need exists. As a result of this process, the City will be made aware of the potential for a third runway and its timing, as noted in item 6, above.</p>
<p>#14. Nighttime Curfew: Is a nighttime curfew a realistic option to consider to address noise impacts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Airport Noise and Capacity Act – 1990 makes a curfew for quiet stage 3 aircraft all but impossible Federal Aviation Regulation Part 161 outlines the process Relatively few people in the 65 DNL noise contour <i>No further study recommended</i> 	<p>1 = 8 2 = 9 3 = 2</p>	<p>1. Look at present and future night operations in the forecasting phase. 2. Brief the advantage/disadvantage of the longer north runway. 3. Consider other recommendations at end of the alternatives phase. 4. Do not actively recruit operations that will probably fly from midnight to 5 AM.</p> <p>* Shouldn't be taken off the table at this time. * I expect a groundswell of political change, and it may affect ANCA. Keep the door open, and keep PDX as an agent of change nationally. * Would like to know if nighttime noise is a huge problem, and if so whether a curfew could actually solve it. * Should we wait for results from the LA study before ruling this out? * This again is not going to happen without total support of the FAA. PDX does not begin to have enough traffic.</p>	<p>We realize that noise levels depend on the numbers of operations. Nighttime flights are considered 10X as annoying as day ops. We do not think we should slam the door on Part 161. We are watching more airports attempt the process. What is certain is that it is not quick, but we have twenty years to work on it. Long range thinking here is needed.</p>	<p>Staff will track the Part 161 process currently under way at other airports and will report back to the PAG on a periodic basis. Current federal law and FAA regulations make it unrealistic to undertake a Part 161 curfew study at this time. The time required to complete a Part 161 is also well beyond the timeframe of the Airport Futures planning process.</p> <p>Detailed operations forecasts will be undertaken in the Forecast phase, and will be used to inform the Facility Requirements and Alternatives Analysis phases.</p> <p>A briefing on the North Runway can be provided to the PAG during the Facility Requirements phase if desired.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#1. High-Speed Rail: Will Airport Futures consider high-speed rail as a means to meet travel demand?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Air Transportation Demand Task Force looked at it. <i>High level consideration in the forecast process</i> <i>Estimate how many might shift from air to rail between selected destinations</i> Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles 	<p>1 = 10 2 = 6 3 = 3</p>	<p>1. The PAG should consider what the RATDTF said and what the rail plans are for Oregon and Washington.</p> <p>2. In the forecasting phase, look at rail usage and potential leakage/relief.</p> <p>3. Request the Port, City & Metro establish an ongoing lobbying commitment with our congressional delegation and USDOT.</p> <p>* High speed rail is no longer too far in the future to be considered in regional transportation planning, at least on the WA side of the river.</p> <p>* Include cargo in this? Look at a very high level since there is considerable investment required to get reliable high-speed rail and a willingness of the public to use it</p> <p>* Support high-level consideration.</p> <p>* I would just like the language to be clear that high-speed rail will get a "high level" consideration in the forecasting phase. It might be good to check in with DeFazio's office about the political reality of high-speed rail in the timeframe we're planning for.</p> <p>* Nice thought, but we don't have the population to support it. Let spend our time on issues in which we can have an impact.</p>	<p>RATDTF 2000 recommendations are not current or balanced with present circumstances.</p> <p>PDX (and SEA) have potential for integrating regional intermodal passenger and freight transport. The problem is political, and needs a political, federal, bi-state solution. The future is HSR, since it will be electric powered.</p>	<p>High speed rail will be considered in the Forecast phase. It is included on the list of key issues and trends that will be used to inform the forecast process. Rail studies completed by the Oregon (2001 Rail Plan, 2003 Rail Capacity Study) and Washington (2007 LATS Phase II Technical Report) Departments of Transportation (DOT) will be used to develop an understanding of the ridership potential of such a system and the potential mode shift from aviation to rail. Further, existing studies completed by Oregon and Washington DOTs (lead agencies on rail) will be used to better understand the timeframe for such a system. This will be part of the Forecasting phase.</p> <p>In an effort to maintain flexibility and keep options open well into the planning horizon and beyond, Airport Futures will consider, in the Alternatives Analysis Phase, how and where PDX could connect to high-speed rail if such a system was developed.</p> <p>The Regional Air Transportation Demand Task Force (RATDTF) findings on high speed rail and findings of all other follow-on studies will be reviewed by the PAG in the Follow-On Studies phase.</p> <p>Separate from this process, the Port will continue to work with the Oregon and Washington DOTs on regional transportation issues. The Port's primary focus is on freight movement.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#3. Move Air Cargo to Another Airport: Will moving air cargo operations to another airport to provide more capacity at PDX be considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No legal way to require them to move Small cargo planes need to be near large jets Facilities in the Metro area don't exist to serve large cargo jets Assume cargo continues to operate at PDX No further study recommended 	<p>1 = 13 2 = 3 3 = 3</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Original study should be briefed to the PAG. Forecasts should be done considering the present economic model could change with price, fleet size, leakage to other modes, etc. Forecast data should be entered into the noise data. Consider in the alternatives discussion. Do not solicit major carriers who will fly at night, E.G., Korea Air. Evaluate impact of minimum landing fee. <p>* It is already clear that in the future there is likely to be more demand for use of PDX than capacity. NO option for dealing with that should be taken off the table at the outset of the study.</p> <p>* This is not going to happen either - passenger planes are part of this system.</p> <p>* Options need to be kept open for alternatives analysis phase</p>	<p>We need a little more experience with Troutdale and UPS. The problem is airline belly-cargo at PDX, tightly integrated with cargo carriers. May make a substantial difference with small cargo feeders that used to operate from Troutdale. Lets market forces determine business.</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to whether market forces might add or shift cargo to other airports (leakage) within Oregon and Washington. The future level of air cargo activity at PDX is dependent on numerous other variables related to local and regional demand for goods (e.g., the future of air-dependent industries in the region, the cost of other transportation modes). We will look to existing research to help inform the discussion of how air cargo is considered in the Forecast phase (Key Issues and Trends). The forecast data related to cargo will then be used to establish Facility Requirements and be further examined in the Alternatives Analysis.</p> <p>Air cargo activity is dependent to a great extent on national and international air traffic patterns and the availability of necessary air cargo infrastructure (not only aircraft ramp, taxiways and runways, but also good surface transportation connections). There are inherent operational reasons why the large cargo aircraft and small cargo feeder aircraft need to be co-located. While we will not consider the forced relocation of existing cargo needs, in an effort to maintain flexibility and keep options open well into the planning horizon and beyond, Airport Futures will consider, in the Alternatives Analysis phase, how and where PDX could accommodate the cargo needs as we currently understand them.</p> <p>There currently are weight-based landing fees for all commercial aircraft at PDX. Because of co-location requirements noted above, landing fees are unlikely to influence use of PDX.</p>
<p>#19. Moving or Piping the Columbia Slough: Will Airport Futures consider moving or piping the Columbia Slough to make way for a third runway?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current plans do not include moving or piping Goals for future could include recommending ways to avoid impacting the slough 	<p>1 = 13 2 = 3 3 = 3</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Brief the FAA "desire" to reduce bird habitat within 10,000 ft of the runways. Discuss the environmental reviews. <p>* The Columbia Slough needs to be a <u>major</u> consideration in this process. The Port's impact on nearby natural resources has been very poorly considered in past planning processes. As a result, the need for major habitat removal has too frequently been discovered after projects were completed and conflicts were discovered.</p> <p>* Would like to see protecting slough/water quality/riparian habitat as a stated priority.</p>	<p>If developments are contemplated for the south side of the field (3rd runway or increased cargo traffic), there is concern for the greenway along the slough.</p>	<p>Any impacts on the slough will be evaluated in the Alternative Analysis and City Land Use Plan phases. There are no plans to move or pipe the slough.</p> <p>As desired by the PAG, we can schedule a presentation on the PDX Wildlife Management Program.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
<p>#2. Move Military Off PDX: Will relocation of the military off PDX be considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military sitting study recommended keeping military at PDX • Oregon Air National Guard has lease to 2029 • Beyond 2029 – Guard wants to stay • 939th Air Force Reserve Unit deactivated • Space need may be less w/o 939th • <i>Important in alternatives</i> • <i>Provide space for military</i> 	<p>1 = 10 2 = 5 3 = 4</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brief PAG on study. 2. No extension of lease until PAG can study issue in the forecast phase and alternatives phase. No extension without public hearings because of environmental impact. 3. Consider noise levels of the F-15 & F-22. Show PAG the difference in noise contours with/without military. 4. Consider reliever airport with military facilities 5. What is the probability of the F-22 at PDX? 6. What is the potential of keeping the F-15 into the forecast period of 2035? <p>* It is already clear that in the future there is likely to be more demand for use of PDX than capacity. NO option for dealing with that should be taken off the table at the outset of the study.</p> <p>* This is not going to happen.</p> <p>* This is not an accurate reflection of the staff recommendation, which actually assumes the military remain. I vote 3 on that assumption.</p> <p>* Would like to hear more discussion of what happens when the lease is up.</p> <p>* Look forward, not back.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Status is changing rapidly at PDX. Forecast phase should look out to 2035. Studies did not look at building a reliever airport for the military and GA. 2. Lease until 2029 is a policy matter that goes out 25 years. Even now, they want an extension. 3. Fighters are the problem because of noise, not ops. 4. \$450 million (less now) available for reliever airport. 5. This needs careful and reasonable forecast attention, which has not happened in the last 2 master plans. Consider future political climate. 	<p>During the evaluation portion of the Alternatives phase, Airport Futures will evaluate master plan alternatives and select a preferred alternative that represents the best long-term interest of the airport and the region it serves. If it is determined that the airport facility requirements cannot be met with the military continuing to occupy its current site or an alternative site at the airport, that issue will be identified and explored as part of the planning process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two existing alternatives showed adequate capacity existed to relocate the military. These alternatives will receive further consideration in the Alternatives phase of the project. • Military siting was the subject of a follow-on study to the 2000 PDX Master Plan. • The 939th Air Force Reserve unit has been deactivated. • The military has a lease agreement that enables them to remain at their current site through at least 2029. • The military has requested an extension of their current lease. The master plan and other long range planning will be considered in all lease negotiations. • The military is seeking to replace the F15 with the F22. • A comparison of the noise levels between the F15 and the F22 can be provided. • If F22s are proposed to be based at PDX or the military is relocated, a NEPA review will be required and noise impacts associated with the proposed changes would be evaluated. • Military operations are not the tipping point for runway or taxiway requirements and don't directly impact terminal facility requirements.

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
#2. Move Military Off PDX – continued				There is much uncertainty associated with the future of the military and the type of aircraft they may be operating. Those questions are unlikely to be resolved within the timeframe of this planning effort, and will be addressed by the federal government, Governor’s office, and the Port Commission. In an effort to maintain flexibility and keep options open well into the planning horizon and beyond, Airport Futures will consider, in the Alternatives Analysis phase, how and where PDX could accommodate the military needs as we currently understand them.
<p>#6. Possible 3rd Parallel Runway: Will Airport Futures consider the third parallel runway?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGAs between Port/City include it • <i>Prudent planning on part of Port to consider it</i> • <i>Review all assumptions</i> • <i>Will not request approval for it in Land Use Plan</i> • Need far, far into the future • Needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated need – 500,000 take offs & landings • NEPA • Funding 	<p>1 = 11 2 = 3 3 = 4</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review all assumptions: forecasts, impacts, alternatives (including terminal size). 2. Could City preclude by land use rules/conditions? 3. Can we assume the ALP will be central to the land use plan? 4. Compare the needs as described in FAA capacity enhancement plans. 5. Look at the relationship of terminal capacity and 500,000 operations. 6. Isn't NEPA an analysis of need and alternatives? 7. We want to look at impacts of 3rd runway, but also the impacts as we approach that level of passengers, cargo and total operations. 8. “Demand management” may eliminate need. <p>* Need more detail on this one---what we do today will drive demand in the future so we view this as a major part of the discussion even if it is far in the future.</p> <p>* The Port said that it was not going to consider or ask for a 3rd runway in this plan. That needs to happen.</p> <p>* Would like to see explicit assurance that slough health will receive high priority consideration (not just as part of NEPA).</p> <p>* As far as the staff recommendation goes, it is correct. But, I expect to consider a third runway elsewhere, too.</p>	<p>Let’s be clear about requesting approval in the Land Use Plan. The FAA considers the ALP the master planning document. So should the City. It is unthinkable the FAA and Port will plan 20+ years ahead for a third runway and not tell the City. While the Port will not request a building permit until they are ready to build, if they intend to build at some time in the future, the City needs to plan around this major impact. Integration of a 3rd runway into the zoning plan could take decades. We believe that certain capacity enhancement measures could make the 3rd runway a fait accompli. Forecast phase should include adoption of expected growth curve. Third runway may <i>never</i> be needed.</p>	<p>The 2000 Master Plan and subsequent Follow-On Studies, including the work of the Regional Air Transportation Demand Task Force, examined the need for additional airfield capacity. Runways along with taxiways, navigation aids and other airfield facilities make up the system within which capacity can be evaluated. All agreements defining this planning process propose beginning it where the 2000 Master Plan ended. As a result, a review of the 2000 Master Plan and Follow-On Studies is considered a key component of this effort and an essential step that must be taken before moving forward. The PAG will participate in a discussion of the Facility Requirements’ calculations that resulted in the 2000 Master Plan, including consideration of a third parallel runway. The need for a third parallel runway will be considered in the assessment of facility requirements and, based on that analysis, could again be considered during the Alternatives Analysis phase.</p> <p>As with high-speed rail, a third runway is likely at or beyond the current planning period, and, based on demand (influenced by rail development, development of new service at other area airports, etc.) will be a subject for further evaluation in subsequent master plans, which traditionally happen every 7 to 10 years. The fact that the third parallel runway may be shown on the airport layout plan does not mean the Port intends to construct it any time soon, if ever. It simply means they have reserved an appropriate amount of land in case the need materializes.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
#6. Possible 3rd Parallel Runway - continued				<p>The Airport Layout Plan (ALP) is required by the FAA. Acceptance of the ALP report by the FAA “does not in any way constitute a commitment on the part of the United States to participate in any development depicted therein, nor does it indicate that the proposed development is environmentally acceptable in accordance with appropriate public laws.” It is unknown otherwise how the ALP will relate to the land use plan as this is the first time the Port has undertaken a legislative land use process with the City.</p> <p>Demand management and NEPA questions have been addressed in other items.</p> <p>Any impacts on the Columbia Slough will be evaluated in the Alternative Analysis and City Land Use Plan phases. There are no plans to move or pipe the Slough.</p>
<p>#9. NEPA Review: PDX Master Plan: Will there be a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis of the PDX Master Plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Master plans by themselves don't require NEPA</i> • Projects that come out of master plans DO require NEPA • NEPA <i>screening</i> will be applied to projects • Indicate the level of future review • <i>Consider in alternatives process and capital improvement planning</i> 	<p>1 = 12 2 = 5 3 = 1</p>	<p>1. If MP is federally funded, it requires a NEPA process, but a finding of categorical exclusion may be sufficient.</p> <p>* If I understand correctly, NEPA comes into play on the build-out of specific projects, which might be included in the Master Plan.</p> <p>* I think THREE is the right answer, but I defer to our NEPA expert, Erwin Bergman. This is a legal issue, not a policy issue. Follow the law.</p>	<p>There should not be much debate here. Just follow the law. NEPA will require serious consideration of all alternatives including the “no build” option. The PAG should be doing a “bridge study” just like was done for the extension of the north runway.</p>	<p>As outlined in the City-Port Intergovernmental Agreement, there will be an environmental screening of all projects recommended in Airport Futures using the NEPA criteria. That screening will not be a substitute for a full NEPA analysis required for implementation of the projects. The timing for such project will be demand-based and triggered by specific metrics.</p> <p>This environmental screening will occur as part of the Alternatives Analysis capital improvement planning and City Land Use Plan phases.</p> <p>At present, it is not anticipated that there will be a NEPA analysis of the Port's Master Plan, itself.</p>

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
Other Items with No PAG Triage				
<p>#20. FAA Compelling Capacity: Can the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) compel PDX to add capacity to the runways, terminal building, or roadways?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAA cannot compel PDX to add capacity. That is the prerogative of the local airport operator. • At PDX, we tend to add capacity when we run out of it in some area - or when we foresee that we will run out of capacity - generally in the near term. • Some believe that if you build capacity, growth will follow (“build it and they will come”). This has not been the experience at PDX. 	New	Consider the impacts of future Port development on wildlife habitat. There is absolutely no mention of habitat impacts. This is a big issue. The Port has insisted in various planning processes that there should be no additional regulatory protections established for wildlife habitat within 10,000 feet of the runways. This process is the appropriate forum to get a clear understanding of how Port development at PDX will intersect with the City’s efforts to protect wildlife and wildlife habitat.		The FAA cannot compel PDX to add capacity. That is the prerogative of the local airport operator.
#21. Suggested Additional Topic	New	Consider the impacts of future Port development on wildlife habitat. There is absolutely no mention of habitat impacts. This is a big issue. The Port has insisted in various planning processes that there should be no additional regulatory protections established for wildlife habitat within 10,000 feet of the runways. This process is the appropriate forum to get a clear understanding of how Port development at PDX will intersect with the City’s efforts to protect wildlife and wildlife habitat.		Required mitigation will be discussed in the City Land Use Plan phase.

Updated PAG Triage of Project Sideboards

Topic <i>(Initial Staff Recommendation in Italics)</i>	Triage Votes	PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant)	PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	Revised Staff Response/Recommendation
#22. Suggested Additional Topic	New	<p>I suggest adding the potential impacts of technological change. What expectations of breakthroughs are being projected over the next 10 - 20 years that could change our view of problems? e.g., new energy sources being driven by climate change (the recent united nations report). Given the rapid expansion of public opinion/concern about this topic area, our collective comments about it relative to moving freight and people will be expected.</p> <p>Another way to get at this topic area: examine the top trends that will reshape the world in the next 10 - 20 years for applications to our area of study. For instance, the next generation internet, plus increases in computing power, will provide opportunities that reduce the need for travel, but by how much? What is a reasonable expectation? Our collective answer could be that no relevant changes can be expected, which sets expectations appropriately.</p>		Aviation technological changes are being tracked by Port staff on an ongoing basis and will be shared with the PAG as relevant. This will be evaluated in Facility Requirements and Alternatives Analysis phases.
General Comment	N/A	My primary issue with my "2" votes is that I believe our assessments and research might lead us to want to include some recommendations somewhere in our final report.		Recommendations to be included in the final PAG report are yet unknown. The PAG may want to keep a running log of possible recommendations, as they surface, to be included in its final report.