

PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07

PAG Numeric Results From 1-2-3 Triage Voting Exercise

Members	1 Rail	2 Military	3 Cargo	4 Replacement Supplemental Airport	5 Traffic	6 3 <sup>rd</sup>	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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
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	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	3
Hudson																			
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	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	3
Weigant	2	3	3	1/3	2	2	1	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1
Williams																			
# of 3s	2	6	4	5	3	5	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	4
# of 2s	6	4	2	2	4	4	1	5	4	5	9	5	4	10	5	4	6	3	3
# of 1s	10	8	12	11	11	8	12	11	10	12	8	12	13	5	12	13	9	14	9

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

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Staff and PAG Narrative Details</b>				
<b>Topic (Staff Rec. in Italics)</b>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant</b>	<b>PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant</b>	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<p><b>#1. High Speed Rail (HSR)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Air Transportation Demand Task Force looked at it.</li> <li><i>High level consideration in the forecast process</i></li> <li><i>Estimate how many might shift from air to rail between selected destinations</i></li> <li>Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles</li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 10 2 = 6 3 = 2</b></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 &amp; Metro establish an ongoing lobbying commitment with our congressional delegation and USDOT.</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. 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><b>#2. Move Military Off PDX</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Military sitting study recommended keeping military at PDX</li> <li>Oregon Air National Guard has lease to 2029</li> <li>Beyond 2029 – Guard wants to stay</li> <li>939th Air Force Reserve Unit deactivated</li> <li>Space need may be less w/o 939th</li> <li><i>Important in alternatives</i></li> <li><i>Provide space for military</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 8 2 = 4 3 = 6</b></p>	<p>1. Brief PAG on study.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3. Consider noise levels of the F-15 &amp; F-22. Show PAG the difference in noise contours with/without military.</p> <p>4. Consider reliever airport with military facilities</p> <p>5. What is the probability of the F-22 at PDX?</p> <p>6. What is the potential of keeping the F-15 into the forecast period of 2035?</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>	<p>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.</p> <p>2. Lease until 2029 is a policy matter that goes out 25 years. Even now, they want an extension.</p> <p>3. Fighters are the problem because of noise, not ops.</p> <p>4. \$450 million (less now) available for reliever airport.</p> <p>5. This needs careful and reasonable forecast attention, which has not happened in the last 2 master plans. Consider future political climate.</p>	

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Topic (Staff Rec. in Italics)</b>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant</b>	<b>PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant</b>	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<p><b>#3. Move Air Cargo to Another Airport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No legal way to require them to move</li> <li>• Small cargo planes need to be near large jets</li> <li>• Facilities in the Metro area don't exist to serve large cargo jets</li> <li>• <i>Assume cargo continues to operate at PDX</i></li> <li>• <i>No further study recommended</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 12 2 = 2 3 = 4</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Original study should be briefed to the PAG.</li> <li>2. Forecasts should be done considering the present economic model could change with price, fleet size, leakage to other modes, etc.</li> <li>3. Forecast data should be entered into the noise data.</li> <li>4. Consider in the alternatives discussion.</li> <li>5. Do not solicit major carriers who will fly at night, E.G., Korea Air.</li> <li>6. Evaluate impact of minimum landing fee.</li> </ol> <p>* This is not going to happen either - passenger planes are part of this system. * 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><b>#4. Building Replacement or Supplemental Airport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studied in Regional Air Transportation Demand Task Force</li> <li>• Environmental cost, statewide land use policy, capital cost all make it not feasible</li> <li>• \$1 billion + invested at PDX</li> <li>• <i>No further study recommended</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 11 2 = 2 3 = 5</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relook at RATDTF assumptions.</li> <li>2. Look at this option as an outgrowth of #5, below</li> <li>3. Look at implications in forecast data</li> <li>4. Consider whether supplemental airport is not being done through "natural" methods, i.e., growth around Salem – Corvallis area. See #5.</li> <li>5. Expand regional view to include regional solutions.</li> </ol>	<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. <i>A supplemental airport is a must-consider option.</i></p>	
<p><b>#5. Shifting Traffic to Other Airports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passenger shifting occurs with natural growth</li> <li>• PDX – Seattle</li> <li>• Redmond – LAX and Salt Lake</li> <li>• Salem – Salt Lake City</li> <li>• Medford – San Francisco</li> <li>• Connect Oregon Investments</li> <li>• No regulatory mechanism to "require" traffic to move</li> <li>• General Aviation reliever airports attract some GA traffic</li> <li>• <i>Consider during forecast element</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 3 2 = 4 3 = 11</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the forecasts for other airports in Oregon?</li> <li>2. Consider their growth factors within the forecast and if it pencils out, consider in alternative phase.</li> <li>3. No request to "move" traffic, but no regulatory requirement to make them come here rather than fly out of their local area.</li> <li>4. Landing fees could be adjusted to make GA service pay its pro rata share.</li> <li>5. What government/private incentives are/could increase service in other local areas such as Salem, Eugene-Springfield, and north coast cities?</li> </ol> <p>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>	

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Topic (Staff Rec. in Italics)</b>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant</b>	<b>PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant</b>	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<p><b>#6. Possible 3rd Parallel Runway</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IGAs between Port/City include it</li> <li>• <i>Prudent planning on part of Port to consider it</i></li> <li>• <i>Review all assumptions</i></li> <li>• <i>Will not request approval for it in Land Use Plan</i></li> <li>• Need far, far into the future</li> <li>• Needs               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated need – 500,000 take offs &amp; landings</li> <li>• NEPA</li> <li>• Funding</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 8 2 = 4 3 = 5</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review all assumptions: forecasts, impacts, alternatives (including terminal size)</li> <li>2. Could City preclude by land use rules/conditions?</li> <li>3. Can we assume the ALP will be central to the land use plan?</li> <li>4. Compare the needs as described in FAA capacity enhancement plans.</li> <li>5. Look at the relationship of terminal capacity and 500,000 operations</li> <li>6. Isn't NEPA an analysis of need and alternatives?</li> <li>7. We want to look at impacts of 3<sup>rd</sup> runway, but also the impacts as we approach that level of passengers, cargo and total operations.</li> <li>8. "Demand management" may eliminate need.</li> </ol> <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 3<sup>rd</sup> runway into the zoning plan could take decades. We believe that certain capacity enhancement measures could make the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway a fait accompli. Forecast phase should include adoption of expected growth curve. Third runway may <i>never</i> be needed.</p>	
<p><b>#7. City Council Consideration of 3rd Parallel Runway in Land Use Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Port will not be asking for approval</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 12 2 = 1 3 = 3</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The City Land Use plan should consider the impacts of 500,000 plus operations.</li> <li>2. Make a decision on whether or how land use rules could accommodate the growth.</li> </ol> <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>	

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Topic (Staff Rec. in Italics)</b>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant</b>	<b>PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant</b>	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<p><b>#10. Air Quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus will be on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational efficiency and comparison between alternatives</li> <li>• Development of sustainable practices and policies to reduce emissions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Will not create new air quality standards</i></li> <li>• <i>Consider in the alternatives process</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 12</b> <b>2 = 5</b> <b>3 = 1</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We agree that the PAG does not have a role in setting EPA standards.</li> <li>2. In the forecasting phase, will we discover a point at which PDX operations might exceeds standards?</li> <li>3. There should be an air quality briefing by DEQ/EPA before the land use and alternatives phase.</li> </ol> <p>* Need more detail here. * 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. Anything considered in the alternatives phase must also be considered in the forecasting phase. (General principle that applies to several issues.)</p>	
<p><b>#11. Climate Change</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar to #10</li> <li>• Seek to minimize emissions of green house gases in design and operating policy</li> <li>• Approach is to minimize impact while meeting demand</li> <li>• <i>No plan to reduce demand through mandatory taxes or fees</i></li> <li>• <i>Consider in the alternatives process</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 8</b> <b>2 = 9</b> <b>3 = 1</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider in the forecasting phase: will it affect demand more, the same or less?</li> <li>2. What can we do at PDX under each of these scenarios?</li> <li>3. Forecast phase needs two scenarios (one Republican, one Democrat) in early forecasts. After the election, select the best.</li> </ol> <p>* I think the Port needs to go further---want to see more than just aspirations.... * Climate change is a byproduct of other issues (emissions, aviation demand, and technology). So considering climate change by itself is too nebulous. * It must also be considered as part of the forecasting phase.</p>	<p>Similar to 10 "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><b>#12. Emissions from Jet Aircraft</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus is on operational efficiency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficient circulation</li> <li>• Ground power at gates</li> <li>• Pre-conditioned air</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>No effort to create new emissions standards for jet aircraft engines</i></li> <li>• <i>Continue to support research into jet emissions</i></li> <li>• <i>Consider in the alternatives process</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 12</b> <b>2 = 5</b> <b>3 = 1</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider airfield layouts that may minimize emissions.</li> <li>2. Consider an east end cross-field taxiway (north - south) to prevent long taxi time to preferred runways.</li> <li>3. Sell only unleaded aviation gas at PDX (I.E. consider emissions from ALL aircraft).</li> </ol>	<p>This layout has both noise mitigation and fuel saving implications. A reliever airport could be constructed with sloping runways (see <i>Economist Magazine</i>) to use gravity to aid takeoffs and landings.</p>	

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Topic (Staff Rec. in Italics)</b>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant</b>	<b>PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant</b>	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<p><b>#13. Noise Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Use the recently completed noise study (Part 150) as a source</i></li> <li>• 28 recommendations, 3 year, \$million study</li> <li>• <i>Supplement with additional info if needed</i></li> <li>• Revise noise codes –both sides of the river – consider (being done by noise office as part of 150 process)</li> <li>• <i>Consideration in alternatives process</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 13 2 = 4 3 = 1</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Brief the Part 150 study to the PAG, including future noise contours (relate to forecasts). Brief State Noise Rule to PAG.</li> <li>2. Explain noise impacts and all the noise metrics that are being suggested.</li> <li>3. Use noise considerations as a part of forecasting phase and land use.</li> <li>4. Stop Port Noise Office discussions with affected jurisdictions on land use changes until the PAG land use subcommittee can look at the issues.</li> <li>5. Consider recommending a multijurisdictional IGA to establish a Noise Committee.</li> </ol> <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. 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><b>#14. Nighttime Curfew</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airport Noise and Capacity Act – 1990 makes a curfew for quiet stage 3 aircraft all but impossible</li> <li>• Federal Aviation Regulation Part 161 outlines the process</li> <li>• Relatively few people in the 65 DNL noise contour</li> <li>• <i>No further study recommended</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>1 = 5 2 = 10 3 = 3</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Look at present and future night operations in the forecasting phase.</li> <li>2. Brief the advantage/disadvantage of the longer north runway.</li> <li>3. Consider other recommendations at end of the alternatives phase.</li> <li>4. Do not actively recruit operations that will probably fly from midnight to 5 AM.</li> </ol> <p>* 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>	

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Topic</b> <i>(Staff Rec. in Italics)</i>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments</b> Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant	<b>PAG Reasoning</b> Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<b>#15. Water Quality</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different alternatives will have different water quality impacts, or perhaps similar</li> <li>• <i>Consider water quality goals</i></li> <li>• <i>Consideration in the alternatives process</i></li> </ul>	1 = 12 2 = 5 3 = 1	Same as # 10.  * Alternatives analysis depends on forecasts, and nothing should be closed to the forecast phase.		
<b>#16. Deicing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing project under way to improve current \$32 million dollar deicing system</li> <li>• <i>Consider in alternatives analysis process</i></li> </ul>	1 = 13 2 = 4 3 = 1	1. Brief de-icing system. 2. Are there a number of operations that would exceed planned system capabilities?  * 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.	As the new system uses the River for waste discharge, will there be impacts that will limit system expansion?	

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Topic</b> <i>(Staff Rec. in Italics)</i>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments</b> <b>Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant</b> <b>* = Other Members Including Weigant</b>	<b>PAG Reasoning</b> <b>Bergman, Stovel and Weigant</b>	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<p><b>#17. Neighborhood Improvements Not Related to PDX Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required mitigation versus action items</li> <li>• <i>Impacts directly related to PDX will require mitigation</i></li> <li>• <i>Other deficiencies will be addressed through action items in City's Plan</i></li> </ul>	<p>1 = 9 2 = 6 3 = 3</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 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><b>#18. Economic Development Areas Adjacent to PDX</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industrial and employment areas along Columbia South Shore</li> <li>• <i>Analysis of opportunity sites for airport related uses</i></li> <li>• <i>Identification of issues or deficiencies</i></li> </ul>	<p>1 = 14 2 = 3 3 = 1</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>* The background issues may have major impact in alternatives analysis.</p>	<p>This is a Land Use Plan focus, but needs very careful attention regarding the issues of sustainability.</p>	

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Topic (Staff Rec. in Italics)</b>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant</b>	<b>PAG Reasoning Bergman, Stovel and Weigant</b>	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<p><b>#19. Moving or Piping the Columbia Slough</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Current plans do not include moving or piping</i></li> <li><i>Goals for future could include recommending ways to avoid impacting the slough</i></li> </ul>	<p>1 = 9 2 = 3 3 = 4</p>	<p>1. Brief the FAA “desire” to reduce bird habitat within 10,000 ft of the runways. 2. Discuss the environmental reviews.</p> <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. * 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 (3<sup>rd</sup> runway or increased cargo traffic), there is concern for the greenway along the slough.</p>	
<p><b>#20. FAA Compelling Capacity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FAA cannot compel PDX to add capacity. That is the prerogative of the local airport operator.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Some believe that if you build capacity, growth will follow (“build it and they will come”). This has not been the experience at PDX.</li> </ul>	<p><b>New</b></p>	<p>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.</p>		
<p><b>#21. Suggested Additional Topic</b></p>	<p><b>New</b></p>	<p>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.</p>		

**PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments as of 12-10-07**

<b>Topic</b> <i>(Staff Rec. in Italics)</i>	<b>Triage Votes</b>	<b>PAG Comments</b> Numbers = Bergman, Stovel and Weigant * = Other Members Including Weigant	<b>PAG Reasoning</b> Bergman, Stovel and Weigant	<b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b>
<b>#22. Suggested Additional Topic</b>	<b>New</b>	<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>		
<b>General Comment</b>	<b>N/A</b>	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.		