

## Meeting Summary

### PDX 2045 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting 7

---

May 19, 2025; 5:30 PM – 8:00 PM

Port of Portland HQ, Chinook Room (eighth floor) and Zoom

#### Attendees:

##### **PAC Members**

- ☒ Aidan Simpson
- ☒ Allyssa Bromley
- ☐ Angela DeHaven
- ☒ Anne Sweet
- ☒ Brian Kuzera
- ☒ Caleb Powell
- ☒ David Duncan
- ☒ David Van't Hof
- ☐ Heather King
- ☒ Jennie Heidrick
- ☒ Kathy Bareno
- ☒ Keith Miller
- ☐ Laura Young
- ☐ Mark Luna
- ☒ Maryhelen Kincaid
- ☒ Matthew Hodson
- ☐ Mychal Hornbeck
- ☒ Pete DeVasto
- ☒ Philip Rowe
- ☒ Phuong Truong
- ☒ Stephanie Barnes
- ☒ Steven Lowe
- ☒ Tsering Sherpa
- ☐ Xavier Phanthongphay

##### **Port of Portland**

Aaron Ray  
Dan Pippenger  
Evan Howington  
Jeff Broderick  
Jennifer Rabby  
Sean Loughran  
Symeon Walker

##### **Consultant Team**

Bridger Wineman, EnviroIssues  
Cadence Purdy, EnviroIssues  
Cameron Modjeski, Ricondo  
Jenna Johnstone, Ricondo  
Julie Gueho, JMG Consulting  
Suzanne Donaldson, Donaldson Consulting

## Welcome, Meeting Goals, PAC 6 Recap

- PAC facilitator, Suzanne Donaldson, welcomed PAC members to their seventh meeting, and reviewed the agenda and meeting ground rules. Meeting goals included reviewing preliminary airfield and terminal alternatives, participating in an alternative evaluation activity, and hearing an overview of landside requirements.
- Cameron Modjeski, Ricondo, provided a recap of the previous PAC meeting, where PAC members identified priorities for terminal alternatives, including the potential size and location of the International Arrivals Facility (IAF).

## What's New at PDX

- Dan Pippenger, Chief Aviation Officer at the Port of Portland, provided updates on what's new at PDX.
- The Port of Portland (Port) commissioners recently voted to revoke the Port's social equity policy to comply with Executive Order 14151. The Port is a federal contractor that provides dredging on the Columbia River for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers needed to maintain marine shipping. The policy change does not change the Port's mission, values, or how it operates.
- As a result of the schedule changes from Alaska Airlines' new banked schedule, there are now several large peaks (or "banks") throughout the day during when Alaska conducts many arrival operations, soon followed by many departure operations that provide opportunities for passengers to transfer to a connecting flight at PDX. The Port is responding to these changes as the banked schedule ramps up. The first month went well, and the schedule will be fully implemented by mid-June.
- PDX held their triennial emergency response exercise that involved simulating an airplane collision with a vehicle. Services involved in the exercise included search and rescue, fire and rescue, other emergency responders, a friends and relatives center, and the emergency operations center.
- The last portion of the terminal roof has been installed. Next steps are to complete the walls and interior. The bypass corridors will be removed over the next year as the terminal expansion project wraps up.
- Dan thanked the PAC members for their involvement in the master plan process and noted that the concept for PDX Next (including the New Main Terminal) originated with the previous master plan.
- Oregon Public Broadcasting (OPB) has published a piece on Port employee Nick Atwell and the wildlife hazard management program at PDX.

*Q: Regarding the social equity policy, can you share exactly what was revoked?*

- A: The policy stated the Port of Portland's commitment to social equity. No staff lost employment because of the revocation, the Port's values have not changed, and the revocation is required to comply with federal mandates.

*Q: Do any of the changes impact work already being done towards inclusive spaces such as all user bathrooms?*

- A: No, things like all-user restrooms and sensory rooms benefit the whole community and will not be altered because of the policy change.

*Q: Does this impact our sustainable procurement policy? We worked with Tribes on minority contracting for the new terminal—can we continue to interact with Tribes on future projects?*

- A: The Port can continue to work with Tribal governments and will follow requirements and federal rules around minority contracting. The Port is committed to providing small, emerging businesses with opportunities to support regional prosperity, while navigating a complicated landscape of conflicting laws, executive orders, and the Port's mission.

## **Public Comment**

- Kevin Mackiz provided public comment requesting that the Port improve the biking experience to reach PDX, including providing better connections to the Portland bike network and valet bike parking at PDX.

## **Preliminary Airfield and Terminal Alternatives**

- Cameron described preliminary observations from the last PAC meeting that focused on terminal requirements, including adding additional gates and increasing the size of the IAF. The north side of the airport has greater opportunity for accommodating growth, although the south side of the terminal provides opportunities for enhancing existing facilities.
- Cameron shared maps of the terminal that included four preliminary airfield and terminal alternatives.

*Q: Can the new IAF be “bags first” like Seattle or other airports?*

- A: The “bags first” process is where travelers claim and bring their luggage with them through the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) screening process and then recheck their bags with airlines if making connecting flights. CBP generally prefers a bags first approach, but this is a level of detail that is determined later in the planning process. For preliminary alternatives, the focus is on providing adequate square footage for the facility rather than focusing on how the facility will operate in the future.

*Q: What is the path that the large aircraft would take if parked at the end of Concourse E (CCE)?*

- A: This depends on the airfield flow (east or west) at the time of departure, including which runway the aircraft is using, as well as pilot preference. Most pilots choose the runway closest to their gate, although this may not be true in the future with increasing air traffic. Taxi time, delays, idle time, and other metrics will be analyzed more in depth in the next steps of alternative evaluation.

*Q: Is there any possibility of shifting Concourse B (CCB) south and/or CCE to the north to allow for double-loaded concourses?*

- A: FAA requires that airports maintain a safe space around the runways and taxiways. There is limited space to shift concourses south and north because of those constraints, so there is not enough room to double load those concourses (provide gates on both sides) without significantly changing the airfield or requiring costly relocation of many facilities.

*Q: Are there any other impact considerations we should consider, such as construction disruptions?*

- A: The alternatives maps note all facility impacts that the PAC should consider as they review these alternatives. Construction disruptions and phasing will be evaluated in the next steps of the alternatives evaluation process.

*Q: Are we really removing the crosswind or just decommissioning it?*

- A: Alternatives that show removal of the crosswind runway assume that the runway is decommissioned; however, the pavement would likely remain through its useful life and could potentially function as a taxiway for additional connectivity between the north and south portions of the airfield. This would allow for incremental phasing to the final preferred taxiway layout.

*Q: Is there any feedback from pilots on keeping the crosswind runway? Or reasons to keep it with future changes in climate?*

- A: The planning team is engaging airline stakeholders to understand the impacts of different alternatives. However, due to increased capability of aircraft and the decrease in weather patterns that would require use of the crosswind runway, it is rarely used today and will continue to see low utilization in the future.

### **Interactive Exercise Part 1 (Individual Activity)**

- PAC members worked individually on assessing each of the four terminal development alternatives, using red and green dots to “like” and “dislike” different components of each alternative.
- Below are tables summarizing individual results from the exercise, though it is important to note that some responses changed during the group exercise.

*Table 1: Concourse C (CCC) and D (CCD) Expansion Alternative: Interactive Exercise Part 1 Results*

Name	Closure of Crosswind Runway	CCD Expansion	IAF Location	CCC Expansion
<b>Total Likes</b>	11	16	15	15
<b>Total Dislikes</b>	2	0	0	1
<b>No Response</b>	3	0	1	0

*Table 2: CCE Expansion Alternative: Interactive Exercise Part 1 Results*

<b>Name</b>	<b>IAF Location</b>	<b>Terminal and Curbside Opportunity</b>	<b>CCE Expansion</b>
Total Likes	6	5	7
Total Dislikes	9	9	7
No Response	1	2	2

*Table 3: CCE Expansion with IAF Relocation Alternative: Interactive Exercise Part 1 Results*

<b>Name</b>	<b>IAF Location</b>	<b>Terminal and Curbside Opportunity</b>	<b>CCE Expansion</b>
Total Likes	12	11	6
Total Dislikes	3	4	6
No Response	1	1	4

*Table 4: CCD and CCE Expansion Alternative: Interactive Exercise Part 1 Results*

<b>Name</b>	<b>IAF Location</b>	<b>Closure of Crosswind Runway</b>	<b>CCD Expansion</b>	<b>CCE Expansion</b>	<b>Terminal and Curbside Opportunity</b>
Total Likes	13	9	14	10	6
Total Dislikes	2	1	0	5	9
No Response	1	6	2	1	1

## Interactive Exercise Part 2 (group activity)

PAC members worked in small groups to discuss the four terminal development alternatives and place dots on shared maps for each group while discussing their reasoning.

*Table 5: CCC and CCD Expansion Alternative: Interactive Exercise Part 2 Results*

Element	Likes	Notes for Likes	Dislikes	Notes for Dislikes	Additional Notes
CCC Expansion	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilities</li> <li>Likely better cost/benefit</li> <li>Gates on both sides</li> <li>Easy runway access</li> <li>Crosswind runway removal</li> <li>Balanced</li> <li>Consensus to expand</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walking distances</li> <li>Concern about congestion at node and imbalance with north side</li> <li>Okay with crosswind runway going away</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If you keep crosswind runway, you can extend CCC to east</li> </ul>
CCD Expansion	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as CCC</li> <li>Liked IAF upgrade</li> <li>Likely better cost/benefit</li> <li>Symmetry</li> <li>Walk time to</li> <li>Opens more options</li> <li>Consensus to expand</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as CCC</li> </ul>	
IAF Location	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable</li> <li>Need it now</li> <li>Like this location but upgrade to modern is more important</li> <li>Like the idea of a roof corridor, would prefer closer to core</li> <li>Okay with location</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walking distances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not just expand IAF, also modernize it</li> </ul>
Crosswind Runway Closure	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Okay with it going</li> <li>Not used much</li> <li>Only cargo affected</li> <li>Consensus to remove</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cargo uses it</li> <li>Moving it east would save westward expansion for future growth opportunities</li> </ul>	

*Table 6: CCE Alternative: Interactive Exercise Part 2 Results*

Element	Likes	Notes for Likes	Dislikes	Notes for Dislikes	Additional Notes
CCE Expansion	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flexibility in expanding CCD later</li> <li>Possibility for curbside, although possibility for confusion, perhaps designated airline or function at curb?</li> <li>If expanding CCE it should include IAF</li> <li>Like growth to the east</li> <li>Separate entrance negates long walk</li> </ul>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expensive</li> <li>Maybe "yellow" -- the group did not dislike or like</li> <li>CCE will be crowded</li> <li>Gates on one side only</li> <li>Too long</li> <li>Not favorite plan</li> <li>Do not want too much on CCE</li> </ul>	
Terminal and Curbside Opportunity	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helps vehicle traffic</li> <li>People wish for a pickup opportunity closer by</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex</li> <li>Will bottleneck traffic on Airport Way main terminal access</li> <li>Splitting the public side of the terminal would create many issues, including confusion</li> <li>More services needed (TSA, bag drop)</li> <li>Could end up like LAX and St. Louis,</li> <li>Do not want another drop-off/pickup site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lots of questions from groups</li> <li>If just for arrivals this would be good</li> </ul>
IAF Location	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Function is most important</li> <li>Location for group vs. most useful</li> <li>PDX does not have a lot of international flights</li> </ul>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keeping in current location is harder to phase</li> <li>Current issues require relocation</li> <li>Does not solve for endcap crowding (does not extend D)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can this be split? Arrivals but not departures</li> <li>Want a new IAF</li> </ul>

*Table 7: CCE with IAF Relocation Alternative: Interactive Exercise Part 2 Results*

Element	Likes	Notes for Likes	Dislikes	Notes for Dislikes	Additional Notes
CCE Expansion	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green if only for domestic gate expansion</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less gates</li> <li>The hanger was a big investment in big new building</li> <li>No improvement in CCC or CCD that need updates with this expansion</li> </ul>	
Terminal and Curbside Opportunity	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arrivals opportunity</li> <li>Like if only for international arrivals</li> <li>Pick up areas are helpful, but signage is important</li> </ul>	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complexity with pickup/drop-off</li> <li>Need to hear more about how this would work</li> <li>Could be confusing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed opinions</li> <li>Questions about parking garage access</li> </ul>
IAF Location	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could have dedicated PDX experience</li> <li>Ability to phase CCC would have greater flexibility if there was a departure and arrival function</li> <li>Like IAF and expansion together</li> <li>Puts everything on its own curbside</li> <li>Mini-international terminal could be nice</li> <li>Allows for CCC and CCD as future expansion phase</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expensive</li> <li>Potentially long walking distances</li> <li>Could be more crowded</li> <li>Other airlines (non-international) still operate here</li> <li>Would they be able to use these gates for domestic arrivals?</li> <li>Unbalanced</li> </ul>	



*Table 8: CCD and CCE Expansion Alternative: Interactive Exercise Part 2 Results*

Facility	Likes	Notes for Likes	Dislikes	Notes for Dislikes	Additional Notes
CCD Expansion	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Like extending CCD</li> <li>Cost effective with gates on both sides</li> <li>Renovate and refresh of this space is needed</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not expanding CCC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally okay with this but not loving it</li> </ul>
CCE Expansion	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less distance</li> <li>"Fine, not as much as symmetrical"</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same as CCD</li> <li>Only likes expansion for IAF</li> </ul>	
Terminal and Curbside Opportunity	5		13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More confusing without IAF</li> <li>Doesn't look needed with this level of expansion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will we figure out if terminal and curbside is departures, arrivals, or both?</li> </ul>
IAF Location	15		3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumption that if IAF stayed on CCD, the IAF/ International experience would not be improved (current facilities would be retained, condition would be unchanged)</li> </ul>	
Crosswind Runway Closure	17		1		

## Open Discussion of Alternatives

- One member of each group reported on how their group members voted for each alternative, as well as the reasoning behind their votes. Groups also weighed in on the following questions:

*What was your groups preferred alternative and why?*

CCCD expansion was the most popular. Reasons given were removal of the crosswind runway leaves more room for expansion, and it gives the Port the opportunity to expand and modernize the IAF.

*Were there any disagreements in your group?*

PAC members had mixed opinions on increasing walking distance and adding terminal and curbside opportunities to CCE. Some PAC members shared that adding a second

curbside processor would be confusing if there are multiple points for pickup/drop-off. Another concern was parking and how to get passengers from garages to the end of CCE.

*If there was one element you would add to your preferred alternative, what would it be?*

Some PAC members added that they would like to see CCD modernized regardless of what alternative is chosen. Others added that they would like to see consideration of existing parking garages and distances to parking if expanding CCE is chosen as an alternative.

## Overview of Landside Requirements

- Cameron provided a recap of the future facility requirements for landside facilities at PDX, which include primarily on-airport roadways, parking lots, parking garages, and facilities supporting taxis, rideshare, shuttle services, and other public modes of transportation. The recap covered projected levels of service of facilities and factors that drive facility needs.

*Q: Do we have data on TriMet and bike access?*

- A: The Port has data for employees and passengers on TriMet, though the Port does not control TriMet service. The Port can only provide more waiting room for transit riders and expand the station. Cyclist data is harder to capture, and the Port has done its own counts. Though the numbers are low, providing the option to bike to PDX expands choice for passengers and PDX employees. There is even less data on employee shuttles and other public transit options, though the Port has some data on the Multnomah County's ACCESS shuttle.

## PAC Next Steps

- The next PAC meeting, scheduled for July 15, 2025, will focus on landside alternatives. PAC members should start thinking about what they will prioritize when it comes to landside alternatives so we can begin to evaluate different options.
- Suzanne shared the PAC timeline and noted that the PAC is halfway through the total series of planned PAC meetings. Following the July meeting, the next PAC meetings are set for September 16 and November 12.
- The project team is recruiting a couple more PAC members using the applicant pool from the initial PAC recruitment. These new members will likely join the PAC during the July meeting.
- Evan Howington, a key player in making these meetings successful, is finishing his internship with the Port of Portland. This is his last meeting with the PAC.
- The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.