

## Meeting Summary

# PDX 2045 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting 8

---

July 16, 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
- ☒ Evan Howington
- ☒ Heather King
- ☒ Jennie Heidrick
- ☒ Kathy Bareno
- ☐ Keith Miller
- ☐ Laura Young
- ☒ Lin Felton
- ☒ Mark Luna
- ☐ Maryhelen Kincaid
- ☐ Matthew Hodson
- ☒ Mychal Hornbeck
- ☒ Pete DeVasto
- ☒ Philip Rowe
- ☒ Phuong Truong
- ☒ Sheena Sharma
- ☒ Stephanie Barnes
- ☒ Steven Lowe
- ☒ Tsering Sherpa
- ☐ Xavier Phanthongphay

#### Port of Portland

Aaron Ray  
Arainnia Armendariz  
Jeff Broderick  
Jennifer Rabby  
Mike Coleman  
Savanah Partridge  
Symeon Walker

#### Consultant Team

Bridger Wineman, EnviroIssues  
Cadence Purdy, EnviroIssues  
Cameron Modjeski, Ricondo  
Gavin Duncan, InterVISTAS  
Jenna Johnstone, Ricondo  
Suzanne Donaldson, Donaldson Consulting

## Welcome, Meeting Goals, PAC 7 & Tour Recap

PAC members welcomed new participants and received project updates, along with highlights on current and upcoming Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) and Port of Portland cyclist and pedestrian improvement projects near PDX.

### Public Comment

- Eva Frazier, BikeLoud PDX, requests more protected, direct bike routes to the terminal and improved wayfinding to PDX (i.e., Google Maps not showing existing bike paths that run along the MAX Red Line).
- Kevin Mackiz, BikeLoud PDX, called for reimagining access, including bikeability and bike-share availability to access PDX and natural areas near the airport.
- Kiel Johnson, Go by Bike founder and BikeLoud PDX, highlighted the potential of new businesses to operate and connect with PDX, such as B Line Urban Delivery. Kiel shared highlights that Go by Bike offers on the south waterfront, including providing valet bike parking for hundreds of bikes, a repair shop, and a pedicab.
- Nick Burns, neighbor, shared that biking to the airport has felt scary, but that the new multi-use path next to the MAX is fantastic, and they would like to see a few more connections into the neighborhood greenways.

### Preliminary Landside Alternatives – Parking

Gavin Duncan, InterVISTAS, presented future parking needs, noting that the forecasts for PDX indicate a 50% increase in passengers by 2045, so an additional 25 to 50% in parking demand is anticipated by 2045. He noted key considerations, like flexibility, pricing, and how travel modes may shift over time. Gavin presented a series of potential sites to provide additional parking on-airport, as well as a concept for remote parking locations around the metro region.

#### Q&A on Parking Alternatives:

*Q: Are there existing targets or goals the Port has around modes of transit?*

- A: Master plan processes like PDX 2045 need to consider strategies for accommodating forecast demand independent of efforts to shift mode choice toward transit and away from single-occupancy vehicles. In the master planning process, the Port will assess plans that protect for a variety of access needs. Although the Port has limited ability to influence mode choice, we will continue to partner with TriMet, PBOT, and others to ensure that there are effective and safe alternatives for employees and travelers to access PDX.

*Q: Does just providing access to different modes of transit help, or does setting goals help make this change?*

- A: The Port encourages usage of different modes of transportation through Port policy, which is outside the scope of a master plan. The master planning process assumes a conservative scenario to protect space as much as possible for flexibility in the future. As the master plan is implemented, the Port will only build parking (and other facilities) as they are actually needed in the future.

*Q: Where is PDX's current bike parking? Within each of these potential parking sites, does that also include parking for bikes and/or motorcycles?*

- A: There are two spots at PDX for bike parking, both by the MAX near the north end of the lower level of the terminal. Once the terminal expansion project winds down, there are plans to add

additional parking on the north side in addition to new bike parking under the south ramp. As these potential sites are further evaluated, we will also consider what roles these facilities could play in improving bike and pedestrian access.

*Q: Is Site 4 on undisturbed land?*

- A: This alternative shows building a parking structure over the south portion of the existing economy surface lot.

*Q: Is Site 5 also being considered for industrial development? Would developing it for commercial use be a bigger revenue generator?*

- A: There is competition for space, especially Site 5, and the Port will have to evaluate the highest and best use of this space. Site 5 is part of the Cascade Station Plan District, which has development restrictions and is unlikely to be used for anything other than parking or kept vacant.

*Q: Will environmental impacts be considered? Which sites would be replacing green space with parking?*

- A: The Port will evaluate potential environmental impacts later in the master plan process during the evaluation of the alternatives. Sites 5 and 7 are currently undeveloped spaces.

*Q: Would wetland mitigation be needed?*

- A: All sites are just conceptual at this time. The need for wetland mitigation would be assessed later in the planning and site development process. Environmental impacts will be a key factor in our evaluation process.

*Q: If Site 6 is chosen, would employees have to park farther out?*

- A: Most of the capacity is needed by the public, not employees. Building a structure on this lot offers more capacity than is needed for employees alone. Lot use can be interchanged or relocated as needed.

*Q: How many parking spaces are needed by 2045?*

- A: The existing parking capacity of PDX is around 19,000 spaces according to the Port's website. Current analysis shows anywhere from 2,000 to 11,000 additional spaces should be considered.

*Q: What is the level of demand for these sites other than for parking?*

- A: Sites 1 and 7 are the most in-demand for other uses due to their location, as they are adjacent to the terminal complex and the airfield, respectively.

*Q: Is Site 7 one of the options being considered for cargo expansion?*

- A: Yes, cargo is one of the possible uses for Site 7. Further evaluation of the combined alternatives is needed to determine the best use for this site.

*Q: For the sites that require a shuttle, are there any sites that have better routes for accommodating cyclists?*

- A: Sites 1 and 2 connect most easily to existing bike infrastructure.

*Q: Are there any bottlenecks already that will limit access, such as the potential In-N-Out along NE Airport Way?*

- A: The Port works with the City of Portland to understand traffic impacts of proposed developments near the airport, but outside of the airport boundaries. The Port is monitoring projects like the potential new In-N-Out, which is being proposed on non-airport land not owned by the Port. The team has a traffic model they will use to assess potential traffic impacts, though focused on metrics like time and proximity to PDX.

*Q: Are there concerns over obstructing views of Mt. Hood?*

- A: This would depend on the number of levels in a parking structure, which site location(s) is chosen, and existing sightlines. This could be assessed further once we get to the preferred parking alternative(s).

## Interactive Exercise Part 1 & Discussion

PAC members completed a survey to provide feedback on the three concepts that all parking options fall under which include close-in and walkable, on-Airport with shuttle access, and remote parking at regional sites. Staff then shared the survey results for discussion. Survey results are provided in Appendix A.

### Additional Questions and Comments

- One PAC member shared that remote parking and bus options work well in San Diego and between Corvallis and PDX.

*Q: Are these sites all built together as a group, or are they single options?*

- A: Some combinations of sites will be developed depending on what is determined to be the best fit and the number of parking spaces needed over time.

*Q: How hard would it be to get a MAX train between Site 2 and the terminal?*

- A: It would be difficult to put a platform between Site 2 and the terminal due space constraints between the site, Airport Way, and 82nd Avenue.

## Preliminary Landside Alternatives – Curbside

Gavin provided an overview of current curbside operations at PDX and curb space needs. He presented eight options for future curbside facilities, using four concepts: creating additional curbside close to the terminal, reducing curbside demand, optimizing the use of existing facilities, and creating a new remote pickup/drop-off area.

### Q&A on Curbside Alternatives:

*Q: Could limos be moved into the garage with Uber and Lyft to free up the Island 3?*

- A: Island 3 is also used as an option for pickup/drop-off that does not work with other options available due to vehicle size or the way the service is operated, such as picking up a sports team, large buses that do not fit in parking garages, and services where the driver goes inside to meet the passenger. The vehicles that currently use Island 3 also tend to have drivers entering the airport to pick up customers as part of the service they provide.

*Q: Do vans pay the airport to park?*

- A: Yes; all commercial vehicles – including limos, TNCs, and other for-hire vehicles – pay the airport a fee.

*Q: Could on-demand vehicles be moved to the transportation plaza?*

- A: That could be considered, though demand for rideshares is dynamic, and on-demand vehicles operate differently than most other vehicles. If on-demand vehicles are moved to the transportation plaza, it may require other vehicles to be relocated.

*Q: On Option 7, would all vehicles “rematch” (meaning inbound trips on Lyft or Uber being automatically paired with a subsequent outbound trip)?*

- A: At some times of the day there isn't demand for a rematch because of the flight schedule, so some TNCs would only be doing a drop-off or a pick-up but not both.

*Q: How do you prevent people from trying to park as close as possible to the terminal?*

- A: This requires operational support and management by the Port and its partners. A lot of travelers only travel once a year and may not be aware of other options. Effective communication and familiarization are key, along with traffic management and incentives such as lower pricing and easier availability. A key driver of Option 3 is drivers knowing close-in parking is always available, and drivers can enter the terminal and use amenities while waiting.

*Q: Could Option 3 function as a premium cell phone lot?*

- A: Yes, although there would be a cost to the driver to park.

## Interactive Exercise Part 2 & Discussion

PAC members completed a survey rating each curbside option. Staff then shared the survey results for discussion. Survey results are provided in Appendix B.

### Additional Q&A:

*Q: How would drivers know where the new valet curb is for Option 1?*

- A: With all options, the Port would make sure to advertise options and update wayfinding signage.

## Evaluation Approach

Cameron Modjeski, Ricondo, shared that the project team will assess alternatives using a holistic evaluation that includes qualitative and quantitative means. He shared an overview of comprehensive evaluation approach guided by the Economic viability, Operational efficiency, Natural resources, and Social responsibility (EONS) framework, which is currently being refined with the Port. Input gathered from the PAC is helping to shape the evaluation criteria.

## PAC Next Steps

Suzanne Donaldson, Donaldson Consulting, closed the meeting by sharing an evaluation survey and announced that the next meeting will occur on September 16, 2025, with a focus on preferred alternatives.

## Appendix A. Activity Part 1 Results

## Appendix B. Activity Part 2 Results