

Meeting Summary

PDX 2045 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting 9

September 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

Port of Portland

Aaron Ray
Arainnia Armendariz
Jeff Broderick
Jennifer Rabby
Mina Mora-Gonzalez
Savanah Partridge
Sean Loughran

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 8 Recap

- PAC Facilitator, Suzanne Donaldson, welcomed PAC members to their ninth meeting and reviewed the agenda and meeting goals. Meeting goals included reviewing needs and potential locations for cargo, general aviation, and support facilities and confirming PAC feedback on functional area alternatives.
- Cameron Modjeski provided a recap of the previous PAC meeting where PAC members identified priorities for landside alternatives and learned about the framework used to evaluate alternatives.

What's New at PDX

- Aaron Ray introduced Port of Portland Aviation Planning Intern Savannah Partridge.
- Construction is underway at the intersection of NE 82nd Way and NE Air Cargo Road, and includes repaving, upgrading ramp signals, improving the connection to the multi-use path, and installing visually appealing wraps on signal boxes.
- PDX 2045 Open House 2 will be held on Tuesday, October 14th from 5-8 p.m. at University of Oregon Portland Campus Library and Learning Center. Meeting content will cover project background and functional alternatives. PAC members are encouraged to attend, and notifications for the event will be sent soon. PAC members are also encouraged to share this event within their own networks.
- The Port will also host open house content online and host a webinar on October 21st 7-8 p.m. as well as smaller meetings at community locations and event tabling.
- Delta Air Lines recently completed a pilot project to bring Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) to PDX. SAF is an alternative jet fuel made from renewable sources.
- An optional PAC event will be held October 8th 4-6 p.m. and will be open to family members. The event will involve plane spotting with Port of Portland staff. More information will be sent out via email about the event.

Q: Are there any updates on offering new international service at PDX?

- A: There are no updates currently, though talks are ongoing on restoring service to Asia. Restoring service to Asia is also part of the Executive Director's performance goals for this year.

Public Comment

- No public comments were made.

Cargo, General Aviation, and Support Facilities

- Julie Gueho shared a map of siting opportunities and constraints at PDX for cargo, general aviation, and support facilities. The project team is considering sites including the Southwest Quad, the northern portion of the airfield near the fire station, and a few smaller parcels to the south and east.

Q: Are there any environmental concerns about the parcel by NE Elrod Rd and NE 33rd Drive?

- A: All alternative sites have been through a feasibility analysis that included environmental considerations and were found to be developable.

Q: Would new cargo space be in addition to the existing Airtrans Center or replacing it?

- A: The sites shown are in addition to the existing Airtrans Center. The strategy is first to infill and redevelop within the Airtrans Center so that is fully built out before developing a new cargo site.

Approximately 40 additional acres of cargo space are needed based on future activity projections.

Q: What would be lost if the crosswind runway was removed?

- A: Historically, the crosswind runway has been used for certain aircraft in certain weather conditions. Over time, wind conditions have changed, and aircraft technology has improved so that they do not necessarily need a different facility when winds blow from the north or south. Use of this runway has decreased over the years, and it is seldom used today. Currently 99 percent of operations use the two parallel runways. The crosswind runway is not needed to meet projected airfield capacity demands.

Q: What is an FBO?

- An FBO, or Fixed Base Operator, is a terminal that provides services to private aviation. These include terminal amenities, maintenance facilities, and hangers to store planes.

Q: Is the Southwest Quad site being considered for other uses [besides general aviation]?

- A: The Southwest Quad is a large area that could serve multiple uses. Cargo and general aviation facilities could both be developed there, as well as MRO and/or wildlife management facilities.

Q: Who uses general aviation facilities? Is it just privately-owned planes?

- A: Many different types of aircraft use general aviation facilities, including private jets, small aircraft, sports teams, charter flights, and military charters. General aviation at PDX mainly accommodates corporate general aviation as opposed to general aviation for recreational purposes. The Port operates a portfolio of airports, including Hillsboro and Troutdale Airports, which also provide services for general aviation aircraft.

Q: Can Hillsboro Airport accommodate a 737?

- A: Yes, Hillsboro Airport can handle Group III aircraft, such as a 737, although the FBO is not designed for to service large aircraft on a frequent basis.

Q: Is there any data available on where people go once they land from general aviation flights?

- A: The Port does not track this data, though general aviation passengers are likely heading to the highway system, like most commercial passengers at PDX.

Q: Would it be smart to prepare to relocate general aviation especially since there is a terminal alternative that would expand in the area?

- A: The general aviation hangar may be impacted by one of the terminal expansion plans. General aviation facilities were previously relocated when Concourse E was extended and the FBO, Atlantic Aviation, is in the process of planning and developing an additional hangar. The Port is evaluating multiple terminal expansion alternatives.

Q: If general aviation wants more space, does the Port tell them where they can relocate to?

- The Port shares with the general aviation provider (FBO) sites where they can relocate, and then the general aviation provider manages and implements development.

Q: Are there any issues with landside access to some of these proposed sites for support facilities?

- A: This will be explored further as the Port evaluates alternatives. This could impact highway traffic and/or traffic on NE Airport Way. It will take additional landside studies to understand all the potential impacts.

Q: Are there any additional security concerns with moving the flight kitchen off-site?

- No, but it will change some of the procedures and screening operations. The biggest concern for flight kitchen operations is having enough room for their operations and for staff parking within a short driving distance to the airfield.

Q: How does the Port navigate coupled decision making with regards to the different alternatives?

- The Port will narrow down the best alternatives for each functional area (airfield, terminal, parking, curbside, cargo, general aviation, and support facilities). From there, we will examine alternatives holistically to see how they impact each other. Choosing to keep or remove the crosswind runway is a significant decision in terms of how it will impact other decisions. We will be looking at different combinations of integrated alternatives to evaluate which one(s) would best meet future needs and understand impacts.

Q: Does the Wildlife Team have a preference for their future facility site?

- A: The project team has been engaging technical teams and has vetted all of the alternative sites presented here. All of the alternatives shared here would work for the wildlife management team.

Alternatives and Input Review Interactive Exercise

- PAC members worked individually on assessing alternatives for each functional area and recorded what was important to them when comparing the alternatives.
- PAC members also worked in small groups to discuss alternatives for each functional area and recorded whether the Port has correctly summarized feedback collected from the PAC on all of the functional area alternatives over the past series of meeting, if there was anything else the Port should consider, and if they would recommend dropping any of the alternatives.
- PAC members agreed that the Port captured most of their feedback correctly. PAC members identified the following additional feedback previously provided that was not included in the Port's summary: ease of navigation with two terminal entrances, include bike parking in parking alternatives, and consider other transportation modes like driverless cars in curbside alternatives.
- For airfield alternatives, PAC members recommend weighing the value of the crosswind runway for different users (cargo, electric, aircraft) and considering safety and cross-airfield traffic if the crosswind runway is removed. Most PAC members preferred removing the crosswind runway, and some PAC members suggested dropping any alternatives that involve preserving the crosswind runway.
- For terminal alternatives, PAC members recommended considering access for mobility needs, redundant curbside processor capability, considering how long aircraft would have to taxi to and from the runway and gates, and considering travelers' first impressions of the terminal if the international arrivals facility (IAF) is relocated. Most PAC members preferred the Concourse C and D Expansion alternative and recommended removing alternatives that require busing. One group recommended dropping Concourse E Expansion with IAF, and another group suggested making Concourses D and C the same length (if expanded) for symmetry.
- For parking alternatives, PAC members shared that the Port should consider affordability, safety, and security at all parking locations, support public transit, and consider the balance of premium and economy sites. PAC members suggested that regional parking options could be a public/private arrangement, and hotel parking should be considered. One group recommended dropping alternatives that require parking far away like the Southwest Quad.
- For curbside alternatives, PAC members considered accessibility to the Transportation Plaza, ensuring all sites are easy to find and accessible, redesigning existing curbside uses for

efficiency, and publicizing all curbside options. Some groups recommended opting for a single pickup/drop-off site for curbside, and another group recommended including a remote curbside option for accessibility. One group recommended moving transportation network companies (TNCs) to floor four of the P1 short-term garage and adding a bridge to make the crossing safer. Several PAC members recommended removing the remote curbside (“kiss and fly”) options.

- For cargo, general aviation, and support facilities alternatives, PAC members recommended removing the crosswind runway for cargo expansion, repurposing existing buildings, considering connectivity of similar uses, prioritizing terminal development for the terminal area, considering the near-term needs of existing facilities and their room to expand, and relocating general aviation for Concourse E expansion. One group suggested moving public safety and airline support uses away from the terminal.

Q: Are there real-world examples of kiss and fly drop-off areas?

- A: Yes, at Sunset Transit Center in Beaverton there are designated areas in the garage for pickup/drop-offs.

Evaluation Approach

- Cameron Modjeski revisited the EONS (Economic Viability, Operational Efficiency, Natural Resources, and Social Responsibility) evaluation framework that the Port will use to evaluate the alternatives holistically. He shared a summary of how PAC feedback on the functional area alternatives can be used within the EONS framework as alternatives are evaluated.

PAC Next Steps

- The next PAC meeting will focus on integrated alternatives, implementation considerations, and ongoing engagement and is scheduled for Wednesday, Nov. 12, 2025.
- PAC members were reminded about the October 8th plane viewing event.
- The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Attachment A: Transcribed Group Discussion Notes

Group	Airfield: Did we get your feedback right?	Airfield: What else should we consider?	Airfield: Any alternatives you recommend we drop?	Terminal: Did we get your feedback right?	Terminal: What else should we consider?	Terminal: Any alternatives you recommend we drop?	Parking: Did we get your feedback right?	Parking: What else should we consider?		Curbside: Did we get your feedback right?	Curbside: What else should we consider?		Cargo, general aviation, and support facilities: Did we get your feedback right?	Cargo, general aviation, and support facilities: What else should we consider?	Cargo, general aviation, and support facilities: Any alternatives you recommend we drop?
1	Yes, highest and best use is important.	Weighing value especially for different users (cargo, electric, aircraft).	N/A	Yes, all considerations are accurate.	Create extra access for mobility needs. Organized Curbside.	Drop any alternatives that require bussing.	Where is bike parking captured?	We will likely need a combination of multiple sites.	Drop any alternatives that are too far away (like the SW quad).	Other transportation modes like Waymos, etc. Where would these go?	Accessibility to the Transportation Plaza. Make sure all sites are easy to find and access.	N/A	Agree.	Remove crosswind runway for cargo expansion.	N/A.
2	Yes.	There is not a use for 3-21 - what is the cost to remove it? It seems to help everything else to remove - cargo, terminal.	No.	One point left out - concern over confusion with two terminal entrances.	Make Concourse C and D the same length. Make the IAF at the end of E more innovative and consider what would make it feel more international.	No, though they liked Concourse C and D expansion the best.	Yes.	Affordability. Safety and security at parking locations. Regional parking could be a public private arrangement. Make parking more visually attractive/innovative. Support public transit as much as possible to reduce congestion on airport way.	No, keep all. Really like regional sites option.	Yes	Wayfinding - single pickup/drop-off is way easier.	Remote economy/kiss and fly option. Possibly rental car and new east west curb alternatives.	Yes.	Repurposing existing buildings - historic original terminal? Connectivity of similar use (in addition to proximity).	No, liked idea of remaining 3-21 so cargo could be continuous.
3	Yes.	If we never get it back, are we at risk of losing capability? Nostalgia. High energy crossings, safety issue.	Drop preserve alternative, keep remove crosswind alternative.	Yes.	International traveller first impression. Redundant processor/curbside capability for phasing.	Drop domestic E configuration (busing).	Yes.	Like off-airport but was idea security of off-airport capacity. Manage distribution of premium vs. economy products.	One vote for removing closer-in option.	Yes.	TNC's on floor 4 of parking 1, safety of crosswalk. Passenger amenities with remote curbside. Accessibility. Like limiting the crosswalk.	Remove remote curbside, bus curbside is the worst.	Yes.	Prioritize terminal development in the terminal area. Think about near-term needs and their room to expand.	Public safety not near terminal.
4	N/A.	Possible safety with cross-traffic.	No one will notice if it's gone.	N/A.	Long taxi to south runway with Concourse E extension. Too much complexity with IAF in Concourse E. Walkability is very important.	Drop Concourse E with IAF alternative. Concourse C and D extension is preferred alternative. Concourse D and E alternative might be ok to keep. Keep all options on the table.	Yes.	Portland traffic bad for remote sites. Add more to current economy lots. PDX hotels.	Keep all options on the table.	Yes.	Redesign existing curbside uses for more efficiency. Publicize rental car curb/East curb.	Keep all but remove econ lot it is hard to explain.	N/A.	PDX likely a candidate for UAV/AAM due to remote network using PDX as hub. Move general aviation for Concourse E expansion.	All have merit to keep as alternatives.

Attachment B: Transcribed Individual Feedback Worksheet

Number	Airfield considerations	Terminal considerations	Parking considerations	Curbside considerations	Cargo, general aviation, and support facilities consideration
1	Important to consider operational efficiency and future needs. Is the runway more useful or the additional space "inside the fence?"	Consider ease of navigation, cost effectiveness (gets on both sides). Balance of passenger flow, increase in length one landside access.	I really like the remote sites! I would consider the congestion on Airport Way, capacity needs, cost of parking, time to terminal, and maybe EV's?	Consider confusion and ease of access. Are we gaining enough space to justify confusion? TNC is no brainer.	Consider future needs and cost efficiency. Is crosswind being removed? What makes the most sense long term?
2	Remove crosswind runway. Opens up more options.	N/A	Safety! Convenience, price, affordability.	N/A	N/A
3	Ability to support needed aircraft. It seems like there isn't a dedicated need anymore? Cost to remove v. alternative uses.	Keeping PDX feeling "small" and local. One terminal entry/exit. Like the idea of all terminals being the same length and not super wrong. Update IAF (remove busing in all cases).	Liked the different types/options overall to balance price, availability, bigger regional demand, etc.	Wayfinding again! I want options that are easy to figure out. Love the TNC consolidation idea and relocating valet.	Grouping like with like feels useful. Moving general aviation seems logical. All the suggestions felt straightforward here!
4	Usefulness of crosswind runway. Airfield operational advantages to removing it.	3-21 decommissioned. C&D expansion. Easiest way to bring in most gates on both sides of concourse. Expand IAF. No need for unit terminal.	Remote regional would be a game changer if people would use it. On-airport sites are probably the most practical.	New P-1 level 4 curb. New east curb. All TNC dropoff/pickup at Transportation Plaza.	Move general aviation due to Concourse E expansion. Combine additional cargo and general aviation to SW Quadrant. 3-21 decommissioned.
5	Is there an identified need for the runway? If not, remove. Does it gain space for other uses?	Walking distance. Does the IAF need more separate location? E Expansion seems very long, especially for walkability.	Walkable is of course preferred. The remote parking would be hampered by traffic congestion. Shuttle is the secondary option.	N/A	SW Area optimal for use. Large footprint, NW area too.
6	Weather potentials, availability for cargo and/or airspace clearances.	Large A/C in a concourse. Keep IAF where it is (D-E expansion).	Ease for family use.	N/A	Fewer cars.
7	Removing the crosswind runway would create so much flexibility in placing the other alternatives. Underutilized - better uses for this land. Creates a barrier for airport operations.	Thinking for the future, which alternative pairs nicely with other changes needed at the airport. Which options replaces land uses of lower value (or parking).	Parking dominates walkable access to the terminal now. Don't need more in this valuable space. Like the idea of regional parking. All our checked bags at these locations (London, Taipei). Further away with shuttles, makes the most sense.	Sacrificing a small amount of parking tradeoff for drop-off/pick-up. Don't penalize pedestrians, traffic is already bad. Love ideas for options for dropoff/pickup from further away. This would add a lot of flexibility. Reduce single occupancy vehicles.	Don't use available space just because it is available. Want to maintain availability for future uses. Add more uses where it makes sense to keep efficiencies (cargo location near existing cargo). Keep like uses near like uses.
8	Safety. As long as the runway can be removed and maintain equivalent safety then remove.	Length of walk. Beauty, what greets traveler when stepping out of terminal or terminal windows. Simplicity -- is the building easy to navigate for all users.	Ease of use for customer congestion at and around airport.	Walking distance. Safety for pedestrians.	That fire and police have location that allows for best outcomes. Efficiency of what is instead of multiple new builds.
9	What if the South or North runway were damaged? Weather changes moving forward. Keeping increases risk of collision. Keep crosswind and remove North.	Accessibility. Distance to go from parking. How much traffic for international? Preferred E with IAF. Can we expand D?	Remote parking decreases local traffic. Makes airport travel more accessible. Are all shuttle busses accessible? Is parking free offsite?	Yes to P1 short-term.	Split fire into two departments. Move wildlife closest to runways for immediate clearance needs.
10	If crosswind is indeed a feasible option. Are we certain it won't be needed when wind direction changes, if there is any chance, need to ensure a contingency plan is in place to accommodate any aircraft that needed it.	Consider walking time/distance. Consider the negative feeling those among international flights feel when having to 'bus' to exit. Consider a 'seamless' experience, exciting visibility to all PDX has to offer. IAF with separate arrival/departures like its own international, makes it more seamless experience for international travel.	For local area, use Lyft/Uber services rather than parking. For suburbs around Portland, use close-in or shuttle depending on personal budget. Prioritize close-in for those who need it (disabilities). Security/safety for late night waiting, vehicle security.	Remove crowding at curbside (easy short term garage). If not curbside dropoff, easy walking/free luggage trolley available. Safe, easy, seamless.	Important: meet the need of each department's basic requirements. Consider using the best use of space and whether options are expandable. Design/build for future need.
11	Too little value for so much cost and trouble. So long, farewell, auf weidershein adieu.	Walking. Improve international experience. Balance sides. Alley constraints. Disruption with D and old E rehabilitations. Big E!	Better pricing signals. Abundance of premium parking. Handling staff. Expected friction. Reliance on partners (C-Tran/TriMet).	Ease of use. Ease of circulation. Wayfinding. High quality users.	Plan for future terminal area expansions. No airfield access folks out. Maintain full use of the campus. SkyChefs, Alderwood. Move general aviation to NW side. Cargo on the crosswind runway. Move MRO to ORANG. Move wildlife to old old old terminal. Co-locate public safety with maintenance.