

Meeting Summary

PDX 2045 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting 11

January 22, 2026; 5:30 PM – 8:00 PM

University of Oregon, Campus Center Building, 2823 NE Holman St, Portland, OR 97211

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
- Tsering Sherpa

Port of Portland

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

Consultant Team

Cadence Purdy, EnviroIssues
Cameron Modjeski, Ricondo
Chad Townsend, Ricondo
Jenna Johnstone, Ricondo
Joey Posada, EnviroIssues
Julie Gueho, JMG Consulting
Suzanne Donaldson, Donaldson Consulting

Welcome, Meeting Goals, Project Updates

- PAC Facilitator Suzanne Donaldson welcomed PAC members to their eleventh meeting and reviewed the agenda and meeting goals. Meeting goals included: share an update on engagement; learn about the PDX customer experience program; share and discuss alternatives prioritization; share and discuss new options for the International Arrivals Facility (IAF); share integrated alternatives and potential phasing; and review next steps for the PAC.
- Cameron Modjeski provided a recap of the previous PAC meeting where PAC members learned about and provided feedback on alternatives integration and the Port's ongoing engagement efforts.
- Aaron Ray shared that consultant Bridger Wineman is leaving the project for a new role and thanked him for his work on the PAC over the past two years.

What's New at PDX

- Aaron Ray shared an update on the PDX new main terminal project. The south node of the terminal core is now open with the bypass hallway closed, and the north node will be open in March.
- Automated exit lanes will open in April, leading to the meet-and-greet area and concessions. Passengers will continue to use the existing elevators and escalators to baggage claim until June 2026, when direct connections from each exit lane will open.
- Additional work in the terminal following the terminal core project will include a new baggage claim ceiling/lighting and restoration of the terminal window wall.

Customer Experience Program

- Meg Rarick provided an overview of the PDX Customer Experience Program. Meg works with the customer service team to improve how the Port tracks passenger feedback to ensure timely and consistent responses.
- The Port is working on updating the accessibility page on the Port's website with help from the Accessibility Committee and testing new signage on the roadway to help connect passengers with wheelchair service faster.
- PAC members shared that PDX has done a commendable job on improving accessibility.
- One PAC member noted that they used the 2-hour parking promotion, and it was very easy. Employees were aware of the program, although it was a little bit of a process to get the parking validation completed. Meg shared that she would share this feedback with the customer experience team.

Q: What kinds of things can people look forward to with the completion of work in the terminal?

- A: The stadium stairs area will no longer be used as an exit for passengers, so this space will be available for events. Potential events could include farmers markets, concerts, and fairs.

Q: What is the most common feedback the Port hears?

- A: Walk times. As the number of planes increases, airports need to grow. PDX was designed with passengers in mind and has shorter walking distances than most similarly sized airports.

Q: Do you hear about anything weird from passengers?

- A: All sorts of things come up in the Customer Experience program.

Q: As more retail spaces close in east Portland, is there any thought to using PDX as a retail island for those who might not want to go downtown? Any efforts to make it more accessible?

- A: The Port would love for people to shop in the pre-security shops at the airport. The Port offers free 2-hour parking during the holidays and may use free parking in the future to incentivize shoppers. The Port plans to introduce a gate pass program once construction is finished so that people can shop in the post-security area.

Q: Can we add motorized scooters or carts for passengers as an accessibility option?

- A: Unfortunately, no, the floors at PDX are not designed for the weight of motorized scooters or carts. Passengers can request wheelchair assistance if needed.

Q: There is a stigma about having to ask for wheelchair assistance for certain passengers. Can PDX create an ad or video to destigmatize using wheelchair assistance? The interaction with wheelchair pushers can be a wonderful experience and that might help people feel more comfortable requesting a wheelchair.

- A: This is a great idea. The Port is already working on ways to destigmatize the use of wheelchair assistance, but this is a great idea that we will take back to the customer experience team.

Public Comment

- Phuong Truong, PAC member, shared that they are excited to check out the new terminal. Phuong also asked if there is any information the Port provides on smaller seasonal airlines.

What We Heard

- Joey Posada shared final results from the Open House 2 Online survey. In total, 166 survey responses were recorded. Most respondents said they use PDX to travel, expressed support for closing the crosswind runway, and almost half supported the Concourse C and D Expansion alternative. For passenger pick-up and drop-off curb and parking alternatives, respondents generally preferred options located closest to the terminal. 57% of respondents shared that they would not use a regional parking location.
- Jeff Broderick shared updates from the shared prosperity working group, an internal Port group used to gather internal feedback on planning. The working group recommends considering travel time of airport workers to and from work and prioritizing spaces that already exist over developing new areas. Generally, feedback from this group aligns with feedback from other advisory groups and survey results.

New International Arrivals Facility Alternative

- Cameron Modjeski provided a refresher on how the IAF works at PDX today, as well as constraints of the existing facility. The Port wants to increase capacity for international arrivals and eliminate the busing operation.
- Chad Townsend shared specific needs of the new IAF and how these needs drive the different alternatives. He then shared refined options for IAF locations on Concourses D and E.
- An additional IAF alternative, the Central Core IAF Alternative, was introduced. This alternative would relocate the IAF to the north side of the main terminal as a two-story or three-story expansion.
- Key differentiators between the Central Core IAF Alternative and other alternatives were shared. One large benefit to the Central Core IAF Alternative is shorter walking distances. This option is also easier to develop as it does not require temporarily relocating the IAF during construction, and it opens more future development opportunities.
- Cameron addressed a public comment the Port received in the project inbox asking if the team considered a Concourse B IAF option. This was not explored in depth as large international aircraft cannot be parked here due to the proximity to the south runway.

- By a show of hands, most PAC members supported the Central Core IAF Alternative. Four PAC members expressed interest in expanding Concourse E with IAF.
- One PAC member shared that the connection from the CCE IAF Alternative to the MAX is really far.
- Aaron Ray shared that the Port is still exploring all options fully.

Q: Would the Central Core IAF Alternative be a completely different building?

- A: It would be an expansion/extension of the main terminal, not a completely different building.

Q: Would the Central Core IAF Alternative impact the gates and require the extension of Concourse D and/or Concourse E to accommodate more gates?

- A: Two gates on the north side of the terminal (currently closed for the terminal core construction) would be closed to accommodate the new IAF. Two additional gates would need to be added to one of the concourses; this would likely happen in conjunction with additional gates added to meet expected demand.

Q: Could the IAF be a part of the mezzanine level in the main terminal like the new Alaska lounge?

- A: The planning team considered a Concourse D IAF alternative on the mezzanine as one of the IAF location alternatives. Conceptually, this may be possible but runs into a lot of challenges due to the aging facility of Concourse D, level changes, existing electrical systems, etc. The Central Core IAF Alternative could potentially have passengers exiting on the mezzanine.

Q: What percentage of international travelers end at PDX vs. transfer somewhere else?

- A: A very small percentage of international travelers are catching connecting flights. International travelers make up approximately 10% of total travelers at PDX, and only a small share of those total passengers connect to other flights.

Q: Does the area of the Central Core IAF Alternative shown meet the capacity needed for a large international plane?

- A: Yes, the diagrams are to scale and meet the space requirements for large (Group V) aircraft. Should additional space be required, the Central Core IAF could be expanded. Additionally, the rescreeing checkpoint is an optional amenity; this could potentially be combined with regular TSA screening.

Q: For the Central Core IAF Alternative, are passenger screenings occurring on level 2?

- A: Yes, in the layouts shown, passenger screenings would be conducted on level 2 as part of the immigrations process. Passengers would go through a primary inspection with US Customs and Border Patrol (CBP). Passengers could then collect any checked bags and then proceed to secondary inspection if they are directed to do so for additional screening. Passengers catching connecting flights would need to re-check their bags and go through TSA. There could be a TSA checkpoint where connecting passengers would exit with PDX-bound passengers and then go through a regular TSA line. There is also an alternative where this would occur on level 3 (mezzanine), which would leave level 2 available for concessions, amenities, hold room space, etc.

Q: How many people move through the IAF at any given time?

- A: The existing IAF can accommodate around 500 passengers per hour during busy times; when two or more large international planes land around the same time, this is less than the capacity needed. PDX is expecting to see international arrivals of 1,000-1,200 passengers per hour in the future. A new facility would be designed to serve 1,000 to 2,000 passengers per hour.

Q: How would the Central Core IAF Alternative impact the viewshed of the main terminal? Would it block views to the north?

- A: Opportunities for views from the Central Core IAF would be up to the designers, but there is an opportunity to have more of a panoramic view if the building is expanded north and there are windows on three sides (looking west, north, and east) towards the Columbia River.

Q: Would the Central Core IAF Alternative mean all domestic and international passengers enter and exit PDX through one space? Wouldn't this "stuff" them all into one space?

- A: Yes. Under the Central Core Alternative, the main terminal would continue to have one entrance and exit area for all passengers. The new main terminal has been designed and built to accommodate 35 million annual passengers, which is the project number over the next 20 years.

Q: If the Central Core IAF Alternative is built with two levels, would there be an option for expand it by adding a third level in the future?

- A: It's possible but it is usually hard to put buildings on top of buildings. It would be easier to build all three levels during the initial construction. It is also technically feasible to use the mezzanine on the north side as a screening area for international arrivals who are re-entering the terminal for a connecting flight, though it would require bridging over that area and over old Concourse D.

Q: If the IAF were constructed in Concourse E it would come with additional curbside; will the Central Core IAF Alternative affect curbside demand? Would additional curbside be constructed?

- A: Construction of the Central Core IAF (rather than the Concourse E IAF) would mean the Port would need to use other strategies to increase curbside capacity, such as consolidating drop-off for Uber and Lyft to the Transportation Plaza and relocating the valet parking services to meet curbside demand.

Q: What is the difference between the 2-level and 3-level design for the Central Core IAF Alternative?

- A: The 3-level design would have more space. The extra level could be used for concessions, airline lounges, additional amenities, holdroom areas, etc.

Q: Are there differences in concessions opportunities between the IAF alternatives?

- A: With the 3-level Central Core Alternative there would be opportunities for concessions that serve many passengers passing through Concourses D and E, near the center of the terminal. With the Concourse E IAF, new concessions to serve that area would really only serve passengers at the end of Concourse E; they would be less central to the main terminal.

Q: When are we expecting to have more international flights?

- A: There is no news to announce at this time, but the Port is still working on expanding international service, focusing primarily on restoration of international service to Asia and Mexico City.

Q: How would PDX culture be integrated into the Central Core IAF Alternative?

- A: The three-sided nature of this alternative could replicate or improve any view that the Concourse E IAF Alternative may have. However, this is a design decision and will be further evaluated if the Port moves forward with this alternative. We have heard the PAC's priorities for centralization of the terminal, clear wayfinding, and walking distances, which are better addressed with the Central Core IAF Alternative.

Q: Is there a financial incentive to build the third level?

- A: Yes, but it depends on concessions filling and leasing that space.

Alternatives Prioritization

- Cameron Modjeski shared alternatives that the team is recommending deprioritizing as the project advances towards a recommended development plan. PAC members participated in an online poll to provide input on these de-prioritized alternatives. Results from the poll can be viewed in Appendix A.
- All PAC members supported marking the crosswind runway (Runway 3-21) for closure, sharing that it is rarely used, and that space could be used for something else.
- PAC members supported de-prioritizing the large domestic Concourse E expansion with a new curbside, citing walking distances, support for the Central Core IAF alternative, and that expansion of CCE could be considered in the future.
- Most PAC members supported de-prioritizing the recommended two on-Airport parking sites with shuttle access.
- PAC members supported de-prioritizing remote regional parking sites. One PAC member suggested remote sites should be targeted to high traveling companies like Nike.
- PAC members supported de-prioritizing the Rental Car Center curb, the new east curb, and remote Economy Lot curb.

Q: How will noise be impacted by closing the crosswind runway?

- A: Noise exposure will be assessed in the master plan. Currently, very few aircraft operate on this runway. Closing it would mean fewer north-south flights and more east-west flights, but little to no change to noise exposure around the airport is expected to result from closing the crosswind runway.

Q: Where are the blue dots on the parking alternatives figure?

- A: The blue circles represent potential locations for additional parking. The two recommended sites for deprioritization are located along Alderwood Road and Cascades Parkway. The Cascades Parkway location (near Cascade Station across the road from the FBI and Holiday Inn Express) is being reserved for rental car storage, and the Alderwood Road location is currently a surface-level parking spot for employees. Building a structure on top of the lot serviced by a shuttle would be complicated, and zoning code only allows for employee parking.

Q: What is a TNC?

- A: A transportation network company, such as Uber and Lyft.

Integrated Alternatives

- Cameron Modjeski provided three integrative alternative paths illustrating the phasing of development based on dependencies. Airfield and terminal development influence where parking, curbside, and support facilities are located.
- These integrative alternative paths only show the big pieces. The planning team will come back to the PAC in March to share the recommended development path, and it will include more details on facilities development.

Q: What are the differences between the three alternatives? Are these the only three options?

- A: The main dependencies that drive other decisions are whether the crosswind runway is retained or closed, where the terminal is expanded to add gates, and where the IAF is located. These decisions affect the location and timing of other improvements.

Q: It seems like there is a lot of alignment amongst the PAC, Shared Prosperity Working Group, and public feedback. Are there any differing opinions on how to grow the airport?

- A: The proposed alternatives have received a lot of support from different stakeholders, including airlines. Input the Port receives is helping inform analysis to determine the feasibility of options. There was skepticism around closing the crosswind runway; however, this was addressed with modeling and analysis and now has general consensus.

PAC Next Steps

- Suzanne Donaldson shared next steps for the PAC. The next meeting is on March 19, 2026, and will focus on a recommended development plan. The meeting will be held at the same location - University of Oregon, Campus Center Building, 2823 NE Holman St, Room 212, Portland, OR 97211. There will be a final PAC celebration sometime in April/May 2026.
- Suzanne reminded PAC members to complete the meeting evaluation.
- Aaron shared that Alaska Airlines and Loyal Legion are hosting a special culinary event called “The Greatest Airline Meals of the 20th Century” Feb. 20 and Feb. 21. Tickets are on sale on Eventbrite.
- Meeting adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Appendix A: Alternative Prioritization Poll Results

The following are the compiled PAC member input on depriorized alternatives.

Do you support marking the crosswind runway for closure? Why or why not?

Yes. It is seldomly used and takes up a lot of real estate that could be used for gate extensions.

Yes, it is no longer needed, and opens up far more possibilities.

Yes, after the past few meetings, there is little usage reserved for this crosswind runway; therefore, it is better to use the space for something else if applicable

Yes, because it has little use to airport operators

Yes - based on all prior discussions, the utility relative to cost to maintain / loss of alternatives makes closure worthwhile

Yes I believe it is not really needed based on the usage

Yes, it's not used often and can make space for something else.

Yes- opens space for other development

Do you support marking the crosswind runway for closure? Why or why not?

Yes. It seems like it's no longer needed and there is benefit from removing

Yes, this will allow the expansion of C and D.

Yes, it seems unneeded at this time and could be reallocated to a higher and better use.

Like the characters on the hit HBO show "Heated Rivalry", it's time for the crosswind runway to come out.

Yes, it's no longer useful in long term planning

Definitely support! Don't get winds strong enough very often, and criteria requiring its use are much less stringent.

Yes, I support it should be closed given the lack of use, risk to airplane crashes, etc. The only purpose for keeping would be due to future weather changes, growth, etc. Time to let it go...

Yes, if it does not change air noise levels to nearby PDX neighborhoods such as Wilkes, Argay Terrace. If it does it is a no.

Do you support marking the crosswind runway for closure? Why or why not?

No, most airliners do not use the runway.

There are certainly much better uses of the land for other purposes.

Yes, it is no longer needed.

Yes

Support

5



17



Do you support de-prioritizing the large domestic Concourse E expansion with a new curbside? Why or why not?

Yes

Support.

Yes, I the expansion can be explored in the future.

If it is not needed right now, then why do it. It is better off to leave it for the future.

I don't feel strongly one way or the other on this.

Yes agree with the decision based on the details discussed (ie does not make sense to expand without a new IAF).

Support. Makes sense that the space is left for potential IAF expansion

Yes, with Central Core option, there is more flexibility now, which I was not aware of before. the construction in central core will not hinder the current operations. More centralized services too.



13



Do you support de-prioritizing the large domestic Concourse E expansion with a new curbside? Why or why not?

Yes, the new alternative is more promising for pdx's current and near future demands. Concourse E expansion also has too far of walking distance to the rest of the airport.

Yes I support this, the other options here overall provide better solutions for travel

Yes! I like the idea of keeping terminal lengths balanced for walkability too, so eliminating a long E makes sense

In the immortal words of Tyra Banks: We were rooting for you. We were all rooting for you

I liked the idea of having another drop off sit closer to the entry as it could reduce traffic jams around the main drop off area. I'm fine holding off to expand in future years out this way.



13



Do you support de-prioritizing the two on-Airport parking sites with shuttle access? Why or why not?

Yes

Yes, I believe a larger garage in walking distance of the terminal is the most efficient option for passengers and parking capacity for future proofing.

Yes based on the capacity studies, makes sense to deprioritize these!

I think staying on airport is best. The more you have to shuttle, the more cost there is to operate the airport resulting in too much cost and a greater carbon footprint.

Better to hold off for now.

Let them be natural preserves for decommissioned Waymos when they get too old and need to be sent to "a farm upstate"

Yes I support as the distance from the terminal seems to be too far away, the other options I think travelers would prefer and use

Yes. Having to use a shuttle is not ideal, it is like having a layover, its a hassle. Especially for those with mobility issues.

1



14



Do you support de-prioritizing the two on-Airport parking sites with shuttle access? Why or why not?

If we do any make sure they are fairly close to terminal.

The remote sites should be targeted to high traveling companies i.e. Nike. Otherwise closer parking is great as long as it includes more accessible parking to reflect current needs.

I support not using the on-airport sites for shuttle access. I do love the idea of regional parking sites but PDX does not seem busy enough for that sort of system.

Yes

Yes! (My bias is I live so close I always Uber and will never use parking so my opinion matters less)

Yes. Still think regional would be doable with education and marketing.

Yes, with a condition that we make sure to build the building tall enough to have more vertical space rather than continuously relying on horizontal space

Do you support de-prioritizing remote regional parking sites? Why or why not?

Sure. It can always be implemented later if the community wants it.

Yes. People won't use them I feel

For now this is fine.

Yes.

I do because not many feel their car will be safe while they are away. Break-ins are a major issue.

Yes I support. There options around the airport provide options for people coming to here. Agree focus on parking here for shopping, events, etc



6



Do you support de-prioritizing the Rental Car Center curb, the new east curb, and remote Economy Lot curb? Why or why not?

Yes

Yes, proximity and accessibility seems most problematic with these options

I support not bussing people away.

Yep! Those seemed less convenient or confusing anyway

Support

Yes, I believe that we can get better use from moving the shuttle busses and ride-share away from the main loop.

Yes, I prefer the other options, so these rental car curb, new east and Economy lot are not a big priority

Yes, due to fewer potential benefits ;)



14



Do you support de-prioritizing the Rental Car Center curb, the new east curb, and remote Economy Lot curb? Why or why not?

Support

Yes support!

Yes. Other curb side strategies seem to be better planning solutions

Like the 2026 Oscar nominations, these were always going to be weird choices

Yes

I do support deprioritizing these. I especially like reallocating valet parking and the TNC plaza. I am skeptical about the P1 flyover, that seems complicated and possibly expensive



Meeting Summary

PDX 2045 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting 11 Make-Up Session

January 28, 2026; 3:30 PM – 5:00 PM
MS Teams Meeting (Virtual)

Attendees:

PAC Members: Stephanie Barnes, Allyssa Bromley, Brian Kuzera
Port of Portland: Aaron Ray, Jennifer Rabby

Port staff shared the same presentation provided to PAC members at Meeting 11, held on January 22, 2026. Below is a summary of questions, comments, and discussion topics from the make-up session.

What We Heard

Comment: Regarding the regional parking option, this would be a paradigm shift. It's a great idea, but more and more people want and are willing to pay for a "premium" experience (in this case close-in parking). Eventually premium experiences will be oversaturated.

- Response: Regional parking sites may still be a useful approach to address high demand around the holidays or as we start to approach capacity limits with on-Airport parking. For master planning purposes, we are not going to depend on regional parking sites as a means to accommodate parking demand through 2045.

New International Arrivals Facility Alternative

Q: With the previous alternatives that would keep an international arrivals facility (IAF) on Concourse D or construct an IAF on Concourse E, would they require passengers to be bused?

- A: No; we would figure out how to connect the IAF to the main terminal with a hallway under any alternative.

Q: Can the new international gates be made independent flex gates with their own escalator going up/down to the IAF?

- A: Gates for the new IAF would still need a sterile corridor like we have on Concourse D today, but would be designed to be "swing gates" that could function for domestic or international flights; they might swing in pairs rather than individually. Today all of the international gates at the end of Concourse D have to "swing" together.

Q: How many international gates are we planning for?

- A: All alternatives assume 6 international gates.

Q: Would construction of the Central Core IAF Alternative take longer to build because it would be multiple stories? Would it also require additional parking like the need for the P4 garage with the Concourse E IAF Alternative?

- A: The Central Core IAF Alternative could be constructed as either a 2- or 3- story facility; this decision will not be made in the master plan, but estimated costs will assume the more expensive option. Under any of the IAF alternatives, the next step will be a refinement study. Additional parking is planned under any alternative. With the Concourse E IAF, the P4 garage would be needed with that facility rather than when driven by parking demand. Independent of that IAF facility, the P4 garage might not otherwise be needed until later in the planning period (closer to 2045).
Regarding construction of the Central Core IAF Alternative, this would not necessarily take longer than constructing other IAF alternatives. In the case of an expanded/renovated Concourse D IAF, phasing would be more complicated because construction would be occurring while keeping the existing facility operational; whereas constructing an IAF in a completely new location would likely be simpler from a phasing perspective.

Comment: The Central Core IAF Alternative has merit and presents a wonderful option - provided that the gates attached to it are swing gates. The Concourse E IAF Alternative would be more like a "unit terminal." The Central Core IAF Alternative accomplishes all of the goals for a new IAF and preserves passenger flow into the main terminal.

Comment: Really like the Central Core IAF Alternative. International arrivals would be more included in the core of PDX and not an afterthought. The swing gates are a good idea.

Comment: Previously liked the Concourse E IAF Alternative because it was "intentional," but the Central Core IAF Alternative accomplishes that.

All three participants noted that the Central Core IAF Alternative is now their preferred/favorite option.

Alternatives Prioritization

Airfield: All three participants noted support for closure of the Crosswind Runway. One noted that it is not used much now and there is no foreseeable need for it in the future.

Terminal: All three participants noted support for deprioritization of the Concourse E Domestic Expansion Alternative.

Parking: All participants noted support for deprioritization of the on-Airport sites reserved for rental car storage and the one not likely needed within the planning period, as well as the remote regional parking sites.

Curbside: All participants noted support for deprioritization of the new rental car curb, new east curb, and remote economy lot curb.

Integrated Alternatives

Q: How would Alaska Airlines' plans play into which concourse would be extended first?

- A: Individual airlines' plans and preferences would not impact where gates would be expanded first. Concourse D is ripe for expansion because it's not as long as Concourse C and it's in need of asset renewal work. Alaska uses available common use gates on all concourses.