



PDX COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #21

Wednesday, January 18, 2017

12:30-3:30PM

Notes

| Name | Interest Represented | Attendance |
|--|---|------------|
| VOTING MEMBERS | | |
| Erwin Bergman | Central Northeast Neighbors | Present |
| Tina Burke | Airport Employee | Absent |
| Tony DeFalco | Environmental Justice | Absent |
| Walt Evans | Business Organization | Absent |
| Katie Larsell | Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission | Present |
| Dick Goldie | East Multnomah County Neighborhood (City of Fairview, Gresham, Maywood Park, Troutdale, and Wood Village) | Present |
| Maryhelen Kincaid | Citywide Land Use Committee | Present |
| Brendan Korsgren | Passenger Airline | Absent |
| Micah Meskel <i>Alternate: Bob Sallinger</i> | Environment/Wildlife/Natural Resources | Present |
| Jeff Owen | Multi-modal transportation representative | Present |
| Col. Jenifer Pardy <i>Alternate: Lt. Col. Jason Lay</i> | Military | Present |
| Juan Morena <i>Alternate: Joe Quitugua</i> | General Aviation | Present |
| Ahmed Abed-Rabuh | Air Cargo | Absent |
| Ron Glanville | East Portland Neighborhood Office | Present |
| Dr. Steven Sachs | Clark County neighborhood representative (Camas/Washougal) | Absent |
| Martin Slapikas | North Portland Neighborhood Services | Present |
| Mike Sloan | Vancouver neighborhood | Absent |
| Joe Smith | PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee | Present |
| Adam Lyons | Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods | Present |
| Corrina Chase | Columbia Slough Watershed Council | Present |
| NON-VOTING MEMBERS | | |
| Nick Atwell | PDX Wildlife Committee staff | Present |
| Barbara Cartmill | Clackamas County | Present |



| | | |
|--|---|---------|
| <i>Alternate: Dan Johnson</i> | | |
| Melissa De Lyser | Washington County | Absent |
| Chad Eiken <i>Alternate: Willy Williamson</i> | Vancouver Community Development Director (or designee) | Present |
| TBD | Federal Aviation Administration | |
| Vince Granato | Chief Operating Officer (or designee) | Present |
| Dan Moeller | Metro | Present |
| Tom Armstrong | Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Director (or designee) | Present |
| Gordy Euler | Clark County | Present |
| John Wasiutynski | Multnomah County | Absent |

Port Staff and Consultants Present: Sam Imperati and Kristen Wright, Dorothy Sperry, Dot Clingman, Lisa Appel, Matt Parowlek, Mike Coleman, Chris White, and Sean Loughran.

Public and Invited Guests Present: Michael Hall of UniteHere, Kallen Gatherer of Mortenson, and Jeremy Simer of SEIU Local 49

Introductory Comments

Mr. Sam Imperati called the 21st meeting of the PDX Community Advisory Committee to order at 12:30pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Mr. Imperati noted that due to many members being absent, the group photo originally scheduled for today will be postponed to next meeting.

Mr. Imperati took an informal poll of the group to determine if the current schedule with lunch at noon and 12:30pm meeting start time is still working for group members. Group members signaled with a show of thumbs up that the current schedule is working well. Mr. Imperati invited any additional thoughts, comments or suggestions from the group on the topic. No comments were shared. Mr. Imperati invited group members to contact him if meeting timing becomes problematic at any point in the future.

Mr. Imperati noted there were several absences and some alternates that were present for the meeting. Noted absences were Tony DeFalco, Mike Sloan, Tina Burke, John Wasiutynski, Dr. Steve Sachs, Barbara Cartmill, Brendan Korsgren, and Joey Quituga. Alternates attending include Juan Morena attending as Joey Quituga’s alternate and Dan Johnson attending as Barbara Cartmill’s alternate. Mr. Imperati invited Juan Morena and Dan Johnson to introduce themselves to the group.



October Meeting Notes Approval

Mr. Imperati referred the group to the minutes from the October 19, 2016 meeting and asked if there were revisions or corrections needed. Mr. Joe Smith inquired about the reference to “see meeting notes approval in April 6th meeting notes.” Mr. Imperati explained the April 6th date is incorrect, and that the statement refers to notes from today’s meetings. Mr. Imperati clarified that the statement was referring to meeting notes revisions and approval that will be reflected in the meeting notes from today’s meeting. No additional revisions or corrections were noted and meeting notes were approved unanimously.

Agenda and Materials Review:

Mr. Imperati reviewed the meeting agenda and material handouts provided with the committee.

PDX CAC Annual Report: 2016

Mr. Imperati referred the committee to the PDX CAC Annual Report provided. He indicated the report was an unformatted version, and requested any suggestions for revisions and clarifications.

Mr. Joe Smith complimented the report as well done and suggested the following revisions to the report:

- On the first page, first paragraph, the years should be corrected to 2008 and 2011 from 2008-2001.
- On the fourth page, Mr. Smith indicated the motion advising Port to encourage businesses to set pay scales that promote retention is described twice, both as fifth item under action taken and again as the sixth paragraph. Mr. Smith suggested eliminating one of these instances.
- Page six, last sentence in the paragraph beginning “The first recommended project...,” there should be changed to their, to read: “Their communities are Argay...”
- Page 7, second bullet “Pubic notice and discussion for one proposed project,” Mr. Smith suggests that the committee add a description of the project here.
- Mr. Smith proposed the committee update their bios on the website, as some may be out of date.

Mr. Imperati thanked Mr. Smith for his suggested revisions and shared that the committee’s bios will be circulated with committee members to update as suggested.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid noted that on the sixth page, the paragraph beginning “The first recommended project...,” all neighborhoods on the list are eastside neighborhoods. Ms. Helen explained there might be other neighborhoods affected and suggested that adding neighborhoods to the list could indicate more involvement. A staffer reported that they looked at Friends of Trees community opportunities in terms of activities scheduled with current partners, then looked at airport proximity and generated this list.

Mr. Imperati invited members to review the final PDX CAC Annual Report with their constituents to share the work of the committee.



Mr. Ron Glanville inquired when the report would be ready. Chris White from the Port shared that the report would be available at the end of April, but if members needed it earlier to let her know.

Friends of Trees Plantings

Mr. Imperati brought the group's attention to meeting material provided on the Friends of Trees. Mr. Imperati shared that CAC members and their friends and family are invited to volunteer at Friends of Trees events sponsored by the Port of Portland in various neighborhoods. Mr. Imperati brought attention to a Saturday event at the Columbia Children's Arboretum from 9 to 1pm. Members were invited to contact Chris White if they planned on attending the event.

Roundtable Updates & Discussion: Ideas for Future Agenda Topics

Mr. Imperati invited committee members to share news from their group related to the Portland airport and to share suggestions for future agenda items.

Mr. Joe Smith shared that he found a presentation by Daren Griffin at a recent PDX Community Noise Advisory Committee (PDX CNAC) meeting to be valuable and encouraged the committee to consider having adding a presentation from Mr. Griffin as a future agenda item. Mr. Smith also provided an update from the PDX CNAC saying that a few community members are raising most of the noise complaints. Mr. Smith indicated it was his hope that the Port will continue to address the noise problem associated with Horizon airplanes, and provide noise baffling or other solutions to help with the ongoing construction noise. Lastly, Mr. Smith indicated that Clackamas County was having difficulty finding a representative for the PDX CNAC, and wondered if there was not enough of an imperative for Clackamas to participate and perhaps they didn't need a representative on PDX CNAC anymore.

Maryhelen Kincaid shared that the Port is helping to support the upcoming Vanport Mosaic Festival taking place on Memorial Day weekend. Ms. Kincaid indicated the Port has lent support through donating buses, and Port employee, Lisa Appel, has been lending her expertise in her involvement in the planning committee. Ms. Kincaid referred the committee to www.vanportmosaic.org for further information.

Mr. Ron Glanville invited members to attend the Friends of Trees event on Saturday the 23rd in his neighborhood; flyer included in material.

Mr. Juan Morena explained that construction of the new Atlantic Aviation facility is ongoing and expected to be completed in the next month, and they are hoping for a March 21st grand opening.

Mr. Nick Atwell informed the committee that the wildlife hazard management plan had been submitted to the FAA in November and that they are still awaiting approval. He expected approval should be soon.



Mr. Dan Moeller announced that Metro Parks and Nature has released the annual reports for 2015-16 for those members who might be interested in Metro's work that compliments Port's work for wildlife management and habitat enhancement. The report can be found at www.oregonmetro.gov/parksandnature.

Mr. Dick Goldie stated that some counselors in Troutdale seemed happy about the Piper Project. He also reported that a recent newspaper article purported that Amazon will be moving into the industrial property adjacent to the airport in Troutdale.

Mr. Micah Meskel recommended that a future topic could be around the superfund effort. He suggested that the committee could discuss and make recommendations to the Port for how the community process might move forward. He speculated this might entail local job training or prioritizing getting certain work done earlier rather than later. Mr. Meskel also proposed an air quality discussion as a future agenda topic. He indicated there are multiple discussions on this topic in the region, and given the specialized expertise of committee members, it could be a useful discussion. He recommended the discussion could be framed with the lens of emissions at the airport and /or the issue of lead gasoline in the Hillsboro airport.

Mr. Marty Slapikas proposed that in consideration of the recent Ft. Lauderdale incident, a future agenda topic might be to discuss security needs for non-TSA protected areas of the airport. He would like to know what the Port's efforts are in working with the Joint Terrorism Task Force. Additionally, Mr. Slapikas indicated that there had been some complaints about low flying plane noise, which had been addressed at the PDX Community Noise Advisory Committee (PDX CNAC) and the Port had responded to the individual who had filed the complaint.

Ms. Corrina Chase stated that the Columbia Slough Watershed Council (CSWC) was hiring a new stewardship director. Ms. Chase explained that the CSWC had a stewardship intern in place as the current director has reduced hours. Ms. Chase reminded the committee that this was related news as the CSWC is currently conducting a survey that is funded by the Port. Ms. Chase announced the CSWC celebration gala is on February 10th and welcomed members to attend. At the gala, Ms. Chase noted, the Port along with others will be presented with awards. Ms. Chase shared that tickets and information can be found on the CSWC website. Lastly, Ms. Chase shared the CSWC is also engaging in tree planting on Saturday and invited members to attend.

Mr. Chad Eiken informed the group that Vancouver's local airport had a growing conflict with developers who want taller buildings downtown. Mr. Eiken indicated the FAA had approved taller buildings, but the Vancouver committee did not agree. He shared that the committee is working to understand the FAA approval process and has learned that the FAA group responsible for overseeing Pearson airport is based out of Renton and does not communicate to the FAA counterparts that oversee PDX. Mr. Eiken explained this means there are two entities that control aircraft in same area that aren't communicating.

Mr. Tom Armstrong expressed that the City of Portland approved the last portions of the comprehensive plan in December. He reported that the plan is now with the Oregon Land and Conservation Development Commission, which will review according to their rules. Mr. Armstrong shared that hearings are expected this summer, and plan changes are expected to be effective January of 2018.



Mr. Sam Impeati introduced Kristen Wright, of the National Policy Consensus Center, as the new note taker for the committee.

PDX Updates

Vince Granato from the Port reported the following on the recent weather event that impacted airport operations:

- The snow event was more substantial than observed in 40 years and there was a tremendous response to ensure the airport stayed open.
- The airport is accustomed to managing snow and ice but fell behind with this event. As a result, he shared that there was a decision to ignore the north runway and focus on the south runway. The airport did have to close for an hour to catch up.
- Airlines are responsible for deciding whether to cancel flights, not the airport, and it is increasingly common to see airlines preemptively cancel to avoid having stuck airplanes. He reported that there were more cancellations in the prior week's icy weather.
- During the most recent event, PDX ran low on deicing materials and the Port of Seattle shipped 20 tons of sodium acetate. Mr. Granato expressed appreciation for this support from Seattle.
- The Port had \$1.4 million in materials costs before the last event, which didn't include staff time or other costs. Mr. Granato estimated that weather related costs would likely reach \$2-3 million. He also noted that as these costs are not in the budget, the Port would either absorb them or pass them on to airlines. He indicated an effort to offset the costs as much as possible, but that this had limitations.

Mr. Granato provided the following updates on airline activity:

- Airline activity is up 9% from last year.
- Southwest Airlines is going to add three flights daily to San Francisco. There are already a lot of San Francisco flights, but competition is increasing. Mr. Granato expected summer flights to San Francisco to be cheap.
- Iceland flights have also increased. One can fly anywhere in Europe from Iceland.
- Alaska also has announced new flights, and Delta has announced a new nonstop to Heathrow airport.
- Cathay Pacific is a new freighter service at PDX with 747 flights to Hong Kong twice a week. PDX has had freighter service off and on for the past few years. Mr. Granato reported that freighter services typically have a short stay before they leave and as such PDX wanted the right carrier for this market and are happy Cathay Pacific has started in November. Most of Cathay Pacific's activity is shipping Nike airsoles from the manufacturer in Beaverton, which are made into shoes and sent back to U.S. by ship.

Mr. Granato informed the committee about the following rural air service changes and efforts:



- Pen Air started service to Klamath Falls in October. Mr. Granato indicated Klamath Falls has not been serviced for some time.
- Sea Port provided Pendleton air service, which was subsidized by the federal government, but they filed Chapter 7 bankruptcy earlier this year.
- Boutique Air is a new operator that started up in December and is providing air service to Pendleton.
- Rural air service is a difficult line of business to get into, and the Port is working to coordinate more opportunities for rural service. Big airlines have stopped providing rural service. Mr. Granato shared that he is on the state aviation board, and there has been jet tax money approved by the legislature to enhance more rural air service. Mr. Granato explained that old models of operating air service to rural areas will not be successful, and new models are needed.

Mr. Granato provided the committee with the following concession updates:

- About 75% of concession leases were up for renewal and the Port has been working through these renewals in three phases.
- Most of the second wave of the concessions program have opened and most are doing well so far as revenues are up and these concessions are hiring.
- New concessions include new coffee shops, house spirits, Kenny and Zukes Deli, and a new Capers grab and go.
- Heading into third phase of concessions in early February, which will be a smaller group of offerings. About 4 locations are up for renewal.
- Ron Glanville will participate in the third phase of the PDX concessions selection process.

Mr. Granato informed the committee about new exit doors installed at PDX:

- PDX installed new exit doors in December. Currently the exit from the concourses goes against the stream of security. This project moved automated doors to the south (ending up toward Alaska and Spirit ticket lobby) and the north (by Delta ticket lobby).
- These new exit doors are expected to save on staffing costs and create more of a hard barrier for people going the wrong way.
- Testing was conducted, and PDX decided not to implement the new doors during the holiday season.
- There are two new coffee locations near these exit doors that are anxiously awaiting the new doors to be open.
- Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid asked how far the doors were from escalators or baggage. Mr. Granato answered that the ticketing desk was not relocated, so they are the same distance.



- Mr. Joe Smith asked about the effect on crews. Mr. Granato explained that crew would have a separate entrance, which was another advantage of the new exit doors.
- Mr. Ron Glanville asked whether staff would be directing people to the new exit doors. Mr. Granato affirmed that there would be staff redirecting people for a couple of months.

Mr. Granato updated the committee on current construction projects:

- There are four construction projects of focus currently: 1) quick turn around area, 2) planning and design on parking and consolidating rental car facility, 3) terminal balancing project adding 6 gates on E concourse, 4) terminal core project.
- New rental quick turn around area is \$67 million project.
- Parking and consolidating rental car facility, goes directly to the south with more public parking. The Port will award a design build contract (\$240 million) in the upcoming Port commission meeting.
- Terminal balancing project is about 30% designed. Port had to pause that project for a bit, but expects to start construction on the ramp and some civil work in the spring. It is expected this will be about a two-year project.
- The big project is the terminal core project. The project includes building seismic resilience, allows for different operating models for airlines, replaces aging infrastructure. Port is working with airlines who have a contract, which permits Port to get about 10% of design in April and/or May, then will talk with airlines about the next phase. It will cost \$17 million to complete 10% of the design. Mr. Granato shared that the Port will bring the project back to the PDX CAC as the project progresses to help give the committee more understanding of the project. Mr. Granato shared it is challenging to work in the area and try to keep the airport operational.

Mr. Granato informed the committee about sustainability updates at PDX:

- Mr. Granato reminded the group that the Port had made the decision about 2-3 years ago to be ISO 14001 certified. The Port had decided to go ahead with the assessment process, and received good remarks from the auditor. There were no negative findings that came out of the assessment, which is rare. Mr. Granato expressed that the Port was very happy about the ISO 14001 certification.
- Mr. Granato shared that the Port was involved in an alternative fuels project, and brought the group's attention to recent news of the first biofuel flight from Seattle to Washington DC. He indicated there would be more to come on the topic.

Mr. Granato reported that executive director Bill Wyatt has decided to retire at the end of June and the Port has started the search process for a replacement. The Port will use an outside firm to help with the search process. He



explained that there would be opportunities for public comment on both the search process and qualifications or characteristics of a new executive director. Mr. Granato invited the committee to provide feedback on the website listed in the report, and shared that the profile created through the input process will be used to identify and screen candidates. He noted that the advisory groups would interview the candidate in the spring with a meeting with the final candidate slated for May/June. Lastly, Mr. Granato shared that there would be opportunities to acknowledge Bill Wyatt's efforts and the Port will notify the committee of these opportunities as they arise.

Mr. Ron Glanville inquired about who makes the hiring decision. Mr. Granato clarified that the Port commission will make the decision.

Mr. Micah Meskel shared his appreciation for the public participation included in the process, and asked who were the external stakeholders. Mr. Granato shared that the Port has not identified these stakeholders, but they will be local community members. He shared that he is unsure about the process to select these 2 or 3 stakeholders. Mr. Meskel inquired if the Port had considered a member from the PDX CAC, to which Mr. Granato answered he was unsure. The Port commission is handling this process.

Mr. Granato informed the committee that the Port operations team had been awarded a national honor for their efforts in working with the TSA. He shared his pride in the proactiveness of the team in dealing with passenger traffic, and noted that the TSA delays reported in the news had not occurred at PDX. Mr. Granato recognized Tina Burke for her efforts, and reported that PDX has more national award winners than any other airport in the country.

Mr. Granato discussed the recent airport incidents in the news in Fort Lauderdale, Brussels, and Istanbul. He explained that PDX would have a larger show of force patrolling the front of the airport as a result, noting people will see more TSA and Port Police and they will be carrying larger weapons. The challenge, Mr. Granato shared, is that there is no credible threat, which leaves the question about how to affect these kinds of events. Mr. Granato shared that things like gates around baggage claim areas did keep people from the building, but were removed to allow for more space and movability.

The Port is looking at options for protecting the front of the building like bars to prevent larger trucks; however, Mr. Granato cautioned that efforts like this simply push the problem further out. He shared that the Port is discussing what kinds of things can be done differently, but noted that PDX will not be able to prevent everything, and must also consider the kind of airport experience people want to have. Mr. Granato explained that there was a focus on checkpoints after 9-11, but that the focus has moved now to public areas. He noted that the Port is a member of the Joint Terrorism Task Force, and are in communication with the city, state, and federal government



on the matter. Mr. Granato assured the committee that the Port is doing what they can to protect the building and the people.

Mr. Joe Smith expressed his hope that when the Port is considering safety and security, they are aware that ISIS and others “win if they turn America into a prison.” Mr. Erwin Bergman seconded this sentiment.

October Meeting Tour

Mr. Jeff Owen provided his impressions of the October tour. He expressed that it was nice to get out on the airfield and see wildlife, and he pointed out that there are thorough notes from the tour. He thanked the Port staff for taking the time, and expressed a desire to see tours continue. Mr. Owen reported that written feedback from attendees reported lots of positives about the tour.

Overview of Participation on PDX Concession Selection Process

Mr. Ron Glanville shared that the PDX concession selection process, in which he would be participating, would begin in February. Mr. Glanville reported that he has 30 years of restaurant business experience, and was an executive chef and suggested that security and logistics would be important. He expressed his appreciation at being able to participate.

Future Capital Program Update

Ms. Terri Burk, Sr. Manager of Planning and Development, provided the committee with information on the Port’s capital projects. Ms. Burk shared that the Port had made a commitment to keep the PDX CAC updated on capital projects, not limited to public notice projects, and to provide information on future happenings. Ms. Burk explained that a capital project is anything valued over \$5,000 that creates a physical asset like a road, building, or something that extends the life of an existing asset. She indicated that these updates allow for transparency with the CAC, provide the CAC an opportunity to gain more information about projects, and give an initial view of projects that will require public notice.

Ms. Burk directed the committee to the handout spreadsheet provided and explained that the sheet was developed with the CAC to best reflect the potential interests of the CAC. She invited any feedback on the format of the document and noted the following about information reflected in the spreadsheet:

- Project cost estimate reflected for projects is money spent through the entire duration of the projects, which may extend into multiple years.



- Projects on the sheet are broken into project years, which are the year the project is initiated.
- Finished projects are removed from the list.
- Yellow highlighted projects are those that might be of interest to the CAC.
- Orange highlighted projects are those that require contact with the CAC.
- Un-highlighted projects are in the planning phase and have not yet been initiated.
- While projects are listed for implementation on a certain year, their actual implementation may vary depending on needs, resource limitations, etc. Some projects may not occur, or projects that are not listed may be implemented. As such, Ms. Burke recommended the group regard it as a living document.

Ms. Burke shared one of the drivers on the capital projects list was the accommodation of significant growth as is reflected in the four major projects Mr. Granato discussed. Other factors include planning for flexibility for future needs, resiliency, and sustainability. This includes not only how to accommodate passengers, but also aircraft, which includes ensuring overnight parking.

Ms. Burke provided a review of the types of projects seen on the capital projects list. She pointed out to the committee that the 2015 Storm water Master Plan resulted in several stormwater projects, and shared that these projects included replacing pipes, and treatment projects. Ms. Burk also indicated that asset aging resulted in asset renewal projects, which has expanded the project list compared to last year. She noted that the Port is keeping energy efficiency and carbon reduction in mind when engaging in asset renewal projects. Ms. Burk pointed out that next year's capital program will be impacted by the current process underway to update the maintenance and central utility master plans. Ms. Burk invited the committee to review the list, and let the Port know of any projects of interest of which the committee would like additional information.

Questions/Comments for Ms. Burke on the capital program:

Mr. Joe Smith inquired when the document was completed. Ms. Burk replied that the document was created about two weeks prior. Mr. Smith expressed that he would like to have the document emailed to the PDX CAC for a more thorough review prior to the next presentation. He recommended that the more thorough review might allow for more valuable feedback from the PDX CAC.

Ms. Katie Larsell asked about the Port's equity hiring or contracting for capital projects, as there is a lot of money reflected in the project list. Sean Loughran replied that the Port could invite Kimberly to talk about the contracting process with the CAC. He also shared that there is an annual presentation that outlines how goals were set for contracts, etc. Ms. Larsell continued that she is interested in community benefit agreements and asked if the Port had any of these agreements? Mr. Loughren replied that during the Airport Futures process they considered that



model and learned that Los Angeles had the most developed form. Mr. Loughren explained that instead of that model, the Port has the CAC, which is thought to provide input for planning.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid inquired if there was a way to easily find a project of interest for her community on the spreadsheet. She recommended that a map, or category for traffic disruption or noise could be helpful in that regard.

Mr. Loughren replied that members do not have to try to figure out which projects impacted their community on the provided sheet as the Port has procedures that identify projects of interest for a community. He went on to explain that in the planning process there is a public notice requirement set up.

Ms. Kincaid replied when people see neighborhood action like surveyors, they often wonder what is happening even if there was a public meeting. She indicated that she advises community members to call the Port.

Mr. Loughren replied that there had been a project that did not implement as it was originally proposed and presented to the PDX CAC. He advised that any projects that have substantially changed would be brought back to the PDX CAC, and Mr. Granato would continue to provide any project updates. Mr. Loughren offered that the Port would be happy to come out and update the communities when asked. Terrie Burk added that the capital projects list is only Port projects, and other projects like the tenant project brought up today are not on this list. Ms. Kincaid reiterated that it was difficult to tell from the list how a project might affect a community.

Mr. Erwin Bergman recommended that it would be a good time to share procurement procedures for these projects so that the community is aware of how the project proceeds from conception to contract award. He suggested that the whole process could be presented at the same time so that PDX CAC comment could be considered early on in the process.

Ms. Katie Larsell seconded Mr. Bergman's recommendation and shared that she has more interest in the equity considerations. Ms. Larsell inquired if the equity consideration could be included as a future agenda item. Mr. Imperati indicated this was one of our annual presentations where the Port will talk about procurement processes and equity goals.

Break



Port Social Equity Program Presentation

Mr. Imperati shared there had been some work by the social equity ad hoc work group and that the committee requested an update on that work. He noted that much work had been done since the issue was last addressed and introduced Mr. Steven Nakana as presenter.

Mr. Steven Nakana introduced himself to the group sharing that prior to the Port, he had worked at the National Policy Consensus Center, and at Mercy Corp had designed conflict resolution programs. In addition he has taught conflict resolution and negotiation at Portland State University, and has some training in project management. Mr. Nakana recognized and appreciated that the PDX CAC had a role in creating his position.

Mr. Nakana provided the following introductory information on the Port's social equity program:

- The program and Mr. Nakana's position had been created because the community wanted the Port to work on advancing equity outcomes. The community had expressed a desire for a social equity definition, program, and report.
- The deliverables achieved to date include the creation of a social equity program--with a clear definition, goals and implementation strategy-- and a draft social equity commission policy that will be used to guide the Port when making decisions.
- The program framework is currently in the design phase and will provide a road map for how to create and implement a social equity program at the Port.

Mr. Nakana updated the committee on the progress and process of the social equity program to date:

- A stakeholder assessment, interviewing 60 people, was conducted and asked three key questions included in the handout.
- In the assessment it was learned that stakeholders would like the Port to consider race when designing a social equity program as it was considered key to social equity. Additionally, stakeholders wanted a long-term vision, and ongoing discussions with stakeholders for input—especially when designing and implementing new programs.
- Additionally, 50 internal staff was interviewed. The common themes heard was that staff were interested in social equity, that there were different views about the definition of and means to achieve social equity, and that the Port needs to involve everyone.

Mr. Nakana explained the Port's approach to social equity is about dismantling barriers, not treating everyone the same. He informed the committee that people come with different needs and skills, and therefore, need different kinds of help. As such, Mr. Nakana stated, equity is about dismantling barriers that people face to have access to opportunities. Part of the new social equity program would be helping the Port understand how to do this equity work. Mr. Nakana shared that the Port's equity definition was the "fair treatment and equitable access to opportunity." The Port was viewing this definition as an umbrella concept that informs employee diversity and inclusion strategies, community affairs and engagement, selection committees for employment, procurement,



among others. As an example, Mr. Nakana noted that the RFP process for concessions that Mr. Glanville was working on already included equity language in the questionnaires.

Mr. Nakana expressed that the Port has been doing equity work that has not been labeled as such and that some of the work of the new program is to communicate and document those activities. He shared an example of the Port providing lactation rooms at PDX. Mr. Nakana reported that to aid in this communication, a program matrix with three key outcomes had been created. He pointed out that as the framework is in the design phase, the outcomes are big picture achievements.

Mr. Nakana reviewed the following three desired outcomes of the Social Equity Program with the committee:

1. Increase access to prosperity related to Port activities. Mr. Nakana noted that the key was to build organizational capacity around the concept of equity so that people not only know what it is, but how it relates to their work at the Port. He shared that the social equity program will use the equity framework, to help teams implement.
2. Create more diverse and inclusive employee workforce.
3. Demonstrate regional equity and leadership. Mr. Nakana noted that the Port is a huge economic driver in the region and there is a desire to see how the Port might use its position to influence others to advance equitable outcomes, or to intentionally partner to advance outcomes in the region.

Mr. Nakana reviewed the following next steps of the social equity program with the committee:

- The program will continue dialogue with external equity organizations, the PDX CAC, and influencers.
- There will be a Request For Proposal for Port-wide discussion and training on social equity. The goal is to create a safe place to talk about race, which has been identified as a key issue, and is difficult to talk about.
- Program is creating a strategy document and metrics, a social equity lens, and a website with reporting.
- Work to implement diversity and inclusion strategy, which will be led by Dot Clingman at the Port.
- Work with individual departments to come up with their own social equity work plans.
- Will explore some pilot equity projects, which will provide good learning opportunities. Mr. Nakana noted that mistakes would be made but that success should not be judged by a single failure. Instead the program wants projects to work on, evaluate, and adjust as an ongoing learning process.

Questions/comments from the committee to Mr. Nakana:

Ms. Corrina Chase expressed excitement and congratulated Mr. Nakana. She asked how the PDX CAC could support implementation and whether there are challenges or enough resources for the program. Mr. Nakana replied that the only challenges are new program challenges and there is a great team working on the program currently. He expressed that input from the CAC is the help that is needed, as well as support for a safe place to openly discuss concepts.



Mr. Ron Glanville shared that he was happy the work is being done and thought it was amazing. He asked if there was a success profile, goals, or a measurement tool for the future.

Mr. Nakana indicated that the framework is being designed now and there is thinking about metrics. He shared that the idea is to have metrics related to the three outcomes to report on and share with the PDX CAC. Currently, he explained, there are internal discussions about what can be realistically measured. As the Port is a complex entity, there is a desire to work with individual teams to create their own goals and outcomes, but this will require front-end work. Mr. Nakana suggested that one metric was the creation of a social equity program, which has been successfully met.

Mr. Ron Glanville inquired if the program was to be implemented Port-wide or just at the airport. Mr. Nakana responded that it was an umbrella concept with the intention of integrating it into Port-wide thinking and equity work.

Ms. Katie Larsell shared she was pleased to hear the CAC had influenced the hiring of Mr. Nakana. She explained that she has been working on the East Portland Action Plan that represents Portland past 82nd Avenue, and is concerned with restoring middle income, family-wage jobs. She invited Mr. Nakana to the group. Ms. Larsell explained that there was some interest in opening the Columbia Corridor, but for people without cars it is difficult to get down the corridor, which was a good example of a barrier to equity.

Mr. Nakana responded that Ms. Larsell's request was in alignment with the third outcome of demonstrating regional equity leadership and that the Port wants to look at partnerships to advance social equity. He explained that the Port would look at that from a regional perspective with a focus on disadvantaged communities. Mr. Nakana indicated he would be pleased to attend her group and look at partnerships to improve outcomes.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid thanked Mr. Nakana for his work and shared that there was some debate during the past Airport Futures process on the topic of how to measure effectiveness.

Mr. Joe Smith inquired about metrics to be used and who would be conducting the measuring. Mr. Nakana explained there would be a focus on work plans for departments that include social equity goals that make sense based on the work of that department. The work plans can be used to understand what the departments are doing. The metrics can be qualitative or quantitative. What metrics will be used will be part of an internal discussion after work plans are created.

Mr. Nakana explained that there still need to be discussions to move beyond the program creation stage. He provided examples of metrics like percentage of staff that know the definition of social equity, or how many programs integrated social equity during the design phase. Mr. Nakana explained that with 800 employees at the Port, it is not realistic that he or his team could be responsible for conducting the measurements. He explained that the work plans for each department would show what has been considered and what has been done.



Mr. Vince Granato shared that the metrics and measurement development reminds him of the process to develop environmental outcomes measurement. He stated that early in the process the conversations were about how to measure, and have evolved to where everything the Port does is now viewed with an environmental lens. He speculated that the social equity process would be the same, that there will be measurement initially, but over time that will fade as it becomes a regular practice.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid referenced previous comments regarding partnering and the Port's influence in the region. She encouraged the Port to champion that and noted that she sees many similar initiatives in the area. Ms. Kincaid recommended that the Port initiate a meeting to invite these stakeholders to come and share their work being done on social equity in the region.

Streaked Horned Lark Project Presentation

Mr. Dana Green presented an update on Streaked Horned Lark habitat requirements and the land use conflict with PDX.

Mr. Green presented the following information about the Streaked Horned Lark species:

- Streaked Horned Lark is rare subspecies of a more common species.
- Species only found in the Pacific Northwest, in Puget prairie, dredge placement sites, agricultural fields, and on airports.
- The three habitat areas represent Port activity areas, and all sites except two were created from dredging.
- The larks rely on early successional habitat, evolved out of river systems that created alluvium, which created sand bars.
- The species waits two years for weeds to grow, then nests for 5-6 years until the area is too weedy, and then moves on to the next sand bar.
- With the damming of the river, the natural alluvium deposits have changed and the species is now only found where dredge sand is pumped for industrial services.
- The species require disturbance to create nesting habitat areas, and with the developed river changing the natural disturbance patterns, the species is now found on man-made and man-disturbed sites.

Mr. Green explained the land use conflict and a background on previous management efforts:

- As the birds need 200-300 acre patch sizes, the US Fish and Wildlife Service recognizes that airports attract these birds.
- FAA requires airports to take immediate action to alleviate wildlife hazards whenever they are detected, and the Port has programs designed to keep birds out of harms way.
- The Streaked Horned Lark was listed in 2013 as a Threatened Species due to mortality caused by plane collisions.
- Five killed birds have been documented since 2012 (by airplane collision and one by automobile), which is a lot when considering that total nesting pairs in any given year is four.



- The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) recognizes that airports are not good for conservation, as conservation requires recovering the species to the point of sustaining populations without the protection of the Endangered Species Act (ESA).
- As plane collisions are taking about 25% of the potential breeding population, this presents an ecological trap as conservation as defined by the ESA will not happen at an airport.
- Under a special rule, the USFWS has granted PDX an incidental take permit, allowing mortality by accidental plane collisions.
- Since 2007 the Port has attempted different approaches including: coaxing the birds off the property, attempting to negotiate a candidate conservation agreement with assurances for PDX to have an incidental take cover for ongoing PDX operations, attempting to find alternative conservation sites, engagement with many stakeholders (multiple airports, aviation industry, airport councils, AAAE, state and federal agencies, and bird strike committee USA) to create awareness and advocate on behalf of the aviation community with USFWS.
- The other option under the Endangered Species Act, Section 10, is to apply for a permit, which allows incidental take (birds killed by collision).
- As part of this Section 10 option, the applicant must propose a strategy based on a habitat conservation plan that meets federal standards for preserving the species despite the proposed take.
- Port filed an application for the Section 10 permit, along with a draft environmental assessment, and a habitat conservation plan in September.
- The application has completed a 45-day public review period, and the USFWS is now reviewing public comments and draft documents submitted. USFWS submitted a draft environmental assessment.
- The process is for the USFWS to review all documents and determine if the situation has merit, and issue a biological opinion.
- Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires consultation with the agency that has primary responsibility for that species, which is all USFWS in this case. USFWS will need to complete consultation and biological opinion before they can sign the permit.
- The Port found three properties, which might be appropriate for conservation sites, but narrowed down to one most suitable site, Sandy Island.
- The Sandy Island site has been designated previously by USFWS as critical habitat.
- Sandy Island site is at capacity for taking new dredge material and as a result would be encroached by scotch broom and other plant species without additional management.
- Lark conservation plan proposes enhancing the current Sandy Island site (by taking out some scotch broom and cottonwood trees) and then maintaining it over a thirty-year lease as a habitat site for the lark species.
- Under the proposed conservation plan, Sandy Island would be the only dedicated site for these larks without conflicting land uses to date.
- USFWS will determine if conservation plan has merit.

Questions/comments for Mr. Green:

Mr. Ron Glanville inquired whether the proposal was for Sandy Island to become a permanent location, and whether the Port would pay for maintenance and dredging.



Mr. Green explained that Oregon Department of State Lands owns the land with a maximum lease allowed of 30 years. As such the proposal is to maintain the habitat for three decades. After thirty years, Mr. Green replied, it will depend on the status of the species. Mr. Green affirmed that the Port will pay for maintenance, but not dredging as the site is already at capacity. He noted that the Army Corps of Engineers would need to find another placement site in this reach of the river, and that island mass could be an active placement site, which can serve as habitat during the life of the site, and then open another opportunity for another site proximate to this. Mr. Green indicated both sides of the river could work and other ports have been in discussion on the topic. He shared that as placements fill up, the Port could obtain a conservation easement.

Mr. Micah Meskel inquired how many acres were included in the Sandy Island proposal. Mr. Green reported that 32 acres were included. Mr. Meskel expressed concern that the 32 acres is mitigating 178 acres of current suitable habitat.

Mr. Green addressed Mr. Meskel's concern explaining that while the species require a large patch footprint, the nesting habitat area is a much smaller area within that footprint. He explained that currently, while there is 178 acres of potential habitat, there is much less suitable nesting habitat. Mr. Green noted that the Port is proposing to mitigate that ephemeral nesting opportunity and maintain in situ on Sandy Island over time at an optimum level. This is opposed to the Rivergate site in north Portland, which is overgrown due to lack of management. The SW Quad at PDX, which is being managed for geese currently, creates a patch (about 100 acres) and within that patch there are only two nesting pairs. It is unknown why there are not more nesting pairs, and USFWS see this proposal as an opportunity to have a laboratory to study optimum pairing nesting capacity of a site. Mr. Green clarified that this proposal is strictly to obtain a permit, and if the permit does not get granted, then Sandy Island will lose the nesting birds due to encroachment of scotch broom. A similar decline will occur within a few years at Rivergate.

Mr. Micah Meskel speculated that Oregon Department of State Lands might have an obligation to manage for endangered species, to which Mr. Green replied that the species is not listed in Washington and so only Oregon site owners would have obligation.

Mr. Meskel expressed concern with the site's compatibility with the methanol refinery proposed two miles north of the site. He shared that the Audubon Society thinks this will be a conflict due to air pollutants from the refinery. Mr. Meskel inquired whether other proposed developments were reviewed.

Mr. Green replied that the Port is just the permit applicant and this inquiry would fall under the Environmental Assessment (EA) as part of the NEPA process.

Mr. Meskel expressed some concern that those conducting the EA may not be aware of the proposal.

Mr. Green shared that this is outside of the Port's participation with the permit application. He noted one caveat is that the open patch size is only met with the Sandy Island location. He indicated that for the Port the situation is either a lose/lose or being able to demonstrate a thirty-year conservation benefit.



Mr. Joe Smith asked for a clarification of slide 8 and if he is correct in assuming 16 adult birds, and 16-32 chicks per year.

Mr. Green confirmed these calculations. Mr. Smith inquired what might be the incremental expense, to which Mr. Green confirmed is over \$1 million.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid inquired of Mr. Micah Meskel if he knew of an alternative site that could be suggested.

Mr. Meskel stated due to the population of the species in the thousands, there is a need to protect habitat that already exists. He recognized that the SW Quad has a conflict with airport operations, but Rivergate, which has been a productive site –at proper management level—if we could manage, it would be a good habitat for the species. He recognized that this would be a difficult economic proposal, but expressed that as a public/private organization the Port should be interested in recovering the species.

Mr. Green stated he understood the argument, but suggested it could be in conflict with other mandates and would not be sustainable over time. He reported that it is up to USFWS whether to issue the permit. He indicated that USFWS would issue the biological opinion, which is the mechanism where USFWS may constrain the permit, reject it, or propose alternatives. He reported that USFWS is currently assembling their comments.

Public Comments

No public comments offered.

Meeting Adjourned



Evaluations

11 Forms received.

| | Too Slow | - | Just Right | - | Too Fast | No Answer |
|------------------|----------|---|------------|---|----------|-----------|
| 1. Pacing | 1 | 1 | 9 | | | |

| | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent | No Answer |
|-------------------------------|------|------|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 2. Overall Mtg Quality | | | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 3. Presentations | | | 2 | 7 | 2 | |
| 4. Documents | | | 1 | 6 | 4 | |
| 5. Discussion | | | 1 | 8 | 2 | |

6. Most Useful?

- PDX Updates (Juan Moreno)
- PDX Updates (Ron Glanville)
- Vince’s Reports & Equity Discussion (Joe Smith)
- Equity (Maryhelen Kincaid)
- PDX international airport update from V. Granato
- Social equity and horned birds (Katie Larsell)

7. Least Useful

- Streaked Horned Lark Presentation (Ron Glanville)
- Streaked Horned Lark Presentation (Joe Smith)
- Capital improvements (Maryhelen Kincaid)
- Capital projects (Katie Larsell)

8. Comments, suggestions or questions:

- Please continue to ask CAC to inform future agenda topics
- Bio breaks never later than 2 hours (Joe Smith)
- Suggest finding a different format for presenting hard to explain capital improvement expenditures. Also think there should be consideration to only list highly viable projects. (Maryhelen Kincaid)