



**PDX COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #19**

Wednesday, June 22, 2016

12:30 – 3:30 pm

**Final Notes**

Name	Interest Represented	Attendance
<b>VOTING MEMBERS</b>		
Erwin Bergman	Central Northeast Neighbors	Absent
Tina Burke	Airport Employee	Present
Tony DeFalco	Environmental Justice	Present
Walt Evans	Business Organization	Present
Katie Larsell	Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission	Absent
Dick Goldie	East Multnomah County Neighborhood (City of Fairview, Gresham, Maywood Park, Troutdale, and Wood Village)	Absent
Maryhelen Kincaid	Citywide Land Use Committee	Present
Brendan Korsgren	Passenger Airline	Present
Micah Meskel <i>Alternate: Bob Sallinger</i>	Environment/Wildlife/Natural Resources	Absent
Jeff Owen	Multi-modal transportation representative	Absent
Lt. Col. Jenifer Pardy <i>Alternate: Lt. Col. Jason Lay</i>	Military	Present
Robert Pinedo <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)	Present
Martin Slapikas	North Portland Neighborhood Services	Present
Mike Sloan	Vancouver neighborhood	Present
Joe Smith	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	Present
Damon Isiah Turner	Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods	Absent
Corrina Chase	Columbia Slough Watershed Council	Present





<b>NON-VOTING MEMBERS</b>		
Nick Atwell	PDX Wildlife Committee staff	Present
Barbara Cartmill	Clackamas County	Absent
Melissa De Lyser	Washington County	Absent
Chad Eiken <i>Alternate: Willy Williamson</i>	Vancouver Community Development Director (or designee)	Present
TBD	Federal Aviation Administration	Absent
Vince Granato	Chief Operating Officer (or designee)	Present
Dan Moeller	Metro	Present
Deborah Stein	Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Director (or designee)	Present
Gordy Euler	Clark County	Absent
John Wasiutynski	Multnomah County	Present

**Port Staff and Consultants Present:** Sam Imperati and Nellie Papsdorf, Institute *for* Conflict Management; Susan Aha, Brian Freeman, Sean Loughran, Kimberly Mitchell-Phillips, Steve Nakana, Phil Ralston, and Chris White, Port of Portland.

**Public and Invited Guests Present:** Jeremy Simer, SEIU Local 49.

Introductory Comments

Mr. Sam Imperati called the 19th meeting of the PDX Community Advisory Committee to order at 12:36 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

He announced that members Ms. Melissa De Lyser, Ms. Katie Larsell, Lt. Col. Jenifer Pardy, Mr. Erwin Bergman, and Mr. Jeff Owen were unable to attend the meeting due to conflicts. He noted that Lt. Col. Jenifer Pardy’s alternate Lt. Col. Jason Lay would be attending in her absence.

Mr. Imperati also informed the committee that the last PDX CAC meeting of the year would be held on October 19. He reminded the committee members that the meeting would begin in the PDX Conference Center’s St. Helens Room, instead of the usual location.

Meeting Notes Approval

Mr. Imperati asked if there were any corrections that needed to be made to the April 6, 2016 meeting notes. Hearing none, the April 6, 2016 meeting notes were approved unanimously.





## Follow Up

Mr. Imperati provided a follow-up on Mr. Joe Smith's motion made at the April 6 PDX CAC meeting. He noted that the meeting notes on page 23 and 24 referred to the motion and included post-meeting notes to ensure transparency.

Mr. Imperati explained that after the meeting, Mr. Jeff Owen realized that he may not have had authority to speak on behalf of TriMet and therefore changed his vote to abstain. Mr. Imperati informed the committee that this change impacted the voting and he had shared the change with Mr. Smith. Mr. Imperati stated that following this change, Mr. Smith had forwarded the information to Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid, who had attended the meeting but left before the vote due to prior obligations. Ms. Kincaid agreed that had she been in attendance at the meeting, she would have voted in support of the motion, providing enough supportive votes for the motion to pass.

Mr. Imperati noted that he had included the relevant PDX CAC Collaboration Principles in the meeting notes. He explained that a quorum was signified as "a simple majority of voting PDX CAC members." He stated that if there was no consensus (meaning everyone voting with a 1 or 2), then a majority was needed (signified as 51% of the voting membership, not of the voting membership present). Mr. Imperati summarized that with Ms. Kincaid's vote, the motion had passed by majority.

Mr. Imperati thanked Mr. Smith for bringing up the topic, noting that it had been a while since he had last reviewed the Collaboration Principles. He explained that because of this, the Coordinating Committee had agreed that it would be helpful to refresh the committee and discuss how to move forward.

Mr. Imperati informed the committee that at the April 6 meeting, 17 of 21 members had attended, with 16 present at the time of the vote. He noted that this signified a quorum. Mr. Imperati explained that the final vote, with Mr. Owen's vote changed, was 10 in support, 4 against (not a majority). However, he added that with Ms. Kincaid's vote included, the vote was 11 in support, 4 against, meaning the motion had passed. He stated that as a result, Mr. Vince Granato would forward the information to the Port Commission as part of his quarterly report and update.

Mr. Imperati reported that the Coordinating Committee discussed the topic at its last meeting. He explained that their preliminary recommendation was that, with some exceptions, such as annual funding for the Natural Resources program, the PDX CAC should continue its informal updating process. Mr. Mike Sloan explained that the Coordinating Committee believed that when a motion came up, it would be best to take the temperature of the room and see if there was consensus on what to do next. He noted that if the committee was interested in voting on the motion, they believed it would be best to postpone the vote to the next meeting, in order to allow members to consider the motion and discuss it with their constituencies before moving forward on a vote.





Mr. Imperati asked the committee if they felt the Collaboration Principles were still working well, noting that he felt it was important to be prepared for the next time a similar situation occurred.

Mr. Smith asked if it was necessary to adjust the Collaboration Principles to implement Mr. Sloan's proposal. Mr. Imperati replied that he didn't know if it was necessary to change them to include the amendment, as the Collaboration Principles did not speak to the issue one way or the other. He added that it would be possible to edit them if the committee was interested.

Mr. Smith noted that the committee only met four times a year, and one of the meetings did not allow time for voting due to other activities. He explained that he felt it could always be possible to postpone a vote if members felt they needed more time to consider the issue, but added that he did not feel it was necessary in all circumstances.

Ms. Kincaid stated that taking the temperature of the room may be more appropriate as it would allow the Port more opportunity to move quickly if they were interested. She explained that it was important to remember that the committee's role was advisory, meaning that the Port was not required to act on all of its recommendations. She emphasized that she believed the Port listened to the committee's opinions and noted that she felt the Port would pay attention to contentious issues, regardless of the outcome of a vote. Ms. Kincaid explained that she felt voting was important, particularly related to Natural Resources programming or other topics that required a definitive answer, but added that they may not be necessary for other topics, such as social recommendations or environmental concerns, as the Port was already participating in the discussion at the meetings. She noted that she was in support of a consensus, instead of polling people note at the meeting. She explained that there should be a way to collect votes if needed, but stated that she was not sure how often votes would help any more than a discussion.

Mr. Martin Slapikas explained that he felt that when the resolution occurred, he had no forewarning and therefore no opportunity to discuss it with his constituents. He stated that he felt it would be helpful to have information about formal votes ahead of the meeting in order to allow members to disseminate the information amongst their respective groups.

Mr. Ron Glanville asked what practical action would occur as a result of the vote. Mr. Granato responded that the practical consequences of the vote would be the letter sent to the Port Commission in support of the issue, as the committee's role was advisory. He stated that because of this, the motion was informational and would not necessarily lead to any implementation.

Mr. Smith agreed that the committee could only advise the Port on what to do and not direct them. He stated that it's influence was in direct relationship to the intelligence of the committee's discussion and its recommendations. He explained that he was satisfied knowing that the expression of the committee's sentiment would be sent to the Port Commission so they would have an opportunity to consider the issue. He noted that he had no assumptions that the Port would act on the information,







though he may be disappointed when they did or did not. Mr. Smith added that in terms of constituency, acting as a representative was a complicated issue.

Ms. Kincaid agreed that acting as a representative was complex, using herself as an example. She noted that as the member representing Citywide Land Use, there was no way she could possibly poll all 95 neighborhoods she represented.

Mr. Imperati informed the committee that the Collaboration Principles (included in the packet for the meeting) referred to representative voting on page 7, section 9b, stating that “a vote represents that the member will recommend to his or her government, organization, or group that they should support or oppose the voted-upon proposal consistent with the member’s vote.” He explained that he felt it was each member’s prerogative, as representatives, to make recommendations to their groups. He stated that members were free to discuss the motions with their constituents, but noted that they were also allowed to exercise their own judgement when votes occurred.

Mr. Slapikas explained that after reviewing the motion, he did not see it as an emergency issue, which would allow time for him and others to return to their constituents for input. He noted that the North Portland Neighborhood Services had appointed him to serve them and as a result he felt it was important to consider and share their viewpoints.

Mr. Imperati suggested that members, if they knew of a motion they would like to make at an upcoming meeting, should try to send the motion to Mr. Sean Loughran or himself ahead of time in order to have it shared with the committee before the meeting. He noted that it seemed that the committee felt the Collaboration Principles were still working well and did not require editing.

Mr. Loughran clarified that while the last meeting of the year would include a tour of the airport, there was still committee business that needed to be taken care of before the committee began its tour.

### Meeting Agenda Review

Mr. Imperati reviewed the meeting agenda and the contents of the meeting packets.

### Roundtable Updates & Discussion

Mr. Imperati introduced the roundtable discussion and asked the committee to share any community updates.

Ms. Tina Burke reported that it had already been a busy summer for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) at Portland International Airport and shared some of the efforts TSA workers were making to keep things running smoothly at PDX. She noted that PDX had managed to prevent the 3-hour wait times reported at other airports around the country. She explained that TSA was





recruiting and hiring new employees year-round in order to continually bring on new officers. She noted that many previously part-time officers had also been converted to full-time, and overtime hours had been used when necessary. She informed the committee that administration staff were now also working at the security checkpoint, with each staff member given one 12 hour shift during the busy summer months. She added that the Port had also supported providing 16 additional workers at the security checkpoint throughout the summer. She noted that these workers helped TSA officers with bin loading, divesting, and other tasks in order to allow more trained officers to focus on screening passengers. Ms. Burke explained that other strategies included opening the security checkpoint earlier in the morning, monitoring the schedules of upcoming days, and reaching out to local hotels to help let passengers know they should plan on arriving at the airport two hours before their flight. She noted that the airport would also be encouraging passengers to sign up for TSA PreCheck, with a mobile enrollment center to be made available at the airport from July to August. Ms. Burke added that the airport had also recently made the cut as one of the country's top 20 airports and as such would be participating in the TSA Incident Command Center's recurring phone call with the Federal Security Director and others.

Ms. Burke also announced that TSA would be returning to Klamath Falls Airport. She informed the committee that TSA had held a recruitment for security officers with 170 individuals in attendance. She expressed excitement about the response from the community and noted that TSA looked forward to beginning that service. She added that she was happy to answer any questions.

Dr. Steven Sachs asked if it was possible to apply for TSA PreCheck online. Ms. Burke explained that it was possible to begin an application online, but noted that it did also require an in-person interview. She stated that there were currently three regional locations available for in-person interviews and added that enrollment would also be possible at a temporary mobile enrollment center located on site at PDX from July 25 to August 5.

Mr. Ron Glanville asked about the mobile enrollment centers. Ms. Burke explained that mobile enrollment centers allowed individuals to complete the entire TSA PreCheck application process in-person, including the interview needed. She noted that it was also possible to begin the process online and pay the \$85 fee before going to an enrollment center to interview.

Mr. Imperati noted that the process seemed very efficient, as he received his approval within a few weeks of applying.

Mr. Brendan Korsgren informed the committee that it would be a record summer for Southwest Airlines at PDX, with the addition of some new services. He explained that when flying during the summer months, it was important to allow for extra travel time in order to take away some of the anxiety that can come with "lobby shock." He noted that despite this initial shock, security lines were moving very fast due to TSA's efficiency, and agreed with Ms. Burke's comments that the airport was





not having the same challenges as some other airports across the country. He explained that he felt that this was due to the strong partnerships between the airlines, the Port, and TSA.

Mr. Glanville noted that the high price of TSA PreCheck (\$85) seemed to limit the potential of the program.

Dr. Steven Sachs announced that the Camas Washougal Aviation Association would be hosting an Aviation Summer Camp from July 12 to July 16. He explained that participants would learn about aviation, use flight simulators, tour a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) control tower, and work on radio control airplanes. He noted that of two fully-paid scholarships, there was still one remaining. He encouraged committee members to reach out to anyone they knew that might be interested in the opportunity. He shared an informational flyer with the committee members and urged them to share the information with their constituents.

Mr. Joe Smith asked about the age range of the summer camp. Dr. Sachs responded that it was for children ages 9-17.

Ms. Chris White asked about the location of the camp. Dr. Sachs explained that it would be held at Pearson Field Education Center.

Dr. Steven Sachs then made the following motion: "In recognition and appreciation of the time and commitment provided by the PDX CAC members, the committee requests that the members receive validated parking when flying at PDX."

Dr. Sachs explained that he felt having the committee members' parking validated when flying would show an appreciation for their work throughout the year.

Mr. Imperati asked the committee if they had any questions or comments concerning the motion.

Mr. John Wasiutynski explained that as a representative of a public agency, he would vote in opposition to the motion, as receiving a material benefit for participating in the committee may present the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid noted that she sat on a number of different committees and explained that while some would pay for parking at the meeting, none of them would pay for her to park for non-meeting related activities. She explained that she did not feel that the Port of Portland should pay for parking at times when she was not serving, stating that it was more complicated than simply an act of gratitude. She emphasized that serving on the committee was a volunteering opportunity and noted that she felt it was important to preserve that aspect of the role.





Dr. Sachs explained that he did not see it as a conflict of interest, as the committee was not voting on anything related to parking and the Port. He noted that he felt having the parking paid for was well-deserved and added that if it was an issue to receive a gift of public funds, the committee should not be given food or paid parking at the meetings. He stated that he was only interested in putting the motion up to a vote, and if the committee voted in favor, and the Port agreed, great, if not, he would have no problem paying for parking in the future.

Mr. Tony DeFalco seconded the motion. Mr. Imperati asked if there were any more comments or questions. Hearing none, he asked members in favor of the motion to raise their name tents.

The following members (2) voted in favor of the motion: Dr. Steven Sachs and Mr. Tony DeFalco.

The following members (8) voted against the motion: Mr. Mike Sloan, Mr. Brendan Korsgren, Mr. Ron Glanville, Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid, Mr. Martin Slapikas, Mr. Joey Quitugua, Ms. Corrina Chase, and Mr. Joe Smith.

The following committee members (9) are non-voting members: Mr. Nick Atwell, Ms. Barbara Cartmill, Ms. Melissa De Lyser, Mr. Chad Eiken, Mr. Vince Granato, Mr. Dan Moeller, Ms. Deborah Stein, Mr. Gordy Euler, and Mr. John Wasiutynski.

Ms. Tina Burke and Lt. Col. Jason Lay abstained from voting. Mr. Walt Evans was not yet present at the meeting when the vote took place.

With 21 voting members on the committee, and 12 voting members present, the motion did not pass.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid reported that the Vanport Mosaic Festival held on Memorial Day weekend was a huge success. She noted that the Port of Portland had sponsored the event and several Port employees were in attendance. She informed the committee that over 3,000 people attended the combined events and she expressed excitement that many visitors had donated money to support next year's festival. She added that the whole event went very well and would be happening again next Memorial Day weekend.

Ms. Kincaid also commented on the success of the PDX Job Fair. She noted that she had heard from neighbors that they were hired after learning about the job fair on social media and on her group's website.

Mr. Martin Slapikas announced that the North Portland Neighborhood Services had used the seismic reports from the April 6 PDX CAC meeting and disseminated the information to various chairs. He noted that the report's information would help local neighborhoods form their own safety nets in case of widespread emergency.







Mr. Joey Quitugua explained that some may have noticed construction occurring on the north side of the runway as a result of Atlantic Aviation’s new facility. He informed the committee that both hangar one and the fixed-base operator (FBO) were on schedule and added that the workers were doing a great job of making sure the project remained on track.

Ms. Corrina Chase reported that the Columbia Slough Watershed Council had hosted its Explorando el Columbia Slough event on June 11. She expressed excitement about the event’s large turnout, especially since it took place the same weekend as the Rose Festival. Ms. Chase also invited the committee to participate in the Great Slough Cleanup on July 9 and the Columbia Slough Regatta on August 7. She explained that the Regatta event would include kayaking on the Columbia in the St. Johns neighborhood. She informed the committee that those that were interested in participating could register on the Columbia Slough Watershed Council’s website. Ms. Chase also noted that the Watershed Council was recruiting for two different positions: a volunteer coordinator and an outreach and events intern. She explained that the internship was a part-time, entry-level position intended to help someone step into the field. She asked committee members to please share the opportunity with their constituents.

Mr. Dan Moeller informed the committee that in April Metro had kicked off its update to the Regional Transportation Plan. He noted that a forum was scheduled for September to continue the update process. He explained that the Metro Council had invited community and business leaders to be a part of the forum and encouraged PDX CAC members to attend if they were interested. He stated that more information about the forum could be found on Metro’s website by searching “Regional Transportation Plan.” Mr. Moeller announced that the Metro Council was also scheduled to adopt its Equity Strategy at its meeting that day. He explained that the strategy was available for review on the Metro website.

Mr. John Wasiutynski stated that Multnomah County, Washington County, the Port of Portland, Metro, and the City of Portland were currently working on a collaboration to explore the potential of developing a common set of clean diesel standards so that when any of the governments went out to procure construction services, their partners would be required to have the most modern pollution controls in place. He noted that they were modeling their efforts after other states and jurisdictions that had already set such standards. He informed the committee that the project was still in the early development phase but added he would share more information as it became available.

Mr. Tony DeFalco stated that many of the employees at the airport had to travel great distances to work, noting that many concessions workers faced one hour to one and half hour commutes. He explained that the issue was directly related to the lack of affordable housing for workers in Portland. He informed the committee that after 18 months of organizing with 33 different community groups, a set of requirements was included in the city’s Comprehensive Plan that focused on preventing further displacement of low income people, particularly those of color, and putting the city on a pathway to create better workforce housing. He expressed excitement for this watershed moment and noted that





there was a lot of celebration when the plan was passed the previous week with a unanimous vote from the Portland City Council.

Mr. DeFalco also reported that the U.S. Forest Service had released more data about toxics in the Portland metro area. He explained that the Cully neighborhood in Northeast Portland had some of the highest concentrations of ten different air toxins. He noted that there was a possibility that the airport contributed to those numbers and asked again for a presentation from the Port of Portland on possible air toxins as a result of airport emissions. He also expressed interest in learning more about how community organizations could help their neighbors and communities better understand whether or not the Port had a role in these emissions. He stated that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) had responded to a letter from the Living Cully neighborhood association and would conduct air monitoring in and around Cully. He reported that the Cully Air Action Team had agreed to install a monitor inside the neighborhood to evaluate multiple air toxins.

Mr. DeFalco also informed the committee that Verde on behalf of Living Cully had received a \$90,000 grant from Metro to complete its section of the Regional Trail Network. He explained that the grant would help begin community-based planning for a Regional Trail System along the Columbia Slough watershed through Cully. He noted that part of the trail would run along Cornfoot Road, so Verde would be working to engage with the National Guard and other nearby stakeholders.

Mr. Joe Smith reported that the Citizen Noise Advisory Committee (CNAC) continued to be very interested in the impact of technology on noise reduction, not only with new technology for planes but also for guidance systems. He informed the committee that new systems had been developed that enabled aircraft to fly very precise paths allowing them to take advantage of the river heading in both directions. He stated that the committee also received complaint reports at every meeting. He explained that the complaints were almost always in excess of 100, but noted that with the removal of three individuals, there was a 90% reduction in the complaints, meaning that the three individuals were responsible for the bulk of them. He added that often even by removing one individual's complaints, the number was reduced by 80%. He explained that the complaints were most often related to the Oregon Air National Guard (ORANG) because their aircraft generated the most noise, but noted that the committee was very pleased with ORANG's cooperation and help. Mr. Smith also reported that he had discussed his motion from the last PDX CAC meeting with CNAC and received unanimous approval, except for one member who dissented, not because he did not agree with the motion, but because he felt it would not make a difference. Mr. Smith explained that based on his experience with CNAC, he felt the Port had been very responsive to its committees and therefore he was not nearly as pessimistic. He emphasized that other than that individual, CNAC had been very supportive of the motion.

Mr. Nick Atwell informed the committee that the PDX Wildlife Management team was still on track to update its Wildlife Hazard Management Plan. He explained that they were working to better integrate





it with the Oregon Air National Guard's Bird Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) plan and aimed to send it to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for review sometime in mid to late August.

Mr. Chad Eiken explained that the large amount of development happening in the City of Vancouver, including many projects downtown, had been great for the economy and affordable housing, but was also affecting Pearson Field Airport. He noted that the airport's flight path was situated directly over the downtown area and informed the committee that this was causing some issues with the FAA. He stated that some of the decisions coming from the FAA's regulatory office in Seattle had caused concerns with local pilots and he encouraged those interested to keep an eye on the situation as it played out.

Ms. Deborah Stein announced that the City of Portland had recently adopted its Comprehensive Plan, the city's 20-year plan for growth and development. She noted that the plan included transportation plans within the vicinity of the airport with policies that explicitly acknowledged the PDX Airport as a key landmark and economic driver.

Mr. Sam Imperati recognized a member of the audience, Ms. Michelle Stone. He informed the committee that Ms. Stone was working on getting her masters in negotiation and conflict management, following a career in the army as a nurse anesthetist. He noted that he would be mentoring Ms. Stone throughout the summer as part of her studies and welcomed her to the meeting.

### PDX Updates

Mr. Vince Granato, Port of Portland Chief Operating Officer, shared his PDX Update with the committee and highlighted the following:

Mr. Granato informed the committee that there was still room available for Runway Run participants. He noted that the run would take place on Saturday, September 24 on the airport's north runway and explained that those interested could register online.

Mr. Granato reported that the airport was still incredibly busy, with 60,000 people flying through PDX in June. He explained that with the local economy doing well and oil costs still low, PDX passengers had grown at a rate of 9.8%. He acknowledged that while the growth could not continue forever, the airport was managing it well while it lasted. He noted that the growth was putting some pressure on the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) officers, but stated that the airport was doing a good job of managing the crowds by getting more people into TSA PreCheck without compromising the safety of the airport's passengers.

Mr. Granato announced that there were a number of different services coming to the airport, including a new Alaska Airlines nonstop service to Orlando, a market that had been missing from the Portland Airport for years. He explained that providing nonstop flights to Orlando had been difficult since it was







what was called a “long-haul, low-yield” market, as it was not a high business market as the majority of passengers represented families going on vacation. He expressed excitement for the new service, adding that it was one of the last top 40 markets the airport did not service.

Mr. Granato explained that another important addition was a nonstop Delta flight to Heathrow Airport. He noted that it would be interesting to see how the service worked out, as flights to London were generally much better supported in summer than winter. He informed the committee that the service would begin in May 2017. Mr. Granato recognized the importance of the airport’s relationship with its airlines and expressed excitement for the growth in services. He stated that in addition to the Heathrow flight, Condor Airlines would resume nonstop flights to Frankfurt, and Icelandair would resume its nonstop flights to Reykjavik, with double the amount of weekly flights.

Mr. Granato informed the committee that in terms of airport concessions, construction was underway on the second phase of PDXNext concessions redevelopment. He explained that the new coffee operators would open on July 1 and the rest of the new concessions would be opening within the next few months.

Mr. Granato reported that in addition to the new concessions, construction was also underway on the new concourse exits. He stated that instead of going against the flow of traffic next to the security checkpoints, the new concourse exits would funnel passengers out and away to the ticket lobby, in an effort to help decongest the area.

Mr. Granato stated that the taxi hold lot had been moved to NE Air Cargo Way and NE 82nd Avenue to make room for the relocation of the employee parking lot just east of the long-term parking garage. He explained that the relocations would help make room for the rental car quick-turn-around project that aimed to keep rental cars in close and customer service at the airport running smoothly.

Mr. Granato provided an update on the PDXNext program, the project that was originally slated to move Alaska Airlines from the south side of the airport to the north, and United Airlines from the north side of the airport to the south. He stated that the design portion of the project had been completed with a contractor on board when Alaska Airlines approached the Port and asked them to reconsider aspects of the project. Mr. Granato explained that Alaska Airlines had recently changed their aircraft; having previously used Bombardier Q400 propeller-driven planes, they were now replacing those aircraft with the Embraer E175, which would help them explore new markets. He noted that they originally planned to continue to ground load, but eventually made the strategic decision to use gates instead. He informed the committee that while the airport did have gates, it did not have enough to keep up with Alaska’s scheduled needs. He stated that because of this, the project was put on hold and the Port had begun to develop a new project over the course of the last 88 days. He noted that the Port would meet with the airlines on June 23 and present the new project. He explained that the proposal still included an extension on Concourse E, but added that the extension had been increased from 200’ to 600’ with six loading bridges. Mr. Granato expressed his appreciation for







Southwest Airlines, noting that they had been very flexible throughout the process. He informed the committee that Southwest would now potentially be moving from the south side of the airport to the north, in an effort both to consolidate Southwest in one area as well as better balance the terminal. Mr. Granato explained that 70 percent of passengers were currently located on the south side of the airport and this had posed some challenges. He noted that a decision would be made by the end of July. He added that the changes did delay the project and announced that the project would now be completed closer to early 2020.

Mr. Granato explained that a number of other projects were also taking place, including the development of the new Hollywood Theater annex and the opening of the new lactation stations, with one located on each concourse. He added that the pet relief area would also be opening up shortly, adding to a number of new customer services amenities that the Port was excited about providing.

Mr. Granato recognized Mr. Steve Nakana as the Port's new social equity manager. He explained that the Port had brought Mr. Nakana on to help with its Social Equity Initiative, not just within PDX Airport but with the entire Port and incorporating many different elements. Mr. Nakana introduced himself to the committee, stating that before joining the Port, he had worked for Mercy Corps, and noted that he was excited to take on this important role. He added that he was in the process of reaching out to different people to help him as he worked on assessing current conditions at the airport.

Mr. Joe Smith stated that he felt the new social equity manager was a great example of the Port really listening to its advisory committees. He explained that he had participated on the Social Equity Ad Hoc Committee and felt that having a body fully dedicated to addressing such issues reflected an important result of that work. He noted that such work was rare amongst other airports and expressed strong support for the program.

Mr. Granato provided an update on the PDX Workplace Initiative. He reminded the committee that when the program was adopted in April, it addressed three core areas: job pathways, worker benefits, and employee-employer relationships. He noted that he was excited to hear from the committee that the PDX Jobs Fair had helped community members find employment. He explained that the PDX Jobs Board had also been very successful, as there were always job openings at the airport. Mr. Granato added that the Port had also been working closely with TriMet to develop new transportation opportunities for employees that needed to arrive at the airport early in the morning or get home late at night, when light rail was not running. He recognized that transportation and transit had been some of the most challenging factors facing airport employees.

Mr. Tony DeFalco commented that in terms of working with TriMet, he felt it was great that the Port was working to improve transit options to the airport. He suggested that an additional solution would be to encourage vendors to pay their employees a higher wage so that they would be able to afford a





car, childcare, and whatever else was needed to work such shifts. He noted that a balanced, multi-pronged solution would help solve the issue more quickly and efficiently.

Mr. Granato noted that as part of the workers benefits program, the Port graded concessions proposals based on the business' employee-employer benefits plan, including wages, benefits, education opportunities, etc. He explained that this new criteria represented 25% of the proposals' ratings and stated that the businesses would be held to these plans as part of their leases. He added that the program was not yet perfect, but would help create better opportunities for employees at the airport.

Ms. Kincaid agreed that transportation was a significant challenge for potential employees. She noted that some of her neighbors had been unable to accept employment from the airport due to an inability to arrive at the airport during the scheduled hours. She expressed interest in exploring how to improve pedestrian access to the airport, explaining that PDX would only be a 15 minute walk from her neighborhood if access was available. Ms. Kincaid also asked for an update on the storm water fees issue.

Mr. Granato responded that it was a complicated subject, but summarized that the airlines had sued the City of Portland and filed a complaint with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) because they felt the storm water fees as assessed by the City of Port constituted a form of revenue diversion, because the Port handled all of its own storm water and the airlines (and the Port) were being still charged with paying offsite storm water fees. He noted that they were challenging this practice as revenue diversion, because there was a law that stated that federal money for airports must stay at the airport. He explained that the case had been dismissed by the Circuit Court and was now being considered by the FAA and the Department of Transportation (DOT), a decision that the Port agreed with, as they felt that was where the case belonged.

Ms. Kincaid noted that the drainage districts also did not pay for onsite treatment and faced the same issues as the airlines. She explained that she was interested in learning more about the subject, as the drainage districts were still working on how to voice an opinion about the issue.

Mr. Granato reported that water quality at the airport, particularly related to lead concentrations, was an important issue. He informed the committee that an industrial hygienist had been at the airport on June 17 to test out all of the Port's facilities, beginning with PDX. He noted that it would take a couple of weeks before the test results were available.

Mr. Walt Evans replied that when the water quality testing was completed, the committee would appreciate a summary of the findings.

Mr. Granato announced that Mr. Michael Alexander had joined the Port of Portland Commission. He explained that Mr. Alexander was the former president and CEO of the Urban League of Portland and





had been assigned to the Commission's Aviation Task Force. Mr. Granato expressed excitement about having Mr. Alexander on board.

Mr. John Wasiutynski noted that he had biked and flown before at the airport. He asked if there was bicycle parking specifically for employees. Mr. Granato replied that there was, with secure lockers available under the ramp leading to the upper roadway.

Mr. Wasiutynski added that Multnomah County had recently installed a bike repair station for its employees. Mr. Granato stated that such a station was also available at the airport.

Mr. Tony DeFalco thanked Mr. Granato for the update on the air quality program. He asked if there would be a presentation in the future with more detail. Mr. Sean Loughran responded that in the past, Air Quality Program Manager Dave Green had presented specifically on air quality. He noted that Mr. Green could come back to the PDX CAC for another presentation at a following meeting. He explained that a Special Topics meeting focused on air quality could also be scheduled if there was enough interest.

Mr. Smith asked that with all of the changes happening on the north side of the airport, the Port remember to preserve motorcycle parking. Mr. Granato agreed to keep the parking in mind.

Ms. Corrina Chase voiced her support for an air quality presentation. Mr. Loughran noted that with only one meeting left in the year, the presentation would need to take place in 2017, or at a Special Topics meeting. Dr. Steven Sachs proposed having the information emailed to the committee. Mr. Loughran replied that there was also a summary included in Mr. Granato's Airport Update.

#### Informal Presentation: Stormwater Master Plan

Mr. Imperati introduced Ms. Susan Aha, Senior Manager of Water Resources, and Mr. Brian Freeman, Manager of Civil Engineering and explained that they would be finishing their informational presentation on the Port's Storm Water Master Plan that had been cut off at the last PDX CAC meeting due to time restrictions.

Ms. Aha stated that the presentation would serve as both an update on the Portland International Airport's Storm Water Master Plan as well as a perspective on the geological layout of the airport. She explained that at PDX, rainfall generated storm water runoff, which flowed south to the Columbia Slough, managed for flood control by the Multnomah County Drainage District (MCDD). She informed the committee that storm water quality and quantity at PDX was primarily regulated by Oregon Department of Environmental Quality National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, delegated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). She explained that several permits regulated various activities at the airport, including the 1200 COLS permit that regulated







activities and maintenance and the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit, a permit shared by the City of Portland and the Port, that regulated the storm system itself.

Ms. Aha shared photographs of flooded buildings and roadways at PDX and noted that the airport often saw flooding during large rainstorms. She explained that there were certain areas where the conveyance system was not working adequately, causing the areas to be more prone to flooding as a result of hydraulics issues.

Ms. Aha used a map to identify the different drainage basins around PDX. She informed the committee that when the airport was created in the late 1930s, the land was filled in with Columbia River dredge sand. She explained that the storm water was sent to the Columbia Slough, rather than the river, because it was easier to send the water south using gravity, then to send it north through the levy via pump.

Ms. Aha reported that there were nine basins in total, each with an outlet to the slough. She explained that there were miles and miles of storm water system under the airport, some having been built as early as the 1940s. She stated that this was one of the reasons why it was very important to update the storm water system, in order to ensure that none of the aging pipes led to a failure of the system. She informed the committee that much of the basins' infrastructure had aged and met its useful life.

Mrs. Aha explained that due to the complexity of the project, a number of different partners were involved in the update. She noted that the consulting firm Gresham, Smith and Partners had taken the lead on the PDX hydraulic analyses, while other sub-consultants helped the Port manage pollutant analyses, marine hydraulic analyses, sustainability and best management practices, and outreach.

Ms. Aha informed the committee that the project was incredibly substantial as a result of the size of the airport and its storm water system. She stated that the project had begun with a lot of research and a Master Plan, which was now beginning to be implemented. Ms. Aha noted that the major goals of the Storm Water Master Plan were as follows: comply with MS4 and 1200-COLS permit requirements for water quality and quantity, address surface flooding and wildlife attractants, plan for future development and redevelopment, identify aging infrastructure and develop database to support development of an asset management program, and develop a recommended list of projects for storm water system modifications.

Ms. Aha noted that the project was further complicated by all of the interrelationships related to the storm water system and storm water management. She explained that staff had not only evaluated existing and future conditions of the system based on the PDX Master Plan, but also on the Port's strategic goals and policies, regulatory requirements, safety, sustainability, and natural resources. She stated that the goal was to integrate solutions into both short-term and long-term planning and







facility management using capital projects as well as operations and maintenance projects and activities.

Ms. Aha reported that because of the differing ages and circumstances of the different basins, they all faced different issues. She explained that Basins 3, 4, 5, and 6 were functioning well; Basins 1, 2, and 7 were undersized and facing aging infrastructure; Basins 1, 2, and 8 experienced wildlife attractant issues; Basins 1, 8, and 9 faced complex ownership issues; Basin 8 faced relatively new undersized infrastructure; and all basins need storm water treatment.

Ms. Aha informed the committee that there were four main elements in the Storm Water Master Plan: Storm Water Program Management, Storm Water Planning Objectives, Storm Water System Description, and Implementing Storm Water Improvements. She noted that in terms of regional facilities, the team had worked to find sites for treatment facilities for all of the basins within the airport. She used a map to identify existing regional storm water treatment structures as well as additional recommended structures that had been considered for plan development, occurring within the Master Plan lifecycle going through 2035. She emphasized that as the airport continued to develop, it would need to be able to treat increasing amounts of storm water, so it would be developing more structures in order to meet these demands, in part due to its MS4 permit requirements.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid asked if there was a graphic that depicted existing structures and asked about one built along 33rd Avenue. Mr. Freeman explained that the structure along 33rd was a deicing plant, not a treatment facility. Ms. Aha added that the airport did have a Storm Water Pollution Control plan that included a map that showed all existing treatment structures across the airport, but explained that the map she was using was solely focused on showing potential future facilities.

Dr. Steven Sachs asked if wildlife attractants referred to the ponding of water. Ms. Aha replied affirmatively.

Dr. Sachs asked what was meant by complex ownership. Mr. Freeman responded that due to the age of the system's infrastructure, many issues related to ownership were unclear. Using Basins 1 and 2 as an example, he explained that the City of Portland owned the right of way along NE 33rd Avenue but did not own the storm water infrastructure beneath it because it crossed under ditches that fell under the MCDD's jurisdiction. Ms. Aha added that because much of the infrastructure was so old, no one had considered what would happen to the pipe at the time. She stated that this was a prevalent national issue and noted that storm water systems were failing across the United States. She explained that Port staff were starting a process with the MCDD and the City of Portland to develop a way to deal with these ownership issues.

Mr. John Wasiutynski asked if the Portland International Airport had its own MS4 permit. Mr. Freeman responded that the City of Portland and the Port had shared the permit for 21 years.





Mr. Joe Smith asked why the ground underneath the road would not belong to a recorded owner. Ms. Aha replied that as an example, NE 33rd Avenue was originally built by Multnomah County in the 1950s then later annexed by the City of Portland. She noted that the question they faced was if the underlying road infrastructure was included in the annexation. She explained that the Port's position was that it was, but added that the city could take a different position. She noted that because of this, the annexation may have already made the decision, but it did involve legal issues in any case. She pointed out that each basin had its own unique set of circumstances that required in-depth research.

Mr. Smith asked what could not be solved by having all of the potentially affected entities figure out who owned what. Ms. Aha agreed that was what they were working through; Mr. Freeman noted that in some cases no one wanted to take responsibility.

Mr. Freeman provided a graph of all of the issues related to the basins. He explained that Basin 7 was the most constrained basin. He noted that it was part of the eastern portion of the airport and covered most of the airfield. Ms. Aha added that the photographs showed earlier depicting flooded were from Basin 7.

Mr. Freeman then shared a photograph of a 60" straw pipe built in 1936, used to drain storm water. He explained that the pipe was located off-site and represented another complex ownership issue. He informed the committee that the pipe was well-past its useful life, and was identified in the Storm Water Master Plan as something that needed to be repaired quickly in order to ensure the airfield did not become flooded. Ms. Aha added that the repair would result in a road closure, so staff was currently working with the City of Portland on permitting for that project.

Mr. Smith asked what the replacement pipe would be made of. Mr. Freeman replied that it would be a 72" concrete pipe with a life span of at least 50 years. Ms. Aha noted that the pipe would not completely solve the drainage issues in Basin 7 but would provide another way to drain the airfield in case the existing pipe collapsed.

Ms. Aha then asked if the committee had any questions or comments.

Mr. Walt Evans commented that the presentation had been surprisingly interesting, especially given the complexities in regards to lack of ownership. He noted that one of his law partners had represented some of the airlines in a conflict related to deicing and asked if the issue had been laid to rest. Ms. Aha replied that it was, as far as she knew.

Mr. Ron Glanville asked what would happen if the Columbia Slough flooded, seeing as it was the only drainage area. Ms. Aha responded that the water would back up to the airport and noted that this was why the MCDD needed to continue to pump water. She explained that the Columbia Slough was first pumped to the lower slough, then through the Smith and Bybee Wetlands, before making its way to





the Willamette River. She stated that the Drainage District was simply moving water, noting that if there were water quality issues, they would be addressed either on the water's upstream or outfall.

Mr. Glanville asked if there was a cleansing process for the outfall where it approached the Willamette River. Ms. Aha noted that such processes were regulated by the Department for Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the City of Portland.

Mr. Phil Ralston, Port Director of Environmental Affairs, noted that he sat on a number of different drainage district boards as a Port representative. He explained that in terms of the cleansing question, it varied depending on the area. He noted that the upper slough water came from the City of Fairview and the water quality was fairly good. He stated that the middle slough included water from the Port, and had a variable water quality that was regulated by the EPA, while the lower slough was affected by tidal action and occasional flushing. Mr. Ralston explained that the main issue was the quality of contaminated sediment hotspots found in certain areas of the bottom of the slough that were occasionally disrupted by tides and other factors. He noted that the DEQ was working on the hotspots with the responsible partners in order to clean them up.

Mr. Ralston informed the committee that there were four continuous drainage districts with two key tasks: keeping storm water out and maintaining the levees for flood protection. He explained that because the drainage districts had been working for almost 100 years, the aging infrastructure needed to be replaced. He noted that the community was working together to develop a strategy to modernize the whole system and had assembled about \$10 million in funding from 23 different jurisdictions to perform engineering analyses. He reported that the analyses were about halfway done and information would be available in a year to better understand the deficiencies in the system and the estimated costs to correct them. Mr. Ralston summarized by noting that the drainage districts were another example of complex, aging infrastructure issues.

Mr. Ron Glanville asked if there had been a plan to take care of these issues. Mr. Ralston replied that included in the completed PDX Master Plan were a number of capital projects sequenced and funded to address these issues. He noted that the drainage districts also had their own plans that addressed these updates.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid asked if Basin 7 encompassed the levee. Mr. Freeman replied positively. She noted that the MCDD did not own any land and instead simply managed the water in its jurisdiction. She asked if the project was connected to the Levee Ready Columbia project. Mr. Ralston replied that the levees were not owned by the drainage districts, but instead owned by the respective property owners, including in some instances the Port. He explained that the MCDD had access and easements for maintenance. He noted that if a deficiency occurred in the levee and ownership was identified, theoretically the landowner would be approached first to fund corrective action, but added that there were areas of the levee where the owners could not fund corrective action and consequently other solutions would need to be found.







Mr. John Wasiutynski noted that the Levee Ready Columbia project was an impressive and interesting topic of interest that directly affected the airport. He suggested that if there hadn't already been a presentation on the topic it might be worth scheduling for the next year.

Mr. Wasiutynski then asked if the storm water facilities be surface treatments. Mr. Freeman responded that the facilities would use different treatments, including surface treatment. He explained that in some cases, the location of the basin and soil conditions did not allow for low-impact best management practices for water pollution and required certain unique solutions.

### Break

### Informal Presentation: Port Small Business Program

Ms. Kimberly Mitchell-Phillips, Small Business Development Program Manager, provided a presentation on the Port's Small Business program.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips explained that the purpose of the Small Business program was to enhance opportunities for small businesses in the region to successfully compete for and participate in the performance of Port contract opportunities by ensuring nondiscrimination in the award and administration of Port contracts; creating a level playing field on which small businesses can compete fairly for Port opportunities; helping remove barriers to the participation of small businesses in Port opportunities; and assisting the development of firms that can compete successfully in the marketplace outside of the Port's Small Business Development program. She noted that her presentation would review each of the Small Business Development programs and provide an overview of what had been accomplished.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips began with the Minority, Women, and Emerging Small Business (MWESB) program. She explained that the goals of the program were set on non-federally funded procurements equaling over \$500,000. She informed the committee that the program was voluntary, not mandatory. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips reported that during fiscal year 2015, the Port awarded 40 prime contracts totaling \$162 million. She stated that these contracts resulted in 298 subcontract awards, of which 128 were awarded to MWESB firms totaling \$28.2 million.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips noted that the Port tracked not only the dollars awarded but the number of awards given to small businesses. She explained that 38% of the awards went to small businesses by number of contracts, exceeding the Port's goal of 30 percent. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips reported that the percent had been higher the previous year, but added that she was still proud to reach the established goal. She informed the committee that in terms of awards by dollar, MWESB firms were awarded 17% of the awards, exceeding the goal of 16%. She stated that this number was less than







the previous year, but noted that this was partially due to the fact that some Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) contracts had not yet been given dollar amounts.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips shared Kodiak Construction's PDX Mt. GA West Development Phase 1 as a notable award from the program. She explained that Kodiak Construction was a women-owned firm that had participated in the Port's Mentor-Protégé a few years earlier. She expressed excitement for their success, noting that the firm did a great job of hiring other small firms for their sub-contracts.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips provided a graph demonstrating a breakdown of the dollar awards given to MWESB firms according to ethnicity. She explained that the dollar amounts awarded to African-American owned businesses had grown since the previous fiscal year, now reaching \$5,502,454, and explained that much of the growth was attributed to the Carlton Heart architectural firm which had been awarded a \$3.6 million design contract.

Ms. Corinna Chase informed the committee that the graph was presented as a log scale, and noted that such a scale was not the best way to present the data as it obscured the difference in dollar amounts awarded to each group.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips then provided an update on the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program. She explained that the DBE goals were set on United States Department of Transportation funded procurements, and had been set at 8% in fiscal year 2011-2013. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips informed the committee that during fiscal year 2015, two FAA funded contracts were awarded totaling \$16 million, resulting in eight subcontracts totaling \$675,717 awarded to DBE firms. She reported that DBE participation in fiscal year 2014-2016 was evaluated at 5.36%. She explained that the DBE program was more difficult to participate in, as runway construction often required special equipment that was very costly and therefore difficult for small businesses to afford. She noted that as a result, the Port was doing better with its DBE awards, but still not reaching its goals. She stated that the Port would continue to reach out to small businesses in hopes of raising participation in the program. She added that one of the two projects awarded in the identified period was a CMGC project, meaning that at the time the report was filed, the DBE firms working under the contract had yet to be identified. She explained that because of this, the firms were not included in the report, although the prime contractor had committed to a 10% DBE goal, and noted that the percent would most likely be higher in the following year as a result.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips then gave an update on the Airport Concession Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (ACDBE) program. She explained that the program applied to Concession and Rental Car opportunities at PDX, and added that the two were tracked and reported separately.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips reported that food and retail concession revenue generated \$104.7 million in gross sales with \$24.8 million going to ACDBE firms, exceeding the Port's goal of 12.9%. She explained that the goal was set based on the overall availability of ACDBE firms.





Ms. Mitchell-Phillips announced that the Port did fall short in terms of rental car ACDBE achievement. She explained that it was very difficult to involve small businesses in the rental car program, as the industry in the region was dominated by national chains. She informed the committee that rental car operators at PDX were utilizing ACDBE firms certified as goods and/or service providers outside of Oregon and Washington, making them ineligible to be included by the Port. She noted that the Port had reached out to these ACDBE firms requesting that they seek certification in Oregon.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips then provided an overview of the Port's Mentor-Protégé program. She explained that the program, started in 1995, paired two mentors with a protégé firm to work on developing business strategies over a three-year period. She noted that 103 firms had graduated from the program to-date and stated that the firms experienced a greater than average industry survival rate while being better prepared to take on projects at the Port.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips informed the committee that the current cohort (fiscal year 2015-2017) included ten firms, now in their second year of the program. She explained that all firms had seen a 39% increase in their gross revenue while all of the construction firms had seen a 49% increase in their bonding capacity. She added that the program had also helped job creation, with nine full-time and six part-time jobs created during the course of the program.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips shared two notable success stories from the program. She explained that an MBE trucking firm that had participated in the program saw a substantial 146% increase in gross revenue while in the program, and was recently awarded a large trucking job directly with a prime contractor. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips noted that this marked the firm's first time working directly with the prime contractor as opposed to participating as a second or third tier subcontractor on a project. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips also reported that an MBE traffic engineering firm that had participated in the program saw a substantial increase of 91% in gross revenue and recently leased their first office, hiring a part-time employee to help manage the work flow.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips announced the program initiatives for 2016. She stated that the Port would begin working on a new disparity study beginning in late 2016 and concluding in 2017. She explained that the study would examine whether there were disparities between the contracting dollars the Port awarded to DMWESB firms and the amount they may be expected to receive based on the number of such businesses available to perform the work among the total pool of eligible contractors. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips noted that the analysis would allow the Port to continue to set race-conscious goals on its construction contracts.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips informed the committee that the Port would also host an open house for subcontractors to meet Port project managers and large prime contractors that generally work on Port projects. She explained that the goal was to provide DMWESB firms the opportunities to meet decision-makers and develop new relationships. She stated that the open house would take place in





October at the Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs (OAME) and added that it had been a huge success the previous year.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips explained that the last initiative focused on expanding the Mentor-Protégé program to include ACDBE concessionaires. She then asked if the committee had any questions or comments.

Dr. Steve Sachs noted that some of the programs involved helping minority or women-run businesses and asked if it was correct to say that the Port was helping these businesses succeed. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips responded affirmatively, explaining that each business involved in the Mentor-Protégé program was paired with two mentors, one with an industry background specific to their protégé's business, and one with a financial background (often former CFOs). She noted that the mentors helped the business identify its challenges and develop strategic goals, among other things.

Dr. Sachs clarified that he was wondering how much public funding was being used to help small businesses, as he felt such programs were irrelevant to aviation and tangential to the role of the airport. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips replied that the Technical Assistance program operated on a budget of \$50,000 a year. She noted that the program also received additional funding from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) that was part of a USDOT grant of \$45,000 a year.

Mr. John Wasiutynski thanked Ms. Mitchell-Phillips for her presentation and noted the importance of such work. He explained that the Metropolitan Contractor Improvement Partnership (MCIP) had recently received a grant from the EPA to give money to small disadvantaged businesses for clean diesel engine retrofits. He noted that the grant may be helpful for small businesses that could be at a disadvantage in the trucking industry.

Mr. Tony DeFalco stated that he felt the program was a perfectly legitimate use of funds. He explained that disparities in the region would ultimately limit its success by increasing social costs and other negative trends. He noted that he had seen public agencies better succeed using disparity studies as it allowed them to work more effectively and increase regional prosperity. Mr. DeFalco added that he would also like to see the Port track the businesses coming out of the protégé program over time in order to monitor the program's success.

Mr. DeFalco also noted that in discussions about contracting, he had heard a lot about the emerging small business (ESB) designation and how it had been abused. He explained that relatively large firms, often multimillion dollar firms, were using the category to secure contracts and meet such goals. He suggested having the Port review its use of ESBs and possibly eliminating the designation.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips agreed that the ESB designation had posed problems and noted that its elimination could very well be a result of the disparity study. Mr. DeFalco expressed his support for the study and thanked Ms. Mitchell-Phillips for her work.







Dr. Sachs explained that his position was that airport funds were not appropriate for such programs, but public funds certainly were.

Mr. Granato noted that the Port of Portland had a very small property tax levy at about \$9 million a year, and explained that all of that money went to the marine and industrial development side of its work, not to the airport. He informed the committee that as a result, the Small Business program was funded out of the airport, which was exclusively funded by its users. He explained that because of this, it was not public money funding the program, but airport money. He stated that he agreed with Mr. DeFalco in the sense that this was an appropriate use of funds. He noted that in some cases, it was required for airports, but added that the Port would support the program regardless, as there was a lot of work the airport did, including supporting the PDX CAC, that focused on supporting and engaging with its community.

Mr. Smith expressed his agreement with Mr. Granato.

Ms. Corrina Chase also expressed her support for the program, noting that it would do well to be even better funded. She added that in her experience, large companies were not quite sure how to go about doing work with minority-owned businesses. She noted that it would be helpful to have tools that would make such partnerships more accessible for large contractors. She asked Ms. Mitchell-Phillips if she knew of any resources to help partner with minority-owned businesses, create mentorship programs, etc. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips replied that there were a number of great resources for locating minority-owned businesses and stated that she would be happy to share them. She explained that many of the larger contractors in the region already had such programs in place and noted that it was often the midsize contractors that were more unfamiliar with the process. Ms. Chase replied that the specific case she was thinking of was the Metro Metals cleanup project. She thanked Ms. Mitchell-Phillips for her help.

Mr. Dan Moeller expressed his appreciation for the program. He asked if acting as a mentor was a contractual obligation for contractors. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips replied that participation in the mentor program was completely voluntary.

Mr. Moeller asked if staff approached a variety of organizations and asked them to participate. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips responded that many of the volunteers were retired CEOs who were looking to help. She explained that in other cases, staff worked with the participating firms to see what their needs were and asked individuals that had the relevant skills to help.

Mr. Wasiutynski explained that he was working with Multnomah County and the Portland Development Commission (PDC) on a few programs that would make it easier for commercial entities to invest in energy efficiency and renewable energy. He noted that as they had enrolled contractors into the program, they had limited enrollment to DMWB (disadvantaged, minority, and women-owned







businesses) firms in order to avoid the fraudulence associated with the ESB designation. He stated that he felt this was one example of a model that could be used to make sure the focus remained on those businesses that truly need the support.

Ms. Mitchell-Phillips stated that she agreed with Mr. Tony DeFalco's analysis, noting that she had been working in the field for 15 years and had seen some of the issues he mentioned firsthand. She explained that this was a significant reason why she was looking forward to reviewing the disparity analysis.

Mr. Chad Eiken noted that the Port had gone above and beyond its concessions goal for the last three years. He asked if there was a point when the goal would be adjusted to reflect these trends. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips agreed that she would, as long as the FAA allowed it.

Mr. Walt Evans asked how the goals were set. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips explained that the goals were set using standard methodology. She stated that first staff compared the number of projects with the firms that were available to perform the work. Next the figure was weighed against how the Port performed over the last three to four years. Following that, the proposed goals were shared with nonprofits that work with small businesses for their feedback. Using that feedback, Ms. Mitchell-Phillips set the goals and provided a public hearing forum for thirty days before it was marked official.

Mr. Walt Evans explained that graphic presentations were often helpful for understanding such topics. He asked if it was possible to create a five-year graph in order to have a visual representation of how the program was working.

Dr. Steven Sachs noted that many of the committee members had extensive contacts that might be helpful for identifying potential volunteers and asked if the mentor program was in need of any more volunteers. Ms. Mitchell-Phillips responded that the current cohort was at capacity, but added that she would definitely reach out to the committee when coordinating the next year's group.

### Public Comment

Mr. Jeremy Simer, representing Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 49, provided public comment discussing working conditions at the airport. He explained that he had sent an email the previous day with a link to a report that he also shared at the meeting in hard copy.

Mr. Simer informed the committee that the report, "Poverty Doesn't Fly: An Analysis of the Economic Impact of a \$15 an Hour Minimum Wage for Outsourced Portland International Airport Workers," was recently released by the University of Washington Harry Bridges Center for Labor Studies and evaluated wage issues at PDX. Mr. Simer noted that he had attended the meeting to share the findings of the report with the committee, adding that he had also provided a one-page summary of the report.





Mr. Simer announced that PDX had the lowest minimum wage for airline service provider workers relative to its peer airports on the west coast, currently \$9.25 and going up to \$9.75 on July 1. He explained that the report's economic analysis, using a large set of data from the state employment department, found that over 300 PDX airline service workers qualified for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the Oregon Health Plan, and Medicaid, costing Oregon taxpayers about \$3 million a year.

Mr. Simer informed the committee that a number of other leading airports on the west coast paid their service employees at a minimum of \$15 an hour and stated that airport workers at PDX had been calling for the same wage for some time. He explained that the report showed that if the Port was to mandate a \$15 an hour minimum wage, it would result in over \$7 million in new regional spending and create 81 new jobs, leading to a beneficial ripple effect for the regional economy. Mr. Simer stated that raising all outsourced workers to \$15 an hour would cost the airlines less than four percent of their overall commercial profits in Oregon.

Mr. Simer reported that in the meeting evaluation comments from the April 6 PDX CAC meeting, one member had noted that it was unclear what the Port could do to raise wages. He clarified that LAX and SFO, among other airport authorities, had passed either a living wage ordinance or a requirement for their airline service providers, requiring that if they wanted to do business at the airport, they would need to pay their employees a living wage. He informed the committee that the Port had the same authority.

He explained that the Oregon state legislature had even passed new legislation a few years ago to give the Port the authority to raise its standards and improve service and job quality. He stated that the airline service providers had a 30-day operating agreement and noted that the Port could choose to renegotiate with the airlines at any point in time. Mr. Simer emphasized that it was critical that the Port work to help its employees escape poverty. He explained that SEIU 49 believed that the Port should review its policies and not be satisfied with the current minimum wage, noting that the airline industry was incredibly profitable and could afford to make changes now, and not wait for the slow increases in the state minimum wage.

Mr. Simer thanked the committee for their time and added that he was happy to answer any questions.

Dr. Steven Sachs noted that it was important to keep the taxpayer in mind when dealing with these kinds of issue. He explained that he had recently asked a friend about the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and if employees were automatically removed from the program if they went above the poverty line. He reported that his friend had informed him that they would be, as there were databases that monitored such changes. He noted that in this sense, taxpayers would benefit from employees at the airport earning a better wage.





Mr. Tony DeFalco commented that he had noticed in the meeting evaluations from the April 6 PDX CAC meeting that a member had noted that they were tired of hearing from SEIU. He emphasized that the committee needed to encourage tangible actions. He explained that SEIU representatives would continue to come to the meetings because their issues were important and needed attention. Mr. DeFalco noted that he had met some of the workers that had been subjected to distressing work conditions at the airport and stated that the situation was heartbreaking. He explained that with the main airlines posting such large profits, there was no reason why they should not be extending the same benefits to their employees. Mr. DeFalco stated that the more the committee did to encourage the Port to take action on the issue, the faster the issue would be resolved. He announced that he felt the topic signified a reputation issue for the committee, as having served on the PDX CAC for years, he was proud of the airport in many respects except for this. He emphasized that the committee and the Port could do better on the issue in order to best support social equity at the airport.

Mr. Joe Smith noted that whoever stated in their meeting evaluation that they were tired of Mr. Simer's comments at the meetings should realize that poverty at the airport would not go away simply because the committee stopped discussing it.

Ms. Maryhelen Kincaid explained that she fully supported SEIU's work, but added that she felt it was a larger issue than wages at the airport. She stated that it seemed that the group was focused solely on Alaska Airlines and the Port, while the City of Portland faced the same issues. She noted that she felt that all efforts needed to be recognized and questioned what the Port could do to make the airlines comply.

Mr. Vince Granato informed the committee that such changes would need to be included in the airlines' contracts, otherwise they would need to renegotiated with the airlines. He stated that the Port Commission's position was that because the airline service provider workers were not Port employees, the Port would not get involved with another business and their employees and therefore not delve into wage issues.

Ms. Kincaid stated that it would be better to promote a larger scale initiative to raise the minimum wage, perhaps by collaborating with the city or the state. She noted that Oregon State Representative Tina Kotek was a large supporter of a higher minimum wage.

Mr. Simer clarified that the report focused not on airline employees, but on outsourced contractors that served the airlines, as that was where the lowest paying jobs were. He explained that the Port had the legal authority to implement a higher wage in 30 days. He added that if an employee worked directly for an airline such as Alaska, they often were part of union and likely earned a family wage. He noted that service contractors were at higher risk and paid less because they were not covered by such unions.





Mr. Simer added that the increase in the state’s minimum wage had been a compromise for all businesses, including small, independent, family-owned businesses, and that was why it was not immediately raised to \$15, because such businesses would not have been able to afford such a jump. He emphasized that the airlines at PDX were making millions of dollars a year and could easily afford to pay such wages. He noted that because of such profits, there was a great opportunity to fix the problem now. He explained that the Port did not control the economy for the state, but could affect the poverty and high turnover rates that were occurring at its airport.

Mr. Martin Slapikas noted that a statement included in Mr. Simer’s handout dictated that PDX employee turnover was 64% on average. He asked if Mr. Simer knew where such employees went after leaving PDX. Mr. Simer replied that he had talked with some such employees and the stories varied widely. He explained that they often moved from own low-paying job to another, but added that there were likely some exceptions.

Mr. Martin Slapikas asked why the organization would not encourage them to find higher-paying jobs. Mr. Simer responded that there were simply not that many higher paying jobs out there. He added that the union was interested in representing workers. He explained that a generation ago, employees at the airport could support a family working at these same jobs, but airlines had made decisions over the years that made that impossible.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Granato if there was any business spillover on our cargo operations from what had happened to the container side of Port. Mr. Granato replied that there was not much spillover.

### Meeting Wrap Up

Mr. Imperati thanked the committee and each of the presenters. He asked committee members to fill out their meeting evaluation forms and reminded them that the next PDX CAC meeting would be held on October 19 at the PDX Conference Center.

Mr. Imperati adjourned at meeting at 3:37 pm.

***NOTE: These meeting notes will be updated and approved at the October 19, 2016 PDX CAC meeting. Please see the “Meeting Notes Approval” section in the April 6 notes for any additions, subtractions, or corrections to these notes.***







**PDX COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #19**

**06.22.16      11 Evaluation Forms**

	<b>Too Slow</b>	<b>Just Right</b>	<b>Too Fast</b>	<b>No Answer</b>		
<b>1. PACING</b>	2	9				
	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>2. OVERALL MTG QUALITY</b>			2	3	4	2
<b>3. PRESENTATIONS</b>			1	8	2	
<b>4. DOCUMENTS</b>		1	1	6	3	
<b>5. DISCUSSION</b>			4	5	2	

**6. MOST USEFUL?**

- Good flow of meeting, good control of time/discussion, good food!
- The Q & A.
- Small business program presentation.
- Small business presentation and discussion.
- Small business presentation – short but dense with information.
- Stormwater Plan.

**7. LEAST USEFUL?**

- Extended discussion of advisory role. Should be clear by now to everyone.
- Small business.
- ?
- N/A

**8. COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, QUESTIONS**

- Too many electronic pref.
- (Scribe note: in regards to presentations and documents) Some maps hard to understand, a lot of acronyms. Need better microphones or louder voices on some folks.
- Presenters: pretend you are talking to the person farthest away from you (because you should be).
- Group is getting better at discussing/raising issues.
- Please remind presenters not to read to slides to audience.

