

Meeting Summary

PDX 2045 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting 10

November 12, 2025; 5:30 PM – 8:00 PM

Port of Portland HQ, Chinook Room (eighth floor) and Zoom

Attendees:

PAC Members

- Aidan Simpson
- Allyssa Bromley
- Angela DeHaven
- Anne Sweet
- Brian Kuzera
- Caleb Powell
- David Duncan
- David Van't Hof
- Evan Howington
- Heather King
- Jennie Heidrick
- Kathy Barenco
- Keith Miller
- Laura Young
- Lin Felton
- Mark Luna
- Maryhelen Kincaid
- Matthew Hodson
- Mychal Hornbeck
- Pete DeVasto
- Philip Rowe
- Phuong Truong
- Sheena Sharma
- Stephanie Barnes
- Tsering Sherpa

Port of Portland

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

Consultant Team

- Bridger Wineman, EnviroIssues
- Cadence Purdy, EnviroIssues
- Cameron Modjeski, Ricondo
- Jenna Johnstone, Ricondo
- Julie Gueho, JMG Consulting
- Suzanne Donaldson, Donaldson Consulting

Welcome, Meeting Goals, Project Updates

- PAC Facilitator, Suzanne Donaldson, welcomed PAC members to their tenth meeting and reviewed the agenda and meeting goals. Meeting goals included learning about and providing feedback on alternatives integration and the Port's ongoing engagement efforts.
- Suzanne provided a recap of the previous PAC meeting where PAC members learned about the needs and potential locations for cargo, general aviation, and support facilities.
- PAC members, friends, and family joined Port of Portland staff for an extracurricular plane spotting event on October 8th.
- Two recent in-person Open Houses occurred, one at the University of Oregon Portland Library on October 14th and another at Vancouver Community Library on November 6th.
- A webinar was held on Zoom November 3rd.
- The online open house includes a survey covering alternatives and is available on the project website through December 1st.

What's New at PDX

- As of November 7th, PDX has experienced a five percent cancellation in flights due to the government shutdown which is less than the ten percent that was expected. So far, PDX has not seen long security lines like other airports are experiencing. Staff impacted by the government shutdown include TSA and air traffic controllers who have not received pay for over a month. The Port of Portland has organized a donation bin for workers, as well as providing breakfast and lunch for workers.
- Phase two of the new main terminal is nearing opening, with tentative opening dates of January 19th for the south node of the terminal and March 5th for the north node. Additional work will continue into 2027.

Public Comment

- No public comments were made.

What We're Hearing

- Jeff Broderick shared key feedback on PDX 2045 from the Shared Prosperity Working Group which includes potential noise pattern reductions in NE Portland from removing the crosswind runway, the impact of having one main entrance to the airport to maintain the present PDX culture, and considering travel distances for employees to avoid unpaid commute times.
- Bridger Wineman shared early results from the Open House 2 survey to-date. Survey respondents so far have had mixed opinions on closing the crosswind runway. Of the terminal alternatives, expanding Concourses C and D is the highest ranked alternative, and 62 percent of respondents expressed concern when concourse extensions required 3,500 feet or more of total walking distance. The highest ranked curb alternative is relocating valet service. Respondents ranked the parking alternatives with those closest to the terminal as the most preferred and remote parking at regional locations as the least preferred.

Q: How and why would it benefit the community to have one entrance to the airport?

- A: Having one entrance is an easier method of wayfinding for people who do not use the airport frequently.

Q: Does this mean literally one door or one entrance area?

- A: One area, like the main terminal entrance area that exists today.

Q: How would removing the crosswind runway reduce noise generation? Wouldn't that push more noise elsewhere in Portland?

- A: Aircraft traffic on the crosswind runway would shift to the existing parallel runways with flight patterns that are further away from population centers. This could decrease noise in these neighborhoods (reference to Concordia neighborhood) due to the lower altitude routes the smaller aircraft fly.

Q: How long does it take to complete the survey?

- A: Times can vary as respondents can choose to answer or skip any questions. It takes roughly 15 minutes to complete the whole survey.

Q: Is the survey anonymous?

- A: The survey is designed to be anonymous. There are some optional demographics questions to help us understand who we're hearing from. There is an option to share contact information for those who want to stay engaged, but those data are held separate from the rest of the survey input.

Q: Are there spaces set up at the airport for people to do the survey?

- A: Not currently, though the team is looking to promote the survey in the terminal before the Thanksgiving travel period.

Q: What are the ramp areas next to the nodes near Concourse D and Concourse C currently being used for?

- A: This is currently being used as a lay down area for construction. The long bypass corridors will be removed in phase two of the new main terminal and gates will be restored.

Q: What is the feasibility of adding a tunnel connector between the end of Concourses C and D?

- A: Both tunnels and bridges are feasible, although costly. Similar connectors have been constructed at other airports; bridges have to be high enough for aircraft clearance under them. PDX already has some underground tunnels. The decision to add a tunnel connector comes down to a cost benefit analysis and is a Port business decision.

Alternatives Integration Presentation and Individual Exercise

- Cameron Modjeski shared development paths and the dependencies between different functional area alternatives. For example, if expanding Concourse E a close-in garage would be developed near the Concourse E entrance.
- The planning team recommends removing the Domestic Concourse E with curb alternative within the PDX 2045 planning horizon.
- Individually, PAC members reviewed four different development paths and determined their ranking, reasoning, and preferred curb and parking options. Refer to Appendix A for a summary of exercise responses and verbatim comments provided by individuals in their ranking of the development paths.

Q: How would light rail passengers access a Concourse E entrance?

- A: This could be managed through several options including pedestrian bridges or shuttles. This is a drawback of any Concourse E expansion as the MAX station is far from where a new Concourse E entrance would be located.

Q: Why did some survey takers choose not to remove the crosswind runway?

- A: Some respondents were worried that closing the crosswind runway would reduce capacity, and some were unsure of where small planes would operate.

Q: Is it only small planes that use the crosswind runway? How many planes use it?

- A: The crosswind runway is currently used by some very small cargo planes for its convenient access to the cargo facilities. Over the past decade, less than 1% of aircraft operations at PDX have occurred on the crosswind runway.

Q: How many international passengers would end their journey at Concourse E?

- A: The Concourse E curbside would likely serve both international passengers as well as domestic passengers.

Q: How would vehicles access the Concourse E entrance? Would there be additional lanes at the Concourse E curbside area?

- A: Vehicles would exit NE Airport Way to access the Concourse E curbside. There would be a flyover from the Concourse E curbside that would take vehicles to eastbound NE Airport Way to exit PDX without going through the main terminal loop.

Q: Is there enough space that vehicles could bypass the Concourse E curbside and just go to the main terminal?

- A: Yes, vehicles headed to the main terminal would not go through the Concourse E curbside area.

Q: The "Big E" option would be duplicating curbside services, which is not efficient. Can we centralize the location of shuttle services instead of duplicating curbside shuttle services?

- A: Yes, it may be possible to create a commercial vehicle courtyard between the two terminal entrances, though it is not convenient (for passengers) to relocate stops away from the main terminal.

Q: Can we close the crosswind runway and expand Concourse E with international arrivals facility (IAF) relocation?

- A: Yes, it is not necessary to keep the crosswind runway open in any terminal expansion scenario.

Q: What are shuttle sites vs. regional parking sites?

- A: Shuttle sites are parking areas on the airport property (like the existing red and blue economy lots), while regional sites are at more distant locations not on airport property. Regional sites would provide access to PDX via an express bus or the MAX.

Alternatives Integration Group Exercise

- PAC members broke into four small groups, each tasked with discussing a different development path. Groups discussed what additional information is needed and what types of airport users the development path would support or

challenge. One staff member was present with each group and reported a summary of their group's discussion at the end of the breakout session.

- **The Development Path 1 Group** discussed the scenario of keeping the crosswind runway, expanding Concourse E with the IAF, and new curbside at Concourse E. The group shared that the following additional information is needed:
 - The cost to maintain the crosswind runway
 - How keeping the crosswind runway impacts space available for cargo expansion
 - Location of long-term parking
 - The long-term costs to replace/relocate general aviation capacity
 - How connecting passengers and terminal passengers will navigate the terminal with the new configuration
- The group shared that this development path benefits frequent users of the airport who are good at wayfinding and origin/destination passengers who use Concourse E. The group also shared that this development path may hurt connecting passengers and new users.
- **The Development Path 2 Group** discussed the scenario of closing the crosswind runway and expanding Concourses C and D with the IAF in Concourse D. The group shared that the following additional information is needed:
 - The cost effectiveness of the development path
 - How this path would stand up to different downsizing scenarios
 - How many passengers will utilize different facilities
 - Additional information on international travelers' experience
 - Details on sightlines, busing, and amenities
- **The Development Path 3 Group** discussed the scenario of closing the crosswind runway, expanding Concourse E, and keeping the IAF in Concourse D. The group shared the following additional information that is needed:
 - How the IAF can be improved and buses avoided
 - The associated costs in comparison to other paths
 - Understanding the advantages of expanding Concourse E without IAF
- **The Development Path 4 Group** discussed the scenario of closing the crosswind runway, expanding Concourse E with IAF in Concourse E, and new curbside at Concourse E. The group liked the idea of having the IAF relocated to Concourse E, as it is easier for international passengers to navigate. The group discussed benefits and drawbacks and shared that while the increased walking distance is a drawback, closing the crosswind runway would reduce noise impacts for residents. The group shared the following additional information that is needed:
 - What wayfinding would look like
 - If there could be a loop/circulator to help passengers with the increased walking distance to Concourse E

Ongoing Engagement

- Aaron Ray provided an overview of the different community engagement groups the Port of Portland works with including the PAC, the PDX Community Advisory Committee (CAC), PDX Accessibility Advisory Committee, Citizen Noise Advisory Committee (CNAC), and the International Air Service Committee.

- As the Port considers refreshing the CAC, the team solicited feedback from the PAC on three key questions: 1) What aspects of the PAC are working well? 2) Who should be included in the CAC? 3) What does success look like?
- PAC members shared that the following aspects of the PAC are working well:
 - The diversity and representation of the community, extracurricular activities, breakout groups, format and timing of meetings, level of meeting organization, focus on providing accessibility, and hybrid meeting flexibility.
- PAC members recommended adding the following to the CAC:
 - Youth, tribal governments, planning and design students, business organizations, schools and universities, and additional seats for neighborhood representatives of neighborhoods most impacted.
- PAC members identified what makes the PAC successful, including the time and attention spent creating and sustaining the committee.
- See Appendix B for a full list of PAC feedback.
- The Port will appoint a PAC member to attend a CAC meeting early 2026 to share feedback on what has worked well.

Q: How does the Port of Portland interface with local governments?

- A: Traditionally, the Port has involved local governments through the PDX CAC. For PDX 2045, there is a separate Interagency Advisory Committee.

Q: Does the Port ask for local agencies' input on the same things that the PAC has been looking at?

- A: Yes.

Q: How will members of the new CAC be appointed?

- A: That is still to be determined.

Q: How will noise be worked into a future intergovernmental agreement (IGA) for the CAC? With CNAC ending, how will the Port include considerations about noise in the CAC discussions?

- A: The Port is developing a long-term solution for incorporating noise into the Port's engagement. For now, noise will become a roundtable topic for the CAC.

Q: Daytime meetings prioritize government employees and retirees, but evening meetings accommodate a more diverse group. How do you consider how to balance these needs?

- A: This has been a struggle for CAC. For the PDX 2045 project, it's been addressed by having a separate interagency advisory committee that meets during the day, while the PAC meets in the evenings.

PAC Next Steps

- The next PAC meeting will focus on the identification of the recommended development plan and will be held in a new location which will be announced when finalized. The meeting will be held Thursday, Jan. 22, 2026.
- PAC members were asked to complete the meeting evaluation survey.

Q: Is there any way to send monetary donations to impacted staff at PDX?

- A: The Port will investigate and share what they find.

Appendix A: Options Integration Individual Exercise Results Summary

The following are the compiled PAC member input on preferred options for curbside and parking for four proposed development paths, as well as rankings of development paths and reasoning as transcribed from the Alternatives Integration Individual Exercise at PDX 2045 PAC Meeting 10.

Preferred Curbside and Parking Options

Development Path 1 - Keep Crosswind, Concourse E (IAF in Concourse E), Curb at Concourse E

Curbside Options	Count
Two-Hour Parking	11
P1 Level 4	6
Relocate Rideshare App Drop-Off	3
East Curb	3
Economy Lot Curb with Shuttle	3
Relocate Valet	2
Rental Car Curb	0

Parking Options	Count
Shuttle bus Sites	7
Remote regional Sites	7

Development Path 2 – Close Crosswind, Concourse C and D (IAF in Concourse D)

Curbside Options	Count
Two-Hour Parking	10
P1 Level 4	8
Relocate Rideshare App Drop-Off	4
Relocate Valet	3
East Curb	2
Rental Car Curb	0
Economy Lot Curb with Shuttle	0

Parking Options	Count
New Short-Term Garage	10
Shuttle Bus Sites	6
Remote Regional Sites	5

Development Path 3 – Close Crosswind, Concourse D and E (IAF in Concourse D)

Curbside Options	Count
Two-Hour Parking	10
P1 Level 4	8
Relocate Rideshare App Drop-Off	4
Relocate Valet	2
Economy Lot Curb with Shuttle	2
Rental Car Curb	1
East Curb	1

Parking Options	Count
New Short-Term Garage	7
Shuttle Bus Sites	7
Remote Regional Sites	5

Development Path 4 – Close Crosswind, Concourse E (IAF in Concourse E), Curb at Concourse E

Curbside Options	Count
Two-Hour Parking	8
P1 Level 4	7
Relocate Rideshare App Drop-Off	5
Relocate Valet	2
East Curb	2
Economy Lot Curb with Shuttle	2
Rental Car Curb	0

Parking Options	Count
New Short-Term Garage	10
Shuttle Bus Sites	5
Remote Regional Sites	0

Ranking of Development Paths

Development Path	Rank 1 Most Preferred	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4 Least Preferred
Path 4	11	1	2	0
Path 2	2	8	3	3
Path 3	2	1	8	3
Path 1	3	5	0	6

Reasoning for Development Path Preference

Development Path 1

Rank 1 comments:

- This location has the greatest sightlines of mountains and rivers for IAF. Remote regional – while not the most popular, it limits car traffic to airport area and considers that the Glenn Jackson bridge is a choke point for all the population expansion North.
- Like the new, expanded IAF facility and curbside opportunity.
- Seems the most reasonable.

Rank 2 comments:

- Except to pay for maintenance this at least gets me Big E. I think this one is dead on arrival. What are the maintenance costs and impacts of new cargo sites and RON sites?
- Keep the close needed services near the terminal – valet, rental car, rideshare should be near the terminal.
- It makes the best financial sense, and the location is there.
- I am in favor of extending Concourse E and adding IAF there but would prefer closure of the crosswind runway for optimal cost/operational efficiencies.
- I would still close the crosswind runway.

Rank 4 comments:

- Crosswind must go.
- The idea of relocating IAF to E while upgrading makes sense. What is the cost to maintain the crosswind runway even though it is not used?
- I don't like the IAF in Concourse E, and I don't want the crosswind open!
- I now understand that the crosswind runway is not needed. Closing it up frees up space and reduces complexity. Least preferred due to crosswind runway not needed.
- It's already a well-known fact that I really don't see a need to keep the crosswind runway, so any path that would involve holding onto it is not a good thing in my book.

Development Path 2

Rank 1 comments:

- I want to extend C and D. I like all the factors of this option.
- IAF in D keeps things in closer, especially for folks with disabilities who might need aids like wheelchairs.
- Please add rental scooters at no cost throughout the airport.

Rank 2 comments:

- I think C&D is acceptable, but a distant 2nd to E expansion.
- Expanding C&D would increase the number of gates near current airlines if they would like to expand operations out of one area.
- Good balance for gates and flights, people spread across the terminal. Potential to make the IAF/International departures have its own area.

- While it lacks additional curbside opportunity and terminal entrance, walking distance seems shorter.
- It's not my favorite, but I am giving it a chance.
- I prefer that we close the crosswind.

Rank 3 comments:

- Kicks the can down the road on congestion and makes it a problem for the next PAC.
- It would cause confusion and too much congestion in the main area.

Rank 4 comments:

- Short term needed for IAF parking. Avoid remote sites as it doesn't seem that people would use it according to surveys.
- Would create more noise west and east neighborhoods.
- Prefer IAF in Concourse E, upgrade/expansion to Concourse D instead of C.

Development Path 3

Rank 1 comments:

- I'm still debating this option and the last one (4) because I still can't imagine how much traffic would increase with IAF in Concourse E and having a separate entrance terminal for E vs. Having IAF in D and not having a separate entrance terminal.
- Prefer 1) closing crosswind runway, 2) upgrade to Concourse D over C and 3) moving IAF to Concourse E.

Rank 2 comments:

- I like the IAF in D.
- Rank 3 comments:
- I'm happy to have E expansion, good to have D too. Just sort of a meh option, two ok options combined without doing the things that best work with a D or an E expansion.
- D to E would be extremely far if connecting (don't currently see this happening, but you never know!)
- Makes E so long.
- Allows expansion and improvements to IAF.
- It's better than the previous option.
- Same as the least preferred.

Rank 4 comments:

- This is a terrible idea and an affront to God.
- The distance is too far in my opinion and that would cause a lot of confusion and congestion in the main terminal. International flights will be increasing, so it makes sense to build it out in the new space to ensure accessibility standards are high!

Development Path 4

Rank 1 comments:

- Redoing E with the IAF pairs nicely together in phasing. Love the idea of regional park and rides, and it's important to dream big!

- Access to “separate” IAF/E gates would be preferred. Does IAF location impact tarmac operations?
- Instead of increasing walking distance for both C and D, we condense the accessibility needs into one path/destination. Fluid experience.
- Consolidate rideshare drop off to remove bloat at new curb. Balance STG with remote sites.
- Parking makes sense near new IAF in E. I feel P1 Level 4 and Two-Hour Parking would make the flow more efficient for arrivals/departures.
- I like the idea of international terminal (+ domestic) with its own entrance/exit. Would like to reduce congestion at the main terminal. Though Portland is a small city, this kind of terminal is like most others with options to enter specific terminals based on your flight!
- This makes the best sense to me.
- The best option!

Rank 2 comments:

- Same reason as development path 1 – mountain sightline.

Rank 3 comments:

- This is better because no crosswind.
- Prefer scenario that includes upgrades to Concourse D.

Appendix B: Ongoing Engagement Exercise

outputs

The following are transcribed notes from the ongoing engagement exercise at PDX 2045 PAC Meeting 10.

1. What works well at PAC?

- Diverse representation in the committee
- Represents the Portland committee
- Representation
- Diversity and inclusion
- Diversity of thought
- Different backgrounds
- Having monthly meetings helps us keep momentum
- Daytime meetings preferred by some --> split between day or evening
- Time and place of meeting
- Meeting time and place very good
- Next level well organized meetings and well facilitated, time respected
- Dedicated person in the room watching for comments/questions online
- Having the flexibility of being in person or online
- In-person presence
- Format: like to have time for discussion/breakout sessions
- Breakouts
- Breakout sessions to dive deep
- Deeper conversation
- Breakout groups, allows deeper conversation and exposure to thoughts and ideas
- Breakout sessions
- Expertise presentation
- Expertise is very helpful
- Current updates
- Current updates
- Extracurricular activities
- “Extras” → tours really help see vision
- Extra-curricular
- Works well
- Opportunity to collab
- Working from an accessibility standpoint
- People like to have materials ahead of time

2. Who to include in CAC?

- Everyone
- Gen Alpha

- Younger demographic
- All 6 quadrants
- Separate seats for each Portland district
- Add seats for impact (example: Landing --Wilkes)
- Add leaders of culturally diverse community programs, youth voices, family voices, rural communities
- For agencies, need representatives who want to be there, not just there because they have to
- What are we asking the reps to do?
- Planning & design students
- Need to represent schools/universities
- Masters program rep/university
- PDX accessibility committee needs a seat
- Native Americans
- Indigenous
- Tribal government
- Clearer explain “business organization”
- Small to mid-size business population.
- Travel Portland?
- Business organization Portland Metro Chamber?
- Tourist/visitor services
- Travel – facing F&B/concession
- Representative → ensure enjoyable passenger experience
- All employee (passenger- facing)
- Creatives
- Artists
- Public art organizations

3. What does success look like?

- Clear communication
- Clear communication disseminated
- Clear channels to broadcast information and increase input from public”
- Helpful and consistent
- Actually present in community
- The time you take to create the committee reflects its success. The effort to create an inclusively represented group lends itself to softening inherent challenges.
- Strengthen the outcomes with diverse lens/viewpoint
- Less controversy, opposition if issues get resolution
- Guide thinking
- Strengthen the outcome
- Everyone appreciates feeling seen and heard
- Success may be more invisible in that “bad outcome” will always be noted more than “good outcome”
- Goals and action items
- Size of group is important → does it need to be as large as 30 people?
- Require careful selection of participants → nobody with a preconceived agenda

- Success would be having an engaged committee with members actively advocating for the areas they represent
- Important to have different voices
- A true representative/brand ambassador
- Group agreement to define who decision makers are
- Have primary and secondary attendees based on topics on agenda
- Option for people to rotate on/off
- Term limits?
- Cap on how often a company etc. is present
- Scrutinize expert ideas to litmus test them
- Reciprocity
- Success