



# AIRPORT FUTURES

CHARTING A COURSE FOR PDX

## Planning Advisory Group Meeting #4 Notes

Tuesday, January 15, 2008 5:00 pm – 8:30 pm  
Port of Portland Commission Room

### 1-28-08 REVISED DRAFT MEETING NOTES

#### I. Welcome –Sam Imperati

##### Announcements

Sam wished everyone a happy new year. He announced that Bill Blosser and Dave Smith both had to cancel their participation in this PAG meeting. Dave had a family commitment out of town and Bill is in London on a work assignment. Sam will both chair and facilitate the meeting.

##### Approval of December 18, 2007 Meeting Notes – Sam Imperati

No email comments were received on the draft notes. Sam asked if there were any changes and there were none. The December 18, 2007 Meeting Notes were approved.

Members	Affiliation	Present
Lisa Barton-Mullins	E. County/City of Fairview	
Erwin Bergman	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill Blosser	Chair	
Catherine Ciarlo	Planning Commissioner	√
Andy Cotugno	Metro	√
Tom Gerharter	Horizon Airlines	√
Cam Gilmour	Clackamas County	√
Alan Hargrave	Port of Camas/Washougal	√
Laura Hudson	City of Vancouver	√
Gloria Ibarra	FAA, <b>Alternate Present: Stan Alison</b>	√
Maryhelen Kincaid	N. Portland Neighborhood Services	√
Lt Col. Stuart Mathew	ORANG	√
Patrick Metzger	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	√
John Mohlis	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	√
Ross Monn	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Dennis Mulvihill	Washington County	√

Brian Nelson	Intel	√
Mary Olson	Port Commissioner	√
Jordan Papé'	Flightcraft	√
Veronica Rinard	Portland OR Visitors Association.	√
Hector Roche	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	√
Lawrence Russell	Coalition for a Livable Future	
Bob Sallinger	Audubon Society of Portland	√
Michael Sloan	Vancouver Neighborhoods	√
Dave Smith	Vice Chair	
Denny Stoecklin	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred Stovel	ONI	√
Vicki Thompson	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John Weigant	AIR	√
Travis Williams	Willamette Riverkeeper	

Staff & Consultants	Affiliation	Present
Joe Barden	Port's Aviation Consultant (HNTB)	√
Debbie Bishop	Port	√
Ben Blessing	Port	√
C.F. Booth	Port's Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
Mindy Brooks	City	
Bronwyn Buckle	City Planning Bureau	√
Chris Corich	Port Project Manager	√
Rene Dowlin	Port	√
Melissa Egan	Asst. Facilitator (ICM)	√
Jason Gately	Port	
Lise Glancy	Port	√
Geoffrey D. Gosling	City's Consultant (Principal, Aviation System Consulting)	√
John Gray	City	√
Bob Hillier	PDOT	
Nancy Hendrickson	BES	
Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Scott King	Port	√
Steve Johnson	Port	√
Sean Loughran	Port	√
Mary Maxwell	Port	√
Linda Perry	Jacobs Consultancy	√
Kama Simonds	Port	
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√
Chris White	Port	√
Joe Zehnder	Planning Bureau	

**Public Present:** Lee Perlman, Frank Howatt, Mitchell Berck (PAG alternate), Mike Bieniewicz (PAG alternate), Julie Wilson (EnviroIssues), Debbie Deetz Silva (PAG alternate), and Justin Moderie.

### **New Meeting Evaluation Form – Sam Imperati**

Sam passed out the new meeting evaluation form. He asked the PAG if they have any interest in having a meeting evaluation summary included in the notes. They do, and it will be included in the future.

### **PAG Membership Changes – Sam Imperati and Jay Sugnet**

- Denny Stoecklin has asked George Bruender to serve as his alternate. George will attend the February meeting.
- Travis Williams has informed us that he is unable to serve on the PAG due to family and work commitments. Jay has been in touch with the Coalition for a Livable Future to seek an environmental replacement. They have some names, are getting in contact with those folks, and will let the PAG know about any progress.
- Lisa Barton-Mullins is looking for an alternate. If folks know of anyone in East County who may be interested and appropriate, please contact Sam, Jay, Chris, Lise, or Lisa.
- Jay announced that they are seeking additional consultants to create a transportation model and perform a traffic impact analysis and are looking for any PAG members would like to volunteer to help select consultants. Please let Jay know.

### **Final Vision and Values – Sam Imperati**

There was no new action on this item, other than asking members to clean out their notebooks of all old copies. To help with this purging task, Lise, Bronwyn, Sean, and Debbie were available to take PAG member binders and clean them up.

Staff developed a visual of the Visions and Values, which will be posted at all PAG meetings.

### **Collaboration Principles – Sam Imperati**

Sam sent the document around for signing by all PAG members and alternates present. Once all signatures are collected, a copy will be distributed to the PAG.

At Sam's request, staff developed a board to highlight the Commitment to Community Principles from this document. This will also be posted at all future PAG meetings.

### **Agenda Change – Sam Imperati**

The discussion of the letter on high-speed rail written by Erwin Bergman was deferred to the Sideboard conversation on that subject.

## **Telephone Survey Follow Up – Sam Imperati**

Sam referred everyone to the meeting packet. There was a letter about the weighting of the Airport Futures telephone survey. One question was if the secondary impact area were to be reconfigured (after the fact), would the noise findings be any different? Staff and consultants are still evaluating this issue and will report back.

## **Subcommittee Reports – Sustainability (Cam Gilmour) and Forecasting (Dennis Mulvihill)**

### **Sustainability**

Cam Gilmour provided a brief report. They met on January 8 and there were 15 people in attendance. They started with “what is sustainability?” That question kicked off good discussion and there were different viewpoints represented for the subcommittee to consider. From there, they tried to flush out what kind of framework will be developed to determine how this work relates to and enhances sustainability. It will be complex, but ideally useful for decision-making. At this meeting, Erwin Bergman handed out an article on “growth vs. quality of life.” These and other subcommittee documents will be emailed to subcommittee members.

### **Forecasting**

Chair Dennis Mulvihill also gave a brief report. They met on January 9 and were joined by members of the sustainability subcommittee. John Weigant gave an illuminating presentation on the “limits of growth.” The subcommittee discussed key issues and trends relative to forecasting and they got their first peek at initial model tests. Dennis asked the consultants to come to the PAG meeting tonight because their presentation was very robust and stimulating. He asked consultants to report to the PAG regarding the input received from the subcommittee, PAG and public and how that input has been used in the forecasting process. The Aviation Forecast Subcommittee will most likely next convene at 9:30 a.m. on February 13 in the Port Building.

## **Study Area Boundaries – Jay Sugnet and Sean Loughran**

Jay asked folks to refer to Yellow Tab #3 for the Study Area Boundaries memo. This discussion was deferred from the December meeting. This evening, Jay and Sean wanted to update the PAG and gain approval to proceed with the boundaries as they are currently drawn, knowing that they may change with more information in the future. Staff did review and make slight changes to the natural resources study area based upon initial PAG feedback. The transportation study area boundaries have not changed yet, but staff will continue to study the issue and data, which could result in subsequent changes.

*Fred Stovel:* would like someone from DEQ to explain what the air shed looks like. If you consider it like a cap on the region, given airflow and other relevant factors, what is the effect of aircraft emissions in that space? He has heard one estimate that said the total annual emissions were equivalent to a day of driving, and that they were in the process of analyzing components. He thinks we should wait to hear from DEQ before we decide what the study area for air is.

*Jay Sugnet:* air quality is unique. We’ll look at what the airport generates compared to the region.

*Renee Dowlin*, Port of Portland from the audience: the Port works very closely with DEQ, so this information is mutually shared. For the Port's emissions inventory, we go up 3000 ft. Information on this topic will be presented as part of the follow-on studies phase.

After a bit more discussion, Jay asked the PAG if the project can proceed with these boundaries. The PAG said yes. Jay welcomed further input.

### **Planning Process Background/Sideboards – Sam Imperati**

Linda Perry presented several slides that documented how the input the consultants had received to date would be used in the various project phases. It can be found on the project website.

The key issues and trends identified by the Forecast Subcommittee, PAG, and public were:

- sustainability and climate change;
- national economic recession potential in the next few years;
- cargo leakage to other modes and airports;
- FAA and airport funding, plus their impact on general aviation costs;
- aircraft size (seating capacity);
- congestion at other airports;
- new market/airline services developed by Port;
- the challenge of distinguishing between policy driven decisions, operational matters, and assumptions that could affect forecasts;
- activity by very light jets (VLJs);
- the price of oil in general and as affected by increasing global demand;
- the dot-com bubble and burst.

Sam displayed a summary slide that described where each project assumption would be discussed in the project work plan.

Sam then referred the PAG to Attachment 4, the matrix of Sideboards, which includes PAG feedback and subsequent Staff Recommendations. He explained that the matrix was re-ordered, going from the least number of people voting 3 to most number of people voting 3. He further explained that the objective tonight was to discuss the far right column, the New Staff Recommendations. Sam recommended the following process: take items one at a time, see if there are any questions, briefly discuss and clarify as necessary, then take 1-2-3- vote on that issue. If all vote 1 or 2, then we have consensus. The difference is that we would not ask those who vote 2 what would be need to change to a 1. If you vote 3, it will be noted as a 3. We need 14 people voting 1 or 2 for a majority. Those voting in the minority can submit information for the minority report, which will be reflected in the Meeting Notes.

*John Weigant*: the whole purpose of sideboards could be to eliminate some of these. Some issues may need full discussion.

*Catherine Ciarlo*: by eliminating the discussion of 2s, are we eliminating quite a lot of helpful discussion?

*Sam Imperati*: perhaps.

*Catherine Ciarlo*: I say this only because discussion of 2s tends to be very informative.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* Agreed.

*Sam Imperati:* let's go, see how it works and we'll edit on the fly.

*(For recording purposes, vote totals will be indicated in parentheses after each Sideboard. There were 25 of 27 voting members/alternates present.)*

**# 10) Consider air quality?** PAG consensus vote on this item as follows: 1=25, 2=0, 3=0.

**# 12) Consider emission standards from jet aircraft?** PAG consensus vote on this item as follows: 1=24, 2=1, Bergman, 3=0.

**# 13) Consider noise impacts?** PAG consensus vote on this item as follows: 1=23, 2=2, Bergman, Sloan, 3=0.

*John Weigant:* there has been a lot of money spent on studies, and not much on action. Throughout the planning process, he'd like to look at the action that the Port or city may take.

*Chris Corich:* agrees with Weigant. There will not be a new noise study. If there are any holes in our understanding of the issues, we will try to fill them, but no new Part 150.

*Erwin Bergman:* wants to look at a study area other than FAA area. Noise is the principal concern to many. The purpose is not to identify the noise, but to identify areas that are incompatible with the noise.

**# 15) Consider water quality?** PAG consensus vote on this item as follows: 1=25, 2=0, 3=0.

**# 16) Consider deicing?** PAG consensus vote on this item as follows: 1=25, 2=0, 3=0.

**# 18) Consider economic development areas adjacent to PDX?** Majority (24) and (1) minority vote on this item as follows: 1=19, 2=5, Bergman, Ciarlo, Gilmour, Ballinger, Sloan, 3=1, Weigant.

*Bob Sallinger:* how does this tie into the Columbia Corridor Plan?

*Jay Sugnet:* There was concern about doing too much at once. We are still trying to move Columbia Corridor Plan forward, but the Airport Futures process had to come first. We are aware that this plan needs to fit into the Columbia Corridor Plan.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* expressed the concern that all neighborhoods be included.

*Jay Sugnet:* we are not restricted to industrial area for this, but the Columbia Corridor Plan is restricted to industrial areas. You'll see this as part of the inventory work we are doing.

*John Weigant:* economic development is a driver of forecasting, so to limit this to a sideboard seems not right. John moves to eliminate this from the sideboard process.

*Jay Sugnet:* does not see sideboards as limiting anything.

*Sam Imperati* – Andy, would you like to share Metro's perspective?

*Andy Cotugno* – Metro will be considering this in its planning

*Jay Sugnet* – it is a matter of making the best use of the land around the airport, assessing what the city can do to facilitate development of airport related uses on sites around PDX. We are focused on these issues, all the while bringing in sustainability principles and practices. Neighborhood economic development is important to us.

*Catherine Ciarlo*: to clarify her 2 vote, her concern is about natural resources areas in conjunction with economic development. She wants to see a little more definition on these brought to the PAG.

*Erwin Bergman*: pushing for additional economic development areas is in conflict with people's need for recreation and natural areas. This should not be ignored in a wild rush to develop areas for commercial and industrial uses.

*John Weigant*: His Minority Report is attached at page 14.

**# 8) Consider terminal alternative other than Centralized and Decentralized?** PAG consensus vote as follows: 1=25, 2=0, 3=0.

*Brian Nelson*: is there a relationship between centralized and decentralized terminal and a third runway?

*Chris Corich*: yes, both are part of alternative solutions we are developing and examining.

**# 11) Consider climate change?** PAG consensus vote as follows: 1=25, 2=0, 3=0.

*Bob Salinger*: some of these don't seem terribly aspirational. He wonders where there's room for this type of thinking here.

*Lise Glancy*: Climate change will be considered in forecast and sustainability recommendations. Also in evaluation of alternatives.

*Sam Imperati*: this will be part of key issues and recommendations.

*John Weigant*: "climate change" is a key word for sustainability. Treating this as a limitation in anyway does not seem right.

*Sam Imperati*: it seems like folks are not entirely clear that the 4<sup>th</sup> column, which we are currently discussing does, in fact, include PAG comments. Climate change is going to be considered..

**# 17) Neighborhood improvements not related to PDX impact considered?** PAG consensus vote as follows: 1=25, 2=0, 3=0.

*John Weigant*: doesn't think anyone's asking for improvements related to PDX? Not sure why this is a sideboard.

*Jay Sugnet*: intent is not to say we are not going to discuss, but to be clear that any mitigation required by the City must be proportional to the impact and meet any legal requirements.

*John Weigant:* what's an example of something not related to PDX?

*Lise Glancy:* sidewalks in neighborhoods.

*Chris Corich/Jay Sugnet:* we'll consider anything within the legal framework.

*Erwin Bergman:* mentioned devaluation of property by noise. Seems to him the Port should be required to compensate for that loss. Apparently, FAA money cannot be used for this, but some monies could be used as compensation. Parking, perhaps?

*Chris Corich:* parking money is Port/Airport money.

*Sam Imperati:* we'll discuss the merits of this issue at the appropriate time.

*Lise Glancy:* there will be a discussion of airport finances at the next meeting.

*Andy Cotugno:* would vote 2 because the oral explanation seems correct, but it doesn't say that in the document. The purpose of the discussion is to agree upon the scope of what we are going to embark upon. Let's build it into the work program.

*Sam Imperati:* will do.

Sam did a quick check in and asked for public input. There were no comments from the public and the PAG decided to proceed and break later.

**# 4) Consider building a replacement or supplemental airport?** Majority (24) and minority (1) vote by PAG as follows: 1=23, 2=1, Stoecklin, 3=1, Weigant.

*John Weigant:* this is really 2 issues. He thinks a supplemental airport needs discussion.

*Sam Imperati:* let's go first to questions for clarification of what staff is intending, vote, and then members can present their positions and reasoning.

*Fred Stovel:* is satisfied that we are considering leakage, but would like some study on encouraging leakage.

*John Weigant:* voted 3. In line with what Fred said, to have a regional approach, we should look at existing regional airports, which are not focused on passengers. PDX focusing on passengers, the high-value option should be considered.

Weigant to send in minority report.

**# 5) Consider shifting traffic to other airports?** Consensus vote by PAG as follows: 1=23, 2=2, Ciarlo, Weigant, 3=0.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* is interested in looking at shifting traffic to other airports.

*John Weigant:* market forces can have a significant impact on how traffic moves around.

**# 7) Will City Council consider approving a third parallel runway in the land use plan?** Consensus vote by PAG as follows: 1=23, 2=2, Bergman, Weigant, 3=0.

*Stan Allison:* (Gloria Ibarra's FAA alternate) is there a term, as in time limit, on a land use plan? Is there a threshold for change that would necessitate a change in the current plan?

*Jay Sugnet:* Seven to 10 year life for the conditional use. The legislative land use plan is not time limited. It allows a certain envelope of building, but a large amount of unanticipated growth would trigger an additional review.

*John Weigant:* the issue is whether or not there is a fatal flaw in the third runway planning. If the City Council is not told there's a 3<sup>rd</sup> runway in the works but the Port proceeds, then we are cheating the people of their process.

*Sam Imperati:* looks like this is covered in the New Staff Recommendations.

*Chris Corich:* a third parallel runway could very well be the outcome of this process, but in 1999, we were not there.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* she represents Planning Commission, will educate them; and they will, in turn, educate the City Council on this.

**# 14) Consider nighttime curfew?** Consensus vote by PAG as follows: 1=25, 2=0, 3=0.

*Laura Hudson:* are you totally discounting the curfew?

*Chris Corich:* at this point, yes. There is no chance of this being approved now. We'll continue to track the issue nationally, but that's where it is at.

Due to time constraints, the remainder of the discussion was deferred to the next meeting. The Sideboards left for consideration at the February 19, 2008 meeting are:

- 2) Consider moving the military off PDX?
- 3) Consider moving air cargo to another airport?
- 6) Consider the possible third parallel runway?
- 9) Will there be a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review of the master plan itself?
- 19) Consider moving or piping the Columbia Slough
- 20) FAA compelling capacity improvements
- 21) Wildlife, and
- 22) Technological changes.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* if folks know they are voting 3, then she would like to have this sent out in advance of next meeting.

*Sam Imperati:* an off-line process will be done to try to make this happen.

### **Aviation Forecast Discussion and Methodologies** – Linda Perry

Sam referred the PAG to Attachment 5, the Climate Change Memo, as well as the PPT Linda Perry put together which synthesizes key issues and trends that emerged from the Forecast Subcommittee discussion, a review of initial model tests, and forecast scenarios. He then introduced Linda Perry, who presented the slides, which can be found on the project website.

Linda discussed the initial model test and results. She explained that the dependent variable (e.g., total domestic enplaned passengers) is what is being tested by the independent variable (e.g., the cost of oil). “Dummy” variables are independent variable used to account for structural changes in the industry. In their initial model test, they used the impact of 9/11 and the impact of low of establishing cost service, in this case Southwest at PDX, as dummy variables. They are looking at the question of if these impacts diminish over time or is there a consistent impact? To get the best results, when choosing the variables to include in a model, the objective is to have variables that operate independently of each other. For example, one would not want both U.S. GDP and Portland/Vancouver incomes because they are related. The bottom line is that more variables are not always better!

To clarify a term the PAG will see frequently, Linda explained that “yield” typically means profit for unit of investment. In aviation, it means fare revenue per passenger mile, that is to say, the average price someone pays to fly one mile. It is used as a measure of the cost of travel to passengers. This does not capture net profit. Yield takes the distance factor out and allows for better comparison.

In summary:

1. The final model will likely include socioeconomic and cost of travel variables.
2. Consideration of other (secondary) key issues and trends will be in terms of how they affect the primary variables
3. Available, reliable data limits model construction and consideration of other key issues and trends.

Next steps:

1. Input from Subcommittee on Initial Model Results, Preliminary Findings, and Forecast Scenarios
2. Selection of Final Model
3. Preparation of Passenger and Cargo Forecast Scenarios
4. Definition of Probability Distributions of Independent Variables

## **Discussion**

Sam asked that the discussion be in two parts. First, any questions for clarification PAG members may have for Linda. Then, he a check-in from the PAG re: “are they getting it.” That is to say, do the consultants properly understand the issues raised by the PAG?

*Tom Gerharter:* how do you take into account size of aircraft?

*Linda Perry:* we take demand and translate it into operations based on size of aircraft and their load. In addition, to understand the potential for VLJs (Very Light Jets) in Portland, we have to come at that particular issue from a different angle.

*John Weigant:* re: slide 16. Two of these don’t make sense to him. It seems like increase in income and increase in population would give different results than you indicate here.

*Linda Perry:* We tried it different ways, this one worked the best. We want a model with elasticity, maybe there’s a reason for less impact - lower cost airlines lowering the whole bar, etc.

*Fred Stovel:* would like further explanation of growth in enplanements re: income growth.

*Linda Perry:* history and projections of data comes from Metro.

*Andy Cotugno:* agrees with Fred. The model will help us with contingency planning, which is basically what this is about: if A happens, we do B; if C happens, we do D.

*Vicki Thompson:* how do you take into account projected airline mergers? Decrease in cost of labor due to renegotiation of contracts? How do you project all this?

*Linda Perry:* by funneling those factors through the cost of travel. Several contract re-negotiations are coming up in the near future; decreasing capacity (limiting supply) of airlines; we can increase the cost of travel through yield. Over the long haul, Portland traffic is becoming more sensitive to fluctuations.

*Tom Gerharter:* following 9/11, we saw a lot of changes.

*Linda Perry:* that's part of deciding on the model – do we want to factor in “external events” and how?

*Linda Perry:* United has gone on the record saying they are not buying any more aircraft until they are profitable. On the domestic side, they're not at full capacity. On international side, they are definitely adding capacity.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* are you going to look at international aspects? And, you said US domestic yield is comparable to Portland, but there are very big differences between different airports.

*Linda Perry:* when you look at US domestic yield and PDX yield, they rates are comparable – *in terms of explaining variation in traffic*. This is why they are using national data. If they had 31 years of Portland specific data, they would definitely use that data. They do not; there is only 17 years of data for Portland. Concerning domestic and international travel: this will be broken down. If you add one international flight, it makes a big difference which must be accounted for.

*Andy Cotugno:* is now the time to think about seasonality? Time of day?

*Linda Perry:* we will deal with that later with derivative forecasts.

*Tom Gerharter:* how do you factor in air traffic capacity?

*Linda Perry:* that is more a facility issue, which occurs later in the process. It is not necessarily a forecast issue.

At this point the discussion came to a close. We had 5 minutes left; Sam asked if the PAG wanted to tackle the next sidebar concerning high-speed rail and Erwin Bergman's letter. A majority voted to proceed.

**# 1) Consider high-speed rail?** Majority (24) and minority (1) vote by PAG as follows: 1=20, 2=4, Ciarlo, Gilmour, Sallinger, Thompson, 3=1, Bergman.

*John Weigant:* high-speed rail could be considered a separate carrier, perhaps going down the I-205 corridor instead of downtown. Much easier that way, instead of trying to get the right of way rights downtown.

*Catherine Ciarlo*: would like to see the response talk about more than connecting to high speed rail. She'd like to see some discussion of how we might encourage the development of high-speed rail beyond simply considering it as part of the forecasting phase. That issue was placed on the PAG Potential Recommendation Board.

*Erwin Bergman*: the Port identified some intermediate improvements, but will postpone a true high-speed rail system. All this does is create something with a dead end and postpone what is needed. This is not a practical approach.

Erwin will submit his minority report.

**Erwin Bergman's Letter on High-Speed Rail** (1=6, Bergman, Metzger, Monn, Sloan, Stoecklin, Stovel, 2=5, Gilmour, Hudson, Mohlis, Sallinger, Weigant, 3=13, Ciarlo, Cotugno, Gerharter, Hargrave, Kincaid, Matthew, Mulvihill, Nelson, Olson, Papé, Rinard, Roche, Thompson)

Erwin wrote the letter to avoid discussing language and multiple drafts. He wanted to bring it to the attention of the political leaders so they can begin planning to avoid a crisis situation. High speed rail will provide a supplemental system that does not rely on non-renewable fuels. He describes the issues in an attachment to the letter, which reflect very much of what Geoff Gosling said in his memo. While Erwin wrote it, he'd like the entire PAG to have the credit for this, should we see positive results.

*Maryhelen Kincaid*: she is actually supportive of high-speed rail, but not of this process. She is concerned that we are setting a precedent here, that if every member did this, such issues will take up a lot of time.

There was no majority in the vote, thus individuals can sign it as individuals if they so choose.

## **Final Business**

Chris Corich drew the PAG's attention to a letter from Governor Kulongoski on the military at PDX. This is related to Sideboard # 2, which will be discussed at the next meeting. He asked everyone to please read it and noted we would be sending the Port's response letter soon.

Sam asked everyone to please complete his or her meeting evaluation forms, noting the feedback makes a difference.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 19 in this room.

## **Policy Issues: Ongoing List**

We will keep a running list of policy issues that emerge from PAG discussions. They will be noted during the meetings and tracked in the last section of the notes.

1/15/08, Meeting 4 High speed rail funding and planning (Ciarlo and Bergman)  
Everyone was thanked for their participation and advance review of the materials.

## **Adjourn**



To: Fellow PAG Members:  
From: John Weigant, AIR representative  
Date: 01/13/2008  
Re: Comments on the sidebar issue #18, Development of economic development areas.

At the January forecasting committee meeting, I gave a presentation on an emerging paradigm shift from one of growth (including economic development) to one of sustainability. I observed these two paradigms are in fundamental conflict, since physical growth forever cannot be sustained. A key is population growth, both locally and globally. As planners for the Airport's Future, we have a responsibility to *think globally, and act locally*.

The usual purpose of economic development is to create jobs for local people. However, in a society where people are free to move, there is rarely an assurance the jobs will be reserved for local people. In general, population forecasting focuses on the number of jobs expected at some future time, adjusted by labor force participation rates and unemployment rates, to determine the population needed to fill the jobs. In short, jobs drive both the population and the economy, both of which are drivers of air travel projections.

Economic development areas are policy issues that will help determine the future population, economy, and in turn demand for air travel. Projected impacts should be inputs to policy makers to help decide what policies best serve the region. With different scenarios, policy makers can set policy to further their goals. At issue, therefore, is the timing of economic development policy consideration. Economic development options should be considered in the forecasting phase. To *assume* there will be economic development activities, to be considered in the last step of the process, creates a self-fulfilling prophesy. It is an abrogation of correct procedure. What should happen is that any projected economic development actions should be developed as inputs into the alternatives analysis phase, not as outputs from it.

There are limits to the complexity we can consider in forecasting, but if economic development areas are to be considered at all, they should be considered at a point where they can be sources of policy information about *if*, and not just *where*. *If* is a much more fundamental question. Even so, it should not be difficult to project the air travel needs of populations of different sizes, and to offer different population sizes as options open to policy decisions.