

**Planning Advisory Group Meeting #11**  
**Tuesday, January 20, 2009 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm**  
**Draft Final Meeting Notes**

**Announcements, Approval of Meeting Notes, Agenda Review and PAG Action Items – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati (Attachment 3)**

Bill Blosser welcomed everyone to the PAG meeting, noting we have not met as a full group since October 20, 2008. He hopes everyone enjoyed this very special Inauguration Day and our goal is to expedite tonight's meeting, if possible. Because the November PAG meeting was canceled, we have added another meeting to the calendar – **February 17, 2009**. Please mark your calendars for this meeting.

Bill introduced Lai-Lani Ovales, asking her to say a few words about herself. She is a member of Planning Commission and will be replacing Catherine Ciarlo on the PAG.

**Lai-Lani Ovales** is the Indigenous Organizing Coordinator at the Native American Youth and Family Center. She is here to learn and to represent Native Americans, as well as the Planning Commission. Portland is the 9<sup>th</sup> largest urban Native American population in the United States. She is honored to serve. She has heard from Catherine and Jay about all the work the PAG has done thus far, and she is working to catch up.

Bill then acknowledged Mary Maxwell, who will be retiring at the end of March.

*Mary Maxwell, from the audience:* is impressed with the strong attendance and high level of engagement of the PAG, and thanks everyone involved. She is looking forward to a product we can all be proud of.

**Approval of Meeting Notes – Bill Blosser**

No changes were requested. The Meeting Notes from 10/20/08 were approved.

**Announcements and Agenda Review – Sam Imperati**

Sam continued with additional announcements and agenda review.

- Erwin Bergman will not be making comments on sustainability at this meeting, but will be given time at our 2/17 PAG meeting.
- All PAG members should complete their Annual Process Evaluation form and turn into Lise Glancy.
- New binders available! Staff will re-organize your binder for you if you like. Please leave it by the door and you can pick it up at the next meeting. Alesia Reese suggested that a CD version of the PAG Notebook might be a good idea.
- Vision PDX – won national award for “Best Public Involvement,” kudos to Bronwyn Buckle! Thank you for your work and being part of the team.
- Brian Nelson from Intel is back with us tonight. He has been living in Malaysia on a special assignment, and has traveled to many places in SE Asia, including Singapore, Thailand and Beijing. PDX is still his favorite airport! He will be back on sabbatical next month, and then back in March for good.

Sam reported that the subcommittees have been very active in these past three months, and we will hear about their work tonight. The bulk of the meeting will be spent on a mid-term process review from the Master Plan perspective, the Land Use perspective, and from the PAG process perspective.

Members	Affiliation	Present
Lisa <b>Barton-Mullins</b>	E. County/City of Fairview <b>Alternate Mark Clark in attendance</b>	√
Erwin <b>Bergman</b>	Central NE Neighborhoods <b>Alternate Eric Meyer in attendance</b>	√
Bill <b>Blosser</b>	Chair	√
Lai Lani <b>Ovalles</b>	Planning Commissioner	√
Andy <b>Cotugno</b>	Metro	√
John <b>Frevola</b>	Flightcraft	√
Tom <b>Gerharter</b>	Horizon Airlines	√
Cam <b>Gilmour</b>	Clackamas County	√
Alan <b>Hargrave</b>	Port of Camas/Washougal	
Chris <b>Hathaway</b>	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership	√
Laura <b>Hudson</b>	City of Vancouver	
Gloria <b>Ibarra</b>	FAA <b>Alternate Stan Allison in attendance</b> (Jim Fisher to replace Gloria Ibarra and Stan Allison)	√
Maryhelen <b>Kincaid</b>	N. Portland Neighborhood Services	√
Lt Col. <b>Stuart Mathew</b>	ORANG	√
Patrick <b>Metzger</b>	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	√
John <b>Mohlis</b>	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	√
Dennis <b>Mulvihill</b>	Washington County	
Brian <b>Nelson</b>	Intel	√
Mary <b>Olson</b>	Port Commissioner	√
Alesia <b>Reese</b>	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Veronica <b>Rinard</b>	Portland OR Visitors Association	√
Hector <b>Roche</b>	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	√
Lawrence <b>Russell</b>	Environmental Justice	√
Bob <b>Sallinger</b>	Audubon Society of Portland	
Michael <b>Sloan</b>	Vancouver Neighborhoods	
Dave <b>Smith</b>	Vice Chair	√
Denny <b>Stoecklin</b>	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred <b>Stovel</b>	Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Vicki <b>Thompson</b>	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John <b>Weigant</b>	Airport Issues Roundtable	√

Staff & Consultants	Affiliation	Present
Joe Barden	Port's Aviation Consultant (HNTB)	
Debbie Bishop	Port	√
C.F. Booth	Port's Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
Mindy Brooks	City Planning Bureau	√
Bronwyn Buckle	City Planning Bureau	√
Chris Corich	Port Project Manager	√
Renee Dowlin	Port	√
Melissa Egan	Assistant to Facilitator, ICM	√
Jason Gately	Port	√
John Gray	City Office of Transportation	√
Lise Glancy	Port	√

Nancy Hendrickson	City Bureau of Environmental Services	√
Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Scott King	Port	√
Sean Loughran	Port	√
Mary Maxwell	Port	√
Linda Perry	Jacobs Consultancy	
Phil Ralston	Port	√
Kelly Rodgers	David Evans and Assoc.	√
Dennis Sandstrom	Port	
Kama Simonds	Port	√
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√
Chris White	Port	

**Public and Staff Present:** Duane Decker, Bruce Fisher (new FAA PAG representative), Linda Robinson (Public Involvement Subcommittee), Karen Munday (Audubon), Lee Perlman, and Kelly Sweeney (Public Involvement Subcommittee).

**Sustainability Subcommittee Report and Policy Statement Discussion – Sean Loughran and Cam Gilmour (Attachment 4)**

Attachment 4 is the Sustainability Policy Recommendations as proposed by the Sustainability Subcommittee and staff. We have reviewed this at prior PAG meetings, but have not had PAG action. The meeting in November produced the Policy Statement. The Subcommittee believes it reflects comments and ideas from the PAG. They wanted it to be as readable as possible, concise and to the point.

Bob Salinger emailed his comments to the PAG, which hopefully everyone had a chance to read. He has concerns and made four or five points. Sean put Bob's comments up on screen, and Sam distributed paper copies of the email, see below. Next, Sean Loughran will address those points.

**Bob Salinger's email comments**

Audubon does not support this document as written. It is in our opinion unclear and provides almost no guidance to the committee or the community as to how sustainability concepts should inform our decision-making or even as to what those sustainability concepts might be. Specifically we have the following concerns:

Recommendation # 1: The definition of sustainability assumes that we can meet the region's air transportation needs with compromising future generation's livability or quality of life. What if it is not possible to both? How do we deal with situations where meeting the region's air transportation needs conflicts with livability and quality of life (for example generating increased pollution and removing habitat in the community surrounding the airport) ---this document provides no insight into these types of questions. I would recommend a cleaner definition of sustainability such as the following: "Sustainability is defined as actions and decisions which do not compromise future generation's livability, quality of life AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH" There is no reason to include language regarding meeting the region's air transportation needs in the actual definition of sustainability.

Recommendation # 2 and # 3: These are pretty weak statements—basically we are saying that we will "consider" sustainability and we will "balance sustainability" with other objectives, but there is no clear commitment in these statements to actually achieving anything in terms of sustainability. These recommendations could be much stronger if in fact there is a real commitment to sustainability.

Recommendation # 4: This is probably the most significant section of the document since the "sustainability criteria" are what will be used to evaluate alternatives. However, the document provides no detail about the sustainability criteria or how they will be applied. In my opinion this should have been the focus of this document-the rest is really just window dressing. I would suggest significantly expanding this section.

Subcommittee Proposal: Not sure how this connects with the recommendations above. It reads a bit like a preamble and it really doesn't say very much. The first line about sustainability being a global issue reads like a disclaimer. The line about the Port showing leadership and making PDX the most sustainable airport in the world is good as an aspirational statement. The final line seems to go back to a balancing test that promises nothing other than that sustainability will be considered...along with lots of other things.

Sorry to be harsh, but this document in my opinion makes no real commitment to sustainability. It is a lot of verbiage, much of it vague and ambiguous and some of it contradictory, that basically amounts to a commitment to consider sustainability...along with everything else. We do not see the type of fundamental commitment that we were hoping for and which is at the core of the city's planning objectives moving forward.

*Sam Imperati:* Bob was unable to attend tonight's meeting, Karen Munday is here from the Audubon Society. In deference to Bob, we are simply looking for comments and will withhold voting.

*Karen Munday, from the audience:* just here to listen to discussion and answer questions if she can.

Sean responded with the following points:

- 1) The intent of the Sustainability Policy Statement was to provide broad level recommendations and the aspiration of the subcommittee that PDX be the most sustainable airport in the world. The PAG and subcommittee have both spent a lot of time on this issue, and "meeting the region's air transport needs" has been central to the discussion from the start. As always, we are striving for balance.
- 2) Bob asserts they are "pretty weak statements" with no clear commitment to achieving anything on behalf of sustainability. It has always been the intention of the City and Port to make a clear commitment to sustainability in our approach to this project. Further, It was the subcommittee's and PAG's intention to make a clear commitment to sustainability, our Vision and Values clearly state this, and that intent has not changed. We will monitor our progress going forward.
- 3) Sustainability criteria – As we will discuss this evening and have been reviewing with our various subcommittees, our initial assumptions, in terms of selecting between alternatives, have certainly changed and we are now beginning with the centralized alternative as our working assumption. At this point, given our proposed process for moving forward, we will not be screening to centralized and decentralized alternatives using our sustainability criteria. However, the sustainability criteria developed through the subcommittee and city/port sustainability work group are still meaningful and useful and will be used going forward as we map out how sustainability is addressed in the master plan.

*Fred Stovel:* Bob suggests there are measurable criteria/goals. Does the Audubon Society have anything they care to share with the PAG? He was at a loss when he read this comment, did not see any specific recommendations.

*Karen Munday, from the audience:* Audubon does not have any broadly applicable or transferable criteria.

*Sean Loughran:* has received a number of pieces of info, for example from Veronica on sustainability in the tourism industry and C.F. with respect to airline industry. We are gathering more and more information to incorporate into our plans around sustainability. He thinks that is what Bob is looking for, and that while we are not there yet, we are going in the right direction.

*Eric Meyer, Erwin Bergman's alternate:* on behalf of Erwin, he totally agrees with Bob's letter. Feels the present needs are not the future's needs. The devil is in the details, also it is important to consider whose needs are being prioritized.

*John Weigant:* If we substitute “highway transportation needs” in this statement, we would come away with the fact that we have not given enough attention to the broad impact that is going to be needed.

*Denny Stoecklin:* while not discounting Bob’s comments, he thinks the subcommittee has done good work and is in support of their approach.

*Chris Hathaway:* not sure about #3. Would like clarification.

*Bill Blosser:* good question! He would like to note that #1 and #3 are on the placemat in front of you as part of the Vision and Values we agreed to in the beginning of this process, and which serve to guide this process.

*Sam Imperati:* the next step is members of the Coordinating Committee will meet with Bob between now and next meeting to see if the policy statement ought to go back to subcommittee for vetting and then back to PAG. As Bill just said, the Vision and Values were designed to balance the Environmental, Economic and Social aspects of PDX’s impact on our communities. Is the PAG ok with the next step?

PAG: yes.

*Bill Blosser:* encourages attendance at the next Subcommittee meeting so folks can weigh in given this discussion and your engagement in this issue. Some of the questions raised by Bob should really be discussed as they will guide our sustainability benchmarks, land use plan, and master plan.

## **Public Involvement Subcommittee Report – Hector Roche**

### Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS)

The OPIS’s primary focus is on the development of a recommendation to share with the PAG on the future public involvement committee to follow Airport Futures. To date, they have reviewed 20+ case studies of ongoing committees at the national and local levels. (If anyone would like to receive the PPTs summarizing this research, please let Lise or Bronwyn know.)

Based on this research and our subcommittee members’ own experiences, we are discussing:

- Scope and purview (what would the group focus on – what would the key charge function be),
- Sponsorship of this group might be (who would establish this body – City, Port, regional),
- Authority (would this be an information body, an advisory body, or a decision-making body),
- Membership (size and composition at a general level), and
- Resources (budget, staffing, etc.)

This is an iterative process, we will develop scenarios, and folks can weigh in on them. Then the Public Involvement Subcommittee will bring something back to PAG on 17<sup>th</sup> so folks can get a sense of direction. Please join us on January 28<sup>th</sup> for our next meeting.

### Annual PAG and Public Involvement Evaluation

The PAG was reminded to please fill out their evaluation and leave with staff at the end of the meeting. This evaluation helps us improve our public engagement processes/efforts. We will summarize the results from this at our next PAG meeting on 2/17.

At our 1/28 Public Involvement Subcommittee meeting, we will be discussing Membership and Resources and look at some potential committee models. This meeting will be from 6-9 pm at the East Portland Neighborhood Office. All are welcome to attend.

## **Master Plan / Sustainability Subcommittee Report – Sean Loughran**

The Joint Sustainability and Land Use Subcommittee was created to assist with balancing the overlapping content of these two issues. It made sense at this point in the process. The meeting on November 18, 2008 was a success in terms of joining these two groups with about 30 persons attending. The upcoming Mid-Term Process presentation was the focus of this meeting; folks concur with it.

## **Land Use / Transportation Subcommittee Report – Fred Stovel**

Met on 12/10. Also, had to look at mid term review and the 10 step process memo. Additional updates:

- The Transportation Impact Analysis consultant will be selected by end of week
- The Economic Development Inventory consultant is on board and began work
- Natural Resources work is progressing - Jay will provide some details as part of the City's Land Use Plan discussion coming up next

The next subcommittee meeting is on January 29<sup>th</sup>; please join us as we dig deeper into the City's Land Use Plan.

## **Mid Term Review and Process (Attachment 5 and 6) – Chris Corich, Jay Sugnet and Sam Imperati**

Sam began the presentation saying that large scale planning projects such as Airport Futures benefit from a mid-term review. We have completed a significant volume of work, to date, represented by the Vision and Values, Project Assumptions, Inventory of Existing Conditions, Forecast, and Facility Requirements. This is a valuable opportunity to assess what we have learned and where we should go from here.

In this presentation, we will propose a step-by-step plan for the remainder of the Airport Futures process. It was designed to be responsive to the comments received at the last two PAG meetings, the combined Sustainability and Alternatives subcommittee meeting on November 18, and the Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee on December 10.

## **PDX Master Plan - Chris Corich**

Chris presented several slides concerning the Master Plan, describing where we started, where we are today, and how staff and consultants recommend we proceed.

### Slide 9: Initial Project Assumptions

- a) Two airport terminal alternatives
  - Goal: Recommend alternative that best meets the Region's air transportation needs without compromising livability and quality of life for future generations.
- b) 3rd Parallel Runway
  - Included in both terminal alternatives

### Slide 12: Initial Project Assumptions

#### 3rd Parallel Runway

- Need outside 25 year planning period

#### 3rd Parallel Runway Agreements

- Port will not seek City Council approval to build 3rd the runway in City Land Use Plan
- Do need to complete a planning level review of impacts of potential 3rd Parallel Runway
- City Land Use Plan will detail a land use review process for a potential 3rd Parallel Runway

Slide 13: Work Plan Assumptions Evolution  
Major Driver of Evolution – the Forecast:

	<u>2000 Plan</u>	<u>2010 Plan</u>
Forecast Year	2020	2035
Passengers	27m.	27m.
Operations	485,000	378,000

Slides 14 and 15: Approach for Moving Forward

- Completed Work: Facility Requirements (50th Percentile Forecast)
  - Significant change in aviation industry and assumptions about sustainability = significant change in required facilities
  - Existing airfield can accommodate forecast demand and maintain level of service with no major modifications
  - Required passenger processing facilities can be accommodated within boundaries of the existing passenger terminal complex
- Begin Alternatives Analysis with Centralized Alternative
- Consider levels of activity greater and less than the 50th Percentile Forecast
  - Importance:
    - Sustainability
    - City long term land use planning
  - Majority of work based on 50th Percentile Forecast
  - High level analysis of 90th and 10th Percentile Forecast important for land use process and airport planning.
  - Port and City support potential PAG recommendations related to *preserving options* for a 3rd Parallel Runway or both terminal alternatives for future generations to decide.
  - Does not imply even tacit approval of those long-range concepts.

Slides 16, 17 and 18: Moving Forward – Why consider the broader range of probability expressed in the forecast?

- Planning for a Sustainable Future:
  - Need to constantly evaluate how decisions we make today might limit flexibility to address issues in the future.
  - Leave future planners with a range of options.
  - Conditions change.
  - Future PDX Master Plans.
  - Future changes to City Land Use Plan.
- Decisions made before next Master Plan have long-term implications for future airport development options.
  - Intersection improvements at 82nd & Airport Way
  - Location of future rental car facilities
  - Location of General Aviation
- Forward thinking planning has paid off in the past
  - Pedestrian tunnels in parking garage built with moving sidewalk pits installed but covered – until now.
  - High capacity transit right-of-way planned and built into I-205 facilitated Max to PDX.

Slides 19, 20 and 21: Key Assumptions for Moving Forward

- Start with the Centralized Terminal Alternative
  - Cost (\$1 billion difference)
  - Phasing (far less complex in terms of relocations and new facilities)
  - Environmental Impacts (measurable difference between alternatives)
  - Efficiency (more efficient movement of aircraft)
  - All relate to the overarching goal of sustainability
- Confirm that Centralized Terminal will work at 90th percentile levels

- Reiterate: No 3rd Runway needed for 2010-2035 Master Plan time frame
- Consider impacts of potential 3rd Parallel Runway and strategies as to how those impacts might be avoided, minimized or mitigated
- Evaluate how a future decision on a 3rd Parallel Runway might be made within context of City Land Use Plan
- Military Status Quo
  - Military leasehold property not needed for terminal or cargo development in 2010-2035
  - Cost of relocation very high
  - Uncertain future
  - Potential new master plan, change to existing plan

## Discussion

*John Weigant:* the Port traditionally looks at projects when need is demonstrated; he still finds the 2035 deadline to be a little awkward (a vertical line), because what we need to consider is level of service (a horizontal line). We should probably plot the bar out and look at what current technology would look like, and its impact on the threshold. Instead of 2035 deadline, we could shift our perspective and look at the 50% to see where it crosses the line, and then we can see when we'd need to do certain things. It will provide a longer term focus, may help with sustainability.

*Chris Corich:* agrees that 2035 is an arbitrary deadline, but rather than trying to come up with a new forecast, we will use the 90% that came out of our forecasting process. We have looked how different technologies will impact demand. Proposes that we will go where you want to go, maybe just a different way.

*C.F. Booth:* on the activity, the project is driven by activity, not by time. We are trying to divorce our activity from time. There will be triggers that will trigger development; we will identify them. Effects of technology, for ex., we spent time explaining what is coming down the pipe for ticketing, air traffic control, etc. We have done our best to take these into account. Argues that we are actually doing what John is proposing.

*Sam Imperati:* what John is saying is in addition to, not replacing. The forecast is based upon Metro data, so can you just draw that line out (that would be statistically correct) or would we need to do a new forecast?

*C.F. Booth:* yes; there's a wide range of time that you can hit the horizontal line.

*John Weigant:* suggests the line is upward sloping;

*C.F. Booth:* you are right, capacity is changing.

*Sean Loughran:* an example is what we did looking at the airfield, you'll see how we assessed the airfield with no changes; and then, we show the incremental additions of various technologies. It is in the new binder, the facilities requirements CD.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* wants to understand the 10% - 90% options. Are we now saying 90% could happen within 2035?

*Chris Corich:* we felt it was a simplifying thing for presentation.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* feels extremes do not happen, so has concerns about this.

*C.F. Booth:* in a traditional MP discussion, you would never have this discussion, the forecast is the forecast. Here, we are taking an approach to plan for 50% but test solutions for 90%. We do not want to

skew the world to accommodate 90%, but do want to see the ability of the key elements of the plan to accommodate 90%, to see if all the pieces fit in space available. If we find 90% doesn't work, it doesn't mean we stop, but it will give us information to help with decision-making.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* she is just worried about citizens understanding.

*C.F. Booth:* he is trying to use the same principles that Chris mentioned earlier, that some forward-thinking planners made space for the later addition of Light Rail on I-205. We want to emulate that.

*Sean Loughran:* to be clear, we are *planning* for 50%, but *testing* for 90%

*Sam Imperati:* for messaging to your constituencies, it may help to think of the 90% and 10% as a "what if" exercises.

*Hector Roche:* agrees that how we discuss this with the public is very important

## **City Land Use Plan – Jay Sugnet**

### Slide 24: City Land Use Plan

Policies, objectives, and implementation strategies that include:

- development code language
- a development review process
- a plan amendment process for future Port master plan updates
- an ongoing public involvement strategy

### Slide 27: 1. & 2. Comprehensive Plan Amendments

*What policy amendments are needed to reflect the work of the PAG?*

- *Transportation, Economic Development, Natural Resources, Noise, etc.*

### Slides 28, 30 and 31: 3. Plan District

- Replaces Conditional Use permit as the regulatory structure
- Allows airport growth (within a building envelope or growth threshold)
- Specifies review processes (approval criteria and mitigation requirements)
- Includes site development standards
- Lists uses
- Relates to OPIS – what development decisions are reviewed by the OPIS, the City, or both
  
- *What is an appropriate building envelope or growth threshold?*
- *What triggers should be in place?*
- *What types of projects would benefit from input from the community and/or review by the City?*
  - *Stumptown Coffee lease, reconfiguring a concourse, new short term parking structure, 3rd parallel runway*
- *What are the appropriate Plan District site development standards? (e.g., landscaping, floor area ratio, setbacks, etc.)*
- *What uses are allowed, limited, conditioned, or prohibited in the Plan District?*
- *What are the Plan District review procedures, mitigation requirements, and possible approval criteria for airport development projects?*

### Slide 32: 4. Height Overlay

- *What adjustments are needed to the current height overlays for better safety and coordination?*
- *Should the City expand the height overlay to include a potential 3rd parallel runway?*
  - *What are the opportunity costs in terms of lost development potential or housing units?*

Slide 33: 4. Noise Overlay

- *Should the City extend density or use restrictions to areas beyond the 65 DNL?*
  - *Should the City and Port consider noise metrics other than DNL?*
- *Should the City constrict or expand the noise overlay?*
  - *Opportunity costs in terms of lost development potential or housing units?*
  - *Existing homes impacted using the various noise metrics, etc.*

Jay feels that the height overlay will not be significant, but the Noise Overlay will.

Slides 35 and 36: 5. Natural Resources

- Update the City's natural resources inventory for the area around the airport
- Bring the area into compliance with State and Metro requirements
- *What landscape standards are needed to balance stormwater management, habitat protection and wildlife hazard issues?*
- *What are the priority restoration/mitigation sites in the watershed?*
- *What are the restoration priority areas that will improve the overall health of the Slough?*

Slide 37: 6. Community Agreements

- *How do we memorialize the good ideas and decisions?*
- *What is appropriate for development code and what is appropriate for formal agreements?*
- *What is the periodic progress reporting process?*
- *What are the OPIS elements?*
  - 1) *Scope/Purview*
  - 2) *Sponsorship*
  - 3) *Membership*
  - 4) *Resources*
  - 5) *Authority*

**Discussion**

*Alesia Reese:* we discussed at what point can we bring the public with us in this journey. How can they, in her committee, bring them with us? How effective have we been? Doing concrete work and ideas and involve our constituency...how do we do that with this discussion? She feels she needs a little bit of direction for the public involvement piece.

*Jay Sugnet:* This is partially what Sam will discuss in the 10-step process. We are still working on the detailed timing of broader public input, but natural resources is a great example; we will soon be at a stage where we need to share a draft inventory with property owners and the general public. It will happen, so please "trust us."

*Lise Glancy:* we will develop a partial timeline for open houses, and will look at natural resources. Also, there is going to be a critical time to get input from stakeholders. We are always looking for ways to make this a more collaborative process.

*Alesia Reese:* "when we have something more concrete to share," it might be too late. She does not want to present a product, wants them to be part of a process.

*Chris Corich:* Sam will be discussing this in his part of the presentation.

*Alesia Reese:* wants to hear from constituencies now, not at the end.

*Sam Imperati:* you will see folks will be brought along the way.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* “this group” or “the City” ...explain.

*Jay Sugnet:* when he says “the City,” he is referring to a formal review process. This group will see more than the city.

## **Break**

*Stan Allison:* wanted to make an announcement, the he has been promoted to Assistant Manager of the Seattle District Office. With him is Bruce Fisher, who will be replacing Stan on the PAG.

**Bruce Fisher:** has been hired as Stan Allison’s replacement to cover Oregon and Idaho. He was a contractor for runway safety and has airport management experience, including working on a master plan for Renton Airport, and worked for many years with the Coast Guard. He is also a pilot.

## **Ten Step Process – Sam Imperati**

Next, Sam introduced the Ten Step Process, which was designed to take feedback from PAG ....a method to make what/if analyses

Slides 41 – 49 Proposed Ten Step Process Plan

### **Step One: Begin Analysis**

- a) Start with Centralized Terminal and no 3rd Parallel Runway working assumption
- b) Conduct fatal flaw assessment of the core passenger terminal complex area using the 90% percentile forecast for testing purposes only
- c) If some element of the Centralized alternative will not meet the 90th percentile needs at a LOS comparable to the existing LOS, then:
  - i) Consider modifications to Centralized layout, or
  - ii) Test Decentralized alternative
- d) Begin developing the airport development concepts using the 50th percentile forecast with a detailed look at the facilities, impacts, terminal, general aviation, cargo, access, parking, airfield, intersections, noise, natural resources, cross-field taxi way, and RON parking
- e) Start analyzing elements of sustainability and environmental issues and continue throughout the process
- f) Simultaneously analyze impacts of traffic, noise, and natural resources using the forecast 90th and 10th percentiles at a high level to inform the City’s Land Use Plan on issues like: near-term actions, long term planning process elements, noise, transportation, height restrictions, natural resources, and the 3rd parallel runway
- g) Begin development of Land Use Plan and the Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS) in Step Four
- h) Consider the appropriate follow-on studies during each of the following steps, and

- i) Result: 25% Plan Detail Completion with possible staff and subcommittee charrettes, open house, subcommittee, and PAG input

**Step Two: Check Emerging Concepts against Prior Work**

Ask, to what extent, if any, should we change the emerging development concepts (At 25% Plan Detail Completion) after reevaluating the facilities assumptions, the facilities requirements, project sideboards, and continuing our sustainability work?

**Step Three: Test High (90th percentile) and Low (10th percentile) Growth “What If” Scenarios**

- a) Ask, to what extent, if any, could changes be made (At 50% Plan Detail Completion, which includes the work on traffic, land acquisition needs, etc.) in order to preserve options for the long-term future accommodation of:
  - i) Decentralized Terminal
  - ii) Third Runway
- b) Based upon results post staff and subcommittee charrettes, public meetings, subcommittees and PAG, explore placement of: cargo, GA, military, airlines support, and airport support.
- c) Should the PAG’s final report to the Port and City include policies and recommendations that preserve the options for a 3rd parallel runway and both terminal options for future generations to decide (i.e., height overlay, noise overlay, road right-of-way, etc.)
  - i) If yes, what are those recommendations? (i.e. what actions and when would they take effect) This will involve an exploration of the associated opportunities and risks.
  - ii) If yes, any such recommendation would not need to imply even tacit approval of a 3rd parallel runway or terminal concept.
  - iii) If yes, should PAG recommend actions now or defer those actions for later consideration as part of the Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS)?

**Step Four: Fine Tune Land Use Plan and Ongoing Public Involvement Elements**

Staff and the PAG will be close to final drafts of the City’s Land Use Plan and a Post-PAG, Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS.) Topics include:

- Natural Resources
- Height Overlay
- Noise Overlay
- Plan District
- Comprehensive Plan Amendments
- Transportation
- Mitigation Strategies
- Negotiated Agreements to memorialize good ideas
- Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS)
  - *Goal/Scope/Purview*
  - *Sponsorship*
  - *Membership*
  - *Resources*
  - *Authority*

**Step Five: Final Check: Sustainability and Forecast**

Ask, to what extent, if any, should we change anything (At 75% Plan Detail Completion, which will include the balance of the facilities requirements needed.) based upon a final “sustainability” check and final review of the forecast.

**Step Six: Final Refinement, Development Phasing Work, and Cost Analysis at 90% Plan Detail**

## Completion

**Step Seven:** Financial Analysis

**Step Eight:** Final Recommendations on Port's Master Plan and City's Land Use Plan

**Step Nine:** Plan Documentation including Airport Layout Plan (ALP) set, Master Plan Technical Report and Executive Summary Report

**Step Ten:** Final Approvals

## **Discussion**

*Brian Nelson:* are we really doing a 10% analysis?

*C.F. Booth:* short answer, no.

*John Weigant:* slide 41 and 45. Look at some other alternatives, for example, a reliever airport, as well as no-build.

*Sam Imperati:* this would be looked at in the Project Sideboard review, Step 2.

*John Weigant:* so it is still an option to be considered in Step 3.

*Chris Corich:* we will look at it.

*Jay Sugnet:* this is the other reason to look at 10%; it's basically a "no build" option.

*Mark Clark:* thinks folks want to see a guarantee that sustainability will not suffer due to growth increases.

*Sam Imperati:* you can bring up this issue in Step 3 (c) (i) – "associated opportunities and risks"

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* I have not heard anything in the process about dual stream departure. Are you going to bring this up in Land Use?

*Sam Imperati:* we will have to talk about this when we talk about what if the 90% materializes. We know that the FAA would never let us jump to a new runway without squeezing all capacity.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* many people probably do not even know what dual stream departure is, she feels like it is the elephant in the room.

*Chris Corich:* we will be looking at dual and triple stream. These are at the above 400,000 operations.

*Sean Loughran:* 50% operations forecast as the airfield exists physically today, with noise abatement rules, has the capacity to meet our 2035, 378,000 forecasted operations capacity. We do not get to look at any of these things unless we look at 90%.

*Alesia Reese:* does this process include an outside audit or peer review?

*Chris Corich:* not budgeted and traditionally it has not been done.

*Jay Sugnet:* this is another reason we have the TAP from other agencies, and there is interest from outside this project. There is a tiny bit of Geoff Gosling's time we could request.

*Sam Imperati:* the FAA does its own independent forecasting, and they will speak up, as well.

*Sean Loughran:* feels the critical piece was the forecast, and that is why we had the peer review during that phase. Feels like we have great confidence that we set the table correctly.

*C.F. Booth:* in addition to the FAA, we have the airlines participating.

*Lise Glancy:* and we have the public, as well.

*John Weigant:* currently the FAA prohibits “demand management” does our current 425,000 reflect demand management?

*Chris Corich:* its not a tool we have today, folks are talking about it, and we ought to have it in our sustainability recommendations.

*John Weigant:* if in the next 25 years, that demand management will be

*Mary Olson:* please explain demand management.

*John Weigant:* demand management means that currently there are no restrictions on airlines for when they can set their schedule, so at crowded times, they pay the same to land/take off. With demand management, you can vary landing fees to impact demand during peak times.

*Fred Stovel:* they also talk about a lottery, where you get your time and you (the airline) cannot change.

*Andy Cotugno:* would like to know all the steps to go through if you really did want to do the third runway – would like to know what those steps are. Some will cost money and some will be simply information. Feels this would help the PAG.

*Eric Meyer:* Colwood impact?

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* or any land acquisition?

*John Weigant:* are the two options he said being added?

*C.F. Booth:* wants clarification on what John means by “other options”.

*Sam Imperati:* no build is part of scope of work; de facto 10% is essentially the no build option.

*Bill Blosser:* clarify “other”...

*C.F. Booth:* we are going to look at this and tell you what we think, and what other ideas we have, and consult the Port and you on how to proceed. Right now it’s impossible to know exactly what that will be.

*Sam Imperati:* to frame it up: adding Step One, C, iii, adding “other” as a place holder for these concepts and questions; on the feeder airport issue, we will again look at the Project Sideboards.

### **Public Comment – Sam Imperati**

Before we proceed with the vote, Sam asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

**VOTE: should staff and consultants go forward with the process as presented today?**

*Chris Hathaway:* to be sure he understands the vote, basically he sees that you have put together a great process, thought about it, assessed where we are at, and made some changes?

*Bill Blosser:* exactly. We re-tooled and are ready to proceed.

**All members present voting 1, except Eric Meyer, abstaining to consult with Erwin.**

**Next Meeting Agenda, Process Review and Other Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation Form and Adjournment – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati**

*Bill Blosser:* the next PAG meeting is on February 17 from 5:30 to 8:30. Land Use and Public Involvement will be the main issues.

The Public Involvement Subcommittee for its meeting on 1/28. It is a very important meeting, working on the OPIS. The location is: 1017 NE 117<sup>th</sup> Avenue, in former Hazelwood Water District Building – look for the water tower, a little south of Halsey.

Sam asked everyone to please turn in their Meeting Evaluation forms and the PAG/PI evaluation form.

Happy Inauguration Day!

Adjourn.

***Please see next page for Meeting Evaluation Summary***

