



Planning Advisory Group Meeting #5
Tuesday, February 19, 2008 5:00 pm – 8:30 pm
 Port of Portland Commission Room

2-25-08 FINAL MEETING NOTES

Welcome – Dave Smith

Dave Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting. He announced that Bill Blosser in Abu Dabi, U.A.E. on a work assignment. He sends his regrets.

Announcements – Dave Smith

We have some alternates representing PAG members today:

- 1) George Bruender is representing Denny Stoecklin. George has served on a variety of committees, including Chair of the Land Use Committee for the NE Neighborhood Association. He has been involved with these issues for many years.
- 2) Stan Allison is with us again representing Gloria Ibarra, FAA.
- 3) Gene Hahn is here in place of Tom Gerharter. Gene is with Horizon Air Flight Operations. He has been to a Forecast Subcommittee, and tonight is his first time with the entire PAG.

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 (Left Early)	√
Tom Gerharter	Horizon Airlines, Alternate Present: Gene Hahn	√
Cam Gilmour	Clackamas County	√
Alan Hargrave	Port of Camas/Washougal	√
Laura Hudson	City of Vancouver	
Gloria Ibarra	FAA, Alternate Present: Stan Alison	√
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 (Arrived Late)	√
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 Alternate Present: George Bruender	√
Fred Stovel	ONI	√
Vicki Thompson	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John Weigant	AIR	√

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: Jim Edelson (Oregon Interfaith Global Warming Campaign), Frank Howatt, Lee Vander Voo (media), Lee Perlman (media), Amy Cleary, and Jim Howell

Overview of PAG Accomplishments to Date and Today's Key PAG Decisions – Dave Smith

Dave recapped the PAG's accomplishments to date and highlighted key decisions we hope to make during tonight's meeting. We are officially ¼ of the way through our process.

To date, the PAG and its subcommittees have accomplished the following:

- Adopted Collaboration Principles – These principles represent our agreements about how we will work together as a group.
- Adopted Visions and Values – They will guide the process, provide the foundation for the sustainability framework, and be used to evaluate the project alternatives.
- Got two of the subcommittees up and running
- Gave approval to proceed with the study area boundaries
- Got a common understanding of the background factual and regulatory issues
- Considered extensive community outreach
- Conducted and explored a telephone survey
- Approved key project assumptions (a.k.a. project sideboards) noting where they will be addressed in the planning process. (Will complete the remaining eight today.)
- Identified Key Issues – Will be considered in the Facility Requirements, City Land Use Proposal, and Alternatives Analysis
- Identified Key Trends and Issues for the Forecast - The forecast model and scenarios reflect this input and are more robust, as a result.

Dave noted that tonight's key decisions will be:

- 8 Remaining Project Sideboards: Final discussion and action
- Military Lease Extension
- Forecasting: Are we on the right track?

Meeting Notes – Dave Smith

The PAG was asked for any additional changes to the meeting notes from last month. No changes were brought up by the PAG. Sam made a clarification that came from off-line comments regarding making clear that the Portland Planning Commission advises the City Council. The notes will be changed to reflect that. The January 23, 2008 meeting notes were approved with Sam's correction.

Follow-up on Airport Futures Survey – Sam Imperati and Scott Drumm

Sam reminded us that at the December meeting, Riley Research presented the telephone survey results. PAG Alternate Eric Meyer and a member of the public asked if the secondary impact area could be expanded to reflect the noise impact area from PDX. Sam introduced the Port's Scott Drumm to address this question.

Scott Drumm explained that Riley Research was not able to collect sufficient data in the secondary impact area, which lead to statistically invalid results. He said in the primary impact area, they were able to collect 30-40 responses; in the secondary area, they only got maybe 10. Thus, the margin of error was too great to draw meaningful conclusions.

Fred Stovel: Eric Meyer raised the question of *weighting*. What was the statistical effect of the weighting? Did it dilute the responses? If you've been making a lot of noise complaints, then is the impact greater? That is what he was trying to get at.

Chris Corich: the responses were statistically invalid in the secondary area, correct?

Scott Drumm: correct. We'd done more sampling in the noise impact area than in the general population. Based on this question, we did go back and look at the weighting, and it did not change the meaning of the results. There was only a 1 or 2% point difference.

John Weigant: it might still be interesting to still see the results, even knowing they are not statistically significant.

Sam Imperati: for your reference, much of this is covered in Attachment 3, "Weighted Cross-tabulations," from our January meeting.

Collaboration Principles – Sam Imperati

A couple of PAG members and alternates have not had the opportunity to sign our Collaboration Principles. It was passed around for signatures, noting that PAG members should sign on page nine and alternates sign on the back. Final version will be circulated when we have all signatures.

Erwin Bergman's Letter – Sam Imperati

Erwin has agreed to make a couple of changes to his January High Speed Rail letter to reinforce that the letter does not represent the feelings of the PAG as a whole, but rather individual members of the PAG. The final version and a track change version were circulated for those PAG members who would like to sign.

Sustainability Subcommittee Report – Cam Gilmour

Cam Gilmour, the Chair of the Sustainability Subcommittee, gave a report from their 2/14/08 meeting. He learned more than he ever thought he could in a couple of hours. Sustainability has not been applied as a goal in any airport planning process, so we are breaking new ground. The methodology being recommended is an analytic hierarchy process; it was illuminating to apply the methodology to examples (e.g., Sam's son choosing a college) to show that as a model it can be applied broadly. Using a Venn diagram with the criteria that the PAG is looking at (social, economic, environmental factors); the overlap in the center is the area of sustainability.

Lawrence Russell: is there any way to have evening meetings? He is unable to come during the day, but would like to participate.

Cam Gilmour: thank you for letting me know, we can discuss it.

Six-Month Process Evaluation of PAG – Sam Imperati

At the outset, project staff committed to conduct a process evaluation at the six-month, year, and two year marks in the planning process. We are at the six-month point and tonight. The Port and City want this to be a meaningful check-in and candid narrative comments are appreciated. The PAG members took a few minutes to fill out the form. Feedback from these forms will be share at our April 15 PAG meeting.

Public Involvement – Jay Sugnet

Jay Sugnet: when the Sustainability and Forecast Subcommittees were proposed, a Public Involvement Subcommittee was also proposed. There was insufficient interest from the business community representatives at the time, so we brought an ad hoc group together to work on the telephone survey. We are now at the six-month point and want to re-visit the establishment of an official Public Involvement Subcommittee. Is there interest from any business reps in joining this effort?

Hector Roche: despite not having a business interest represented, Hector feels we should have this subcommittee.

Jay Sugnet: feels it is important to have the regular check in on public involvement issues that a formal subcommittee would provide.

Maryhelen Kincaid: Debbie Dietz-Silva, her alternate, works for a business and serves on the Board of Directors for the Columbia Corridor Association, a business association. Is that too much of a stretch?

Jay Sugnet: it is preferable to have an actual PAG member.

Hector Roche: several of us have expressed interest.

John Weigant: on the IGA committee, he was surprised by the requirement to have balanced coverage with business, government, and citizens. He's concerned that this could be not done because no businessperson wants to volunteer. How about some balance on the Coordinating Committee? Right now, it is primarily government. He agrees with Hector that it is important to get it going now.

Jay Sugnet: will send email to whole PAG with an open invitation.

Forecast Exercise – Sam Imperati

Sam asked the PAG to please take 4 - 5 minutes to fill out a Forecast Scenario worksheet. The consultants will take this information, compile it, and present it at the next meeting.

Other Business – Dave Smith

At the last meeting, we started a running Policy Issue board to track issues that may not be ripe for discussion. This list is not limiting. Bill Blosser suggested that we remind you that we have agreed we can reopen any policy issue if we learn something new during the process or change our mind.

PAG Members in the News - Erwin Bergman was recognized for winning the Columbia Slough Watershed Award Neighborhood Advocate Leadership Award and Ross Monn for the Portland Tribune article on the coyotes in his backyard.

Remaining Planning Process Sideboards – Chris Corich, Jay Sugnet and Sam Imperati

Sam referred the PAG to Attachment 3, the result of the PAG triage. Nine members responded. Sam went over the document to explain the layout and refresh our collective memory on the evolution of this sideboard process and matrix. For tonight, the process will be to go over any questions for clarification on each sideboard, then go into our 1-2-3 voting.

#3, moving cargo (1-2-3 vote results: 21 members present, 21 voted 1)

Lawrence Russell: would like more information and explanation of this issue.

Chris Corich: does not see major impacts. In general, industry responsiveness and market factors address this.

Linda Perry: agrees. We are not going to be able to have a lot of control over what the market does.

John Weigant: thinks every time staff says they are going to look at an issue and monitor it, that we deserve some feedback.

Chris Corich: we can do that.

John Weigant: has no problem with this issue, just the accountability aspect.

#19, moving or piping the Columbia Slough [1-2-3 vote results: 21 members present, 20 voted 1, 1 voted 2 (Bergman)]

Chris Corich: the 2000 plan did not recommend piping the Slough; wildlife could be affected and that is a concern. Right now, there is no plan to pipe the Slough, and we would rather not. Should the 3rd runway go forward, we would have to revisit this issue.

Erwin Bergman: the wildlife habitat should be considered initially as part of looking at the facilities, even if the 3rd runway does not materialize.

Sam Imperati: the current plan has this issue discussed in the Land Use Plan and Alternatives Analysis, does that not go far enough for you?

Erwin Bergman: correct, it should be discussed in the facility planning. He agrees with Bob Sallinger's comments that were sent out this morning via email.

Catherine Ciarlo: to clarify, I assume that when we talk in the alternatives analysis, we will talk about facilities, right?

Chris Corich: yes, we can talk about it in both places.

Catherine Ciarlo: she very much supports considering these two things together.

Jay Sugnet: facilities phase is not going to be designing facilities; it is just to consider what we may need.

Catherine Ciarlo: going back to our Values statement, avoid first, then we mitigate. Avoidance is key to discuss in the facilities.

Chris Corich: it is a two-way street in his mind; the more we can talk about safe aviation and protecting the environment, the better.

John Weigant: fully agrees with Bob Sallinger's email.

Maryhelen Kincaid: in the neighborhoods, what are the city codes concerning wildlife management? She wants to make sure the land use plan coordinates and lines up with city code.

Erwin Bergman: we will be looking at one or two new terminals; the Port could argue for a larger terminal. This does set the stage for a new runway. What we see is incremental impact upon incremental impact. We want to avoid impact.

Chris Corich: agrees.

Stuart Mathew: what would drive a facility requirement concerning the Slough? How do you avoid something without the facility requirement?

Chris Corich brought out a visual of a decentralized alternative to explain all the impacts that must be considered with a new facility. Its not just wildlife, there are many factors.

C.F. Booth: when it comes time to formulate requirements, we need to be very careful to not prejudice the alternatives. If we need to process X number of passengers, we'll look at where we can do that without any new building first. Chris explained it well.

#9, NEPA analysis of the Master Plan (1-2-3 vote results: 21 members present, 21 voted 1)

Erwin Bergman: there's no federal funding in the Master Plan, so it does not require NEPA. The end result is there is no need for NEPA.

#6, 3rd Runway [1-2-3 vote results: 20 members present (Andy Cotugno left), 20 voted 1]

Fred Stovel: we may discover a cap to growth because the impacts are more than we are willing to accept. Which is similar to Erwin's comments about incremental impacts, you cannot allow growth incrementally without ever examining the impacts. It will be a constant worry that we may not understand the impacts of development because we cannot look far ahead enough.

John Weigant: yes, we will consider a 3rd runway, and he hopes it is considered in the City planning.

Jay Sugnet: agrees.

John Weigant: if the 3rd runway is going to occur, then it will require extensive and time consuming planning with the City to address the human and environmental impacts. He does not happen to believe that it will ever materialize. As much as he was upset when it hit the podium, he is now at ease.

#20, FAA Compelling Capacity [1-2-3 vote results: 20 members present (Andy Cotugno left), 20 voted 1]

#21, Wildlife [1-2-3 vote results: 21 members present, (Mulvihill arrived) 19 voted 1, 2 voted 2 (Bergman and Ciarlo)]

Sam noted this is a new sideboard that has not been discussed previously. The comments we have made pertain to this issue, as well.

Catherine Ciarlo: the previous discussion covers this. For clarity of purpose and process, she would like a written document saying because we are considering this in X phase, does not mean we are not considering it in Y phase.

Sam Imperati: we are gathering all the information from the various versions of the sidebar matrix to get a current version of the status of each of these issues. This will be available for the April meeting.

#22, Technology Changes [1-2-3 vote results: 21 members present, 20 voted 1, 1 voted 3 (Bergman)]

John Weigant: is concerned that we are being too linear, just moving from step 1, step 2 without looking back to evaluate.

Public Comment – Sam Imperati

Sam invited any interested member of the public to comment.

Jim Edelson of the Oregon Interfaith Global Warming Campaign addressed the PAG. He has been involved in Forecast Subcommittee and is very concerned about global climate instability. He thanks the Port and consultants for being so responsive. Mr. Edelson thinks that perhaps the Airport Futures project has not fully grasped the issue of emissions. He would like to send a direct message to Bill Wyatt and the Governor: no explicit measurement of emissions has been done, or is planning to be done, and he thinks that should happen. There are several policy options; what is being done in the European Union could serve as a model. Mr. Edelson thanked the PAG and looks forward to continued involvement.

Military Lease Extension [1-2-3 vote results: 21 members present, 9 voted 1 (Bergman, Ciarlo, Gilmour, Mohlis, Monn, Roche, Russell, Stovel, Weigant), 12 voted 3 (Barton-Mullins, Hahn, Hargrave, Kincaid, Mathew, Metzger, Mulvihill, Nelson, Olson, Pape, Bruender, Thompson)]

The issue was, “Should the PAG provide input to March 12 Port Commission on Lease Extension?”

To give the PAG background, there were three PowerPoint presentations from Chris Corich, Stuart Mathew and John Weigant discussing military and lease extension issues. The PAG was referred to Attachment 4 for further elaboration of these issues.

Chris Corich: The Port has always included military’s presence at PDX. The number of take-offs has been declining. PDX has 267,000 takeoffs and landings annually; the military, approximately 10,000. From a planning standpoint, it does take 210 acres, which is significant. This is something we want to talk about with the PAG. Concerning the lease, the cost to move military is a huge negotiating point. The airlines are not likely to want to pay one billion dollars to move the military. Flexibility is the key for planning in Portland.

From an Airport Futures perspective, there will be extensive discussion with PAG and public on location of the military. It will be part of the Alternatives Analysis. Chris’s perspective is that the lease is not the big issue. The Commission welcomes any comments, as a group or individually.

Lawrence Russell: wants to hear more about the lease.

Sam Imperati: this will be covered after the sidebar discussion.

John Weigant: seems to him that the lease extension is a simpler issue.

Maryhelen Kincaid: is not clear on why we are even discussing it, doesn't seem to be in the scope of PAG. It seems to be a broader topic and that they are having a Commission to discuss this.

Stuart Mathew: Thanked Maryhelen, she said it very well. The PAG and a lease negotiation are two different aspects of planning at PDX. The Port will not bind itself to any lease that would preclude any centralized or decentralized options. The PAG is a planning body; we work on the Master Plan for the Port and the City Land Use plan. The Port is very well aware that future costs of relocating military would have to be considered. For more detail on why we want the lease, please see the email Stuart wrote, which is in Attachment 4.

John Weigant: An extension of the military lease is not appropriate at this time; it should be tabled so we have time for planning. John thinks we have responsibility to do contingency planning. It is important for our planning process to know that most decisions are not local, they are federal. The decision to close a base is "99% federal." He feels that probability of closure is 95% within the next 5 years. This is the trend in the military. So, by the time we get a lease agreement, there is a strong possibility that the military will be gone by then. Jobs seem to be the biggest cost to us locally. He recommends no action, feels that waiting will resolve the problems.

Sam asked if there were any questions for clarification on what was presented by Chris, Stuart, John.

Hector Roche: wants to know what is being discussed and decided at the March 12th Commission meeting?

Mary Olson: as Commissioner, we are going to have presentations by military as to why they are asking for this extension. It is an informational meeting. There are no decisions for the Commission until a final proposed lease is presented, which will take time. Both processes will go on. The public can come and comment. Given the fact that the Governor has asked us to consider this, the Port will do so.

Jordan Papé: question for John Weigant: it seems like current lease is small and lacks detail, and certainly does not reflect the values of the PAG. In your view, what's the downside of discussing a new lease?

John Weigant: as a former planner, he thinks we have to keep options. Until there is a demonstrated need, the Port would be wise to basically sit on its hands.

Jordan Papé: the military cannot do any capital improvements without a lease?

Stuart Mathew: we need to have 25 years left on a lease. So with 21 years left, it is looked at as lacking longevity.

Maryhelen Kincaid: has problem basing any kind of decision based on conventional wisdom. Given that, she would like to know what were the sources for John's presentation?

John Weigant: Port data.

Maryhelen Kincaid: this should not be based on political opinions about the military, and she thinks what we have heard are opinions. To clarify the noise issue, single event level is different from constant drone of noise. Sam Adams commissioned a study of North Portland noise – the results

showed that trains and I-5 were the top two, airport noise was something like 25th on the list – it was not in the top ten. She can get this if folks are interested. She is currently not comfortable with making a decision now based on what we know.

Hector Roche: posed a lease clarification question to Stuart Mathew.

Stuart Mathew: even though it is a barebones document (a “legacy lease”), we are still bound by all pertinent laws and environmental standards.

Erwin Bergman: agrees with John Weigant, we can wait on this issue.

Catherine Ciarlo: question for Chris and Mary Olson: the scenario she is concerned about is a lease that ultimately drives decisions that we are not in agreement with or do not plan for. Also, should military activities contract or decline, then will there be accommodations for that in the lease?

Chris Corich: your point is well taken. That has happened before, where the military does return land to PDX. We will try to focus on getting a good lease deal that does not tie our hands in the future.

Fred Stovel: we have heard enough new information in the PAG that an extension of the lease would preclude a decentralized terminal. Airline and passengers are not willing to pay for things they consider to be non-essential. We are used to deals being made behind closed doors and then being brought to the Commission for a vote, so he really appreciates the openness with which this is being discussed.

Erwin Bergman: to add to Maryhelen’s comments on noise and F22s being louder than F15s. The European Union has completed a study of 5,000 individuals, which found that when noise occurs, blood pressure is elevated even while people are sleeping.

Sam Imperati: is there a motion?

Catherine Ciarlo: moves to urge Port to keep maximum flexibility.

John Weigant: seconds that motion.

Mary Olson: the staff is going to go forward with discussions with the military to extend the lease.

Catherine Ciarlo: she’s not saying “do not continue with the lease negotiations,” she is saying continue with the values we have discussed and agreed upon, and with the intention of keeping maximum flexibility in the lease terms.

Stuart Mathew: what you are saying is keep open all possible options regarding planning.

Catherine Ciarlo: we cannot anticipate all possible options, but within what we can do, creating a lease that keeps public interests and alternatives in mind.

Stuart Mathew: that seems more like policy than planning. He’s admittedly partisan on this issue. What is the PAG’s role in terms of approaching the Port Commission?

Maryhelen Kincaid: needs clarity, too. Should we provide input?

Sam Imperati: to summarize and clarify Catherine's motion, he recapped that the motion was in response to the question "Should the PAG provide input to the March 12 Port Commission on the Military Lease Expansion." The motion was: yes, the PAG should provide input and the input should be to consider maximum planning flexibility when engaging in lease negotiations with the military.

Maryhelen Kincaid: again, she is back to the role of PAG.

Brian Nelson: if that is our input, then we should vote no input, because that is what they are doing. He does not think we are qualified to make any other input.

Jordan Papé: noted that the PAG wavers between being academic or activist in nature. He sees us as more academic, and does not want to veer into an activist role. He does not want the work of the PAG to limit the Port Commission. He thinks its PAG's role is to essentially play catch on this issue and then figure out what to do.

John Weigant: there is important land use planning down the pike, so we should not make decisions that would preclude future decisions.

Sam Imperati: asked the PAG to vote on Catherine's motion by show of hands. 9 members voted 1 and 12 members voted 3. There was no majority per the PAG's adopted Collaboration Principles. (A majority is defined as a majority of all voting PAG members, not just those present. A total of 14 votes is required for a majority vote.)

Chris Corich: the message has been sent. A Commissioner is here and your voices will be taken into consideration in the process.

#2, Military [1-2-3 vote results: 20 members present (Cam Gilmour out of room), 19 voted 1, 1 voted 3 (Weigant)]

Forecast Presentation – Linda Perry

Brian Nelson: from his participation on the Forecast Subcommittee, he feels it is very valuable information and that there is not enough time.

Dennis Mulvihill: agrees.

Chris Corich: the Port staff will be giving the FAA briefing at the Seattle regional office of the Airports Division.

The PAG agreed that this is too significant to handle in the remaining 15-20 minutes. The presentation and discussion will be set-over.

Next Steps – Chris Corich

Given the lengthy discussion of military issues, we are now a little behind schedule, but we will make up this ground. There is no PAG in March, but there are two public meetings: March 18 – Downtown Portland at the Port Building and March 19 – Vancouver at Hudson Bay High School (NOTE: These dates have been changed to April 8 and April 9. See project website for public meeting locations.). Further details will be sent out.

Jay Sugnet: at the April meeting, we had hoped to get the PAG's agreement on a Forecast, so we will have to re-think that. We will get back to the PAG on that.

Sam Imperati: it would be great if PAG members were present at the public meetings. There is also the March 20 final Forecast Subcommittee meeting (NOTE: The Forecast Subcommittee meeting has been moved to April 8 from 2-4 pm.)

Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation, and Adjournment

Mary Olson: is really concerned that we did not get to the Forecast portion of the agenda. She feels we need to stay focused, that tonight, we got off topic. The PAG has got 19 of these meetings that we are all committed to and there is a lot to accomplish. She suggested that if a PAG member feels strongly about an issue then he or she needs to come prepared to express him or herself concisely in one shot.

Hector Roche: shares Mary's concerns about accomplishing what we have set out to, but feels differently. He sees three important roles for the PAG, only one is accomplish tasks. The other two are process and relationships. He thinks the PAG accomplished a lot tonight in the latter two roles, and hopes we do not minimize it even though we did not get through the entire agenda. Working in a large group on an important issue is about more than attending to every item on the agenda.

Dennis Mulvihill: he feels that the group did a good job of handling a hot button issue, and does not think there is anything predictable about planning how long these things can take. We had good conversation and he fully agrees with the spirit of Hector's comments.

Sam Imperati: asked who would open to a mini-PAG meeting for a Forecast update in March?

Sean Loughran: March 20 is the next Forecast Subcommittee meeting; perhaps it could be a joint meeting? We will have just finished the public involvement meetings. (NOTE: These dates have been adjusted.)

Sam asked the PAG to please complete evaluations. Project staff will re-group and be in touch with PAG members with a plan for attending to the Forecast update.

Meeting adjourned.

Notes respectfully submitted by the ICM, Inc. facilitation team.

Please see next page for Meeting Evaluation Summary

1. OVERALL MEETING QUALITY: Poor Fair Good Very Good Excellent
 RESPONSES: 1 4 6 6

2. PACING: Too Slow Just Right Too Fast
 RESPONSES: 5 5 6 1

3. PRESENTATIONS: 1 3 5
 RESPONSES: 3 7 4 1

4. MATERIALS/DOCUMENTS: 1 3 5
 RESPONSES: 1 7 7 2

5. DISCUSSION: 1 3 5
 RESPONSES: 1 4 2 5 2