

Remaining Project Sideboards

PAG Numeric Results From February Triage

Members	2 Military	3 Cargo	6 Third Runway	9 NEPA	19 Slough	20 FAA Compelling Capacity	21 Wildlife	22 Technology Changes	Process
Barton-Mullins									
Bergman									
Ciarlo	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Cotugno									
Gerharter									
Gilmour									
Hargrave									
Hudson									
Kincaid	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Matthew	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Metzger									
Mohlis									
Monn									
Mulvihill									
Nelson	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Olson									
Papé									
Rinard									
Roche									
Russell	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
Sallinger	1	1	2	2	n/a	2	3	1	n/a
Sloan									
Stoecklin									
Stovel	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	n/a
Thompson	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	n/a
Weigant	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	1
Williams									
# of 3s	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
# of 2s	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	0
# of 1s	5	7	5	7	7	7	7	8	6

N/A = No Answer Given. Blank = No Response

Remaining Project Sideboards

<p>Topic (Material from the Far Left Column of Attachment 4 from the January Meeting) Presented in Order of Prior Voting</p>	<p>Vote</p>	<p>Questions for Clarification</p>	<p>Reason for Voting Three</p>	<p>Staff Response</p>
<p>#3. Move Air Cargo to Another Airport: Will moving air cargo operations to another airport to provide more capacity at PDX be considered?</p> <p>Consideration will be given to whether market forces might add or shift cargo to other airports (leakage) within Oregon and Washington. The future level of air cargo activity at PDX is dependent on numerous other variables related to local and regional demand for goods (e.g., the future of air-dependent industries in the region, the cost of other transportation modes). We will look to existing research to help inform the discussion of how air cargo is considered in the Forecast phase (Key Issues and Trends). The forecast data related to cargo will then be used to establish Facility Requirements and be further examined in the Alternatives Analysis.</p> <p>Air cargo activity is dependent to a great extent on national and international air traffic patterns and the availability of necessary air cargo infrastructure (not only aircraft ramp, taxiways and runways, but also good surface transportation connections). There are inherent operational reasons why the large cargo aircraft and small cargo feeder aircraft need to be co-located. While we will not consider the forced relocation of existing cargo needs, in an effort to maintain flexibility and keep options open well into the planning horizon and beyond, Airport Futures will consider, in the Alternatives Analysis phase, how and where PDX could accommodate the cargo needs as we currently understand them.</p> <p>There currently are weight-based landing fees for all commercial aircraft at PDX. Because of co-location requirements noted above, landing fees are unlikely to influence use of PDX.</p>	<p>7 = 1</p> <p>2 = 2</p> <p>0 = 3</p> <p>Prior</p> <p>13 = 1</p> <p>3 = 2</p> <p>3 = 3</p>	<p>Russell: I believe moving the air cargo to another airport will impact the local economy somewhat. Where is the alternate air field located? Will this move shift economic impact to another city?</p> <p>Stovel: The question of operational control over the cargo feeders is probably not a direct issue of the PAG but ought to be a side issue that affected jurisdictions can raise with the Port outside the CNAC venue. The same can be said of night time cargo operations.</p> <p>Weigant: Staff statement is too soft to have meaning. A responsible party (committee?) needs to be named, with a reporting schedule to PAG. Step 1 should be a plan to look at the “numerous variables” and “existing research.” If the staff answer to the issue was a simple “no,” I’d vote 1. But the current answer requires a management follow-up process if it is to be taken seriously.</p> <p>Prior Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Original study should be briefed to the PAG. 2. Forecasts should be done considering the present economic model could change with price, fleet size, leakage to other modes, etc. 3. Forecast data should be entered into the noise data. 4. Consider in the alternatives discussion. 5. Do not solicit major carriers who will fly 		

Remaining Project Sideboards

		<p>at night, e.g., Korean Air. 6. Evaluate impact of minimum landing fee.</p> <p>* It is already clear that in the future there is likely to be more demand for use of PDX than capacity. NO option for dealing with that should be taken off the table at the outset of the study. * This is not going to happen either - passenger planes are part of this system. * Options need to be kept open for alternatives analysis phase</p> <p>We need a little more experience with Troutdale and UPS. The problem is airline belly-cargo at PDX, tightly integrated with cargo carriers. May make a substantial difference with small cargo feeders that used to operate from Troutdale. Lets market forces determine business.</p>		
<p>#19. Moving or Piping the Columbia Slough: Will Airport Futures consider moving or piping the Columbia Slough to make way for a third runway?</p> <p>Any impacts on the slough will be evaluated in the Alternative Analysis and City Land Use Plan phases. There are no plans to move or pipe the slough. As desired by the PAG, we can schedule a presentation on the PDX Wildlife Management Program.</p>	<p>7 = 1</p> <p>1 = 2</p> <p>0 = 3</p> <p>Prior</p> <p>13 = 1</p> <p>3 = 2</p> <p>3 = 3</p>	<p>Russell: I need to wait for the presentation.</p> <p>Prior Comments</p> <p>1. Brief the FAA “desire” to reduce bird habitat within 10,000 ft of the runways. 2. Discuss the environmental reviews.</p> <p>The Columbia Slough needs to be a <u>major</u> consideration in this process. The Port’s impact on nearby natural resources has been very poorly considered in past planning processes.</p> <p>As a result, the need for major habitat removal has too frequently been discovered after projects were completed and conflicts were discovered.</p> <p>Would like to see protecting slough/water quality/riparian habitat as a stated priority.</p> <p>If developments are contemplated for the south side of the field (3rd runway or increased cargo traffic), there is concern for the greenway along the slough.</p>		

Remaining Project Sideboards

<p>#2. Move Military Off PDX: Will relocation of the military off PDX be considered?</p> <p>Please review the Governor's January 11, 2008 letter and the Port's January 16, 2008 response.</p> <p>During the evaluation portion of the Alternatives phase, Airport Futures will evaluate master plan alternatives and select a preferred alternative that represents the best long-term interest of the airport and the region it serves. If it is determined that the airport facility requirements cannot be met with the military continuing to occupy its current site or an alternative site at the airport, that issue will be identified and explored as part of the planning process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two existing alternatives showed adequate capacity existed to relocate the military. These alternatives will receive further consideration in the Alternatives phase of the project. Military siting was the subject of a follow-on study to the 2000 PDX Master Plan. The 939th Air Force Reserve unit has been deactivated. The military has a lease agreement that enables them to remain at their current site through at least 2029. The military has requested an extension of their current lease. The master plan and other long range planning will be considered in all lease negotiations. The military is seeking to replace the F15 with the F22. A comparison of the noise levels between the F15 and the F22 can be provided. If F22s are proposed to be based at PDX or the military is relocated, a NEPA review will be required and noise impacts associated with the proposed changes would be evaluated. <p>Military operations are not the tipping point for runway or taxiway requirements and do not directly impact terminal facility requirements.</p> <p>There is much uncertainty associated with the future of the military and the type of aircraft they may be operating. Those questions are unlikely to be resolved within the timeframe of this planning effort, and will be addressed by the federal government, Governor's office, and the Port Commission. In an effort to maintain flexibility and keep options open well into the planning horizon and beyond, Airport Futures will consider, in the Alternatives Analysis</p>	<p>5 = 1</p> <p>3 = 2</p> <p>1 = 3</p> <p>Prior</p> <p>10 = 1</p> <p>5 = 2</p> <p>4 = 3</p>	<p>Russell: We should extend the lease. The Air Guard needs to stay for security reasons.</p> <p>Sallinger: I am interested here also in how planning, land use and management decisions on the military base are coordinated with PDX in general. For example, PDX's effort to develop a wildlife management plan was undermined early on by the fact that similar efforts were not developed for the military base.</p> <p>Stovel: It is highly likely that the AF will not pay to move the ORANG from practically new facilities. It is highly unlikely that the airlines and the flying public would be willing to pay for such a move if a decentralized option is proposed. Doesn't this conflict with the Governor's proposal and wouldn't it be a fatal flaw for the decentralized option?</p> <p>Haven't other ORANG units been moved into the vacated AF Reserve facilities? Would the Port be liable for their relocation?</p> <p>Weigant: Was the military siting study done by unbiased participants? Bill Wyatt suggests a joint study by USAF and ORANG to consider needs at PDX, prior to lease extension. USAF and ORANG should not be considered unbiased participants with a clear view of the bigger picture. What is the realistic probability that the F-15s will be replaced by even noisier F-22s? I'd say less than 1%, given projections of our national future and economy within the world situation If relocation is carried out, who will provide the \$450million (1997\$). If noise studies are done, will they focus on SEL? Since fighters are the noisiest aircraft at PDX, their impact is best considered as SEL. Their number of</p>	<p>Ciarlo: "Reason for voting 2" Analysis of noise impacts during the alternatives phase will be important, as it may lead to consideration of operational and/or structural means of reducing those impacts. Those considerations should be part of lease discussions. Perhaps that is implicit in the staff response; if so, it would be useful to have it spelled out a little more clearly.</p> <p>Weigant: Military use of the airport must also be given data-driven consideration in the forecast phase. My personal analysis is that ORANG has a 95% probability of closing during the next two rounds of BRACC closures, within 9 years (the probable span of the next administration.) Moving ORANG to K. Falls would benefit both K. Falls and Portland. My risk analysis guesses the probability of ORANG saving lives in the PDX region is 4 lives in 100,000 years, while its existence has a probability of losing many more lives in the same period though accidents. It is quite possible (50%?) that the military issue will resolve itself through federal action before Airport Futures is complete. Our process should at least anticipate that action in its alternatives phase.</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

Remaining Project Sideboards

<p>phase, how and where PDX could accommodate the military needs, as we currently understand them.</p>	<p>operations is so small that DNL makes their impact appear less than it actually is. "There is much uncertainty..." This is true, but it's no excuse to write a plan-certain. The probabilities can be estimated, and they are changing daily. By the time PAG meets, Super Tuesday will be over and there will be much more certainty about who might run the next administration. A proper plan evaluates uncertainties with different scenarios, and the Port should develop a scenario where the ORANG base is closed, since that is the highest probability option. Note that none of these decisions are made at the local level, although local political action can have an impact. The airbase would now be entirely closed without strong political action by Senator Wyden.</p> <p>What motivated the Governor's letter? If it was simply a request by his military department, that should not be considered a full and unbiased request.</p> <p>Will the Master Plan evaluate military needs rationally? Will it consider if the highest and best use of the 245 acres is not military?</p> <p>Prior Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brief PAG on study. 2. No extension of lease until PAG can study issue in the forecast phase and alternatives phase. No extension without public hearings because of environmental impact. 3. Consider noise levels of the F-15 & F-22. Show PAG the difference in noise contours with/without military. 4. Consider reliever airport with military facilities 5. What is the probability of the F-22 at PDX? 6. What is the potential of keeping the F-15 into the forecast period of 2035? <p>* It is already clear that in the future there is likely to be more demand for use of PDX than capacity. NO option for dealing with that should be taken off the table at</p>		
--	---	--	--

Remaining Project Sideboards

		<p>the outset of the study. * This is not going to happen. * This is not an accurate reflection of the staff recommendation, which actually assumes the military remain. I vote 3 on that assumption. * Would like to hear more discussion of what happens when the lease is up. * Look forward, not back.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Status is changing rapidly at PDX. Forecast phase should look out to 2035. Studies did not look at building a reliever airport for the military and GA. 2. Lease until 2029 is a policy matter that goes out 25 years. Even now, they want an extension. 3. Fighters are the problem because of noise, not ops. 4. \$450 million (less now) available for reliever airport. 5. This needs careful and reasonable forecast attention, which has not happened in the last 2 master plans. Consider future political climate. 		
<p>#6. Possible 3rd Parallel Runway: Will Airport Futures consider the third parallel runway?</p> <p>The 2000 Master Plan and subsequent Follow-On Studies, including the work of the Regional Air Transportation Demand Task Force, examined the need for additional airfield capacity. Runways along with taxiways, navigation aids and other airfield facilities make up the system within which capacity can be evaluated. All agreements defining this planning process propose beginning it where the 2000 Master Plan ended. As a result, a review of the 2000 Master Plan and Follow-On Studies is considered a key component of this effort and an essential step that must be taken before moving forward. The PAG will participate in a discussion of the Facility Requirements' calculations that resulted in the 2000 Master Plan, including consideration of a third parallel runway. The need for a third parallel runway will be considered in the assessment of facility requirements and, based on that analysis, could again be considered during the Alternatives Analysis phase.</p> <p>As with high-speed rail, a third runway is likely at or beyond the current planning period, and, based on demand (influenced by rail development, development of</p>	<p>5 = 1 3 = 2 1 = 3 Prior 11 = 1 3 = 2 4 = 3</p>	<p>Russell: I agree we need the 3rd runway, but we need to review all data.</p> <p>Sallinger: I would amend this to say that any impacts the Columbia Slough <u>or any other proximal natural resources</u> will be evaluated.</p> <p>Stovel: If the Port decides to build additional support facilities, viz., terminals and cargo facilities, and those facilities are filled and operational capacity is maximized, the pressure for a third runway could be brought to bear on the city and Port. Even if NEPA is invoked, the FAA is the approval authority and it seems like city objections could be overcome if the Port was compelled to move in that direction.</p> <p>Weigant: Will the ALP be forwarded to the City for its approval so it can take steps to</p>	<p>Kincaid: I don't have the prior documents available to me (binder cleaning?), but it seemed that in earlier renditions there was stronger language regarding the Port not including the 3rd runway in the plan and Bill Wyatt stating there would be no request to build a 3rd runway. If that's the case, then why the discussion on whether to build or not build?</p> <p>Weigant: The simple answer to the question is "1" is yes we'll consider a third runway. The reason for my "3" vote is with the staff answer. The ALP developed in 1997 was deeply flawed from its inception, and its PAC had serious disagreement, so much that RATDTF was formed to revise and validate projections. These were reduced, but with no change in the ALP. Local resistance forced delay of the plan until 2000. The current process is far superior and more comprehensive than the 1997 process. However, before the Port would agree to fund it, it insisted on building the update on the faulty</p>	

Remaining Project Sideboards

<p>new service at other area airports, etc.) will be a subject for further evaluation in subsequent master plans, which traditionally happen every 7 to 10 years. The fact that the third parallel runway may be shown on the airport layout plan does not mean the Port intends to construct it any time soon, if ever. It simply means they have reserved an appropriate amount of land in case the need materializes.</p> <p>The Airport Layout Plan (ALP) is required by the FAA. Acceptance of the ALP report by the FAA “does not in any way constitute a commitment on the part of the United States to participate in any development depicted therein, nor does it indicate that the proposed development is environmentally acceptable in accordance with appropriate public laws.” It is unknown otherwise how the ALP will relate to the land use plan as this is the first time the Port has undertaken a legislative land use process with the City.</p> <p>Demand management and NEPA questions have been addressed in other items.</p> <p>Any impacts on the Columbia Slough will be evaluated in the Alternative Analysis and City Land Use Plan phases. There are no plans to move or pipe the Slough.</p>	<p>plan for the external impact of a third parallel runway? Clearly, the airport boundaries can accommodate a third runway. The question is the off-site impact of a third parallel runway. Will that be considered? (The Port claimed to RATDTF that a replacement airport would require a 10,000 acre site, mostly for sound buffers. Since the current PDX is only 3,200 acres, the remaining 6,800 acres are sound buffers, i.e., neighborhoods.) To what degree will the Master Plan address neighborhoods as sound buffers? Will a reliever airport be considered as a third runway if the noise impact of a third parallel runway appears unacceptable?</p> <p>Prior Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review all assumptions: forecasts, impacts, alternatives (including terminal size). 2. Could City preclude by land use rules/conditions? 3. Can we assume the ALP will be central to the land use plan? 4. Compare the needs as described in FAA capacity enhancement plans. 5. Look at the relationship of terminal capacity and 500,000 operations. 6. Isn't NEPA an analysis of need and alternatives? 7. We want to look at impacts of 3rd runway, but also the impacts as we approach that level of passengers, cargo and total operations. 8. “Demand management” may eliminate need. <p>* Need more detail on this one---what we do today will drive demand in the future so we view this as a major part of the discussion even if it is far in the future. * The Port said that it was not going to consider or ask for a 3rd runway in this plan. That needs to happen. * Would like to see explicit assurance that slough health will receive high priority</p>	<p>foundation of the 1997 plan. I would vote “1” to this question if the process would accept full analysis of all options, including mitigation for off-site impacts of noise generated by a third parallel runway and the flight patterns that would likely result. But I will only vote “1” if the ALP is part of the land use plan considered by the City. The City needs <i>at least</i> as much advance planning time to prepare for the impacts of a third runway as the Port. If the third runway proves to be a fatal flaw, it's best to know that early so alternative plans to accommodate expected growth can be developed.</p>	
--	---	---	--

Remaining Project Sideboards

		<p>consideration (not just as part of NEPA). * As far as the staff recommendation goes, it is correct. But, I expect to consider a third runway elsewhere, too.</p> <p>Let's be clear about requesting approval in the Land Use Plan. The FAA considers the ALP the master planning document. So should the City. It is unthinkable the FAA and Port will plan 20+ years ahead for a third runway and not tell the City. While the Port will not request a building permit until they are ready to build, if they intend to build at some time in the future, the City needs to plan around this major impact. Integration of a 3rd runway into the zoning plan could take decades. We believe that certain capacity enhancement measures could make the 3rd runway a fait accompli. Forecast phase should include adoption of expected growth curve. Third runway may <i>never</i> be needed.</p>		
<p>#9. NEPA Review: PDX Master Plan: Will there be a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis of the PDX Master Plan?</p> <p>As outlined in the City-Port Intergovernmental Agreement, there will be an environmental screening of all projects recommended in Airport Futures using the NEPA criteria. That screening will not be a substitute for a full NEPA analysis required for implementation of the projects. The timing for such project will be demand-based and triggered by specific metrics.</p> <p>This environmental screening will occur as part of the Alternatives Analysis capital improvement planning and City Land Use Plan phases.</p> <p>At present, it is not anticipated that there will be a NEPA analysis of the Port's Master Plan, itself.</p>	<p>7 = 1 2 = 2 0 = 3 Prior 12 = 1 5 = 2 1 = 3</p>	<p>1. If MP is federally funded, it requires a NEPA process, but a finding of categorical exclusion may be sufficient.</p> <p>* If I understand correctly, NEPA comes into play on the build-out of specific projects, which might be included in the Master Plan.</p> <p>* I think THREE is the right answer, but I defer to our NEPA expert, Erwin Bergman. This is a legal issue, not a policy issue. Follow the law.</p> <p>There should not be much debate here. Just follow the law. NEPA will require serious consideration of all alternatives including the "no build" option. The PAG should be doing a "bridge study" just like was done for the extension of the north runway.</p>		
<p>#20. FAA Compelling Capacity: Can the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) compel PDX to add capacity to the runways, terminal building, or roadways?</p> <p>The FAA cannot compel PDX to add capacity. That is the prerogative of the local airport operator.</p>	<p>7 = 1 2 = 2 0 = 3</p>	<p>Russell: I will need more information. Are the City and Port conducting a study to explain the reasoning behind this proposed capacity increase?</p> <p>Sallinger:</p>		

Remaining Project Sideboards

	New	The Port frequently seems to cite the FAA as a pretext for unpopular decisions including development activities. I would like more explicit clarity on what the FAA can and cannot mandate.		
<p>#21. Wildlife</p> <p>Consider the impacts of future Port development on wildlife habitat. There is absolutely no mention of habitat impacts. This is a big issue. The Port has insisted in various planning processes that there should be no additional regulatory protections established for wildlife habitat within 10,000 feet of the runways. This process is the appropriate forum to get a clear understanding of how Port development at PDX will intersect with the City's efforts to protect wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Required mitigation will be discussed in the City Land Use Plan phase.</p>	<p>7 = 1</p> <p>1 = 2</p> <p>1 = 3</p> <p>New</p>	<p>Sallinger:</p> <p>When I suggested the topic of wildlife I was referring to something broader than "mitigation." Limiting the wildlife discussion to mitigation suggests that the airport will simply eliminate wildlife on an around PDX and mitigate for it elsewhere. I am looking for inclusion of a more comprehensive assessment of wildlife and wildlife habitat on and around PDX that can be used to help inform a variety of decisions (for example locations where PDX may want to avoid expanding, implications of third runway, how the airport influences natural resource planning beyond its boundaries, alternatives analysis, etc.) One key point that I would like to see clarified in this process is the FAA mandated 10,000 foot zone around PDX. The Port has used this previously to argue against natural resource protections both on and beyond airport property. We believe that the Port has at times far exceeded a legitimate application of this FAA Advisory Circular using it as a pretext for avoiding regulation. This Master Plan is a good place to integrate the outstanding work done on the PDX wildlife Plan with the broader airport planning effort.</p> <p>Prior Comments</p> <p>Consider the impacts of future Port development on wildlife habitat. There is absolutely no mention of habitat impacts. This is a big issue. The Port has insisted in various planning processes that there should be no additional regulatory protections established for wildlife habitat within 10,000 feet of the runways. This process is the appropriate forum to get a clear understanding of how Port development at PDX will intersect with the City's efforts to protect wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p>	<p>Ciarlo:</p> <p>"Reason for voting 2"</p> <p>The City Land Use Plan phase is the appropriate place to discuss this issue – but the discussion should include avoiding impacts (per our values statement) in addition to required mitigation.</p>	

Remaining Project Sideboards

<p>#22. Technology Changes</p> <p>I suggest adding the potential impacts of technological change. What expectations of breakthroughs are being projected over the next 10 - 20 years that could change our view of problems? e.g., new energy sources being driven by climate change (the recent united nations report). Given the rapid expansion of public opinion/concern about this topic area, our collective comments about it relative to moving freight and people will be expected.</p> <p>Another way to get at this topic area: examine the top trends that will reshape the world in the next 10 - 20 years for applications to our area of study. For instance, the next generation internet, plus increases in computing power, will provide opportunities that reduce the need for travel, but by how much? What is a reasonable expectation? Our collective answer could be that no relevant changes can be expected, which sets expectations appropriately.</p> <p>Aviation technological changes are being tracked by Port staff on an ongoing basis and will be shared with the PAG as relevant. This will be evaluated in Facility Requirements and Alternatives Analysis phases.</p>	<p>8 = 1</p> <p>1 = 2</p> <p>0 = 3</p> <p>New</p>	<p>Weigant: Policy changes should be added to this category. PDX should consider the impact of changing technology, but it will have little impact on creating those changes. Of greater consequence might be policy changes like demand management, congestion pricing, and policies that apply market forces to aviation. PDX, after analysis of such options, could be a force to have them be adopted.</p> <p>Just because a policy now exists, like no congestion pricing, is no reason that PDX should not consider the probability and impact on operations and development, and lobby for changes that make PDX more economically viable. The potential for policy change will become clearer after Super Tuesday.</p> <p>Prior Comments Mulvihill: I suggest adding the potential impacts of technological change. What expectations of breakthroughs are being projected over the next 10 - 20 years that could change our view of problems? e.g., new energy sources being driven by climate change (the recent united nations report). Given the rapid expansion of public opinion/concern about this topic area, our collective comments about it relative to moving freight and people will be expected.</p> <p>Another way to get at this topic area: examine the top trends that will reshape the world in the next 10 - 20 years for applications to our area of study. For instance, the next generation internet, plus increases in computing power, will provide opportunities that reduce the need for travel, but by how much? What is a reasonable expectation? Our collective answer could be that no relevant changes can be expected, which sets expectations appropriately.</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

Remaining Project Sideboards

<p>Process Recommendation</p> <p>Recommendations to be included in the final PAG report are yet unknown. The PAG will keep a running list of possible recommendations, as they surface, to be discussed for inclusion its final report.</p> <p>In response to conversations at the January 2008 PAG meeting and the Meeting Evaluations, items raised by individual PAG members will first go to the Coordinating Committee for discussion. The Committee will consider the request and make one of the following process decisions: A) Refer to full PAG, B) Refer to PAG Subcommittee, C) Place on the possible recommendation running list, or D) Give the member an opportunity to present during the Public Comment Period.</p>	<p>6 = 1</p> <p>0 = 2</p> <p>0 = 3</p> <p>New</p>	<p>Ciarlo: Clarify who is on the PAG Coordinating Committee</p> <p>Stovel: Items could be raised by groups of PAG members and they should be able to present and defend their proposals.</p> <p>Weigant: Any recommendation that staff assumes responsibility for should have a plan of action presented to the PAG or one of its committees, with an appropriate reporting cycle on its achievement of plan.</p>		
---	---	---	--	--