

**Planning Advisory Group Meeting #6**  
**Tuesday, April 15, 2008 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm**  
**Portland International Airport**  
 St. Helens A and B Conference Rooms

**Final Draft Meeting Notes**

**WELCOME, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AGENDA REVIEW, APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES, AND FOLLOW-UP – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati**

Bill welcomed everyone to the meeting. The PAG has new alternates and members; those in attendance were introduced.

- Jill Eiland from Intel for Brian Nelson, who is overseas on sabbatical for several months
- Mitchell Berck from Flightcraft will replace Jordan Papé, who will be relocating to Eugene
- Willy Williamson, new manager for Pearson Airport, is the new alternate for Laura Hudson from the City of Vancouver. Both attended.
- Travis Williams position to be filled by a representative from Lower Columbia Estuary Program in the next month

Members	Affiliation	Present
Lisa <b>Barton-Mullins</b>	E. County/City of Fairview	√
Erwin <b>Bergman</b>	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill <b>Blosser</b>	Chair	√
Catherine <b>Ciarlo</b>	Planning Commissioner	√
Andy <b>Cotugno</b>	Metro	√
Tom <b>Gerharter</b>	Horizon Airlines	√
Cam <b>Gilmour</b>	Clackamas County	√
Alan <b>Hargrave</b>	Port of Camas/Washougal (arrived late)	√
Laura <b>Hudson</b>	City of Vancouver	√
Gloria <b>Ibarra</b>	FAA <b>Alternate Stan Alison in attendance</b>	√
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	
Ross <b>Monn</b>	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Dennis <b>Mulvihill</b>	Washington County	√
Brian <b>Nelson</b>	Intel <b>Alternate Jill Eiland in attendance</b>	√
Mary <b>Olson</b>	Port Commissioner	√
Jordan <b>Papé</b>	Flightcraft <b>Alternate Mitch Berck also in attendance</b>	√
Veronica <b>Rinard</b>	Portland OR Visitors Association	√
Hector <b>Roche</b>	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	√
Lawrence <b>Russell</b>	Coalition for a Livable Future	

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>	ONI	√
Vicki <b>Thompson</b>	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John <b>Weigant</b>	AIR	√
Travis <b>Williams</b>	Willamette Riverkeeper <i>Resigned</i>	

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	√
Renee Dowlin	Port	
Melissa Egan	Assistant Facilitator, ICM	√
Jason Gately	Port	√
Lise Glancy	Port	√
Geoffrey D. Gosling	City's Consultant (Principal, Aviation System Consulting)	√
John Gray	City	√
Nancy Hendrickson	BES	
Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Scott King	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:** Willy Williamson (Hudson alternate), Mitchell Berck (Papé alternate), Pia Welch (PACA), Delia Chi, Shannon McArthur, Brian Watt, and Lee Perlman

### **PAG Make-up Tour and Orientation – Bill Blosser**

The tour will be this Saturday, April 19, from 11:00-2:30 pm at PDX St. Helens A and B. Bill asked folks to RSVP to Lise tonight. It will be entirely on airport property, not out in the neighborhoods like the first tour.

### **Special Recognition – Sam Imperati**

Tomorrow is Ross Monn's birthday, and Bronwyn Buckle's birthday is on Saturday.

## **Final PAG Project Assumptions – Sam Imperati**

Staff has completed its work incorporating PAG discussion and comments in the Final PAG Project Assumptions document. It will be emailed to you within the next couple of days. It has been reformatted for ease of review. The intent is to capture the conclusions and to synthesize them in a logical fashion. If there are any concerns about this document, please send comments to Sam by next Wednesday, April 23. The Coordinating Committee will discuss and recommend a PAG process, if any is needed. We will defer the full conversation on this topic until next month so everyone has time to review the new document.

## **March 11 Draft Meeting Notes (Attachment 1) – Bill Blosser**

Bill asked if there were any comments on the draft meeting notes. There were none, and the notes were approved.

## **Other Handouts on Your Table – Sam Imperati**

There were several documents for the PAG this meeting:

- Letter on Sustainability Features in New Port Headquarters building
- Forecast PPT – to be discussed in Forecasts
- Price of Oil Research – to be discussed in Forecasts
- Technical Advisory Pool List – to be discussed in Public Involvement
- Public Involvement Update – to be discussed in Public Involvement
- PAG Vision and Value Placements/Commitments to Community

## **AVIATION DEMAND FORECAST – Dennis Mulvihill, Geoff Gosling and Linda Perry**

The main event for this PAG meeting was the forecast presentations. There have been very productive meetings with the Jacobs Consultancy group along with Geoff Gosling, the City peer reviewer.

## **Forecast Subcommittee Report – Dennis Mulvihill**

On April 8, the Forecast Subcommittee met prior to receiving the Gosling report. Dennis reports they had great discussion, and speaking for the committee, he believes the forecast process was done well. The committee got everything they asked for. It required more time from the consultants, but they did as requested. There were some surprising results. Dennis thought it would be good for PAG members to hear the peer review comments before going forward with a recommendation.

## **Forecast and Sensitivity Report (Attachment 2) – Linda Perry**

Linda Perry presented a PowerPoint with the final passenger, cargo, military, general aviation (GA), and operations forecasts. The topics for discussion were:

- Follow Up Items
  - Oil Price Forecasts
  - Carbon Futures
  - Revised Yield Equation
- Revised and Proposed Final Probabilistic Forecasts
  - Passengers
  - Air Cargo
- Proposed Final Aircraft Operation Forecasts
- Sensitivity Tests
- Master Plan Consultant Closing Remarks

Action items: consider and comment on the forecast results and make a recommendation.

Linda started the presentation with results: the PDX total aircraft operations are forecast to increase an average of 1.3% between 2006-2035. They revised the yield equation for the passenger model. The likely increase in fuel costs was the primary motivator in revisiting the yield equation; second was that carbon costs will have a higher value in the future.

Airlines will always try to approach break-even yield. One limitation is that the airline industry, overall, is not the most profitable. In the last 16–17 years, airlines have not broken even in ten of them.

The PAG has expressed repeated concerns about the price of oil, and Jacobs Consultancy did extra work to respond and provide information. Linda explained that the Department of Energy prepares oil price forecasts and they are the most common source for this information. The International Energy Agency, the World Bank, financial investors, and commodity traders also do forecasting in this area. DOE forecasts actually vary by about 21% from actual prices. On average, excluding whether they are high or low, they are 21% off. In recent years, they tend to underestimate.

Linda talked about four types of forecasts: Passengers (probabilistic), Cargo (probabilistic), General Aviation (FAA estimates), and Military (FAA estimates). Below are the PPT slides with the key takeaways from each forecast.

#### Probabilistic Passenger Forecast: Key Takeaways (Slide 10)

- **Passenger demand is shifted 15 years into the future**
  - The 1999 MP forecast 13.5 million enplaned passengers in 2020 (medium forecast)
  - The 2008 PDX MPU forecasts 13.4 million enplaned passengers in 2035 (median or 50 percentile forecast)
- **Revised and Proposed Final Forecasts of 13.4 million or 27 Million Annual Passengers (MAP) are more sensitive to fuel and carbon costs**
  - Previous forecasts = 15.8 million
  - Forecast Subcommittee/PAG estimate = 14.0 million
- **PDX enplaned passengers are forecast to increase an average of 2.3% per year between 2006 and 2035 in the median or 50 percentile forecast.**
  - FAA 2007 TAF for PDX = 2.5% per year between 2006 and 2025
  - FAA National Domestic = 2.7% per year between 2007 and 2025
  - 1999 MP Medium forecast = 3.4% per year between 1998 and 2020
  - Historical growth = 4.9% average per year between 1976 and 2006
- **Probabilistic forecasts provide a range of possible outcomes and likelihood**

#### Probabilistic Air Cargo Forecast: Key Takeaways (Slide 12)

- **Air Cargo demand shifted more than 20 years into the future**
  - The 1999 MP forecast 957,500 tons in 2020 (medium forecast)
  - The 2008 PDX MPU forecasts 732,000 tons in 2035 (median or 50 percentile forecast)
- **Proposed Final Forecasts of 732,000 tons are sensitive to fuel and future carbon costs**
- **PDX total air cargo forecast to increase an average of 3.3% per year between 2006 and 2035 in the median or 50 percentile forecast.**
  - Boeing Forecast of U.S. Domestic Cargo\* = 3.8% per year between 2005 and 2025
  - FAA National Domestic Cargo\* = 3.2% per year between 2007 and 2025
  - 1999 MP Medium forecast = 5.1% per year between 1998 and 2020
  - Historical growth = 5.4% average per year between 1976 and 2006
- **Probabilistic forecasts provide a range of possible outcomes and likelihood**

#### Passenger Airline Aircraft Operations Key Takeaways (Slide 16)

- **Passenger airline aircraft operations are shifted more than 20 years into the future**
  - The 1999 MP forecast 348,000 operations in 2020 (medium forecast)
  - The 2008 PDX MPU forecasts 275,000 operations in 2035 (median or 50 percentile forecast)

- **Load factor and seats per departure assumptions account for differences**
  - 69% load factor in 2020 in 1999 MP medium forecast vs. 80% in 2035 in the 2008 PDX MPU (domestic mainline)
  - 161 seats per departure in 2020 in 1999 MP medium forecast vs. 148 in 2035 in the 2008 PDX MPU (domestic mainline)
- **PDX passenger airline aircraft operations are forecast to increase an average of 1.4% per year between 2006 and 2035 in the median or 50 percentile forecast.**
  - 1999 MP Medium forecast = 2.3% per year between 1998 and 2020
  - Historical growth = 0.4% average per year between 1990 and 2006
- **Future mix of aircraft affect operations**
  - Horizon up gauges from Q200 (37 seats) to Q400 (74 seats)
  - Alaska replaces MD-80s (140 seats) with B737-800 (157 seats)

#### All-Cargo Airline Aircraft Operations Key Takeaways (Slide 19)

- **All-cargo airline aircraft operations are shifted more than 20 years into the future**
  - The 1999 MP forecast 64,000 operations in 2020 (medium forecast)
  - The 2008 PDX MPU forecasts 52,000 operations in 2035 (median or 50 percentile forecast)
- **Average enplaned cargo per departure assumptions**
  - 28.6 tons per departure in 2020 in 1999 MP medium forecast, compared with 27.7 tons in 2007, and 39.2 tons in 2035 in the 2008 PDX MPU (domestic air carrier)
  - 1.0 tons per departure in 2020 in 1999 MP medium forecast vs. 0.8 tons in 2035 in the 2008 PDX MPU (regional feeders)
- **PDX all-cargo airline aircraft operations are forecast to increase an average of 1.6% per year between 2006 and 2035 in the median or 50 percentile forecast.**
  - 1999 MP Medium forecast = 3.2% per year between 1998 and 2020
  - Historical growth = 4.0% average per year between 1990 and 2006
- **Future mix of aircraft affect operations**

#### General Aviation Aircraft Operations Key Takeaways (Slide 22)

- **General aviation aircraft operation forecasts are for continued decline through 2012, then slow growth from 2012 through 2035**
  - The 1999 MP forecast 45,000 operations in 2020 (medium forecast)
  - The 2008 PDX MPU forecasts 33,000 operations in 2035 (median or 50 percentile forecast)
- **General aviation operations account for 8.6% of total aircraft operations in 2035**
  - 10.8% actual share at PDX in 2006
  - 10.4% share in 2025 in FAA 2007 TAF
  - 49.8% forecast share in 2025 for total U.S. general aviation operations in the FAA National forecast
- **PDX general aviation aircraft operations are forecast to increase an average of 0.5% per year between 2006 and 2035 in the median or 50 percentile forecast.**
  - FAA National = 1.3% per year between 2007 and 2025
  - FAA 2007 TAF for PDX = 1.4% per year between 2006 and 2025
  - 1999 MP Medium forecast = an average decrease of 1.7% per year between 1998 and 2020
  - Historical growth = an average decrease of 4.5% per year between 1990 and 2006

#### Military Aircraft Operations Key Takeaways (Slide 24)

- **Military aircraft operations are forecast to remain at a level of 6,000 through 2035**
  - The 1999 MP forecast 10,000 operations in 2020
  - The 2008 PDX MPU forecasts 6,000 operations in 2035

- **Military operations are forecast to account for 1.6% of total PDX aircraft operations in 2035**
  - 1.9% actual share at PDX in 2006
  - 1.1% forecast share in 2025 at PDX for FAA 2007 TAF
  - 3.2% forecast share of total U.S. military operations in 2025 in the FAA National forecast
- **No growth in PDX military aircraft operations is forecast between 2006 and 2035 in the median or 50 percentile forecast.**
  - FAA National = No growth forecast between 2007 and 2025
  - FAA 2007 TAF for PDX = No growth forecast between 2006 and 2025
  - 1999 MP Medium forecast = No growth forecast between 1998 and 2020
  - Historical growth = an average decrease of 5.8% per year between 1990 and 2006

#### Total Aircraft Operations Forecasts (Slide 27)

- **Total aircraft operations are shifted more than 20 years into the future**
  - The 1999 MP forecast 485,000 total aircraft operations in 2020 (medium forecast)
  - The 2008 PDX MPU forecasts 378,000 in 2035 (median or 50 percentile forecast)
- **PDX total aircraft operations are forecast to increase an average of 1.3% per year between 2006 and 2035 in the median or 50 percentile forecast.**
  - FAA 2007 TAF for PDX = 1.8% per year between 2006 and 2025
  - FAA National Domestic = 1.8% per year between 2007 and 2025
  - 1999 MP Medium forecast = 1.8% per year between 1998 and 2020
  - Historical growth = 0.6% average per year between 1976 and 2006

Next Linda discussed the Sensitivity tests. Sensitivity tests provide a means to measure the effect of changes in model variables and the impact of variables not included in the model such as external events. The consultants selected 25 sensitivity tests, and we looked at five: oil prices; leakage to other airports; leakage to other transport modes; video conferencing; airline mergers.

#### Break

#### Peer Review Comments – Geoff Gosling (HANDOUT)

Geoff Gosling presented his peer review comments to the PAG. He performed an independent assessment and he worked closely with the consultants to help develop methodology and make suggestions. They have had a very productive relationship with good interaction. There have been significant improvements to the Monte Carlo model that came partly from Geoff.

Geoff focused on the issues he believes the PAG should give particular consideration to when making its recommendation.

Scope of tonight's presentation:

- Objectives of the Forecast Peer Review
- General comments on the forecast process
- Comments on the technical analysis
- Forecast models
  - Passenger model
  - Cargo model
- Forecast assumptions
- Other aspects of the forecasts
- Recommendations for further work

In Geoff's recent visit to the FAA Forecasting Conference, he asked how and if they are thinking about and incorporating climate change issues. Their response was that they talk about it and are working on it, but are not there. PDX is leading the way on this aspect of forecasting.

Geoff thinks the PAG needs to look at the PDX Enplaned passenger model (Slide 7) in particular. It is a graph that shows the difference between the model, with and without, dummy variables. The model fits the actual traffic fairly well up to 2000. The post-2002 dummy variable has a significant effect on future traffic. If the effect disappears, this would increase traffic by about 50%.

*Andy Cotugno:* question for clarification on Geoff's issues with the post-2002 dummy variable.

*Geoff Gosling:* it is a traffic composition issue. The current model has the proportion being the same as it is today. The PAG has to decide if it is comfortable with that.

Geoff continued, reviewing issues to consider for the passenger model, cargo model, and forecast assumptions. In summary, his recommendations were as follows:

#### Recommendations

- Further work appears warranted to clarify some of the issues identified in the review
  - Will require additional time and resources
  - Could probably be accomplished in 3 to 4 months
  - Other planning activities could proceed in parallel
- Would help establish whether these could have a material effect on the forecast values
  - If so, this could be an important consideration in the use of the forecasts in subsequent steps
- Would be better to know this in the near future rather than in several years time after the master plan has been prepared

#### **PAG Discussion and Recommendation on Forecast**

*Sam Imperati:* the question before the PAG today is, are you ready and willing to proceed with a recommendation?

*Andy Cotugno:* passenger numbers dropped after 9/11; cargo dropped after 1999. Why?

*Linda Perry:* market forces.

*Andy Cotugno:* concerning passengers, the question seem to be how long will the 9/11-effect last?

*Linda Perry:* yes, that is the question. We have included the dummy variable because we thought it was prudent. When we update in 5-10 years, we will see if the effects have lessened over time. Considering all we are doing here, to include it, fit in the model. There are arguments both ways.

*Geoff Gosling:* cargo issue. The reduction favors are an explanation in the drop of the observed data. 9/11 is a factor, but there are other factors (e.g., lingering impacts from dot.com bust). Since late 90s, there is a shift toward a more integrated logistics approach, with cargo shippers using trucks more, particularly as oil prices go up. With even further increases in the price of oil, we could see this as a repeating effect, not a onetime effect.

*Linda Perry:* we did test the "dot.com" bust.

*Tom Gerharter:* how often is this updated?

*Chris Corich:* we do a new master plan every 5-10 years. We will do another master plan in five years or so after this. If something dramatic happens in the industry, we will act sooner.

*Bill Blosser:* if we did the studies Geoff is talking about, we could end up with the higher projection of the forecast we are considering today. The low would drop down, the high would go up, and the median

would probably stay close to what it is at now. Is that correct?

*Geoff Gosling:* yes, that is about what we would expect to see.

*Bill Blosser:* so if we did do that, considering the third runway issue, the higher numbers would drive the third runway conversation and a reasonable person would say we need to address it.

*C.F. Booth:* it would increase our need to include the third runway in the master plan.

*John Weigant:* in "dot.com" bubble, did you test for an inflation or deflation effect?

*Linda Perry:* we tested many aspects of it, and we did not get anything that explained it as well as the dummy variable

*Erwin Bergman:* 1) carbon taxes. Polls have been taken that indicate a fair number of people would be willing to pay additional money, but he wonders if people would pay when asked, that is to say, is what they say they will do and what they actually do the same? 2) Price of carbon, will the price of carbon skyrocket? 3) Will there be more people that will follow a moral obligation and feel that "it's a sin to fly?"

*Geoff Gosling:* re: first question, it would not be voluntary. Currently there is no legislation, but the presumption is that it will happen, and airlines will have to figure out how much to pass on to customers. The MIT study looked at what it would cost to reduce carbon in various sectors, and the related carbon cost.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* question about effect of changes in traffic composition, please clarify.

*Geoff Gosling:* what we mean by that is there are four different segments of the market that make up "traffic" - Portland area, visitors, folks outside Portland area who drive here, and connecting passengers who change planes in PDX. Our model has the Portland area population and the PDX yield, so it will predict Portland area residents well, leaving the question; will the other three grow in proportion similarly to the Portland area folks?

*Linda Perry:* they have looked at this and it is historically fairly stable.

*Mary Olson:* well, the model seems like a guess, as opposed to using historical figures, which makes more sense.

*Geoff Gosling:* service at secondary airports is growing, a higher proportion of trips handled there.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* so will the number shift our median very much? Does not seem like it will. What is the probability that we spend 3-4 months on further study and get the same results?

*Geoff Gosling:* not saying it is necessarily a cause for concern, but more an attribute of the model to be mindful of.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* if we were to broaden the range as Bill explained, lower low, higher high and similar median, Chris, how much would this change the master plan? We have talked about building in points of evaluation in the process, and she is curious if it would change things.

*Chris Corich:* he does not believe it would change it very much. Low getting lower is not a concern, but if a higher growth rate does occur, then we are still talking 2022 or 2025 before we would need to build something. He is not deeply concerned if the line is 3.3 or 3.5.

*Bill Blosser:* the issue he can see is that if we have the higher scenario, the Portland Planning Commission has in front of them a new scenario of, perhaps, a 70% chance we will need a new runway.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* exactly what she was getting at.

*C.F. Booth:* Stan, how will the FAA do forecasts? We will have to submit ours to them, and the third parallel runway is a key issue.

*Stan Alison:* the FAA's role in all of this is to review what is forwarded to them as the preferred recommended forecast. We are waiting to see what we get from you, review it, and compare it to our forecasts (the 2007 TAF). If there is a wide divergence, either lower or higher, then we will have to have discussions before you get your final approval to move on to facility requirements and seek funding. They tend not to want to invest significant dollars for something like a third runway unless they see actual demand.

*C.F. Booth:* if we want to build a runway, we are going to have to submit to you a cost-benefit analysis.

*Stan Alison:* any investment over \$10M requires such an analysis.

*John Weigant:* a lot of this is political, and in six months, we are having an election, and six months after that we will have some idea of the new political landscape. The farther we get into the future, the clearer it is! He would like further study, but wants to see the political stuff play out first.

*Dave Smith:* from the presentations, he definitely got how inexact the airline forecasting business is. He feels the work that has been done has been good, that we are unlikely to get much better, and is comfortable proceeding with the recommendation.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* is also comfortable moving forward, and based on the purposes of master plan, it makes sense. As we move forward, we will keep an eye on the issues that have been raised and we can work on contingencies in the land use planning phase.

*Erwin Bergman:* if there are changes from figures we have heard tonight, at what point (in lowering or raising numbers) do we get into a completely new area of construction?

*C.F. Booth:* the answer to that gets back to the triggers we have talked about. For example, a certain level of activity will necessitate a new parking garage.

*Chris Corich:* we are constantly doing real-time planning as well as this type of longer range planning.

*C.F. Booth:* a master plan is a land use plan.

*Sam Imperati:* to put the subcommittee on the spot, Sam wonders if the subcommittee would share their recommendation and if that has changed as a result of what we have heard tonight.

*Dennis Mulvihill:* would like to hear from the subcommittee members, they are well studied.

*John Weigant:* he was very critical of 1997 and 1999 projections, and he is very satisfied with these current projections. He remains concerned about military projections. Military decision will be made at the national level. He thinks there is a high probability the Department of Defense will close the PDX base, so it might be good to look at what we would do should it close.

*Fred Stovel:* stands with subcommittee input. He thinks there is a place for all questions to arise. Supports recommendation.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* thinks we have good data to move on to the next step. Does not want to lose talented people by dragging on too long.

*Erwin Bergman:* financial situation will not allow military numbers to continue, sees decline in general aviation, and sees increase in leakage to other airports. Comfortable with passenger and cargo. Would like to explore the option of provisionally adopting and revisiting later to see if it is totally valid.

*Pia Welch, Portland Air Cargo Association, from the audience:* is very pleased from the cargo perspective with the subcommittee recommendation.

Sam read the Forecast Subcommittee's recommendation which follows: 1) the forecast process was done well, 2) the subcommittee's comments and recommendations were considered and/or incorporated, 3) the forecast results are reasonable and should be adopted, 4) there should be a check-in at a point approximately six months before the end of the PAG process to see if any of the key variable used in the forecast have sufficiently changed that would cause us to explore whether to re-run the model with the new information, and 5) we should develop now a list of issues and what we have learned items from this process for use down the road in the next, post-PAG forecast.

Sam then took a vote and the PAG unanimously agreed to adopt the forecasts.

*Bill Blosser:* thank you to the folks who pushed for the subcommittee design; this is exactly how it was supposed to work.

**PUBLIC COMMENT – None.**

## **PAG PROCESS EVALUATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT UPDATE – Sam Imperati/Hector Roche/Lise Glancy/Jay Sugnet**

### **PAG Process Evaluation – Sam Imperati (Attachment 3)**

Sam called the PAG's attention to the six-month process evaluation completed several weeks ago. The staff has studied the results and appreciates the candid comments. Generally speaking, the feedback was positive. Sam asked if folks have any further comments for process improvement.

*Vicki Thompson:* are we all going to be crammed into this room for the rest of our meetings?

*Sam Imperati:* we will get to that topic at the end of the meeting.

There were no further comments.

### **Ad Hoc Public Involvement Group Report – Hector Roche**

They have been meeting as an ad hoc group, and Hector is very pleased to announce that we now have the business member we needed, Jill Eiland from Intel, and so we will be a formal committee. Hector acknowledged and thanked the people who have been participating and encouraged their continued participation: Bob Eaton, Patrick Metzger, Ross Monn, Eric Meyer, Linda Robinson, Lawrence Russell, John Weigant, and Hector Roche. The staff is Bronwyn Buckle, Lise Glancy, Jay Sugnet, and Sean Loughran.

This means there will now be Public Involvement representation on the Coordinating Committee, which Hector hopes will increase community involvement even more. He wants to help communities feel like they have ownership over the process and results. Like the unanimous vote tonight for the forecast, he wants the larger community to feel as supportive of this process. Hector wants to increase use of website to make it a more interactive too.

Lise announced that the first public involvement subcommittee meeting will be April 22 from 3-5 pm at

County offices, and will focus on public involvement website survey, website refinements. If anyone has groups who need or want a presentation on this process, then let Lise know.

### **Report on Stakeholder Outreach and TAP – Lise Glancy/Jay Sugnet (HANDOUT)**

Lise reviewed the project team's summary of our public involvement efforts for the forecast phase. Recently, they have had two additional open houses, with 50 people in attendance. Thank you to PAG members who attended. Most feedback was good; people liked the forecasts and they liked our attention to sustainability. We also put out a web survey with 41 responses. In addition, the team met with \_\_\_ 11 stakeholder groups meeting with 315 people. From all this outreach, no new issues were identified. In general, there was over-all concurrence that our process is on the right track.

Lise also summarized other ongoing public involvement efforts which include monthly electronic updates on the planning process to neighborhood, business and environmental groups; electronic notification of developments to those signed up on our website, and media releases.

Jay reported the Technical Advisory Pool met on April 10, 2008. Thirteen people attended the meeting. Some of the TAP members have been pulled into the forecast process; others are interested in land use planning. There is a new list of the TAP in the packet.

### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS – Cam Gilmour/Jay Sugnet**

#### **Sustainability Subcommittee – Cam Gilmour**

More detailed discussion of the sustainability subcommittee work will occur at next PAG meeting. Cam was not able to be at the last meeting, but Bill Blosser attended and thought it was a terrific meeting. They delved into the nineteen issues listed on the placemat. Trying to come up with clear measurables on each item is difficult, but an extremely important part of this process.

#### **Land Use and Transportation Subcommittee – Jay Sugnet**

As the Forecast Subcommittee is phasing out, the Land Use Subcommittee will ramp up. We will talk about alternatives, transportation model, and traffic analysis. It is a long-term subcommittee. Proposed start is the end of April or first week of May. The goal is to have three meetings prior to the early direction from Planning Commission on land use alternatives sometime this summer.

*Sean Loughran:* re: the Sustainability Subcommittee. He is trying to set up next meeting for end of this month. You will get an email from Sean.

Sam handed out the charter and sign-in sheet for this subcommittee, welcoming new members to sign up.

### **NEXT MEETING AGENDA, CLOSING COMMENTS, MEETING EVALUATION FORM, AND ADJOURNMENT**

#### **Brief overview of Next Meeting and Upcoming Phases – Jay Sugnet**

Keep agenda items for May 20, 5:30 to 8:30 pm include: 1) Debrief on Planning Commission, Port Commission, and FAA Meetings on Forecast and Forecast Subcommittee Report. 2) Sustainability Subcommittee Report. 3) Land and Transportation Subcommittee Report. 4) City land use overview and land use alternatives. 5) City-Port Existing Conditions. Detailed recalibration of the planning process presented at that meeting.

The next few phases will be intertwined and we hope to continue to improve the presentation of

