

**Planning Advisory Group Meeting #8**  
**Tuesday, July 15, 2008 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm**  
Horizon Airlines Operations Hangar, 8070 Airtrans Way, Portland, OR

**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 at the Horizon Airlines Portland headquarters, noting that Tom Gerharter will lead folks on a tour of the Horizon hangar before the meeting, and during the break.

Welcome New Members:

- Chris Hathaway from Lower Columbia River Estuary Program has recently joined the PAG, replacing Travis Williams from Willamette Riverkeepers. Chris briefly introduced himself and his organization. LCREP is a bi-state, non-profit that started in 1995. They focus on habitat restoration, water quality monitoring, and education. He is happy to be here and participate in this process.
- Wood Village Councilor Mark Clark is Lisa Barton-Mullins' alternate, and he was in the audience.

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	√
Chris <b>Hathaway</b>	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership	√
Laura <b>Hudson</b>	City of Vancouver	√
Gloria <b>Ibarra</b>	FAA	
Maryhelen <b>Kincaid</b>	N. Portland Neighborhood Services	
Lt Col. <b>Stuart Mathew</b>	ORANG	√
Patrick <b>Metzger</b>	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	√
John <b>Mohlis</b>	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	√
Dennis <b>Mulvihill</b>	Washington County	
Brian <b>Nelson</b>	Intel <b>Alternate Jill Eiland in attendance</b>	√
Mary <b>Olson</b>	Port Commissioner	√
Jordan <b>Papé</b>	Flightcraft <b>Alternate Mitchell Berck in attendance</b>	√
Alesia <b>Reese</b>	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Veronica <b>Rinard</b>	Portland OR Visitors Association	√
Hector <b>Roche</b>	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	√
Lawrence <b>Russell</b>	Environmental Justice	

Bob <b>Sallinger</b>	Audubon Society of Portland	
Michael <b>Sloan</b>	Vancouver Neighborhoods	√
Dave <b>Smith</b>	Vice Chair	√
Denny <b>Stoecklin</b>	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred <b>Stovel</b>	Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Vicki <b>Thompson</b>	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John <b>Weigant</b>	Airport Issues Roundtable	√

<b>Staff &amp; Consultants</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Joe Barden	Port's Aviation Consultant (HNTB)	
Debbie Bishop	Port	√
C.F. Booth	Port's Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
Bronwyn Buckle	City Planning Bureau	√
Chris Corich	Port Project Manager	
Renee Dowlin	Port	
Melissa Egan	Assistant to Facilitator, ICM	√
Jason Gately	Port	
Lise Glancy	Port	√
Nancy Hendrickson	BES	√
Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Scott King	Port	√
Sean Loughran	Port	√
Mary Maxwell	Port	
Linda Perry	Jacobs Consultancy	
Kelly Rogers	David Evans and Assoc.	√
Kama Simonds	Port	√
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√
Chris White	Port	√

**Public Present:** Mark Clark (alternate for Lisa Barton-Mullins), Lee Perlman, Willy Williamson (alternate for Hudson and Sloan), and Glenn Thompson (PSU Graduate Student)

### **Approval of May 20, 2008 Meeting Notes (Attach. 1) – Bill Blosser**

Bill asked if there were any comments or corrections. There were none. The minutes were approved.

### **Clarification of AHP Vote from Last Meeting – Sam Imperati**

At the May PAG meeting, Sam asked for a vote on AHP as a tool for evaluating options. He noted that on further reflection that this PAG vote was unnecessary as it was never intended that the AHP be the only tool for evaluating options. The PAG had been clear that they would not use the AHP as a substitute for judgment. Given this, Sam proposed that the PAG vote on the AHP was unnecessary and null. There was no objection from the PAG.

### **Project Assumptions with Follow-on Studies (Attach. 2) – Sam Imperati**

Sam referred the group to Attachment 2, "Project Assumptions with Follow-on Studies." He requested that the PAG please email him with any suggestions or corrections. Staff wants it to be a living document.

## **Horizon Facility and Operations Overview –Tom Gerharter**

The Horizon Airlines facility in Portland is celebrating their 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary this year. Horizon Airlines celebrated their 25<sup>th</sup> year, and their parent company Alaska, is 70 years old. Tom went over the operations at this hangar and the types of planes they have. They have a great relationship with the Port and continue to be solid partners. They are trying to adapt to the changes in the industry and a major focus is customer service. Their flights are 99% reliable, and just short of 95% on time – the best in the country right now. All they need to do is make a little money and they will be ok! The company employs 4,000 and about half are in Portland.

## **Members in the News – Sam Imperati**

- Congratulations to Jill Eiland on the graduation of her daughter.
- Ross Monn had a fabulous goodbye party with new City Council member, Nick Fish, in attendance.
- John Mohlis is the president at the Columbia Pacific Trades Council and was noted in an article on the Columbia River Crossing project. Catherine Ciarlo has also been active in this issue.
- Alesia Reese wrote an article on Airport Futures in the East Portland Neighborhood Office newsletter. The article included a photo of Catherine Ciarlo and other PAG members.

## **Time/Location of Next Meeting – Sam Imperati**

Because Airport Futures has a bi-state impact, staff proposed the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting be held in Vancouver. Because of bridge traffic issues, it was proposed that the meeting time be changed to 3-6 pm. The PAG was asked if this would work for them. PAG members were fine with the meeting time/location. The meeting will be at the Firstenburg Community Center. (POST MEETING NOTE: The meeting location has been moved to the Vancouver Hilton, which is downtown and more accessible.)

## **Packet Delivery Check-In – Sam Imperati**

As requested by PAG, staff has continued to send e-mail packets and hard copy packets. Sam wondered if there was anyone not interested in receiving hard copy packet in mail. Lise passed around a sheet so folks could indicate their preference.

## **Product/Process/Relationship Balance – Sam Imperati**

At each meeting, we propose to begin identifying the focus of the meeting as product, process, and/or relationship. For example, tonight, we will have product in the form of voting on the City Early Land Use Proposal. Some of us are very product-oriented, some are process-oriented, and some are more relationship-oriented. Over the course of the Airport Futures process, we hope to keep this in balance. Sam wanted to acknowledge that the request to add this as an aspect of our meetings comes from Hector. Folks will notice that this has also been added to the Meeting Evaluation form.

## **Agenda Review – Bill Blosser**

Bill noted that there are no changes to the agenda, and that we would proceed with a presentation from Bill Wyatt. Tonight will be fairly general and in September, we will get a more in-depth look at the finance side of PDX and the industry. PAG members were encouraged to think of questions, but to hold off on them until September. (NOTE: Due to extended discussion on the Airline Industry and Sustainability agenda items, the Overview on Follow-on Studies presentation was deferred to the September PAG meeting.)

## **Airline Industry Update - Bill Wyatt, Executive Director of the Port of Portland**

Bill greatly appreciates everyone's commitment to the PAG. He had the pleasure of visiting with City Council two weeks ago, and it was a happy occasion. We are making progress and people are noticing.

Bill thinks that, especially these days, there is a great deal more said than known about the airline industry. He hopes to illuminate and personalize it tonight. He will discuss finances a bit, but notes that it can be simplified by "you fly, you pay." The industry is based on user-fees.

The forecast is a moving target and fuel is a major component of that. For the first time ever, fuel is a more expensive cost than labor. This is a stunning development.

Changes in capacity at PDX: September is a significant month for airlines; it is when adjustments are made because things slow down after the summer months. He said there are six types of capacity changes – discontinued service; reduced frequencies; smaller aircraft; larger aircraft; increased frequencies; and new service.

Airlines are a very data centric business and they are well informed about how high fares can be raised before folks will stop buying tickets. From a national perspective, we are lucky in the Northwest because our economy is relatively strong. Nobody wants to give up the Portland market, but you must match your capacity with demand. For example, if there are six flights to Atlanta now, in the fall, there might be five.

It used to be that funds generated by airlines/airports were used for all sorts of civic functions, such as hiring police and fixing roads. The FAA and airlines fixed this through federal legislation on revenue diversion. Now, federal law requires that revenue generated on the airport stay on the airport or be limited to projects directly related to airport operations. This issue came up in the effort to bring light rail from Gateway to PDX. The FAA declined to support this initially as they perceived this project as revenue diversion. While there was unified local support for this project, it was not easy to achieve and required a lot of discussion/work between the FAA, Bechtel, Port, Tri-Met, and City.

Bill showed different pie charts, explaining revenue and expenses at the Port. He noted that any belt tightening comes from Operations - Labor, Materials, and Services; the other areas of the budget are fixed. The Port's Chief Financial Officer characterizes PDX as having a "medium-high" level of debt, and Bill noted that he certainly does not want to see that increase.

In the future, there is going to be an airline industry, but it is going to look a little different. In 1980, 17% of Americans flew, today about 75% of us fly at least once a year. Our two dominant carriers at PDX are Alaska/Horizon and Southwest, and thankfully, they are the two most successful in the country. With that and the relatively stable economy in the Northwest, he thinks we are in good shape to weather the current economic troubles.

*Alesia Reese:* is interested in info re: the tax and fee portion of ticket prices and the impact on local jurisdictions (e.g., hotel revenue). Are there fees connected to the airport, which affect other parts of the economy?

*Bill Wyatt:* we will be able to give you that. Activity at PDX does generate about \$160 million in state and local taxes. This is from activity related to PDX, not part of an airline ticket fee/tax.

*Andy Cotugno:* at Metro, they forecast for traffic/cars, looking at many aspects including efficiency. What are you seeing for aircraft re: efficiency? They do not turn over as fast as cars, so he wonders about how responsive airlines can be in making improvements.

*Bill Wyatt:* yesterday in the news, a \$9 billion order for Boeing for new 737s was announced. Airlines are making investments in efficiency and getting rid of old planes, but planes take a long time to build.

However, given the current oil situation, suddenly it is worth it to a carrier to get rid of planes they may have kept in the past.

*Bill Blosser:* please email staff with any further questions with you to our meeting in September and we will get back to your prior to our meeting in September.

### **Public Involvement – Hector Roche, Lise Glancy**

Hector provided a brief Public Involvement Subcommittee Report. Their deliverables are: 1) an on-going public involvement process; 2) periodic evaluation of the PAG process; and 3) increasing outreach efforts, which is the core focus right now. Their last meeting was June 3, at which they started expanding their list of Key Stakeholders. This will be brought to the group and the PAG will be asked for assistance in reaching out. The subcommittee's next meeting is July 22. The goals for that meeting are to review and finalize the work plan.

Lise referred the PAG to an eight-page memo regarding public involvement activities, asking folks to please read this memo after the meeting. They have had seven stakeholder forums; she highlighted three of them. The noted Air Fair this past weekend was a tremendous success. Patrick Metzger, Alesia Reese, Fred Stovel, and Hector Roche all came and added greatly to the success of the day. Hector thanked Chris and Shannon for the wonderful job they did putting it together. Alesia added that it had a great vibe; it was really a fair, a celebratory event. About 800 people went on tours, most of who reported that it helped make airport issues more relevant to them.

Lise briefly mentioned the 6/25/08 City Council Information Meeting. It was a positive event. Council was thrilled to have such collaboration and hope it will serve as a model for public processes in the future. Lise noted her appreciation for PAG members who participated in this event. Maryhelen Kincaid, Alesia Reese, Fred Stovel, John Weigant, and Bill Blosser.

In closing, Hector asked everyone to please fill out the Action Request Form.

### **PAG Explores the Columbia Slough – Nancy Hendrickson, Bureau of Environmental Services**

Nancy Hendrickson from the Columbia Slough Watershed Management Program of Bureau of Environmental Services announced two opportunities to explore the Columbia Slough. On July 27, from 9:00 AM to 2:00 PM, there will be public tours and on September 13, a Saturday, 10-noon, there will be a special hour and a half tour for the PAG. Sam will send out an email to get folks signed up.

Nancy works on the entire Columbia Slough Watershed. She reports that it is significantly cleaner than it used to be, and the main problem facing the Slough is perception, which is why seeing it in a canoe is the best way to experience this treasure. Hector asked if folks could bring their own canoes. Nancy's response was yes.

### **Land Use Update and Discussion – Fred Stovel and Jay Sugnet**

Fred provided a brief Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee Report, noting that the committee was unanimous in selecting the Plan District option.

Jay went through a PowerPoint to explain how and why the subcommittee arrived at that decision. Jay said that there is very little difference between the Airport Zone and Plan District options.

Jay highlighted the primary differences between a conditional use process and a plan district:

- Duration of approval
- Review authority is different (who reviews, when, etc.)
- Examples of Land Uses

## Impact and mitigations

Public Involvement (what will on-going public involvement look like and how that will relate to the plan district notice and public review provisions?)

One of the main benefits of a Plan District is that it meets all the needs set out in our Vision and Values. When we started this process, Jay felt there would be a clearer difference, but there is not. There will be an additional discussion opportunity at the Citywide Land Use Chairs Meeting on July 28. They know all about these constructs, and this will be the time to fill them in and identify issues before going to Planning Commission.

*Sam Imperati:* are there any questions or comments on the proposition to move from a Conditional Use to a Plan District?

*Stuart Mathew:* how long do you see it taking to write all the new rules/codes?

*Jay Sugnet:* 6-9 months, which is built into the schedule. We knew we would have to do this even if we stayed with a Conditional Use.

*Stuart Mathew:* who writes it?

*Jay Sugnet:* city staff. He promises he will not give the PAG a big pile of code to sift through. It is a big group of people, representing many bureaus, who take on code writing. We will start with a Code Concept – which is essentially an outline of the code that we want to write and get agreement from the subcommittee and PAG on what are the key elements of the Plan District and what do we hope to accomplish.

*Alan Hargrave:* any difference in the boundary between Plan District and an Airport Zone?

*Jay Sugnet:* this is one of the benefits of the Plan District. It is more flexible. You can draw the boundary larger and address things like landscaping requirements for wildlife.

*Alesia Reese:* code enforcement. Is there a difference in a Plan District as opposed to the current system?

*Jay Sugnet:* it is all in how you design it. Essentially, it is the same.

*Erwin Bergman:* how much input will PAG have to the code writers?

*Jay Sugnet:* it is open for comment, but group writing of code is not recommended for the PAG. Some of it may be brought to the subcommittee.

*Sam Imperati:* major decisions will be discussed by the PAG.

*Chris Hathaway:* can you talk more about geographic boundary? It would have to be closely related to airport functions, correct?

*Jay Sugnet:* yes, the one exception is wildlife. We do not want to go outside industrial area; he does not see a need to go into residential areas.

*Hector Roche:* Conditional Use has an 8-10 year review cycle. For a Plan District, what is that like?

*Jay Sugnet:* Plan District review is based on development and growth. If they are just changing the light bulbs, there is no need to review. This is one of the questions for the PAG, should it be based on time or development issues?

*John Weigant:* current city code has noise overlay. Will the new option?

*Jay Sugnet:* yes.

*Sam Imperati:* question for Port and City - are you comfortable with this recommendation?

*Scott King:* yes, he thinks the Plan District is the best route for us to take.

*Jay Sugnet:* agreed.

*Sam Imperati:* is there any public comment on whether the PAG should adopt the subcommittee recommendation to change from Conditional Use to Plan District?

*Mark Clark, from the audience:* is there going to be a quicker response to citizen concerns?

*Jay Sugnet:* it depends upon the type of issue to determine the type of response. If it has a low impact, within the fence, low impact on city, then a minor process will occur. A larger process will occur for issues that have a greater impact or a direct impact on the community.

**VOTE: all members present voted 1, supporting subcommittee recommendation**  
**Break**

### **Sustainability Update and Discussion – Cam Gilmore, Sean Loughran, and Sam Imperati**

Cam turned it over to Sean went over the PowerPoint on Sustainability. Sean explained that they did a number of exercises with subcommittee and we will do that tonight with the PAG as a way to focus the discussion.

#### **Slide 2: Tonight's goals**

- 1) Review Where We Are on Sustainability
- 2) Consider Subcommittee's Recommendations
- 3) PAG Exercises to Focus Discussion
- 4) List of Potential Future Discussion Topics
  - A) Current Sustainability Efforts
  - B) Which of Those Are Not Sustainable
  - C) Impact of Marketing
  - D) Income and Job Aspects of Growth on Sustainability

#### **Slides 3 and 4: PAG Recommendations to Date**

- 1) How will the PAG evaluate the Airport development options?
  - AHP tool to help select between Centralized and Decentralized alternatives
  - Other issues may use the same or different tool
- 2) What specific recommendations should the PAG make to the City and the Port to accomplish the overarching sustainability goal?
  - Ongoing
    - Strategic and Tactical ideas
    - "Bucket" and Agreed Upon Ideas: Final PAG Report

#### **Slide 5: Tonight's Topic**

Action on Sustainability Subcommittee's recommended answer to the following question:

- 3) What is the PAG's recommended 2035 level of sustainability goal for PDX and its environs, and how does that relate to the issue of growth and level of service?

## **Slide 6: Subcommittee Process Recommendations**

PAG should:

- A) Weight the three sustainability factors by allocating 100 points, use the AHP process, and select a descriptive term to provide more detail to its sustainability recommendation.
- B) Recommend to the City and Port where they should be on the issue of population growth.
- C) Discuss what reduced overall level of service, if any, it would be willing to recommend for PDX and its environs if it was necessary to achieve its sustainability goal.

## **Slides 7 and 8: PAG's Current Sustainability Statements and Recommendations**

- 1) Sustainability as defined by PAG will be considered at the core of and throughout Airport Futures - a major theme.
- 2) Sustainability means, "meeting the region's air transportation needs without compromising future generation's livability and quality of life."
- 3) PAG's Vision and Values will frame our sustainability discussion and are an overarching project goal, reinforcing Portland's planning legacy and PDX's reputation as premier airport.
- 4) The PAG will fairly, realistically and optimally balance the Vision and Values elements.

## **Slides 9 and 10: Subcommittee's Additional Statements and Recommendations**

- A) Unrestrained global population growth is in conflict with sustainability. This is a global issue that we cannot effectively address in the Airport Futures process.
- B) In the areas where the City and the Port have control, they have a responsibility to address sustainability as they plan for the future of the airport and its environs. They should show leadership by striving to be the most sustainable airport in the world.
- C) In light of the State's "Big Look" and Global Warming Commission, Metro's urban reserve discussion, and the City's Portland Plan, the City and the Port should recognize the importance of regional coordination, plan for, and manage the anticipated level of regional growth.

*Hector Roche:* question for clarification on slide 6, #2, population growth.

*Sean Loughran:* Metro's projecting we will get to 3.2 million in 2035.

*Erwin Bergman:* re: slide 7, # 2 – what does "meeting needs" really mean?

*Sean Loughran:* you are getting ahead of us, and this is a great segue into Level of Service (LOS). We will be dealing with this a lot with facility requirements. This presentation is about what we have done to date. The statement on the PowerPoint is intended to be broad.

*John Weigant:* maybe the sustainability subcommittee could be tasked to reconsider the definition because he is not sure if it is possible to meet needs without compromising livability and quality of life.

*Sean Loughran:* we are striving for balance.

*Sam Imperati:* to respond to Erwin's concerns, went over the agreed upon Vision and Values. This is not the last conversation we will have about sustainability. Issues can be brought to the subcommittee and then to the larger PAG. We are peeling layer by layer and we are far from done. Today we are looking at population growth and the trade-offs, if any, on level of service.

Sam introduced the new electronic voting machines. He led the group through two questions so folks could get a sense of how the voting and data displays work.

Next, the PAG completed a paper exercise, weighing sustainability factors, allocating 100 points between three sustainability areas: economic, environmental, and social. The results of this could be used in a situation when we need to make decisions when looking at sustainability in the master plan and land use plan.

**Exercise I. Weighting Sustainability Factors:** You have 100 points. Allocate them among the three categories for purposes of establishing the PAG’s recommendation for the Project’s (MP & LUP) overall sustainability goal: Economic, Environmental, and Social.

PAG Member	Allocation of Points			
	Economic	Environmental	Social	Total
Bill Blosser	30	40	30	100
Dave Smith	40	30	30	100
Laura Hudson	33	34	33	100
Mary Olsen	40	20	20	80
Andy Cotugno	40	30	30	100
Cam Gilmour	50	25	25	100
Hector Roche	20	50	30	100
Tom Gerharter	50	30	20	100
Veronica Rinard	30	40	30	100
Mitchell Berck	80	10	10	100
Lt. Col. Stuart Matthew	45	30	25	100
Jill Eiland	40	20	40	100
Chris Hathaway	30	40	30	100
Vicki Thompson	33.3	33.3	33.3	99.9
Erwin Berman	15	40	45	100
Fred Stovel	30	30	40	100
Patrick Metzger	30	30	40	100
Denny Stoecklin	40	30	30	100
Alesia Reese	50	35	15	100
Michael Sloan	25	35	40	100
Alan Hargrave	55	20	25	100
Lisa Barton-Mullins	30	40	30	100
John Weigant	25	40	35	100
<b>Average</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>99</b>

*Sam Imperati:* we are going to use the AHP approach for this very same process, like Holland Young’s example of buying a car. In a pair-wise comparison, we will compare, pair by pair, Economy – Environment; Economy – Social; and Social – Environment, to see how folks would choose between two potentially, but not necessarily, competing factors.

**Exercise II AHP Pair-Wise** for purposes of establishing the PAG's recommendation for the Project's (MP & LUP) overall sustainability goal:

<b>Economy - Environment</b>			<b>Economy - Social</b>			<b>Environment - Social</b>		
100%	0	0%	100%	1	4.55%	100%	0	0%
	1	4.55%		0	0%		1	4.55%
75%	2	9.09%	75%	5	22.73%	75%	5	22.73%
	8	36.36%		4	18.18%		4	18.18%
50/50	1	4.55%	50/50	3	13.64%	50/50	7	31.82%
	3	13.64%		4	18.18%		3	13.64%
75%	7	31.82%	75%	5	22.73%	75%	2	9.09%
	0	0%		0	0%		0	0%
100%	0	0%	100%	0	0%	100%	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>		

<b>Economic</b>	<b>0.3108</b>
<b>Environmental</b>	<b>0.4934</b>
<b>Social</b>	<b>0.1958</b>

**Exercise III. Descriptive Term:** Pick the choice below for purposes of establishing the PAG's recommendation for the Project's (MP & LUP) overall sustainability goal:

**Responses**

A.	Top 5% in the world	8	36.36%
B.	Top 25% in the world	8	36.36%
C.	Top 33% in the world	3	13.64%
D.	Top 50% in the world	1	4.55%
E.	Top 66% in the world	0	0%
F.	Top 75% in the world	2	9.09%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Exercise IV. Population Growth Policy Overlay:** Pick spot on below continuum that best represents your PAG recommendation on the policies that the Port and the City should institute in response to the predicted growth of 1.4%:

**Responses**

A.	Promote Zero Growth or Decline ( $\leq 0$ )	0	0%
B.	Promote Even Less Growth (+ 0.4%)	0	0%
C.	Promote Less Growth (+ 0.9%)	4	18.18%
D.	Accept the Predicted Growth (+ 1.4%)	18	81.82%
E.	Promote More Growth (+ 1.9%)	0	0%
F.	Promote Even More Growth (+ 2.4%)	0	0%
G.	Promote Even More Growth than that (+ 2.9%)	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Exercise VI. PDX (Inside Property Line) All Facilities Level of Service (LOS) Exercise:** Level of service standards are based on qualitative and quantitative assessments of comparative service and convenience. Assuming PDX is at LOS “B” now, what is the lowest LOS you would be willing to accept at PDX if necessary to meet your sustainability goal for the Project (MP & LUP)?

After some discussion to clarify the intention of the question and possible answers, this question was asked in two ways – once considering no increase possible, once allowing for all options. Sean reminded folks that it is important to remember that these are hypothetical questions. The underlying concepts are important, and it may be that we can find a way to achieve our sustainability goals while maintaining the same level of service.

<b>Version I – if decrease</b>			<b>Version II – all options available</b>		
<b>Responses</b>					
A	0	0%	A	1	4.55%
B	1	4.55%	B	9	40.91%
C	14	63.64%	C	7	31.82%
C/D	5	22.73%	C/D	4	18.18%
D	2	9.09%	D	1	4.55%
E	0	0%	E	0	0%
F	0	0%	F	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Exercise VI. Neighborhood/Environs (Outside Property Line) Multi-modal Transportation Level of Service (LOS) Exercise:** Assuming the Neighborhoods/Environs are at LOS “C/D” now, what is the lowest LOS you would be willing to accept in the Neighborhoods/Environs if necessary to meet your sustainability goal for the Project (MP & LUP)?

*Andy Cotugno:* is this peak time?

*Sam Imperati:* we discussed that in the subcommittee, and decided to make it, at this point in the conversation, a broad generalization.

*Andy Cotugno:* current population is about 2.1 million in the seven county area.

*Sean Loughran:* we are not asking are you happy with these growth projections, but rather...

*Andy Cotugno:* should you design the master plan to accommodate and serve that level of growth.

Similar to the above question, this question was asked in two ways – once considering no increase possible, once allowing for all options.

<b>Version I – if decrease</b>			<b>Version II – all options available</b>		
<b>Responses</b>					
A	0	0%	A	0	0%
B	0	0%	B	4	19.05%
C	1	4.76%	C	7	33.33%
C/D	2	9.52%	C/D	8	38.10%
D	17	80.95%	D	2	9.52%
E	1	4.76%	E	0	0%
F	0	0%	F	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Sam Imperati:* to the PAG, what is your reaction to the results?

*Alesia Reese:* was expecting a little bit of change, but not sure that the measurements at the end reflect how she started. The explanation of the car seemed a little bit odd, now to use it in a real example is a bit confusing.

*Andy Cotugno:* the point Sam made that this is the very first exercise is important. If we had to adopt based on this exercise, I would want to do it over again.

*Alesia Reese:* exactly.

*Andy Cotugno:* this tool lets everyone participate and weight in.

*John Weigant:* this is a little sensitive to extreme votes

*Sam Imperati:* showed the pair-wise results, which were quite different from the manual tally.

*Stuart Mathew:* thinks its key to frame the questions right. It is easier to think about two options than three.

*Andy Cotugno:* would like to know how his results look individually, so he can see how inconsistent he might be.

*Alesia Reese:* also interested in how her answers might be impacted by each method and the info she receives from PAG to make these decisions.

*Sam Imperati:* we purposely did not give you information and wanted your instinctual responses.

*Sean Loughran:* there is output from the program that indicated consistency at the overall group level.

### **Slide 30: Potential Future Discussion Topics for Subcommittee and then the PAG**

- A) What are PDX and City currently doing for sustainability?
- B) What things are they doing now that are not sustainable?
- C) Do current marketing activities create growth: 1) that would otherwise not happen, 2) create more convenience for the current residents, 3) both, or 4) neither?  
If yes, by how much? 1) Port, 2) City/PDC, and 3) State.
- D) Should Income and Job growth be part of sustainability recommendation?

### **Closing Comments – Bill Blosser, Sam Imperati**

In closing, Bill went over next agenda. In addition to the standing items, we will likely have presentations on Port Finance 101, an Existing Conditions Update, a Follow-on Studies Overview, PDX Facility Requirements, and recommendations on sustainability that we did not get to tonight. He told the PAG that the subcommittee also went through the same exercises we went through tonight, and reassured the PAG that the frustration was shared. They thought it would be useful for everyone to see what the subcommittee is struggling with. We will come back to you with clarified recommendations.

Next Meeting September 16, 3:00 to 6:00 pm in Vancouver.

Meeting adjourned.

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

