

Planning Advisory Group Meeting #9
Tuesday, September 16, 2008 3:00 pm – 6:00 pm
 Vancouver Hilton, Pine/Spruce Rooms (2nd floor), 301 W. 6th Avenue, Vancouver, WA

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

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

Bill Blosser welcomed to everyone to the meeting and introduced Royce Pollard, the mayor of “America’s Vancouver!”

Vancouver Mayor Royce Pollard: Welcomed the PAG to Vancouver, USA. He noted the airport was a huge asset and an economic multiplying factor, but it had significant noise impacts for Vancouver residents. He expressed his pleasure that Vancouver was participating in this planning process.

Bill Blosser: Noted that the Port is serious about Vancouver’s involvement. Dave Smith serves as co-chair. At the outset of the process, the PAG took a tour of Vancouver and Portland neighborhoods. We take this partnership seriously.

Mayor Pollard: Appreciate Dave Smith’s role as vice-chair. He also noted that Dave and staff have provided regular updates to the Vancouver City Council. Those reports are on TV for our community which is worth a lot.

Bill Blosser: Expressed appreciation on behalf of the PAG.

Welcome new PAG Members:

John Frevola is taking over for Jordan Papé. Jordan has moved back into the family business. John has been in the aviation business for twenty-five years. He is just getting acquainted with his new job and his role on the PAG. He is happy to be here.

Barry Hennelly from Metro will be the alternate for Andy Cotugno. He has been with Metro for six months and has had a variety of professional experience.

Members	Affiliation	Present
Lisa Barton-Mullins	E. County/City of Fairview	
Erwin Bergman	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill Blosser	Chair	√
Catherine Ciarlo	Planning Commissioner	√
Andy Cotugno	Metro: Alternate Barry Hennelly in attendance	√
John Frevola	Flightcraft: Alternate Mitchell Berck in attendance, as well	√
Tom Gerharter	Horizon Airlines	√
Cam Gilmour	Clackamas County	√
Alan Hargrave	Port of Camas/Washougal	√
Chris Hathaway	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership	
Laura Hudson	City of Vancouver	√
Gloria Ibarra	FAA	
Maryhelen Kincaid	N. Portland Neighborhood Services	√
Lt Col. Stuart Mathew	ORANG	√
Patrick Metzger	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	√

John Mohlis	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	√
Dennis Mulvihill	Washington County	√
Brian Nelson	Intel	
Mary Olson	Port Commissioner	√
Alesia Reese	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Veronica Rinard	Portland OR Visitors Association	√
Hector Roche	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	
Lawrence Russell	Environmental Justice	
Bob Sallinger	Audubon Society of Portland	
Michael Sloan	Vancouver Neighborhoods Alternate Willy Williamson in attendance	√
Dave Smith	Vice Chair	√
Denny Stoecklin	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred Stovel	Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Vicki Thompson	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	
John Weigant	Airport Issues Roundtable	√

Staff & Consultants	Affiliation	Present
Joe Barden	Port's Aviation Consultant (HNTB)	
Debbie Bishop	Port	√
C.F. Booth	Port's Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
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 Rodgers	David Evans and Assoc.	√
Kama Simonds	Port	√
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√
Chris White	Port	√

Public Present: Doug and Merrily Graham, Lee Perlman, Kelly Sweeney, and Glenn Thompson

Approval of Meeting Notes and Announcements – Bill Blosser

No changes were requested. The Meeting Notes from 7/15/08 were approved.

Lise Glancy: There will be a hearing tomorrow night on the Colwood Golf Course to address an appeal of the hearings officer's decision on the requested re-zone. The Port had submitted letters to the hearings officer in support of the re-zoning to industrial. The Port Commission authorized the purchase of forty-seven acres pending the re-zone in April 2008. Lise noted that she would be testifying for the Port in support of rezone of that parcel. She noted that there will be others on the PAG testifying on the other side of this issue and asked if any PAG members wanted to share their perspective.

Erwin Bergman: is looking forward to having the opportunity to develop a park for the whole city, not just Cully.

Alesia Reese: will be sending a letter of support for the open space on behalf of the East County Parks Committee.

John Frevola introduced himself as Jordan Pape’s replacement at Flightcraft. Jordan has rejoined the family business in Eugene. John has 25 years in the aviation business.

Barry Hennelly introduced himself as the new Metro delegate. He will be Andy Cotugno’s alternate.

Subcommittee and Other Report Outs – Chairs

Public Involvement Subcommittee – Kelly Sweeney and Lise Glancy

Kelly Sweeny – Public Involvement Subcommittee member - was asked by Hector Roche to make a presentation because Hector could not be here this evening. Kelly has many years of experience in aviation and was with Intel for twenty-eight years.

The PAG was showed a very large spreadsheet containing the list of individuals and organizations that that the committee is trying to reach. They are proactive, not waiting for folks to come to them. We are working on success measures and interested in increasing representation from Vancouver.

Kelly reviewed the summer outreach and upcoming outreach. He invited the PAG to join the public involvement subcommittee for a meeting with public involvement panel on 9/24. He also let the PAG know about the upcoming open houses on 10/8 and 10/13 and urged PAG members to participate in these meetings.

<p style="text-align: center;">Update on Outreach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer Outreach Highlights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 7/21 Vancouver City Council work session – 8/1 Metro Transportation Policy Advisory Committee – 8/14 Metro Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation – 8/2 – 8/12 Neighbor Night Out – 9/3 North Portland Neighborhood Chairs – 9/4 Technical Advisory Pool 	<p style="text-align: center;">Update on Outreach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upcoming Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 10/9 PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee – 10/14 Portland Business Alliance Transportation Committee – 10/16 International Organization of Women Pilots – 10/27 Columbia Slough Watershed Council • E-mail update to stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – July 2008 – August 2008 	<p style="text-align: center;">Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key deliverable of Public Involvement Subcommittee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Define the public engagement process to follow Airport Futures • Coordination with Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee and PAG will be critical • Discussion scheduled with public engagement consultants on 9/24 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 7:00-9:00 pm – Northeast Coalition of Neighbors, 4815 NE 7th • JOIN US FOR THIS DISCUSSION!
---	--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">October Open Houses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning for Airport Futures open houses underway • Two dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Wednesday, October 8 5:30-7:30 pm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver – C-Tran Fisher’s Landing Transit Center, 3510 SE 164th Avenue – Monday, October 13 5:30-7:30 pm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portland – Meek Pro Tech High School, 4039 NE Alberta Court • Mark your calendars! Participate in the open house!
--

The open house dates were rescheduled to avoid conflicts with the presidential debates so more folks could come to these meetings.

Land Use and Transportation Subcommittee – Fred Stovel

After July, when PAG approved the Plan District option, they took the decision and plans to the Citywide Land Use Chairs Committee for a healthy discussion that lasted 1.5 hours on 7/28/08. Fred noted that, despite questions on impact on other institutions and neighborhood input, this committee seemed satisfied with the proposed land use approach. On 8/12/08, staff briefed the Portland Planning Commission. All groups agreed that the PAG had made the right recommendation.

As Lise mentioned, we are encouraging folks to attend the Public Involvement Subcommittee because land use involves public involvement. In fact, public involvement is required under state law. PAG members are encouraged to attend.

The next meeting of the Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee is 9/30. The focus will be on surface transportation.

Master Plan Alternatives Subcommittee – Chris Corich

Chris is still putting this subcommittee together. At their first meeting on 9/10/08, the subcommittee did a quick overview of the 2000 Master Plan, as well as Facilities Requirements. These topics will be discussed later in the agenda. He could use four or five more committee members and a chair.

Overview of 2000 PDX Master Plan and Follow-on Studies – Chris Corich

Chris presented the following information as an update for the PAG, noting that they started with a more linear, sequential plan, but have realized over time that an overlapping approach better suits the process. He showed several slides of Concepts from the 2000 MP and the Decentralized and Centralized alternatives.

The SEE, Strategic Environmental Evaluation, is used to help select between options (for example, this analysis reveals which Alternative involves the most impervious surface area).

Slide 13: 1. Strategic Environmental Evaluation Study - SEE

Significance in Airport Futures:

Use data in Alternatives Analysis

Provides a comparison of: Air quality
 Water quality (impervious surface)
 Natural Resources

Slide 17: b) Citizens Noise Advisory Committee

– 4 current and former CNAC'ers on the PAG

“The Port will continue to participate in and support the CNAC program in finding reasonable ways to reduce the impact of noise on the community.”

Significance for Airport Futures: The Port provides a high degree of support to our bi-state multi jurisdictional + adhoc citizen advisory committee on noise.

Slide 18: c) Local, Regional, State, and Federal Regulations and Agreements

Previously briefed at PAG meeting #2:

Long list of Federal, State, and City regulations, permits, agreements.

Significance for Airport Futures: The airport is highly regulated. All development and operations subject to regulations.

Slide 22: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
Significance for Airport Futures: We do NEPA often.

Typically FAA is the lead agency.
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Environmental Assessment (EA)
Categorical Exclusion (CATEX)

Slide 25: a) Hillsboro Airport Master Plan
– Commercial service market driven
– Currently no demand for commercial service
– Intel Shuttle – carries estimated 100,000 Intel employees in an airline like operation
Significance for Airport Futures:
Hillsboro is a major GA Reliever – existing role
Intel employees served at PHA
Commercial service not likely in short term (or long?)

Slide 27: Military Siting Study
Four + alternatives to be considered in the alternatives analysis tasks:

- Centralized Alternative– Military in SW Quad Area
- Decentralized Alternative – Military in NW Quad Area
- No build - military stays where they are
- No military – if they were no military at PDX

Slide 47: Major Alternatives

Centralized Terminal with 3rd Runway

Could be built with no 3rd runway planned
Could be built and military stays where they are
Could be built with no military at PDX

Decentralized Terminal with 3rd Runway

Could be built with no 3rd runway planned
Cargo moved to another location
Could be built with no military at PDX

Chris Corich: the alternatives will be compared to “no build.”

Slide 30: I-5 Rail Corridor Improvements

- Focus has been on freight movement
- Emphasis on bottle neck areas
- Will improve movement of passengers

Significance for Airport Futures: Rail system improvements will improve speeds for passenger rail service.

Used in forecast process sensitivity analysis.

Erwin Bergman: Add federal funding or involvement to Slide 19.

Alesia Reese: question re: Slide 30, reductions in travel, is the bottleneck on I-5 part of it?

Chris Corich: this concerns rail, not roads.

Alesia Reese: to follow up on the road issue, question re: Columbia Crossing.

Barry Hennelly: in rail planning, there is not a one-to-one correlation between road and rail use.

Erwin Bergman: to Alesia, just to let you know, nine or ten members of this PAG signed a letter to support high-speed rail.

Catherine Ciarlo: I have a fascinating article about high-speed rail; cities that are 300-500 mile apart are the best candidates for true high-speed rail.

Chris Corich: With respect to noise, noted that we could give the PAG an hour, three hour, or eight hour briefing on noise. (No direction requested of the PAG at this point.)

BREAK

PDX Facility Requirements – Loughran

C.F. Booth presented a PowerPoint on the subject of Preliminary Facility Requirements. The presentation was for information only and no action was requested of the PAG.

The purpose of the Facility Requirements analysis is:

- Understand the capabilities of existing facilities
- Identify new facilities needed to meet forecast demand
- Establish a basis for alternatives analysis

Facility requirements were discussed for airfield, passenger terminal complex, ground transportation and parking, air cargo and general aviation. Additional subject areas will be evaluated in the final facility requirements analysis.

Key findings presented include:

- Consistent with the forecast and consideration of sustainability, facility requirements have changed considerable since the last master plan.
- PDX is well positioned to accommodate forecast demand through 2035.
- Major facilities (terminal, airfield) are adequate to accommodate the projected 27 million annual passengers.
- Incremental improvements will be required to maintain balanced utilization of the airport facility through 2035.

Slide 6:

COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS MASTER PLAN

Some requirements have changed

BASIS OF REQUIREMENTS	Previous Master Plan (2020)	Current Master Plan (2035)
Total annual passengers (million)	27	27
Aircraft operations	485,000	378,000
Total cargo (annual tons)	958,000	732,000
AIRFIELD		
Capacity (annual operations; current procedures)	410,000	425,000
Number of parallel runways	3	2
Critical aircraft	A380-200	B747-400
TERMINAL		
Gates	107	67
Increased building area	50%	-
GROUND TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING		
Public parking spaces (on-Airport)	25,000	28,000
Employee parking spaces	3,000	3,100
Enplaning, curbside (linear feet)	1,035	1,200
Deplaning, curbside (linear feet)	2,240	730
AIR CARGO		
Building area (square feet)	823,000	1,100,000
Ramp (square yards)	336,000	610,000

JACOBS
CONSULTANCY

6

C.F. Booth: it reinforces need for flexibility and why we do not build facilities based on time, but on demand triggers.

Erwin Bergman: was on the Master Plan committee last time and it was entirely different; there were convincing arguments for all the numbers we arrived at.

Bill Blosser: re: Slide 10, showing other parts of the world use the midnight – 5:00 a.m. window more. Why not here in Portland?

C.F. Booth: it is driven by demand. We are not a hub, we are an O&D (originating and terminating passengers are most of our service) type airport.

Merrily Graham: are there more flights in the early morning? Seems like they are stacked from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

C.F. Booth: cannot answer that.

LOS (level of service) is measured differently for all functional areas of airport. They use, among other things, density of people to help determine the LOS of a given area.

Alesia Reese: how are we impacted when other airports make changes?

C.F. Booth: you are impacted when a delay happens. However, as an O&D airport, you are not as impacted as a connecting hub.

Veronica Rinard: we will be seeing airlines sharing gates more, and a general higher utilization of existing facilities – will that lead to more delays?

C.F. Booth: it could, but it depends on how you schedule, the amount of buffer time is important. You have a minimum buffer time between flights, which is decided upon the schedule certainty. CF does not think we have to worry about that here; making six turns a day is within our capacity. (A “turn” is industry lingo for a landing-deplaning-enplaning-take off cycle.)

Slide 33: Experience, Judgment, and Analytical Tools

- Focus on understanding how to maximize performance and minimize capital expenditure
- Experience and judgment supplemented with information and analysis
- Use of appropriate analytical tools
 - Comprehensive airport simulation tool (CAST)
 - Gate model
 - Passenger flow model
 - Regional ground transportation model

Slide 37: Airfield Conclusions: Future technology will help

- Spacing between the two parallel runways—3,100 feet
 - Certain future technologies may enable simultaneous independent approaches to parallel runways spaced as close as 3,100 feet
- Noise-abatement departure procedures
 - RNAV technology will enable aircraft to fly precise paths over the ground

Slide 38: Airfield Conclusions

- Estimate of annual airfield capacity
 - Capacity is 425,000 - 510,000 annual aircraft operations depending on delay
 - Forecast demand is 378,000 annual aircraft operations
 - Aircraft delays will remain low to moderate through 2035
 - No near-term need for significant capacity increase
- Spacing between parallel runways will influence development
 - Passenger terminal
 - Other facilities
- Timing of technology improvements and accompanying capacity increases is uncertain

Slide 39: Aircraft Gates, domestic

- Existing domestic gates
 - Are utilized at rate of 4.3 turns per gate per day
 - By increasing utilization to 6.0 turns per gate per day, the number of existing gates will be adequate through 2035
- Increased gate utilization will allow passenger facilities to remain within the existing central terminal envelop longer

Slide 41: Aircraft Gates, international

- Existing international gates are cross-utilized by domestic aircraft
- Two additional international gates (i.e., gates connected to the international facilities) will be needed by 2035

Slide 47: Terminal Check-in: counters and kiosks with and without bag check-in

- Terminal ticketing (check-in) lobby
 - Technological advances will result in fewer transactions occurring in the lobby
 - Will meet processor requirements through 2035
- Available queuing space
 - Will increase as baggage screening equipment is relocated
 - Will meet requirements through 2035

Slide 49: Passenger Security Screening: TSA's Checkpoint Evolution program should roll out in 2 years

- Significant operational changes are expected with the TSA's Checkpoint Evolution program; anticipate:

- Screening equipment with faster processing rates
- Greater queuing space requirements
- Possibility that need for increased space may not be significant
- Terminal footprint is adequate to allow passenger security screening space to evolve

Slide 57: Ground Transportation and Parking: Summary of Access Requirements

- Major needs:
 - NB on-ramp improvements at I-205/Airport Way Interchange – 2012
 - New interchange at Airport Way/82nd – 2017
- Minor needs:
 - Selected intersections at/near PDX
 - Additional turn lanes
 - Some new traffic signals
 - Through planning period (2012 – 2035)
- Comprehensive review during alternatives analysis

Slide 60: General Aviation: Facility needs are related to market, Port policy, FBO objectives and FAA

- Existing market
 - High-end corporate aircraft
 - Aircraft maintenance, fueling, and storage
 - Military traffic
 - 80-85% visiting aircraft
- Port policies and objectives
 - Primary commercial service role
 - Supporting airport system
 - Area reserved
 - Minimum standards
- FBO business objectives
 - Accommodate every class of customer
 - Provide first class service
 - Regional focal point for aircraft maintenance
- FAA requirements
 - Upgrade the class of customer

Slide 61: General Aviation: Is a second FBO needed

- Potential advantages of a second FBO
 - Increase in service due to competition
 - Ability to serve more market segments
 - Accommodate every Airport user
 - Compliance with FAA grant assurances
- Potential disadvantages of a second FBO
 - Possible dilution of profits resulting in decreased service
 - Congestion
 - More land area and facilities will be needed

Alesia Reese: Did the last master plan get anything right?

Catherine Ciarlo: to Sean, were you guys surprised by this?

Sean Loughran: no, because we watch changes in the industry. The good news is that we are in a very good position for a while. The surprise is the amount of change we have seen in such a short amount of time in the industry. The Forecasting process really set the stage for this, and this just brings home what we were thinking. We knew from the Aviation Demand Forecast that there was less demand; and secondly, we are getting better utilization out of our existing facilities.

Mary Olson: we have also been very fortunate in terms of timing for the improvements we have done, the terminal expansion, and new parking structure. We are set up well for the future, and we are lucky we got it done before the industry fell apart.

Alesia Reese: are the needs of the flying public also changing? The public are also becoming more educated and experienced.

Dave Smith: question Benchmark airport; SeaTac, their cargo level, is that correct?

Barry Hennelly: they go to Boeing field.

Dennis Mulvihill: need for overnight parking?

C.F. Booth: it is for airplane parking, not cars.

C.F. Booth: We will be writing up assumptions for these facilities requirements and will share this at our 10/21/08 PAG meeting.

Public Comment

Merrily Graham, Ester Short Park Neighborhood Association: We are playing catch up in the community re: noise abatement. We have a noise overlay (thanks to Sean) but have old construction standards in some structures. We are concerned about flight paths and airline adherence to those flight paths. We are being patient and know that work is being done. She is very pleased with and supportive of the CNAC group.

Framing Sustainability continued – Cam Gilmore, Sean Loughran, and Sam Imperati

Cam gave a brief introduction as the Committee Chair. They have met six times already. In July, the PAG weighed in on sustainability as it relates to Airport Futures. The overarching goal is to create the most sustainable airport in the world. Tonight we will try to summarize where we are at. We need the PAG's direction and input, and we want to have discussion about future steps. Our next meeting is 9/30/08.

Next Sean went over the PowerPoint. He noted that PDX traffic goes right over downtown Vancouver and that the Hilton Hotel (where we were meeting) was the first LEED certified Hilton. Vancouver is also committed to sustainability. He noted that Esther Short Park (next to the Hilton) is Vancouver's Pioneer Square. Air traffic from PDX goes over the park and downtown Vancouver.

Slides 3 and 4 PAG recommendations to date:

1. Sustainability will be considered at the core of and throughout Airport Futures.
2. Sustainability defined as "meeting the region's air transportation needs without compromising future generation's livability and quality of life."
3. Vision and Values state that the PAG will explore and make recommendations that fairly, realistically and optimally balance the defined values and goals.
4. Recommend a framework for comparing Master Plan alternatives based on sustainability.
 - Agreement that sustainability criteria should be used to screen alternatives.
 - Agreement that a transparent analytic process was needed to employ the criteria.

Action item for PAG tonight; follow up from July exercises. Sean said the staff and consultants have been looking at AHP and other analytical tools to be sure we are using the most effective one for this process. Sean went over the recommendation that PAG will vote on.

Slides 6, 7 and 8: PAG Action

5. Unconstrained global population growth is not sustainable, in particular the desire by all peoples to increase their standard of living, thereby increasing their consumption of resources considerably beyond the earth's capacity. This is a global issue that we cannot effectively address in the Airport Futures process.

However, recognizing that each of us must play our part to achieve worldwide sustainability and that we must think globally and act regionally, the PAG recommends that the Port and City:

- a. not intentionally institute policies that promote unsustainable growth;
- b. institute policies that accept, plan for, and manage the Metro projections for growth;
- c. recognize the importance of regional coordination with the Western Climate Initiative, the State's "Big Look" and Global Warming Commission, Metro's urban reserve discussion, and the City's Portland Plan;
- d. institute policies that encourage the growth of family wage jobs with benefits and quality land use, to foster the region's sustainability; and
- e. show leadership by *becoming* the most sustainable airport in the world.

Slide 9: Sustainability in 3 Places

Good Ideas Bucket

- List of sustainability considerations important to any Master Plan alternative.
- ### Alternative Selection
- List of sustainability criteria and metrics to help select final alternative.
- ### Benchmarks
- List of sustainability indicators to measure and track progress in achieving sustainability goals.

Slide 10: Future Action Items:

- I. What are PDX and City currently doing for sustainability?
- II. What things are the City and Port doing now that are not sustainable? What additional things should be considered?
- III. 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?
 - a. If yes, by how much? (Port, City/PDC, and State)
 - b. Is it significant?
- IV. The Use of AHP or Other Tools?

Re: III: in the future, we may want to invite marketing folks to a PAG to have a presentation and discussion on effects of marketing.

Re: IV, AHP. With further thought, may want to use a tool that is much simpler. Staff and C.F. are consulting with a colleague of Bill Blosser's.

PAG Discussion and Vote

Erwin Bergman: In #5, add "maintain" to increase their standard of living.

Dennis Mulvihill: question re: connection between sustainability and facility requirements. If we are finalizing the requirements at the next meeting, we should have the sustainability done by then, shouldn't we?

Sean Loughran: they are connected and we look at the sustainability considerations with all decision-making and assumptions; always trying to do better in this area. We are finalizing the facility requirements on 10/21/08, but the sustainability criteria will be used in looking at PDX development alternatives.

Sam Imperati: there is another piece to that, which C.F. will address.

C.F. Booth: we will be able to decide on requirements, figuring out whether or not we will use AHP or something else.

Dennis Mulvihill: could it happen that we will throw out a facility requirement that does not meet the sustainability test?

C.F. Booth: yes.

Bill Blosser: from CF's presentation, it seems like the two alternatives from the 2000 MP (or one of them) has vanished because we do not need anymore gates and we are not building a new runway.

C.F. Booth: we have to put our thirty year hat on, and even look beyond that concerning what appears to be the best way to look at development in the future, which, in this case, does involve assessing where a third runway would go, as you do not want to stick an expensive structure there and have to tear in down if the need for a third runway materializes in the future.

Sean Loughran: our last MP did look beyond the MP timeframe for this reason. In any planning process, you have to keep your eye on the horizon past the planning period. We are going to squeeze as much use out of current facilities as possible.

Erwin Bergman: Despite global warming and price of fuel, there is little likelihood of a third runway. However, in his long experience of master planning, the Port does not believe in the term, "never."

Catherine Ciarlo: process question re: Slide 9, Sustainability in Three Places, the "metrics." Will we see those before the facilities are decided upon?

Sean Loughran: you will see them about the same time, in October. Believe there is a simpler method than AHP.

John Weigant: when you are talking about facilities requirements, you are talking about how many, not configuration?

C.F. Booth, Sean Loughran: correct.

PAG Action Slide 7 Vote and Discussion

(Text of Slide 6, 7 and 8 – Item # 5, above.)

Vote result: 1-3 (Fred Stovel); 8-2 (Erwin Bergman, Maryhelen Kincaid, Stuart Mathew, Dennis Mulvihill, Veronica Rinard, Willy Williamson, Denny Stoecklin, John Weigant); 10-1 (Catherine Ciarlo, Barry Hennelly, Tom Gerharter, Cam Gilmour, Alan Hargrave, Laura Hudson, Patrick Metzger, John Mohlis, Alesia Reese, Mary Olson)

Sam asked folks who did not vote "one" to please comment.

Fred Stovel: voted 3. The action statement on #5 about “unconstrained” growth is a problematic concept for him. He finds it to be a mutually contradicting set of statements. It does not bring him any place further in the realm of sustainability.

Erwin Bergman: voted 2. Suggests the introductory text read “increase or maintain” standards of living.

Catherine Ciarlo: Agreed with Fred – was 1 or 2 – now 1. A and B are not necessarily compatible. No way are we going to come up with something perfect. This is a good start given our evolving understanding.

Maryhelen Kincaid: voted 2. She had the same thought as Fred about “unconstrained.” In D, tie family wage jobs and benefits to quality land use does seem to tie well together.

Stuart Mathew: voted 2. He does not understand C, does not know enough about the State’s global warming commission; also has questions about D.

Dennis Mulvihill: voted 2. He not sure why you need #5, the text on #5 (not the following text)

Veronica Rinard: voted 2. Thinks the statement is fine as long as we are not saying its only “jobs with benefits.” You can encourage that, but it is not possible for all employers to do that and not all employees want it.

Willy Williamson: voted 2. Is concerned that the emphasis on sustainability ends up putting you in a box, perhaps preventing creatively thinking. Closing yourself in with this whole #5.

Denny Stoecklin: voted 2. Agrees with Dennis

John Weigant: voted 2. “address” change to “solve”; 5(b) should be eliminated, as projections for growth are based on history that has not taken into account sustainability;

Stuart Mathew: Don’t understand C, but perhaps don’t know enough. Need better understanding of 5(b).

Sam Imperati: Noted that there is no way the PAG can move forward in the time left. This feedback on the vote will be discussed with Chairs and staff and will be presented to PAG again.

Next Meeting Agenda (October 21, 5:30 to 8:30 pm), Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation Form and Adjournment – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati

The agenda for the next PAG meeting will focus on: sustainability evaluation framework, metrics and final facilities requirements, and open house and subcommittee reports.

Below are the upcoming Public Involvement meetings; all PAG members are encouraged to attend.

9/24, 7-9 pm, Public Involvement Consultant Panel, Northeast Coalition of Neighbors, 4815 NE 7th Avenue, King Elementary

10/8, 5:30-7:30 pm. Open House, Vancouver C-Trans Transit Center, Fisher’s Landing, 3510 SE 164th Avenue

10/13, 5:30-7:30 pm, Open House, Portland, Meek Pro Tech High School, 4039 NE Alberta Court

Folks were asked to fill out evaluation forms and thanked for a good meeting.

9. MOST USEFUL:

Facilities overview.
Love day time meetings.

10. QUESTIONS: None