




AIRPORT FUTURES

CHARTING A COURSE FOR PDX

Planning Advisory Group Meeting #24
Tuesday, October 19, 2010 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
Port of Portland Headquarters at PDX, 7200 NE Airport Way, Chinook Room

Last Meeting ~ Notes NOT Approved by the PAG

Members	Affiliation	Present
Erwin Bergman	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill Blosser	Chair – Portland	
Mark Clark	East Multnomah County (Five Cities)	√
Andy Cotugno	Metro	√
Bruce Fisher	Federal Aviation Administration	
John Frevola	Flightcraft	
Cam Gilmour	Clackamas County	√
Gene Hahn	Horizon Airlines (replaced Tom Gerharter)	√
Alan Hargrave	Clark County (Camas/Washougal)	
Chris Hathaway	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership	
Laura Hudson	City of Vancouver	√
Maryhelen Kincaid	N. Portland Neighborhood Services	√
Lt. Col. Stuart Mathew	Oregon Air National Guard	√
Patrick Metzger	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	
John Mohlis	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	
Dennis Mulvihill	Washington County	
Brian Nelson	Intel	
Mary Olson	Port Commissioner	
Lai-Lani Ovalles	Portland Planning Commissioner	
Alesia Reese	E. Portland Neighborhood Coalition	
Veronica Rinard	Travel Portland	√
Hector Roche	Multnomah County	√
Lawrence Russell	Environmental Justice	√
Bob Sallinger	Audubon Society of Portland	√
Michael Sloan	Vancouver Neighborhoods	
Dave Smith	Vice Chair – Vancouver	√
Denny Stoecklin	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred Stovel	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Vicki Thompson	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John Weigant	Airport Issues Roundtable	√

Staff & Consultants	Affiliation	Present
Susan Barthel	City – Bureau of Environmental Services	
Debbie Bishop	Port – Noise and Long Range Planning	√
C.F. Booth	Port’s Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
Mindy Brooks	City Planning Bureau	
Chris Corich	Port’s Project Manager	√
Renee Dowlin	Port – PDX Environmental	
Jason Gately	Port – Long Range Planning	
John Gray	City Office of Transportation	
Lise Glancy	Port – Government Relations	√
Zoe Haseman	Jacobs Consultancy	
Dave Helzer	City – Bureau of Environmental Services	
Nancy Hendrickson	City Bureau of Environmental Services	√
Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Tom Imeson	Port – Public Affairs Director	
Jamie Jeffrey	City Transportation	
Misti Johnson	Port Legal	√
Steve Johnson	Port – Media Relations	
Scott King	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Sean Loughran	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Cameron Modjeski	Jacobs Consultancy	√
Phil Ralston	Port – Aviation Environmental	√
Steve Schreiber	Port – Aviation Director	√
Alan Snook	DKS Associates	
Deborah Stein	Planning and Sustainability Bureau	
Jay Sugnet	City’s Project Manager	√
Abbey Tennis	Facilitation Team (ICM)	√
Chris White	Port – Community Affairs	√
Ian Whitlock	Port Legal	√

Public Present: Jacob Brostoff, Frank Howatt, and Melissa McCluney

Those not attending included: Bill Blosser, Dave Smith, Bruce Fisher, John Frevola, Chris Hathaway, Alan Hargrave, John Mohilis, Dennis Mulvihill, Brian Nelson, Mary Olson, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Alesia Reese, and Mike Sloan. The chairs have asked Sam to chair the meeting.

Announcements, Approval of 5/25 PAG Meeting Notes (Attachment #2), and Agenda Review (Attachment #1)

Corrections to the Meeting Notes:

Bob Sallinger: The meeting notes should have included a solid commitment to not take the PAG report forward without a natural resources plan.

5/25 PAG Meeting Notes accepted unanimously without other changes.

Process Comments

Sam Imperati: You may notice staff and I are wearing special t-shirts that reflect our experiences over the past year. This is my gift to staff. I hope you will enjoy the sentiment and the fact that your gift will not be a “t-shirt!”

Comments from Mary Olson who is at the Oregon Transportation Commission:

I regret I am unable to attend tonight's PAG meeting. In 2010, I was appointed to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and unfortunately the OTC meeting in Bend conflicts with this meeting. I do hope to see as many of you as possible at the Nov. 3 joint Portland City Council/ Port Commission hearing in the Port's offices. At the joint hearing, I plan to reinforce how valuable and eye opening the Airport Futures planning process has been - all voices were heard, issues were discussed robustly, and input was reflected in the final product. It has been an amazing three years. The collaborative process has resulted in a truly superior product that meets air transportation needs of region and reflects community values. I want you to know how appreciative I personally am of your time, dedication, and insight over past 3 years and offer thanks on behalf of the Port Commission as well. I look forward to keeping tabs on this collaboration moving forward through the PDX Community Advisory Committee (PDX CAC). I hope many of you will consider participating on this body.

As has been our habit for the past couple of meetings and will be as part of the PDX CAC, we have asked Steve Schreiber to provide an update on the airport.

Aviation Directors' Report

Steve Schreiber: Passenger growth has been flat for a while. There are many reasons for that; we expect 1-2% growth moving forward.

Our Bond rating was affirmed by Standard & Poors as AA-. We feel good about this and want to keep it in place.

Ecotality is working with us to provide electric vehicle charging stations in Parking Garage 1 and Parking Garage 2.

• **Conde Naste**

- PDX has been named the best U.S. airport by subscribers of Conde Naste Traveler magazine. PDX has now earned the top award in four of the last five years. (Last year we were ranked second behind Washington D.C. Reagan International Airport.)
- The magazine conducts an annual online poll of its readers who rate U.S. airports based on several criteria including location/access, ease of connections, customers/baggage, food/shops/amenities, comfort/design, and perceived safety/security. The poll rates U.S. and international airports, airlines and hotels.
- This year, in overall scores PDX ranked first, followed by Washington D.C. Reagan and Tampa.
- PDX received the top score this year in five of the six overall areas surveyed:
 - Ease of connections
 - Customs/baggage
 - Food/shops/amenities
 - Comfort/design
 - Perceived safety/security
- This is the first year that we have ranked #1 in so many categories.

• **Aviation Biofuels**

- Alaska Airlines, Boeing, PDX, Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, Spokane International Airport, and Washington State University have initiated a strategic initiative to promote aviation biofuel development in the Pacific Northwest. The first regional assessment of its kind in the United States, the "Sustainable Aviation Fuels Northwest" project will look at biomass options within a four-state area as possible sources for creating renewable jet fuel.

• **ORANG Lease Negotiations**

- We continue to work with ORANG regarding their request to extend the term of their lease.

- **NREX**

- The North Runway was re-opened on Friday, October 15. The final work on this combined runway project will occur next summer.

- **Airline Agreement**

- We completed negotiations on an airline agreement in June. The airlines wanted their cost of operating here lowered, and we allowed them to have some approvals over some of our capital projects going forward (something over \$1 million that would affect their rates they would get to vote on.) We put in much stronger environmental language than in previous years, and got the carriers to start working on a sustainability committee. This will connect with the PDX Community Advisory Committee moving forward.

Discussion:

Maryhelen Kincaid: Where do you stand with baggage handling?

Staff: We are in the middle of the Transportation Security Administration testing process. We passed the security part of the test, but we are tweaking some system operations details and will start our “go live” date on October 26. If we can’t hit that date, we’re going to have to wait until after the holidays to avoid undue disruption of the holiday season.

Vicki Thompson: Where will you put in the common gate use equipment?

Staff: It will be all over the airport.

Andy Cotugno: Will you charge a fee for electric charging of vehicles in your parking lots? If not, I think the public sector is missing the boat on this. I don’t see a reason to give away free gas.

Staff: We are not sure of the details yet. It looks like we will not initially charge electric vehicle owners to plug in at the airport, but we don’t know what the long-term fee structure will be. In the near-term, however, we want to encourage use of the technology.

Recognition

Chris Corich: Sam Imperati received the Oregon State Bar Association Lezak Alternate Dispute Resolution award on Oct. 7. Sid Lezak was considered the "Godfather of Alternative Dispute Resolution" in Oregon. The Alternate Dispute Resolution section of the Oregon State Bar established the Sidney Lezak Award in 1997 for outstanding contribution to the field so Sam’s receipt of this award is truly an honor.

In September, the Port on behalf of Airport Futures received the 2010 Outreach, Education, and Community Involvement Award from Airports Council International - North America, a trade association that represents airports across the country. The award belongs to the cities of Portland and Vancouver and their residents. Airport Futures’ success was dependent on the engagement and input of the communities surrounding and using the airport. This is recognition of the entire region’s commitment to planning for the future of PDX.

Beyond 65 DNL Noise Work Group Report and Recommendations (Attachment #3)

Sean Loughran presented the PowerPoint and reported on the City-Port work group. Sean provided an overview on work completed to date, eight new recommendations of the Noise Work Group over the course of five meetings and eight months. These recommendations will be part of an ongoing work plan to be tracked by the PDX CNAC with reports to the PDX Community Advisory Committee (PDX CAC).

He also reviewed the previous two recommendations from the Noise Work Group that have already been included in the PAG Report.

NWG Member comments:

John Weigant: We had way more info than we could cope with, so we are forwarding it all to the PDX CAC and to the Port.

Sam Imperati: We will attach the additional information to the PAG report.

Vote: Do you support the Noise Work Group recommendations for inclusion in the Airport Futures' package for transmittal to Portland City Council and Port Commission?

Unanimous approval.

Update on City-Port Adoption Process

Jay Sugnet reviewed the process to date and the outstanding issues.

Jay updated the group on what has happened since PAG meeting on May 23, 2010. A notice was sent out to property owners and the Planning Commission held a series of hearings between June and August. In the process, the Planning Commission heard a lot from industrial, business, and residential property owners about their concerns. City staff held additional meetings with property owners over the summer, conducted site visits, developed additional outreach materials, and answered lots of questions/responded to many concerns.

Staff expects the environmental overlays to be a topic of concern at the proposed Nov. 3 joint City Council/Port Commission hearing, from the Columbia Corridor Association, and some area businesses and residents. The business concern is a recommended 50-foot protection zone extending from water bodies and the potential impact on the viability of industrial development in the Columbia Corridor (an industrial sanctuary). Specifically, there is a concern about the overlays making redevelopment of small industrial lots more difficult. The residential concerns are primarily related to the mapping of wetlands in the East Columbia Neighborhood. In response to the industrial users concerns, staff proposed to revise the overlay (protection overlay zone for the first 25 feet and a modified conservation zone for the second 25 feet). The Planning Commission did not hear any support for the revised proposal and as a result, on August 24, 2010, opted to keep with the PAG's original recommendation to forward the original package onto the Portland City Council.

Discussion:

Maryhelen Kincaid: This was in my neighborhood. I commend staff on dealing with all of the concerns that were raised; east Columbia is ~ 40% industrial, 40% residential, and 20% farmland, etc., and everyone was concerned that they would lose the ability to do what they want with their property. Jay and staff (Jacob, Lise, and Mindy) spent a lot of time putting out fires in our neighborhood. On the plus side, I met many (angry) new neighbors. Once everyone got all of the correct information, most of the people are happy with it, though not everyone. Staff did a great job in a short period of time.

Bob Sallinger: The Planning Commission really took a leadership role in saying they need to take a stand for natural resource protection and setting the goalpost.

Federal Aviation Administration Feedback on Airport Futures Package (HANDOUT)

Chris Corich provided an overview on the many discussions with the FAA related to revenue diversion issues, reinforcing the progress made. He noted that the FAA's initial review of the natural resource enhancement element was negative. He then highlighted the "minor" refinements to the IGA and PAG Report proposed by staff as a result of those discussions. He believes there is general support for the PAG package.

Chris walked through the refinements related to:

- **Natural Resources**

- Does not change the amount of money committed by the Port to natural resource enhancement.
- Removed language allowing accelerated mitigation at Port's option (this does not mean the Port cannot revisit)
- Clarify that work will be consistent with the PDX Wildlife Hazard Management Plan
- Tree canopy and watershed enhancement work consistent Port's Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) obligations as a Designated Management Agency (DMA) for the Columbia Slough – The focus of tree planting will be those areas in the watershed that contribute to water quality. While this limits our ability to do neighborhood tree planting with Airport funds, the Port will continue to do Friends of Trees projects in other areas.

- **Transportation**

- Port to pay proportionate share for combined Columbia Blvd. project v. entire cost – We proposed the Port assume responsibility for 100% share of these two intersections based on previous FAA direction in CascadeStation/PIC. The FAA has reversed itself and has directed the Port to only pay proportionately its share (FAA revenue diversion language). Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) and the Port will work to define a set of project elements (such as signalization) that we can do within our proportionate share (22.5%). The Port has a strong track record of advocating for and completing transportation projects adjacent to its facilities and will continue to pursue funding with the City for completion of the remaining elements of these projects.
- Work with City to find additional funding to complete Columbia Blvd. intersections
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between City and Port detailing future project development responsibilities. The MOU will be developed in the future.

The PAG were given copies of the IGA changes with track changes showing.

Discussion:

Steve Schreiber: I understand that the FAA's job is to uphold federal law as it relates to airports. They started out with the whole proposal saying "no" to everything, asserting that it is all in violation of federal law, but they have moved a bit towards our position. Over time, our "batting average" with the FAA is pretty good in terms of getting them to move towards our position, and receive their approval for things. We believe that we are right and we will keep fighting for it. If we have to fly to DC to make our case to their headquarters, we will, because it is the right thing to do. We thought we would be closer to this by the proposed November 3 Council-Port Commission joint hearing, and we are just not there yet. We are sorry that this may feel like we are walking the PAG down the gangplank, as that is not our intention, but it is what it is. If you are not comfortable with how we are proceeding, then we can try a different tact.

Bob Sallinger: Audubon is not okay with this. We are very frustrated to be here. We voted 1 with the understanding that these unresolved issues will be resolved before we move forward with the adoption process. That's all I could give my constituents. I was promised by Sue Anderson at the City/Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability that a hearing would not even be scheduled before these issues are resolved. The Port and the City both testified before the Planning Commission that they would not schedule it until the issues were resolved. Then they scheduled it, but promised they would not have it until the issues were resolved. Then they changed their mind and said we will have the first hearing, but not the second one. I don't trust the process anymore. In addition, I just heard about this new development yesterday, and I'm upset that the FAA isn't here tonight after blowing this process up.

I don't trust that the Port will be able to get through this process. If we continue to proceed with the natural resource issues unresolved, it's going to be difficult to halt the process down the road if the issues aren't resolved well. I have lost confidence with the City, because they have lied to me too many times.

Let's go to the FAA, get it right, and then move forward. We need to stop and wait until we get these issues resolved. It will be harder to do it right once we get into the adoption process.

We would have voted 3, we would have testified against this before the Planning Commission if we knew this was going to happen. We won't support this plan, and we will work against it unless these issues are resolved. I'm upset that I have even been put in this position.

Maryhelen Kincaid: The only argument I've heard as to why we should continue to push forward without all the issues resolved is because it's difficult to schedule. What's the benefit of having the hearing if you don't have all of the pieces nailed down? Won't that just waste the City Council's time?

Staff: There are many issues to discuss in this process, and many stakeholders to hear from, including the neighborhoods, industrial community, as well as FAA. The community has already been noticed, and this is an opportunity for the Council to hear from the community. There will be multiple hearings, so this is an opportunity to deal with some of the issues, though not the FAA one. There will always be incomplete information. This is a moving train.

Maryhelen Kincaid: I've heard from my community that there hasn't been enough time to explore the issues. I worry that pushing forward will create the perception in the Council that we haven't done enough work yet.

Vicki Thompson: I see this as a fact-finding hearing. The Council doesn't need to come to conclusions on everything that first night. However, moving forward will allow the Council to move forward on the fact-finding.

Bob Sallinger: We'll have to mobilize against it, and the very fact that the Port is trying to move forward on this makes me lose trust in them.

Vicki Thompson: You should. If the FAA sees the huge conflict, there will just be additional pressure for them to agree with our position.

John Weigant: I see two issues: the community and the FAA. It's easier to ask forgiveness than permission. Let's move ahead and deal with asking for forgiveness later.

Denny Stoecklin: If we cancel the meeting, and we get as far as we can in the FAA process and they say no, what would happen next?

Staff: We could do several things, including reconvening the PAG, and exploring other options. The PAG's recommendation was clearly "no net loss" and we're not willing to settle for less than that.

Bob Sallinger: This is why we've worked so hard for years about getting the natural resource stuff on the table. We've had major discussions with the Port, and the fallback is zoning (which will incur major disagreements). If we go forward and say "we are okay with all of it except the environmental stuff," and the environmental stuff is cut off, and then we lose all of our leverage to gain strong environmental results. The benefit to this process has been that the recommendations come as a complete package, because it means that the whole thing won't move forward unless it's a balanced set of recommendations. Public processes are useless if the public officials break their promises over and over again to the public. Audubon has been at the table for three years. We almost left, but have stayed because of these promises.

Mark Clark: I have fought the FAA about these issues before, and not all airports are dealing with the natural resources issues that we have. The beauty of Oregon is that we have great resources to protect – but it's a special set of circumstances. I support Bob's position. Is there any way we could say "we don't need your money, FAA" and move forward in our own direction?

Staff: No, the FAA provides certification and plays other regulatory roles; it's not just a funder. We can't cut ties with them.

Maryhelen Kincaid: I don't know whether this is semantics, but maybe is that it's going to take the City Council more than one meeting to "get it" – there is no way there will only be one hearing. People are passionate about all of these issues. I have no illusion that anyone will make any decisions at this first meeting. I've been screamed at, yelled at, threatened by my neighbors because I've stood behind this process and this project. Granted, pieces have fallen off the table, and I've called a lot of the city staff crazy for not doing certain things earlier than they have. However, I don't want to throw the baby out with the bathwater. It's not going to be sealed up in two meetings. I think we should honor Bob's position and not make any decisions yet, but I also think that people should be able to have their say, because there are many people who want to speak to the council on this – not just the environmentalists. I think Bob should fight against it at the Council meeting. I don't think it will hurt anyone to hear these things.

Fred Stovel: My view is that the PAG had consensus to make a recommendation. Realistically, the City Council can choose to accept our recommendations or not. We don't come back to the table to make a new recommendation just because someone doesn't accept our recommendation. We know where the various public bodies stand on this, and we know there is resistance from the FAA. I think we should have public officials on the Port Commission. We're the Port of Oregon, not the Port of Portland. If our recommendations aren't accepted, we can pursue different ways of making change: the PDX CAC, other public hearings, and Audubon trying to get different people elected, etc. This doesn't affect what I voted for.

Bob Sallinger: I was promised we'd either go track A or B: Track A move forward as recommended, or Track B if we hit barriers, we'll come back to the PAG. This is saying, "we've hit barriers and we're not coming back to the PAG." We were promised a certain process going forward, and this is a different process. I didn't vote for this. Why participate in a process if you're going to be lied to. I was told there would be an additional four or five meetings if we hit this barrier, and now, the Port is saying we're not going to have those meetings.

Andy Cotugno: I'm less worried about the hearings than the fact that we don't have a product. If we're not on track A anymore, then we don't have a product. I wanted this to be a celebration, but we're not done now. I don't like the idea of calling for more meetings, but we should finish our job. If our process still has this big hole in it, then we need to keep going. We've been doing this for 3 years – it's better to keep going with us than start with a new group. In addition, the regulation pathway is much more expensive, so I think it's a bad idea to pursue that route, but still I don't think we can move forward with a hole in this.

Lawrence Russell: What will it take to get them to accept this one piece? Because this is my money now, and I don't want to spend it twice. I understand that the Port is legally bound to do something, but they have to honor their obligations.

Laura Hudson: Is the reason to proceed in December just that it's hard to schedule?

Staff: It was really hard to schedule a joint hearing of two bodies. The community is geared up for a hearing after notice was sent to 500 people announcing the November 3 hearing. There are also other issues that the City is being lobbied on (i.e., natural resource overlays related to Airport Futures); timing is important. If we don't do this planned meeting, we may not do a joint hearing at all. That's not the end of the world.

Laura Hudson: It sounds like you're trading off convenience of scheduling for the integrity of the group's process. You need to reschedule. Re-noticing the public isn't the end of the world.

Staff: We wanted the PAG's input on this and on the environmental overlay – that's why we're here.

Hector Roche: I agree with Laura.

Vicki Thompson: Could the hearing open, and get testimony, but not close? Just have the testimony out there, but not move towards any recommendations?

Staff: That was the idea for this hearing, yes that we wouldn't move forward past fact-finding.

Stuart Mathew: What's pushing us schedule-wise? Why did this happen?

Staff: As to "why," we really didn't expect this. We thought the FAA was on board, and we had every intention of having those issues resolved, and the rug was pulled out from underneath us yesterday. In addition, it's really difficult to get in front of Council.

Bob Sallinger: I've raised this issue over and over again; this isn't a surprise. I know it's hard to schedule these things, but don't say you're going to avoid scheduling the hearing and then do it for convenience. There is no integrity here.

Maryhelen Kincaid: There are only a few people who are going to oppose the environmental overlay zone issue. No matter what, there are going to be some people who oppose it. We do need to present it all as one package, because that's how we've been going all along, and that's how this process has integrity. No matter what, the people who disagree now are going to continue to disagree. Hearings will not eliminate dissent.

John Weigant: I think if the neighborhood had a chance to really consider it, they would come to our conclusions eventually. The FAA needs to understand that this process is a unique joint land use planning process. We have to battle them because this is bigger than them. Our process is more important.

Denny Stoecklin: What's the likelihood of coming to a positive conclusion with the FAA? In addition, what can we do to support the "doing battle" with the FAA?

Staff: We are not on different sides. We all want to get this done as we proposed with the whole package. In addition, we've seen progress with the FAA – they initially said no to everything, and now they're only saying no to some things. We think we can make more progress. We're all committed to getting it done. We're still all on the same page. If you aren't comfortable, if you feel like we're switching the rules on you by having the hearing, then we won't do it. That's why we're asking your opinion. If you want us to cancel the hearing, we can cancel the hearing.

Denny Stoecklin: How long will the process take, even if you are moving forward?

Staff: It will take months; nothing will go fast once we're at the federal level.

Mark Clark: I think we should see whether we in solidarity on this, and go from there.

Hector Roche: I came in to this meeting thinking we should go ahead with the November 3 hearing, but I've been swayed. Not just because of the FAA issues, but also because of the integrity of the process, and the community we've created around this group. We owe each other integrity.

Fred Stovel: I don't want to lose momentum. I don't want to make any decisions, but I want to move forward with fact-finding. Even if the FAA rejects our plan, we have still voted this plan with integrity, and our recommendations are pure. People above us may still reject our recommendations.

Erwin Bergman: I think we need to cancel the meeting. We should move forward with this process that we believe in and implement it. If it takes another few months for this group, that's not ideal, but I wonder how much of a hardship it

would be. I'm committed to this. Don't put this on the PDX CAC – they're not up to speed yet. Keep us together until we finish this out.

Bob Sallinger: I think the best way to send a message to the FAA is to stop the process until they show up and work with us. They need this plan, too. If we send the message that “we'll move forward with or without them,” we won't keep the pressure on the FAA. This group has principles of striving for consensus and closure on issues (#11 Collaboration Principles: Commitments for Community).

Mark Clark: I agree with John. I think we need to push back on the FAA. I think this could be a game-changer for the industry if we push back on them on a non-monetary thing. This is bigger than even just this process and our recommendations.

Sam Imperati proposed a five-minute break for a City-Port project team caucus. The Staff and Facilitator took 5 minutes to caucus.

Veronica Rinard arrives

Steve and Jay proposal on how to proceed:

We wanted to hear what you had to say about whether to move ahead with the hearing. We're not where we want to be with the FAA, but I think we'll get there. We're all on the same page. We all want the same recommendations to go forward. Clearly the majority of the PAG is not comfortable with proceeding with the joint hearing. We will pull the plug. It is more important that the PAG is comfortable with our approach. The integrity of the process is important to us. So we won't move forward with hearings until we get this worked out with the FAA.

Jay Sugnet: It was helpful to have this discussion. It was not our intention to set up a conflict with the scheduling of this hearing. The recent FAA feedback was a surprise to us all.

Vicki Thompson: I just want it said that I don't want this issue passed onto the PDX CAC. Do not disband the PAG until this is resolved. People should dance with the person that brought you!

Proposed Changes to PAG Report

Jay Sugnet provided an overview of the minor changes made to the PAG Report to reflect the Intergovernmental Agreement language and incorporate the Noise Work Group recommendations. Specifically on Page 33 and in the Appendices, the reference to the Noise Work Group Scope of Work was changed to the Noise Work Group Report.

Public Comment

No members of the public wished to comment.

Planning for PDX Community Advisory Committee

Lise Glancy provided a quick update on next steps in planning for the PDX CAC. The three Sponsors will jointly lead this effort. Lise introduced Chris White and Sean Loughran as Port liaison; Deborah Stein as city of Portland liaison; and Laura Hudson as city of Vancouver liaison.

One of the first steps will be for sponsors to develop selection criteria for appointment. If you have ideas on this, please forward them to Lise.

While appointments will be made by other organizations, staff would appreciate a sense of the interest of those PAG members present in volunteering to be part of the soon-to-be-created PDX CAC. Given all that we have learned over the past three years, it would be helpful to have some carry over. Lise asked for a show of hands of PAG members who

would be interested in joining the CAC. Lawrence Russell and Erwin Bergman expressed an interest. Lise committed to send an email to the PAG to see if there is broader interest.

PAG Recognition

Lise played a PAG Retrospective slideshow. *Chris Corich and Jay Sugnet* presented the PAG with their gift of a travel bag and letter of thanks from the Mayor and Bill Wyatt, even though the process isn't over as they initially expected it would be. The staff liked the idea of a bag for the PAG as they were involved in Airport Futures and may have travel in their future. The bags also reflect our sustainability goal as they are made of 72% recyclable material. The logo for Airport Futures is included on the inside flap so the bag will be more appropriate for day-to-day use.

Hector Roche: I think we should celebrate, and even celebrate what we did tonight. This group held true to each other and to our process. That's worth celebrating.

Closing Comments/Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:27pm for cake and refreshments.

OCTOBER 19, 2010 PAG MEETING EVALUATION

1. Overall Meeting Quality	Poor 1	2	3 (2)	4 (2)	Excellent 5 (7)
2. Pacing	Too Slow	2 (2)	Just Right (7)	4 (1)	Too Fast
3. Balancing "Product, Process & Relationship" Meeting Goals	Poor 1	2 (2)	3 (4)	4 (4)	Excellent 5 (2)
4. Presentations	1	2 (1)	3 (4)	4 (6)	5 (1)
5. Comprehension of Presentations	1	2	3 (3)	4 (6)	5 (3)
6. Materials/Documents	1	2 (1)	3 (2)	4 (6)	5 (3)
7. Discussion	1	2 (1)	3 (2)	4	5 (9)
8. Comments and Suggestions for Items 1 – 7, Above: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best meeting yet. Honest, frank discussion of complex issue. • Difficult to understand options and reasons for them • I believe the major players in the mix, but did not raise the one issue. Also, re: 3 - one sticking point, and re: 7 - we get stuck sometimes • Nothing • The hard, emotional, somewhat contentious discussion demonstrates the maturity and growth of our group as community. 					
9. Least Useful: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none 					
10. Most Useful: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All • allowing everyone to voice their views and concerns • Dialogue, facilitation • Excellent discussion! • Get ALL in votes from major funding groups - highlight points that don't fit • Time in break for 1:1 					
11. Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I hope we could get this closed out 					