



# AIRPORT FUTURES

CHARTING A COURSE FOR PDX

**Planning Advisory Group Meeting #19**  
**Tuesday, November 17, 2009 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm**  
Port of Portland, 121 NW Everett, Portland, OR

## FINAL DRAFT NOTES

### Announcements – Bill Blosser

*Tom Gerharter* from Horizon has announced his retirement; *Gene Hahn* will continue to represent Horizon on the PAG.

*Bill Blosser* introduced *Sean Loughran* who presented the new recycle bins, with food waste option. Previous confusion about how to compost has been banished—new bins take care of everything. All of the utensils and vessels are compostable. *John Weigant* demonstrated how easy it is to use the new system to thunderous applause!

*Bill Blosser* then presented the list of attendees, absent and substitutes.

*Bill Blosser* asked that all presenting speakers use the microphone to help those sitting in the back to hear.

### Approval of Meeting Notes/Agenda Review – Sam Imperati

*Sam Imperati* presented the 10/20/09 PAG meeting notes, with apologies for late delivery. Staff is committed to a more timely delivery of notes from this meeting. *Sam Imperati* will call for Approval of the 10/20/09 PAG meeting notes at the next PAG meeting.

*Sam Imperati* then presented tonight's Agenda (Attachment #1), which focus on two items primarily: 1) the ongoing PDX Community Advisory Committee, including PAG action on the 10/21/09 PISC recommendation on the ongoing advisory committee and 2) informational presentation (no voting) on the Sustainability Package.

*Sam Imperati* gave a brief overview on final documents and PAG Schedule. He reminded everyone that at the end of the process, tensions are normal, and gave us all a reminder to not personalize criticisms. Based on your feedback, he will be more vigilant. However, he wanted to praise the group for being in the top 10% of groups he's facilitated in terms of civility and good process flow.

<b>Members</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Erwin <b>Bergman</b>	Central NE Neighborhoods	
Bill <b>Blosser</b>	Chair	√
Mark <b>Clark</b>	E. County	
Andy <b>Cotugno</b>	Metro	√
Bruce <b>Fisher</b>	FAA	√
John <b>Frevola</b>	Flightcraft	√
Gene <b>Hahn</b>	Horizon Airlines (replaced Tom Gerharter)	√
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	√
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	√
Mary <b>Olson</b>	Port Commissioner	
Lai-Lani <b>Ovalles</b>	Planning Commissioner	
Alesia <b>Reese</b>	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Veronica <b>Rinard</b>	Travel Portland	√
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 (Kelley Sweeney attended as alternate)	√
John <b>Weigant</b>	Airport Issues Roundtable	√

<b>Staff &amp; Consultants</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Debbie Bishop	Port – Noise and Long Range Planning	√
C.F. Booth	Port's Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
Mindy Brooks	City Planning Bureau	
Jacob Brostoff	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	√
Nancy Hendrickson	City Bureau of Environmental Services	
Sam Imperati 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	√
Chris White	Port – Community Affairs	√

Other members of the public present: Lee Perlman, Mark Swank, Mathew Hayes, Bill Barber.

**CNAC Communication – Bill Blosser**

*Bill Blosser* introduced *Maryhelen Kincaid* to present the PDX Citizen's Noise Advisory Committee (CNAC) letter to PAG on its work and the Beyond 65 DNL Noise Work Group, which will work on impacts beyond the 65 DNL. The letter is on table, with the packet for each participant.

*Maryhelen Kincaid* then presented the letter to the group, which is intended to clarify CNAC's role and work, and document CNAC's willingness to collaborate on the Noise Work Group. She explained that CNAC is very interested in working on issues beyond the 65 DNL.

*Sam Imperati* stated that staff is working to establish a date for the Beyond 65 DNL Noise Work Group work scope development meeting. Two dates being proposed are Thursday, December 3 and Thursday, December 10. 16 have signed up (tentatively) for this work group. *Sam Imperati* passed around Date Preference Sign-in Sheet. People can sign up for the Work Group if they like on the date preference sign-in sheet.

**5:45 – 5:55 pm Final Documents and PAG Project Completion Schedule – Imperati (20 min.)  
(Attachment #2)**

*Sam Imperati*. Presented a review of the final documents and PAG Schedule (Attachment #2). NOTE: PPT has slight differences in the level of detail in slides 2 and 3.

**Documents from Airport Futures Process**

PAG Report and Recommendations –PAG  
PDX Master Plan –Port

PDX Land use Plan –City  
Sustainability Report –City/Port  
Intergovernmental Agreements –City/Port

**PAG Project Completion Schedule –revised (subject to change)**

November 17, 2009 PAG Meeting #19

Focus: Ongoing PDX advisory committee, sustainability package, process for natural resource and PAG recommendations

12/2 LU/T SC and MP/Sust. SC  
Dec. –Beyond 65 DNL Noise Work Group

December 15, 2009 PAG Meeting –canceled

January 19, 2010 PAG Meeting #20

Focus: 100% PDX Land Use Plan, MP imp./financial plans, sust. package, project sideboards

1/6 Final Report Ad Hoc Group (combo SC)  
Public meetings

February 16, 2010 PAG Meeting #21

Focus: City-Port agreements, noise work group report, project sideboards, PAG recommendations, overall project sust.

TBD Final Report Ad Hoc Group

March 16, 2010 PAG Meeting #22

Focus: Draft PAG Report

TBD Final Report Ad Hoc Group

April 20, 2010 PAG Meeting #23

Focus: Final PAG Report adoption

*Sam Imperati* asked for questions.

Brian Nelson asked how the adoption process works.

Jay Sugnet explained the adoption process: at the April meeting. A full package (Comprehensive Plan amendments, maps and Zoning Code amendments) will be presented to the Portland Planning Commission. Following that, the Planning Commission will hold a hearing, and then after taking testimony, hold a subsequent work session. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to Portland City Council to adopt, amend and adopt, or not adopt the land use plan component of the package. The City Council will follow a similar process: first, a hearing, then a 2<sup>nd</sup>

reading where Council will discuss the plan and testimony, then Council will decide whether to adopt as-is, or make changes and adopt, or not adopt. Following City Council adoption, there is an appeal period during which time those with standing (people who testify or receive notice of the process) can appeal the decision to the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), and then to the Courts. Assuming there is no appeal, after the appeal period ends; the land use plan is then in effect after the appeal period ends and can no longer be appealed. However, if people are concerned about the application of the Zoning Code, they can appeal individual decisions about how the Bureau of Development Services applies the Zoning Code to the City and in some cases directly to the Land Use Board of Appeals.

Alesia Reese asked if process issues could delay t-shirts or mugs. When will people express their concerns?

Jay replied that people have hopefully been expressing their concerns throughout this process, but that there can be testimony at any point in the City process.

*Sam Imperati* asked Laura Hudson to provide some information on the City of Vancouver adoption process.

Laura Hudson said that the process is similar to the City of Portland process in that the project will be presented to the Vancouver Planning Commission for recommendation to the City Council. However, before that, the City of Vancouver Aviation Committee would be presented the package.

Lise Glancy clarified that the City of Vancouver would be asked to sign IGA for the PDX Community Advisory Committee.

*Sam Imperati* asked for information on how the Port would adopt the package.

Chris Corich said that package would be presented to Port Commission for a hearing, then a month later, adoption, and finally, approval by the FAA.

Bruce Fisher said that the Master Plan and ALP would likely be approved by FAA as-is.

John Weigant asked if there should be a placeholder for a minority report in the report committee's process.

*Sam Imperati* agreed that there is a place for a minority report in the full PAG report package.

Chris Corich said that the PAG (majority) report would be written by *Sam Imperati*. Chris Corich's understanding is that if there is disagreement, then the minority report could be written by anyone.

*Sam Imperati* clarified the process. Staff prepares a draft, then it's presented to committee, then draft is revised, then it goes to PAG. The final report will follow the same iterative process that has been used throughout this process.

*Bill Blosser* said that there could be two kinds of minority reports: 1.) adding information that hadn't been mentioned, and 2.) recording disagreement.

*Sam Imperati* said that the report would be based on the work of the PAG, and that it will be primarily copying and pasting from PAG's work/meeting notes. We have a record of who said what, who voted what, etc. etc. The goal is that an outside reader, who is unfamiliar with process, could read it and know what happened within 50 pages.

*Sam Imperati* reminded the group that the December 15, 2009 PAG meeting has been cancelled. Mark your calendars for the 2010 PAG meetings: Jan. 19, Feb. 16, March 16, and April 20. There will be a celebration in July.

**5:55 – 6:15 pm      City Process for Remaining Natural Resource Issues – Sugnet (20 min.) (Attachment #3)**

Jay reviewed the City process for resolving natural resource inventory questions (Attachment #3). Based on comments from last PAG, staff thought that it would be helpful to provide an update on the Natural Resource process.

Part of the strategy is to comply with regulations but also to update the City's Natural Resource program for the airport area. The first step is to update the natural resources inventory (NRI). The focus there is on watershed and watershed health. In previous City work, it was focused on riparian areas and waterbodies (typically wetlands). Now the City is also looking at uplands.

In the September Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee (LUTSC) meeting, City staff presented maps along with the proposed regulatory program. Since then, we have been working on ensuring that there is defensible science behind the proposed inventory, especially for Special Habitat Areas (SHAs). The City is convening a scientific review group to look at science about SHAs. In the handout you have before you today, there is a Natural Resources update along with questions for SHA review group and list of SHA review group membership (including Bob Sallinger). There is a special emphasis on candidate species and upland/grassland species.

The NRI feeds the Environment, Social, Economic and Energy (ESEE) analysis. The ESEE analysis evaluates conflicting/competing goals. There are three potential decisions that can be made as a result of the ESEE process: allow, limit, or strictly limit development in resource areas, based on conflicting uses analysis.

For a simplified example, it is possible that the NRI could identify a wetland. Once identified in the NRI, the ESEE process begins. In the ESEE process, the City could decide: 1) not to protect the wetland and allow development there, 2) to allow

development but require mitigation, or 3) to not allow any development and protect the wetland.

The City anticipates coming back in early December with a staff recommendation to the LUTSC, and then again in January 2010 for discussion in front of the full PAG.

*Maryhelen Kincaid* asked if the Columbia Corridor planning process is included in this process.

Jay Sugnet clarified that when the Airport Futures started, the City anticipated looking at the entire Columbia Corridor. However, that project was not funded. Airport Futures was funded, and part of the old proposed Columbia Corridor study area is included in this process.

Andy Cotugno said that part of decision to allow/limit/strictly limit is part of land use regulation, but asked where we tackle restoration, and how the PAG might do that.

Jay said that we would talk about the goals for Natural Resources. As part of Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP), staff and scientific experts are identifying where there are wildlife habitat and wildlife hazard management issues and conflicts in and around the airport. Staff is developing a proposal to allow the Port to convert habitats in exchange for mitigation. Staff is struggling with how to do enhancement/restoration.

Andy Cotugno confirmed that the PAG would come back to this issue.

Jay said that it would.

Alesia Reese stated her concern that we would identify resources without identifying funding for ongoing maintenance.

Jay said that ongoing maintenance is typically part of required mitigation.

Jay concluded by stating that the tentative date for the Natural Resource Technical Review (with the scientific experts) is 11/23.

The next meeting of the LUTSC is 12/2/09. This is a joint meeting of the LUTSC and the Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee.

- 6:15 – 7:15 pm**      **100% Ongoing PDX Advisory Committee** – Glancy/Roche (60 min.) **(Attachment #4A-B)**
- Public Involvement Subcommittee Public Outreach, Report, and Recommendation
  - Overview of PDX Advisory Committee framework and draft work plan
  - PAG Discussion and Action

- Next Steps: Sustainability refinement recommendations by 12/2 Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee and Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee

### **Public Involvement Subcommittee Report – Hector Roche**

Hector Roche introduced the agenda item. He noted that we had to reschedule the Lessons Learned meeting with Sponsors to January and will be reporting out on a new date. The new date is 1/20.

### **PDX Community Advisory Committee Recommendation – Lise Glancy**

Lise went through the PDX Community Advisory Committee recommendation on the framework and draft work plan using a PPT.

*Maryhelen Kincaid* asked about differences between PowerPoint presentation and handouts.

*Sam Imperati* clarified that the handout is the more specific document that controls. Lise Glancy explained that the PowerPoint presentation is intended to familiarize people with the proposal at a high level. The intent is that the framework document as approved by the PAG would be memorialized as part of an IGA between the Sponsors.

Hector Roche clarified that the work plan “special focus area” is set aside for the community to bring issues to OPIS. (Last slide.)

### **Subcommittee Comments - Hector Roche**

Hector Roche asked for comments from PISC members engaged in developing the PCAC framework and work plan.

*Maryhelen Kincaid* pointed out that sustainability “tripod” should include social/equity elements that do not include geographic representations (i.e., not just neighborhoods). This reference in the intro paragraphs should be changed to “community.” Lise noted that all sustainability references in the documents will be reviewed to ensure consistency with the Sustainability Subcommittee’s work. Patrick Metzger concurred.

Alesia Reese said that EPNO is really East Portland Neighborhood Association. This needs to be corrected on the document.

Alesia Reese asked if OPIS would change to the final committee name. Lise Glancy said that it would. The proposed name is PDX Community Advisory Committee (PCAC). The Public involvement Subcommittee recommended that “community” and “advisory” were two key words to include in the title. PCAC was a recommendation by Maryhelen Kincaid.

John Weigant stated that it is important that the public be able to bring issues to PCAC without approval from sponsors. He is concerned that sponsors will control the agenda.

Hector Roche and Lise Glancy pointed out that the intent was to allow the community to bring forward agenda items. The Coordinating Committee Sponsors and Facilitator will meet prior to each meeting to develop the agenda for the next meeting. *Sam Imperati* asked for general comments from subcommittee members, then specific comments once document is on screen.

There were no other subcommittee comments.

### **PAG Discussion and Action – Sam Imperati**

*Maryhelen Kincaid* recommended that the framework document reinforce that the PCAC discussion needs relate to the airport. She would like more specific language to show that the discussion is about the airport.

John Weigant proposed the following language addition in the Scope/Purview section: “Scope/Purview may include issues and projects proposed by the public without prior approval of the Sponsors. PCAC controls its own agenda.”

Alesia Reese said that the Public Involvement Subcommittee tried to respect the PCAC’s self-determination. She urged everyone to think about their proposed changes in this context. She also reminded the group that there was a lot of discussion about sponsors controlling the outcome by determining the agenda. Because the group is advisory, the strength of group is in setting its own agenda and hearing those who want to speak.

*Bill Blosser* asked if “PCAC controls its own agenda” language covers Alesia’s comments.

Alesia clarified that PCAC would create an agenda and workplan, and members of the public may try to divert the focus of the group. We’re not trying to set rules or regulations for this group.

*Maryhelen Kincaid* expressed her concern that the language is adversarial: PCAC vs. sponsors. This is not in the spirit of what PCAC is about. The spirit of PCAC is more in the coordinating committee language about jointly developing an agenda. She is opposed to the adversarial language because of its tone, which may be divisive.

Patrick Metzger stated that a lot of these issues are covered in the mission.

*Sam Imperati* asked if “Consistent with its mission, the sponsors and OPIS members will set the OPIS agenda.” language would work. There was consensus on this language.

John W wants to make sure that the Sideboards and beyond 65DNL have a place in the OPIS process/program. *Sam Imperati* committed to having this in the document. The language added to the PCAC framework document, Scope/Purview section was: “The Scope/Purview will include PAG carryover issues (e.g., Beyond 65 DNL noise work group, sideboards).” There was consensus on this language.

*Maryhelen Kincaid* proposed that under Scope/Purview: Other City/Port agreements section, that the “where possible” language be deleted. There was consensus on this language. Under the Scope/Purview Public involvement section: *Maryhelen Kincaid* again asked if the scope should be narrowed to show that it is the airport and related projects. Two changes were made here.

John Weigant proposed that under the Scope/Purview Other section that the name be changed to “miscellaneous.”

Under the Membership section, Alesia Reese asked what might happen if PCAC membership/participation becomes low?

Lise Glancy proposed changing the voting members to “up to 20.” There was consensus on this language.

Alesia Reese asked what quorum was. *Sam Imperati* said 11. Lise clarified that PCAC would determine this. They would define their decision-making. This was added to the framework under the Decision-making section.

Under the Relationship to other Port and City standing committees section, Andy Cotugno asked if Port and City of Vancouver website should be referenced since City of Portland Planning & Sustainability website is mentioned. Lise Glancy confirmed that all Sponsor references in the document will be broadened to include City of Vancouver.

*Maryhelen Kincaid* recommended that replace mention of specific governments with “sponsors,” to include City of Portland, City of Vancouver and Port of Portland.

Hector Roche asked if the sponsors could choose to disband PCAC by withholding staff support. Lise Glancy said that they could. If withheld, Sponsorship rights would be removed.

Alesia Reese asked if PCAC could determine a sunset date. Lise Glancy said that they could as part of their annual evaluation process and with concurrence of Sponsors.

Under the Work Plan, Lise noted that the chair would debrief in introductory comments on any interim Coordinating Committee actions and agenda requests.

#### **7:15 – 7:25 pm      Public Comment**

*Sam Imperati* asked for comments from the public. There was none.

## **PAG Vote**

*Sam Imperati* called the questions:

- 1) *Does the PAG support the 10/21 Public Involvement Subcommittee recommendation on the framework with proposed friendly amendments?*
- 2) *Does the PAG support the draft work plan for the ongoing PDX advisory committee as a starting point?*

All members present voted 1 on both questions.

*Maryhelen Kincaid* called for applause for Hector's leadership.

Hector Roche praised Port and City staff to the Public Involvement Subcommittee.

**7:25 – 7:35 pm      Break**

**7:35 – 8:25 pm      Sustainability Package – Loughran/Gilmour/Sugnet  
(Attachment #5A-E)**

- Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee Report
- Overview of Sustainability Package
  - Sustainability Report Contents
  - City Sustainability Policy Objectives
  - Guiding Principles Charter/Framework
  - Key Goals (draft)
  - Facility Planning
  - OPIS Sustainability
- PAG Discussion – Informational and some potential recommendations
- Next Steps: Sustainability discussion (12/2 Master Plan/Sustainability & Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee meeting, 1/19 PAG action on sustainability package)

## **Sustainability Subcommittee – Cam Gilmour**

The Sustainability Subcommittee met on Nov. 10 to review the various work elements that have been drafted to date, make any final adjustments, and agree on a package of items that represent the body of work on sustainability. The subcommittee has covered a tremendous amount of ground on the topic of sustainability and its application in Airport Futures. Our understanding of sustainability has continued to evolve as we have learned more about City and Port programs, the application of sustainability in the aviation industry and sustainability in other areas of both public and private practice.

The subcommittee believes that sustainability has indeed been a key focus of the airport futures planning process. The work products presented as a package this

evening have served to inform the work completed in the Master Plan and Land Use Plan, to date, and will continue to provide important guidance to the Port, City, and ongoing PDX Advisory Committee in the future as we continue the process of implementing sustainability.

In addition to the Vision and Values, the sustainability package developed includes the Guiding Principles, Facility Planning Objectives, and Considerations for Future Project Development, and Key Goals. The subcommittee has recommended that these work products, as well as ongoing work, such as the “good ideas bucket or sustainability roadmap” will be assembled as part of a separate Airport Futures Sustainability Report.

### **Sustainability Package – Sean Loughran**

Sean Loughran will go through the PowerPoint presentation. The goal is to go through the elements of the package, and then ask for input on the Guiding Principles and Goals for consideration by the Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee.

Sean gave a reminder that the next meeting of this committee (in combo with Land Use/Transportation) will be held on 12/2/09.

Jay Sugnet presented the Comprehensive Plan proposed amendments.

### **Sustainability Guiding Principles discussion (Attachment 5B) PAG Discussion and Action – Sam Imperati**

- *What advice do you have for the Master Plan Alternatives/Sustainability Subcommittee for their ongoing work on the following elements?*

Andy Cotugno proposed to separate Reduce, Restore, Recycle/Avoid, Minimize, and Mitigate in Guiding Principle #6.

John Weigant agreed with Andy Cotugno.

*Sam Imperati* pointed out that they are broken out separately in Vision and Values.

John Weigant stated that he likes both.

Bob Sallinger stated that there should be a restoration component to the proposal.

Bob Sallinger asked that “ethnic” be added to Guiding Principle #8-9/Equity.

Sean Loughran clarified that Guiding Principle #2 is an example of where these ideas show up. #3 is another example (restoration).

### **Airport Futures Key Sustainability Goals (5E) discussion:**

Bob Sallinger proposed a separate exterior air quality goal and a separate water quality goal. He also asked that we separate tree issues from wildlife habitat.

Andy Cotugno suggested that climate change goal refer to state goal instead of carbon neutrality. He asked if they were aiming for 100%.

Veronica pointed out that carbon neutrality is there but we are not saying climate neutral (other global warming contributors).

*Bill Blosser* clarified that it should not say climate neutral. Also clarified that they are working toward reducing emissions and then offsets to get to 100%.

Sean Loughran agreed with *Bill Blosser* about subcommittee intent.

Phil Ralston pointed out differences between state goal and proposed subcommittee goal. Different target dates.

Veronica asked if this was a higher goal with a longer timeline.

*Bill Blosser* clarified that this is PAG's recommendation, not the Port's commitment.

Sean Loughran reminded the group that this is about the goals (strategic) and defining the direction we want to go and not figuring out how to get there (tactical). These are not all of the goals, just the key ones that the sustainability subcommittee wanted to pass forward.

*Sam Imperati* said that these are not inconsistent.

Bob Sallinger asked how these will be reconciled when the package when it goes forward to decision-makers.

Andy Cotugno asked where the reconciliation would occur.

*Sam Imperati* and Sean said that it would be reconciled in the PAG report, not necessarily by the decision-making bodies.

Chris Corich clarified that it will also be in the staff sustainability report.

*Bill Blosser* said that he was "watching the pea move under the shells" and asked for clarification. Will the sustainability goals be in the Land Use Plan or the Master Plan? Alternatively, will they go as a recommendation to the Port?

Chris Corich stated that it is staff's job to communicate what PAG has recommended.

Jay Sugnet clarified that the guiding principles and goals will be memorialized in the City-Port intergovernmental agreement and provide direction to the PDX Community Advisory Committee.

*Bill Blosser* asked if the IGA would say that the Port/City would adopt these goals. Alternatively, we agree to work on these.

As such, Jay said that the goals would be adopted.

John Weigant asked what reference to Airport Futures in comp plan language means?

Jay Sugnet clarified that it means that Airport Futures becomes part of comp plan.

John Weigant and *Bill Blosser* asked if it was everything or was just the record.

Jay said that the Intergovernmental Agreement was where the action was – stronger than a Comp Plan reference.

Bob Sallinger stated his concern with PAG committing to the Master Plan grey infrastructure without consideration of the green infrastructure. He has concerns with just aspirations for environmental issues. They do not materialize in his experience. He feels that we could commit to concrete goals for the environment if we want to.

Fred Stovel asked if the PAG recommend it, then would it go in the Intergovernmental Agreement. Can we force the City and Port to put anything in the agreement that the two governments can't agree on? Is it a commitment or recommendation?

Jay Sugnet agreed with that clarification—it's a recommendation.

Andy Cotugno asked for clarification on Goal #9. What is the ISO reference? It needs to be in English.

*Bill Blosser* stated that the supply chain should be forced to comply with Port's standards (1401 compliant).

Andy Cotugno suggested a long footnote to clarify that reference.

### **Public Comment after PAG discussion**

*Sam Imperati* asked for any other guidance or feedback from the public. There was none.

**8:25 – 8:30 pm      Next Meeting Agenda (Jan. 19, 5:30 to 8:30 pm), Process Review and Other**  
**Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation Form, and Adjournment – Blosser/Imperati (5 min.)**

### **Next Meeting Agenda – Bill Blosser**

Reminder: NO PAG meeting in December. There will be a Noise Work Group on December 10 and PAG Recommendations meeting on December 15.

January 19 PAG meeting will focus on the 100% Land Use Plan, an update on Master Plan implementation and financial plans, and refinement of the sustainability package.

### **Process Review and Other Closing Comments – Bill Blosser**

Thanks for a good meeting. We are making progress (2 out of 3 of our products – Land Use Plan). This is something to feel good about. Long road.

*Bill Blosser* thanked the group for its ongoing commitment and willingness to see the project through. He feels that we will get much better products by continuing the process a little bit longer.

Happy Holidays!

### **Meeting Evaluation Form – Sam Imperati**

Please turn these in. It does help.

Happy Holidays!

## November 17, 2009 PAG Meeting Evaluation

<b>1. Overall Meeting Quality</b>	<b>Poor</b> 1	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b> (2)	<b>4</b> (5)	<b>Excellent</b> 5 (4)
<b>2. Pacing</b>	<b>Too Slow</b>	<b>2</b> (4)	<b>Just Right</b> (4)	<b>4</b> (4)	<b>Too Fast</b>
<b>3. Balancing "Product, Process &amp; Relationship" Meeting Goals</b>	<b>Poor</b> 1	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b> (2)	<b>4</b> (6)	<b>Excellent</b> 5 (2)
<b>4. Presentations</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b> (2)	<b>4</b> (6)	<b>5</b> (3)
<b>5. Comprehension of Presentations</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b> (2)	<b>4</b> (7)	<b>5</b> (3)
<b>6. Materials/Documents</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b> (1)	<b>3</b> (3)	<b>4</b> (6)	<b>5</b> (1)
<b>7. Discussion</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b> (1)	<b>4</b> (7)	<b>5</b> (1)
<b>8. Comments and Suggestions for Items 1 – 7, Above:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All painful work at this point</li> <li>• Great job!</li> <li>• Meeting accomplished what set out to do. Good Job!</li> <li>• Organization of documents vis a vis PPT confusing at times</li> </ul>					
<b>9. Least Useful:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Half too slow - Second half just right</li> <li>• Hard to suit through but it's vital</li> <li>• New stuff not in packets</li> <li>• None</li> <li>• Wordsmithing documents – better process is to have PAG members do before meeting and submit</li> </ul>					
<b>10. Most Useful:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion clarified issues</li> <li>• Heads up about respectful communication helped improve conversation</li> <li>• Sustainability</li> <li>• The final recommendations</li> </ul>					
<b>11. Questions:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NONE</li> </ul>					