

**Planning Advisory Group Meeting #3 Notes**  
**Tuesday, December 18, 2007 5:00 pm – 8:30 pm**  
 Port of Portland Commission Room

**FINAL MEETING NOTES**

**I. Welcome** –Chair Bill Blosser

**Announcements**

Chair Bill Blosser welcomed everyone and congratulated the group on a good meeting last month. Lise mentioned that there are a few remaining photographs needed for the website: Laura Hudson, John Mohlis, John Gray from PDOT, and our forecast consultants. The photographer will come to a future meeting.

**Agenda Changes** – Bill Blosser

We are moving discussion of Study Area Boundaries until after the Planning Process Background to make time for full discussion of the project sideboards. We will take it up at 8:10 versus 6:15. If we need more time for sideboards, we will kick the Study Area Boundaries discussion to another meeting.

**Approval of November 20, 2007 Meeting Notes** – Bill Blosser

No email comments were received on the draft notes. Bill asked if there were any changes proposed and there were none. The November 20, 2007 Meeting Notes were approved by voice vote.

**Housekeeping**

Erwin Bergman: Eric Meyer will be his alternate, as well as the alternate for John Weigant.

<b>Members</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Lisa <b>Barton-Mullins</b>	E. County/City of Fairview	√
Erwin <b>Bergman</b>	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill <b>Blosser</b>	Chair	√
Catherine <b>Ciarlo</b>	Planning Commissioner	√
Andy <b>Cotugno</b>	Metro	√
Tom <b>Gerharter</b>	Horizon Airlines	
Cam <b>Gilmour</b>	Clackamas County	√
Alan <b>Hargrave</b>	Port of Camas/Washougal	√
Laura <b>Hudson</b>	City of Vancouver	√
Gloria <b>Ibarra</b>	FAA (Alternate: Stan Allison was in audience)	
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, <b>Alternate Present: Jim Pauley</b>	√
Ross <b>Monn</b>	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Dennis <b>Mulvihill</b>	Washington County	√
Brian <b>Nelson</b>	Intel	√
Mary <b>Olson</b>	Port Commissioner	√
Jordan <b>Papé'</b>	Flightcraft	
Veronica <b>Rinard</b>	Portland OR Visitors Association.	√
Hector <b>Roche</b>	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	
Lawrence <b>Russell</b>	Coalition for a Livable Future	√
Bob <b>Sallinger</b>	Audubon Society of Portland	√
Michael <b>Sloan</b>	Vancouver Neighborhoods	
Dave <b>Smith</b>	Vice Chair	√
Denny <b>Stoecklin</b>	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred <b>Stovel</b>	ONI	√
Vicki <b>Thompson</b>	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John <b>Weigant</b>	AIR	√
Travis <b>Williams</b>	Willamette Riverkeeper	

<b>Staff &amp; Consultants</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Joe Barden	Port's Aviation Consultant (HNTB)	√
Bridget Bayer	Asst. Facilitator (ICM) with Melissa Egan	√
Debbie Bishop	Port	√
C.F. Booth	Port's Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
Mindy Brooks	City	√
Bronwyn Buckle	City Planning Bureau	
Chris Corich	Port Project Manager	√
Rene Dowlin	Port	
Jason Gately	Port	
Lise Glancy	Port	√
Geoffrey D. Gosling	City's Consultant (Principal, Aviation System Consulting)	√
John Gray	City	√
Bob Hillier	PDOT	
Nancy Hendrickson	BES	
Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Scott King	Port	√
Sean Loughran	Port	√
Mary Maxwell	Port	
Linda Perry	Jacobs Consultancy	√

Kama Simonds	Port	√
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√
Chris White	Port	√
Joe Zehnder	Planning Bureau	

**PUBLIC PRESENT:** Lee Perlman, Frank Howatt, Jim Edelson, Eric Meyer (PAG alternate), Mike Bieniewicz (PAG alternate), and Brendan Fitzpatrick (OR Pilots Association).

**Follow-up:**

**City Regulatory Policy and Planning Memo Addendum – Jay Sugnet**

Jay Sugnet noted that the ORS Noise citation has been added to the City Policy and Planning Memo Addendum #2.

**Final Stakeholder Outreach Memo/Matrix – Bill Blosser, Jay Sugnet, and Lise Glancy**

The final summary of stakeholder outreach on Goals and Issues was passed out to the group, including a cover memo and the complete matrix. Lise said that due to a copying error, the PAG did not get the full matrix last time, just the Surrounding Areas positives and negatives. With this handout, everyone now has the full matrix. It will be posted on the project website, as well.

Lise said there are three additional issues that surfaced from the six additional public outreach events. The staff feels that these are implicit in the adopted Vision and Values statement, but that the suggestions are worth the PAG's consideration. Attachment 4 was shown on the screen during discussion.

1. Multimodal reference: the suggestion was made to add "multi-modal transportation links." The staff feels this notion is important, but is already covered by the text in Economic item #3, "integrating PDX better into the regional transportation system."
2. Advocacy for transportation funding: some feel it is important to include a reference to advocacy for transportation funding. Lise said, if desired by the PAG, "and support transportation funding" could easily be added to Economic item #3.
3. Integration with other planning efforts: again, while this is already addressed in the Vision and Values, "integrate other local and regional planning efforts into Airport Futures" could be added as a Recommendation.

**Final Vision and Values Discussion – Sam Imperati**

*Catherine Ciarlo:* in the "avoid, minimize, mitigate" footnote, she would like to change "practical" to "possible."

*Bill Blosser:* "possible" was not selected for the reason that anything is possible if you take enough time and throw enough money at it. "Practical" was chosen because conceptually it takes into consideration the constraints we are faced with.

*Cam Gilmore:* how about feasible?

*Dennis Mulvihill:* "possible" and "practical" seem "equally soft" to him. He does not see that there is much difference.

*John Weigant:* feels that the most standard usage is the language we should follow.  
*Lise Glancy:* this was the language pulled from the City code.

*Sam Imperati:* is the word “practical” in the City’s plan?

Jay Sugnet: Unsure.

*Sam Imperati:* to refocus the discussion, he reminded everyone that as a Vision and Values piece. This is an aspirational, perfect world scenario, not an attempt to create a legally binding contract.

*Erwin Bergman* – “possible” is an absolute, “practical” is a judgment.

*Sam Imperati:* suggestion to strike “where practical?”

*Catherine Ciarlo:* agreed, striking is a good choice.

*Bob Sallinger* has issues with “avoid/minimize/mitigate” concept as compared to the use of the word “ensure” in the Economic section.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* sees this as more of a guideline than a parameter. They do not have to limit us, nor do we need strict definitions. This should be used as a guiding force rather than a limiting force.

*Sam Imperati:* it seems like your “quarrel,” so to speak, is that the words in the Economic section seem more forceful than in the Environmental or Social sections.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* proposed that Economic #1 begins with “meet” and the removal of “where practical.”

The vote was 18 ones and 2 twos.

*Sam Imperati:* asked the twos what changes they would like to see.

*Stuart Matthew:* strike the asterisk and leave off definition of avoid/minimize/mitigate.

*Lawrence Russell:* would like to leave Economic number 1 and number 2 as they are, wants to have “ensure” remain in the definition.

There was no second in response to Stuart and Lawrence’s suggestions, and no more discussion. The proposed changes passed by consensus.

### **Consideration of Final Stakeholder Outreach – Sam Imperati**

*Sam Imperati:* do we feel the need to add “mutli-modal” and “support transport funding” to #3 in the Economic section, plus the additional bullet in Recommendations re: “integrating into other regional planning efforts?”

*Andy Cotugno:* thinks all three are good, they add meaning to, and clarify the document. Andy made a motion to add the text.

A unanimous vote, all ones, adopted the Vision and Values, as amended with additions from recent outreach, plus changes to footnote and first economic bullet.

Sam asked if there are any questions on status of outreach activities, which, for clarification, are concluded for the Issues and Goals phase. Further outreach will happen on other phases. There were no PAG comments or questions.

### **Final Collaboration Principles - Sam Imperati**

Attachment 5 was put on the screen to show the group the new text in the Collaboration Principles document. Minor changes were made to: A) clarify notice for posting subcommittee meeting notices and B) clarify the consensus language. Sam noted that these are non-substantive changes, done just to make the text flow. No further changes were made. All were in favor of adoption in this final form. The document will be passed around for signatures at the next meeting.

## **II. Telephone Survey Results and Discussion – Scott Drumm, and the Riley Research Associates Consulting Team**

The City and Port sponsored a telephone survey to help inform future PAG decision-making on key issues and evaluate trade-offs associated with airport development. The survey instrument was developed with input from PAG members. The Survey Results and PowerPoint were handed out to the PAG for this discussion.

Scott Drumm from the Port was introduced. He explained that they wanted statistically significant and reliable data to provide PAG with the info they will need to make informed decisions. They did a phone survey, which is different from the on-line survey. The phone survey done by Riley Research Associates may be more scientific, but the on-line survey has the benefit of providing immediate feedback. Both types of information will be useful in their own ways. PAG Public Involvement subcommittee provided invaluable input. The report will be available on the website, including the cross-tabulations.

John Campbell, with Riley Research, was introduced and presented the survey results. He was the project manager. The goal of the research was to gain insight into:

- Current satisfaction rates with the Airport
- Airport usage and behaviors
- Sustainability attitudes
- Quality of life choices

They used a stratified random sample, which means the sample groups were divided into primary and secondary impact areas by looking at complaint maps. Just over 1200 residents from the Portland-Vancouver area participated in this survey.

In general, the Riley team said PDX earns a strong B+ on “satisfaction” posed as a general question. (What is your current level of satisfaction with PDX?)

The rating system was explained: 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Respondents were given that scale, nothing further.

*John Weigant:* so is 3, “neutral,” as in no opinion?

*John Campbell:* No.

In the Tradeoffs section, John Campbell explained the nearly perfect bell curve means the basic message is that people would like a balance between neighborhood livability and economic vitality.

Sustainability options: the data reveals that most people are willing to pay to offset their carbon impact. 70% are willing to pay something.

Neighborhood issues: respondents were asked open-ended questions. Topics that bothered folks a “great deal” were traffic congestions, the state of school funding, noise from airplanes and noise from trains. 13% of the primary and 17% of the secondary respondents strongly agreed that noise impacts their quality of life. It was particularly interesting that a higher percentage in the secondary impact area responded this way.

Behavior section: a very large number of people state they are “very willing” or “willing” to do something to decrease the environmental impact due to transportation.

Conclusions:

- Residents are currently very satisfied with the Airport.
- Residents are looking for a balance in protecting neighborhood livability and airport’s ability to support region’s economic vitality; air travel options.
- Residents appear willing to pay a voluntary surcharge to offset environmental and carbon impact of their flights.
- Residents are in support of most sustainability options except surcharge to fly at peak times.
- Most resident appear satisfied with issues in their neighborhoods

## Discussion

*Denny Stoecklin:* is there any way to determine how often respondents use the airport?

Yes, things such as how often they drive to PDX, how often they fly for pleasure/business, etc., were all asked and are available on the website. If folks have questions, the Riley Research Associates welcome calls and emails, (503) 222-4179.

*Frank Howatt from the audience:* feels that the sample could be diluted because the area is too broad and a lot of area is not on East-West departure flight paths, but rather the crosswind runway. In his opinion, this is why the noise problem got such a low percentage from the survey.

## Aviation Forecast Discussion – Dennis Mulvihill, C.F. Booth and Linda Perry

Bill Blosser noted that Dennis Mulvihill had been elected to serve as the chair of the Aviation Forecast subcommittee. He will provide a brief report on the Subcommittee’s work.

**Forecast Subcommittee Report:** Dennis noted that the subcommittee has had two meetings to date. The notes are posted on the website. They have reviewed the Subcommittee Charter, met with the consulting team, reviewed existing forecasts, and have started discussion of key issues, assumptions and forecast methodologies. Next meeting of the subcommittee is January 9, 2008 at the Port from 7:00 – 9:00 PM.

Jay introduced Geoff Gosling, the City's peer review, forecast consultant.

C.F. Booth provided an overview of the master planning process describing the major elements including inventory, forecasts, facility requirements, alternatives analysis, and the drafting of associated drawings and narrative documents that become the plan. The intent of presenting the overview was to familiarize the group with the context for assessing the importance of various issues that have been discussed and when in the process that discussion will occur.

C.F. spoke about the role of forecasting in the overall planning effort and gave an overview of the forecast phase. The objective of forecasts is to develop a basis for determining facility requirements, alternatives, and effective decisions. This process will produce planning schedules and derivative forecasts, which is a series of annual numbers to be used in developing and assessing alternatives. The forecasts will enable us to develop detailed operations information necessary for determining flight schedules, gate requirements, parking requirements, etc., and provide the level of information necessary for future noise analysis. As planners, what is needed from the forecasts is a realistic understanding of what aviation activity will be in the future. We need to look at unconstrained demand – a very important concept. We should not muddy the waters in the forecasting period; we need to create an objective baseline to work with. This will be essential for us to evaluate the impacts of meeting demand and fully understand the consequences of the development alternatives as well as the “do nothing” alternative.

In the Facility Requirements task, we will evaluate the facilities needed to meet forecast activity, establishing the capacity of all major functions and identifying areas where there are shortfalls in capacity. The Alternatives Analysis will involve a broad discussion of issues related to the centralized, decentralized and “no-build” alternatives. It will be important in the discussion that we make appropriate distinctions among the issues identifying those that can be dealt with effectively in the master plan and those that require a different or broader context and should be the subject of future studies. In general, the master planning process is completed with the development of drawings and narrative documents describing the preferred airport development concept, how it is implemented and the impacts. Future development will be demand-based and not time based. A key objective is to develop a plan with the flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances. The plan will be reviewed periodically and revised as appropriate.

Alternatives: objective is to identify alternatives; the starting point will be the centralized and decentralized options.

As issues arise, some will be effectively dealt with during the Master Planning Process; others will not be appropriate for this stage.

Plans: the tangible output will be drawings and narrative reports, which requires preparation of airport layout plans. It also involves refinement of previous studies. We want to create a flexible plan; typical master plans are revised on 5-10 year cycle.

*Andy Cotugno:* is interested in demand-driven description for forecasting, does this include lead-time?

*C.F. Booth:* we will look at what type of activity creates the demand. Concerning time, we vacillate between using time and demand.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* lead times are lower, to use your example, for a parking garage, as opposed to a new runway.

*C.F. Booth:* Correct. We try to estimate the times for all the major functions at the airport.

*Fred Stovel:* when do you think sharing of info will happen between the developing of the Master Plan and informing the City?

*C.F. Booth:* he expects that the City will have demands for information and he will work with the City and Port to provide the required information

*John Weigant:* has concerns about what is referred to as the sustainability overlay. He feels that sustainability needs to be considered as a foundation, rather than an overlay.

*C.F. Booth:* sustainability is a key component in this planning process; by using the word "overlay," he did not mean to imply that it was in any way unimportant.

## **BREAK**

The discussion continued with Linda Perry, Jacobs Consultancy.

Ms. Perry went over the Aviation Forecasting Process. There are a number of steps, including data collection, interview, and surveys of key stakeholders, and identification of key issues and trends. She pointed out that identifying key issues and trends now is unique to this process; often it occurs at the end. This was intentional, to try to do forecasting in a different way. It is also unique to engage a peer review expert at the initial steps of the forecasting process so that they can have independent influence on the entire effort. Additionally, for any forecast process to work well, there has to be a lot of input, give and take. A lot of this will happen in the same timeframe.

Critical path tasks:

- Define a model, selecting the independent (causal) variables
- Obtain input from Forecast Subcommittee on model variables and structures
- Define potential forecast scenarios
- Prepare probabilistic forecasts – must understand uncertainty associated with independent variables so we can predict future forecast values by expressing the likelihood of obtaining any given result.

The consultants will look at 1999 Master Plan forecast and FAA 2006 Terminal Area Forecasts (TAF) prepared by FAA for every airport in US.

Main forecasting areas:

1. Enplaned Passengers
2. Cargo
3. Total Aircraft Operations (Total = airline, military and general aviation, biggest slice is airline)

Note: forecasts have to be approved by FAA. If they differ by more than 10% (5-year period) or 15% (10-year period), then an explanation is required.

Identification of Key issues and Trends

- Regional/Economic
- Aviation Industry Related
- External Events (terrorism, etc.)
- Technology (aircraft related, fuel, web-based collaboration efforts to reduce travel)

- Global Issues (climate change; exchange rates; travel patterns, better internet access = less traveling in tours, going to different places, etc)

These issues can be muddled, that is to say, they are complicated unknowns.

Any assumption made in the forecast on greenhouse gas emissions will have to consider that US policy on the matter is not defined. Aviation “appears to have” less options than other industries in terms reduction potential. Climate change and sustainability have been identified in the Key Issues and Trends, and they will be the subject of additional research to understand how they can be incorporated in the modeling process.

*Maryhelen Kincaid:* what is behind the “aviation “appears to have fewer options than other industries in reduction” assertion?

*Linda Perry:* she believes this because of how aviation industry works. Airplanes have a shelf life of 50 years. Fuel costs and the lack of synthetic alternatives are by far the biggest issue.

*John Weigant:* what if we disagree with the FAA on the forecasts?

*Chris Corich:* we will work it out. The FAA is a good partner in the process.

*Andy Cotugno:* how does cost of fuel impact this?

*Linda Perry:* fuel is more costly on a per mile basis than labor. We have and will look at the experts in the field for the ranges of possibilities.

*Catherine Ciarlo:* concerning the price of fuel; if there is a significant spike in price in conjunction with lead-time, how will that impact a major terminal expansion?

*Linda Perry:* One is a planning question, one is a demand question, and with the use of forecast scenarios, we can look at these issues?

*Fred Stovel:* the professional literature suggests that people will find other ways to meet travel needs if capacity is not provided for. So, if it is burdensome to get to PDX, people might go to Seattle.

*Linda Perry:* if there is significant leakage to other airports that can be documented, we will look at that.

*Bill Blosser:* clarifying question about forecasting scenario; will you look at the possible outcomes of different policy decisions?

*Linda Perry:* usually, that will happen down the line. We are trying to give us, based on the best data, what the demand is likely to be, under the scenarios, we will test.

*Bill Blosser:* so the Forecast Subcommittee will come up with variables and you will tell them if we can or cannot test a given variables?

*Linda Perry:* yes.

## **Planning Process Background – Sam Imperati**

Chris Corich first explained that the airport *could not be required* to build anything to meet demand; the FAA cannot compel us to do anything. This is explained in the document called, Addendum: Rights of Airport Proprietor Not to Add Capacity, which for PAG purposes is Attachment 7 supplementing Meeting Tab #2 – Planning Process Background.

## **PAG Triage of Project Sideboards with PAG Comments - Sam Imperati**

Sam went over the spreadsheet of the responses from PAG members. There are six issues that C.F. Booth will discuss now with more discussion in January.

C.F. Booth presents consultant response to sideboards.

*Item 1. High-speed rail? Will be considered in forecast?* High-speed rail will be considered in the Forecast. The key issue is when high-speed rail might be implemented. The potential time frame will help determine the degree to which it is considered in the alternatives.

*Erwin Bergman:* at this point, Erwin Bergman made a short presentation and passed out a couple handouts. He said that 18,000 passengers come into PDX from somewhere along the I-5 Corridor. High-speed rail could be a way to reduce traffic. We should not assume aviation is the only long distance regional transportation option. Waiting is unrealistic considering all the global issues we face (fuel alternatives not where they need to be: ex, 747 takes 57,284 gallons of jet fuel; population growth, etc.). Erwin is asking that we start this in earnest now, because it will take at least 10 years to get something going. He handed out a letter he wrote to the Governors of Oregon, California, and Washington, and would like PAG members to sign, if they agree at the next meeting.

*Item 2. Move military off PDX?* Oregon Air National Guard has lease until 2029 and wants to stay; staff recommends providing space to military. The military activity including in the forecasts is not a tipping point for runway or taxiway requirements and will primarily be useful for future studies of aircraft noise. As planners, we have no way to assess the future of the F15 and certainly no way to know about follow-on types of aircraft. We do not assess military space requirements. The alternatives process will allow us to review the location of the military. If we were to decide that the needs of the airport cannot be met with the military occupying its current site or even being at PDX we will say so. With this in mind, we do not envision the military resulting in a less than optimal solution for future airport development.

*Item 4. Consider building a replacement or supplemental airport?* We will consider supplemental airports in the Forecast phase. As a planner, C.F. Booth is very confident in asserting that we do not need a new airport to accommodate the demand within the timeframe we are considering. We will consider existing and planned improvements to other regional airports and airports in the greater Oregon and Washington State Aviation Systems.

*Item 6. Consider the possible third parallel runway?* It will be looked at in the Master Planning process, if a need did appear, the consultants would be obligated to say so. At the highest level, a Master Plan is a land use plan, so it is prudent for the planners to look at what it will look like in the future. Just because it is drawn on the Airport Layout Plan, does not mean it will be constructed, but only that the land would be reserved for that use.

*Item 11. Consider climate change?* Climate change is of great importance and falls within the general framework of sustainability. Sustainability principles will be applied throughout the

planning process, and are currently being considered as part of the forecast effort. During the alternatives phase, we intend to evaluate alternatives relative to sustainability principles.

*Item 14. Consider a nighttime curfew?* Staff has recommended that no further study of this issue be conducted as part of the master plan. The consultants concur. Very low probability of getting such a curfew, so linking it to a Master Plan is not useful. A number of airports are engaged in the required Part 161 process, but no noise restrictions have been approved by the FAA, and any action at these airports is uncertain. Given the scope and time requirements the master plan does not provide the proper context for this issue.

Comments and discussion from the PAG will be set over until the January meeting.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Eric Meyer:* Eric is the alternate for Erwin Bergman and John Weigant. He wants to point out that his impression is that the PAG is considering economic issues separate from the other issues. He thinks it is a good idea to consider the economic impacts for the neighborhoods as well as PDX.

## **VI. Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation and Adjournment – Bill Blosser**

*John Weigant:* will comment next week. He thinks C.F. Booth took some stances that could be disputed.

*Erwin Bergman:* wants to know if we can re-address the letter he wrote at the next meeting.

*Bill Blosser:* yes, it will be on the next agenda.

*Geoff Gosling:* each of these assumptions (plus others) is planning or policy decisions that, at least partially, lay outside the scope of the Master Plan Forecasting process. Input assumptions will, of course, impact the timing of likelihoods. This is part of the challenge we face in this Forecasting Subcommittee.

Next PAG meeting is on Tuesday, January 15, 2008, 5:30 to 8:30 pm at the Port, same location.

Sustainability Subcommittee is targeted to begin in February. There will be an informal meeting in January. Bill thinks it is a great idea for Sustainability Subcommittee members to attend the forecasting meeting, as there is quite a bit of overlap.

Land Use and Transportation Subcommittee targeted to begin in March.

Have a Happy Holiday!

## **MEETING ADJOURNED**

Respectfully Submitted by the ICM facilitation team.