



## Master Plan Alternatives Subcommittee Charter\*

\* Subject to change based on PAG schedule.

### DRAFT

**Subcommittee Chairperson:** TBD

**Start Date:** PAG meeting #9

**Anticipated End Date:** PAG meeting #17

**Required Representative Membership:**

*Community:* Fred Stovel, John Weigant, Maryhelen Kincaid (email only), Erwin Bergman

*Business:* Mitchell Berck, Stuart Mathew

*Government:* Cam Gilmour, Dennis Mulvihill

**Other PAG Members:** Dave Smith

**Non-PAG Members:** Nancy Hendrickson, Bureau of Environmental Services  
Andrew Johnson, Oregon Department of Transportation  
Jim Mason, Continental  
Mookie Patel, Alaska  
Pia Welch, PACA

**Port-City Staff Liaison:** Chris Corich, Port of Portland  
Jay Sugnet, City of Portland

**Subcommittee Charge:**

Informed by the PAG Vision and Values and Issues and Goals identified in the Stakeholder Outreach Summary, the Alternatives Analysis subcommittee will work with Airport Futures staff and the Aviation Consultant to help determine the future facilities required to accommodate forecast aviation demand, evaluate the alternatives for meeting the requirements, and identify the preferred Airport development plan. This will involve review of the Centralized, Decentralized and no-build alternatives for both airside and landside requirements identified in the 2000 Master Plan and analysis of each alternative's ability to meet demand as defined in the forecast and facility requirements analysis. In evaluating the alternatives, the subcommittee will consider the following in its review of the alternatives:

- Application of new information developed from the follow-on studies,
- Adjustments related to the new forecasts,
- New information on technologies,
- Business practices by the airlines and airport,
- Customer/passenger trends,
- Sustainability,

- Regulatory constraints and opportunities,
- Financial feasibility,
- Development phasing and constructability, and
- Environmental impact of the alternatives.

The subcommittee will consider the strengths and weaknesses of each development alternative based upon the criteria above with the goal of recommending to PAG a single direction for the future development of the airport.

**Subcommittee Deliverables:**

Recommendation to PAG on the following issues/subjects for PAG meetings #9-11:

1. Are the criteria and methods used to identify facilities requirements and evaluate alternatives appropriate and complete?
2. What level of service or range of service should be planned for?
3. Have new technology and systems and other trends been appropriately explored for their potential ability to increase facility utilization?
4. Have sustainability principles been appropriately considered?

Recommendation to PAG on the following issues/subjects for PAG meetings #12-14 (or sooner)

1. Are the assumptions related to facility requirements and development alternatives reasonable?
2. What is the recommended airport development alternative and have reasonable steps been taken to ensure that it postpones major new development as long as appropriate and provides the necessary flexibility?

Recommendation to PAG on the phasing plan for the selected alternative for PAG meetings #14-17. (or sooner)

Ongoing: At the first subcommittee meeting, the subcommittee will develop a work plan to achieve the charge of the subcommittee. For all meetings, the subcommittee will provide meeting agendas in advance. These agendas and meeting locations will be posted on the project website. The subcommittee will provide meeting notes or summaries of the discussion points, including points of agreement and disagreement within the subcommittee.