

**PAG Forecast Subcommittee  
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date	<b>1/8/08 4:00 – 5:30 pm</b>
Meeting Location	<b>Port of Portland Bldg</b>
Attendance	Cam Gilmour Bill Blosser John Weigant Erwin Bergman Veronica Rinard John Mohlis
Staff	Chris Corich Jay Sugnet Sean Loughran John Gray Jason Gately Renee Dowlin Judy Crockett
Consultants	C.F. Booth Kelly Rodgers

The meeting started with introductions and a review of the Subcommittee Charter.

Jay reviewed the Charter and described the proposed sustainability framework as the lens through which we will evaluate the AF alternatives.

Erwin proposed two divisions of sustainability. We can keep going as is (status quo) or develop a new model for growth that does not hurt future generations (modify our behavior). He discussed a related article that he would provide to the subcommittee at a future date.

Sean discussed the importance of sustainability to the project as a whole and his belief that we have a strong team that brings a broad perspective on the subject of sustainability. He mentioned the specific expertise that Port Staff and Jacobs Consultancy has in the airport environment and the broader background DEA brings to the project based on their involvement on a variety of non-airport projects.

The focus of the subcommittee is on developing a framework, but we may also consider goals that could be included in the master plan going forward.

Cam described his involvement with sustainability issues for some time and pointed out that sustainability is not just about climate change. It can be broad or narrow. Too broad a definition can be out of focus. Cam hopes we don't get too broad. He suggested we consider defining sustainability relative to this effort, develop some goals and use those as a means of judging whether the decisions being made are sustainable.

Judy described that sustainability to her means designing something so that people and nature can thrive now and into the future. She posed two questions: What does sustainability mean from the standpoint of operating an airport and how does the function of the airport affect the function of the city as a whole?

John proposed that forecasts are self fulfilling prophecies. We are at the leading edge of a paradigm shift – a “growth” paradigm shift. Sustainability means that you can’t grow forever. Sustainability is in conflict with the old paradigm. It means shifting goals from getting bigger to getting better. John sees hard times ahead. John says we can’t behave as we have. He sees major behavior changes ahead.

Erwin shared a quote on sustainability.

Bill observed that most everyone at the table probably believes in the importance of sustainability and suggested that, to some degree, we were preaching to the choir. He posed the question, “What can we do to ensure that we are living within one planet, instead of the four we currently require?” He challenged the group to think about what we can do for this airport at this point in history to move us in the correct direction with respect to sustainability. He suggested we consider metrics such as energy or water use that we could use to compare alternatives in some objective way.

John suggested that the sooner we take policy actions that move us to a more sustainable future the better.

The group discussed the potential for advances in technology that may help (alternative fuel sources). It was also discussed that society may have to make some sacrifices to achieve greater sustainability goals.

We will want to consider what is already being done with respect to sustainability efforts in the (Portland) region.

Cam mentioned that to some degree this is a philosophical discussion vs. planning process. He sees a dichotomy. He suggested that certain federal policy decisions could overwhelm our efforts very quickly. He posed the question “What can we do?” Can we do something through this Airport Futures project that can be viewed as a model for other airports? Will the airport and the surrounding community be better for our efforts?

Veronica believes that we can be a model, but we can’t solve all the world’s problems with this planning process.

Bill suggested that we have to work with what we have and see how far we can go. The City (of Portland) has accomplished a great deal by focusing on a lot of little things. Sometimes the little things can add up to a lot.

Judy: She noted that the airport has an enormous amount of space devoted to automobile parking. She referred to some maps she had seen (aerials I think). She said that gas prices are rising and fossil fuel reserves are shrinking – how can we get people to drive less? If that is a goal of this effort, let’s make it easier

for people (to get to the airport). If we tell people they can't drive to the airport, what range of alternatives do we offer? It was discussed that the number of parking spaces or quantity of impervious surface may be useful metrics for comparing alternatives.

Mass transit (to the airport) needs to be addressed. Not just the bus, but shuttles and other alternatives. Alternative modes can take away a portion of the parking demand, diversify access alternatives, etc. We could consider policy aimed at the development of shuttle services (super shuttle) or expanded public transportation services.

John indicated the potential for many win-wins. He offered the example of sound insulation not only lowering noise levels inside homes, but also cutting energy consumption for heating. Could a carbon credit be offered for this?

Bill suggested that we consider setting high level goals and then break them down into smaller goals and implementation measures. Broad goals lead to more specific ideas on how to get there.

Jay suggested we keep in mind the vision and value statement. Collaboration (among other groups – agencies, business, etc) will be one of the outcomes of this process.

We should also look to the survey results. The survey indicated that users were willing to pay to offset carbon impact of a flight. The group discussed a range of ideas and issues associated with the revenue that may be generated by a carbon offset.

Kelly indicated that she liked the approach of keying on a particular issue and then developing particular metrics from it.

Chris mentioned that there is a website called "sustainable airports.com" – but he wasn't sure of the exact address. He also asked John what information he would like the Forecast Subcommittee to know about.

John responded that they need to know the big picture. He asked how can we take the sustainability concepts into the forecast. He mentioned that Oregon has a long tradition of innovation – are we going to continue that here? He said that the Forecasting Subcommittee needs permission to push the envelope.

Veronica said that the subcommittee needs to know how to change and influence the forecast based on the goals that the sustainability committee comes up with.

Sean indicated that the sustainability subcommittee will have many opportunities to have influence on this process. The forecast is only one place where we can identify sustainability as a key issue. When we look to the future and plan for a certain volume of growth we then get to discuss what we want that growth to look like. We will have the opportunity to consider, "what will parking at PDX look like at 20MAP?" Will there be a greater emphasis on alternative modes? Sustainability has been identified as a central theme for Airport Futures and will have an impact on this planning process well beyond the forecast.

Erwin mentioned that he is sensitive to the “stimulation of demand”. He noted an example from Europe of short leisure trips from Britain to Eastern Europe. He mentioned that the Port responds to demand but that the Port also does marketing. Marketing stimulates demand. He suggested that this in turn stimulates the economy which leads to more people and this causes problems when there is a downturn (in the economy). He said that we should let growth be more organic.

Sean mentioned that the Forecasting Subcommittee is already considering sustainability in their work and he listed some of the key issues that have been identified and how they are being incorporated into the forecasting process.

Jay suggested it was time to select a chair person for the subcommittee. He mentioned that Cam was the only person who had expressed interest in being chair, but that he may not be able to due to work constraints.

Sean mentioned that staff support for each subcommittee meeting is significant. He mentioned that the Chair was primarily responsible for leading the meetings, reporting back to the PAG and working with the Project Team.

John Weigant volunteered to serve as Vice Chair. Following a brief discussion the committee unanimously support Cam as Chair and John as Vice Chair.

The committee discussed when and where to meet. Most seemed to want to meet at the Port’s downtown building. Tuesday’s seemed like bad days for many. Nancy cannot meet on Wed mornings. It was mentioned that they should meet again before PAG mtg. #5 on Feb 19<sup>th</sup>. Sean will follow-up with a proposed meeting date.