

LONG-TERM AIR TRANSPORTATION STUDY (LATS)

Washington State Aviation Planning Council

MEETING SUMMARY

December 4, 2008

**Spokane Doubletree Hotel
322 North Spokane Falls Ct, Spokane**

Present:

Council Members: Carol Moser (Chair), Paul Roberts (Vice Chair), John Townsley, Penelope Loomis, Dave Field, Neal Sealock, James McNamara, John Sibold, Don Garvett

Staff: John Shambaugh, Nisha Marvel

Consultant Team: David Hollander (SH&E), John Yarnish (URS), Rita Brogan (PRR), Kimbra Wellock (PRR)

Chair Moser opened the meeting and reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda:

- Review public input on alternative strategies and options
- Preliminary definition of preferred strategic investment option
- Discuss potential legislative recommendations
- Council reviews existing statewide aviation funding issues and potential funding strategies

Chair Moser welcomed members of the public and introduced Latisha Hill, who was recently appointed to the Washington Transportation Commission.

Council Member Sibold thanked the Council members for the time they have devoted to the Council and encouraged the Council to maintain a high level view when reviewing alternatives. He reminded the Council that this is a statewide effort, and encouraged Council members to raise all ideas for discussion today and to let the consultant team and staff know if we are not going the right direction. He noted that additional meetings can be scheduled.

Council Member Sealock thanked Ms. Hill for attending the meeting, and commented that she has been a catalyst for the region, and that she will be a great addition to the Washington Transportation Commission.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Approve October 2, 2008 Meeting Summary

Vice Chair Roberts requested a revision to his comment on page 11 of the October meeting summary, to revise his comment to say, “Vice Chair Roberts asked how smaller airports such as Harvey Field serve as a reliever to SeaTac.”

Council Member Sealock commented that this is often an airspace management issue, and not just about what is happening on the ground. The public typically focuses on ground-related issues, but for the airports, airspace is often the more pressing issue.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that people traditionally think of civil aviation as commercial aviation only, but it also includes air taxi and civil aviation, which we traditionally think of as general aviation. He noted that many major commercial airports have limited air taxi general aviation activity, but that there may be more of this kind of activity at SeaTac than we realize.

Council Member Garvett moved to approve the October 2, 2008 meeting summary as amended. Motion seconded by Vice Chair Roberts. The October 2, 2008 meeting summary was approved, as amended.

Follow Up From Previous Meeting

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that John Yarnish will talk about caps at SeaTac, which was a topic we promised to gather information about at the last meeting. Mr. Shambaugh directed the Council Members to a number of newspaper articles included in the Council packet that relate to Paine Field and Boeing manufacturing. At the previous meeting, we discussed whether or not Boeing manufacturing data was captured in the LATS data analysis. We have confirmed that Paine Field data does capture Boeing throughput.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that his background is in land use and aerospace issues and that at a previous meeting he requested that we explore the aerospace industry production capacity needs to ensure that it is incorporated into the alternatives analysis work. Vice Chair Roberts clarified that his response to a recent *Everett Herald* guest commentary by Mukilteo Mayor Joe Marine was not submitted on behalf of the Council, but of his own accord, and that he recognizes the Chair has primary responsibility for speaking on behalf of the Council.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) explained the Paine Field data as it pertains to the issue aerospace industry production, noting that the consultant team reviewed the Paine Field activity forecast and the Paine Field Master Plan. The Master Plan forecast used calendar year 2000 as the base year. Actual operations were 143,000 in 2005. While the forecast projected an increase, actual operations were 143,000 in 2005, a sharp decrease of about 50,000. The LATS analysis used 2005 as the base year which accounts for the lower level. We feel confident that our forecast incorporates the full realm of activity at Paine Field, exclusive of any commercial activity currently under discussion, such as Horizon and Allegiant.

Council Member Garvett commented that emergence of Allegiant of Horizon was unexpected. It is a wild card issue, and one that he is not sure how to address.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) responded that it is not an issue that we did not forecast this. We have been looking at how much room might be available in the commercial sphere. Commercial service at Paine Field would provide some degree of relief at SeaTac. Our analysis does not say that

commercial service should not come into Paine Field, but rather how much space would be available if it did.

Council Member Sibold responded that this fits with the policies we have developed. We have been looking at available capacity at existing airports. We need to understand that there may be capacity issues at Paine, but there are other airports that have available capacity.

Council Member Garvett commented that Paine Field is not fungible. From the commercial side, people want service there because of its location. But it is infrastructure that is the issue.

Vice Chair Robert commented that he raised this issue so that we are sure to consider the impact of actions on the aerospace industry since it is so important to the State's economy. He noted that state and federal regulations do not really provide the distinctions that industry needs at airports. Boeing is the largest manufacturing facility in the world and the number one producer of the nation's outbound trade balance. The issues between commerce and the FAA at the federal level would certainly be respected in terms of how we balance capacity decisions. We want to be clear that we have considered this issue and addressed it in our work.

Council Member Sealock commented that another way to put it is that we are reflecting potential and not being directive. We are recognizing what is possible. It does not mean that if we build it that the airlines will come.

Chair Moser commented that it is important that we correct misstatements as once information is out in the public realm, it is viewed as fact. She commented that she appreciated Vice Chair Roberts taking the time to write the article to correct this misstatement.

Council Member Garvett commented that Paine Field is a political, lightning rod issue in the community. He asked how we address it, whether we should ignore the issue or incorporate into our work, and if so, then how.

Chair Moser responded that at the last meeting, Vice Chair Roberts recommended that the Council base its decisions on fact, and let the Legislature address the political issues.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that there are people that put forth misinformation. It is the Council's job is to counter it with fact. It is the Legislature's job to figure out how to deal with it.

Council Member Sealock commented that he has received calls from reporters about military airfields. He responded that he does not represent the Council, and encouraged the reporter to consult the Council's white paper which outlined the results of its study of this issue. He felt that the white paper was the best source for facts for media coverage, and a better approach than answering questions on the fly. He noted that to date he has not seen any news coverage on this issue.

Council Member Sibold noted that he has been meeting with airport directors to obtain their comments on the draft statewide aviation policies. He has been encouraging them to comment now, rather than waiting until the end of the process. Council Member Sibold also clarified a comment he made at the previous meeting for the record. His comment read in the meeting summary that if Harvey Field closed, its traffic would likely go to Renton. He clarified that any decision to close Harvey Field would be made by its owners, and that it was unlikely that it would close. He further clarified that if Harvey Field closed, it is likely that its traffic would go to many airports, and not just Renton.

Chair Moser reported that Senator Keiser responded that she appreciated the Council's response letter. Chair Moser discussed with Senator Keiser that her comments were somewhat ahead of where the Council is at in the process. Senator Keiser indicated that she was fine with the way the Council's work has been progressing.

Work Plan Review

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) explained that the purpose of today's meeting is to get input on the alternatives and to raise all concerns with the alternatives today. There is a lot of work left to do to develop the alternatives, and we want the Council's input to help guide the work. Our goal is to have the draft report documents completed by January 1st, so that the Council has time to review the material prior to the February 5th Council meeting. We may set up an email tree, followed by a conference call, to facilitate Council discussion of the reports. He asked the Council to let staff know how much time will be needed to review the documents. The goal for the next meeting is to have the Council take action on the reports so that they can be released for public review. We are planning on a 45-60 day public review period. We will present a summary of public comment and the revised documents to the Council at the May meeting.

Council Member Sibold commented that we want to be sure that we do not try to stick to a meeting schedule that is not doable given the volume of work. We should be sure to consider another meeting if we feel it is needed.

Chair Moser added that the additional meeting could be a Go To Meeting, instead of an in person meeting.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) explained that we plan to deliver a system wide plan. We distributed the outline for the Council report at the previous meeting. The legislative package will be developed later in the process, but will likely be part of the Council report.

Council Member Sealock asked if the Legislature is aware that a legislative package is forthcoming from the Council.

Council Member Sibold responded that we need to vet the legislative package through our internal process, working with legislative staff. We have already missed this session, and we need to be far enough ahead in our work to get this done.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) added that this might be broader than the next session, and might be moved through the next few sessions. We believe that there will be some legislative issues to address, but the Council needs to decide this.

Council Member Sibold added that we will need to brief the legislature on any funding issues in late summer. We will need time to complete the necessary due diligence to make this happen.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) added that we have a process in place to accomplish this, which will be implemented starting in January, going through February and into the spring.

Council Member Garvett asked if the election resulted in any changes that will impact our work.

Council Member Sibold responded that we typically work through the Governor's office on a staff level, and that the assumption is that this process will work the same. The Council is mandated to deliver

recommendations to the Washington Transportation Commission and Governor, but administratively, we need to work through the Governor's office. We will brief the Washington Transportation Commission on December 17th, so we should discuss any timeline issues we have today.

Chair Moser asked for clarification on what will be delivered to the Legislature in January/February.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) replied that we will deliver the alternatives concepts.

Council Member Sibold added that those would be vetted in advance.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) added that we may need to have a two-day meeting in February, either back to back days, or staggered across two weeks.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that he agrees with Council Member Sibold that we should hold an extra meeting if it is needed. He suggested that we only meet once the Council has had adequate time to review the document. We should develop a strategy so that we are not writing these reports by committee. It is more efficient if we raise major thoughts and comments prior to the meeting, so that we come to the meeting prepared to make decisions. Any issues requiring further attention should be assigned to subcommittees.

Alternative Investment Strategies

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) presented information on the alternative investment strategies to determine if the Council was in agreement with the approach and if the consultant team is moving in the right direction with its analysis. He began by describing the alternatives development approach and reviewing key issues identified in LATS:

- There are significant deficiencies in airport capacity (Airfield, Terminal, Air Cargo, Aircraft Storage and Airspace) within the Puget Sound Region. Most of the rest of the State has adequate capacity
- Commercial service to small communities in the State is continuing to erode
- Privately owned Public Use Airports are especially vulnerable to closure and lack access to funding for improvements
- Land use compatibility protection is inadequate at many airports
- Many airport facilities and services across the State do not meet Performance Objectives that are appropriate for their airport classifications
- Many airports lack all-weather access (instrument approaches) that are necessary to provide access and for economic vitality.

Council Member Garvett commented that there are airfield and terminal capacity issues at SeaTac and some would say there is an aircraft storage issue, if the definition is finding a convenient spot to park.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that SeaTac is trying to find a balance with the three runway system, especially concerning aircraft storage. He noted that the Port of Seattle's official position is that they will achieve balance within the three runway system.

Council Member Townsley asked for a definition of "balance."

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that balance means mathematically calculating the number of landings on the three runways. This requires making assumptions based on aircraft size. Determining how to optimize the efficiency of the airport and runways is an ongoing issue.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that this refers back to SeaTac's comprehensive plan which defines its capacity at 45 million passenger annually. He noted that since that work was completed, we are seeing changes at SeaTac, such as larger aircraft and higher number of occupied seats (load factor), which means the number of passengers coming in on each plane has increased.

Council Member Sealock commented that this is a moving target. It is not a build it and they will come situation. There are a number of things that impact decision-making about where to park aircraft overnight. It is very hard to pin down a specific number.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that this issue is likely coming up because we had previously discussed a cap. However, it is not a cap, as the situation is always changing. It is a difficult thing to explain.

Council Member Townsley asked if this is an administrative definition or something developed by the Port.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that it is a planning number.

Council Member Sibold commented that there are some unique airport situations that are not included in our information where there are substandard facilities, or airports that will not meet performance standards. Two of these airports are Colville and Clark County. There is capacity in those areas, but they are unique situations. We do not want to lose this point. It may not be a capacity issue, but at some point we need to address these performance-based unique situations.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that there are a number of things that do not get addressed in a capacity analysis, such as Vista Field. That doesn't account for the other issues such as stewardship or economic development. These issues are not getting picked up in a strict capacity analysis. At the end, we need to address these issues in the performance objectives section.

Council Member Sibold commented that people are relying on us to address these issues and as such we need to not lose this point. There are people waiting on decision-making until the LATS findings are released and are looking to us to resolve these issues. It is an important point that is not reflected here, and should not be lost.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that we cannot make decisions about the minutia. We can make decisions about what the performance objectives should be as it sets the framework to address the individual issues.

Council Member Sibold stated that he believes that at the end of the process, it is possible that some issues important to communities might not be addressed. He asked if and how this should be handled, and noted that people will ask how this report helps if it does not address these issues.

Council Member Field commented on the earlier discussion about SeaTac and the issue of determining figures that are moving targets. The 45 million figure that John Yarnish commented about is a planning number arrived at during a master planning process. It is a moving target, and if the calculations were done again, they would result in a different number. If the FAA changes its rules on instrument approach

procedures it results in a different theoretical number. We need to stress the point that these are moving targets and as such, we cannot put some sort of limiting number on capacity.

Chair Moser commented that we need to explain that this is a moving target and that the performance objectives set the standard for how we move forward.

Council Member Garvett commented that 16 months ago fuel prices were high and airlines were in trouble. Today, fuel prices are too low and it is still problematic. The key issue is volatility, which has been at a record high. We may conclude that the best solution may not be the best answer, but rather the second best answer because it allows the flexibility needed to deal with volatility.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that it would serve us well if the framework we relied on is very clearly understood. We need to clearly show what we looked at, what the questions were, and how we approached it. Everything should be defined clearly and explained well.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) continued with the presentation, identifying the key players and their roles and responsibilities.

- WSDOT Aviation:
 - Stewardship of state aviation system
 - Technical assistance to airports, cities, counties, regional agencies
 - Search and rescue operations
 - Review local land use regulations for compliance with state criteria
 - Administer the state grant program
- FAA: Steward of national system, airspace and safety
- Regional Agencies (RTPOs, RPCs, RTCs, COGs): Consistency with regional and state planning
- Local Jurisdictions: local transportation and land use planning, and local infrastructure
- Airport Sponsors: airport operations, maintenance and planning
- Private Sector: meets service demands

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that we need to identify what the interest of the state is. The state cannot do everything. For example, the public wants service in Moses Lake and in Skagit County, but the airlines will not go there.

Council Member Sibold pointed out that the state's ability to own and operate airports is not listed as one of its roles.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that it is included in stewardship.

Council Member Sealock commented that it might help to state that airports can do what they want to do, but all airlines get to vote on key issues. The fact that the industry plays a huge role is a point that should be highlighted.

Council Member Townsley added that it is not just the commercial industry, but also tenants.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) continued with the presentation reviewing the distribution of airports by state classifications and the performance objectives.

Chair Moser asked if all of the airports agree with the state classification system, and asked for an explanation of how the classification system was developed.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) explained that the classification system was first proposed in the AIRTRAC study. The purpose of the classification system is to help prioritize and target our investments. A committee was convened in 2004 to determine criteria for developing the classification categories, and the classification was included in Phase I of LATS. In LATS Phase 2, we applied the performance measures across the system. This is our baseline, and tells us each airport's place in the system, and how well they meet performance objectives. Most of the airports in the first three categories – commercial service, regional service, and community service – are NPIAS airports. These are airports with 20 or more based aircraft. We found that an airport with 20 plus based aircraft typically has services that attract businesses to the community and tend to have larger populations around them.

Council Member Townsley commented that when looking at runway lengths and fuel, most of the airports in the state are at fairly low elevation. He noted that on the east side, there are warm days that affect density, and asked if this should be noted. He further explained that there are several airports on the east side that play a critical role in fire protection. In this case, jet A fuel becomes an issue, but yet it is not part of the classification. This demonstrates that there may be a few holes in the standards.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the performance standards are minimums, and do not preclude someone from exceeding them.

Council Member Townsley responded that minimums set priorities, and in instances where there are critical needs for a facility, it might fall out. This is a hole, and we need to communicate this so that it is included in the standards.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the 90-minute standard for access to regional airports ensures that there is adequate access.

Council Member Townsley responded that staff should look into this issue and address the deficiency in the standard.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) commented that staff should review this issue and make adjustments as needed. This allows us to capture the issues that are not necessarily capacity driven, but are issues that are critical to the system.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) added that the classification system and performance objectives also help us to measure our progress and determine if we reached our goals. It also allows us to compare existing facilities and develop cost estimates for the improvements needed to meet performance objectives. It should not be used as a means to preclude an airport from undertaking certain activities. It is a minimum standard.

Council Member Garvett commented that it sets up a framework to help us determine costs.

Council Member Sealock commented that the more clarity we can provide, the better off we are. He noted that fuel is a perfect example, and asked what expectation we might be setting if we set a performance measure for fuel. He asked if we are saying that we will address the issue and noted that the challenge is staying at the 30,000 foot level.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that we need to be sure that we do not preclude the state from stepping in to take a certain action, for example, developing a fuel station at Omak, but we also need to be sure we do not obligate the state to undertake certain actions.

Chair Moser commented that we need to be sure that these technical issues do not stop our ability to make decisions.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that we have built in flexibility to deal with these kinds of issues.

Council Member Sibold asked if we should obtain a letter from the FAA for our documentation that backs up our decision-making.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) replied that we have documented all of this and looked at other states. Washington, Oregon, and Utah have classification systems. The FAA will be looking at the state's needs, but it will still require balancing of state and FAA needs.

Council Member Sibold asked if the Council has enough support on record from the FAA and other states that we have appropriately vetted this. We need to be able to prove we have done our due diligence, so that we can be confident that we are making our decisions based on a good foundation.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that other states are different.

Council Member Garvett asked how they are different.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) replied that Washington using the 90-minute drive time as a standard, while Oregon uses a 120-minute drive time. They have broken their categories out differently.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that performance standards based on role and level of activity serve as a guide to direct investments. We might want to add the caveat that we can refine the system in the future as issues arise, but the basic concept is to guide investments, which seems intuitive and logical.

Council Member Sealock commented that if it is seen in this light, as a guideline, it is fine. But if it can be used very specifically as a sound bite, then that is a different issue.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) continued with his presentation reviewing information about compliance with the land use, safety, pavement condition, and instrument approach performance objectives.

Council Member Garvett asked how we should deal with the fact there is not enough funding available to address all needs, and if it would be better to fund everyone at a lower level or fully fund some airports and not fund others.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that in theory, the classification system provides the ability to prioritize projects.

Council Member Garvett commented that there is both a quantity and political element, and there are many questions to address, such as do we bring all airports up to the safety standard, or do we decide to get rid of excess. We need a framework to make decisions.

Chair Moser commented that the legislation and state policy lays out guidelines on safety, mobility, and other areas. The Transportation Commission also has investment guidelines. We need to be in concert with these.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that the State Transportation Policy was not included in the last report, and that it needs to be.

Council Member Garvett asked if we should determine a threshold or if we are trying to balance priorities.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) responded that will be a balance based on circumstances.

Council Member Sealock commented that it is important to keep that flexibility. We need to prioritize and deal with the system and circumstances on the ground.

Council Member Garvett commented that we need to be explicit that we have addressed these issues.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) continued his presentation, explaining how to apply the airport classification to the alternatives, taking into consideration advantages and cost.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that this is good information, and noted that there are capacity benefits associated with certain actions that should be explicitly stated in the Council's recommendations.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that the purpose and benefit of the classification system is to improve the state aviation system.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) suggested adding a column to the table on presentation slide 16 for benefits.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that it would be helpful upon completing our work to be able to present cost and benefit information for each alternative.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that it is possible to provide this information at the alternatives level we are considering today, but it would be difficult to do this on an airport by airport basis.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that we need to be clear what we are looking at, to explain costs and benefits, what we will achieve with the investment. This would be a very useful tool.

Council Member Sibold added that this will help build understanding for our decision process.

Council Member Townsley commented that this implies the decision process is set. We need to acknowledge the technical standard that is implied when developing cost estimates. It may be necessary to consider relaxing standards to make sure it fits within the available budget.

Council Member Sibold commented that we have been saying we want to meet FAA standards as it provides a safer system, but we may not have to in all cases.

Council Member Townsley asked what the incremental cost in dollars would be for the incremental lowering of accidents.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that we might decide to not apply standards to certain classifications based on class.

Council Member Sealock asked what the available budget is.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the existing state aviation budget is approximately \$6 million.

Council Member Sealock commented that the existing budget is less than AIP expenditure at one of the state's largest airports, and we are trying to apply this to the broader perspective. He noted that while these are reasonable criteria, they do not address airports like SeaTac and Spokane.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that the Council will need to think about whether or not more revenue is needed. At the end of the process, we will have a preferred alternative. It is more than likely that one recommendation will be to increase revenue.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that in his view, the task is not to choose one alternative for the state, but to develop a hierarchy that enables us to work through the individual decisions as they come up. It is a case by case process, ranging from the least intrusive to most intrusive options.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that we have discussed this at the staff level and recognize that it might be an option.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) continued his presentation, presenting capacity data related to airfield capacity, airspace capacity, terminal capacity, aircraft storage, and air cargo.

Council Member Garvett commented about the graph presented on presentation slide 19, "2030 Statewide Demand vs. Capacity by Airport Classification," is not useful, noting that while the information is factually correct, one could infer that a statewide issue does not exist. This needs clarification.

Council Member Field agreed with Council Member Garvett's comment.

Council Member Garvett added that looking statewide is misleading and meaningless.

Vice Chair Roberts suggested that we should look region-wide instead of statewide.

Chair Moser commented that the public will wonder if there is capacity elsewhere. She noted that while there may be capacity, it may not be accessible.

Council Member Townsley commented that the idea is that all capacity is local. The most useful way to communicate this is to emphasize reasonable regional boundaries and identify the capacity within the boundaries.

Council Member Garvett suggested creating a graph to show some adequate measure of adequacy comparing state and regional issues.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) presented information on 2030 projected operations demand vs. capacity for the Puget Sound Special Emphasis Area.

Council Member Garvett commented that an airline might not necessarily move to another Washington airport with capacity, but instead might move to another state.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that we cannot measure the cost of not having a direct flight.

Council Member Sealock commented that this is a moving target, and we cannot predict the decisions the individual airlines will make. He noted that it is a fluid situation subject to change.

Council Member Townsley commented that airports and airlines are responding to incentives.

Council Member Sealock responded that it is not necessarily based on economics, noting that while costs in Spokane are lower, the structure makes it cheaper to fly through SeaTac. In this sense, the economic models that we as individuals might want to apply do not make sense. Each airline has to make its own decisions and with the existing spoke and hub system, SeaTac becomes the spot, even though it is more costly.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that the state cannot direct where the traffic will go. However, if Horizon decides it wants to fly into Paine Field and the public asks what the state's opinion is, right now, the State would respond that it has no direction to provide, that we would let it happen and then react to address the necessary infrastructure needs. Keeping the conversation at the 30,000 foot level is in keeping with the state's goals. Mr. Yarnish agreed with Council Member Sealock that it is difficult to predict what airlines will decide.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that it is important to talk to the airlines to understand their plans and needs when deciding how to invest in the system.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that it is critical to understand that the airlines are a major player.

Council Member Sealock added that the airlines are really the only player. He asked how the final product will be used, noting that the data and statistics being used must support the end use of this information.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the purpose of the statistics being provided is to help us plan for future system needs.

Council Member Sealock noted that much has already changed, and the data is already dated.

Chair Moser suggested that the Council discuss the alternatives as one group instead of breaking into subgroups.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) explained the purpose of the group discussion. She noted that the alternatives are a continuum and that the final system plan will combine these strategies, with different strategies for different parts of the state.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) explained the four alternatives, 1) No Action, 2) Provide Capacity Where the Demand Is, 3) Allow Demand to Move, 4) Provide New Capacity. He noted that the no action alternative leaves the market to decide, and is basically how the system operates today.

Council Member Garvett suggested that "scenario" is better word than "alternative," and noted that scenario three talks about expansion.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that the alternatives are cumulative, with alternative four including the elements of alternatives one, two, and three.

Council Member Townsley commented that it is difficult to understand the difference between the alternatives. For example, with alternative one, if someone has the funding, they will build an airport.

This alternative also seems to also include elements of the others. He asked if there are variations on level of state involvement.

Council Member Sibold asked if Council Member Townsley was saying is that the alternatives will address the state's role. He noted that it is confusing when one looks at it based on the role of airports.

Council Member Townsley commented that the state could decide to spend money on an airport. Alternative One would allow for that, but there would not necessarily be any guidance.

Council Member Sealock commented that he could not imagine how the state would find the funding for this.

Council Member Field commented that he understands Alternative 1 to mean that the state would have little involvement in improving the system and that the other three alternatives are what would be done to the extent they were needed to meet demand or improve safety.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) clarified that Alternative 3 is meant to expand existing facilities and Alternative 4 is meant to build a new facility. She noted that the staff and consultant team want direction from the Council regarding whether or not the state should be expanding existing facilities or building new facilities, especially in the Puget Sound region.

Council Member Sealock commented that the starting point is to refer to the four RCWs that require the protection of existing essential public facilities. That is the system and that is why we use public dollars to establish airports, and because of this we must protect these sites from incompatible uses. It is possible that we are not doing as good a job as we should, as there are four RCWs on the books, but yet we still encounter these issues.

Council Member Field asked if we are looking at alternatives to address constraints or if the issue is capacity.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that the issue is primarily capacity.

Council Member Field commented that if the state has a role in encouraging improvements to provide for adequate capacity, it should start by encouraging the airport to provide capacity where demand is, as it is the cheapest thing to do. When that option is exhausted, the next step is to build a new airport. He commented that he does not see how we distinguish between the alternatives, as all the others are dependent upon solutions that might be available.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) asked where within the 2030 planning horizon these alternatives fall, and what we should recommending.

Council Member Field responded that we should be recommending that the state have a continuously developed system plan that identifies the needs and all potential solutions including developing a new airport.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that we are struggling with the need to think about what we would do to successfully court an airline. Alternative 1 hopes that someone will come to the door. Alternative 2 starts to look at capacity demands and might require some investment decisions. Alternatives 3 and 4 are more aggressive approaches, and include more specific investments to increase stewardship and capacity, conversations at the Federal level, more focus on intermodal policy, and more aggressive decisions about land use around airports. However, this does not mean anything if we are not paying attention to the

market. If this is what we are trying to do, then we need to determine what recommendations we need to make to achieve this.

Chair Moser asked for clarification about what we are trying to do, and if we are trying to shape demand. She noted that that state is currently trying to shape demand on the state highway system by tolling, starting with active management techniques. She asked if this is something the Council should be looking at.

Council Member Sibold asked if this has to do with ground transportation investments.

Chair Moser responded that it might, but it is also potentially about transit oriented development and smart growth as well.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that there are opportunities for the state to provide facilities, such as adequate runway length, to shape demand.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) asked if the alternatives should respond to demand, shape demand, or not consider demand.

Council Member Garvett noted concern about the discussion, noting that some decisions are driven by technical demands, while others are business decisions. If a governmental body makes those decisions, it is saying it knows how to make those decisions better than those whose money is on the table. There are times when this might be appropriate, such as when there are externalities to address, but if we say this, we need to know that we are smart enough to know how to spend other people's money.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that it is appropriate if we are looking at market demand. It might not be a hard directive, but we are saying that this is where capacity exists.

Chair Moser commented that in the end, the public does wind up paying for it, and in the end, the public and government has a role. If we can shape the demand in the long run, the public should help support the industry, it might end up being far more costly in the long run.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) explained that the alternatives mix two issues, the role of the state and the intensity of the investment approach, whether there is a small state role or a large state role, and whether we are looking at a low intensity investment approach, such as demand management, or a high intensity approach, such as building a new airport.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) added that there is a correlation between a large state role and a high intensity investment approach.

Council Member Sealock commented that the State of Washington is not seen in the national view as facing a capacity constraint by the year 2030.

Council Member Field commented that the alternatives should look at the level of aggressiveness toward each policy. We should be looking at the capacity policies and assign an intensity level to each area.

Council Member Townsley commented that the state has the option to regulate, provide incentives, or do nothing. The question to ask is how much public money will be put into the mix. Using the existing criteria would be a good way to approach this. If the public does not like the heavy handed government approach, we can craft a response to that. If the public likes the high cost option, then we need to make the recommendation to the Governor to find the money.

Council Member Field commented that we have already stated a policy about using the existing system more efficiently before building new capacity.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that we would use the Council's policies to guide decision making, to compare the policies with the alternatives under consideration. He noted that we do not have to get it right at today's meeting, but that we need to develop material to put before the public. He commented that we do not think that doing nothing will meet the Council's objectives.

Council Member Field asked if we tell the Legislature that these are the policies, and this is what it takes to make these policies happen.

Council Member McNamara commented that it seems that we are talking about apples and oranges with how the alternatives apply to land use and how they apply to capacity. Land use policies are aimed at stopping encroachment. He commented that it is a different discussion and that the four alternatives presented here are not the ones he would develop to address land use and environment issues.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) asked if the Council could develop decision-making policies regarding how to approach capacity constraints in the state.

Chair Moser commented that the alternatives deal with capacity, and that we are lacking a means to address the other issues.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that much of this is not new. He noted that the Council spent a lot of time on policy development and suggested that the Council has the information needed if it goes back to those policies. The real question is whether or not the policy framework is adequate. If we look at the alternatives as a continuum, Alternative 1 states that we do nothing, and Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 might be mostly the same from that point forward. It does not necessarily need to be any more complex than revisiting our past work.

Council Member Townsley commented that it will be difficult to let the public know where we are going with all of this, as it is confusing.

Council Member Field commented that in Vice Chair Roberts land use example, there is some potential for regulation, which represents one alternative. Level of effort is another issue. In terms of cost, the level of effort of the state aviation division is a significant piece. With these alternatives, the aviation division can implement a few of the policies, and with more money, they could do more.

Council Member Townsley responded that this approach lends itself to the alternatives.

Council Member Field commented that this relates too much to just one issue.

Discussion – Alternative Investment Strategies

The Council discussed how the following alternatives address the policy goals established by the Council:

- Take no action
- Meet existing need
- Expand existing facilities
- Build new facilities

The discussion is summarized in the following table:

Does this alternative address this issue?	Take no action	Meet existing need	Expand existing facilities	Build new facilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity • Stewardship • Mobility • Economy • Environment • Land Use • Safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not advance safety • Would put the burden on airports and the FAA. • Would not address non-NPIAS Airports (safety). • Continued deterioration of smaller airports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works for most, but not all parts of the state. • Does not provide for future growth. • Need to clarify that we are meeting need that has been identified. • Relying on local sponsors to meet needs is not a statewide approach. • Does not consider climate change issues • It is a reactive approach. • Does not fulfill state’s stewardship role of planning for the future. • Does not address long-term planning horizon for large capital projects. • Does not allow us to address long-term funding needs. • Forces hand on where we invest – does not provide flexibility. • Could exacerbate capacity problems. • Could include demand management. • May encourage utilization of other modes. • Transfers future issues to others to address. • Could encourage system users to craft their own solutions. • Forces utilization of other modes. • Could result in loss of future economic activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be high investment risk given market volatility. • Risk of market changing and expansion not needed. • Commercial capacity in the Puget Sound region, where appropriate. • Need to consider intermodal, land use, and environmental context. • Human capital development needed to address crew and mechanic shortfalls. • The issues are more complex than just looking at concrete. • Expansion may not work unless improvements are made on the human capital side. Partnerships may be needed. • The state is interested in how it can influence the development of the system, not in building airports. • High cost of environmental mitigation and land use regulations pose significant challenges. • Optimizing the money spent to get the greatest efficiency and funding use. • May be feasible to have funding partnerships with other states. • Make funding decisions based on airports’ proximity to each other. • Stewardship decisions should be based on long-range planning horizon. • Look at cross border facilities. • Look at distribution of FAA AIP funds. • Block grant program would allow the state to have a larger role funding allocation toward capital projects. May require legislation. • Additional state funding may be required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be cost prohibitive. • High cost of environmental mitigation and land use regulations pose significant challenges. • Requires major intervention and time, potentially twenty years or more. • Risk of incurring land use and environmental costs when it could be unnecessary. • May be a need for regional airports. • May impact communities not previously impacted. • May not be any land available for commercial service (such as in the Puget Sound Region). • Cost of operation and maintenance may be high. • Additional state funding may be required.

Report on Electronic Town Hall 2

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) presented preliminary results from the second electronic town hall, which was held on November 18, 2008. Approximately 100 people participated in the event. Approximately 30 participants also attended the first electronic town hall.

Key results are as follows:

- Views on top funding priorities for meeting aviation system needs:
 - Improving airport landing safety (83%)
 - Local economic development (60%)
 - Supporting disaster relief (58%)
 - Meeting passenger capacity demand (57%)
- Level of support for meeting the State's future capacity needs:
 - 68% support or strongly support converting a current airport to commercial service through expansion
 - Opinion was divided on building a new airport or conversion of existing airport without expansion as a means to meet future capacity needs.
- Level of support for building a new commercial airport:
 - Participants were most supportive of establishing new commercial service in communities that want it (71% support/strongly support).
 - Participants were also supportive of choosing options that are least likely to contribute to global warming (64% support/strongly support).
 - Opinion was divided about establishing another airport in the Puget Sound region.
- Views on ideas for things the state could do to address aviation capacity shortfalls:
 - Most support for avoiding incompatible land uses near airports (89% responded 'excellent' or 'good')
 - Support for expanding existing airports to include more commercial service (93% responded 'excellent' or 'good')
 - Opinion was divided about building a new airport outside of the Puget Sound Region. Fifty percent responded 'excellent' or 'good' to this idea; 50% responded 'fair' or 'poor.'
 - Least amount of support for building a new airport in the Puget Sound region. Sixty-five percent responded 'fair' or 'poor'; 35% responded 'excellent' or 'good.'

Council Member Garvett asked for guidance on how the funding priority responses should be interpreted, noting that while safety is important, it may not necessarily be the top priority.

Council Member Sealock asked if the responses of 100 participants are reflective of the broader state.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that the purpose the electronic town hall is to help us reach more people and obtain additional public input. We will conduct a statewide on-line survey in March, which will involve 1,000 randomly selected people, and will allow us to validate the results of our other outreach efforts.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) added that when doing public involvement, you often only hear from people who are against something. The electronic town hall enables us to broaden our reach.

Council Member Garvett asked if in the online survey are all responses are treated equally, or if we would weight the responses of certain groups differently, such as airport owners.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we will have the ability to craft questions and analyze the results to help us obtain input that will help the Council in its decision-making.

Policy Development

Council Member Townsley presented the subcommittee recommended actions on the safety, stewardship, economy, and mobility policies.

- Safety Policy 1: The Council accepted the subcommittee’s recommendation to accept the staff’s proposed changes: Washington State should use incentives, including state and federal resources to ensure that airport facilities meet applicable federal or state design criteria and safety standards.
- Safety Policy 2: The Council accepted the subcommittee recommendation to move this policy to stewardship.
- Safety Policy 3: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language: The Washington State Aviation System Plan should identify strategic aviation facilities to support the Washington Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.
- Safety Policy 4: The subcommittee proposed a slight word change so that the policy states:
Washington State should encourage and support precision instrument approach procedures at all airports with a classification service role of “Regional Service Airport” or higher, and non-precision instrument approach procedures at all airports with a service role of “Community Service Airport” or higher.

Council Member Loomis asked for clarification on the meaning of “support,” noting that currently, the FAA provides support. She asked if this means that the state would take over this role from the FAA.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) expressed concern with the policy, noting that he could identify three regional airports for which this would be a problem. One unintended consequence is that precision instrument approaches may require a facility expansion.

Council Member Field suggested that the policy call for the best instrument capability that is possible at the facility.

Council Member Townsley commented that the word should was used, as it is not as strong as shall.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that encourage and support mean the same thing, and asked why the policy focuses on Regional Service Airports or higher.

Council Member Loomis commented that we should strive for the highest level possible at each airport.

The Council accepted the subcommittee’s proposed new language.

- The subcommittee proposed adding the following new safety policy: Washington State should support safe access to airports with weather reporting and other instrument approach facilities.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) asked if the policy means that an airport already has weather reporting and instrument approach facilities or that the airport needs these facilities.

Council Member Sealock commented most airports outsource weather reporting.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that the Washington Transportation Plan includes a policy to facilitate placement of weather reporting in places that need it, and that it was not specific as to what level of AWOS.

Council Member Loomis asked if the National Weather Service would take over maintenance.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that we maintain one AWOS. He noted that the National Weather Services has identified holes in the state system that they would like to support. He noted that a number of states such as Colorado support their own systems.

Council Member Sibold commented that there are some states that have major systems, but that it is expensive. He noted that the state could sign an agreement with Colorado to report non-federal data.

Chair Moser suggested saying that Washington State should provide safe access, noting that one of the state's priorities on the highway system is to provide cable barriers. She asked why aviation would not have these types of safety enhancements.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that this can address smaller airports as well.

Council Member Garvett asked if there is anything else that fits into this category, such as snow removal, and if the policy should be broader or narrower.

Council Member Loomis asked for clarification on the meaning of "other instrument approach facilities." She noted that many regional service airports will have a hard time with maintenance and asked how that would be funded.

Council Member Sibold responded that it means equipment.

Council Member Townsley suggested narrowing the policy to address only weather, asking the Council for input on how wide to open the door, noting that upgrades require funding that could detract from other projects.

Council Member Sealock noted that using the word "should" might lead airports to ask for support, such as the support Kenmore received.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) suggested restricting the policy to focus on adverse weather conditions.

Council Member Loomis pointed out that this is covered by Safety Policy 4.

The Council decided not to accept the subcommittee's recommendation to add the new policy, as it is included elsewhere.

- Stewardship Policy 1: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language: Update the Washington Aviation System Plan (WASP) to include the following:
 - a. Incorporate economic development studies, aviation forecasts, pavement conditions analysis, capacity analysis, airport facility assessment studies and other studies as appropriate to keep the system plan up-to-date to meet changing conditions in the air transportation system.
 - b. At each update cycle, reevaluate Washington State Airport Classification System designations for airports to respond to changing conditions and ensure that airport facilities are meeting established performance standards.
 - c. Maintain a relational database, including physical and operational airport inventory information to support Aviation System Planning and the statewide aviation capital investment program.
- Stewardship Policy 2: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language: Washington State should ensure that the aviation capital investment program strategically prioritizes system investments necessary to provide for the state's air transportation system needs in a cost-effective manner.
- Stewardship Policy 3: The Council accepted the subcommittee's recommended language: Provide technical assistance to airports and promote methods that optimize the net public benefit, as consistent with the WASP, airport master plans, and state and federal assurances and guidelines.
- Stewardship Policy 4: The Council accepted the subcommittee's recommended language: Support joint public-private partnership and private sector initiatives to provide transportation facilities and services that protects the public's best interest, such that:
 - Public expenditures can be reduced
 - Access to aviation facilities is enhanced
 - The quality, quantity and stability of service is maintained and/or
 - Environmental impacts are reduced.

Council Member Loomis asked if this policy was drafted to obtain state funding for privately owned airports.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that he is not sure if that is the intent, but it might lead to development of development of a taxing authority, or something to help prevent escalation of land value, such as addressing the property tax issue.

- Stewardship Policy 5: The Council accepted the subcommittee's recommendation to delete the policy as it is already addressed by Mobility Policy 5.
- Stewardship Policy 6: The Council accepted the following language: Where gaps exist in the aviation system it may be in the State's interest to own, operate, or develop airports.
- Stewardship Policy 7: The Council accepted the subcommittee's proposed new policy: The regional transportation planning process should be coordinated with the aviation system plan and local airport master plans to maximize the net public benefit.
- Stewardship Policy 8: The Council accepted the subcommittee's proposed new policy: It is in the state's interest to implement airport grant terms and conditions that will preserve and protect the State's investments in the system.

- Stewardship Policy 9: The Council accepted the subcommittee’s proposed new policy with the following revisions: The WASP should encourage efficient airspace by actions including working with the FAA and investing in facilities and technologies.
- Economy Policy 1: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language with the following amendments: Washington State should consider state, regional, and national outcomes in the analyses of aviation investments and policy recommendations.
- Economy Policy 2: The Council accepted the subcommittee’s recommendation to delete policy 2.
- Economy Policy 3: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language with the following amendments: Washington State should encourage and support education infrastructure to train and educate the skilled workforce necessary to support aviation.
- Economy Policy 4: The Council accepted the subcommittee’s recommendation to delete policy 4.
- Economy Policy 5: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language: Washington State should work with state and local economic development agencies to support adequate aviation capacity, service and facilities to support economic growth.
- Mobility Policy 1: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language with the following amendments: Washington’s aviation facilities should be planned and developed as an integrated system that meets statewide air transportation demand; complements the overall state transportation system; maximizes the use of existing facilities; and is compatible with the environment.
- Mobility Policy 2: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language: Promote adequate access to the national air transportation system for all Washington residents, using adopted standards of the Washington State Airport Classification System.
- Mobility Policy 3: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language: Washington State should identify transportation needs that extend into adjacent states and promote bi-state/multi modal cooperative solutions to ensure coordinated services and maximum cost effectiveness.
- Mobility Policy 4: The Council accepted the subcommittee proposed new language: Washington State should coordinate with federal, state, regional and local transportation agencies to encourage effective ground access to airports through various modes of transportation, freight/cargo efficiencies and rail and road enhancement projects.

The Council then discussed Council Member Loomis’ proposal to delete land use policies 4 and 6, as they are embellishments of land use policy 1.

Council Member Loomis commented that if the policies are too verbose they will be difficult to use in practice.

Council Member Sibold asked if we are saying that incompatible land use should be spelled out in legislation.

Council Member McNamara commented that being specific will help in drafting future legislation.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that since most of the people that we are trying to reach do not run airports or understand land use, we will have more impact if we are specific.

Council Member Sealock commented that these issues are typically addressed through zoning. He noted that this does not work, as every permit that is granted with an exception sets a precedent and exasperates the situation.

Vice Chair Roberts asked how we can put tools into the hands of people drafting comprehensive plans.

Council Member Sealock commented that in many cases permits are issued by the county.

Council Member Sibold asked if we should include language about the issue of exceptions.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that giving the RTPO's enforcement authority instead of the county gives the Department of Transportation and CTED the ability to say no.

Council Member Sealock commented that these rules already exist, yet he testifies almost weekly against the process.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that policy 1 does not discuss zoning or comprehensive plans and suggested adding language to define the meaning of incompatible.

Council Member Sealock commented that the language exists already, but it is not enforced.

Vice Chair Roberts agreed that the language is in policy 1, but that language is needed in policies four and six about education and enforcement.

Council Member Loomis commented that this is the purpose of the WAC.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that the WAC update might address this, but noted that it is not regulation.

Council Member McNamara commented that this policy is part of the legislative history it would help build the case during litigation.

Chair Moser proposed revising policy one to say something to the effect of "Washington State should define and strengthen the legislation..."

Council Member Sibold asked if this would provide the necessary regulatory authority to WSDOT Aviation.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) asked how other state agencies address growth management compliance issues, such as critical areas ordinances.

Council Member McNamara commented that the Department of Ecology has review authority. He noted that the agency can submit a letter to the hearings board, but there are no additional appeals.

Council Member Sibold commented that the Governor can do this, but it is a difficult process.

The Council decided to retain policies 4 and 6 as written and revised policy 1 to read: Washington State should strengthen legislation to define and prohibit incompatible land uses and promoting appropriate land uses adjacent to public use airports.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that the Council wants to think more about the enforcement issue.

Council Member Sibold added that we also need to think about identifying resources for enforcement.

Vice Chair Roberts reviewed a new land use policy proposed by Council Member Wilkerson and Leonard Bauer (CTED): Require that airport sponsors coordinate with local jurisdictions during the development of airport master plans and airport layout plans. Adopted airport master plans and airport layout plans or amendments thereof shall be distributed to local governments for compatibility planning and integration of land uses and infrastructure needs.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that Council Member Wilkerson think that this is an important policy as local governments rarely have the opportunity to review airport master plans.

Council Member Sealock agreed, and commented that the development of airport master plans is driven by other issues.

Vice Chair Roberts asked if this is the other side of the Council's previous discussion.

Council Member Sealock commented that review does not happen, because we have the land. He noted that there are different circumstances in more densely populated areas.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that these are linked issues, and suggested the need to develop language that addresses the issue in the context of the previous conversation. He agreed to work with staff to develop language for this policy and send to the Council for review and comment.

Council Member Sealock moved to amend the policies as discussed. Council Member Loomis seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Air Transportation and Expenditure Report

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) reviewed the revenue and expenditure report provided to the Council.

Council Member Loomis commented that this is very revealing information and suggested the Council discuss the report in greater detail at a future meeting.

Next Steps

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) stated that staff will develop the following documents before the next meeting:

- Develop order of magnitude costs for alternatives
- Develop narrative for alternatives
- Draft system plan and Council Report to Council by January 1st
- Potential conference call in mid-January to review reports
- Revised reports draft to be provided in the February meeting packet

Chair Moser suggested holding the February Council meeting in Seattle in order to keep costs down.

Council Member Garvett commented that holding the meeting in the Tri-Cities will help us reach more parts of the state, so that the process is not focused primarily in Western Washington.

Council Member Townsley commented that there is a lot of interest in LATS in the Tri-Cities, plus we have already advertised that the meeting will be held there.

Chair Moser suggested tabling the discussion for the time being.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.