

LONG-TERM AIR TRANSPORTATION STUDY (LATS)

Washington State Aviation Planning Council

MEETING SUMMARY

October 2, 2008

Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 300, Seattle

Present:

Council Members: Carol Moser (Chair), Paul Roberts (Vice Chair), John Townsley, Penelope Loomis, Dave Field, Juli Wilkerson, John Sibold, Don Garvett

Staff: John Shambaugh and Nisha Marvel

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

Ex-Officio Member: Jill Satran (Governor's Office)

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

- Review public comment on draft statewide aviation policies
- Subcommittee reports on recommended policy action
- Adopt statewide aviation policies
- Update on alternatives analysis

Chair Moser noted that some of the Council Members had difficulty accessing the meeting documents sent via email.

Council Member Townsley commented that more time was needed to thoroughly review public comments.

Chair Moser commented briefly on a few of the agenda items, noting that the Electronic Town Hall was an interesting public involvement approach and that the public had very astute comments to share. The subcommittees will review those comments today. The Council will also discuss how to respond to Senator Keiser's letter today as it is something that requires attention from the whole council.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided comment was provided.

Approve August 7, 2008 Meeting Summary

Council Member Townsley commented that the discussion about the public meeting results needs more detail about the low participation at the regional meetings. The summary should also state that since participants choose whether or not to attend, there is a self-selection bias. While the comments are important they cannot be generalized. Council Member Townsley also requested that the location of the meeting be reflected in the summary.

Vice Chair Roberts moved to approve the August 7, 2008 meeting summary as amended. Motion seconded by Council Member Townsley. The August 7, 2008 meeting summary was approved unanimously by the Council, as edited.

Follow Up From Previous Meeting

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that public comments were submitted on the draft statewide aviation policies after the end of the comment period, including a letter from Senator Karen Keiser. This letter was included in this month's meeting packet. Senator Keiser's comments and all other comments received are documented in the summary comments. He noted that King County Councilmember Julia Patterson submitted a letter last week which requires Council review.

Chair Moser read Senator Keiser's letter for the benefit of the public. She stated that she had not yet responded to the letter as she felt the Council needed to discuss how to respond as a group. The last three paragraphs of the letter speak to a very specific role of the Council. Chair Moser noted that she is not sure she concurs with this conclusion, and asked for staff and Council input.

Council Member Garvett asked if the Governor was copied on the letter, and if she responded to the letter.

Council Member Sibold responded that the Governor's staff has been in contact, and recommended that the Council discuss how to respond.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that staff drafted a response to the letter for Council consideration. He noted that there are federal obligations to meet, as half of the funding for this project is from federal sources. Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5121 sets four requirements, which the Council adopted as its objectives. The proposed response outlines these four objectives, describes the Council's work plan, and notes that the Council is also considering LATS Phase I and II findings in its work.

Chair Moser commented that the central question is whether or not the Council is tasked with making specific recommendations about siting new airports. She noted that it is her understanding that the Council is not meant to make site specific recommendations, but instead is tasked with identifying regions where additional capacity, possibly a new airport, might be needed. Chair Moser asked for feedback on whether or not that is a correct interpretation of the intent of the legislation.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that he believes this is a correct interpretation and noted that the project team will be developing an order of magnitude of costs as a means to address capacity needs.

Council Member Garvett commented that the Senator refers to legislative intent in one part of the letter, but the other part refers to her personal intent. We need to understand if her personal intent is the same as legislative intent. Second, she is reaching her conclusions based on second hand information from a news

report. If we believe that the news report is not accurate then the Council should address it, either in its response letter, or during a meeting with the Senator.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that part of this comes from the article in the Tacoma News Tribune, which he recalls missed some of the intent. This is not meant as a criticism of the article, as this frequently happens. He commented that Senator Keiser and Council Member Patterson address important concerns in their letters to which the Council has an obligation to respond. He noted concern about confusion between outcome and process. He concludes from reading ESSB 5121 that the Council needs to conduct data analysis in order to develop recommendations. Assuming that conclusion is true, the writers of these letters may not have an appreciation for the state and federal process involved, and how land use considerations impact capacity. Finally, as Washington is a process rich state, and the Council cannot make a decision before it has gone through its process. The Council's recommendations should clearly show the data that forms the basis of the recommendations. The Council does not have the authority to pick a specific site for a new airport. The Council does need to state what it thinks the capacity issues are, and develop a framework for addressing them. It is difficult to look ahead 30 years as settlement patterns, climate, and other issues, may look really different in the future. Therefore, while the Council can outline specific opinions, it cannot outline specific sites. He noted that Council member Patterson's comment about the 4th runway might be completely appropriate.

Council Member Loomis responded that she concurs with Vice Chair Roberts and commented that a phone call may have been a better approach to clarify these concerns, rather than making accusations based on a newspaper article.

Council Member Sibold commented that was involved in discussions during the drafting of the legislation. The statewide focus helped get the legislation passed, but the issue of capacity in the Puget Sound region is very important. There is a lot of interest in this process and an expectation that we will address the capacity issue. He noted that it was his understanding from working on the legislation that Senator Keiser is concerned that Puget Sound capacity issues will be overlooked. However, there were many perspectives at the table.

Chair Moser commented that the Transportation Commission often has to deal with questions about legislative intent. She stated her opinion that she does not think that this Council needs to go that far, that ESSB 5121 is fairly clear, and for that this Council to make decisions that are site specific is too far ahead of the game. The framework has been clearly laid out, and the proposed response is reasonable. The Council can articulate a framework for making decisions about aviation capacity within this work program.

Council Member Sibold commented that those of us that work in the aviation industry know that there is an airport siting process. When I hear the word framework, we need to understand that if that framework was a siting process, it is a long process. Once a decision is made to site an airport, it has to then follow the FAA's process.

Chair Moser asked if the response letter addresses this.

Council Member Sibold responded that it would help address what happens next once we get to a decision, but noted that we have not yet discussed this issue.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) noted that policy 4 states the need to establish a framework for decision making. Senator Keiser commented that this is not a strong enough statement. At the same time, comment from the public to date expresses concern about the nature of the state's role in siting and expansion decisions.

Council Member Sibold asked if the public understands what is involved in siting an airport. There is a lot involved in the FAA decision process. If the Council recommends siting an airport, it would have to go through the FAA's process.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that the issues raised by Senator Keiser and Council Member Julia Patterson are good issues. We seem to be saying that we intend to come forward with recommendations, it remains to be seen if they are specific enough to address their concerns. We have not had any discussion about the 4th runway. We have not had any discussions that are inconsistent with PSRC. We have not said that if SeaTac is full, we go here. The Council needs to be prepared to go forward with recommendations about what happens when we reach capacity, and what we do when we get there. The difficulty siting a new airport leads me to think that you need to use our existing airports first.

Council Member Field commented that the draft letter that has been written does not seem to be responsive to Senator Keiser's letter. Chair Moser feels that the legislation is specific, and so does Senator Keiser. We need to say how we interpret the legislation, not what we are doing. We should then offer to meet with her to talk about the complexity of the process, and give some indication of how far we think we can go. We need to be responsive to her letter.

Chair Moser commented that the last paragraph of Senator Keiser's letter says that we need to identify specific options. If that means that we need to identify where the next airport goes, we cannot do that. Chair Moser asked if the Council disagreed with that conclusion, and asked for discussion. If the Council agrees, then she proposed stating that we are following the intent of the law.

Council Member Field responded that he does not believe the Council can recommend a specific site for an airport, but feels that it can create a framework.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that the Council discussed a framework at its meeting in Vancouver, and agreed that we have received general input from the public related to airport siting, that can inform the Council's work.

Chair Moser summarized the conversation thus far. Staff will revise the letter so that it addresses the specific concerns raised by Senator Keiser, and by the end of today's meeting the Council will have some specific details about a framework that will help to address the last paragraph of the letter.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) added that the letter should state that there a framework, but also what it means to set a framework.

Council Member Garvett commented that it seems that if one looks at the legislation, the words generally speak for themselves. However, the language about recommendations is ambiguous. It is unclear what those recommendations should be. We need to understand the intent otherwise we are substituting our opinion for the intent.

Chair Moser responded that short of an opinion from the Attorney General, we seem to agree we understand what the legislation means, and that by the end of today, we will have the clarity we need to address the letters.

Council Member Garvett commented that there are two letters that suggest we need to be more specific. We need to contemplate how we address these concerns and how it impacts the next step. There may be more letters coming behind it. There is ambiguity about what "primarily" and "commercial" means. The Council needs to be careful in its response.

Update on Alternatives Analysis

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) presented information on the alternatives analysis process. He began with a summary of the work to date and reviewed capacity constraints facing the state's aviation system:

- Significant capacity constraints are anticipated by 2030
 - Airfield capacity constraints are expected to emerge at ten airports
 - Several of these are among the state's busiest airports including Sea-Tac, Boeing Field, and Harvey Field
 - Approximately one-quarter of Washington's public-use airports are expected to have aircraft storage capacity shortfalls by 2030
- Passenger rail improvements are not likely to provide meaningful capacity relief to the commercial air transportation system within the 2030 planning timeframe
- Trends contributing to the loss of service at smaller commercial service airports are expected to continue through 2030
- The loss of private airfields, which are at higher risk of closure due to land use conflicts or sale for alternative use, could reduce available capacity in high-growth regions

There are different types of capacity constraints which require different responses:

- Airfield Capacity
 - Generally addressed with construction of additional runways, normally parallel with the current primary runway
 - Critical, difficult to address, time consuming process, public opposition most likely
- Terminal Capacity
 - Generally addressed with a terminal expansion program
 - Terminal expansion is generally relatively easy to accomplish
 - Airports do not build excess terminal capacity – five years hence is the most
 - SEA is the exception; the port has committed to no expansion beyond 45MAP
- Aircraft Storage Capacity
 - Generally addressed through hangar construction
 - Hangars are built on an as-needed basis
 - Land for hangar expansion is generally, but not always, easier to acquire

Council Member Garvett commented that capacity has both a quality and quantity measure, noting that it is easy to get lost in quantity without looking at quality. He noted that some capacity shortages at SeaTac do not have to do with hangars, but rather with storage at gates.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) reviewed the ten airports that are forecast to exceed or approach airfield capacity by 2030.

Chair Moser asked if the state has any role or jurisdiction at these ten airports.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that each airport is operated locally except for Kenmore, which is private.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that Michael Cheyne's presentation at a previous meeting showed that SeaTac will not reach the capacity level presented in this presentation by the year 2030, and recommended updating this data. He noted that it is important for the Council to recognize this, as there are a lot of comments in the letters regarding the accuracy of the forecast data. It is likely given issues like rising fuel prices that growth in demand may well be lower than what we initially predicted.

Council Member Garvett commented that some airlines having trouble finding quality storage for their aircraft.

Chair Moser noted that at the previous meeting, project consultant Sonjia Murray stated her opinion that over time we will realize these capacity constraints.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) responded that he believes that we will face capacity constraints, but that results based on 2002 data may well change.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that Michael Cheyne reported that SeaTac would reach full capacity by approximately 2027. This should be reflected in our work. We can document what SeaTac has presented in the past and at previous Council meetings. It is still within the scope of this study, to address this issue.

Council Member Garvett noted that we do not know what airlines will do, which also impacts future forecasts.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) stated that we need to look at which will be the critical airports in the future. SeaTac and Harvey will be critical. At Kenmore, we can fairly accurately know what will happen in the short term, 5-10 years. While the specific numbers may change, we do know these are the critical airports. SeaTac, Boeing Field, Harvey Field, and Kenmore are the four airports with the most pressing airfield capacity constraints. The technical team will be conducting research to equip the Council with the information it needs to get to the point of making recommendations.

Council Member Sibold noted that we will look at gaps in capacity. It is separate from this analysis, but we will look at it.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that we will look at unconstrained capacity, similar to how a freeway system is studied. We will figure out if an airport is at or over capacity, and where traffic will shift to.

Council Member Sibold asked if we will also address regional capacity issues.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded yes.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) reviewed four alternative strategies for tackling capacity constraints and shortfalls: no action (least intensive), use existing facilities, expand facilities, and construct a new facility (most intensive). He also noted that under best of conditions, it takes 12-14 years to build a new airport. As such, we need to consider that a recommendation to construct a new airport may not be a viable option by the year 2030.

Vice Chair Roberts asked if we discussed how many airports have been built in this country in past decades. Our record should reflect that only a few have been constructed, including Denver, Austin, Arkansas, and Dallas-Fort Worth.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that we can provide this information to the Council, including which airports have been built and for what purpose.

Chair Moser commented that it would be most relevant to see what has been built in the past 12-15 years.

Council Member Wilkerson asked for clarification on what we are trying to accomplish today as we look at these different airports. At the Vancouver meeting we laid out capacity issues and long term issues. She asked what this review is intended to accomplish.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that the purpose of this presentation is to give a status report to the Council and to obtain input on how we evaluate the alternatives the Council needs to consider. We need agreement that these are the right criteria, and guidance on how to measure the relative merits based on these criteria.

Mr. Yarnish continued with his presentation, applying the alternatives to the specific airports facing capacity shortages – SeaTac, Boeing Field, Harvey Field, and Kenmore.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that we should focus on capacity issues, not on political issues, such as whether or not in the case of SeaTac, the County is opposed to expansion.

Council Member Wilkerson responded that she agrees with Mr. Roberts, but noted that there is a real political component involved here.

Council Member Loomis commented that the Port is committed to 45 MAP capacity. She asked if recent actions that put flights through SeaTac go against that cap when there are full flights being diverted from other airports through SeaTac.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that the 45 MAP comes from Michael Cheyne. He noted that SeaTac is not willing to expand.

Council Member Garvett noted that Alaska Airlines increased usage of its space by improving its check in area for passenger processing.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that air and terminal capacity need to be balanced. The 45 MAP reflects both.

Council Member Field asked if the Port is proposing implemented a restriction at this level, or is this a forecast.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that these are not reasons to take ideas off of the table.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that some airports have physical constraints.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that decisions are made locally, and that this all the technical team can do to analyze options.

Council Member Sibold noted that there is constrained capacity and unconstrained capacity. The Council needs to decide which type of capacity it is discussing. We need to decide if we will consider political factors (constrained analysis) or if we will table the constraints. This is a question that needs to be resolved.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that one of the reasons that the Legislature assembled this Council was to assemble a group to make fact-based recommendations, a bit aside from the political fray, but while considering the public view at the same time. We need to put the facts on the table. He noted that while he is not insensitive to the local interests, he needs to put them at arms length. The capacity questions are fair

and factual. But the political questions are not for the Council to address. He stated that he would like the Council to move in this direction.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) asked if we should only discuss legal binding agreements.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that we need to base our recommendations on fact.

Council Member Wilkerson responded that she supports this approach. Local jurisdictional constraints, geographic or otherwise, exist and are important, but we are trying to deal with capacity facts.

Council Member Field commented that 25 years ago people at Paine Field decided that they would plan as if that airport would never have commercial service. Many people did not think it could happen and it became a fact in the minds of those who live there, that there will never be large commercial aircraft at this airport. Mr. Field stated that he wants the Council's work to be clear that we will not perpetuate as fact something that is a political issue. When we say something, that there is a limit, we need to clarify whether it is a capacity limit, or a stated limit.

Council Member Sibold noted that there are other constraints to consider, such as wetlands.

Chair Moser responded that a constraint is a constraint and noted that she has fewer issues with stating the constraints.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that one of the key questions is to determine what the role of the state is.

Council Member Townsley asked if the capacity figures at Harvey Field include wetlands, noting that Harvey Field has constraints, based on physical facilities. Getting to capacity expansion will involve community planning.

Council Member Field asked if the Council should consider that an airport might close.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded no.

Council Member Garvett asked why an airport would close.

Council Member Field responded that it could be a private airport, like Harvey Field, or it might close due to community pressure.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that Harvey is one of the top 10 airports. If it closed, we would be concerned about where the traffic it serves would go. Moving airport capacity around triggers a cascading effect. Losing Harvey Field would have a critical, significant system impact as it is one of four SeaTac reliever airports.

Council Member Townsley asked if Harvey Field receives NPIAS funds.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that Harvey Field is eligible for federal funds but not state funds.

Vice Chair Roberts asked how smaller airports such as Harvey Field would serve as reliever airports for SeaTac.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that it is not a one for one replacement. The reliever would continue to serve its current function. In the case of Harvey Field, it would take smaller aircraft away from SeaTac. Mr. Yarnish continued that topography, urban development, and politics are common themes. Constrained airports exist in places that did not plan for this kind of capacity and urban development has crept up around them.

Council Member Sibold commented that Harvey Field is privately owned. If the operator decided to sell, or if the airport was constrained, we need to consider where the planes would go. It would likely be Renton. It has a cascading effect. We cannot minimize the effect of the capacity that uses this airport on the system. .

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) introduced two discussion questions for the Council to consider relating to the proposed evaluation criteria for alternatives:

- Are these the right evaluation criteria?
- Is this the right methodology – selecting a list of evaluation criteria and then measuring each alternative against criteria on a high level?

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) introduced proposed evaluation criteria:

1. Does the alternative address the issue?
2. Does the alternative meet the goals of the council:
 - a. Capacity enhancement
 - b. Technology
 - c. Stewardship
 - d. Mobility
 - e. Economy
 - f. Environment
 - g. Land Use
 - h. Safety
3. What are the impacts of the alternative on the region's airspace?
4. What are the impacts of the alternative on the regional surface access system?
5. Can the alternative be implemented based on logistical, political and other decisions made for the airport in their master planning or public participation processes?
6. What is the cost of implementation?

Council Member Garvett commented that this is a fairly standard list and asked if it will be challenged.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that the evaluation criteria are based on the Council's policy areas.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that the Council reviewed state regulations early in the process. He noted that every study has to look at these goals. The draft statewide aviation policies met the state goals and the goals of the Washington Transportation Plan, which address all modes of transportation.

Council Member Garvett commented that he is seeing this in a different light now. He commented that technology is a misplaced item. Everything else is an objective. Technology is a tool for accomplishing an objective. He asked if this is something we want to rethink, as technology is distinct in character.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the subcommittees can discuss these issues, noting that there is an opportunity to combine these policies.

Council Member Garvett asked if we want to rank or prioritize the criteria, if some are more important than others, or if we need to meet them all.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that we generally would want to use them all, to integrate and balance them in decision making.

Chair Moser responded that the Washington Transportation Plan prioritizes its criteria, with preservation being the top priority, followed by safety. She agreed that technology is a strategy and not a policy. She noted that quality of life was the focus of many comments and asked if we should we add it to the criteria list.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) asked if cost is an appropriate criterion to include.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that there are certain criteria approved by the FAA work scope, including impact on surface transportation and cost. We need determine how we will filter the alternatives through these criteria.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) summarized comments so far and asked if we reached consensus on whether or not technology should be a criterion, if we should weight criteria, and if the goals are appropriate.

Vice Chair Roberts commented that the technology discussion focused on applications that enhance capacity. He noted that while he is not sure what the right way is to capture it is, he does not want this point to be lost. He noted that Council Member Garvett's point is good, that we may need to move it elsewhere. He commented that quality of life is a fair issue to capture. It is an intensely personal issue, but if we do not make the right decision, it impacts quality of life. We need to balance the impact on the personal level and the impact on the overall population.

Council Member Garvett asked if quality of life is captured elsewhere, such as in environment or safety.

Chair Moser commented that when you say mobility, you may improve mobility of some, but it may come at the expense of others. She asked how we capture this.

Council Member Garvett responded that is true for every item here. It is difficult to try to explain that.

Vice Chair Roberts stressed the importance of not losing this point.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that is difficult to include quality of life as a quantifiable evaluation criterion. We need a way to make it usable. He stressed that he is not saying we should not add it, but that we need to figure out how to use it as a criteria.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that we focus on quality of life in the guiding principles.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) added that the guiding principles are overarching, and touch all policy areas.

Council Member Field commented that the application of technology seems to be an alternative rather than a goal.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) asked if someone would like to make a proposal about how to revise the list of criteria.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) commented that the no action alternative still includes initiatives like Next Gen, technology initiatives that will be implemented at the federal level, even if the Council does not recommend taking action.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that technology impacts safety, economic, access, and capacity.

Council Member Townsley commented that he feels technology is redundant, and proposed deleting it from the criteria list, but to ensure that it is explicitly included in the list of alternatives.

Council Member Wilkerson asked if there is any need to add something about the federal approach to the list of evaluation criteria and questions. She asked if it is a process by which we decide as a region and state, or if we need to think about federal requirements as well.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) asked if there is concurrence on Council Member Townsley's proposal to remove technology from the list of criteria. The group responded yes, that it should be removed.

Council Member Field commented that the specific federal requirements will be addressed later on, and that the planning part happens first at the state level.

Chair Moser commented that we need to state explicitly that this fits within the federal framework and recommended incorporating it into criterion #5.

Vice Chair Roberts agreed with Chair Moser's suggestions. He commented that Council Member Wilkerson raised a good question earlier, that political has multiple meanings, and that it is hard for the Council to get involved. He noted that he struggles with criterion #5 as written.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) recommended separating this into three areas: the physical capability of the airport, the regulatory framework (federal) and third, local input, which would include local airport master plans and public participation.

Chair Moser commented that it seems that Vice Chair Roberts is questioning if political should be a criterion, or if it might be better to deal with it at the site level. She noted that the political landscape can change rapidly. She suggested replacing political with regulatory requirements. Chair Moser asked if cost-benefit should be considered as part of criterion #6, noting that since cost is always a constraint, if we should be more specific by discussing benefit. This would enable us to make comparisons to another part of the transportation system such as light rail.

Council Member Townsley responded that it is more than just dollar cost, but also what is the net public benefit of implementation, including environmental, social, and economic considerations.. There may be cascading issues that must be considered. Cost is part of net public benefit. But net public benefit is more than cost. Both need to be displayed.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) commented that it sounds like there is a need to develop a definition of net public benefit so that John Yarnish can use it as he does his analysis.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that we need to figure out a measurement based on this conversation, and how we will use it in our analysis.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that we are going to do an order of magnitude costs. We know some of our costs, but others are hard to evaluate such as land, social, and economic costs of a particular airport. Some of this work is being done in the multi-modal plan.

Council Member Townsley proposed using the Delphi technique to bring together an expert panel, to help us understand what we are buying. He noted that discussing only dollars and cents may not be a rich enough metric to be helpful in making a decision on recommendations.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) asked if everyone agrees that cost is an appropriate criterion.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) asked if what we are saying is that is that net public benefit should be assessed when applying these criteria.

Vice Chair Roberts suggested the following rewording of criterion #5: are there physical, legal or regulatory constraints that prohibit the implementation of the alternative.

Council Member Field commented that things will change in the long term, noting that we would not want to remove something that precludes an option should the situation change. He noted that our work has to serve as a guide for the next 20 years, and as such, the situation will change.

Vice Chair Roberts asked if we could limit it to physical.

Chair Moser commented that the question is whether or not criterion #5 should stay or go, and asked if it is logical to include legal in this list.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) summarized the discussion and decisions:

- Technology will be deleted from criterion #2 and imbedded in the alternatives
- Criterion #5 will be rewritten to read: Are there physical, legal or regulatory constraints that prohibit the implementation of the alternative?
- Net public benefit will be added to criterion #6
- Criteria will be prioritization

Report on Public Involvement

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reviewed the results of the first Electronic Town Hall. The event was held on August 26, 2008 and involved 81 participants randomly recruited by Knowledge Networks. Key results are as follows:

- Highest rated aviation benefits:
 - Movement of freight and goods (93%)
 - Response to wildfires (92%)
 - Connecting Washington to global markets (91%)
 - Search and rescue operations (90%)
- Views on the role of state government: :
 - Strong support for state government setting standards for public airports in order to qualify for funds (89%)
 - Participants also indicated support for a state government role in:
 - Providing funding to help maintain airports (71%)
 - Discouraging incompatible land uses near airports (70%)

- and helping local governments protect airports (68%)
- Fewer than 10% of participants indicated little or no support for these roles of state government in aviation
- Participants were most supportive of focusing funding on airports that play an important role in the aviation system
- Participants were also supportive of focusing funding on the airports that carry the most people
- Opinion was divided about:
 - Letting the free market decide who gets service
 - Setting a goal that communities should be within a 90-minute drive of a commercial airport
- Views on future airport capacity and airport expansion:
 - Most support for a stronger state role in airport expansion decisions (46%)
 - Support for the state playing a mediation role to balance long-term air transportation needs with addressing local impacts (38%)
 - Limited support for local government taking the lead in decision-making about expanding airports (13%)
 - Least amount of support for the federal government taking the lead in decisions about airport expansion (4%)

Council Member Garvett asked if participants thought that aviation's impact on ability to take a vacation was listed as an important benefit of aviation. He commented that he would think that impact on personal travel would be an important concern.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we could add this as a discussion at the next E-Town Hall.

Council Member Garvett noted that personal travel is important to airlines as it is a big revenue source. He asked if we knew what participants' occupations were, whether or not they were general public or involved in the aviation industry.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we did not ask about occupation.

Council Member Sibold asked if we asked how aviation stacks up against other modes of travel.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we did not ask this question. She noted that participants were very interested in the topic of aviation and were willing to participate in the second E-Town Hall in November.

Subcommittee Reports

Vice Chair Roberts presented the Land Use and Environment subcommittee's proposed revisions to the land use policies:

- Land Use Policy 1: Washington State should strengthen legislation prohibiting incompatible land uses and promoting appropriate land uses adjacent to public use airports.
- Land Use Policy 2: No changes recommended.
- Land Use Policy 3: Washington State should develop performance measures to assess how well local governments and local comprehensive plans and policies discourage incompatible development adjacent to public use airport.

- Land Use Policy 4: No changes recommended.
- Land Use Policy 5: Regional Transportation Planning Organizations should be given the authority to certify the transportation and land use element of local comprehensive plans discouraging incompatible development adjacent to public use airports and ensuring consistency of comprehensive plan components and regulations across jurisdictional boundaries.
- Land Use Policy 6: Washington State should develop standards discouraging new development of K-12 public schools, daycare centers and medical facilities from locating adjacent to public use airports.

Vice Chair Roberts reviewed the new land use policies proposed by the public during the comment period.

- Potential new policy 1: 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.

The subcommittee does not recommend adopting this policy as it is highly likely that this kind of activity would require SEPA review, which would require disclosure of the impacts associated with proposed uses. Use classifications would certainly be covered by SEPA.

Council Member Sibold asked if proposed changes trigger SEPA/NEPA review, or if it implies additional work.

Council Member Field commented that before state classification can be changed, environmental review is required. He asked if the state plan requires SEPA review.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded no, that SEPA review is not required.

Vice Chair Roberts clarified that we are not bringing this policy forward, as we believe it is already covered by the other policies.

- Potential new policy 2: Add a policy to prevent airports near already developed land from expanding.

The subcommittee does not recommend adopting this policy.

- Potential new policy 3: Consider a policy to provide that cities and counties may no longer move airports inside the urban growth boundary if they lie out of it now. This would require some clarification that aviation related business and industry (are permitted outside of urban growth areas) is permitted in and around the airport - perhaps providing an airport zone around the runways allowing for industrial and commercial that doesn't interfere with airport operations.

The subcommittee does not recommend adopting this policy.

- Potential new policy 4: If an airport is allowed to expand into a developed community, the mitigation costs should be factored into the costs of the expansion. Those costs should include: a tax to replace lost property tax for all affected jurisdictions; co-operation with local jurisdiction regarding changes in zoning to keep the land from lying fallow; transportation impacts especially on small communities facing increased traffic; environmental costs.

The subcommittee does not recommend adopting this policy as SEPA addresses these issues.

- Potential new policy 5: To ensure compatibility of land uses, changing a classification of an airport shall not take place without consideration and mitigation of all related impacts, e.g., environmental, economics, land use, etc."

The subcommittee does not recommend adopting this policy as it is already a requirement in state law.

Council Member Sibold asked if this would be an issue if an airport changed to commercial use.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that this refers to a change in the role of an airport. There is a process in place, and permits are required.

Vice Chair Roberts presented the Land Use and Environment subcommittee's proposed revisions to the environment policies:

- Policy 1: replace "rare" with "threatened and endangered"
- Policy 2: revise to read: Airport facilities plans and operations should use best management practices e.g. energy conservation, alternative fuels, and waste reduction.
- Policy 3: Delete
- Policy 4: Revise to read: Incorporate state and federal greenhouse gas reductions associated with air transportation to minimize the adverse health and environmental impacts on air quality and the climate while promoting jobs and economic development in a sustainable manner.
- Policy 5: Delete.
- Policy 6: No changes recommended.

Vice Chair Roberts reviewed the new policies environment proposed by the public during the comment period.

- Potential new policy 1: Airports should mitigate adverse health impacts, noise impacts, air pollution, impacts on property values or other adverse impacts of construction and operations of airports.

The subcommittee does not recommend adopting this policy based on the opinion that this issue is already addressed by SEPA. He noted that since there is no legal framework to go back ex-post facto, we wanted to make sure that the question of noise is addressed in the conversation as it is a real issue, even if there a legal framework does not exist.

Council Member Townsley commented that some noise issues can be mitigated outside of SEPA.

- Potential new policy 2: Washington State should work with the federal government and industry to develop and accelerate the use of both ground based and airborne technology that will allow for more efficient operations, thereby increasing capacity and reducing the impact of aviation to the environment (i.e. Required Navigation Performance, Ground Landing Systems).

The subcommittee does not recommend adopting this policy. They feel that this idea should not be captured as a policy, but the idea should be captured in the text of the council report.

- Potential new policy 3: Washington State should strongly encourage all members of the aviation community to invest in fuel-efficiency, noise reduction, and air quality improvement technologies.

The subcommittee does not recommend adopting this policy. While these technologies are important, the idea is better captured in the report text than as a policy.

Council Member Sibold presented the proposed revisions to the capacity policies:

- Capacity Policy 1: The State of Washington must take a lead role in addressing its long-term aviation system capacity needs from a system-wide and regional perspective.
- Capacity Policy 2: The statewide airport classification system will guide decisions on future aviation system needs and investments.
- Capacity Policy 3: Washington State shall place a funding and planning priority on maximizing the efficiency and utility of the existing aviation system before creating new airports.
- Capacity Policy 4: If Washington State's existing system cannot provide sufficient aviation capacity to meet existing and future demand and no sponsor has expressed interest, the state will be given the authority to undertake a site selection process for a new airport.

Council Member Townsley asked in reference to policy 2 if it is the classification system or the system plan that will guide decisions on future aviation needs and investments.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that it is both.

Council Member Townsley asked if as a state is there is a clear tie to the system plan in order to communicate priorities.

Vice Chair Roberts asked in reference to policy 3 if we mean creating new airports, or changing the use of existing airports. He noted that it is not clear that we would change use to maximize efficiency is clear. We should place to place a priority on the maximizing existing system, noting that to him, this policy reads as referring to existing airports.

Council Member Townsley asked if we should use the word "shall" or "should," noting that we should be consistent throughout all the policies.

Council Member Wilkerson asked for clarification about the purpose of policy 4.

Council Member Sibold responded that it is intended to address the comment we received that someone needs to take the lead. We are saying that if no one else steps up, the state will be the leader.

Council Member Townsley asked if the institutional framework is that the state will be the leader.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the outcome of LATS will be a recommendation about where capacity shortfalls and excess capacity exist.

Council Member Sibold commented that the FAA is not a sponsor, the FAA is the bank. We have found in the past that state government does not want to take on the sponsor role. But someone needs to take it on.

Council Member Wilkerson commented that it would take a long time for the state to take on this role.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) commented that a local entity typically starts the process, but is typically not around long enough to finish the process.

Council Member Field asked if we want to get the state involved in every local small airport siting decision.

Council Member Wilkerson stated that we need to define what interest we are trying to meet.

Council Member Garvett commented that as a matter of public interest he does not think it is wise to preclude it.

Council Member Sibold commented that the two times the state came close to making a decision about siting an airport was in Southwest Washington and in Colville. However, by the time it came to approve the project, the sponsor had walked away.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) suggested removing the language relating to no sponsor.

Chair Moser commented that we are looking for public private sponsorships and that it reads well if we leave the language in that we will try to find a sponsor. Many people resent government involvement in too many things.

Council Member Townsley asked if it is sufficient to specify site selection process.

Council Member Sibold responded that often the problem is not the site selection process, but rather the environmental process.

Council Member Townsley commented that if we are going to put the State's seal into the line of accountability, it needs to be something that results in the desired outcome, which is to have a facility that meets the intent of the site selection. Otherwise, there is the risk that it will not go anywhere.

Council Member Sibold proposed revising it to say, "To site and develop a new airport."

Jill Satran (Governor's Office) asked if that implies that the state is the owner.

Council Member Sibold responded that typically the state would turn the completed airport over to a sponsor as the State is not interested in operating the airport.

Jill Satran (Governor's Office) commented in response to Council Member Wilkerson's point that it is important to be as specific as possible. If you are implying something, it is best to just say it. If you think that finding a sponsor is the first and best option, you might want to say that. Sponsors should be the ones to move it forward but if not, then the state should be given authority.

Chair Moser stated that we have discussed proposed revisions to capacity, land use and environment policies. She proposed forming a subcommittee to address the remaining the policies.

Council Members Townsley, Field, and Sibold volunteered to serve on this subcommittee.

Council Member Townsley moved to adopt the revisions to the policies discussed today. Council Member Garvett seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Review Council Report Outline

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reviewed the draft council report outline noting that the report is organized around the guiding principles. Each proposed policy would be followed by a narrative to

convey the rationale behind each policy. Ms. Brogan stated that she would email the outline to the Council and discuss revisions with Chair Moser.

Council Administration and Next Steps

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) reviewed changes to the work program. We propose postponing the November meeting until December, so that the technical team has adequate time to develop the alternatives. The second major change is to move the second round of regional meetings from October to the spring of 2009. We received substantial public comment on the draft statewide aviation policies at the July regional meeting. We originally intended to present the revised policies to the public at the second round of regional meetings, but feel that the meetings would be better used as an opportunity to obtain public comment on the Council's draft recommendations. We originally were planning to post the draft recommendations on-line, but feel moving using the public meetings presents a better opportunity to reach out to the public. The Council agreed to move the next Council meeting date to December 4th and to hold the regional meetings in the spring.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that a general LATS informational meeting will be held in the Tri Cities on October 14. The meeting will provide general information on LATS and an update on progress to date.

Chair Moser asked if staff would like Council members to attend.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the Council is welcome to attend.

Council Member Sibold asked if we would be identifying preferred options at the next meeting and if we would be making a recommendation at the February meeting.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded yes.

Chair Moser commented that with regard to the response to Senator Keiser, she feels comfortable with the process to date and that we will be able to explain where we are in the work program with regard to the analysis of criteria. She asked for feedback from the Council on what they think should be included in the response letter.

Council Member Garvett responded that we need to explicitly state that we understand her comments, that we acknowledge them, and that we will address them directly.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) commented that we decided earlier that we will not be identifying a specific site for a new airport. Senator Keiser's letter says that we should. He asked for guidance on how to address that comment.

Chair Moser responded that we need an opportunity to complete the alternatives analysis before coming to any conclusions. We need to explain where we are at and where we are heading. She proposed calling Senator Keiser to follow up, to stress the importance of not getting ahead of ourselves.

Council Member Townsley commented that there is value in stating that there is federal money involved, and as such we have to follow this process. We do not have the resources to be as site specific in our examination as she would like.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.