

# LONG-TERM AIR TRANSPORTATION STUDY (LATS) Washington State Aviation Planning Council

## MEETING SUMMARY

February 7, 2008

### Present:

Council Members: Jim McNamara, Dave Field, John Townsley, John Sibold, Penni Loomis, Neal Sealock, Don Garvett, Juli Wilkerson, Paul Roberts, and Carol Moser.

Staff: John Shambaugh and Nisha Marvel

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

### **Meeting Objectives**

Chair Moser opened the meeting and reviewed meeting objectives:

- Understand roles and responsibilities in transportation system planning
- Understand state and national aviation trends
- Learn about the role of aviation in the multi-modal transportation system
- Learn about the role of aviation in the state economy

Chair Moser explained the difference between Council meetings and workshops, The Council will be taking action (voting, decision-making) at meetings, while at workshops the Council will engage in a work session to address specific tasks.

Council members introduced themselves and their role on the Council.

Juli Wilkerson: Director, Washington State Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (CTED)

David Fields: FAA Technical Expert

John Townsley: Eastern Washington General Public Representative

Paul Roberts: Western Washington General Public Representative

John Sibold: WSDOT Aviation Director

Don Garvett: Airline Representative

Penni Loomis: Washington Airport Management Association Representative

Neal Sealock: Commercial Airport Operator

Chair Carol Moser: Transportation Commission Member

Chair Moser encouraged members of the public to complete a comment form and explained that Council meetings are part of the public outreach effort.

### **Public Comment**

Chair Moser opened the floor for 10 minutes of public comment:

Chas Talbot spoke on behalf the Regional Commission on Airport Affairs (RCAA) based in Normandy Park. He stated that the RCAA submitted comments on the public involvement plan, and that some of the RCAA's comments seem to have been addressed in the revised plan. He also spoke in support of Senator Karen Keiser's comments on the public involvement plan, which called for more emphasis on commercial aviation. He asserted that commercial aviation service will face a crisis by the 2020s – SeaTac will likely run out of capacity. He believes the Council must step forward with an approvable plan, or it will fail. He stated that he does not see how council will get a good look at the needs of commercial aviation and stressed that the Council needs to be aware of the FAA's 60% automatic expansion rule.

Chair Moser responded that she spoke with John Ellworth of Senator Kaiser's office to discuss commercial aviation and feels certain that commercial aviation will be addressed very carefully by the Council.

There was no further public comment.

### **Approve November 1 Meeting Summary**

Chair Moser requested revisions to the November 1 Meeting Summary. None were suggested. Motion to adopt the November 1 Meeting Summary by Sealock. Seconded by Garnett. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

### **Aviation System Planning**

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT), began the Aviation System Planning discussion, explaining that Washington State's aviation system is comprised of 140 airports, ranging in size and function from large airports like SeaTac to small local airports. Of these, 66 are in the NPIAS system, with the rest falling under the State's authority. SeaTac serves 85% of the State's capacity; 95% of freight capacity is served by just 3 airports.

Mr. Shambaugh then described the Aviation System Planning hierarchy (referring to graphic in PowerPoint presentation). NPIAS and the Washington Multi-Modal Plan provide the policy framework at the federal and state levels. The LATS process will involve review of planning principles, policies, and the development or amendment of existing aviation policies.

Paul Parker, Policy Analyst for the Washington Transportation Commission, provided an overview of the Washington Transportation Plan (WTP) and how the work of the Council and LATS Phase III fits into the Plan.

The WTP is developed by the Transportation Commission. The 20-year plan outlines the state's multimodal transportation needs and sets forth policies designed to meet these needs. The WTP is a policy plan that sets direction, but not a specific set of projects.

In 2005, highway and transit investment totaled \$88 billion nationwide. The 2007-2009 Washington State transportation budget is \$7.53 billion. The estimated annual need for highway and transit is \$187 billion, freight rail \$12 billion, and intercity passenger rail \$3.3 billion. The nation faces a large deficit in infrastructure spending.

Steady growth is forecasted for air travel, between 40-70% at certain key hubs. The WTP provides a comprehensive, balanced, and statewide guide for transportation policy and investment decisions. It addresses all levels of government, and looks at private sector needs, investment, and action.

The WTP identifies a need to invest over \$67 billion over the next 20 years, \$38 billion of which is unfunded. Existing resources, primarily from Nickel and TPA revenue, will provide about \$30.5 billion for transportation services investments and facilities over the next 16 years.

The WTP sets forth five key investment guidelines:

- Preservation: preservation of prior investments is fundamental and the foundation for other investment guidelines
- Safety: Safety of the traveling public is the state's highest priority. Examples are installation of cable median barriers, snow and ice clearing
- Economic vitality: reduce passenger and freight delay, support increase of economic productivity and local/regional economic development
- Mobility: facilitate movement of people and goods; increase use of transit to reduce congestion on heavily traveled highways
- Natural environment and health: enhance natural environment and health by improving the state's transportation infrastructure

Aviation-specific policy recommendations in the WTP include:

- Safety: Determine needed weather-related improvements to general aviation airports, to make airports safer and more effective

- Mobility: Identify gaps and deficiencies within the air transportation system and provide recommendations on how to address future long-term passenger, air cargo, and airport facility needs

A variety of efforts will inform development of a solution to address the state's transportation needs, including: Commission Tolling Study, Commission Rail Capacity and Needs Analysis, long-term revenue strategies, the Highway System Plan, Ferry System Plan, Public Transportation Plan, LATS, and the State Bike-Ped Plan. All modes of transportation will compete for a limited amount of funding. The state needs to decide how much money and effort is devoted to the state's aviation system. The solution will likely require a mix of public and private efforts. All transportation modes will be facing the same questions.

Potential new solutions for meeting the state's transportation needs include:

- Technology and Efficiency: Tolling - two tolling facilities underway:
  - Tacoma Narrows Bridge
  - SR 167 HOT Lanes Pilot (employing variable pricing technology)
- Innovation and Partnerships: innovative public-private partnerships
  - Railex (Walla Walla County), reduces travel time for cross-country shipping of perishable produce by half – to just 4-5 days.
  - Port of Tacoma, Fife and I-5: improves truck access to the Port of Tacoma
  - The Grape Line: state-local effort to bring public transit back to Walla Walla-Pasco filling void left by termination of Greyhound service
  - Columbia River Crossing: OR/WA partnership to construct new bridge to link Portland and Vancouver

Mr. Parker concluded with information on the 2010 update to the WTP. The update will include modal plans such as LATS, and will also build on RTPOs work at the local level. Staff work on the WTP update is underway, and early outreach is expected to begin in May of 2008.

Council Member Wilkerson stated that the Council has a great opportunity to identify high, medium, low priority aviation needs to inform the WTP update.

Council Member Wilkerson asked for clarification on data provided in a handout on unfunded transportation needs.

Paul Parker responded that the \$38 billion estimate is low, in reality is probably closer to \$50 billion, including a combination of state and local needs, as well as some private needs. There is currently no strategy in place to address the shortfall. It will need to be addressed over time. The Commission has made tolling recommendations, a strategy that will need to be looked at in the future as a means to fund large state projects. The Ferry study is looking at ways to get more revenue to ferries.

Council Member Wilkerson asked for clarification of the purpose of the comparison between growth in obesity rates and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Paul Parker responded that it was included to show the connection between our transportation decisions and human health.

Chair Moser added that this points to need for multimodal system to promote the health of people and the environment.

Council Member Roberts asked how the Council's work applies to the next update of the WTP, what are the procedural steps?

Paul Parker responded that this question is more suitable for John Shambaugh (WSDOT Aviation staff). The Transportation Commission does not have authority over WSDOT or any other agency – its role is to set ferry fares, tolls, and provide policy recommendations through the WTP. The Council's work will inform the 2010 WTP update, and it is likely that the Council's next annual report will include at least some of the Council recommendations as well as information heard from around the state relating to aviation needs.

John Shambaugh added that under SSB 5412, the Legislature established five policy goals (preservation, safety, mobility, environment, and environmental stewardship) to guide planning and investment in the state transportation system. Aviation must look at goals and integrate them into the planning process. Establishment of performance measures is part of the process. Per ESSB 5121, the Council will make recommendations to the Governor, Legislature, and Transportation Commission and others regarding investments to meet future statewide aviation system needs.

Chair Moser added that since the WTP currently has just 2 aviation-related policies, the Council has much work to do to make an impact on the 2010 update.

Dennis Roberts, FAA Regional Administrator, provided a presentation on federal-level aviation planning and programs, with an emphasis on the Next Gen program.

The nation's existing aviation infrastructure is ageing rapidly and cannot be sustained nor can it accommodate the anticipated growth in aviation demand. The FAA sees satellite navigation as the future of aviation.

Mr. Roberts introduced the Next Gen project, a joint planning and development effort intended to coordinate the R&D efforts of multiple agencies and showed a DVD about the Next Gen Air Transportation System.

The Next Gen Air Transportation System is led by the Joint Planning and Development Office, comprised of representatives from the departments of Transportation, Commerce, Homeland Security, FAA, White House, and the Office of Science and Technology. Next Gen is a satellite-based navigation system will double system use in 10 years. The aviation sector contributes 9% of GDP. Next Gen can meet new demands to keep this sector strong.

The Next Gen concept was unveiled in 2006. It can improve weather forecasting, providing real time information to support better decision making by pilots.

Mr. Roberts spoke about the Capstone Pilot program taking place in Alaska. Alaska Air has experienced huge benefits from the pilot, achieving a return on investment within 2 years. The program has potential to result in huge cost savings for the aviation industry and reduce environmental impact. In addition, the pilot has shown a 40% decrease in accidents.

FAA funding for Next Gen is in a perilous situation. The cost of build-out is \$17-22 billion by 2025. Next Gen's enabling legislation expired, and is currently operating under continuing resolution which is set to expire on February 29. If it is allowed to expire, the FAA could be faced with furloughing 4,000 FAA employees.

Each state is a piece of the national aviation system. LATS is a critical building block of the federal system.

Council Member Sibold commented that it is important to understand that Next Gen represents an opportunity for increasing system capacity. We need to measure and understand the benefits (capacity, environmental) of new technology like Next Gen and understand what it can bring to Washington State.

Council Member Garvett commented that there is opportunity to substitute new technology for bricks and mortar capacity-building, and asked "how will the Council understand enough about the trade-offs so we know how to approach this issue?"

Council Member Sibold responded that this is a question the Council needs to explore. Next Gen is a capacity solution we need to look at. While it may be impossible to quantify the impact on Washington, it is important to get the concept in front of us. Our recommendation could be that more study is needed about a particular topic or concept.

Dennis Roberts continued that the RNP allows more frequent updates, enabling airplanes to fly closer together with the same level of safety, thus getting more capacity out of existing infrastructure, while reducing noise, not taking more land, and reducing emissions. Air and water quality are two big hurdles still to face.

Council Member Townsley stated that Next Gen will require a skilled workforce to support it and asked if the Council should be considering workforce development as a fundamental need to support the State's aviation system.

Dennis Roberts responded that supply of skilled labor is a huge issue for the FAA. It is an issue in Seattle in particular, with competition from Boeing and other firms, to find skilled workers wanting to work in government.

Council Member Roberts commented that technology changes will produce a more efficient system, but that technology will not deal with depreciation of physical and

human capital. This group will have to struggle with issue of infrastructure depletion, which Next Gen does not address.

Dennis Roberts responded that NPIAS identifies unmet needs, showing a large gap between needs and available funding. The aviation trust fund is funded by a 7% excise tax on plane tickets, which supplies 95% of revenue coming into trust. The FAA proposes restructuring this system to make it more equitable, but it is a struggle given the issues with reauthorization.

Larry Williams from the Department of Commerce, Trade and Economic Development (CTED), spoke to the Council about Economic Viability and the State Economic Plan, which CTED is implementing.

Washington State is the aerospace state. As such, LATS is important to CTED's success in developing the State's economy. Air transportation is key to linking our transportation system.

The Governor's Next Washington Plan has 3 focus areas:

- Skills for the changing economy: skilled workforce is critical to our future
- Foundation for success: infrastructure (traditional and next generation)
- Open for business: remove barriers to doing business in the State.

Infrastructure (traditional and next generation) is the foundation for success. It is more than highways, but also about our ability connect to regional, national, and international markets. It is also how we deal with growth, appropriate land use, livability, and congestion.

Mr. Williams quoted the phrase "Washington State is open for business," stating that we need to remove barriers to doing business here. Manufacturing has changed. Speed and the ability to receive supplies quickly and get product out to market is the competitive advantage of today.

Infrastructure is also about moving people. Air travel is still important to business as e-mail and teleconferencing have not replaced the need for in-person meetings. Further, tourism is a \$14 billion industry in the State. We need air transportation to link people, to get people here, and to move them around the state.

The aviation industry is a growing industry. For state to fully benefit from this growth, we need to have the infrastructure to support it. We are promoting Washington as the premier location for aerospace businesses to locate. We are building our workforce to support the industry. Changing aviation products will require different infrastructure such as longer runways and other changes to load and unload passengers and cargo.

We face several challenges: workforce development, growing demand for industrial land, often near urban centers, affordable housing, which impacts our ability to attract talent. We do not have enough funding resources to meet the growing infrastructure demands.

As the most trade dependant state in the nation, the weakening dollar provides challenges and opportunities (increased tourism, increased demand for our cheaper goods).

CTED is opening regional centers around state. Regional Managers serve as on the ground advocates for local projects.

Council Member Loomis commented that significant parts of the aerospace industry do not benefit from the tax benefits provided by the Legislature (small aircraft producers is one such example). We lose business because we focus on large aerospace.

Mr. Williams responded that there is a bill before the Legislature to address the issue of support industries eligibility for the tax credit.

Council Member Wilkerson added that marketing the program is a challenge – many eligible businesses are not aware of the program or that they are eligible.

The Governor recently created an Aerospace Council, which is charged with:

- Identifying the State's competitors
- Developing strategies to better compete
- Addressing workforce development needs

Consultant team lead David Hollander (SH&E) presented information on key findings from LATS Phases I and II.

Significant growth is expected in all sectors:

- Passenger traffic at Washington airports is forecast to increase by 85% through 2030, from 17 million to 31 million emplanements
- General aviation operations will grow by 1.6% annually, from 3 million in 2005 to 4.4 million in 2030
- Air cargo will grow by 3.5% annually, with total statewide air cargo growing from 600,000 tons in 2005 to 1.4 million tons in 2030.

Activity will remain highly concentrated in the Puget Sound region, which by 2030 will accommodate:

- 87% of Washington's commercial passengers
- 84% of statewide air cargo
- 47% of the state's GA operations

Demand (flights) will be concentrated in the most populated areas of the state:

- The largest airports in the state provide one-third of the state's operations capacity, but attract 75 percent of the demand
- Smaller, outlying airports in Washington provide over 60 percent of the state's operations capacity, but only generate about 25 percent of the demand

We face the following issues and challenges:

- Significant capacity constraints are anticipated by 2030:
  - Airfield capacity constraints are expected to emerge at ten airports (nine of which are located in the Puget Sound region)
  - Several of the state's busiest airports including Sea-Tac, Boeing Field, and Harvey Field are expected to reach capacity by 2030
  - Approximately one-quarter of Washington's public-use airports are expected to have aircraft storage capacity shortfalls by 2030
- Passenger rail improvements will not provide meaningful capacity relief to the air transportation system
- Trends contributing to the loss of service at smaller commercial service airports in recent years are expected to continue through 2030
- The loss of public use private owned airports 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

Issues to explore:

- The impact and potential of Next Gen on SeaTac
- Explore possibility of shifting demand from Boeing Field to other GA airports

Rita Brogan, Council Staff (PRR, Inc) asked the Council to share observations and take-aways from the panel presentation.

Council Member Garvett asked if any research has been done on incentives that would encourage use smaller airports.

Mr. Hollander responded that it is an issue that might be worth exploring in the future, but that even if some redistribution can be achieved, we can still expect to experience capacity constraints at SeaTac.

Council Member Garvett encouraged the team to look at how we grow different parts of the system, not just the overall percentage of growth, but where it occurs.

Mr. Hollander responded that it points to need to understand Next Gen and to talk about it with SeaTac airport leaders.

Council Member Wilkerson asked about the pace at which private airfields are being bought out or closing. Are they gone forever what they close? What incentives are available?"

Mr. Hollander responded that Evergreen field closed in southwest Washington and explained that New Jersey has an incentive program that compensates an airport owner for the difference in value for what they could sell for land development. There is a federal effort underway modeled after New Jersey's program.

Council Member Wilkerson asked, "What is capacity of Portland airport?"

Mr. Hollander responded that Portland believes it has the ability to add runway capacity.

Council Member Sibold added that WSDOT Aviation has been concerned about loss of Evergreen Field and sees that Harvey Field is the next privately owned airfield to be affected by development encroachment. While the State has a good growth management act, it has limitations. We work hard to get local communities to identify airports as essential public facilities, that does not address the issue of an owner that wants to sell. If an airport is deeded federally, Congress can step in, and grants have to be paid back. But the high value of land can offset this requirement. The State needs to decide how to step in.

Chair Moser commented that Next Gen might solve capacity issues, but it creates other issues – where do you put cars, people, how do we deal with workforce development? Is the increase in air traffic going to be acceptable to the community – we need to address these issues.

Council Member Roberts commented that technology advances may deplete our resources. It raises question of infrastructure finance and the need to replenish aging infrastructure. We need to coordinate with the WTP – its not just how you get in and out of the airport, but how you get to the airport. Coordination is needed with all travel modes. There are also significant questions around fuel burn capacity and greenhouse gas emissions, and the impact on carbon footprint. We need to look at the tradeoffs.

Council Member Sealock commented that Next Gen has huge potential, but funding is a challenge. The Federal government and participants in system need to step up. We need to address inequality in how the system is used and funded currently. Cost points involved in providing services must be addressed. As a state, if we want to remain viable, we need to find opportunities that make financial sense and serve the public well. We need to break paradigms, look at how we can best use the capacity that we do have. The uncertain funding for Next Gen shows that the Council cannot rely on it as a panacea.

Chair Moser commented that Washington is an aviation state – as a Council, we understand the economic importance of aviation. But the general public has great concern about any increase in air capacity; it will be a political struggle. We need to educate the public, link the importance of the aviation industry to the well-being of the general economy, its impact on trade, etc. Everyone wants to fly, but no one wants it in their backyard. This is an important issue to deal with in our work.

Council Member Roberts commented that there are two issues relating to land use – promoting compatible land uses around airports and making sure incompatible uses are not near airports.

Council Member Townsley commented that is a short flight to states around us with no sales tax. There is value in the Council discussing tax implications in our deliberations. We need to keep the support industries here.

Council Member Garvett asked if looking at pricing was in the Council's purview. If we have a shortage of parking for aircraft - do we address the pricing? This can impact capacity.

Council Member Wilkerson commented that she was pleased to see the Council discussed green house emissions at the November meeting. Air traffic impacts climate change. Transportation is the number one emitter of emissions, and there is growing awareness about the impact of aircraft emissions. There is a bill before legislature. While that is not for the Council to deal with, the issue will come up in terms of cost, etc. We need to keep the issue in the back of our minds as it impacts our industry and where we are heading.

David Hollander commented that other there is not one solution to deal with the capacity issue. Other regions that have addressed the capacity issue (Boston, San Diego) have employed a series of partial solutions, and a regional strategy. There is no one silver bullet.

## **Actions**

*Note: the Council revised the order of the action items as follows: Elect Vice Chair, Approve Charter, Public Involvement Plan, Discuss Mission Council and Focus.*

- **Elect Vice-Chair:** Council Member Sealock moved to elect Paul Roberts as vice chair. Council Member Wilkerson seconded the motion. Paul Roberts was approved as Vice Chair by unanimous vote.
- **Approve Charter:** Chair Moser reminded the Council that the Charter was reviewed at the previous meeting and asked if there were any concerns about the Charter. Council Member Roberts moved to approve the Charter. Council Member McNamara seconded the motion. The Charter was approved by unanimous vote.
- **Public Involvement Plan**

Nisha Marvel, Council Staff (WSDOT) reminded the Council that the Phase III Public Involvement and Communication Plan was released to the public for comment on November 19<sup>th</sup>. In response to public request, the comment period was extended through January 4.

Ms. Marvel reviewed the comments submitted in response to the plan, along with proposed changes to the Plan. Key changes included:

- Amended the plan to clarify the author/owner of the plan
- Added language to explain WSDOT's legislatively mandated role of providing administrative support to the Council.
- Added Council roster

- Corrected economic data
- Clarified roles of council and consultant team
- Added to key audiences table, and included language to explain the Council may amend as work progresses.
- Outreach tool section – added dates, description of purpose, and explained how information would be distributed.

Council Member Townsley asked that expectations and protocols governing how Council Members communicate with the public be clarified in the Plan.

Rita Brogan, Council Staff (PRR, Inc) responded that Council members are expected to speak with the public, as it is part of the Council's legislative mandate. As speaking with the public and speaking on behalf of the Council are different, Ms. Brogan suggested adding language to the communication plan to clarify.

Council Member Garvett asked how state ethics laws govern the ability to seek feedback from constituency, and stated that it is not clear that enabling legislation permits the ability to seek out feedback from constituency. The key issue is whether or not such outreach creates a benefit to a specific constituency.

Council Member Wilkerson responded that it is important to understand the legal basis of the Council's responsibilities and suggested that the AAG attend a future meeting to speak to the Council about these issues.

Chair Moser responded that the Council went through orientation, but that clarification is needed from the AG regarding how to prevent the appearance of a conflict of interest. We need to get clarification from an AG on this issue. The AG's response should be added to the charter.

Nisha Marvel, Council Staff (WSDOT) suggested that the clarification be included in the communication plan as well.

Rita Brogan, Council Staff (PRR, Inc) pointed out that the Charter already states that Council members play an advisory role, and do not make policies and recommended adding language from the Charter to the communication plan to clarify.

Chair Moser asked for clarification on who will be eligible for stakeholder briefings by WSDOT Aviation staff, stating her opinion that briefings should be available to public groups, not individuals. Meeting are open to the public for individuals to attend, and staff resources are limited.

Council Member Sibold agreed that Aviation Division staff may not be able to meet every request for a briefing, and that parameters may need to be developed in the future.

Council Member Field stated that the website encourages people to set up a briefing, but it is not clear if it is for LATS briefings.

Council Member McNamara added that he doesn't feel that briefings need to be limited to public agencies, but agrees that parameters might need to be set if demand exceeds staff capacity. He added that briefings are a good way to reach people who may be unable to come to Council meetings or other events.

Council Member Field agreed with Council Member McNamara, adding that since this is a public policy effort, its success depends upon having an engaged public.

Council Member Wilkerson added that she appreciates the staffing constraint issue, but feels that it is appropriate to talk to stakeholder groups.

Chair Moser suggested inserting language that reflects what she hears as consensus that the Council wants as much outreach as is possible and practical.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT), suggested setting an attendance requirement for briefings.

Council Member Sibold agreed with Moser's suggested language and cautioned against setting strict parameters.

Council Member Roberts added that the overarching goal is to take all appropriate steps within the limits of available resources to reach all possible audiences. The question isn't who is or isn't a stakeholder, but how do we reach out to stakeholders. The spirit of the legislation is that we are obligated to do as much outreach as possible within the limits of available resources.

Nisha Marvel, Council Staff (WSDOT) suggested adding language to the Plan to inform the public how to request a briefing.

Chair Moser asked for feedback about whether or not to provide a 10-minute public comment period at all Council meetings.

Council Member McNamara stated that he has no objection to 10-minute comment period, adding that the public may have valuable input to provide to the Council.

Council Member Field agreed, adding that it is helpful to allow for public comment, particularly when discussion controversial issues. Field asked if the plan should be amended to address this.

Council Member Wilkerson asked if the comment period should occur at the beginning or end of the meeting, to allow for comments in anticipation of agenda items or in response to Council discussions.

Council Member Roberts added that the appropriate way to handle public comment during meetings may become clearer in the future. Up front comment is okay. Roberts added that the public has other means of providing comment, such as written comments and suggested allowing up to 3 minutes per person.

Chair Moser proposed adding language that each person has 2 minutes to speak, but added that we need to be flexible about this issue.

Chair Moser asked if anyone had issues with including the Knowledge Networks electronic town hall or on-line surveys. No one raised any issues.

The Council provided additional editorial changes which will be captured in the revised plan by Nisha Marvel.

Council Member Townsley moved to approve the Phase III Public Involvement and Communication Plan as amended. Motion was seconded by Council Member Garvett. Vote was unanimous to approve the Phase III Public Involvement and Communication Plan as amended.

- **Discuss Council Mission And Focus**

Rita Brogan, Council Staff (PRR, Inc) explained that the draft Purpose and Need Statement is being presented today for discussion purposes only.

Chair Moser encouraged Council members to e-mail additional revisions to Rita Brogan or John Shambaugh. The Council will be asked to adopt the revised statement at the next meeting.

Rita Brogan, Council Staff (PRR, Inc) reviewed the basic structure of the statement, which provides information on the importance and role of the aviation system, how the council was established, and how the Council's recommendations will be used.

Chair Moser asked Council Member Wilkerson if in her opinion, given the Governor's focus on Washington as "the aviation state," should we add language to the Statement about educating the public about the importance of the aerospace industry to the State economy?

Council Member Sealock asked, "Why not add language about capital investments?"

Council Member Garvett asked if the State has a role in guiding Federal investments in aviation.

Council Member Wilkerson responded yes.

Council Member Townsley asked if language about investments in human capital should be added, adding that the implication of the document is that the Council is focused only on physical infrastructure.

Council Member Wilkerson agreed, adding that workforce development is a huge issue. It was the biggest issue discussed at the recent aerospace summit.

Council Member Field stated that the suggested additions seem useful, and noted that the second to last paragraph comes from the enabling legislation.

Rita Brogan, Council Staff (PRR, Inc) stated that staff will revise the document based on the discussion and will present it to the Council at the next meeting.

### **Review of Work Program and Discussion**

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) introduced the proposed work program to the Council. The work program is designed to meet the objectives of ESSB 5121. Ten council meetings and workshops are scheduled, to be held at locations throughout the state to encourage statewide participation in the Study. Meetings are proposed to occur in Seattle, Spokane, and Southwest Washington. The public participation effort is designed to gather statewide input, with regional meetings to take place in eastern and western Washington in different geographic regions. The Council's recommendations will be forwarded to the Governor by July 1, 2009.

The work program assumes that the Council will review relevant documents in advance of meetings to become informed about key issues. Staff provided a resource list to the Council. Guest speakers will address issues related to topic areas. The Consultant team will highlight key issues identified in LATS Phases I and II at each meeting.

Council Member Loomis suggested having an economist provide information to the Council about cost/benefit analysis and the multiplier effect of potential Council recommendations.

Council Member Roberts stated that the capacity issue may have many different aspects that the Council will need to explore. Sub-committees may be necessary to enable the Council to do more detailed analysis while staying on schedule.

Chair Moser agreed with Roberts that sub-committees may be necessary.

Council Member Wilkerson stated that it may be helpful to be provided with analysis of past policy efforts – what issues have not been addressed by previous policy efforts?

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that a white paper on existing policies is being prepared for the council.

Council Member Loomis inquired about the methodology used to prepare the information in Paul Parker's handout on unfunded priorities in the Washington Transportation Plan.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) stated that it is unclear how much of the identified \$38 billion in unfunded priorities is specific to aviation. The WTP calls upon the LATS process to identify gaps in aviation needs. We will be addressing this issue in the LATS Phase III.

Chair Moser reminded the Council that the work plan is a living document that will change as work progresses. The intent of today's discussion was to review the work plan. Chair Moser asked the Council if they saw any major gaps or missing elements in the work plan.

Council Member Loomis moved to adopt the work plan as presented. Council Member Garvett seconded the motion. The work plan was adopted by unanimous vote.

David Hollander, Consultant Team (SH&E) reviewed the technical team's work program and its key tasks during Phase III:

- Identify a series of key issues and challenges facing the State
- Work with the Council to evaluate alternative strategies that deal with long-term planning challenges:
  - Define alternative strategies
  - Establish decision-making criteria
  - Analyze alternatives based on criteria
- Assess viability of utilizing military airfields as civil airports
- Present Phase I and Phase II findings to Council, provide Council with technical information, and respond to Council directives
- Communicate progress of the study to the public and elicit public input on key issues
- Develop prioritization system to best direct state funds to projects that produce the greatest benefits to the system
- Develop financial plan that considers creative sources of funding state aviation needs
- Prepare an Aviation System Plan document

Council Member Sealock asked for clarification on the scope of work related to military airfields.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) said that there are five military airfields in the state. The study will assess whether they are located in areas where we need capacity and what the possibility is that military airfields will become available for civil use in the future. WSDOT Aviation will discuss the availability issue with military commanders, and include information in the System Plan, as appropriate.

Council Member Sealock stated that this will be a sensitive issue.

Council Member Garvett asked how likely is it that military airports will become available for civil uses.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the likelihood is very low.

Council Member Field stated that the issue should remain on the table, even it isn't likely.

Council Member Townsley stated that we need to clearly define "benefits" when we develop the prioritization system

Chair Moser reviewed schedule of upcoming meetings and encouraged Council members to suggest panel speakers for upcoming meetings.

Council Member Sealock recommended inviting directors of general and commercial aviation airports to the third meeting.

Chair Moser asked the Council if meeting times should be extended, to start and end earlier.

Council Member Sealock stated that longer meetings are easier in nicer weather, but at this time of year, it is difficult.

Council Member McNamara said that starting earlier is easier than ending later.

Council Member Loomis said that starting earlier is difficult for people coming from the east side.

Chair Moser concluded that the meeting time will remain the same (10am-3pm), but may be extended if needed. The Council will not meet during months when regional meetings are held. The Council is encouraged to attend the regional meetings.

Staff will create a meeting calendar to distribute to Council members at the next meeting.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) reminded the Council to submit travel reimbursements.

Chair Moser closed the meeting at 2:35 p.m.