

LONG-TERM AIR TRANSPORTATION STUDY (LATS)

Washington State Aviation Planning Council

MEETING SUMMARY

August 7, 2008

Pearson Air Museum
1115 E 5th, Vancouver, WA

Present:

Council Members: John Townsley, Penelope Loomis, James McNamara, Neal Sealock, Dave Field, Juli Wilkerson, Carol Moser, Paul Roberts

Staff: John Shambaugh and Nisha Marvel

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

Guests: Paul Parker, Sr. Policy Analyst, Washington State Transportation Commission

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

- Review public input on policy recommendations
- Subcommittee reports on public policy review
- Use system information, issues, and key findings to identify strategic options to implement the air transportation system plan.

Public Comment

Scot Walstra, Director of Planning and Development (Port of Camas-Washougal) announced that the Port of Camas-Washougal just began an environmental assessment for work it is doing at Grove Field and stated that his purpose in attending today's meeting is to listen and learn and is interested in the outcome of the Council process.

Council Member Wilkerson asked Mr. Walstra for an update on the Grove Field planning effort.

Scot Walstra, Director of Planning and Development, Port of Camas-Washougal responded that there is an active purchase underway for 110 acres adjacent to Grove field. The Port is working through future challenges facing Grove Field, such as a 75 unit mobile home development at the east end of Grove Field. A plan has been developed to possibly relocate homes under RPZ. Grove Field is a small airport, but it does present an opportunity to create development and jobs to help the local economy. With the closure of Evergreen Airport and Pearson's status as a

historic airport, Grove Field can help relieve capacity issues in the region and assist with emergency relief efforts. While topography limits expansion; there is opportunity to maximize its capacity within constraints.

Approve June 5, 2008 Meeting Summary

Council Member Sealock moved to approve the June 5, 2008 meeting summary, as edited. Motion seconded by Council Member Townsley. The June 5, 2008 meeting summary was approved unanimously by the Council, as edited.

Follow Up from Previous Meeting

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) thanked the Council for submitting comments on the draft statewide aviation policies, which helped staff to prepare for the regional public meetings held in July.

Chair Moser thanked members Council Members Field, Garvett, Sibold, and Townsley for attending the regional public meetings in July.

Strategic Options

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) presented a proposed alternatives analysis framework. The presentation began by recapping the work of LATS Phases I and II, which looked at how the aviation system operates now.

- 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 will not provide meaningful capacity relief to the air transportation system
- 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

LATS Phase III looks to the future and how to address key issues and challenges. A key goal of the consultant team in LATS Phase III is to provide the Aviation Planning Council with information to aid in the development of its recommendations.

Council Member Sealock asked if the statement that passenger rail improvements will not provide meaningful capacity relief to the air transportation system means that the Council should not be discussing rail as a solution to the capacity issue.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that LATS Phase II included an analysis of passenger rail. At that time, the technical committee and consultants concluded that high speed rail is not a good option to relieve air transportation capacity constraints given current technology and funding sources. This finding should not be interpreted to mean that the Council should put the issue of rail transportation aside, when looking at the impact on the overall transportation system.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) added that there are other solutions, but LATS Phase II findings indicate that passenger rail will not provide a meaningful solution to addressing aviation capacity in the study's 30-year planning window.

Council Member Sealock clarified that he does not disagree with the conclusions about rail in LATS Phase II, but pointed out that if the nation continues to put aside the topic of rail, it will never become a viable alternative to improve the overall transportation system.

Council Member Wilkerson asked if there is any connection between rail improvement and trends contributing to loss of airline service.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) proposed reframing the language about passenger rail, so that does not sound dismissive of rail as a potential solution, to state, "Passenger rail improvements are not likely to provide meaningful capacity relief to the commercial air transportation system within the 2030 planning timeframe."

Council Member Sealock agreed that while it is an accurate point, it is dismissive as originally written. The Council needs to consider all scenarios.

Council Member Wilkerson added that it is dismissive, but asked if they are distinct issues and if it will have an impact on capacity.

Vice Chair Roberts noted that we are seeing other forms of transportation being used to move between areas 300-400 miles apart. People are thinking of other alternatives. It will require significant investment in order for rail to fill this niche.

Chair Moser added that funding for this section of the report was limited. We know that smaller communities need service, and rail might be an answer. If you ask communities if they would use rail if available, they would say yes. As originally written, the statement about passenger rail is too strong.

Council Member Field noted that "if it's available" is a key phrase, adding that making rail available is very expensive.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) clarified that Cambridge Systematics looked at the cost of making rail system improvements to compete with air in terms of cost and speed, noting that it was not a full study.

Council Member Sealock proposed a different way frame the discussion. It may not be a competition between air and rail, as we are talking about enhancing our transportation system and providing choices to public, noting that it would be good to see someone push the state and federal government to deal with issue and make investments in the overall system.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) added that the proposed re-wording make sense. LATS Phase II did not preclude rail, but the point is that if we are trying to resolve capacity constraints by 2030, rail will not be the solution.

Council Member Townsley noted that rail may not be available to move people and goods across the state and asked if rail would work in high population corridors such as I-5 to feed local air service.

Vice Chair Roberts noted that we are looking at two parallel tracks, air and rail. In terms of air, we have consensus around the table that based on our limited information, rail is not a viable solution to the capacity issue. Looking at rail issues – Amtrak is having problems enhancing capacity. Adding new capacity to existing tracks involves a different set of issues that are outside of the purview of the Aviation Planning Council.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) committed to reviewing the rail section of LATS Phase II, but noted that SH&E conducted a study on rail between Seattle and Portland, which would be one of the most likely routes to move people away from air travel. SH&E found that rail would not make a significant impact on resolving capacity issues at Portland and SeaTac Airports.

Vice Chair Roberts noted that projects for freight volume in the future are huge as fuel costs are resulting in greater reliance on trains.

Council Member Shambaugh suggested inviting Curt Frederickson from the WSDOT rail office to speak at an upcoming Council meeting.

Council Member Townsley responded that having a rail expert speak to the Council is a good idea, to help the Council understand the issues, especially if it is an issue in which the public has an interest.

Chair Moser stated that if it is part of our alternatives, then we will need to look at it further, but proposed moving ahead with the presentation for now.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) reviewed slides summarizing where capacity constraints exist in the Washington aviation system, based on findings from LATS I and II:

- Ten airports are forecast to experience capacity constraints by 2030
- Fifteen general airports will exceed aircraft storage capacity by 2030
- Nine commercial/regional service airports will exceed airfield, terminal, and/or aircraft storage capacity by 2030
- Private airports contribute significantly to the state system, especially in the Puget Sound and Southwest Washington special emphasis regions

- Many of the smaller commercial service airports in Washington State have lost a considerable amount of air service in the last 10-15 years

Council Member Wilkerson asked if the capacity information presented in the slides takes into consideration issues such as oil prices and retiring fleets.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded there are always fluctuations when using data to make projections.

Council Member Wilkerson noted that the increase in oil prices seems worse than a normal fluctuation.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) responded that when tracking air traffic, there has been long term growth over the past 30 years, despite some significant economic shocks. There are fluctuations in the short-term, but in the long-term, everything balances out.

Council Member Wilkerson asked if we can explain this context in our work, so that the public understands what our recommendations are based upon.

Chair Moser noted that WSDOT's freight study is showing lower than expected growth due to the economy and competition from Long Beach. It is important to consider that we are competing against other assets.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) said that although it took a full five years to come back from 9/11, but we are projecting out 30 years in our work. We are expecting to see increased population growth and traffic. In addition, Washington's economy is stronger, above the national average.

Council Member Sealock noted that we will get questions about our data, adding that we need to be able to show that we are looking at updated numbers.

Vice Chair Roberts asked if it would make sense for staff and consultants to review the assumptions that the projections are based upon to make sure they still make sense. It would be good to include this summary in the final Council report, to show that we accounted for the impact of short term fluctuations on long-term projections.

Council Member McNamara asked how recent the data we have is.

Chair Moser asked if change occurs based on the changing business models of airlines.

Council Member Sealock responded that high fuel prices are exacerbating issues right now.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) added that in places like Moses Lake there may be some indication that people are choosing to fly from the local airport because the high cost of automobile fuel makes the price differential makes sense.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) stated that staff will look at assumptions used in LATS I and II and will report back to the Council with its findings.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) continued with his presentation, reviewing four possible strategies for addressing capacity constraints and shortfalls and explained how to apply the alternatives to individual airports:

- No action (least intensive): the state continues its current programs at current funding levels, and does not play an active role in aviation system development
- Use existing facilities: Employ demand management and new technology to expand capacity at constrained airports, and encourage surrounding airports to absorb excess demand.
- Expand facilities: Add or extend runways, passenger terminals, or additional aircraft storage to add new capacity to existing airports
- New facility (most intensive): construct a new airport in the region

Council Member Sealock noted that there may be pushback on demand management and suggested providing some examples to help explain it.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) noted that it may be possible that the outcome would be a hybrid of the alternatives presented today.

Council Member Sealock suggested noted that building a new airport is an extraordinary action; only one new airport (Denver) has been built since the 1950s, and conversations about this alternative should note this history.

Council Member Wilkerson agreed that it is important that this fact is explained to the public.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) responded that there are other places in which new airports have been built, such as in Arkansas and Ivanpah (Las Vegas' second airport which is under development) but noted that Arkansas airport is unique given the presence of Wal-Mart headquarters.

Council Member Townsley stated that we need to be clear about how long it takes to construct a new airport.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that it will take 14 years to complete Ivanpah airport if everything goes according to plan. It will likely take closer to 20 years to complete, and this is in an environment where there is broad community support for the project.

Council Member Field suggested calling the alternatives as “approaches” to convey that these are ways of thinking.

Council Member Wilkerson asked if we know when airports will reach capacity.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that the consultant team is looking at this now, as this data is needed to help evaluate options.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) noted that when an airport exceeds its capacity, the result is delays and inefficiencies. Not expanding, and having delays is an option, and is a tradeoff that decision-makers can consider.

Vice Chair Roberts asked to what degree the Council should look at aerospace industry as a factor and is it captured in the data. It is a huge part of the state's economy.

Council Member McNamara asked if another strategy could be to allocate aviation resources based on economic impact.

Vice Chair Roberts added that Boeing has limited capacity that dictates how many planes it can produce and expressed concern that this issue which concerns the state's primary economic cluster is factored into the debate.

Chair Moser added that we are trying to capture fixed capacity (industrial use) and what is left over for variable capacity (passenger).

Council Member Sealock responded that this might be a place for the Council to get involved. This also deals with demand management, airspace classification, all of which require decisions outside of our scope, either at state or national level.

Council Member Field added that it is not just Boeing, but also all of the people learning to fly and general aviation that support the industry. Cutting them off leads to deterioration of the industry.

Vice Chair Roberts responded that he does not disagree, but the state legislature made commitments when they created incentives to get the aerospace industry to locate in this state. The question may well not be exclusive to Boeing, but we need to understand what it means for policy making.

Council Member Sealock added state and federal funding requires open access, which becomes a legal matter.

In response to slide 22 which looks at issues to address when considering construction of a new airport, the Council decided that "environmental impacts" must be added to the list.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) summarized the sequence of capacity threshold decisions:

- Determine the period during which capacity will become an issue
- Determine whether current airports can be used more efficiently to delay capacity issues
- Determine whether the existing airports can be expanded, or
- Whether there are surrounding airports with capacity, storage, and facilities sufficient to address the capacity constraints
- Could a new airport be constructed and where

Council Member Sealock noted that we need to remember were looking at the statewide system, and not just at Puget Sound.

Council Member Townsley noted that in discussions about alternative travel modes, we have been focused on how to replace air traffic. We have not been looking at multi modal approaches. We need to look beyond air transportation system impacts, and at the impact on the system as a whole.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) responded that the team will look at the system-wide issue, but in a somewhat limited way.

Mr. Yarnish continued with the presentation outlining external factors that influence capacity and expansion decisions, such as airline fleet changes, technological advances, changing environmental regulations, new transportation service concepts, funding availability, changes in demand, and changes in the economy.

Council Member Sealock suggested adding changes in the airline industry to the list of factors to consider.

Council Member Wilkerson noted that the concerns of industry are a very important part of this discussion, adding that industry is not always as represented in our discussions.

Council Member Sealock noted that the airlines get to vote on airport's decision to add gates.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) described the assessment criteria contained in the project scope of work:

- The ability of the alternative to address legislation ESSB 5121 and Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5070-7 "The Airport System Planning Process".
- The ability of the alternative to meet the goals of the state and council policy recommendations
- The impacts of the alternative on the region's airspace.
- The likely impacts of the alternative on the regional surface access system.
- The ability of the alternative to be implemented based on logistical, political and other decisions made for the airport in their master planning or previous public participation processes.
- The cost of implementation.

Mr. Yarnish then outlined proposed criteria based on draft Guiding Principles and Draft Statewide Aviation Policies.

System Stewardship and Preservation:

- Does the alternative sustain the ability of Washington residents and communities to access Washington State's aviation system to move people and goods safely and securely?
- Does the alternative allow for inter-jurisdictional partnerships?
- Does the alternative safeguard Washington State's aviation system for future generations? Does it address the need for funding for strategic and targeted investment?

Capacity:

- Does the alternative address the overall long term capacity needs of the system
- Does the alternative maximize the efficiency and utility of the existing system?

Safety:

- Does the alternative maintain the safety of communities and the flying public?

Economic:

- Does the alternative make the best use of existing resources?
- Does the alternative enhance the local economy and create jobs?

System Access and Mobility:

- Does the alternative take into account the different roles of airports serving Washington's diverse communities?
- Does the alternative coordinate with other transportation modes to assure cost effective transportation options for people and goods?

Environmental Impact:

- Does the alternative consider environmental and social impacts such as noise, air quality, water quality, impacts on adjacent communities, and climate change?
- Does the alternative allow for decision-making about the expansion or siting of airports through an open and public process that serves the broadest long term interest of the residents of Washington State and our national security?

Vice Chair Roberts asked if the environmental criteria adequately capture CAT 2 work, asking Council Member Wilkerson if it is broad enough.

Council Member Wilkerson responded that the environmental criteria are broad enough.

Council Member Field asked for clarification on how extensive the environmental impact assessment will be in LATS Phase III.

John Yarnish, Consultant Team (URS) clarified that although this is not an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the team will consider environmental criteria.

Council Member Field added that we should assume that any new construction projects will require a separate environmental process.

Council Member Sealock asked with respect to issues like noise, how the team will measure perception versus actual experience.

Council Member Field noted that we should not dismiss an alternative because we think there is an environmental impact. We have to assume that environmental issues can be mitigated.

Council Member Sealock noted that he raised the perception issue, because we are hearing comments like this from the public. We need to figure out how to deal with this.

Vice Chair Roberts noted that Council Member Field's point illustrates the difference between the criteria we are considering are for subsequent actions and the criteria we need for the task at hand. The Council is not charged with conducting an environmental review, but rather identifying the issues that need to be applied when the action we recommend are implemented.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) led the Council in a discussion around the following three questions:

- Does the framework for the alternatives make sense
- Does the process for analyzing the alternatives make sense
- Do the criteria make sense?

Council Member Sealock responded that he is comfortable with the criteria and approach if we include industry perspective.

Chair Moser noted that some of the criteria may change as we move through the public comment process.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) added that the team can conduct outreach to industry representatives and report back to the Council on its findings.

Review of Public Comment on Draft Policies

Council Member Sealock noted that media coverage we have been receiving does not accurately reflect the Council's charge and its work and discussions to date.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) advised that calling reporters to tell the Council's side of the story would be more effective than organizing a press conference.

Council Member Wilkerson suggested that the Council should develop a media protocol.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we have a media protocol in place, and that staff would send it out to the Council again. Ms. Brogan noted that we do not want to release press releases that are not newsworthy. We need to identify what is a good news hook, and then pitch that story to reporters. For the major newspapers, a press release will not capture their attention.

Chair Moser added that the closer we get to release of the alternatives, the more important it is to get our information out to the media and public. We need to keep the public in the loop, explain that it is an open, public process, and communicate the expectation set by the legislation.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) provided information on the outcome of the regional public meetings. Approximately 48 people attended the Mukilteo meeting, while only 4 attended the Wenatchee meeting. Approximately 21 comment letters were submitted and approximately 10 comment forms were completed, in addition to comments written on flip charts by regional public meeting participants.

Kimbra Wellock, Consultant Team (PRR) noted that in general, the public indicated general support for the draft statewide aviation policies. Comment highlights included:

- Policies do not address addition of new capacity (specifically mentioned was construction of a new regional airport outside of King County)
- Environmental policies do not adequately address noise, air pollution, or other adverse impacts on human health
- Concern that draft policies are too focused on needs of aviation and airports, and not on human and community needs
- Concern that land use policies put rights of airports above communities/property owners
- Some uneasiness expressed about public-private partnerships; concern about tax payer exposure to risk

Council Member Townsley asked what the final deadline is for submitting public comment on the draft policies.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that earlier is better, but that we are always open to hear what the public has to say.

Council Member Wilkerson asked if we can compare comments received on the policies to comments received during LATS I and II.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that we cannot identify trends as we did not ask the same questions.

Council Member Wilkerson asked for ideas on how we can increase the number of comments we receive.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that the upcoming E-Town Hall taking place on August 26 will help bolster our outreach efforts, noting that we anticipate approximately 150 people will participate.

John Shambaugh, Consultant Staff (WSDOT) noted that Wenatchee participants expressed interest in maintaining access to airports, and placed more emphasis on the role of airports in emergency response. Participants encouraged expanding policies to address emergency response issues.

Council Member Townsley asked if there was an overrepresentation of certain viewpoints in the public comment we received. He noted that there was low participation at the regional meetings and because participants chose whether or not to attend, there is a self-selection bias. We need to keep this in mind as we consider comments, and make certain that we do not overlook any viewpoints.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) reviewed slides showing responses to the questions asked on the meeting comment forms and explained the upcoming E-Town Hall on August 25. The purpose of the E-Town Hall is to obtain feedback on problems and opportunities facing the aviation system to help inform development of System Plan Alternatives. There will be approximately 150 participants (representative sample, geographically dispersed). The session will last approximately 60 minutes, and will involve discussion in an interactive chat environment, with visual displays. All communication is saved as data. Feedback will be summarized and provided to Council in advance of next meeting.

Council Member Field asked for a definition of “representative” and for information on the participant recruitment process. Council Member Field expressed concern about potential for bias in the process.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that concerns about bias are addressed, at least in part, by the fact that the participants are drawn from a statewide random sample and recruited through random digit dialing by Knowledge Networks. That being said, we need different ways to gather comment from a variety of viewpoints. The council needs to consider public comment, in addition to technical information in making its recommendations, but public comments are not intended to be a substitute for the judgment of the Council.

Vice Chair Roberts stated that the E-Town Hall is an exercise to try to pull more people in. It would be great to get even more input, but we do not have enough funding.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) added that it is important to try a variety of tools to gather comment. There are limitations in each methodology.

Council Member Field asked to review the participant screening questions.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) noted that the E-Town Hall will provide both qualitative and quantitative information, which will be presented to the Council before the next meeting.

Council Member Townsley responded that it is important that the Council receive the e-town hall meeting summary in advance of the next meeting, so that there adequate time to review it and digest it. Council Member Townsley also asked to see the questions that will be asked at the meeting.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) offered to send the presentation instrument to the Council, and requested that comments to be submitted before the pretest.

Council Member Wilkerson stated that the low participation in the regional public meetings is disappointing, adding that we need to be concerned about how we generate data and how we use the results.

Sonjia Murray, Consultant Team (SH&E) added that we has a similar low turn out during LATS Phases I and II, and asked if there is a better way to gather public comment. We can be vulnerable to criticism based on low turn out.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) responded that the E-Town Halls and On-line survey were intended to help bolster participation.

Council Member Field asked how many briefings have been made community organizations.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that five briefings have been made to community organizations

Chair Moser asked if the policies have been sent to the Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) for their review and comment.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) responded that the policies have been sent to the RTPOs but that we have not yet received any comments back.

Council Member Sealock asked if it should request an RSVP to public meetings and cancel meetings with low response so that we do not spend resources on a meeting with low attendance. Another idea would be to solicit comment through the internet.

Council Member Townsley noted that we currently only do briefings upon request, and asked if would be better to be more proactive, and schedule briefings with targeted organizations.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) agreed with Council Member Townsley, adding that we are always talking about upcoming meetings with people, and that there are many organizations that we can reach out to.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) noted that the newspapers were cooperative in announcing the meetings. Another option is to schedule meetings to coincide with conferences, such as WAMA to make it more convenient for interested parties to participate.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) asked if there is a way to do briefings over the web.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) suggested exploring the feasibility of putting the E-Town Hall survey instrument on-line.

Chair Moser stated that she spoke the Washington Pilots Association, which noted it needed more advance notice. WPA has offered to post information in its Wings newsletter.

Nisha Marvel, Council Staff (WSDOT) summarized meeting outreach:

- Aviation News Service notice to 6,000 subscribers
- Notice to the Aviation Advisory Committee
- Media outreach
- Outreach at meetings
- Notice on the APA list serve

Chair Moser added that we do not want to make a lot of extra work if the issue is that people do not care, but we should look at different ways of doing outreach so we can increase participation and the amount of comments we receive.

Council Member Sealock added that we need to be mindful of the cost effectiveness of meetings.

Chair Moser noted that one benefit of the meetings was that there was a lot of conversation and education that occurred as a result of the interaction between staff and public. The meeting set up was good, and allowed for us to provide background information to the public and an opportunity for discussion.

Subcommittee Reports on Draft Policies

The Council decided to postpone the subcommittee discussion to allow more time to review the regional public meeting comment summary. The subcommittees will set up conference calls before the next meeting to review comment and determine next steps.

Council Administration and Next Steps

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) proposed moving the meeting currently scheduled for September 4th to October, to enable more time to summarize public comment from the E-Town Hall.

The Council agreed to move the meeting to October, and will coordinate by email to determine the date. The meeting will be held in Seattle.

John Shambaugh, Council Staff (WSDOT) announced that the second round of regional public meetings will be held in October (dates to be determined) in Olympia and TriCities, and encouraged Council members to attend.

Rita Brogan, Consultant Team (PRR) encouraged Council members to look for opportunities to coordinate with local stakeholder groups to increase attendance at the regional meetings.

Staff agreed to send an email update to the Council at the end of August to provide an update on progress.

Chair Moser adjourned the meeting at 2:20 p.m.