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

MEETING SUMMARY

November 1, 2007

Present:

Council Members:	Jim McNamara, Dave Field, John Townsley, John Sibold, Penni Loomis, Neal Sealock, Don Garvett, Paul Roberts, and Carol Moser.
Staff:	John Shambaugh and Marilee Pribble
Consultant Team:	Sonjia Murray (SH&E), John Yarnish (URS), Sara Funk (WHP), Rita Brogan (PRR), and Steve Smith (PRR, Inc.)

Introductions by Chair Carol Moser.

Council member introductions around the table and an opportunity for each Council member to ask one question about LATS.

Jim McNamara, Growth Management Hearings Board member: Question about land use compatibility and how LATS will result in better land use decisions by local government.

Dave Field, FAA Technical Expert: Question about the Council process and the constituency that they represent, particularly whether there is an expectation that Council members will represent their constituencies' interests in this process.

John Townsley, Eastern Washington General Public Representative: Question about how LATS will affect the tax structure and how the regulatory structure will be affected in addressing the needs of aviation.

John Sibold, WSDOT Aviation Director: Question about what the other Council members' expectations are of him as a Council member.

Penni Loomis, Washington Airport Management Association Representative: Question about how the Council's recommendations will stack up with the rest of WSDOT's transportation priorities as well as whether only gas tax dollars will be used for funding.

Neal Sealock, Commercial Airport Operator: Question about how the Council will separate a complex, technical report used by professionals in the industry from the public perspective of what they are doing.

Don Garvett, Airline Representative: Question about the effects of pricing, rules, policies, etc. on capacity.

Paul Roberts, Western Washington General Public Representative: Question about how the Council can best integrate air transportation with other modes of transportation and the environmental impacts of these decisions.

Juli Wilkerson, Community, Trade, and Economic Development Department Director (absent due to scheduling conflict)

Chair Carol Moser, Transportation Commission Member: Question about what prevents the Council from falling into the same landmines as AIRTRAC and how the Council can ensure its recommendations are taken seriously by the Legislature.

Chair Moser reviewed the meeting objectives:

- Get to know each other
- Provide aviation system background
- Present LATS overview and key findings
- Develop charter and work program
- Discuss Council admin issues and next steps

The role of the Council is set in Revised Code of Washington (RCW) statute via Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5121:

- Recommend how best to meet statewide commercial and general aviation (GA) capacity needs.
- Determine which regions need improvement regarding matching of existing/projected airport facilities and the long-range capacity needs of airports within the region expected to reach capacity before the year 2030.
- Recommend placement of future commercial and GA airport facilities designed to meet the need for improved aviation planning in the region.
- Include public input in making final recommendations.
- Submit recommendations to appropriate legislative standing committees, the Governor, the Transportation Commission, and applicable regional transportation planning organizations (RTPOs).

The Council has until July 1, 2009 to provide recommendations to the Legislature and Governor.

What are some critical questions that the Council will address?

- Are we positioned to respond to rapidly changing aviation environment?
- Are we using our limited resources effectively and efficiently to meet the state's interests in aviation? What should our key priorities be?
- What strategic changes need to be made to satisfy the state's aviation policy, i.e., preservation, safety, capacity, and environmental protection?

The Council's primary data resource will be the results of the LATS Phase I and Phase II studies. The work of the Council is the third phase of the study. The Council will then make its recommendations to the Legislature, Governor, Transportation Commission, and RTPOs.

Rita Brogan, Council Staff (PRR, Inc.), reviewed the contents of the Council Resource & Meeting Notebooks.

Notebook contents include Council Roster, Draft Charter, Media Kit (Media Protocol and Media Log), LATS Project Summary, blank space for White Papers, Legislation, and FAQ sheet.

John Sibold offered opening thoughts to the Council. He stressed that it is important that this work take a statewide perspective. Input into drafting of LATS legislation came from everyone from ports to airlines. The Council must provide leadership for the future – looking forward 25 years and taking its analysis to the highest level possible at the statewide level. He expressed that he wants the meetings to be an effective use of the Council's time and that staff will do whatever it takes to support the Council's work.

John Shambaugh, WSDOT Aviation, reviewed the statutory authority for LATS.

- Chapter 47.68 RCW – authorizes WSDOT Aviation to:
    - Governing authority and providing for the protection and promotion of aviation safety.
    - Develop the statewide system of airports in cooperation with stakeholders.
    - Cooperate with federal authorities in the development of a national aviation system.
- Chapter 47.68 RCW – authorized LATS
- Chapter 47.01 RCW – authorize the Transportation Commission to:
    - Develop transportation policy in Washington State.
    - Develop a comprehensive, multimodal statewide transportation system.
- Chapter 47.04 RCW – requires state transportation agencies to:
    - Perform their duties consistent with policy goals set by the Legislature for preservation, safety, mobility, environment, and stewardship.
    - The policy goals are established to support public investments in transportation.

Mr. Shambaugh then reviewed the five key investment guidelines in the Washington Transportation Plan:

- Preservation: Preserve and extend prior investments in existing transportation facilities.
- Safety: Target construction projects, enforcement, and education to save lives, reduce injuries, and protect property.
- Economic vitality: Improve freight movement and support economic sectors.
- Mobility: Facilitate movement of people and goods to contribute to a strong economy and a better quality of life for citizens.

- Environmental Quality and Health: Bring benefits to the environment and our citizens' health by improving the existing transportation infrastructure.

The Washington State Legislature also established similar issues as goals under RCW 47.04.280 for the planning, operation, and performance of, and investment in, the state's transportation system. The State Transportation goals include Preservation, Safety, Mobility, Environment and Stewardship.

Mr. Shambaugh reviewed the challenges facing Washington's aviation system:

- Unpredictable fuel tax revenues, shrinking federal budgets, and rising infrastructure costs create uncertainty for future air transportation funding.
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) forecasts predict significant increases and changes in aviation activity by 2030.
- Emerging technologies present opportunities for improved air transportation access and will require enhancements to airport infrastructure.
- Washington lacks a statewide strategy to ensure adequate aviation capacity to accommodate predicted growth.

Mr. Shambaugh then described the three-phase approach of LATS:

- Phase I: What we have (completed September 2006) – airport inventory, capacity and airspace assessment.
- Phase II: What we need (completed July 2007) – 25-year commercial service market forecast, air cargo forecast, high speed passenger rail assessment, future capacity analysis, system requirement.
- Phase III: How we meet the needs (completed by July 2009) – Governor-appointed Aviation Planning Council to provide recommendations for future airport strategy and investment statewide.

Mr. Shambaugh provided an overview of Washington's air transportation system, which consisted of 141 public use airports as of 2005, when the LATS study began. There are 139 public use airports today – 66 of those airports are included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). Their ownerships are as follows:

- WSDOT: 17
- Counties: 10
- Cities/towns: 44
- Port districts: 33
- Joint use: 5
- Private: 32

Air transportation activities in Washington State include tourism/personal travel, business travel, aviation-related business, freight/express and mail services, access to remote communities, agricultural activities, recreation, emergency medical transportation, search and rescue, firefighting, and disaster management.

Airports make significant contributions to our economy:

- 4 million takeoffs and landings.

- 17 million enplaned passengers.
- 600,000 tons of air cargo.
- 2001 economic impact study:
    - 171,000 jobs.
    - $4 billion in wages.
    - $18.5 billion in sales output.

Airports serve a variety of roles in the state aviation system including:

- Commercial service (16 airports) – accommodates at least 2,500 scheduled passenger boardings per year for at least 3 years.
- Regional service (19 airports) – serves large or multiple communities; all NPIAS relievers; 40 based aircraft and 4,000-foot long runway, with exceptions.
- Community service (23 airports) – serves a community; at least 20 based aircraft; paved runway.
- Local service (33 airports) – serves a community; fewer than 20 based aircraft; paved runway.
- Recreation or Remote (39 airports) – other land-based airports, including residential airparks.
- Seaplane Bases (9 airports) – identified by FAA as a seaplane base, unless it is a Commercial Service Airport.

Washington's public use airports are geographically dispersed and provide broad coverage to residents and visitors to the state. They are distributed across 14 RTPOs.

The LATS authorizing legislation identified four special emphasis regions of high population/economic activity for detailed aviation analysis:

- Puget Sound Region (King, Snohomish, Pierce, and Kitsap Counties) – 28 airports, 2 military airfields, 3.5 million population, 15 million annual enplanements in 2006.
- Southwest Region (Cowlitz and Clark Counties) – 8 airports, 4 airports are privately owned, 500,000 population, commercial service not reported in 2006.
- Spokane Region (Spokane County) – 5 public-use airports, 1 military base, 440,000 population, 1.6 million enplanements in 2006.
- Tri-Cities Region (Benton and Franklin Counties) – 4 airports, 220,000 population, 225,000 enplanements in 2006.

Mr. Shambaugh concluded by noting that, on average, $49.6 million is made available each year to public use airports in Washington. The annual transportation appropriations for WSDOT is:

- $1.9 billion for capital improvements.
- $188 million for preservation.
- $165 million for maintenance projects.

Sonjia Murray (SH&E) introduced SH&E and the rest of the consultant team. She provided an overview of LATS technical analysis:

- Looked at current day airport assessment and analysis of facilities and services.
- Looked at trends in national, regional, and statewide activity.
- Looked out 25 years to 2030 at demand forecasts for operations, based aircraft, passengers, and cargo.
- Looked at airport capacity utilization shortfalls or excesses 25 years out.
- Studied high-speed rail and whether it can help alleviate the airport system.

Ms. Murray noted that the high-speed rail study, performed by Cambridge Systematics, found that high-speed rail, in and of itself, could not alleviate the aviation system capacity needs.

Ms. Murray reviewed the Washington State Airport classifications, which identify an airport's role and contribution to the local, regional, statewide, and national air transportation system, such as Commercial Service, Seaplane Base, and Recreation or Remote. Airports were analyzed using performance objectives appropriate for the classifications, such as runway length, weather reporting, and fuel sales.

Council Member Garvett asked, "How do performance measures apply? For example, what if an airport has a runway of X length, but no demand? Or why expand a runway to that length at another airport if there is no demand?"

Council Member Roberts added, "What are airports doing today that they may not be doing tomorrow?"

Mr. Shambaugh responded that the performance measures varied depending on how the airport was classified. The airport classification system categorized airports by their contributions to the existing aviation system and the type and level of activity. Depending on capacity needs. Performance measures were structured to address emerging aviation issues and airport design standards for safety and efficiencies in to airport operations.

Council Member Loomis asked, "What happens if the capacity does not mesh with the airport master plans?"

Council Member Sealock stated that one should not put too much weight into the numbers (for example, only 67 percent of airports have navigation – but that may be the right number).

Council Member Field asked, "What is the relationship between framework and objectives for Transportation Commission?"

Council Member Sibold clarified that decisions about airports are made locally – many interest groups with many complexities at the local level. The Council's challenge is to drive it up to the policy level.

Ms. Murray continued her presentation, explaining that GA is a significant user of our state's airport system:

- GA operations represent 82 percent of the total aircraft operations in Washington State.
- GA is the predominant class of aviation activity at 122 of Washington's public use airports.
- The state's GA airports serve a broad range of activity.
- GA provides the benefits of aviation to communities lacking commercial air service airports.
- GA operations grew by four times the average in Washington compared to the rest of the U.S. (1.3 percent in Washington compared to 0.3 percent in the rest of the U.S.)

Ms. Murray then discussed air cargo activity, which encompasses three components:

- Freight: All-freight airlines and in the "belly" of scheduled passenger flights.
- Express Freight: Transported by integrated express carriers principally overnight or deferred envelopes, pouches and boxes, but some larger freight items.
- Mail: Air mail carried in belly of commercial planes and as freight by FedEx under contract with USPS.

Washington's cargo growth has tracked the U.S. average. Air freight in Washington and in the U.S. overall has grown at a rate of 1.5 percent per year over the past ten years. Washington's overall growth is forecast to follow the U.S. average of 3.8 percent annually, based on the Boeing forecast.

Ms. Murray then turned her presentation to commercial service. There is wide variation in the amount of passenger traffic and commercial operations among commercial airports. Sea-Tac is the dominant commercial airport – attracting passengers from across the state. Many smaller commercial service airports have lost air service in the last 10-15 years:

- Since 1995, all airports except Sea-Tac, Boeing Field, and several San Juan Island airports have lost some level of scheduled air service.
- 6 airports in Washington have lost scheduled service entirely.
- Some communities have significant leakage rates to larger surrounding airports due to greater availability of air service and lower fares.

Council Member Garvett asked, "Did you look at the loss of commercial service and its cause?"

Ms. Murray responded that the causes are market driven.

Ms. Murray continued her presentation. There exists a WSDOT-funded Small Community Air Service Development fund, which has money to market and promote existing service as well as seek new service.

LATS utilizes five airport capacity measures:

- Airfield and Landside Capacity: The ability of an airport's runway system to accommodate take-offs and landings without experiencing delays.
- Commercial Airline Passengers: The ability of an airport terminal to accommodate passengers.
- Air Cargo: The ability of an airport to accommodate processing of air cargo tonnage using existing facilities.
- Aircraft Storage: The ability of an airport to accommodate storage of based and transient aircraft tie-downs and hangars.
- Airspace System: The ability of available airspace to safely and efficiently accommodate aircraft in transit between airports.

Over 80 percent of airport operations in Washington State are GA. Currently, funding for hangars is generally not available – up to the private sector to fund.

Council Member Townsley asked, "Have ports pursued meeting needs for hangar growth?"

Council Member Sibold noted that airports are owned and controlled locally and the market drives activity.

Council Member Sealock remarked that we need to expand our views beyond bricks and mortars to new technologies.

Ms. Murray continued her presentation, providing highlights from LATS Phases I and II:

- Sea-Tac will be at capacity by 2024. O'Hare is also at capacity, but continues to operate. Are you willing to live with those delays?
- Overall, in the next 25 years there is substantial capacity in the aviation system statewide. However, available capacity is located in areas with low demand.
- Market and forecast analysis showed that growth in GA activity exceeding the national average.
- Air service at many small communities is at risk due to changing airline trends and market conditions.
- Every airport in the system is important – especially in areas with rising aviation activity. Airport closure or redistribution of aviation capacity may have cascading effects on other airports within the region.
- 15 airports have air cargo activity. The top three airports (Sea-Tac, Boeing Field, and Spokane) account for over 98 percent of all air cargo activities.

This information will be used in Phase III to identify challenges and opportunities, formulate and shape state aviation policies, and discuss strategies to meet existing and future needs.

Council Member Roberts suggested that the Growth Management Act (GMA) should be listed in the slide showing state statutes, as GMA discusses essential public facilities. He also suggested that the Council further discuss the following:

- How Boeing's contractual and operation issues pertain to local airports.

- How military air operations affect our aviation system (i.e., encroachment on military bases by growing communities – a problem noted in the most recent round of base closures).
- Paine Field statutory regulations pertaining to protecting Boeing's operations.
- B&O tax system adjustments made for any airplane manufacturers; Council Member Roberts noted that B&O tax credits were expanded recently.

Council Member Field asked if LATS includes information on GA demand forecasting.

Ms. Murray said yes, in Phase II.

Council Decision Process

Ms. Brogan provided an overview of the Council decision process.

Council Member Roberts asked where public involvement comes into play.

Ms. Brogan responded that, although public involvement will be ongoing, specific public outreach efforts will be structured to inform key Council decisions, such as during policy development and on proposed alternatives.

Ms. Brogan reviewed some of the decision process fundamentals:

- Consensus decision making model will provide decision makers with tools they need to make informed decisions.
- All points of view will have an opportunity to be expressed and recorded.
- Creative alternatives and compromise will be encouraged.
- May use other forms of decision-making (individual, compromise) when appropriate.

Public involvement is structured to support key Council actions.

Mr. Shambaugh stated that the FAA would be involved throughout the process and that the Council can direct questions to the FAA or the Technical Advisory Committee established in Phases I and II of the study.

Ms. Brogan noted that the FAA would provide a presentation to the Council – perhaps at the next meeting.

Council Member Sibold asked, "What if consensus is not possible?"

Ms. Brogan responded that the final report of the Council would capture everyone's point of view to reflect any differences of opinion. She added that the Council may use informal mechanisms such as straw polls, but the Council recommendations will generally follow a consensus model, rather than a "majority rules" approach.

Ms. Brogan then provided an overview of the public information program:

- Targeted information will be used to assure that stakeholders' information needs are met – this would include folios such as the one handed out today.
- The LATS Web site will provide on-going and current information on Council deliberations and technical studies – everything that the Council does will be posted on the Web site (technical reports, meeting summaries, etc.).
- Public information tools will include written and electronic information and media outreach.

We will be holding Council meetings around the state. There is strong media interest outside the Puget Sound area.

Other public outreach tools will include:

- Written and oral comments.
- All Council meetings will be open to the public.
- Regional meetings.
- WSDOT Aviation Speaker's Bureau – available for group presentations.
- Briefings.

Council Member Garvett asked, "Will there be media attention to our work?"

Ms. Brogan responded that the news media are an important way to get our message out to the public. We'll do our best to meet their requests with questions for information.

Bill McCready, Knowledge Networks, made a presentation on the online survey component of the outreach program. He noted that Knowledge Networks has been in business since 1999 and was the first research company to capture true sampling online. KN's online consumer and public opinion research tool uses randomly pre-recruited panel members. Those without computers are provided with computers. As a result, the samples include the 30 percent or so of households without Internet access.

This methodology supports decisions by reducing survey bias because it draws from full population spectrum – those with or without Internet access. Respondents are selected via random sampling. Mr. McCready further noted that Knowledge Networks also makes repeated attempts to involve non-responders; intensive panel management.

The Knowledge Networks panel is statistically valid:

- There are approximately 1,500 individuals in their Washington State sample.
- Panel members are randomly recruited by telephone and provided with access to the Internet.
- Panelists are paid for their participation. No volunteers allowed.
- Knowledge Networks captures the full range of citizens and accurately represents the population.
- The Knowledge Networks panel is compared to the Census CPS on a monthly basis.
- The panel is representative of population minority groups. They will start recruiting in Spanish starting this month.

Ms. Brogan reviewed the electronic town hall meetings, which will also be implemented with the support of Knowledge Networks. The electronic town hall meetings will be held prior to key decision points and will include the following features:

- 60 minutes long with 150 participants per meeting, selected from the Knowledge Networks statewide sample; provided a stipend for their participation.
- Interactive and moderated in an interactive chat environment.
- Includes visual and graphic displays.
- All communication is saved as data.
- Meetings timed to support the Council's decision process:
    - Problem definition phase.
    - System investment alternatives.

Council Member Townsley asked, "Will lower income respondents be more likely to participate because of the incentive? Are we introducing bias?"

Mr. McCready responded that the payments are not extreme enough to cause participants to change their opinions. But they are paid for their time.

Council Member McNamara asked, "Will participants have a background in LATS?"

Mr. McCready responded that they would not unless you tell them. Participants can start with a cold opinion, or you can send them information in advance, you can share it with them during the chat, etc.

Council Member Sealock observed that it seems like there would be a steep learning curve. "What can we expect from participants?"

Ms. Brogan responded that we do not want to require participants to get into technical information, we would like to understand their values. We can also do an online survey of just GA pilots.

Council Member Sibold stated that it is everyone's aviation system. That is why we are taking a look at the state system. It needs to be more than our own special interest, which is why we need to go through this public process and get public input. When it comes down to decisions, that's when there will be attention. In the end, everyone will say, "What did you do?"

Ms. Brogan then described the approach for the LATS statewide online survey:

- 1,000 randomly selected Washington State residents sampling (RDD) pre-recruited by Knowledge Networks.
- 15-minute survey.
- Assesses public opinion on the issues and alternatives.
- Can include some static graphics, such as maps or charts.
- Conducted prior to final recommendations of the Council.

One additional feature of this methodology is that real-time changes in opinion can be captured. For example, during the 2004 presidential debates, a scientific sample of uncommitted voters on the Knowledge Networks panel provided CBS News moment-by-moment real time feedback on cbsnews.com.

This approach will be conducted in addition to traditional outreach methods and provide opportunity for higher quality input across geographic distances. We will obtain representative input in two ways:

- Electronic Town Halls:
    - Representative sample, geographically dispersed.
    - Cost effective.
    - Moderated, with ability to present complex information in graphic form.
- Electronic Survey:
    - Representative sample.
    - Ability to present complex information in graphic form.

Ms. Brogan next reviewed the draft Council Charter – the Council will be asked to approve the Charter at its next meeting. The Charter addresses:

- Purpose and authority
- Membership
- Structure
- Responsibilities:
    - Council Members.
    - Staff.
    - WSDOT Aviation and technical consultant team.

All Council meetings will be open to the public.

WSDOT will issue media releases for meetings, key decision points, etc. A media protocol has been developed for the Council, and Council members are requested to forward media request to Ms. Brogan or Chair Moser. Please feel free to contact Ms. Brogan directly at any time or copy her on any emails from new media.

The Council is not a quasi-judicial body and is therefore not bound by restrictions related to exparte communications. However, this is a transparent process – anything a Council member says or writes can be disclosed to the public. Council members are free to contact the consultants with questions, but please copy Ms. Brogan.

Council Member Garvett asked, "How we should balance our own feelings/views/concerns vs. our constituencies' concerns?"

Council Member Sibold suggested that during policy development, Council members should set aside personal perspectives. Legislation mandates constituency groups – it is expected that members do just that. Council staff (Ms. Brogan and Steve Smith) will work with WSDOT Aviation to make sure the Council has everything it needs to make

informed decisions. Anything needed for decision-making will be provided to the Council in advance of its meetings.

Council members should review the draft Charter and provide suggestions. Council members should provide those suggestions to staff so that they can make changes in track changes mode for discussion at the next meeting.

The Public Involvement Plan is also provided in the Resource Notebook for Council review. It is anticipated that to the Council will approve the PI Plan at the next meeting.

Mr. Shambaugh then reviewed a proposed schedule with Council members.

- Ten Council meetings proposed.
- Meetings will be held in the Seattle (65 percent) area, Spokane (20 percent), and Tri-Cities (15 percent) areas.
- Meetings are proposed to be between 3 and 4 hours on the 3rd Wednesday of every month.
- Next meeting is proposed for January 16, 2008.

It is suggested that the next meeting be held on February 7, the first Thursday of the month – same as today's meeting.

The Council seems to be interested in meeting in January, if there is enough content. January 3, perhaps.

Council staff will confer with the Chair on topics to be covered at a potential January meeting. Staff will notify the Council of next steps.

Meeting location for Seattle will remain the Museum of Flight. Council staff will develop a full program of when/where meetings will be held.

Different resources will be available to the Council at meetings (e.g., FAA to discuss NPIAS, small community airports, etc.).

Marilee Pribble then reviewed administrative procedures:

- Information is included under the administration tab in the binder.
- Contact WSDOT Aviation for all travel arrangements to ensure reimbursement.
- Ms. Pribble can make all airline reservations for Council members (pre-paid).
- She can also make hotel reservations for Council members (not pre-paid).
- Send all expense claims on WSDOT Travel Expense Voucher with original receipts.
- Ms. Pribble is main contact – 360.651.6302 or pribblm@wsdot.wa.gov.
- Reviewed the travel voucher and how to fill out the form with the Council.

Chair Moser suggested that Council staff develop a 1-page sheet that has Council contact information, staff contact info, and consultant contact info.

Ms. Brogan reviewed next steps:

- Select a Vice-Chair.
- Approve Charter.
- Approve Public Involvement Plan.
- Review of LATS study findings.
- Proposed date for next meeting.

Chair Moser asked, "What policy recommendations from AIRTRAC were acted on? Which ones were not? Why or why not? Council wants to avoid falling into the same trap. Could someone come and present on AIRTRAC?"

Council Member Loomis said she would appreciate any comment from Paula Hammond or greater appreciation or priority from her for aviation. What is the level of endorsement from WSDOT Secretary?

Council Member Sealock observed that capacity is the data that always comes up. We need to focus on more than just capacity.

Ms. Murray remarked that there are a lot of external things that we cannot control, but WSDOT can put a system plan in place.

Council Member Sibold shared that WSDOT Aviation has struggled with the question: is it capacity or is it capacity constraint?

Conclusion

Chair Moser asked that each Council member express the key questions on their minds moving into the development of a State Aviation Strategy.

Council Member Sealock observed that focusing on the numbers could be a pitfall. For example, Spokane may have X capacity, but it may not be at a time desirable to others.

Council Member McNamara asked, "What could the Legislature do to make local jurisdiction write (or implement) comprehensive plans that incorporate airports and GA? Maybe someone from CTED could present an Aviation 101 on how GMA comes into play? Some emphasis needs to be applied to what role GMA plays."

Mr. Shambaugh stated that the Council might wish to consider what are some legislative changes that may be required with respect to GMA.

Council Member Townsley also suggested that the Council review the effects of sales or B&O tax structure on maintaining a healthy GA business environment. What are the competitive advantages and disadvantages, especially considering our neighbors to the south have no sales tax or B&O tax? Tax policy that is unique to Washington and the regulatory structure unique to Washington.

Council Member Sibold added that we might have to look at how we fund our aviation system. Council must be well educated on fuel taxes, ticket taxes, etc. Some tutorial work needs to be done.

Council Member Townsley posed a question about airplanes that are in the shop for maintenance for 1 hour for every 4 or 5 hours flown. "Will the owner take that plane to Idaho or to Washington for maintenance work?"

Council Member Sibold stated that land use is an important issue to address.

Chair Moser noted that there were a number of land use proposals in AIRTRAC, but very few have been adopted. She would like more information about why that is the case.

Council Member Roberts said that he shares views expressed on land use and management. We need to factor in, well down the road, getting to and from airports. Our carbon footprint should be kept in mind. It's important to put the environmental issues on the table.

Council Member Garvett stated that more than just taxes play into competitiveness.

Council Member Sealock stated that 38 percent of our business comes from outside the state. It's significant if you lose relevance in the aviation business.

Council Member Loomis stated that one of the few transportation modes that pays sales tax on our fuel at the airport.

Jill Satran suggested that we keep in mind the systemic impacts as a transportation system, other modes.

Ms. Murray said that doing this kind of planning keeps you current. She agrees with Council Member Garvett that forecasting is more of an art than a science. For a state with the kind of aviation activity we have here, the funding is lacking (referring to Mr. Shambaugh's earlier slide on airport funding).

A discussion followed about the time and location of the next meeting. WSDOT Aviation staff will work with Chair Moser to determine a time that will work for most participants.

Chair Moser closed the meeting at 2:30 p.m.