

March 10, 2009

TO: Airport Futures Planning Advisory Group Members (PAG)

FROM: Lise Glancy, Port of Portland
Bronwyn Buckle, City of Portland

SUBJECT: Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS) Work Session at March 17 PAG

At the March 17 PAG meeting, the Public Involvement Subcommittee will ask the PAG for their preliminary feedback on three key elements which will help define the parameters of a future standing advisory committee for Portland International Airport and the surrounding area – often referred to as the Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS). The three elements that we will discuss in this work session are: 1) Scope/Purview, 2) Sponsorship, and 3) Membership. This work session is part of an iterative process for crafting a final PAG recommendation on OPIS.

We will not focus on Authority and Resources on March 17. While important, these elements will largely be influenced by the OPIS' Scope/Purview and will require agreement by the ultimate OPIS Sponsors. The Public Involvement Subcommittee's intention is that the OPIS be a highly influencing advisory committee and that modest in-house staffing from both the City and Port is desired to support this ongoing body. The Public Involvement Subcommittee will make recommendations on Authority and Resources at future subcommittee meetings and incorporate them into a more defined OPIS proposal. This OPIS proposal will be shared with the PAG in June 2009.

To help get the PAG thinking about these exercises, project staff prepared the following:

- Definitions of each of the three elements,
- Options being considered for each element,
- Public Involvement Subcommittee's current preferences for these elements, and
- The questions we'd like PAG feedback on.

We encourage you to review this material in advance of our PAG meeting to help ensure a more robust discussion. Please note that the questions in these exercises are drafts; we are still working out the details, but they will give you a good sense of the type of feedback we hope to take back to the Public Involvement Subcommittee. Our desire is to use the voting machines to do some of the preliminary polling on these issues. We hope you will find this engaging.

Scope/Purview

Scope/Purview is defined as the OPIS' charge or the main issues/specific areas of responsibility that the OPIS will focus on. In discussing this element, the Public Involvement Subcommittee's goal is to have OPIS focus on gaps in coverage, not duplicate the work of existing bodies.

Attached to this memo (**PAG Attachment #4B**) is a diagram of the five areas that the Public Involvement Subcommittee believes OPIS should be involved with in the future. As you can see

from this diagram, the proposed Scope/Purview is fairly comprehensive in nature and intended to provide a regional sounding board for the Port Commission, Portland City Council, and other jurisdictions in the region on PDX and other surrounding area issues.

The boxes on the left-hand side of the diagram represent the general areas of focus for OPIS. The boxes on the right-hand side reflect the specific areas of potential responsibility. The middle boxes emphasize that the Scope/Purview, as well as other elements of the OPIS, will be informed by the ongoing work of other PAG subcommittees. For example, the work of the Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee on sustainability benchmarks will inform the final responsibilities related to sustainability in the OPIS Scope/Purview.

During our March 17 OPIS work session, we would like the PAG to provide feedback on the specific responsibilities in the boxes on the right-hand side:

- 1) Would you add anything to the Specific Responsibilities column?**
- 2) Would you eliminate anything?**
- 3) What wording of the existing language would you clarify?**
- 4) Considering the current overall Public Involvement Subcommittee recommendations for Specific Responsibilities, how comfortable are you with them on a scale of 1 – 7 with: 1) Fully Support, 4) Neutral, and 7) Fully Oppose?**

One area of the Scope/Purview that the Public Involvement Subcommittee has not fully addressed is how the OPIS will relate to other standing PDX committees (e.g., PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee, PDX Wildlife Committee). The Public Involvement Subcommittee recognizes that noise and wildlife issues are likely to surface in any future OPIS discussions and that coordination/collaboration with these standing bodies will be needed. The general bias is to honor the existing work of these bodies. However, additional dialogue on this point is needed. *The relationship to these other PDX standing committees is NOT an issue that we will discuss in the March 17 OPIS work session.*

Sponsorship

Sponsorship is defined as the jurisdictions that will create and sustain the OPIS by some legal mechanism (i.e., resolution, intergovernmental agreement, or memorandum of understanding). The sponsors will define the OPIS' parameters, confirm/make appointments, provide committee resources, receive regular reports on the work, and evaluate performance and future structure based on OPIS feedback.

While the Public Involvement Subcommittee has expressed a preference for joint sponsorship of the future OPIS, five possible sponsorship options have been proposed:

- 1) Port only sponsorship,
- 2) City only sponsorship,
- 3) Port-City sponsorship,
- 4) Regional sponsorship with 4 jurisdictions (City of Portland, Port of Portland, City of Vancouver, and Metro), or
- 5) Regional sponsorship with 8 jurisdictions (above plus Clackamas County, Multnomah County and Washington County in Oregon and Clark County in Southwest Washington)

Other variations of the above may be identified through this exercise.

During the March 17 OPIS work session, the questions on which the Public Involvement Subcommittee would like feedback from the PAG are:

- 1) What other Sponsorship options would you add to this list?**
- 2) What are the advantages and disadvantages of each option?**
- 3) Rank the Sponsorship options (including new options proposed) by noting your first, second, and third choices.**

Final decisions on Sponsorship will need to be negotiated and require additional conversations, particularly if sponsorship includes a commitment to provide some level of resources for this committee (funding or staff). *As noted earlier, we will NOT be addressing Resource issues at the March 17 OPIS work session.*

Membership

Membership is defined as the size and composition of the future OPIS. In other words, how many members should be on the committee, what interests should be at the table, and what role should they play? Should some members be elected officials? Should there be technical or non-voting members?

The Public Involvement Subcommittee's preliminary preference is that OPIS be PAG-like in nature with diverse regional interests represented and the size of the body ranging from 15-20 members or 20-30 members. Attached is a list of current PAG interests as well as other interests identified by the Public Involvement Subcommittee and staff (**Attachment 4C**). One possibility is that appointments to OPIS will be made similar to the process used for the PAG, but this will be discussed in more detail at future subcommittee meetings.

During the March 17 OPIS work session, the questions that the Public Involvement Subcommittee would like feedback from the PAG on are:

- 1) What is your overall goal for the composition of OPIS membership?**
- 2) What other interests do you think should be at the table?**
- 3) Which category does each interest best belong in?**
- 4) What are the advantages and disadvantages of using the PAG system for OPIS?**

Attachments (2)