

Planning Advisory Group Meeting #13
Tuesday, March 17, 2009 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Port of Portland, Commission Room, 121 NW Everett, Portland, OR

DRAFT NOTES

Announcements, Approval of Meeting Notes, Agenda Review, and PAG Action Items – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati

Sam Imperati welcomed everyone to the PAG meeting. Bill Blosser explained that we have a new format tonight, along with a new room set up. We have round tables for small group discussion, which will be in the second half of the meeting. Because we want to leave ample time for discussion during the Public Involvement exercise, we may go over to 8:45 pm.

Absent from tonight's meeting are Tom Gerharter, Dennis Mulvihill, Brian Nelson, and Lawrence Russell. Hector's dad passed away and he regrets that he is not here tonight for the OPIS exercise, but he is back in New York with his family.

Approval of Meeting Notes – Bill Blosser

Bill asked if there were any comments on last meeting's notes. Erwin Bergman pointed out several typos in his presentation; Melissa will make corrections. The Meeting Notes from 2/17/09 were approved with the corrections noted by Erwin Bergman.

Announcements and Agenda Review – Sam Imperati

Sam drew everyone's attention to the two-page memo from Chris and Jay. The short version is that SB 169 does not appear to be going anywhere in the Legislature. The memo also contains some explanation about the budget issues for both the City and the Port.

Concerning tonight's agenda, we will try to stay on time today, just as we always do. The staff has suggested that, instead of additional full PAG meetings, we have special, voluntary information meetings. Members can decide attendance based on subject matter and interest. The meeting topics are: Noise, the City Sustainability efforts (similar to Port's recent presentation), and the Port's Air Service Development.

Clipboards were passed around so folks could sign up and indicate time and date preferences. Staff will send out emails to all to summarize the schedules; the meetings will be open to public; written or oral presentations will occur at subsequent PAG meetings. This is an effort to keep process on schedule, but still go in depth on the necessary subjects.

Sam then announced that we will need a July meeting. Staff will poll the PAG re: which date works best. (July 14th was the date selected for the July PAG meeting.)

Next, Sam introduced the two main features on the agenda tonight. First, there will be C.F.'s presentation on the 90th Percentile Forecast Centralized Terminal Concept Viability Assessment. After C.F.'s presentation, the PAG will be asked to vote on several questions.

Second big piece tonight is on the OPIS. We want the PAG's feedback to give to the Public Involvement Subcommittee on the scope and purview, who should sponsor, and the membership composition.

Erwin Bergman: is OPIS an ongoing committee?

Lise Glancy: yes; how long will be determined by the sponsors with input from the OPIS. It will go on and be adjusted as time goes on based on annual reviews, and may be sunsetted at the appropriate juncture.

Members	Affiliation	Present
Erwin Bergman	Central NE Neighborhoods	√
Bill Blosser	Chair	√
Mark Clark	E. County	√
Andy Cotugno	Metro	√
Bruce Fisher	FAA	
John Frevola	Flightcraft	
Tom Gerharter	Horizon Airlines	
Cam Gilmour	Clackamas County	
Alan Hargrave	Port of Camas/Washougal	√
Chris Hathaway	Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership	√
Laura Hudson	City of Vancouver	√
Maryhelen Kincaid	N. Portland Neighborhood Services	√
Lt Col. Stuart Mathew	ORANG	√
Patrick Metzger	NE Coalition of Neighborhoods	√
John Mohlis	Columbia Pacific Building Trades	√
Dennis Mulvihill	Washington County	
Brian Nelson	Intel	
Mary Olson	Port Commissioner	√
Lai-Lani Ovalles	Planning Commissioner	√
Alesia Reese	E. Portland Neighborhood Office	√
Veronica Rinard	Travel Portland	√
Hector Roche	Multnomah Co. Community Liaison	
Lawrence Russell	Environmental Justice	
Bob Sallinger	Audubon Society of Portland	√
Michael Sloan	Vancouver Neighborhoods	
Dave Smith	Vice Chair	√
Denny Stoecklin	Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Fred Stovel	Office of Neighborhood Involvement	√
Vicki Thompson	PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	√
John Weigant	Airport Issues Roundtable	√

Staff & Consultants	Affiliation	Present
Debbie Bishop	Port – Noise and Long Range Planning	
C.F. Booth	Port's Aviation Consultant (Jacobs Consultancy)	√
Mindy Brooks	City Planning Bureau	√
Bronwyn Buckle	City Planning Bureau	√
Chris Corich	Port's Project Manager	√
Renee Dowlin	Port – PDX Environmental	√
Melissa Egan	Assistant to Facilitator, ICM	√
Jason Gately	Port – Long Range Planning	
John Gray	City Office of Transportation	√
Lise Glancy	Port – Government Relations	√
Nancy Hendrickson	City Bureau of Environmental Services	√

Sam Imperati	Facilitator (ICM)	√
Stan Jones	Port – PDX Environmental Compliance	
Scott King	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Sean Loughran	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Melissa McCluney	Port – Long Range Planning	√
Phil Ralston	Port – PDX Environmental	
Kelly Rodgers	David Evans and Assoc.	√
Dennis Sandstrom	Port Community Affairs	
Kama Simonds	Port Media Relations	√
Jay Sugnet	City's Project Manager	√
Rachel Wray	Port Community Affairs	

Public Present: Duane Decker, Lee Perlman, and Kelly Sweeney.

2035 90th Percentile Forecast Centralized Terminal Concept Viability Assessment – C.F. Booth

C.F. went over a PowerPoint, which covered the process and considerations of the assessment they conducted to examine the 2035 90% percentile forecast. He explained the analysis that has occurred and some of the analysis that will occur.

Slide 11: Approach

Three-part assessment for 2035 90th percentile forecast demand

- **Key terminal elements**
 - Terminal expansion east
 - Aircraft parking and remain overnight positions

- **Key landslide elements**
 - NE Airport Way
 - Rental car facilities
 - Cell phone lot
 - Curbs (enplaning, deplaning and commercial)
 - Parking
 - MAX light rail
 - Ground transportation providers hold lot

- **Ability to accommodate displaced facilities**

- **Other functions (e.g., cargo and military) outside core development to be assessed as part of 50% & 75% plan**

C.F. examined all the above elements and came away with the following conclusions:

Slides 28 and 29: Conclusions

1. **Major facilities good for 2035 50th percentile demand (27 MAP)**
2. **Manageable challenges for 2035th 90th percentile demand (43 MAP)**
3. **Challenges at 2035 90th percentile demand and potential solutions:**
 - Roadways – concern is off Airport
 - Curbside – requirements can be met thorough operational strategies
 - Parking – reduced percentage of total parking provided close-in
 - Taxiways – realign Concourse A to extend Taxiway T

- Remain overnight aircraft parking – do the best possible
- Travel distances – automated people mover system

4. Centralized concept is viable.

- **Opportunities exist for creative and sustainable solutions**
- **Centralized concept**
 - Is flexible and can provide reasonable level of service
 - Can be effectively phased and built
 - Is sustainable
- **Ability to modify or switch concepts will exist for years**
 - Could be dictated by changes in circumstances (e.g. advances in technology, modified passenger behavior, new security regulations) or dissatisfaction with level of service
 - Decision to switch concepts needed before building terminal expansion east or satellite concourse
- **Sufficient analysis completed; proceed with planning**
- **No need to test Decentralized concept at this time**

Discussion and Voting on above conclusions

Veronica Rinard: why are you not considering connecting passengers in your total number of passengers?

C.F. Booth: we are still using the total number of passengers for some calculations, including vendors and gates. For this level of analysis, the real driver in terms of required facilities is originating passengers. It is originating passengers that generate most of the terminal roadway, parking, and other passenger processing challenges.

Bob Sallinger: define sustainable.

C.F. Booth: this Centralized concept is more sustainable than the Decentralized, based on rough but obvious measures such as vehicle miles traveled (one location vs. two), duplication of facilities (e.g. transfer of baggage). With this concept, we have to force ourselves to be more efficient when considering what to do with curbside operations, changes passenger behavior, and change parking, etc.

Bill Blosser: thinks he knows where Bob is going – he had the same reaction. The point is that the centralized terminal concept is more sustainable than decentralized. It is certainly not “sustainable” in the purest sense of the word.

Alesia Reese: do you take in broader, regional impacts outside the airport?

C.F. Booth: we do; the Port has launched a study of the broader transportation impacts. That is being done right now in partnership with the City.

Alesia Reese: when you talk about digging down Airport Way, seems like there could be less expensive solution.

C.F. Booth: agreed, it is expensive. The concepts tonight are not necessarily the best, but they are examples we used when looking at options. In a Master Plan, we will not be trying to design these facilities. We are thinking about location and not fouling up something for the long haul.

Sam then asked the PAG to vote on the following:

- Does PAG agree Centralized concept
 - Presents manageable challenges and opportunities for sustainable solutions
 - Is flexible and can provide reasonable levels of service
 - Can be effectively phased and built
 - Is sustainable
 - Can be modified if dictated by changes in circumstances (e.g., advances in technology, modified passenger behavior, new security regulations)
- Has planning team completed sufficient analysis to proceed with planning for Centralized concept
- Does PAG agree there is no need to test Decentralized concept at this time

All PAG members present voted 1 on all three; the one exception was Bob Sallinger on Conclusion #1, he voted 2.

Bob Sallinger: he thinks the definition of “sustainable” in this case is appropriate.

Sam Imperati: would you change your vote from a 2 to a 1 with “Is sustainable” changed to “More sustainable” as Bill was referring to earlier?

Bob Sallinger: Yes, that would be fine.

Public Comment

Sam asked if there was any public comment. There were no members of the public present who wanted to make a comment.

John Weigant: staff has done a superb job on planning. The choice to move to centralized concept has merit; the issues of environment and economy and world around us are going to be more significant than we are acknowledging. His concern is reflected by Bob’s comment; both concepts are adequate to move ahead and we need more focus on sustainability issues and what we can do.

Sam Imperati: there is going to be a Sustainability Subcommittee meeting to deal with those and other issues on April 8. There will be a MP/Sustainability Subcommittee meeting on April 29 to deal in depth with these issues.

Ongoing Public Involvement Work Session – Lise Glancy, Bronwyn Buckle, Jay Sugnet, and Sam Imperati

SAM: Overview

Tonight, the Public Involvement Subcommittee will ask the PAG for their preliminary feedback on three of the five key elements that will help define the parameters of a future standing advisory committee for PDX and the surrounding area – often referred to as the Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy (OPIS).

This will be highly participatory. We will refresh your memories on the OPIS, consolidate our tables for small group discussions, and then return to the large group to use the electronic polling for preferences.

Background on OPIS before exercise:

Seven OPIS Goals:

1. Builds on partnership/trust from Airport Futures planning process – IGA requirement
2. Tracks commitments from Airport Futures process (Master Plan, Plan District, Sustainability, Community Agreements)
3. Supplements some Plan District regulatory requirements
4. Offers forum for two-way community engagement
5. Informs Port and City decision-making processes
6. Fills gaps – does not duplicate work of existing committees
7. Is sustainable – keeps interests at table with input opportunities, has resources to sustain, and offers the ability to evaluate and alter over time

OPIS work to date. We reviewed 21 case studies during fall 2008 research and drew from those, and the experience of the Public Involvement Subcommittee members to create variables.

(The case studies included AIRPORT (12): 1) Austin-Bergstrom International Airport Advisory Committee, 2) Boston Logan International Airport Community Advisory Committee, 3) Los Angeles International Airport Area Advisory Committee, 4) Minneapolis–St. Paul International Noise Oversight Committee, 5) O’Hare International Airport Noise Compatibility Commission, 6) Oakland Airport Noise Management Forum, 7) San Francisco International Community Roundtable, 8) Hillsboro Airport Issues Roundtable, 9) PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee, 10) PDX Wildlife Committee, 11) PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee, and 12) PDX International Air Service Committee; LOCAL/REGIONAL (9): 1) Airport Issues Roundtable, 2) Portland Planning Commission, 3) City of Portland Public Advisory Council, 4) Portland Multnomah Progress Board, 5) Multnomah County/City of Portland Sustainability Commission, 6) Portland Utility Review Board, 7) Portland Urban Forestry Commission, 8) Portland Parks Board, and 9) Columbia Slough Watershed Council.)

Five elements Public Involvement Subcommittee has focused on:

1. Scope / Purview
2. Sponsorship
3. Membership
4. Authority
5. Resources

The three elements that we will discuss in this work session are: 1) Scope/Purview, 2) Sponsorship, and 3) Membership.

We will **NOT** discuss 4) Authority tonight until Scope / Purview is more firmly established because general role is advisory, with range of engagement depending on issues. While important, this will, in part, be largely determined by the OPIS’ Scope/Purview and will require agreement by the OPIS Sponsors. The Public Involvement Subcommittee’s intention is that the OPIS be a highly influencing advisory committee.

We **WILL NOT** discuss 5) Resources tonight because we have general agreement, resources will likely be modest, shared City-Port part-time staffing, likely existing staff. Additionally, Resources will be determined by the Sponsors. The Public Involvement Subcommittee’s intention is that modest in-house staffing from both the City and Port is desired to support this ongoing body.

Please remember we are taking the pulse of the PAG for Subcommittee consideration – these are NOT final PAG votes.

This is an iterative process for crafting a final subcommittee, and then, PAG recommendation, in June. We will be using the voting machines tonight to do some of the preliminary polling on these issues. We hope you will find this engaging.

LISE: Scope/Purview

Scope/Purview is defined as the committee's charge or the main issues/specific areas of responsibility which 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.

On the 11 x 17 size paper in front of you is a diagram of the five areas in which the Public Involvement Subcommittee believes OPIS should have some involvement. 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 first column of boxes on the diagram represents the general areas of focus for OPIS. The second column of 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. The third column of boxes reflects the specific areas of responsibility, which the OPIS may be engaged. The fourth column is for your notes.

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, which we will discuss tonight.*

Questions we will ask you tonight in small groups:

- 1) (Small Group) Would you add anything to the Specific Responsibilities proposed by the Public Involvement Subcommittee (third column)?**
- 2) (Small Group) Would you eliminate anything?**
- 3) (Small Group) Please make specific notes you want to share with the Public Involvement Subcommittee in the blank Note boxes on the handout especially where you are not comfortable with an OPIS function and the areas of specific responsibilities you would like to see language changed.**
- 4) (Big Group) On a scale of 1 – 5, how comfortable are you with the five main areas of OPIS focus proposed by the Public Involvement Subcommittee?**
 - a) Fully Support**
 - b) Somewhat Support**
 - c) Neutral**
 - d) Oppose Somewhat**
 - e) Fully Oppose**

JAY: Sponsorship

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

Please note that Sponsors create the OPIS formally, confirm all Members, and may make some Member appointments to the PAG. Membership relates to the size of and interests on OPIS. *How members are appointed has NOT yet been determined.* One model could be the current PAG membership model where interest jurisdictions/organizations make their own appointments with Port and City confirmation, and the City-Port Sponsors jointly make appointments where for interests where there are multiple organizations and confirm all appointments. *This is not a topic we will be discussing tonight.*

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 tonight.*

The Public Involvement Subcommittee has expressed a preliminary preference for joint sponsorship of the future OPIS. However, in order to explore the question more fully, they have proposed a total of five possible sponsorship options for consideration by the PAG. They are listed on the yellow sheet in front of you:

- 1) Port only
- 2) City only
- 3) Port-City
- 4) Regional with 4 jurisdictions (City of Portland, Port of Portland, City of Vancouver, and Metro)
- 5) Regional 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.
Questions we will ask you tonight in small groups:

- 1) **(Small Group) What are your top two Sponsorship options?**
- 2) **What are the reasons to support (advantages) the selection of your top two Sponsorship options?**
- 3) **(Small Group) What are the reasons to NOT support (challenges) the selection of your top two Sponsorship options?**
- 4) **(Small Group) Add, any other Sponsorship options would you add to this list?**
- 5) **(Big Group) Rank the Sponsorship options by noting your first and second choices.**

SAM: 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 and/or citizens? Should there be technical ad hoc non-voting members or ex officio, 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. The purple handout shows a list of current PAG interests **as well as** other interests identified by the Public Involvement Subcommittee and staff.

As with the PAG, the general assumption is that appointments would be from the jurisdictions and/or organizations representing the interests identified. Those interests where no one organization exists would be jointly appointed by the sponsors based on applications. 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 meetings.

Explain the four categories on the purple sheet.

- “Voting” members would operate very similarly to the PAG members today. Voting members would sit at the table and have full voting rights.
- “Non-voting/Ex Officio” members would sit at the table with voting members, participate in discussions, and share their expertise, but NOT vote on issues. An example of a non-voting member is the FAA on the current PAG.
- “Technical Advisors” would provide advice or expertise on specific issues as needed. An example of this would be staff, consultants, and Technical Advisory Pool from the current PAG. Other examples could include noise, wildlife, etc. It is possible that the OPIS voting membership could be small with large number of technical/ex officio members. The PAG has some flexibility for how it recommends the OPIS be structured. Individuals or agencies that are determined to **not** need representation can interact with the OPIS in other ways. Meetings will be open to the public.

Questions we will ask you tonight in Big Group after the Small Group exercises:

- 1) **What is the ideal size of the OPIS committee?**
- 2) **How comfortable are you with the current PAG interests participating in OPIS?**
 - If time, note concerns about which PAG interests you have a concern with continued participation and the reasons why in the notes column on the front side of the sheet.
- 3) **Which category does each of the additional interests best belong in?**
- 4) **Add any comments you may have about membership or other participation in the OPIS on the back page of the exercise sheet.**

Break

Ongoing Public Involvement Work Session - All

The group gathered around three tables of approximately 6-8 people each. The scribe facilitated and someone was chosen to be the spokesperson for each table.

Report Outs and PAG Discussion – All

1. Top Two Things to Add to Scope/Purview

Table 2 – nothing for report outs.

[Butcher paper: Would you add anything to responsibility column: NO. What is Follow-on: e.g., ticket lobby will need a plan when its time, rental car facility. What does compliance mean: Plan District will allow but they will still go to OPIS for input. Will other groups form, too? Is it too much: Nothing to add if independent Transp. Remove: Possibly, if there will only be superficial coverage. Priority to keep would be implement land use package. Remove: the OPIS does not need to participate in the next M. Plan? Remove: Sustainability and make its own committee, like wildlife or tech advisory committee. This group could be involved with sustainability at high level.]

Table 6 – a few minor word choice suggestions

[Butcher paper: Comments are passive! I.e. receive updates as example. Better: Review and Comment. Refine and Develop. Add Authority (to escalate → Community Engagement) on some Land Use decisions. Impacts → OPIS. Monitor Master Plan. Massive due to regional size. Split 1A) Different cycle to Master Plan. 2E) Add Ideas to line]

Table 4 – different if a project is in the Master Plan, or if it is not currently in the MP.

[Butcher paper: Add Anything?: In Master Plan = design input. Not in Master Plan = input about shout it be added. Sustainability: Monitor efforts in Region and other airports. Eliminate Anything?: 5b – legislation issues not appropriate for OPIS, and 5a – add including input on State/Fed legislation. Don't take anything out until we know more about sponsorship/responsibilities.]

Bob Sallinger: take sustainability off and develop a separate Technical Advisory Committee.

Andy Cotugno: there should be annual report to sponsors.

2. Top Two Things to Eliminate from Scope/Purview

Table 2 – take sustainability off and develop Technical Advisory Committee

Table 6 - no

Table 4 – do not take anything out until we know more about sponsorship; 5A, legislation

Fred Stovel: do not make OPIS and PAG synonymous, they have different charges. Lise's letter says this is regional in scope, but in terms of who sponsors, it is actually the Port and City. Others may be interested, but they do not have a dog in the fight.

3. Top Two Reasons to Support (Advantages) Your Top Two Sponsorships Priorities

- A. Port only sponsorship,
- B. City only sponsorship,
- C. Port-City sponsorship,
- D. Regional sponsorship with 4 jurisdictions (City of Portland, Port of Portland, City of Vancouver, and Metro), or
- E. Regional sponsorship with 8 jurisdictions (above plus Clackamas County, Multnomah County and Washington County in Oregon and Clark County in Southwest Washington)

Table 2 – liked D the most, C second, E not too far behind

Advantages – known, maintains structure of current PAG, relatively easy to manage

Table 6 – option C

Advantages – City and Port in control of the impact

Table 4 – regional 4, then Port-City

Advantages – known, maintains structure of current PAG

Advantages – Andy came very close to committing funds!

Sam Imperati: two most popular options were C. Port-City and D. Regional 4

4. Top Two Reasons to NOT Support (Challenges) Your Top Two Sponsorship Priorities

Table 2 – possibly too limited (re: city-port)

Disadvantages – size and complexity

Table 4 – too narrow (re: city-port)

Support Somewhat		42.11%	8
Neutral		0%	0
Oppose Somewhat		0%	0
Fully Oppose		5.26%	1
	Totals	100%	19

5. How comfortable are you with the “Other” function in the Scope/ Purview?

				Responses	
				(percent)	(count)
Fully Support		25%	5		
Support Somewhat		40%	8		
Neutral		30%	6		
Oppose Somewhat		5%	1		
Fully Oppose		0%	0		
	Totals	100%	20		

6. What is your first choice for a sponsorship structure at this moment in time?

				Responses	
				(percent)	(count)
Port only sponsorship		0%	0		
City only sponsorship		0%	0		
Port-City sponsorship		65%	13		
Regional sponsorship with 4 jurisdictions		30%	6		
Regional sponsorship with 8 jurisdictions		5%	1		
	Totals	100%	20		

7. What is your second choice for a sponsorship structure at this moment in time?

				Responses	
				(percent)	(count)
Port only sponsorship		0%	0		
City only sponsorship		0%	0		
Port-City sponsorship		20%	3		
Regional sponsorship with 4 jurisdictions		73.33%	11		
Regional sponsorship with 8 jurisdictions		6.67%	1		
	Totals	100%	15		

8. What is the ideal size of the OPIS committee?

		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
Less than 15 members		25%	5
15-20 members		50%	10
20-25 members		15%	3
25-30 members		10%	2
Over 30 members		0%	0
Totals		100%	20

9. How comfortable are you with the current PAG interests participating in OPIS?

		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
Fully Support		10%	2
Support Somewhat		25%	5
Neutral		0%	0
Oppose Somewhat		45%	9
Fully Oppose		20%	4
Totals		100%	20

10. How comfortable are you with the current PAG interests participating in OPIS?

		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
Fully Support		5%	1
Support Somewhat		30%	6
Neutral		0%	0
Oppose Somewhat		50%	10
Fully Oppose		15%	3
Totals		100%	20

11. Elected Officials belong in which category?

		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
Voting Member		10.53%	2
Non-Voting Ex Officio Member		21.05%	4
Technical Advisor Ad Hoc		0%	0
No Representation		68.42%	13
Totals		100%	19

Non-Voting Ex Officio Member		5.26%	1
Technical Advisor Ad Hoc		15.79%	3
No Representation		57.89%	11
	Totals	100%	19
17. Schools (school district, community college, university)			
		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
Voting Member		15%	3
Non-Voting Ex Officio Member		10%	2
Technical Advisor Ad Hoc		35%	7
No Representation		40%	8
	Totals	100%	20
18. Sustainability			
		Responses	
		(percent)	(count)
Voting Member		60%	12
Non-Voting Ex Officio Member		0%	0
Technical Advisor Ad Hoc		30%	6
No Representation		10%	2
	Totals	100%	20

6. OPIS SCOPE AND PURVIEW EXERCISE – SUMMARY OF PAG COMMENTS

A) Planning and Development

Interaction with other groups working together about issues that are related.

Prioritize a thru f

Priorities a, b, c

Top 2 issues = a + b

Split (a) into 2 functions.

Advise on future master planning processes.

Delete future master planning process – too much on plate

(a) Change to read “Monitor 2010 Master Plan implementation and help design future master planning processes”

Split (b), separate issues

(d) Better definition of “complement” (x4)

(d) Change to read “Complement” Plan District regulatory reviews/Not formal

Is (d) a separate review from regulatory review or is it to participate in the regulatory review?

(e) Review and comment, propose vs. receive updates (x3)

(e) Should be as it relates to master plan and regulatory issues

(e) Combines with other quality of life issues

How does this relate to existing committees?

(e) If existing groups are left in place, don't want this committee 2nd guessing them

Will there be subcommittees?

This is a very broad area of coverage. Is a broad group the best way to address specific issues?

(f) Need specialists/ subcommittees for follow on studies authority over process?

(f) Change to read "Participate in future Follow-On Studies/Future issues"

Planning and development should be the #2 priority of OPIS

For elements in the master plan, input should be on design details & timing, not whether to implement.

Fold in wildlife and noise committees

B) Sustainability

(a) and (b) are priorities

(C) Could duplicate other efforts and should relate to master plan & plan district/ regulatory issues

(d) Change to-Influence policy for better sustainability...."

Monitor sustainability efforts regionally and at other airports

Wouldn't (d) be part of (a)?

(e) Change to "Refine and develop sustainability policies/concept/ ideas..."

Need a sustainability subcommittee, technical advisory group, or separate sustainability committee to provide ongoing expertise into sustainability efforts

(a) Change benchmark to "target" or is target same thing as benchmark?

Hope that the sustainability benchmarks include transportation impacts

Who will establish the benchmarks?

Timing of input

Sustainability should be the #4 priority of OPIS

C) Community Agreements

Agree

Community agreements should be the #3 priority of OPIS

D) Community Engagement

Agree that all these are priorities

Focused on impacts than processes

(c) Should they also inform decision making at other government levels: state, county, metro, etc?

Community engagement should be the #1 priority of OPIS

E) Other and Miscellaneous

Realistic?

I do not think these should be the priority.

(a) Including input on state or federal legislation (X2)

(b) Has the potential to be very controversial/ divisive

(b) Eliminate (illegible)

Define advocacy

Take legislation from (b) and work into (a)

Annual report to sponsors

When do these subcommittees sunset?

7. OPIS SPONSORSHIP EXERCISE – SUMMARY OF PAG COMMENTS

Option A	# Sponsors	Advantages/Reasons to Support	Disadvantages/Reasons to NOT Support
Port of Portland Resolution	1	Dictatorship is efficient on the surface	Too limited, inadequate
		Easy to administer	Dictatorship is inefficient
		Direct connection to agency that will build things	Knowledge base too small
			Needs external input
			Not connected to regulator (City of Portland)
Option B	# Sponsors	Advantages/Reasons to Support	Disadvantages/Reasons to NOT Support
City of Portland Resolution	1	Dictatorship is efficient on the surface	Dictatorship is inefficient
		Direct connection to regulatory decision maker	Knowledge base too small, limited
			Inadequate representation for interested jurisdictions
			No connection to Port who will build/ operate
Option C	# Sponsors	Advantages/Reasons to Support	Disadvantages/Reasons to NOT Support
Intergovernmental Agreement between: City of Portland Port of Portland	2	Responsibility and control over impacts	Not broad enough – leaves out some parties
		What PAG has now, it's working	Leaves out Vancouver
		Jurisdictions with greatest concern and power over PDX	
		Main entities of Master Plan/ Land Use Plan	
		Easiest/ simple only 2 parties	
		Prefer IGA – strong legal document	
		Advice to both regulator and implementer	
		Like to see City in the lead	
Option D	# Sponsors	Advantages/Reasons to Support	Disadvantages/Reasons to NOT Support
Memorandum of Understanding between: City of Portland Port of Portland City of Vancouver Metro	4	Ok if not Metro	Too many power struggles
		Includes key jurisdictions affected by PDX development	City of Vancouver and Metro have no regulatory control – unequal partners with City and Port
		Port is a regional airport, regional players	City of Vancouver and Metro are stakeholders like many others – why elevate them to special position?
		More resources	More bureaucracy
		Main entities impacted and includes regional transportation planning	Needs to be an IGA instead of an MOU
		Like to see City in the lead	2 state agreements more difficult
Option E	# Sponsors	Advantages/Reasons to Support	Disadvantages/Reasons to NOT Support
Memorandum of Understanding between: City of Portland Port of Portland City of Vancouver Clark County, Washington Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties Metro	8	Port is a regional airport	Too many parties
		This gets the whole region involved	Disperses responsibility
		Includes key jurisdictions affected by PDX development	Too big, complex
			PDX is subject to Portland land use control – dilutes responsibility
			Difficulty in negotiating agreements
			Some jurisdictions may not care

Option F - Other	# Sponsors	Advantages/Reasons to Support	Disadvantages/Reasons to NOT Support
Option D without Metro			
Option D with an IGA		IGA is stronger document than MOU	

8. OPIS MEMBERSHIP EXERCISE – SUMMARY OF PAG COMMENTS

1. What is the ideal size for the OPIS group?					
a) Less than 15	3	c) 21-25 members	1	e) Over 30 members	
b) 15 –20 members	6	d) 26-30 members	1		
Comments regarding the ideal size for the OPIS group:					
Depends on the role/responsibilities – if decisions are needed, smaller is better. If primarily educational, the more the better.					
2. Are you comfortable with the current PAG interests participating in OPIS?					
CURRENT AIRPORT FUTURES PAG MEMBERSHIP					
Interests	Yes	No	Comments, especially if you answer “No”		
Aircraft Noise Interest (e.g., impacted citizen, Citizen Noise Advisory Committee)	8.5	3.5	No, another group exists No, technical advisor (2) No, OPIS replaces this committee Yes, CNAC and neighborhoods Yes/No could be technical advisors		
Airline Industry (e.g., passenger airline, cargo airline, general aviation)	9	3	No, their voice is heard elsewhere No, Whose interest do they represent? (2)		
Airport Issues Roundtable	3	9	No, replaced by OPIS (4) No, technical advisor Not sure? No, covered by other groups No, nonexistent, represent through neighborhoods Sunset air – move to OPIS. Still need definition of what AIR’s charter is. No, Replace		
Business Organization (e.g., Columbia Corridor Association, Portland Business Alliance)	8	2	No, their voice is heard elsewhere		
City of Portland Planning Commission	9	3	Technical advisor (4) Yes, One member only		
City of Vancouver	9	2	Combine city, county, neighborhoods into fewer slots – perhaps 3 neighborhood/county groups on a rotating basis. No, non voting		
Clackamas County	5	7	Combine city, county, neighborhoods into fewer slots – perhaps 3 neighborhood/county groups on a rotating basis. No, Why? No, represented by Metro No, advisory status		
Clark County Neighborhoods (e.g., Camas/ Washougal area)	8	3	Combine city, county, neighborhoods into fewer slots – perhaps 3 neighborhood/county groups on a rotating basis. No, Represented by City of Vancouver		
Interests	Yes	No	Comments, especially if you answer “No”		
East Multnomah County (e.g., Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale, Wood Village)	10	1	Consolidate neighborhood organization/rotate Combine city, county, neighborhoods into fewer slots – perhaps 3 neighborhood/county groups on a rotating basis. Specific neighborhood representation – not county Yes, one member only		

			Fly over No, represent on noise group	
Environmental Interests including environmental/ social justice	10	1	No, technical advisor Yes, include wild life	
Federal Aviation Administration	5	7	No, advisory (3) No, technical advisor (3) No, they already have a regulatory role Yes, non voting	
Labor Organization (e.g., unions)	5	7	Involved in Aviation Industry Yes, possibly drop to advisory No, Union issues vary with employer	
Large business that uses PDX freight and passenger services	7	5	No, their voice is heard elsewhere No, represented by business organization	
Metro Regional Government	6	4	No, advisory status	
Military	7	4	No, their voice is heard elsewhere No, represented by Aviation as a tenant No, technical expert	
Multnomah County	7	4	Consolidate neighborhood organization/rotate Combine city, county, neighborhoods into fewer slots – perhaps 3 neighborhood/county groups on a rotating basis. No, represented by Metro Official or citizen? No, already represented	
Port of Portland Commission	8	3	Yes, they need to hear Yes, one member only No, sponsor – advisor (2) No, report to them.	
Portland Neighborhood Coalitions	11		Consolidate neighborhood organization/rotate	
Tenant at PDX	6	4	No, their voice is heard elsewhere	
Tourism industry (e.g., Travel Portland)	6	4	No, their voice is heard elsewhere No, technical advisor Yes, possibly drop to advisory	
Vancouver Neighborhoods	8	1	Consolidate neighborhood organization/rotate Combine city, county, neighborhoods into fewer slots – perhaps 3 neighborhood/county groups on a rotating basis. No, on noise group	
Interests	Yes	No	Comments, especially if you answer “No”	
Washington County	4	6	Consolidate neighborhood organization/rotate Combine city, county, neighborhoods into fewer slots – perhaps 3 neighborhood/county groups on a rotating basis. Not sure. No, represented by Metro No, advisory	
General comments about membership:				
Membership depends on how many other committees there are and what their role and representation is. I think they should be consolidated but I don't know enough about them. Avoid duplication and confusion. If not consolidated, then clearly separate assigned role and therefore membership. Size impacts sustainability. Ideal is 15. Attendees have to tell impactful listening post of impacted citizens.				
NEW INTERESTS ADDED BY PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE OR STAFF				
3. Which category does each Interest best belong in?				
	Voting	Non-Voting Ex Officio	Technical Advisor Ad Hoc	No Representation
Elected Officials	1 (staff) 1 elected			12
Executive Branch (e.g., Governor's office,		2.5	2.5	9

state agency)				
Legislative Branch (e.g., state legislator)		1	3	10
Members of the public (e.g. unaffiliated neighborhood, City club, frequent flyer, PDX employee)	4	1		9
Public Transit agencies (e.g., TriMet, C-Tran)	6	2	4	1
Public Transit users	4		2	4
Schools (e.g., school districts, community colleges, universities)	4		2	6
Sustainability	8		3	3
OTHER INTERESTS				
Comments regarding categories each interest best belong in: Technical advisors should always be on call				
Elected Officials	Staff with voting No, Already have City of Portland and Vancouver No, not continuous, would send only staff No, they don't have time to participate. Represented by jurisdictions.			
Executive Branch (e.g., Governor's office, state agency)	ODOT Aeronautics as nonvoting Ex Officio or Technical advisor. No, More of a regional issue than a state one in the context of OPIS/Master Plan			
Legislative Branch (e.g., state legislator)	No, not sure what they add. They represent all these other people.			
Members of the public (e.g. unaffiliated neighborhood, City club, frequent flyer, PDX employee)	No, can be represented through neighborhoods. No, Seems like all this is captured in among all the other interests.			
Public Transit agencies (e.g., TriMet, C-Tran)				
Public Transit users	Can be included with members of public category			
Schools (e.g., school districts, community colleges, universities)				
Comments regarding categories each interest best belong in:				
Sustainability	Who would this be? Already include representatives of environmental social equity and economic interests related to PDX. No representation, already covered in environmental interests Need more definition of how this is different from environmental. Yes, voting. Have no idea what this means in this context. Different than environmental groups? I'd make them a member if I could think of what entity it would be. The Natural Step? Governor's Sustainability Advisor?			

Next Meeting Agenda, Process Review and Other Closing Comments, Meeting Evaluation Form, and Adjournment – Bill Blosser and Sam Imperati

Bill Blosser: we are looking to have a PAG meeting at a new community location and NAYA has volunteered to host a meeting, perhaps May. The next PAG is on April 21, 5:30 to 8:30 pm, at the Port.

Sustainability meeting – April 8, 6-8, at Port – important, but optional. Everyone please attend. Master Plan – April 29, 6-8, Location TBD. Land Use/Transportation – April 1, at PDX. PI – April 1, at PDX.

Sam Imperati: please fill out meeting evaluations

Mary Olson: at every commission meeting, she is asked how the PAG is going. We have been at this for over a year and she is just in awe of the dedication of this group that we have held together.

Thank you to small group facilitators – Vicky, Alesia, and Maryhelen!

ADJOURN

