

**AIRPORT FUTURES  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #9  
MEETING NOTES AND FOLLOW-UP**

<b>Date and Time:</b>	<b>1/14/08, 6:30 - 9 PM</b>
<b>Location:</b>	PDX St Helens B Conference Room 7000 NE Airport Way, Portland, OR
Attendees:	Erwin Bergman Jill Eiland Maryhelen Kincaid Eric Meyer Patrick Metzger Alesia Reese Linda Robinson Hector Roche Fred Stovel Denny Stoecklin Kelly Sweeney John Weigant
Staff:	Bronwyn Buckle Chris Corich Lise Glancy Melissa McCluney Jay Sugnet Chris White
Unable to attend:	Lawrence Russell Mike Sloan Vicki Thompson

<b>1. Welcome, Introductions, Updates – Hector Roche</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>
Hector welcomed the group and introductions were made.	None

<b>2. Overview – Hector, Bronwyn and Lise</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>
Lise and Bronwyn provided a brief review of the work done on research case studies to help inform the committee structure. Hector emphasized that we are not looking for agreement at this point. The objective is to collect ideas for what the OPIS committee structure might look like. “Why OPIS needed”, and “What – OPIS Scope and Purview” were discussed to refresh our memory on why we are creating OPIS and what tasks or functions that OPIS might be involved in. Lise provided a revised OPIS Development, Review and Approval Timeline outlining when the OPIS proposal would go to PAG for initial review, public meetings and stakeholders, PAG review and approval, and then decision-makers. Public Involvement Subcommittee may present 2 – 3 scenarios to PAG for their input.	Lise and Melissa – provide “Why OPIS needed”, “What – OPIS Scope and Purview”, and revised OPIS timeline documents to each member.

<b>3. Group Discussion of Case Studies for OPIS</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>
Each member was provided a packet of Ongoing Committee Comparison worksheets (colored) on Scope	Melissa - Copy and return the packet of colored worksheets to each

<p>and Purview, Authority, Sponsorship, Membership, and Resources. These worksheets included summaries of the research case studies, subcommittee preferences to date, and staff preferences for each of the above OPIS variables. A column was provided for each member to comment and make recommendations on case study characteristics that they would like to see carry over in the OPIS. Subcommittee members were given a half an hour to work on this exercise. Completed sections were turned in for staff to review.</p> <p>A summary was included in the packet which listed dominant characteristics of the Airport and Local and Regional Committee case studies for each of the OPIS variables.</p>	<p>member. Lise and Bronwyn – Review the subcommittee worksheets to assist with development of draft OPIS scenarios.</p>
---	--

<b>4. Review of Scope and Purview, Authority, Sponsorship – Group Discussion</b>	<b>Follow-Up</b>
<p>Hector facilitated a discussion with the subcommittee on their preferences on the Scope and Purview, Authority, and Sponsorship variables. Time did not permit completing all sections. The two remaining variables of Membership and Resources will be discussed next meeting along with some OPIS scenarios developed by staff based on subcommittee input to date.</p> <p>As part of this discussion, some edits were provided to the What functions/tasks OPIS might be involved in poster. (Edits in blue below.)</p> <p><b>Scope/Purview</b> Potential general categories of focus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Perform early review of <b>airport &amp; City?</b> planning and development projects (e.g., land use, noise, natural resources, and transportation) + <b>issues that arise that impact community</b></li> <li>2. Track Sustainability Benchmarks + <b>assessments</b></li> <li>3. Monitor Community Agreements + process for modification</li> <li>4. Ensure two-way communication and information-sharing</li> <li>5. Education/information resource for the public             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pass public input to Port Commission + City/ sponsors</li> <li>2. Sounding board for the Port + <b>City/ sponsors</b></li> </ol> </li> <li>6. Provide input on and active role in ongoing public engagement</li> <li>7. Other?</li> </ol> <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope needs to be broad enough to cover issues that will arise.</li> <li>• May need a reality check with citizen members of the committees studied</li> </ul>	<p>Melissa - Copy recommended characteristics from the group discussion into the Summary of Research and Committee Preferences.</p> <p>All – Complete membership and Resources worksheets for homework.</p> <p>Lise, Bronwyn and interested subcommittee members – Develop preliminary OPIS scenarios for discussion.</p>

- Build in evaluation and possible modification of OPIS in 1 year, 2 years?
- Scope needs to be adaptive to the times - build in a way for community to identify and surface hot issues and identify people who are interested
- Performance based approach is desirable. Request performance audits of various programs.
- There may be redundancy with existing committees and OPIS.
- What will the relationship of CNAC and OPIS be?

**Authority**

1. Involve/collaborate (highly influencing advisory)
2. **AND** Empower (policy-making)?

Additional comments:

- Authority needs to be adaptive to cover issues pertinent for the time.
- Most airport committees are in the involve/ collaborate spectrum. Not many of the case study groups are truly empowered.
- Look at different authority levels. Authority level is likely to vary by issue.
- Independence: first step to authority
- Authority should be negotiated with the sponsors. OPIS may have more authority on some topics than others.
- Do we want an appeal process?
- There is authority of the group and authority of individual members.
- Highly influencing advisory – part of this relates to sponsorship, how the group is set up and how the group conducts itself (form and function will influence our authority).

**Sponsorship**

1. City and Port
2. **AND** Regional jurisdictions
3. **AND/or** Metro

Additional comments:

- Would Port and City be co-equal fiscally and in leadership?
- Consider fiscal and leadership balance.
- Multi-jurisdictional – including Vancouver
- Different roles – airport is multi-jurisdiction but land use is primarily City of Portland
- Who is going to listen is important.
- Who is our audience/ who is our sponsor?
- What respect can be garnered by group from sponsor?
- Add in a jurisdiction that is co-equal like Metro or Bi-State Transportation Committee

<p><b>Miscellaneous Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An ongoing committee and public engagement may not work together – engagement is often issue driven.</li> <li>• Membership - Consider relationship of Port, City of Portland, Multnomah County, Metro and the FAA. The FAA may not be a member or sponsor, but is a key stakeholder or a technical advisor.</li> <li>• Resources – with tightening budgets, who will staff OPIS?</li> <li>• Membership – what is the authority of the group, and what is the authority of the group’s members.</li> <li>• Should we start from the top down (scenarios) or the bottom up (variables)? NOTE: Committee direction has been the latter.</li> <li>• General acknowledgement that the variables are interrelated. Need to look at how the variables hang together.</li> </ul>	
--	--

<p><b>5. Evaluation/Next Meeting Agenda</b></p> <p>Membership and Resources variables are to be discussed at the next meeting. At the next meeting, we will also share OPIS scenarios from staff and others. As part of this discussion, we will there will be additional discussion on all OPIS variables.</p> <p>Next meeting: 1/28/09 from 6:30 - 9 PM  Location: East Portland Neighborhood Office  1017 NE 117th Avenue, Portland, OR</p>	<p><b>Follow-Up</b></p>
--	-------------------------

Hand Outs:

- 1/14/09 Public Involvement Subcommittee Meeting #9 Agenda
- 12/03/08 Public Involvement Subcommittee Meeting #8 Notes
- Worksheet on Ongoing Committee Structure
- IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation
- Summary of Research and Subcommittee Preferences on Ongoing Committee Structure
- Ongoing Committee Comparison worksheets on Scope and Purview, Authority, Sponsorship, Membership, and Resources