

**AIRPORT FUTURES
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #10
MEETING NOTES AND FOLLOW-UP**

Date and Time:	1/28/09, 6:30 - 9 PM
Location:	East Portland Neighborhood Association Office 1017 NE 117th Avenue, Portland, OR
Attendees:	Maryhelen Kincaid Patrick Metzger Lai-lani Ovalles (will be on LUT SC) Alesia Reese Linda Robinson Hector Roche Lawrence Russell Fred Stovel Denny Stoecklin Kelly Sweeney Vicki Thompson John Weigant
Staff:	Bronwyn Buckle Chris Corich Lise Glancy Sam Imperati Melissa McCluney Chris White
Not attending:	Erwin Bergman Eric Meyer Mike Sloan Business representative (Vacancy)

1. Welcome, Introductions, Updates – Hector Roche	Follow-up
<p>Introductions and announcements were made. Due to business commitments, Jill Eiland has resigned from the Public Involvement Subcommittee. Staff is looking for a PAG member from the Business Community to take her place.</p> <p>A list of upcoming Public Involvement meetings is included on the second page of the agenda. Two additional meetings have since been added to the calendar:</p> <p>Master Plan/Sustainability Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for 2/24/09 - time and location to be determined.</p> <p>Community Town Hall with Port Executive Director Bill Wyatt is scheduled for 2/26/09 7:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the former Janzen Beach Yacht Club, 12050 N. Janzen Avenue.</p> <p>Hector reviewed the agenda and the outcomes for the meeting. At the 1/14/09 Public Involvement Subcommittee, the group discussed three elements of</p>	<p>Staff and chair to recruit another PDX User/Business representative to this subcommittee.</p>

<p>the OPIS: Scope/Purview, Sponsorship, and Authority. At this meeting, the group will discuss two other elements: Membership and Resources and then work toward agreement on 1 or 2 scenarios to present at the 2/17 or 3/17 PAG meeting.</p>	
<p>2. Airport Issues Roundtable (AIR)</p>	<p>Follow-Up</p>
<p>Fred Stovel reviewed the structure of AIR committee. He noted that with City of Portland elected officials fully engaged in the process, things are more likely to get done. The Regional Cargo feeder issue was used as an example. When many neighborhoods have the same concern, it becomes a City issue. Noise is one of the primary concerns affecting all residents.</p> <p>Linda Robinson noted that AIR strengthened or waned depending on City leadership. Fred noted that why Community Agreement is needed to weather such fluctuations. Maryhelen Kincaid noted that AIR is not active and that the City chose not to sponsor it. Fred noted that AIR did not go away. Helped drive the City-Port intergovernmental agreement process. AIR was part of Conditional Use Management Permit and Airport Futures Planning Advisory Group (PAG). AIR sees itself as having morphed into PAG.</p>	
<p>3. Discuss Membership and Resource OPIS Variables – Group Discussion led by Lise</p>	<p>Follow-Up</p>
<p>MEMBERSHIP Most groups from research were between 9 and 20 in size. What is the best size? Most agree that a committee of 7-10 members is too small, and one of 32 members is too large. PAG is not necessarily too large – depends on the authority and types of decisions. If an advisory board, a larger, broader representation of stakeholder interest is important. Representation will affect size. Planning Commission does not do public engagement so not comparable. What types of members? A good blend would include the impacted groups of Multnomah County, Portland, Vancouver, and business interests. Seats could be rotated between neighborhoods within broad categories to ensure a voice for interests at the table. Expect representation of those mostly impacted – Portland or Multnomah County. Experience with other organizations shows that elected officials don't attend meetings regularly – send delegates. Need technical representation – experts including environmental, Multnomah County Drainage District, FAA, airlines. State law ensures aviation interests already well represented. Need a liaison to existing Port committees or should there be subcommittees for various issues under direction of the main committee? This will ensure connectivity. Diversity of representation is important. Who is most impacted? PDX creates jobs and generates economic growth.</p>	<p>Come back to interests represented including diversity (income and ethnic background).</p>

<p>Everyone in the metro area is affected by the airport in one way or another. Key stakeholders should not necessarily be selected based on geographic location alone. CNAC includes Clackamas County, Vancouver, etc. East County also impacted.</p> <p>RESOURCES</p> <p>Most groups in the case studies used in-house staff and did not have significant financial resources/budgets except those relating to mitigation (e.g. Chicago O'Hare).</p> <p>What type of staffing and budget are required?</p> <p>Need an independent facilitator. Need access to experts when necessary. Perhaps sponsors need to commit to a percentage of the operating budget, but realistically there is no money for the City to pay. With current budget cuts, the core of this committee is going to be the passion of the members. There may not be funds for staff and sandwiches. Additional funding may not be available for years, so a realistic and inexpensive plan is needed. Staff direction to attend/participate v. new staff dedicated to this effort. Many groups are effective with peer volunteers. While it would be nice to do with volunteers, Bronwyn and Lise provide invaluable behind the scenes work organizing, communicating, notetaking and preparing agendas. Staffing is needed and a combination of Port and City staff is preferred.</p>	
---	--

<p>4. Review Possible OPIS Scenarios – John Weigant, Maryhelen Kincaid, and Lise Glancy</p>	<p>Follow-Up</p>
<p>Hector opened discussion with caveat that these scenarios are beginnings, noting that we are far from closing the deal. Staff scenarios developed based on variable options.</p> <p>John Weigant – Scenario #1</p> <p>John Weigant discussed his OPIS scenario concept which allows for interaction and two way communication and a feedback loop. Suggested Port not structured that way – handed out Aviation organization chart. He noted that there was frustration for citizens making noise complaints and talked about his perspective on CNAC. Complaints go through the noise office and CNAC but the loop never goes back to the noise generators or the FAA. Several members disagreed stating the FAA and users are very involved. Airline chief pilots and the FAA have come to meetings. The military and Port try to keep public informed via periodic email noise alerts. Also noted that agendas developed by CNAC. Additional discussion on CNAC occurred later in the meeting.</p> <p>Scope – Noise abatement subcommittee with a small amount of noise mitigation fund – fund would provide immense public relations benefit for the Port (e.g., Metro garbage dump mitigation fund or insulation grants). This subcommittee could do performance</p>	<p>Maryhelen invited John to attend a CNAC meeting.</p>

audits of CNAC and then possibly propose elimination of CNAC. Example of mitigation fund questioned by some as ineffective – such small amount (\$20K and fund picnics). Others liked concept.

Another subcommittee could propose legislative recommendations for possible ORS rule changes to broaden focus from how the Port does business to focus on neighborhoods. There could be subcommittees for sustainability and land use.

Sponsorship/Resources – Recommends City sponsorship or joint sponsorship.

Resources – Port funding of City staff. Not a lot of funding beyond staff and mitigation resources.

Membership/Authority – not discussed.

Maryhelen Kincaid – Scenario #2

See draft outlined on handout page 15 for greater detail. Main concern trying to do everything, dilute power.

Scope – Serve as review board for land use reviews for PDX Plan District. Big citizen engagement role to ensure follow-through (e.g., Albina Plan District).

Collaborate with existing committees who have invested people doing good work (CNAC, Wildlife, Noise Board, and Sustainability which would continue as peers).

Sponsorship – City/ Port IGA with regional representation. Agreements between jurisdictions for appointments. Work closely with City Council and Port Commission.

Authority – Advisory body. Agenda set by members, not the Port.

Membership – 15-20 members. Diverse interests similar to PAG. Include economic diversity.

Resources – 50/50 City and Port. Other jurisdictions asked to contribute.

Staff based on Subcommittee – Scenarios #3-7

See OPIS Variables and Options on handout page 13-14 & four other possible scenarios on page 16-17.

Reviewed Regional PDX Advisory Committee scenario.

Scope/Purview

Brainstorm list

1. Land use + other issues impacting community
2. Sustainability
3. Community Agreements
4. Community Engagement

CNAC and Wildlife remain as standing technical, stand alone committees.

Standing place on Port Commission agenda with annual report.

Sponsorship

Regional MOU outlining representation/appointments and two-way reporting.

Membership

15 members from diverse interests (citizens, elected, business). 1 seat for CNAC and 1 seat for Wildlife.

<p>Aviation director as ex officio.</p> <p>Resources ½ Port/ ½ City</p> <p>Authority Advisory with empowerment on select issues</p>	
---	--

5. Group Discussion about scenarios	Follow-up
<p>Scope – Committee carries on work of Airport Futures. How do we do so in a way which ensures sustainability? Broader than land use – transportation, fleet mix, legislative changes. Looking at current facility and land use, it may be a long time before Port handling land use requests. Port has pretty much what it needs for 20 years. Community engagement with feedback loop – two-way. Need to determine measureable benchmarks. Annual report. More meaningful engagement – how does this affect public? Public not aware, need more communication as we go along. Prevent a disconnect of reporting upcoming projects and work. Clear charge – important and meaningful, not busy work.</p> <p>Sponsorship – Some difference in opinion regarding sponsorship and relationship with Port committees. A few members expressed they don't want to see a Port committee like CNAC, stating the Port is too involved and a need for independence. Response: CNAC not Port appointed or dominated.</p> <p>Authority – Advisory. Ability of committee to set its own agendas in contrast to PDX Land Use Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Membership - Need realistic balance, group size 15-20. In addition to numbers, think of which groups to include. Public engagement is important. How to get interested parties to the table? Need to select people that can build relationships with the broader community. Who selects the members? Appointed by City Council? If so, you have to take what they send. What about a City Council seat? Not a committee of totally elected members. If land use based, may want greater number of Portland seats. Maybe include representative from Sustainability Commission and Noise Review Board. Some may be at table as non-voting stakeholders.</p> <p>Resources – Would like to consider pay to play.</p>	<p>Additional discussion on scope/purview, sponsorship and membership, appointments as interrelated.</p> <p>Later discussion of other variables beyond five discussed to date (i.e., subcommittees, frequency of meetings).</p>

6. Non-binding Poll of Subcommittee on OPIS Variables
<p>A straw poll was taken to discover any areas of preliminary agreement on the 5 variables. Members placed stickers on wall charts to indicate their preference. Results are listed below.</p>

Scope/Purview		
Subcommittee Brainstorm List	Broader List	Narrower List
6 votes	4 votes	0 votes

Sponsorship		
City – Port	Regional	Metro Council/ Bi-State Transportation Committee/ other Metro Committee
3 votes Comment: City/Port are able to listen to & represent impacts of other jurisdictions	7 votes	0 votes

Membership		
Less than 15 members	15 members	More than 15 members
2 votes	5 votes	4 votes
	Comment: Not all elected	Comment: Combination

Resources		
Quarter time Port & Quarter time City employee	Half time Port employee	Half time Port and Half time City employee
4 votes	0 votes	6 votes

Authority and Purpose		
Advisory – Involve/Collaborate	Advisory – Empower on select issues	
4 votes	6 votes	

7. Review Poll Results and Discuss Subcommittee OPIS Scenarios	Follow-Up
Scope/Purview – Subcommittee Brainstorm list Sponsorship – Regional Memorandum of Understanding Authority/Purpose – Advisory with empower engagement on selected issues Membership – 15 members, not all elected Resources – Half time Port and half time City	None

8. Discuss Timing and Nature of Subcommittee Presentation on OPIS to PAG (2/17 or 3/17 PAG)	Follow-Up
Next PAG meeting, are we ready to present our research and options? Should we solicit their preference on our work to date? Do we give our initial recommendation with caveats on 2/17 or give a mini update and hold off presenting scenarios until the 3/17	Get notes of nuances out asap.

<p>meeting?</p> <p>The subcommittee would like PAG's early input. It is beneficial to engage PAG early on, to avoid overloading them with detail later. There may be some categories in addition to these 5 that we may not be considering. Can give presentation of major ideas to PAG on 2/17 including the brainstorm list, but not our polling, scenarios, or recommendation. Most agree on the need to report something to PAG, just not on the level of detail.</p> <p>After the 3/17 PAG meeting, will be prepared to make recommendation on several scenarios.</p>	
--	--

9. Evaluation/Next Meeting Agenda – Hector	Follow-Up
<p><u>What worked?</u> Good meeting location Dinner was good Finished agenda PISC member input (scenarios) Having homework in prep for meeting Homework was good exercise. Worksheets helped More voices, giving everyone an opportunity to speak around the table Organization of the handout paperwork is fine.</p> <p><u>What would you change?</u> Need to use time wisely with more constructive idea sharing Reorganize paperwork to be more simple and useful Dwell too long on same issues, continue to move ideas forward Dig deeper into the 5 categories</p>	<p>Develop draft agenda for next meeting.</p>

Hand Outs:

- Agenda
- Public Involvement Subcommittee Meeting #9 1/14/09 Notes
- Why Creating Ongoing PDX Committee
- What tasks and functions will OPIS perform?
- OPIS Development, Review and Approval Timeline 1/23/09 Draft
- Summary of Research and Subcommittee Preferences on Ongoing Committee Structure
- OPIS Variables and Possible Scenarios – Preliminary Draft 1/23/09
- OPIS Scenarios --Maryhelen Kincaid, Draft Concept
- Current PDX Public Involvement Process – John Weigant
- Port of Portland, Aviation Organizational Chart
- Possible OPIS Scenarios – Preliminary Draft 1/23/09 (Non-prioritized)

Next Meeting: 2/25/09 – Please note new time: 6:00 – 9:00 pm
 McMenemy's Kennedy School Community Room
 5736 NE 33rd Avenue, Portland