

**Public Involvement Subcommittee -- Possible OPIS Scenarios (1/28 non-binding poll)**

<b>Scope/Purview:</b>	Subcommittee Brainstorm list	<b>OR</b> Broader List
<b>Sponsorship:</b>	Regional Memorandum of Understanding	City-Port Intergovernmental Agreement
<b>Membership:</b>	15 members, not all elected	More than 15 members
<b>Authority/Purpose:</b>	Advisory with Empower engagement on select issues	Advisory with Involve/Collaborate engagement on select issues
<b>Resources:</b>	Half time Port and half time City	Quarter time Port and Quarter time City

<p><b>Subcommittee Brainstorm List:</b></p> <p>1 – Planning and development projects (and other issues that arise that impact the community)</p> <p>2 – Sustainability Benchmarks</p> <p>3 – Community Agreements</p> <p>4 – Community Engagement</p>
---

**VARIABLES AND OPTIONS**

<p><b>SCOPE/PURVIEW</b></p> <p>What is the committee's charge? What will they achieve? What gap will they fill? What relationship will they have to other existing committees?</p> <p><b>Options:</b></p> <p><b>1 - Subcommittee Brainstorm List – see below ( 6 votes)</b></p> <p><b>2 - Broader List – add other to be determined (4 votes)</b></p> <p><del><b>3 - Narrower List – land use only ( 0 votes)</b></del></p>	<p><b>SPONSORSHIP</b></p> <p>Who will create this body - Port, City, regional? Who will the committee report to? Funding and/or staff resources with sponsorship?</p> <p><b>Options:</b></p> <p><b>1 - City – Port (3 votes)</b></p> <p>Comment: City/Port are able to listen to &amp; represent impacts of other jurisdictions</p> <p><b>2 – Regional (7 votes)</b></p> <p><del><b>3 – Metro Council (0 votes)</b></del></p>	<p><b>MEMBERSHIP</b></p> <p>How many members will be on the committee? What geographic area will be represented? What interests should be at the table? Will members be elected and citizens? Will there be technical or ex officio members? Who will make appointments? Membership dues?</p> <p><b>Options:</b></p> <p><b>1 - Less than 15 members (2 votes)</b></p> <p><b>2 - 15 members (5 votes)</b></p> <p>Comment: Not all elected</p> <p><b>3 - More than 15 members (4 votes)</b></p> <p>Comment: Combination</p>	<p><b>AUTHORITY/PURPOSE</b></p> <p>Is this committee an education, advisory or decision-making body? What is the desired level of engagement on most issues on the IAP2 spectrum of engagement (i.e., inform, consult, involve, collaborate, and empower)? Are there functions which the committee could have an empowerment role?</p> <p><b>Options:</b></p> <p><b>1 - Advisory – with Involve/Collaborate engagement (4 votes)</b></p> <p><b>2 - Advisory – with Empower engagement on select issues ( 6 votes)</b></p>	<p><b>RESOURCES</b></p> <p>What type of staffing and resources would you like to see for the committee?</p> <p><b>Options:</b></p> <p><b>1 - Quarter time Port and Quarter time City (4 votes)</b></p> <p><del><b>2 - Half time Port (0 votes)</b></del></p> <p><b>3 - Half time Port and Half time City (6 votes)</b></p>
<p><u><b>Discussion (10/29, 12/3, 1/14 and 1/28 Subcommittee meetings):</b></u></p> <p><b>General</b></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> <li>• Build in evaluation and possible modification of OPIS in 1 year, 2 years?</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Performance based approach is desirable. Request performance audits of various programs.</li> <li>• Need to determine measureable benchmarks. How to measure?</li> <li>• Complete the loop of community engagement. Receive public inquiries at open houses, but what do we do with them? Return to committee with information about what public wants.</li> <li>• How do we ensure sustainability?</li> <li>• Community Engagement - Public not aware, need more communication as we go along. Prevent a disconnect of reporting upcoming projects and work.</li> <li>• Need clear direction from sponsors</li> <li>• Need to have a clear message of what participants in a committee can give and get from the process. What influence opportunities will there be?</li> <li>• Need to be clear of purpose the ongoing public involvement strategy. Is it to look over the shoulder of the Port, help keep the 2010 PDX Master Plan/Land Use Plan on track, serve as Port public relations?</li> </ul>	<p><u><b>Discussion (10/29, 12/3, 1/14 and 1/28 Subcommittee meetings):</b></u></p> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would Port and City be co-equal fiscally and in leadership?</li> <li>• Consider fiscal and leadership balance.</li> <li>• Multi-jurisdictional – including Vancouver</li> <li>• Different roles – airport is multi-jurisdiction but land use is primarily City of Portland</li> <li>• Who is going to listen is important.</li> <li>• Who is our audience/ who is our sponsor?</li> <li>• What respect can be garnered by group from sponsor?</li> <li>• Add in a jurisdiction that is co-equal like Metro or Bi-State Transportation Committee</li> <li>• Some level of independence from Port desired (LUAC example).</li> </ul> <p><b>Funding and/or Staff Resources with Sponsorship?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like to explore some shared financial contribution by sponsors – not dues for members.</li> <li>• Perhaps dedication of staff.</li> </ul>	<p><u><b>Discussion (10/29, 12/3, 1/14, and 1/28 Subcommittee meetings):</b></u></p> <p><b>What is the best size?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most agree that 7-10 members is too small, 32 too large.</li> <li>• PAG is not necessarily too large – depends on the authority and types of decisions.</li> <li>• If an advisory board, a larger, broader representation of stakeholder interest is key.</li> <li>• Need realistic balance, group size 15-20.</li> </ul> <p><b>What types of members?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAG-like in representation. Regional, diverse.</li> <li>• A good blend would include the impacted groups of Multnomah County, Portland, Vancouver, and business interests.</li> <li>• Rotate seats between neighborhoods to ensure a voice for interests at the table.</li> <li>• Need technical representation – experts including environmental, Multnomah County Drainage District, and deicing.</li> <li>• Technical advisors (FAA, cargo, airlines, flight schools) are important</li> <li>• Need a liaison to existing Port committees or should there be subcommittees for various issues under direction of the main committee?</li> <li>• 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 public.</li> <li>• Mix of representation on the committee is important – needs business, pilots, etc to be successful</li> </ul>	<p><u><b>Discussion (10/29, 12/3, 1/14 and 1/28 Subcommittee meetings):</b></u></p> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authority needs to be adaptive to cover issues pertinent for the time.</li> <li>• Most airport committees are in the involve/collaborate spectrum. Not many of the case study groups are truly empowered.</li> <li>• Look at different authority levels. Authority level is likely to vary by issue.</li> <li>• Independence: first step to authority</li> <li>• Authority should be negotiated with the sponsors. OPIS may have more authority on some topics than others.</li> <li>• Do we want an appeal process?</li> <li>• There is authority of the group and authority of individual members.</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some issues may be inform only.</li> </ul> <p><b>Relationship to Decision makers?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is their relationship with decision-makers? How much power do they have?</li> <li>• Perhaps look at models where group has actual decision-making power. See Forestry Commission and Park Commission.</li> <li>• Are there areas of authority where Port Commission or City cedes authority to committee</li> </ul>	<p><u><b>Discussion (10/29, 12/3, 1/14, and 1/28 Subcommittee meetings):</b></u></p> <p><b>What type of staffing?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsors need to commit to a percentage of the operating budget, but realistically there is no money for the City to pay.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Many groups are effective with peer volunteers. While it would be nice to do with volunteers,</li> <li>• Staffing is needed and a combination of Port and City staff is preferred.</li> <li>• Existing in-house staffing is norm.</li> <li>• Should not be solely Port funded - sets Port up for conflict of interest</li> </ul> <p><b>Other resources?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need an independent facilitator for startup at minimum</li> <li>• Need access to information</li> <li>• Need access to experts when necessary.</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting Budget/Frequency of Meetings?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May want monthly meetings because sometimes takes several meetings to decide on issues; need opportunity to have meaningful impact</li> <li>• Down side of monthly meetings – may not have enough material to keep engaged – once set up monthly meetings, hard change to meet less frequently</li> <li>• Bimonthly is more common.</li> </ul>

SCOPE/PURVIEW	SPONSORSHIP	MEMBERSHIP	AUTHORITY	RESOURCES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May want a broader – more flexible body – not a one trick pony</li> <li>• Need ability to bring own issues forward</li> <li>• Neighborhood concerns including transportation, not just noise</li> <li>• Must look at economic development and business concerns</li> <li>• Some areas have no history of public involvement - our structure needs to reflect our history/tradition of public involvement</li> </ul> <p><b>Relationship to Other Committees?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be redundancy with existing committees and OPIS.</li> <li>• What will the relationship of CNAC and OPIS be? Peer collaboration with CNAC and Wildlife proposed by Maryhelen.</li> <li>• Share sustainability information with Sustainability Commission.</li> <li>• Like model with focused subcommittees – perhaps open ended or ad hoc subcommittees</li> <li>• Perhaps broad committee has less focus on noise or subcommittee to review and report back</li> <li>• Hope to see equal presence/parity – CNAC and this body</li> <li>• Another approach is to have CNAC a standing subcommittee of broad committee with representation from CNAC</li> <li>• Approach needs to be realistic – not remaking other committees, but creating one to fill a gap</li> </ul> <p><b>Reevaluation of Scope/Purpose?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A committee can plan a sunset to end when goals are reached</li> <li>• The group needs to set a periodic review of structure or charter process.</li> <li>• Annual retreat/review</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clackamas engagement important with new light rail connection – business engagement critical with ITT in CascadeStation</li> <li>• PDX creates jobs and generates economic growth. Everyone in the metro area is affected by the airport in one way or another.</li> <li>• Key stakeholders should not necessarily be selected based on geographic location alone.</li> <li>• Land use based, may want greater number of Portland seats.</li> <li>• Aviation Director as key player – either ex officio or technical resource to attend all meetings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dues for members?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May want to consider pay to play.</li> <li>• May be challenging for some –do not want to discourage participation.</li> </ul> <p><b>What about elected representation?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience with other organizations shows that elected officials don't attend meetings regularly.</li> <li>• Not a committee of totally elected members.</li> <li>• Electeds may not be answer here – smaller impact compared to noise at Portland International Raceway or police calls – and City does not own the Port</li> <li>• Perhaps should include our state rep in airport area – Tina Kotek?</li> </ul> <p><b>Who appoints/selects members?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CNAC – appointments are by jurisdictions. Includes Clark (Camas), Clackamas County, Washington County, Multnomah County, Portland, Vancouver, and East County.</li> <li>• Should they be appointed by City council/Port? If so, you have to take what they send.</li> <li>• Sponsoring jurisdictions or organizations listed as stakeholders should appoint.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If so we'd need to set up appeal process (to some other body)</li> <li>• There needs to be a flow of accountability to council</li> </ul> <p><b>Are there functions which committee could have an empowerment role?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise mitigation funds</li> <li>• Community enhancement funds</li> <li>• <b>Community Engagement Funds</b></li> <li>• <b>Other?</b></li> </ul>	