

**AIRPORT FUTURES
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #12
MEETING NOTES AND FOLLOW-UP**

Date and Time:	4/01/09, 6:00 - 9 PM
Location:	Portland International Airport, St. Helens A Meeting Room, 7100 Airport Way, Portland, OR
Attendees:	Erwin Bergman Maryhelen Kincaid Stuart Mathew Patrick Metzger Alesia Reese Hector Roche Lawrence Russell Fred Stovel Denny Stoecklin Kelly Sweeney Han Park (Inha University Intern) Lisa Lee (Inha University Intern) Jihyuen Hwang (Inha University Intern)
Staff:	Bronwyn Buckle Chris Corich Lise Glancy Sam Imperati Melissa McCluney Chris White
Not attending:	Eric Meyer Mike Sloan Vicki Thompson John Weigant

1. Welcome, Introductions, Updates – Hector Roche	Follow-up
Following a brief round of introductions, Hector reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives. The primary goal - begin defining OPIS for review and discussion with PAG in May, and the public in June. To reach clarity on Membership, Scope/Purview our table facilitators will debrief on the PAG OPIS work session.	None

2. Discussion on Decision Making – Hector Roche	Follow-up
While this process has been iterative, we need to begin defining the framework for the future standing committee. Staff recommended the subcommittee follow the PAG Collaboration Principles in striving for consensus using the 1-2-3 voting cards. What if the group has diametrically opposed views and is unable to reach a consensus? If no consensus, then majority rules. Hector proposed the subcommittee try consensus first, failing that vote with cards, failing that go to majority vote. All present agreed.	None

<p>Public visiting off the street don't have familiarity with prior discussion, and therefore all agreed that only subcommittee members are eligible to vote.</p>	
---	--

<p>3. Debrief from PAG OPIS Work Session</p>	<p>Follow-Up</p>
<p>Report from voting and Membership worksheet summary To save time, members were asked to review the handouts which detail voting and comments from the 3/17 PAG work session.</p> <p>Table Facilitator Reports – Table 4 – Represented by Maryhelen</p> <p><u>To add to Scope/Purview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a project is already in the Master Plan vs. a project that is not in the Master Plan • Sponsors are part of scope • Monitor sustainability efforts of other airports – globally • Have some input into Master Plan <p><u>To eliminate from Scope/Purview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5b. Legislation issues not appropriate for OPIS and • 5a. Add including input on State/Federal legislation. • Don't remove anything until we know more about sponsorship/responsibilities. <p><u>Sponsorship</u> Supported regional 4 option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advantages - known structure, works with PAG • Disadvantages – more sponsors, more bureaucracy • IGA more binding than MOU (enforceable, accountable) <p>Table 6 – Represented by Alesia and Kelly Exercise was really very good, some minor wording suggestions. Biggest contention was membership.</p> <p><u>To add to Scope/Purview</u> Sustainability was topic of conversation.</p> <p><u>To eliminate from Scope/Purview</u> Fred commented OPIS and PAG are not synonymous.</p> <p><u>Sponsorship</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option C, Port-City only, not surrounding counties • Not regional. City and Port are in control of the impacts. • Pay to play, as sponsor and member. <p>Lise – sponsorship and membership have been blurred, need to tease out the difference between these two.</p> <p>Table 2 – Represented by Bronwyn For the next Master Plan, will there be a new PAG or would</p>	

<p>this OPIS group assume that role?</p> <p><u>To add to Scope/Purview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't need to add anything, may be too many items. <p><u>To eliminate from Scope/Purview</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability is a concern. Want the group to do it justice. • Develop a technical advisory group or form a sustainability committee <p><u>Sponsorship</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threw out first 2 options of only City or only Port. • Like idea of Port – City sponsorship, or one other group. • No real defined recommendation. 	
---	--

4. Staff Report – General Overview and Report from Voting/Worksheets – Lise	Follow-Up
<p>For those not attending the 3/17 PAG meeting, we concentrated on 3 of the 5 elements the Public Involvement Subcommittee has been working with - Membership, Sponsorship, and Scope/Purview.</p> <p><u>Scope/Purview</u></p> <p>There was general agreement on the 5 areas of focus within Scope/Purview. Many items still require more detail from the subcommittees before we can finalize. A summary of PAG comments are included in the hand out for later review. Comments from the table exercises included wordsmithing. Wording refinements based on this input will be proposed at the 4/29 meeting for review and comment.</p> <p><u>Sponsorship</u></p> <p>General support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Priority - City-Port • Second Priority - Small Regional (Cities of Portland & Vancouver, Port, Metro) although not all agreed on which jurisdictions should be included here. In the small group exercise there were some negative comments on Metro as well as Vancouver. <p>Sponsorship does not relate to Membership. This seems to be muddy for some. An interest can be an OPIS member without being a sponsor. Sponsorship is <i>defined as the jurisdictions that will create and sustain the OPIS. The sponsors by some legal mechanism 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.</i></p> <p>A final sponsorship decision will require agreement by proposed sponsors as this presumes some level of resource</p>	<p>Refine language in Scope/Purview to reflect wordsmithing input for 4/29 meeting.</p> <p>Meet with potential sponsors during summer months.</p>

<p>commitment. Staff recommends deferring final recommendation on this until meetings can be held with Vancouver and Metro during summer.</p> <p><u>Membership</u> There was general agreement to keep size to a group of 15-20 (first priority), and less than 15 (second priority). In terms of representation, over 65% of PAG voters indicated NOT to reserve a specific seat for elected officials, executive branch, and legislative branch, which is why those cells are blocked out on the worksheet. Members of the public could be added to this list as well for the same reason. Over 65% of PAG voters indicated preference to have Transit Agency as technical advisor only. Attachment B has more detail summarizing PAG comments. Note: Not all PAG members completed their worksheets so the comment summary is not representative of everyone.</p> <p><u>Bottom line</u> The PAG did not have any disagreement with the direction of the Public Involvement Subcommittee. A green light was given to proceed in development of OPIS.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee Member Questions and Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be a challenge, but it seems we need a smaller body for certain impacts and a broader group for measuring sustainability benchmarks, and public engagement. • How to view impacts depends on where you sit. Some may view that close in, or more broadly. May be something we deal with down the road. • I envision a core committee, and another group with a technical advisory or support role. They would not be voting members but provide technical assistance. 	
--	--

5. Membership exercise – Attachment D	Follow-Up
<p>The homework assignment was to identify how certain interests might participate in a future OPIS. Please use this homework when voting in this next membership exercise. Our goal is consensus on representation so we can make a preliminary recommendation on membership. If we do not have consensus, we will ask for clarity to see if we can move to consensus through discussion.</p> <p>Please think about the PAG direction to keep the OPIS to a 15-20 member body. John Weigant provided us with information on John’s Parkinson’s Coefficient of Inefficiency Law research on optimal size of committees. This research backs up our research, PAG and Public Involvement Subcommittee preference for a body close to 20 members.</p> <p>See voting results on attachment. While our goal was to have a consensus on membership interests, these vote results reveal some extreme viewpoints. In fact we only have a consensus on two interests – East</p>	

Multnomah County, and Portland Neighborhood Coalitions.

Subcommittee members questions and comments

- An issue was brought up with the way the questions were framed for voting. Voting on each interest individually does not reveal what a committee would look like as a whole. Members expressed they would have voted differently based on trying to keep the number count to approximately 15-20 OPIS members.
- For the homework assignment, selection of members needs a way to include prioritization of interests.
- The question was raised, what is the difference between a voting member, nonvoting member, and a technical advisory member? A voting member attends regularly, participates in conversation, decisions, and voting. A nonvoting member would attend all meetings but not have a vote. A technical advisory member would be brought in for a specific project or subject to provide information. In order to assign an interest to one of voting, nonvoting, technical, or not represented categories, it helps to understand what these categories are.
- OPIS will need to make decisions on issues. Looking at the impact areas considered for Airport Futures - the height, noise, and environmental overlay zones are all centered on the airport. The area surrounding the airport is where all the impacts occur. They do not occur in Clackamas or in Washington County. There needs to be more than one representative on OPIS from the primary impact areas as these are the areas with the quality of life issues.
- There are air quality, and economic impacts to neighborhoods in addition to noise impacts. Cargo, shipping, and other business benefits of the airport affects other neighborhoods and counties which are not adjacent to the airport. Those communities should be represented in addition to the communities immediately surrounding the airport.
- The community of color and low income groups should be included under social interest rather than a stand alone interest.
- One seat should be adequate coverage for Vancouver, Camas, and Washougal neighborhoods, and one seat for Vancouver political or government interest.
- Is the critical piece the voting members? OPIS can always add or delete nonvoting and technical interests later. Members and interests will come and go with time.
- Businesses have a channel to deal directly with the Port and therefore do not need a vote. Neighborhoods do not have such a clear channel to communicate and be heard.

Staff reminder – to close in on membership, you will receive a homework assignment to determine how you would prioritize

Continue this discussion after members have completed homework on prioritizing

these interests in allocating the 15 – 20 membership seats.	membership allocation.
---	------------------------

6. Planning and Development – Land Use/Transportation and Public Involvement Subcommittee Joint meeting – Jay, Scott and Chris	Follow-Up
<p>To provide additional information and help determine the skeleton for OPIS, the two committees met together to discuss “Planning and Development” Projects and how they fit into OPIS Scope/Purview.</p> <p>Planning staff provided a list of airport capital improvement projects which opened in 2007, 2008, 2009. The term “opened”, was clarified to mean approved for funding, but not necessarily started. See PDX Capital Project list attached. Many listed projects will not happen now with the economic downturn. These haven’t been adjusted yet.</p> <p>Projects with greater impact to the community would require a higher level of review with the City. What about “Allowed by Right” projects that do not require City review? OPIS Scope/Purview planning and development (item 1.d) lists “complement Plan District regulatory reviews” as an OPIS responsibility. Would OPIS be interested in reviewing these projects? Many of the items are routine maintenance projects. Which projects would be of high enough significance to warrant community involvement?</p> <p>On this list they have been grouped into loose categories of similar project type, for example pavement management and technology enhancements. In 2007 numerous aprons, taxiways, and parking areas were included on the list. PDX Maintenance has a pavement management program designed to extend the life of all asphalt surfaces. This includes rehabilitation and periodic application of slurry seals.</p> <p>Does OPIS care about reviewing each line item? In a year with many projects, it could be a tedious process. OPIS may prefer to consider these on a programmatic level. On an annual basis OPIS could receive an explanation of the program and description of projects included for the year. The pavement management program for example, incorporates sustainability into the process by maintaining assets to ensure a longer useful life. Some pavement projects involve a complete rebuild, some grind and pave, some just a seal coat.</p> <p>Vehicles are another grouping on the capital project list. Would OPIS members care to know each time the Port buys a new truck? Would it be a better use of time to discuss on the program level? The vehicle alternative fuels program includes the use of CNG trucks, buses and hybrid vehicles.</p> <p><u>Subcommittee member questions and comments</u> Staff asked “Would OPIS have an interest in review of these items?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One member indicated a preference to keep items on the list for OPIS Input, or programmatic consideration 	

<p>until having a better understanding of what the grouping of items mean.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion on the program level might have a larger interest base with OPIS.• It seems an annual review on the paving program vs. each individual project would be beneficial. OPIS could request additional information to consider if necessary. The paving program involves sustainability issues. Wouldn't members be interested in materials and procedures with lower ecological impact while maximizing the life of pavement? If later it were found that a different product or procedure were to be used it should be brought to OPIS. Items in the programmatic category should include an annual review like the Environmental/Sustainability briefing Phil Ralston provided for PAG – high level, not deep into details.• The 2007 project list includes purchase of Colwood Golf Course. While money was authorized, the property was not purchased. Would OPIS review each individual land purchase? Would citizens normally know if someone else was buying the land? If the Port is acquiring neighboring land for future development as part of a bigger plan, OPIS would want to know. Land acquisition and development such as this is a major quality of life issue to surrounding neighbors. An impact such as this to neighbors is why OPIS is being created.• Is staff asking the subcommittee to define a set of criteria for planning and development review? There are two motives for this discussion. One is to give the subcommittee a sense of what types of projects there are. How often the OPIS meets may be determined by the projects represented. This discussion will help project staff define the criteria for planning and development review.• Every time the Port paints, puts on a new roof, or paves are they going to bring it to the group? Is this best use of time? Don't see OPIS being the overseer of all Port capital improvement projects.• Maybe some members are interested in eco friendly products and VOCs in the slurry seals. The City has very little oversight over the Port. Some members may want OPIS to keep an eye on these and other sustainability issues.• Don't see how slurry seals and terminal video cameras fit into this group. This level of detail changes the whole scope and purview. How does this fit under land use? This is different than what we've been saying OPIS would do.• Agree OPIS isn't designed to oversee daily operations. We don't want the group to be overwhelmed with minutiae. Do think there are impacts from some things Port does that OPIS will be interested in.• Collectively group items known to have no significant NEPA impact. This is a category we should not waste	
---	--

<p>time on. We don't have time and City doesn't have the time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't want projects discussed too late after already designed and ready to build. We care about uses and impacts, i.e. if the Port builds a hangar for maintenance and the tenant runs up engines at 3:00 am. We care about the noise impact, not that a hangar is being built. That is a defining criterion, if a project makes an impact on the community. • How many things on this list would be helpful to the City or Port for OPIS to review? Does the sponsor have a need for OPIS? • The broader programs such as sustainability would benefit from OPIS input. <p>Jay Sugnet asked members to complete the Capital Project List by checking if each project should fall under the headings of "OPIS Input, Programmatic, or No OPIS Input". This will help staff determine which items OPIS will be concerned about. See attached summary of subcommittee member input on capital project list.</p>	
--	--

7. Project Team Update - Chris Corich and Jay Sugnet	Follow-Up
<p>To determine areas of agreement and ultimately form a recommendation on OPIS, a list of preferences has been developed. Under the column headings of "City Project Team, Port Project Team, Public Involvement Subcommittee, and PAG" preferences have been listed for each of the OPIS elements. The far right column "PISC Homework Questions re: OPIS Scenario Recommendation" includes questions for members to answer about their OPIS preferences. These are to be completed at home and returned to Lise by 4/15. Your answers will be used as a basis for developing a draft OPIS framework.</p> <p><u>Sponsorship</u> There is pretty close alignment among City, Port, Public Involvement Subcommittee, and PAG members with City-Port small regional sponsorship. We need to make sure everyone understands that Sponsorship is different from membership.</p> <p><u>Scope/Purview</u> The scope of this Committee could cover a lot. That is why we did the capital improvement project exercise to help narrow down what OPIS will want to be involved in. There appears to be agreement across the board on the scope with some wordsmithing.</p> <p><u>Membership</u> Across the board pretty good consensus on 15 – 20 members. Broad regional representation, but not agreement on interests at the table yet.</p>	

Authority/ Role

The City and Port have agreement on three bullets. The Port doesn't have a good understanding at this point of what the empowerment portion means. We can address further.

Comments

- Sponsors can say "on this particular project, we empower OPIS to make the decision for us". Empowerment would be in agreement with the sponsors.
- The City could empower OPIS in code with a statutory level of review i.e. administrative review (from land use handout).

Resources

Who will be preparing the agenda, writing meeting summaries, organizing meetings, providing food? The Port envisions existing staff doing this. Staff or project managers from various departments, for example Environmental or Noise, will come to inform group on specific issues. Airport Futures has been highly funded (\$4.9 million). With the Aviation Director as possible moderator at the meetings, it can be assured OPIS will be supported at a similar level to PAG and CNAC.

Comments

- Include in your homework, the kinds of things you would hope to have staff provide.
- Members familiar with CNAC agree that body was pretty well funded, and has worked pretty well in the past.

Appointments

Agreement on this element. Appointment process same as with PAG. Sponsors have ability to confirm appointments. The first year the Chair may be appointed, in subsequent years OPIS will appoint the Chair. The Aviation Director may moderate following the HAIR model.

Comments

- For HAIR a member co chairs, a citizen helps with the agenda.
- A moderator is the same as a facilitator? Yes.
- Does the Aviation Director oversee all activity at PDX even non aviation related activity, for example environmental? The Director oversees everything within the fence.
- If the Aviation Director moderates OPIS meetings, would there be a conflict or would members feel constrained? That would depend on the person, can't make guarantees.

Relationship To Other Standing Committees

The City and Port both think CNAC and Wildlife should continue as standalone peer groups. An annual evaluation could be

<p>made to determine if any adjustment should be made. Possible that these groups may have a seat on OPIS depending on membership resolution. Noise would dominate meetings if taken on by OPIS, preventing the group from having time for other matters. It seems that would be a bad use for OPIS.</p> <p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could Wildlife and CNAC bring issues to OPIS? Yes, coordination would be encouraged between the groups. • What would the OPIS relationship be with other PDX project committees? Not sure what it will look like in the future. Don't want to prejudge. With the next Master Plan update, OPIS may serve as a PAG, or OPIS may say "no", in which case there may be a need to form another PAG. • It would be easier to have a standing OPIS for next Master Plan rather than starting from scratch. <p><u>Subcommittees</u> Would the PI SC be comfortable deferring subcommittee decisions to OPIS?</p> <p><u>Frequency of Meetings</u> – Determined by Scope/Purview. Would the PI SC agree to defer this decision until summer when there will be better definition of Scope/Purview?</p> <p><u>Annual Evaluation/Sunset Provision</u> Agreement that OPIS should have an annual evaluation. This evaluation would determine the work plan for the next year and the future of the group.</p> <p><u>Annual Report To Sponsors</u> Report to community and member jurisdictions as well as Port Commission.</p> <p><u>Decision-Making</u> PAG-like, consensus (1-2 votes) if possible, or majority-minority.</p> <p><u>First Year Draft Work Plan</u> Staff will develop draft work plan based on more detail from subcommittees on scope/purview focus areas.</p> <p><u>Intergovernmental Agreement</u> Legal mechanism to be developed over summer based on PISC and PAG direction.</p>	
<p>8. Group Discussion, Questions And Comments</p>	<p>Follow-up</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some questions may not be answered until we identify and meet with the sponsors. • What is the purpose of OPIS? Is it to see that the product does the job as we'd like to see it? Yes, if there are changes, or problems that come up later so they can be rectified so we end up with the best 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> product. We can't foresee all changes that may arise. This is starting to look real. 	
---	--

9. Next Meeting and Public Involvement- Hector	Follow-Up
<p>The PISC has two more meetings to come up with OPIS framework and one or two scenarios for public review at June Public Meetings. Using members' homework feedback, Hector will help develop a framework and return it to members the week before our next meeting.</p> <p>4/15 Homework due (right hand column, Preference handout) 4/22 Framework developed and emailed to PISC 4/29 Next PI SC meeting – discuss this framework</p> <p>To allow more preparation time for the June public meetings, staff asked the subcommittee to move the 5/27 meeting up to 5/20 or 5/21. Lise will send an email to the subcommittee to determine preference on date.</p> <p>Please look at upcoming Public Involvement meeting dates on back of the agenda. If you are interested in volunteering, your help would be appreciated.</p>	<p>Members to return homework by 4/15.</p> <p>Hector, Lise, and Bronwyn use homework to develop framework for discussion at 4/29 meeting.</p> <p>Reschedule 5/27 meeting to earlier date.</p>

Hand Outs:

- 4-01-09 Agenda
- Attachment #A – Report from Voting
- Attachment #B – Membership Worksheet Notes
- Attachment #C – Next Steps/ OPIS Scenario Development
- Attachment #D – OPIS Membership Exercise
- Planning and Development Projects handout
- Project Team Preliminary (Preferences) handout