

**AIRPORT FUTURES
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING #7
MEETING NOTES AND FOLLOW-UP**

Date and Time:	10/29/08, 6:30 - 9 PM
Location:	Multnomah County Building, 501 SE Hawthorne, Room 112, Portland, OR
Attendees:	Erwin Bergman Maryhelen Kincaid Patrick Metzger Alesia Reese Linda Robinson Lawrence Russell Fred Stovel Denny Stoecklin Kelly Sweeney <i>Vicki Thompson</i>
Staff:	Lise Glancy Bronwyn Buckle Shannon McArthur Chris White Chris Corich
Unable to attend:	Jill Eiland Eric Meyer Hector Roche Mike Sloan

1. Welcome, Introductions, Updates – Maryhelen	Follow-up
Maryhelen asked for introductions and updates from subcommittee members since our last meeting. Maryhelen asked if there were any changes to the meeting notes. There were none proposed.	None

2. Debrief from 10/8 and 10/13 Open House – All	Follow-up
<p>Lise referred subcommittee to open house and web survey summary included in the meeting packet. She then reviewed comments from Hector and staff on the open houses and asked the subcommittee for their perspective. The following is a summary of feedback on the open houses:</p> <p><u>What Worked?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use existing conditions review & question and answer • Big picture overview • Positive response generally to open houses in evaluations – access, information, staff, keep doing this • Well organized • Busy location best – C-Tran, consider Kennedy School • Good 1:1 time at project tables • Good small discussion groups though modestly attended – good explanation of issues 	None

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of staff to addendees was good • Liked presence of citizen committee members <p>Maryhelen also added that there was one gentleman at the Vancouver Open House that was very concerned about noise. She let him know about CNAC, invited him to their meetings and explained how he could be involved. IN the future we should train discussion leaders so they can put participants in touch with existing programs that address their concerns.</p> <p><u>What Didn't?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too early - later start time – 6-8 pm • Not Mondays? • Location for Portland meeting – perhaps busier location next time • Some awkward silences on broad topics at discussion tables • Ads do not appear to produce turnout and are expensive – send future notices through neighborhood land use chairs coalition chairs and community calendars and newsletters • Not enough lead time – next 2 months for chairs calendars and newsletters • RSVP/calls to stakeholders did not produce turnout – labor intensive • Cross-section very narrow - consultants, neighborhoods – only one business organization <p><u>Improvements Needed?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-minute commercials for discussion groups with overview • Define task/role for participants - opportunity for participation – facilitators/discussion leaders; invite one neighborhood rep to next open house. • Explain how people can continue to be involved, what happens next. • Clearer direction on rotation between groups • Possibly conclude with report back about themes • Add questions and responses to website – e.g., Trimet Service • One conversation at a time in discussion groups • Don't expect stakeholders to come to you – go to them – schedule priority neighborhoods • Piggyback on another neighborhood event • Perhaps just Airport Futures next time – maybe with combined open houses once a year 	
--	--

3. Debrief from 9/24 Public Involvement Consultants – All	Follow-Up
Lise referred the subcommittee to the key points from	None.

<p>the 9/24 Public Involvement Consultants presentation. She then asked the group if there were additional comments. There was general agreement that the 9/24 presentation and discussion helped get the group thinking about their work in creating the ongoing public involvement strategy to follow Airport Futures.</p> <p>Group proposed that we need to have a clear message of what can participants in a committee can give and get from the process. What influence opportunities will there be? We 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?</p>	
--	--

<p>4. Foundation of Ongoing Public Involvement Strategy and Examples of Other Airport Ongoing Committees – Lise/Shannon</p>	<p>Follow-Up</p>
<p>Lise and Shannon provided a PowerPoint presentation on the above. When discussing the PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee, Lise mentioned that a summary of the team’s meeting with CNAC was included in the meeting packet. Comments were held to the discussion portion of the agenda which followed.</p>	<p>Lise to make a couple of changes to the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slide 6 – add relationship to other standing Port and City committees (delete parenthetical) • Slide 7 – add relationship to other standing Port and City committees here as well • Slide 17 – Appointment term – replace text with “none”. • Slide 34 – Staffing/budget - correct information to read: “In-house staff (technical studies - Oakland and Minneapolis, dues - Oakland and San Francisco; paid facilitator - Oakland, paid director - O’Hare and San Francisco)” <p>Fred Stovel recommended following the meeting that the PPT be shared with the Land Use Transportation Subcommittee. He also proposed the subcommittee be invited to the 12/3 Public Involvement Subcommittee meeting and that a future joint meeting or ad hoc group of the two subcommittees be formed to work on future committee scenarios.</p>

<p>5. Group Discussion – All</p>	<p>Follow-Up</p>
<p>Maryhelen facilitated this discussion. The following is a</p>	<p>Lise and Shannon to do follow up</p>

<p>summary of comments from the group:</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well presented; good grounding for OPIS work • Ownership of the airport matters • Need to look at City standing committees too • Like model with focused subcommittees – perhaps open ended or ad hoc subcommittees • Delete Minneapolis and O’Hare as examples because huge noise issues • No deletions yet – keep open-mind • May want to pull elements from all • Appointment process is important – what is the direct line of authority/responsibility • What is their relationship with decision-makers? How much power do they have? • Look at intergovernmental agreement goals – supported strong public involvement related to land use and airport • Subcommittee is working on the same task as Land Use Subcommittee – public involvement will be a key part of the plan district and vice versa • Challenging keeping elected officials at table in the Hillsboro Airport Issues Roundtable • 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 • Minneapolis reports to appoint to Port Commission • AIR proposed state law change in Port Commission – ensure City of Portland representation • Mix of representation on the committee is be important – needs business, pilots, etc to be successful • Other airports do not have wildlife committees, PDX is different. • Need wildlife/natural resource component in this region • Transportation concerns are an important business component • Right now PDX committees are PDX only; the new committee should be Port-City. • May want a broader – more flexible body – not a one trick pony • Clackamas engagement important with new light rail connection – business engagement critical with ITT in CascadeStation • PDX generates large and small impacts – we don’t need impacts on Clackamas • Yes we do. PDX is a regional asset. • Technical advisors (FAA, cargo, airlines, flight schools) are important • It should be structured differently than PDX LUAC • Need ability to bring own issues forward 	<p>research on airport committees related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accomplishments – what’s worked • Challenges – improvements needed • LAX roundtable – impetus? Why break off from broader LAX committee? • Success measures: Meeting attendance/length of meetings/turnover of membership • Talk with 2-3 committee members and staff on success/challenges <p>Bronwyn to present information on other City/Regional Ongoing Committees at 12/3 meeting.</p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most groups influence/collaborate – very few decision-making • Types of issues to reviewers where can have true influence • Perhaps look at models where group has actual decision-making power. See Forestry Commission and Park Commission. • Are there areas of authority where Port Commission or City cedes authority to committee • If so we'd need to set up appeal process (to some other body) • Gresham Planning Commission used to have decision-making authority, but that has changed • Neighborhood concerns including transportation, not just noise • Must look at economic development and business concerns • Perhaps broad committee has less focus on noise or subcommittee to review and report back • Hope to see equal presence/parity – CNAC and this body • Another approach is to have CNAC a standing subcommittee of broad committee with representation from CNAC • Some areas have no history of public involvement - our structure needs to reflect our history/tradition of public involvement • New entity will impact other entities – need to be aware of this - look at other committees • There needs to be a flow of accountability to council • Perhaps should include our state rep in airport area – Tina Kotek? • Should not be solely Port funded - sets Port up for conflict of interest • Funding this initiative is important, other examples have larger budgets because includes noise insulation for 1000's of homes. • A Memorandum of Understanding may be needed. • Approach needs to be realistic – not remaking other committees, but creating one to fill a gap • May want monthly meetings because sometimes takes several meetings to decide on issues; need opportunity to have meaningful impact • Down side of monthly meetings – may not have enough material to keep engaged – once set up monthly meetings, hard change to meet less frequently • Follow up research could include asking these case study groups how they define success, whether they believe they are succeeding, and what they would change. • Success could be measured by committee member attendance, quantifying it is hard. 	<p>Staff will look at IAP2 research on measuring success of public outreach</p>
---	---

	– not a lot of information out there on this.
--	---

7. Evaluation/Next Meeting Agenda	Follow-Up
<p>There was no time for a formal evaluation. Maryhelen reviewed the agenda for the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of City / Regional Ongoing Committees (Columbia Slough Watershed Council was added as a possible model) – Bronwyn Buckle • Follow-up Research on Other Airport Examples of Ongoing Committees – Shannon McArthur • Objectives/Criteria for Ongoing Committee Scenarios - All • Threshold Question Discussion – All • Success Measures – Denny Stoecklin/Bronwyn • PAG Evaluation • Research on performance 	<p>Bronwyn to develop draft agenda for next meeting.</p>

Hand Outs:

- 10/29/08 Public Involvement Subcommittee #7 Meeting Agenda
- 9/24/08 Public Involvement Subcommittee meeting notes #6
- 10/9/08 PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee meeting summary
- Summary of Open House and Website Surveys
- Key Points from 9/24/08 Public Involvement Consultants
- 10/29/08 Public Involvement Strategy PowerPoint