

**PAG Public Involvement Ad Hoc Group
Meeting Notes**

Meeting Date	3/4/08 5:30 – 7:30 pm
Meeting Location	Vancouver Room, PDX
Attendance	Bob Eaton Patrick Metzger Ross Monn Eric Meyer Linda Robinson Hector Roche Lawrence Russell John Weigant
Staff	Bronwyn Buckle Lise Glancy Sean Loughran Jay Sugnet

Others not able to attend: Mike Sloan and Maryhelen Kincaid.

1. Welcome/Introductions

Hector Roche served as the group's facilitator. He opened the meeting and asked attendees and staff to introduce themselves and share what interest they represent on the PAG and what interests them about public involvement.

As part of the self-introductions, John Weigant stated that there is too much going on in the PAG and that subcommittees are very important because smaller groups can focus on specific issues. If a public involvement subcommittee already existed, it would have been used already.

2. PAG Public Involvement Overview

Jay Sugnet and Lise Glancy gave a brief overview of early thinking on public involvement, the role of the City-Port Intergovernmental Agreement of 2004, and the Public Involvement Plan that is guiding the Airport Futures process. At the outset of the planning process, project staff identified a number of subcommittees that might support the work of the Planning Advisory Group (PAG). Out of the 15 identified, four were recommended in recognition of volunteer member time constraints. One of these was the Public Involvement Subcommittee.

A Public Involvement Ad Hoc Group formed in October to give input to staff and consultants on the scientific telephone survey and the input was extremely valuable. Several business PAG members participated on this Ad Hoc Group, but were unwilling to participate in a long term committee due to other time constraints. Staff committed to revisit the creation of this subcommittee in 6 months.

Staff noted that the ultimate goal is to attract a business representative and establish a formal Public Involvement Subcommittee, but in the interim, project staff will work with the Ad Hoc Group. Two items in particular would be helpful for input from the Ad Hoc Group:

1. We have the ability to create a non-scientific survey for the web site (discussed below)

2. We need help from the PAG on public involvement as we as staff are sometimes too close to it.

Linda Robinson stated that business groups could decide to not join a subcommittee on purpose, effectively blocking creation of a Public Involvement Subcommittee.

Jay stated that this group should continue whether as an Ad Hoc Group or as a subcommittee. The Ad Hoc Group can still inform the PAG.

Several agreed that getting a business member would be preferable. Hector Roche asked how many business representatives were on the PAG. Lise responded that there are 6 PDX users/business seats, plus 5 alternates.

Eric Meyer added a comment that discussing and educating people on the history of public involvement and PDX is a really good idea, but we need to figure out how to communicate it well.

John said that the IGA process was groundbreaking, a source of pride, showed a sense of cooperation between the parties.

Lawrence said this is great information, but you're not getting through to people. For example, what does Ad Hoc and IGA mean? Presentations/information needs to be understandable. We need to make the process clear to the public and share public input with the PAG. We need to market the process, decisions and implications to the public. We need to demonstrate the importance of the public to the public and the final product.

3. Purpose of Public Involvement

Hector invited everyone to brainstorm about the purpose of public involvement especially as it relates to the Airport Futures process.

- **To provide clear communication** 1) to the public, 2) to the PAG and 3) a feedback loop between the two. We should let people know what will/has happened to their input.
- Clear communication means not only **informing people** about what's going on, but **educating people** about the issues surrounding the project, improving understanding between groups and about issues the project is addressing.
- A Public Involvement Subcommittee would be **the vehicle to get recommendations and information to full PAG**. Public involvement is about input and output. Open houses are good at getting information out, but not about getting info in – a Public Involvement Subcommittee could help get the information from these events back to PAG.
- **Increase public input to, and control of the process**
- Market **product, process and implications** to public (make it relevant)
- Make information more understandable
- Demonstrate importance of **public-to-public communication**, not just staff to public.
- We may need a Public Involvement Subcommittee to get work done.
- **Decrease public isolation in process**
- When talking about history – talk about how public involvement has or has not affected the process.

Eric also asked about whether we could set up a system for letting people ask questions before a meeting or events so the presenter has time to prepare a response. He wants to improve discourse and discussions so that information is exchanged meaningfully, without canned answers, but that no one has to be put on the spot.

4. Website

Bronwyn Buckle briefly described the web site as an example of a valuable public involvement tool that could be further improved by a public involvement group. She asked that the group look at the web site and give feedback about how to make it more useful and more appealing to: 1) the PAG, 2) people who may be tracking the project closely, and 3) the public at large. The group recognizes these 3 groups have different needs because they each have a different awareness and understanding of the project, especially if they have not been tracking it from the beginning.

When looking at the web site, consider questions such as: Is it easy to navigate? Is it serving your needs? Can you find what you need easily? (Project information, documents, meetings, locations, summaries) If we determine that we want to generate traffic to the site, how can we get the word out? Can we make it more interactive?

Linda noted that she doesn't go to the web site unless there is an upcoming meeting or something new listed.

John said that use of the web site is a generational issue. Perhaps there could be a subcommittee of the subcommittee on this, noting that this group needs to think about how to structure itself to get work done.

Eric asked if there is an ability to ask questions on the website. Lise noted that we have an Ask the Team section and plan a Frequently Asked Questions section.

Hector asked if the website is everywhere like Portland online.

Bronwyn noted our goal is to get the community to our web site and make it useful and interactive.

One way to let people know when there is new info on the site is to send an automatic email updating people.

Jay told the group about how staff walked the East Portland Neighborhood Office land use chairs through the website at a recent meeting and that it was a good conversation. Ross Monn will get back to staff with any feedback about the site.

Lise acknowledged Ross for his commitment as a PAG member to connecting his community of interest (neighborhood) to the work of the PAG through regular stakeholder updates. Ross noted that Coalition offices do not like formal presentations – more dialogue.

Bronwyn and Lise noted that staff could use help from this Ad Hoc Group and PAG members to get in front of a broader group of stakeholders.

5. Tasks for this Group

Hector led the group in brainstorming ideas and that this group could take on, or collaborate with staff on.

- Establish or increase opportunities for public discourse (e.g., the IGA process and AIR, Citywide parks)
- Vehicle to get community to our web site and make it useable and interactive
- Online Web Survey/Forecasting activity
- Identify other vehicles for 2-way communication and marketing
- Identify mailings where can piggyback on (libraries, community colleges, neighborhood newsletters),
- Advertise website and survey v. open houses
- Input on future public meetings/events (April 8 and 9)
- Give feedback on the website
- Work with staff on materials for meetings
- Outreach to neighborhoods or other existing groups / identify groups we should talk to – make suggestions as to who we should be talking to and help get the project on agendas
- Other ideas to supplement the ongoing Airport Futures Public Involvement Program

6. Next Steps

Ross, Eric and Linda will meet with staff to discuss Power Point and event plans for upcoming public meetings and stakeholder meetings.

Staff and Hector will get notes out to this group and work on the update that will be given at the April 15 PAG meeting. We will also let the PAG know we have met at the March meeting.

The next Ad Hoc Group meeting will be scheduled soon after the April PAG meeting (1 – 2 weeks). Parking lot items (see below) will be put on next agenda.

Items from Parking Lot:

- Review of what is in the Public Involvement Plan and IGA commitments
- Charter issues for subcommittee – scope of work, chair
 - Public Involvement chair should be a community person and should be a member of the Coordinating Committee
- Can we set up a process for getting questions in before meetings
- Vehicles to get community to our website and make it usable and interactive