

**Public Involvement Subcommittee
Airport Futures
Meeting Summary
October 15, 2007
Kennedy School**

PAG Members Present: Tom Gerharter (Horizon), Hector Roche (Mult Co), Eric Meyer (AIR), John Mohlis (Bldg Trades), Fred Stovel (Neighborhoods)

Others in Attendance: Linda Robinson (Public Committee member)

Project Staff/Consultants in attendance: Jay Sugnet (Bureau of Planning), Sam Imperati (Facilitator), Mike Riley & John Campbell (Riley Research Associates); Scott Drumm, Chris Corich, Sean Loughren (Port)

Chair: Jay Sugnet

Summary: Purpose of the meeting was to work on a telephone survey that would get the PAG started with public opinion and perhaps lead to a future survey or focus groups.

1. The consultants proposed a survey of three groups: the eight most affected zip codes within 55 DNL, the City of Portland, and the greater metro area. Eric Meyer proposed looking at the noise complaint maps to widen the noise significance. Chris said he would work with the consultant on this. Numbers to be surveyed: 800 in noise affected areas, 400 in Portland, and 800 in tri-county area.
2. Survey should repeat questions from North Portland and Columbia Crossing surveys to validate baselines. Survey might take 12 minutes, which was thought too long. So members went through each question to see if some should be eliminated and validate wording.
 - a. Eric Meyer asked about order and type of question (positive or negative). The big attitude questions are to be followed by "Why do think that?" open-ended questions to make sure they are not leading. Other lists of questions will have the lead question rotated so not all those surveyed will be asked questions in the same order.
 - b. Linda Robinson noted that some questions were written to suggest airport had only positive impacts. The questions on "Understanding Key Impacts" were wordsmithed for fairness: we tried to define "sustainability", deal with concept of congestion, and clearly express concept of environmental impacts.
 - c. The consultants and facilitator suggested changing the scale of the response from 1 to 5, to 1 to 100 to give some variation to factors that are not too specific.
3. Several subcommittee members felt there was some "airport bias" in many of questions, in particular Questions 9 - 16, where **seven** of the **eight** questions were written as positive statements about the airport, with respondents asked to agree/disagree, and only **one** written from a neighborhood perspective. The consultants agreed to do additional work on the phrasing of these questions and well as others in the survey.
4. The subcommittee members agreed that more City (specifically ONI and Neighborhood Coalition participation) was needed to insure wider public participation. Since there are not PAG representatives from all required interest groups, the PI subcommittee should be considered an Ad Hoc committee and reconvene when the PAG considers other issues.

Meeting Summary submitted by: Fred Stovel/fstovel@comcast.net/503 281-5589
Staff point of contact: Jay Sugnet/503 823-5869