

**Airport Futures Planning Advisory Group
Process Evaluation Summary and Lessons Learned**

1.	Process Pacing	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		3	12	5	1	
2.	Group Dynamics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		7	11	3		
3.	Decision Quality	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		9	11	1		
4.	Presentations/ Materials <i>*(One person checked four boxes)</i>	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		11*	11*	1*	1*	
5.	Subcommittees	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		8	8	5		
6.	Chairs	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		7	10	4		
7.	Consultants	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		12	9			
8.	Facilitator	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		17	4			
9.	City Staff	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		12	9			
10.	Port Staff	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		14	7			
11.	Your Communications with Your Interest Groups	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		4	8	5	2	1
12.	Public Involvement	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		7	11	2	1	
13.	Project Website	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		6	7	6		

14.	Major Substantive Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd Runway and Decentralized Alternatives • A lot of information to cover – how to be thorough enough but keep process moving – think a good balance was struck • Building trust with wide variety of interests • Challenges associated with getting natural resource issues on the table – took a lot of pressure to get the issues brought forward. At times there seemed like there was a lot of behind the scenes maneuvering going on regarding this issue • Creating a new model for local management of a regional land use/facility • Detailed homework materials • Diversity of goals • Gaining understanding and general agreement in all major elements of the project • History of Port relationship with community, City • Honest differences between key stakeholders • I had an interest in working on subcommittees but found the downtown Portland location during workdays problematic • Initial selection of committee members was politically motivated • Length of meetings • Natural resources (talk about “horns of a dilemma!”) • Problems early when staff insisted that any subcommittees must have representatives from all factions • Reaching agreement on the forecast • Scope of work • Sometimes bogged down on fine details, but overall a very good process • Taking the process forward...what’s next for PDX CAC? • Technical aspects of the process: language, agency relationships, etc. • The basic facility plan proved to be pretty easy in light of a low demand forecast, pushing off the hard issues of a 3rd runway and satellite terminal. As such, the difficult issue was the natural resources program. • Time commitment • Understanding how City process for land use works and its limits, and how the Port works in conjunction with the FAA, and what its options are • Volume and breadth of subjects
-----	-------------------------------------	---

15.	Major Substantive Achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality product inclusive of diverse positions x4 • Commitment to/focus on sustainability – new building for example x3 • PAG recommendations x2 • Community involvement x2 • Working well together – overall functioning of PAG and voting system x2 • Acceptance of the natural resources agreement • Agreement on a common vision and on the final report • Bridging diverse points of view and competing values • City – Port relationship that includes interest groups • Community advisory committee • Consensus decision making throughout the process, and in reaching final agreement • Excellent products: very good advancement of sustainability principles • Good methodology based upon a range forecast • I think there now exists a fairly detailed knowledge of the complexities involved in the operation of this airport. • Integrity of final products, consistency with PAG vision, values, collaborative process, an actual actionable plan • Maybe just a thought – limit the number of subcommittees one PAG member can be on so a few people with a lot of time available don't hijack the project • Navigating natural resource issues to a successful outcome despite challenges listed in 14 (above) • Phenomenal vision and goals • Plan district • “Probabilistic” forecast and selecting the mid-point • Projections • Provided much transparency in all aspects • Sustainability as an essential part of the decision making process • With the 3rd runway being required by FAA, I thought it was a great compromise introducing the “percentile measures” to appease PAG to accomplish this task only when the airport reaches the number of flights to springboard into the next phase of construction
16.	Specific Processes that Worked Well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voting process and ability to navigate through 2s and 3s x7 • Subcommittee process x7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ was good for working through issues ○ allowed skeptics to learn and grow comfortable with issues and policy direction ○ Reporting back to the PAG accelerated community involvement and produced better

		<p>results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance of representation on PAG • Care and attention given to consensus and majority decision-making and respect given to minority opinion • Communication to the PAG members • Community outreach • Conflict resolution by staff and facilitation • Facilitator • Hard work done by City and Port staff • Liked being able to review materials prior to the meetings • Patience for complex issues • Respect for all perspectives • Staff attention to detail and ability to bring cohesiveness • Taking complex technical issues and providing info in a more common approach
17.	<p>Specific Processes that Needed Improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At times it seemed like the process could have gone faster, but given that it came out successful, it is hard to be too critical here. At times, I felt like some of the votes were pre-emptive – i.e., trying to get buy-in before information was completely known. • Consultant collaboration • Final repeat editing • Need to limit personal opinions and speeches. • While there were some contentious meetings, most were productive • Not sure what happened when someone voted “3.” I know they could write a minority report but I never saw a minority report. • Revisiting some decisions toward the end • Sam needs a new writer • Some agendas were packed and difficult to get through in 3 hour timeframe/ too aggressive x2 • Trying to get more public/people to attend public outreach • Working on time consuming details off line
18.	<p>Was the Outcome Better, Worse, or Same as You Expected?</p> <p>How?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better x18 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ consensus seemed to be easier over time ○ did not think the final vote would be a consensus ○ I think we overcame fears expressed at the outcome ○ people were committed to process ○ required to own a position based on work ○ group held together and reached a recommendation that all stakeholders could support. I feared that it would all fall apart at a couple of points along the way

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ thought we might get derailed at times, but we ended up with a very good product ○ much better ○ since opportunity was given for 2s to add comments ○ While I already believe in the collaborative process, this was a great manifestation of it ○ but as an early designer of the process, I had very high expectations ○ a diverse group that came to similar conclusions ● Staff listened and did lots of work in between meetings x2 ● A little lucky with third runway – good sign staff able to let go ● A mix between better and expected ● CF Booth’s perspective: Degree of cooperation / collaboration between City, Port, and Community was unusual. Typically, planning staff meet two to three times with community. This process lasted 128 weeks with engagement throughout – sometimes two times a week. The result of this commitment was a superior product. A product which reflects what is important to participants and is well articulated AND a process to ensure that the recommendations will be implemented ● I crossed my fingers, yet at the same time, expected this outcome as it happened, as there were so many questions, answers and discussions leading up to “finding the middle ground” in this 3-year process by the many diverse people. ● I feel like the report fairly represents the views of the PAG as a whole – as opposed to special interest groups ● Involved with the airport for 12 years – had high expectations – process exceeded my expectations. Not sure I’m the norm. Perhaps perspective of the Port’s aviation consultant might be more appropriate. ● Said words like “transparency” and meant it ● Started with suspicion – the rule setting almost reinforced, but things did not go that way ● Thought we reached consensus with a professional and thorough final product
19.	<p>Was the Process Different from Other Processes You Have Been Involved in?</p> <p>How?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Yes x7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ different groups met – to work out details, have discussions – and come back with a summary of each process ○ initial timeline was maintained; stayed focused on the goal ○ in its overall scope and task ○ larger committee, longer timeframe. Facilitation

		<p>was important and was well done</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ more complex ○ Had to come prepared and not afraid to say “I don’t understand” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Appreciated all the in-between meetings with staff. ● New to process – very impressed, proud to say involved in process. Would like to continue. ● Better. The developed concrete results from consensus with a diverse group of people ● Consensus great, but at times hard to get issues on table, sometimes votes felt preemptive. ● Engagement plus transparency of Port top management (Wyatt, Granato, Schreiber) throughout the process very important. It gave a human face to the Port. ● Good handling of a large group ● Information available from Port and City and outside experts. ● Interesting how patient the facilitator was and how he used subtle group dynamics and decision making tools. ● It was a long road to bring people away from pre-conceived notions about how the Port works and how the Port has changed. ● Large group functioned much better than most advisory ● Longer! More voices made group credible and balanced ● PAG and subcommittees were well supported by staff. ● PAG members hung in for three plus years, agreeing on final product. Airport, community, and environmental interests involved in a similar process in Scottsdale. Very contentious. ● Preliminary education critical – missing from many planning processes. Brought level of understanding of the PAG up a level. ● Presentations were so carefully thought out, then tested on sub-committees, and if necessary, re-worked, and then presented to PAG. A lot of work! Great job! ● Respect of contributions of members was prevalent throughout ● Subcommittee process was a major achievement, in my opinion ● Subcommittee structure with open participation was important. Helped merge the two threads of the process – the master plan and the land use plan. ● The Citywide Land Use Group sung praises of this process as well, noting that they have never seen a process like this. That praise says a lot about staff / consultants. ● The Forecast approach was pioneering – range of inputs, and outcomes. It will serve as a model for other
--	--	---

		<p>processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Portland Citizen Involvement Committee has been tracking the process. The committee has been very impressed with the process. They have been pleasantly surprised with the great product, the listening to people’s opinions, the patience. Equity of representation was a key interest of this group. • This was a bigger panel and a longer process than any I’ve been involved in. Even though some players changed, the group seemed to hold together and reach consensus. It was sausage making, but of a high art. • Very good foundational work educating committee on complex issues. Allowed for more thoughtful consideration of issues down the road. • Yes/no. First time I’ve seen one of this scale
20.	Advice for PDX CAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice to Port / City Council – give PDX CAC some air time for annual reports. Not just PR. Some level of tension will stimulate media interest. • Ask for details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How many flights? ○ Time of day ○ Impact on parking ○ How are decisions made ○ Growth in noise zone, people, houses ○ Port stats – is growth coming? ○ Watch out for city or port staff pushing • Be balanced • Be patient and collaborative • Be proactive in soliciting community input. • Be true to the spirit of the PAG. Respect the past while shaping the future. Remember the triple bottom line and keep the community involved/informed. • Build in a public involvement quality improvement process. Early involvement is key – at the project concept stage, not just prior to contract. • Build in the opportunity for the PDX CAC to be complimentary as well as critical. • Continue community connections – not just PDX-CAC but the port/city together • Get lots of input – documentation • Government Island updates provide an opportunity to showcase the mitigation work. Also, the enhancement investments. • Keep the community informed, don’t just attend meetings • Maintain open minds and represent the community visions and needs, not personal ideals and needs • Maintain some degree of flexibility to adapt to changing

		<p>conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the members of PAG will have been through this process, so it shouldn't be hard to focus on moving forward. • Meet in neighborhoods at least annually • PDX CAC should be an interactive forum with the Port – not just a series of presentations. • PDX CAC should meet in one of four neighborhood coalitions whenever possible, rotating meetings. It will be important to always connect with community in some way. • Proactive in getting community involvement • Probably meet every 2 months to keep people up to speed. I fear that the staff (mostly Port) will drive the agendas in such a way as to skew outcomes • Quantify progress and results • Read the final report (x2), ask questions, stay focused on substantive issues: noise, natural resources, and sustainability • Report – collaboration – with staff and community – rotate meeting locations • Respect path of the PAG – don't start from scratch. Tap body of knowledge from the PAG. • Roll out annual report in different ways – not just Port media release. • Set metrics for recommendations in the report – measurable and objective. • Setting metrics • Solicit community input without being asked • Start studying now if you have not been part of PAG • Strong facilitation/leadership! • Talk out – agree – document • Use staff • Web site • Website should not become a ghost site – update it to allow the PAG and others to continue to track progress!
21.	Additional Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAC report needs our time (Port and City) • Congratulations! • Consultants: ☺ • Extremely impressed with the port and city staff. Very professional and well prepared for each meeting. Great job! • Facilitator: ☺ and “Vote for Sam” • Good meeting location • Great food, thanks! • Great process, which was validated by the fact that the group help together for the entire process – a major achievement!

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I really enjoyed working with such a wonderful team of experts. • I thoroughly enjoyed this, learned a lot, and gained a lot of respect for the quality of Port and City staff and their leaders • I was very happy to be part of the PAG process • Layout could be cozier (liked the final meeting) • Overall Process “!” • Thank you for the feeling that every opinion was of value. And even through I was often in the eye of the storm, I appreciate the support and guidance. As Lise would say, “great sausage making!” • The PAG meetings turned out to be more structured and less interactive due to complexity and group size. As a result, the subcommittees were more important than originally expected • The Port and City took very good care of PAG members and the PAG as a group • This process was the best after hours commitment I have every been involved in • Under the “City, Port, and Community Collaboration,” question someone wrote “unique and groundbreaking.” 				
22.	Overall Outcome	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		17	3			
23.	Overall Process	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		11	9			
24.	City, Port, and Community Collaboration * One person voted “very good ↔ poor” and wrote, “at times it seemed to work very well. At other times it seemed like there was a lot of behind the scenes manipulation of natural resource issues.”	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		12	8*	1*	1*	1*