



CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON
BOARD OF
Planning

PORT OF PORTLAND
Possibility. In every direction.



AIRPORT FUTURES

CHARTING A COURSE FOR PDX

Airport Futures Planning Advisory Group (PAG) Collaboration Principles Chairs' Discussion Proposal with Member Comments

For any complex collaborative process, the participants should establish procedures to govern the process. Such agreement increases success and decreases meeting time by assuring a good faith process that explores competing needs and fashions equitable, practical, and durable solutions. This document contains the agreements of the participants in this "Airport Futures: Charting a Course for PDX" process. It should be read in conjunction with the Intergovernmental Agreements, the Work Plan and the Public Involvement Program.

I. Process Background

Airport Futures is a collaborative effort between the City of Portland (City), Port of Portland (Port), and the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan community to create an integrated long-range development plan for Portland International Airport (PDX).

II. Process Vision and Values

The PAG will adopt and attach a Vision and Values statement.

III. PAG Charge and Scope of Work

A. Charge

The PAG is advisory to City and Port and it will help inform City and Port staff in the development of their recommendations to the Portland Planning Commission, Portland City Council, Port of Portland Commission, and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). City and Port staff recommendations to their respective decision-makers will highlight areas of agreement and disagreement with the PAG and other stakeholder interests. The chair of the PAG will represent the recommendations of the PAG to City and Port decision-makers in conjunction with City and Port staff reports. The City will have ultimate responsibility to approve the legislative land use plan for PDX. The Port Commission and FAA will have ultimate responsibility to approve the PDX Master Plan Update.

B. PAG Scope of Work

The scope of work for the Airport Futures Planning Advisory Group and planning process on the joint project website is at www.pdxairportfutures.com. The work plan is organized by key milestones and decision points. While it is the intent of the City-Port project team to conclude this planning process within a three-year period, it is impossible to contemplate all eventualities. As a result, the dates shown in this three-year work plan are projected, not fixed.

C. Public Involvement Overview

A detailed Public Involvement Program for this joint planning process can be found on the joint project website at http://pdxairportfutures.com/Documents/PDX_Airport_Ftrs_Pblclnvlv.pdf. As the City and Port staff involves the broader community in the issues that the PAG will be exploring, they will be providing summaries to the PAG for their consideration and comment.

IV. PAG Membership and Support

A. Members

The PAG has broad representation reflecting many diverse interests and those who may be impacted by decisions made during the planning process. Membership was developed after extensive public input, and was agreed to in the July 2007 amendments to the 2004 City-Port Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA). As specified in the IGA, the Portland Planning Director and Port Aviation Director made the PAG appointments noted in Section VIII, below.

B. PAG Alternates and Replacements

Due to the complexity of the process, it is best to have one person represent each interest throughout the planning process to maintain continuity of discussion and recommendations. If necessary, PAG members may identify an alternate to represent them in their absence, preferably at the outset of the process.

It will be the responsibility of the primary PAG member to keep the alternate informed so they can represent their group in case the primary PAG member is absent. Alternates may attend PAG meetings, but will not sit at the main table or vote, unless they are substituting for the primary PAG member. Notice of substitution must be submitted to the PAG facilitator in advance of PAG meetings.

PAG member resignations, changes, and replacements must be submitted in writing to the PAG chair by the nominating body. As noted above, the Port Aviation Director and Planning Bureau Director will make all appointments to the PAG, including replacements of existing PAG members due to resignations or extended absences, based on nominations from the interests outlined in the IGA.

C. Coordinating Committee

The Coordinating Committee composed of the PAG chair, PAG vice chair, any active subcommittee chairs, and City and Port project managers, will meet regularly with the PAG facilitator to schedule the work of the PAG and subcommittees, and determine the timing of the information brought before the PAG. The role of the Coordinating Committee is to make recommendations to the PAG on the logistics of the planning process, not to make substantive decisions on issues before the PAG.

D. PAG Subcommittees

The PAG chair will determine subcommittees and their charges, time parameters, and deliverables. Subcommittees will help frame the issues for the full PAG especially on specific subject areas requiring more analysis and input. They will be established in advance to allow adequate time for subcommittees to inform the planning process at key junctures. If broader issues are brought to a subcommittee, they will be noted in its meeting notes and not pursued without PAG approval.

Subcommittee memberships will be open to any interested person. The subcommittee leadership will be self-selecting with a minimum of three members on each subcommittee with representation from government, commercial/business, and community interests to ensure a balanced discussion. The subcommittee leadership will be responsible for establishing agendas, making decisions on how to run the meetings, and reporting to the PAG on the subcommittee's work and recommendations within the established timeframe to keep the planning process on schedule. A PAG member can be chair of no more than one subcommittee at a time. Subcommittees will be encouraged to invite non-PAG and TAP members to make presentations and participate in the discussion.

City and Port staff will assist subcommittees with meeting locations. There will be advance notice of all subcommittee meetings posted on the project website at least 48 hours (Should TAP [one week] and Subcommittee meetings have same notice requirements?) in advance of the meeting. These meetings will be open to the public and will include, at a minimum, one public comment period. Subcommittees will prepare their own summary notes of meeting discussions and decisions for posting on the project website within one week of the meeting. The PAG facilitator will be available to assist subcommittees with meeting mechanics and decision-making guidance. This assistance may be requested by the subcommittee chair with the approval of the PAG chair. The proposed subcommittees are: 1) Public Involvement/Survey, 2) Aviation Demand Forecasting, 3) Land Use and Transportation, and 4) Sustainability

E. Technical Advisory Pool (TAP)

TAP is a resource pool of organizations and agencies with specialized expertise related to airport planning issues. The TAP will address specific technical questions raised by the PAG, staff, and PAG subcommittees – not deliberate on broader policy issues. TAP members will serve as resources to PAG subcommittees related to their area of expertise. The City and Project staff will brief TAP and hold TAP meetings, as needed. Project staff will report to the PAG on TAP meetings. TAP meetings are open to the PAG and the public. They will be listed one week in advance on the project website.

F. Retained Technical Consultants

The Port retained Jacobs Consultancy team to serve as technical consultants to update the 2000 PDX Master Plan Update. The City retained Aviation System Consulting, LLC to provide an independent analysis and peer review of both the aviation forecast assumptions and the possible forecast scenarios developed by the Port's aviation consultant.

G. Project Staff

The City and the Port will staff the PAG process. A list of project staff and their roles can be found at <http://www.pdxairportfutures.com/MeetTeam.aspx>. Their goal is to provide a process that will be open, honest, and transparent with a special emphasis on early involvement in providing policy-setting input to City-Port staff. The public involvement operating principles outlined in the IGA will guide the PAG process and the additional public involvement activities. These principles are to:

- 1) Clearly define opportunities where the public can provide timely input so that there is an opportunity to affect change.
- 2) Be accessible, inclusive, meaningful, regular and timely in addition to open, fair and honest.
- 3) Ensure a collaborative involvement process between the City, the Port, and stakeholders, and meet the planning timelines of both the City and the Port.
- 4) Provide an ongoing record of citizen input, questions and responses, as well as a mechanism to make this information available to the public.
- 5) Include periodic community-based meetings in Portland and Vancouver where the public will be updated on committee activities and have the opportunity to inform policy-making.
- 6) Provide citizens with a way to stay involved and informed during the PDX master plan update and legislative land use process.
- 7) Provide interactive meetings with small group breakouts, which distinguish between information and input opportunities in public meetings.
- 8) Wherever possible, design interactive formats for all meetings to ensure a balanced and fair discussion of issues, which ensures all perspectives are heard.
- 9) Provide the PAG with the relevant, objective information, in a timely fashion, necessary to make informed decisions. Presentations will provide the facts – pro and con – surrounding the issues in a readily understandable format.

- 10) Provide the big picture context and interconnections surrounding all issues, before asking the PAG to make a recommendation.
- 11) Be responsive to PAG requests for information and process support, be clear and transparent about staff positions, and be open to carefully considering PAG recommendations.

H. The Facilitator

An independent facilitator has been hired as a process manager to: assist the PAG chair, PAG and subcommittees, to help facilitate PAG meetings; the Coordinating Committee, and provide advice on the public involvement program. The facilitator has been hired by the Port with the concurrence of the City, separately from the other consultants. The facilitator's "client" is the PAG process, but neither PAG membership, nor process participation is a substitute for independent legal or other professional advice. That is the responsibility of the process participants. The facilitator will be responsible to ensure the PAG process is fair, well run, and productive. The facilitator will be available as a resource to the City and Port for minor conflict resolution and process improvement suggestions. As a neutral collaborative process provider, the facilitator will not act as an advocate for anyone on any substantive issue. However, the facilitator may propose substantive suggestions for PAG consideration, but will not make decisions on substantive issues.

The Institute *for* Conflict Management, Inc. (ICM or the facilitator) has been hired for this process. ICM's Executive Director, Sam Imperati, will act as the facilitator. ICM, Sam Imperati, and any subcontractors are not employees of any participant. ICM's written contract is available for review. The facilitator will not be influenced by payment source. The Port has agreed that his status of facilitator will not be changed without first consulting with the City and the PAG Chair.

The facilitator may have non-confidential, informal communications and perform facilitation activities with staff and PAG members, between and during meetings. The facilitator will address situations where it appears a participant is not acting according to these Collaboration Principles and will advise the chair if it appears probable that the PAG will be unable to fulfill its Charge.

V. Collaboration Protocols

A. Quorum

A quorum is a simple majority of voting PAG members or their alternates. If there is no quorum, the Chair or Vice Chair can cancel/reschedule or conduct the PAG meeting and send all meeting notes and materials to the members for voting at the next meeting.

B. Open Meetings

Meetings of the PAG, TAP, and PAG subcommittees are open to the public and will include an opportunity for public comment. Notice of PAG meetings will be posted two weeks in advance of meetings on the joint project website. Notice of subcommittee meetings will be posted 48 hours in advance of meetings. PAG and PAG subcommittee meeting summaries will be posted on the website one week following each meeting. A media release will be sent to local newspapers announcing all PAG meetings.

C. Public Comment

The chair, vice chair or the facilitator will provide periodic public comment opportunities for non-PAG members during meetings before PAG makes a decision. Comments from the public will be limited in time to allow sufficient opportunity to conduct the other portions of the PAG agenda. Typically, comments will be limited to a maximum of three minutes per person. Citizens are encouraged to submit written comments to project staff for circulation to the full PAG.

D. Meeting Agendas and Meeting Materials

The Coordinating Committee will develop Working Agendas for PAG meetings. Meeting agendas and meeting materials will be mailed and sent electronically to PAG members one week in advance of the meetings, and will be posted on the project website. PAG meetings will begin and end as scheduled.

E. PAG Member Commitments for Community

The PAG members, project staff and participants will participate in good faith, which means:

- 1) Prepare for and set aside time for the meetings and the whole process,
- 2) Participate fully, honestly and fairly, commenting constructively and specifically,
- 3) Speak respectfully, briefly and non-repetitively; not speaking again on a subject until all other members desiring to speak have had the opportunity to speak,
- 4) Allow people to say what is true for them without fear of reprisal from PAG members, the City and the Port,
- 5) Avoid side conversations during meetings,
- 6) Provide information as much in advance as possible of the meeting in which such information is to be used and share all relevant information to the maximum extent possible,
- 7) Generate and explore all options on the merits with an open mind, listening to different points of view with a goal of understanding the underlying interests of other PAG members,
- 8) Consult regularly with their nominating bodies and provide their input in a clear and concise manner,
- 9) Each member agrees to work toward fair, practical and durable recommendations that reflect the diverse interests of the entire PAG - and the public.
- 10) When communicating with others, accurately summarize the PAG process, discussion and meetings, presenting a full, fair and balanced view of the issues and arguments out of respect for the process and other members,
- 11) Not attempt to effect a different outcome outside of the PAG process once the PAG has reached a consensus recommendation,
- 12) Strive vigorously for consensus and closure on issues, and
- 13) Self-regulate and help other members abide by these commitments.

VI. Decision-Making Process [Note: Order of sections changed: Section D is now B and C, D, E and F are now part of C.]

A. Developing Recommendations

The chair, vice chair, and the facilitator will assist the PAG in identifying objectives, addressing the diversity of perspectives and developing substantive, practical recommendations to implement its Charge. The PAG will use a *Discussion Draft* process and a *Consensus Decision-Making* model to

assist the PAG. The PAG will make draft recommendations on an “issue-by-issue” basis, and then, final recommendations as a “package” at each milestone, and again at the conclusion of the process.

B. Representative Voting

Each PAG member will have one vote except those non-voting members (i.e., chair, vice chair, and FAA). A vote represents that the member will recommend to his or her government, organization or group that they should support or oppose the voted-upon proposal consistent with the member’s vote. The names of those voting in favor and those voting against a proposal will be noted and included in the PAG’s recommendations and the City and Port staff recommendations to their respective decision-makers.

C. Consensus

Consensus decision-making is a process that allows PAG members to distinguish underlying values, interests and concerns with a goal of developing widely accepted solutions. Consensus does not mean 100% agreement on each part of every issue, but rather support for a decision, “*taken as a whole.*” This means that a member may vote to support a consensus proposal even though they would prefer to have it modified in some manner in order to give it their full support. Consensus is a process of “*give and take,*” of finding common ground and developing creative solutions in a way that all interests can support. Consensus is reached if all members at the table support an idea or can say, “*I can live with that.*”

C.1. “1-2-3” Consensus Voting Method

The chair, vice-chair and facilitator will assist the PAG in articulating points of agreement, as well as articulating concerns that require further exploration. PAG will use a “**Consensus Voting**” procedure for testing the group’s opinion and adjusting proposals. In “**Consensus Voting**,” the chair, vice chair or the facilitator will articulate the proposal. Each PAG member will then vote “one,” “two,” or “three,” reflecting the following:

- “**One**” indicates **full support** for the proposal as stated.
- “**Two**” indicates that the participant **agrees with the proposal as stated, but would prefer to have it modified in some manner in order to give it full support.** Nevertheless, the member will support the consensus even if his/her suggested modifications are not supported by the rest of the group because the proposal is worthy of general support, as written.
- “**Three**” indicates **refusal to support** the proposal as stated.

The chair, vice chair or facilitator will repeat the consensus voting process, as reasonably necessary, to assist the group in achieving **consensus** regarding a particular recommendation, so that all members are voting “one” or “two.” If a consensus is not reasonably forthcoming, see section F.

C.2. Cooling-Off Period

If consensus cannot be reached, the chair, vice chair, and the facilitator may table the issue for additional discussion with constituencies, the gathering of new information, or perhaps just sufficient time to consider options more carefully. The PAG may then revisit the issue.

C.3. No Consensus – Majority and Minority View

If a consensus on an issue is not reasonably forthcoming as determined by the chair or vice chair, the votes of those present at the meeting will be taken and recorded as a majority - minority vote. Majority is defined as at least 51% of the PAG voting membership. The proposed language and reasoning supported by the majority will be noted along with their names in the PAG's recommendations. Members voting in the minority will have their names, proposed language and reasoning noted in the Minority Report(s). The facilitator will document these issues, the differences of opinion involved, and submit the report to the City and Port staff for inclusion in the PAG recommendations along with other stakeholder comments.

MEMBER PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE TO MAJORITY - MINORITY VOTING – a “Fall Back:”

The “cooling off” period recognizes our values of getting as close to consensus as possible by way of dialogue, clarification, and consideration of alternatives. Absent a consensus, we should charge the Chair with crafting a decision or recommendation that takes all of that into account. This would not preclude a “minority report(s)” expressing any alternative views.

VII. Additional Understandings

A. Communications Outside of PAG

Whenever reasonable, PAG members and staff will refer press, citizen and other inquiries to the PAG chair, vice chair or City and Port project managers. It is often advisable simply to refer others to the project website at www.pdxairportfutures.com or the project managers. Responses to website questions will be provided within two weeks.

B. Meeting Summaries

The facilitator will prepare PAG meeting summaries. They will be provided electronically in draft form to the PAG for proposed correction and comment within one week of the PAG meeting. The final meeting summaries will be posted on the project website. The facilitator will maintain a matrix of what has been discussed at PAG meetings, when such items were discussed, and the resolution of discussions that occur during PAG meetings, including public comments made during the PAG meetings. The facilitator will provide the PAG discussion matrix to City-Port project staff for inclusion in ongoing project matrix of all public comments to be posted on the project website.

The chair of each PAG subcommittee or their designee is responsible for preparing and submitting for posting, meeting summaries on the project website within one week of the subcommittee meeting.

C. Public Records and Confidentiality

PAG records, such as formal documents, discussion drafts, transcripts, meeting summaries, and exhibits are public records. This is not a mediation. It is a facilitation. As a result, PAG communications (oral, written, electronic, etc.) are not confidential and may be disclosed. However, the private documents of individual PAG members and the private documents of the facilitator that are not shared with the City or the Port are not considered public records and are not subject to disclosure under public records laws.

D. Process Conclusion

|

The PAG process will conclude with submission of its recommendations to the City and Port, when necessary funding and resources are no longer available, or when the City and Port determine it is unlikely the PAG will fulfill its Charge.

E. Amendment and Interpretation

Amendments to this document can be made by vote of the PAG. The chair, vice chair or facilitator shall lead a PAG discussion designed to reach a consensus on any process dispute or proposed amendment to these Collaboration Principles.

VIII. Signatures

We agree:

INTEREST REPRESENTED	MEMBER	SIGNATURE
Balanced and fair process	Bill Blosser - Appointed by Portland Mayor and Port Commission President	
Balanced and fair process	Dave Smith - Appointed by Vancouver Mayor and Port Commission President	
Portland Planning Commission	Catherine Ciarlo, Commissioner	
City of Vancouver	Laura Hudson	
Port of Portland Commission	Mary Olson, Commissioner	
Federal Aviation Admin. (FAA)	Gloria Ibarra	
Metro Regional Government	Andy Cotugno	
Clackamas County	Cam Gilmour	
Multnomah County	Hector Roche	
Washington County	Dennis Mulvihill	
Airline Industry	Jerry Gerharter, Horizon Airlines	
Tourism Industry	Veronica Rinard, Portland Oregon Visitors Association	
Tenant at PDX	Jordan Papé, Flightcraft	
Business Association or labor organization	John Mohlis, Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council	
Military	Lt. Col. Stuart Matthew, ORANG	
Large Business that uses PDX Freight and Passenger Services	Brian Nelson, Intel	
Environmental Interests	Bob Sallinger, Audubon Society of Portland Environmental Justice Representative from Coalition for a Livable Future	
	Travis Williams, Willamette Riverkeeper	
Aircraft Noise Interest	Vicki Thompson, PDX Citizen Noise Advisory Committee	
Portland Neighborhood Coalitions Adjacent to PDX	Maryhelen Kincaid, North Portland Neighborhood Services	
	Erwin Bergman, Central NE Neighborhoods	
	Patrick Metzger, Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods	
	Ross Monn, East Portland Neighborhood Office	
	Fred Stovel, Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	
	Denny Stoecklin, Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement	
Vancouver Neighborhood	Michael Sloan	
Clark County Neighborhood	Alan Hargrave, Port of Camas/Washougal Commissioner	
East County Area Impacted by Primary Jet Departure/Arrival Path	Lisa Barton-Mullins, City of Fairview Councilor	
Airport Issues Roundtable (AIR)	John Weigant	
PROJECT SPONSORS		
Port of Portland	Chris Corich, Project Manager, Non-Member	
City of Portland	Jay Sugnet, Project Manager, Non-Member	

We agree:

INTEREST REPRESENTED	PAG ALTERNATE	SIGNATURE
Portland Planning Commission		
City of Vancouver		
Port of Portland Commission		
Federal Aviation Admin. (FAA)	Scott Speer	
Metro Regional Government	Robin McArthur	
Clackamas County	Martha Schrader	
Multnomah County		
Washington County		
Airline Industry	Gene Hahn	
Tourism Industry		
Tenant at PDX	Mitchell Berck	
Business Association or labor organization	Jim Pauley	
Military	Mike Bieniewicz	
Large Business that uses PDX Freight and Passenger Services	Jill Eiland	
Audubon Society of Port		
Assoc. of Environ. Health Academic Programs		
Willamette Riverkeeper		
Aircraft Noise Interest		
Portland Neighborhood Coalitions Adjacent to PDX:		
North Portland Neighborhood Services	Debbie Deetz Silva	
Central NE Neighborhoods		
Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods		
East Portland Neighborhood Office	Alesia Reese	
Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement		
Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement		
Vancouver Neighborhood		
Clark County Neighborhood		
East County Area Impacted by Primary Jet Departure/Arrival		
Airport Issues Roundtable (AIR)	Eric Meyer	