



Airport Futures Planning Advisory Group (PAG) Collaboration Principles

Comments and Response as of 10-8-07 to the September 27, 2007 Discussion Draft

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 Work Plan and Public Involvement Program for the process.

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). Beginning in fall 2007 and concluding in fall 2010, the Port will update the airport master plan and the City will create a land use plan recognizing PDX’s role in the regional economy while managing City infrastructure and livability. The three-year process will reinforce Portland’s planning legacy, PDX’s reputation as one of the premier airports in the country, and incorporate principles of sustainability¹ and livability.

In developing a legislative land use plan for PDX and its environs², the City land use plan proposes to create a zoning mechanism that recognizes the airport as an “allowed use.” Mitigation will still be required for future projects, but the triggers for City review will be based on impacts, and the severity of impacts, rather than a rigid timeframe. PAG MEMBER: This begs the question. The IGA says that order of consideration is “avoid, minimize, or mitigate.” See G. 1.

Sam’s proposal for above paragraph:

¹ The City and Port are committed to incorporating principles of sustainability in the joint planning process. In other words, the project team will evaluate how PDX will meet the region’s aviation transportation needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Through the planning process, the City and Port will endeavor to evaluate the tradeoffs between the economic and social benefits of aviation transportation and the associated environmental, safety, health, ecosystem, and equity impacts. A major focus of the process will be to evaluate ways to maximize the use of the airport’s existing facilities before building any new major infrastructure. The Planning Advisory Group for the joint planning process will further define how sustainability principles will be incorporated into the planning effort in consultation with the City and Port.

² The City identified alternatives that would allow the airport to operate permanently in the current location, while providing for a broader examination of issues associated with airport growth and development. For more information, please refer to Alternatives to the Conditional Use Approval Process for Portland International Airport (PDX), Bureau of Planning, August 2001.

[In developing a legislative land use plan for PDX and its environs³, the City land use plan proposes to create a zoning mechanism that recognizes the airport as an “allowed use,” while using reasonable efforts to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential impacts on the community. Mitigation will still be required for future projects, but the triggers for City review will be based on impacts, and the severity of impacts, rather than a rigid timeframe.]

II. Process Vision and Values

A straw proposal will be developed by facilitator based upon PAG interviews, presented to PAG for its consideration, and ultimately incorporated into this document by reference.

III. PAG Charge and Scope of Work

A. Charge

The PAG is advisory to City and Port and it will help inform staff 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 under the 9/29/07 PAG meeting documents. 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.

IV. Public Involvement Program 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.

V. 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. The challenge of developing any broad-based advisory group is in having a representative cross-section of interests while keeping the group to a size that can function effectively. The following list was developed after extensive public input, and

² The City identified alternatives that would allow the airport to operate permanently in the current location, while providing for a broader examination of issues associated with airport growth and development. For more information, please refer to Alternatives to the Conditional Use Approval Process for Portland International Airport (PDX), Bureau of Planning, August 2001.

was agreed to in the 2004 City-Port Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA), as amended in the July 2007. As a result, the Portland Planning Director and Port Aviation Director made the PAG appointments noted in Section IX, below.

B. PAG Alternates and Replacements

- 1) 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, but only to ensure representation where the submission of a member's written comments are not adequate.
- 2) Alternates should be identified at the outset of the process. Requests for alternates and any changes in alternates must be submitted in writing by the appointing entity with a copy to the PAG facilitator.
- 3) Alternates are expected to keep abreast of the process by the PAG member so they can represent the group/organization/jurisdiction in case the primary PAG member is absent.
- 4) 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. It will be the responsibility of the primary PAG member to keep the alternate informed.
- 5) PAG member resignations and replacements must be submitted in writing to the PAG chair by the nominating body.
- 6) As specified in the 2004 City-Port Intergovernmental Agreement, 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. Replacements will be made based on nominations from the interests outlined in the 2004 City-Port Intergovernmental Amendment #2.

C. PAG Member Duties

The duties of PAG members include:

- A) Prepare for and attend PAG and subcommittee meetings,
- B) Provide advance notice to the PAG facilitator when unable to attend,
- C) Be responsible for providing regular reports to appointing jurisdictions/organizations,
- D) Participate in joint City-Port community outreach forums, and
- E) Participate in City of Portland Planning Commission, Portland and Vancouver City Council hearings, as well as Port of Portland Commission meetings, as appropriate.

D. 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.

E. PAG Subcommittees

Subcommittees of the PAG will help inform the planning process on specific subject areas requiring more analysis and input, and should not be seen as an advisory committee on broader airport issues.

PAG MEMBER PROPOSAL: If broader issues are brought to a subcommittee, they will be noted in the meeting report [notes] and not pursued without full committee [PAG] approval.

[Sam's proposal: Good Addition. See clarifying edits in brackets.]

Subcommittees are intended to help frame the issues for the larger PAG. They will be established in advance to allow adequate time for subcommittees to inform the planning process at key junctures. Subcommittees and the subcommittee charge, time parameters, and deliverables will be determined by the PAG chair.

Subcommittee memberships will be open to any interested person. Subcommittees will be encouraged to invite non-PAG and TAP members to make presentations and participate in the discussion. The subcommittee leadership will be self-selecting from the PAG membership with a minimum of three members on each subcommittee with representation from government, commercial/business interests, 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 report 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.

City and Port staff will assist subcommittees with meeting locations. There will be advance notice of all subcommittee meetings posted on the project web site. Meetings will be open to the public and will include, at a minimum, a public comment period. Subcommittees will prepare their own summaries of meeting discussions and decisions for posting on the project web site. A brief one-page template will be made available to subcommittee chairs with this purpose in mind. 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 subcommittees currently under consideration are:

- 1) Public Involvement/Survey,
- 2) Aviation Demand Forecasting,
- 3) Land Use and Transportation, and
- 4) Sustainability

F. Technical Advisory Pool (TAP)

A resource pool of organizations and agencies with specialized expertise related to airport planning issues will be kept informed of the joint planning process and will consult with the PAG, project staff, and PAG subcommittees, as available, on technical issues throughout the planning process. The TAP will be briefed regularly by City and Port project staff and will hold meetings as needed. PAG MEMBER PROPOSAL: These are public meetings and will be open to the PAG and [the] general public. They will be listed one week in advance on the [project] website.

[Sam's Comment: Good Addition. See clarifying edits in brackets.]

Project staff will report to the PAG on TAP meetings. The TAP's role will be to 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. For example, 1000 Friends of Oregon may participate on a land use subcommittee; the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee may participate on a transportation subcommittee; the Office of Neighborhood Involvement may participate on a public involvement subcommittee; and Audubon may participate on a natural resource subcommittee.

G. Retained Technical Consultants

1) The Port

The Port retained Jacobs Consultancy team to serve as technical consultants to update the 2000 PDX Master Plan Update and plan for future cargo and passenger aviation needs of the region, while using reasonable efforts to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential impacts on the community. This will require preparing aviation forecasts, PDX facility inventory, and forecasted facility requirements, along with the review of PDX supplemental studies, the creation of proposed development concepts for PDX, and the incorporation of sustainability and demand management concepts, where practicable. The PDX Master Plan Update will provide a conceptual plan to help respond to PDX growth, including a clear recommendation for future terminal area development (either Centralized or Decentralized) and all other ancillary development.

2) The City

The City retained Aviation System Consulting, LLC to provide an independent analysis of the aviation forecasts associated with the Port's master plan update. The consultant will provide a peer review of both the aviation forecast assumptions and the possible forecast scenarios, as developed by the Port's aviation consultant.

H. 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 October 2004 City-Port IGA will guide the PAG process and the additional public involvement activities by adhering to the following principles:

- Clearly define opportunities where the public can provide timely input so that there is an opportunity to affect change.
- Be accessible, inclusive, meaningful, regular and timely in addition to open, fair and honest.
- Ensure a collaborative involvement process between the City, the Port, and stakeholders, and meet the planning timelines of both the City and the Port.
- Provide an ongoing record of citizen input, questions and responses, as well as a mechanism to make this information available to the public.
- 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.
- Provide citizens with a way to stay involved and informed during the PDX master plan update and legislative land use process.
- Provide interactive meetings with small group breakouts, which distinguish between information and input opportunities in public meetings.
- Wherever possible, design interactive formats for all meetings to ensure a balanced and fair discussion of issues, which ensures all perspectives are heard.
- 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.
- Provide the big picture context and interconnections surrounding all issues, before asking the PAG to make a recommendation.
- 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.

VI. Decision-Making Process

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. They will use a *Discussion Draft* process and a *Consensus Decision-Making* model to assist the PAG. Recommendations will be appropriately noted as either: “Working Draft,” “Draft,” or “Final” as they evolve throughout the process. 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. Discussion Draft: A Discussion Draft provides an opportunity for many parties to collaborate in drafting a single document. The process will allow the PAG to evaluate existing draft recommendations and propose changes. PAG members will have the opportunity to respond to each portion of the Discussion Draft with the goal of achieving consensus on the final recommendations.

VII. Decision-Making Model

A. Overview: Consensus decision-making is a process that allows PAG members to distinguish underlying values, interests and concerns from stated positions, in hopes of developing widely accepted solutions. The process requires each PAG member to work in Good Faith toward consensus recommendations. 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.*” A consensus does not mean a member can veto or filibuster the process.

PAG MEMBER COMMENT: My experience is that a consensus model requires an agreed to fall back position in the event the group cannot reach consensus. There should be agreement that the fall back position of the person who will make the decision where there is no consensus (e.g. The Chair) will use all of the PAG input to that point, and that his/her decision will not greatly vary from the position around which there is near consensus. I think section F below tries to get at it, but my experience is that you risk losing up to half of your stakeholders if you go to “majority” voting. This might be something to have the entire PAG discuss.

Sam’s Proposal: Let’s explore at the 10-9-07 meeting. Discussion Question: What are the advantages and disadvantages of Consensus and Majority Voting?

B. “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 and recommendation amendments. 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 provide opportunities for members who vote “two” to explain their suggested modifications to the proposal. They will provide opportunities for members who vote “three” to explain their reasons for not supporting the proposal, and to note their alternative recommendation(s). They 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”, below. Additionally, the chair, vice chair or the facilitator may use this process early in the exploration of a given topic to “take the pulse” of the group in order to gauge the degree of challenge facing the group.

C. Good Faith: Good faith is defined by the process participants’ agreement, among other things, to:

1) Only make promises they can keep; 2) Accurately summarize the PAG process, discussion and meetings; 3) Act consistently during the process and in other forums related to this process; 4) Exchange information; 5) Not attempt to affect a different outcome once the PAG has reached a consensus recommendation; PAG MEMBER PROPOSAL: It is recognized that an issue decided in good faith by a “1-2” vote may be affected by a vote on another issue. It is not bad faith to discuss interconnections of decided issues;

Sam’s Comments: Section C.5. applies only to those decisions reached by “consensus” – meaning everyone votes “1” or “2.” It does not apply to “majority” decisions. Consider clarifying that the sentence is meant to relate to change efforts **outside** of PAG – not **inside** PAG.

If an issue is multi-faceted, as many may be, the PAG should raise those interrelated issues at the time the first issue is discussed and note then, under what circumstances, if any, it will want to revisit the issue later. One challenge will be if the initial issue is decided during one project milestone and there is a desire to re-visit it during the work surrounding a subsequent milestone.

Finally, there may be a need to distinguish between a PAG **decision on an underlying issue** versus a **formal recommendation**, which the above sentence is directed at.

Sam’s Proposal: The PAG should explore this on 10-09-07.

and 6) Follow the Meeting Ground Rules.

D. Representative Voting: Each member agrees to work toward fair, practical and durable recommendations that reflect the diverse interests of the entire PAG - and the public. Each PAG member will have one vote except those non-voting members noted above (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.

E. 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.

F. No Consensus – Majority and Minority View: The PAG will go to great lengths to make decisions through consensus. However, 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 as such and incorporated into the then current Discussion Draft of the PAG's recommendations. Members voting in the minority will have their proposed language and reasoning noted in the Minority Report(s). The facilitator will document those issues, the differences of opinion involved, and submit the report to the City and Port project staff for inclusion in the PAG recommendations. While the PAG may not be able to agree on resolution of an issue itself, its members may reach agreement on some basic guiding principles that give guidance to the decision-making bodies. The names of those voting in favor and those voting against a proposal will be noted and included in City and Port staff recommendations to their respective decision-makers along with other stakeholder comments.

VIII. Collaboration Protocols

A. Quorum: A quorum is a simple majority of voting PAG members or their alternates. PAG MEMBER QUESTION: What happens if we do not have a quorum? Do we cancel the meeting or just not take any votes?

Sam's Comment and Proposal: We will need 14 voting PAG members or their alternates to have a quorum. We will know if this is an issue in advance when PAG members RSVP, and depending on the Agenda, the Chair or Vice Chair could: A) cancel/reschedule or B) conduct the 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 meeting notice for all PAG meetings will be posted in local newspapers, as well.

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. PAG subcommittees will have a public comment period, as well.

D. Meeting Agendas and Meeting Materials: The Coordinating Committee will develop Working Agendas. Meeting agendas and meeting materials will be sent electronically to PAG members (STAFF: one) two week(s) in advance of PAG meetings and will be posted on the joint project website. PAG meetings will begin and end as scheduled.

E. Information and Document Exchange: PAG members will provide information as much in advance as possible of the meeting in which such information is to be used. This can be done by sending it to the facilitator at least two weeks in advance. The members also agree to share all relevant information with each other to the maximum extent possible. If a member believes the relevant information is proprietary in nature, the member will provide a general description of the information and the reason for not providing it.

F. Meeting Ground Rules: (PAG MEMBER SUGGESTS Creating Community) The PAG members (Sam: and project staff) will:

- 1) Agree to set aside the required time for the meetings and the whole process,
- 2) Participate fully and in Good Faith,
- 3) Comment constructively and specifically,
- 4) Speak respectfully, briefly and non-repetitively,
- 5) Allow one person to speak at a time,
- 6) Not speak again on a subject until all other members desiring to speak have had the opportunity to speak,
- 7) Avoid side conversations,
- 8) Address issues without personal criticism,
- 9) 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,
- 10) Consult regularly with their nominating/appointing bodies and provide their input in a clear and concise manner,
- 11) Strive vigorously for consensus,
- 12) Achieve closure on issues as they are processed, and
- 13) Self-regulate and help other members abide by this document.
- 14) Confidentiality. To allow people to say what is true for them without fear of retaliation from organization they represent

Sam's Comment: The open meeting and public record laws create a legal issue as to the availability of "confidentiality" outside of a mediation. See, section VIII. I, below.

Sam's Suggestion: Explore at the 10-09-07 PAG Meeting whether "Allow people to say what is true for them without fear of retaliation," is acceptable without the word 'confidentiality.'"

PAG MEMBER COMMENT ABOUT ABOVE GROUND RULES: These are basically fine, but I think PAG members and the process benefit from creating their own ground rules (see below). It not only increases ownership, but articulating their ground rules out loud, we all gain clarity and build relationships.

Sam's Proposal: Explore at the 10-09-07 PAG Meeting the advantages and disadvantages of the PAG developing these rules.

G. Communications Outside of PAG: It is the role of the chair and vice-chair to represent the work of the PAG before decision-making bodies and in the media. While other PAG members are free to communicate with the media and others, PAG members recognize that the collaborative process is enhanced when they raise all of their ideas and concerns, especially those being raised for the first time, at a formal PAG meeting. Is this referring to issues before the media? How could it mean any idea or concern? PAG members will give each other, the City, and the Port a "heads-up" as to the substance and timeframe before they go to the decision-makers on issues related to this process. Does this mean, "how the PAG operates" or makes decisions? Does it mean that any time the Port rep wants to talk to the other commissioners, she has to pre-brief the PAG? III C B - D makes us responsible to brief and interact with many different interest groups. We are not expected to pre-brief the PAG all these contacts. There has to be some room for trust. When doing so, PAG members agree to present a full, fair and balanced view of the issues and arguments out of respect for the process and other members. The PAG recognizes that its work happens at its meetings; the process will not work if there is a parallel political process occurring behind the scenes. This assumes that political pressure may force the PAG into some position it wouldn't voluntarily take. On the other hand, discussing the process, ideas, issues, political or otherwise, is what we do with our elected and appointed officials. The diversity of the PAG certainly would prevent undue pressure on the PAG from

affecting its task. The PAG is certainly capable of expressing its discontent with members who violate the trust. Additionally, members recognize that the way in which positions are represented anywhere outside of PAG meetings may affect the ability of the PAG to achieve consensus. See above. This could also apply to how a member of the press characterizes an issue. The PAG has to be ready for misunderstandings. Therefore, whenever reasonable, members will refer press, citizen and other inquiries to the PAG chair, vice chair or City and Port project managers. Finally, each PAG member agrees not to knowingly mischaracterize the views of any member, group, or the PAG, as a whole. Redundant. It is often advisable simply to refer others to the project website at www.pdxairportfutures.com or the project managers Chris Corich (Port) and Jay Sugnet (City). Responses to website questions will be provided within two weeks.

ANOTHER PAG MEMBER COMMENT: G. Communications Outside of PAG: It is the role of the chair and vice-chair to represent the work of the PAG before decision-making bodies and in the media. While other PAG members are free to communicate with the media and others, *Previous sentence suggests that one should refrain from communicating with anyone "and others" on anything, issues, concerns etc., "their ideas and concerns". Suggesting in a fashion that all these issues did not exist before and just waited to be discovered at coming PAG meetings. Does not make sense! Should address media contacts only!. What is the purpose of previous sentence? It is totally unworkable approach: Every aspect of an intended communication whether it be in person, telephone, email, fax etc. can, including the person to be contacted is subject to 100% change prior to follow through! So what is the sense of it? I am rather disappointed by including this proposed requirement as it seems rather selectively restrictive on neighborhood PAG members as a leftover from past unsubstantiated allegations, of backroom dealings. Which were not necessarily to be forgotten but were to be left behind. Also: How would this proposed requirement have applied to Mary Olson, Port Commissioner and other government representatives? When doing so, PAG members agree to present a full, fair and balanced view of the issues and arguments out of respect for the process and other members. Modify this sentence to read, "When talking with the media PAG members agree..." When dealing with their constituents concerns, goals and interests may call for a higher level of advocacy, which may be viewed by others as an imbalance. The PAG process to succeed must be based on trust among this group. It is unrealistic to assume that PAG members do not consult, discuss, advise, solicit and receive validation of their stances and positions from their constituency or officials who appointed them during their 3 year service. To assume that such contacts would undermine or cause PAG to involuntarily be sidetracked is a highly unlikely scenario considering the size and diversity of the PAG . Any PAG member stepping grossly out of line certainly would feel the displeasure of the group. Therefore, whenever reasonable, members will refer press, citizen and other inquiries to the PAG chair, vice chair or City and Port project managers. Finally, each PAG member agrees not to knowingly mischaracterize the views of any member, group, or the PAG, as a whole. It is often advisable simply to refer others to the project website at www.pdxairportfutures.com or the project managers Chris Corich (Port) and Jay Sugnet (City). Responses to website questions will be provided within two weeks.

ANOTHER PAG MEMBER COMMENT: The process outline seems as if we are a bit too sensitive. I agree that public statements from PAG should be made by the chair or vice-chair, and the random statements by PAG members to the media can be damaging. But calling for the requisite "heads up" to City and Port officials prior to any discussion with a city or port decision maker is ridiculous. It seems to me that this issue should just be removed from the document.

PAG MEMBER LANGUAGE SUGGESTION: It is the role of the chair and vice-chair to represent the work of the PAG before decision-making bodies and in the media. While other PAG members are free to communicate with the media and others, PAG members recognize that the collaborative process is enhanced when they raise all of their ideas and concerns, especially those being raised for the first time, at a formal PAG meeting. When dealing with the media, PAG members agree to present a full, fair and balanced view of the issues and arguments out of respect for the process and other members. PAG members agree not to knowingly mischaracterize the views of any member,

group, or the PAG, as a whole. Whenever reasonable, members 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 Chris Corich (Port) and Jay Sugnet (City). Responses to website questions will be provided within two weeks.

PORT AND CITY'S LANGUAGE SUGGESTION: The City and Port project managers (City: Jay Sugnet, Port: Chris Corich) will represent the work of the City and Port to the decision-making bodies and the media, while the chair and vice-chair will represent the work of the PAG. While other PAG members and City-Port staff are free to communicate with the media and others, participants recognize that the collaborative process is enhanced when they raise all of their ideas and concerns, especially those being raised for the first time, at a formal PAG meeting. When dealing with the media, PAG members and City-Port staff agree to present a full, fair and balanced view of the issues and arguments out of respect for the process and other members. PAG members and City-Port project staff agree not to knowingly mischaracterize the views of any member, group, process sponsor, or the PAG, as a whole. Whenever reasonable, members 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. PAG members and City-Port project staff will provide the full PAG with a brief verbal summary of their communications outside the PAG with elected officials, their staff, and the media on Airport Futures matters.

Sam's Comment: The originally proposed language was intended to apply to the City staff and the Port staff, in addition to the PAG. This is why there is a signature line for Chris and Jay at the end of the document. I should have made this clearer when I wrote section G – sorry!

Sam's Proposal: Explore at the 10-09-07 PAG Meeting the advantages and disadvantages of the following concepts:

- 1) A "heads-up" before the fact,
- 2) A summary after the fact,
- 2) The "parallel political process" concept, and
- 3) Characterizations of issues outside of PAG meetings impacting the PAG process.

H. 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 joint project website within one week of the PAG subcommittee meeting.

I. 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 (SAM: 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.

J. 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.

K. Role of 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.

L. Interpretation

PAG members are encouraged to communicate information or concerns to the chair, vice chair or facilitator. The chair, vice chair or facilitator shall lead a PAG discussion designed to reach a consensus on any process dispute surrounding these Collaboration Principles. If a consensus is not reasonably forthcoming, the chair shall, in his sole discretion, interpret this document.

IX. 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	
	Yalonda Sinde, Association of Environmental Health Academic Programs	
	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	

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		
Business Association or labor organization	Jim Pauley	
Military	Mike Bieniewicz	
Large Business that uses PDX Freight and Passenger Services	Jill Eiland	
Environmental Interests: 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 Path		
Airport Issues Roundtable (AIR)	Eric Meyer	