

APPENDIX F: PROCESS EVALUATION

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT

JUNE 2016

Appendix F
Process Evaluation

TROUTDALE AIRPORT SHAPING OUR FUTURE



TTD PAC Process Evaluations Summary PAC Version 18 Responses

Pacing

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	1	5	9	2		1
Weighted Average	↑ 2.3					

Group Interactions

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	1	10	5	1		1
Weighted Average	↑ 2.6					

Materials

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	4	8	3	1		2
Weighted Average	↑ 2.9					

Presentations

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	3	12	2	1		
Weighted Average	↑ 2.9					

Your Communications with Your Interest Groups

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	2	4	9	1		2
Weighted Average	↑ 2.4					

TROUTDALE AIRPORT SHAPING OUR FUTURE



Public Involvement

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses		2	6	8	2	
Weighted Average	↑ 1.4					

Project Website

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses		7	6	1		4
Weighted Average	↑ 2.4					

Port Staff

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	5	9	3	1		
Weighted Average	↑ 3.0					

Consultants

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	5	5	4	4		
Weighted Average	↑ 2.6					

Chair

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	4	7	6			
Weighted Average	↑ 2.9					


Facilitator

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	5	10	2	1		
Weighted Average	↑ 3.1					

TROUTDALE AIRPORT SHAPING OUR FUTURE



Overall Process

(Weight)	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	No Answer
# of Responses	1	7	8.5	0.5		1
Weighted Average	 2.5					

- * One member who refrained from grading wrote “?” next to this section.
- ** The chair did not evaluate his own performance.
- *** This member marked both Fair and Good.
- **** Excellent=4, Very Good=3, Good=2, Fair=1, Poor=0. “No Answers” were not included.

OVERALL COMMENTS

The eleventh hour questions concerning the incongruences between FAA specifications and potential prohibitions in insurance coverage for operations in the proposed runway length remains a concern that I believe could have been brought to light earlier in the process. (I realize the question was not raised until meeting #11, by the public, which is unfortunate.) P.S. Thanks to the Port staff and consultants for all their efforts in this process. (“Good” for Communications and Public Involvement, “Excellent” for Pacing, Presentations, Port Staff, Consultants, and Chair with “Very Good” for the rest.) **Mark Brown**

Some challenge with expectations or opportunity to do what or take action. Was unclear, especially during critical/key action items making it challenging or frustrating on making revisions/amendments. Facilitation was/seemed touch and go. Consultant/experts comments not considerate to some stakeholders. (This unnamed person thought the materials were “Very Good,” gave “Fair” scores to Public Involvement, Consultants, and Facilitator, and scored “Good” to all other categories.)

Consultants, lack of providing good facts. Several fibs throughout the process. (Gave “Fair” scores to Public Involvement and Consultants. “Good” to Pacing, Website and Overall Process. “Very Good” to the rest.) **Bob Fowler**

I felt that a couple (few) individuals dominated the conversation/process. Others should be encouraged to also have a voice. But overall, great process. Thank you Port! (“Excellent” to Materials, Presentations, Port Staff and Consultants, “Good” to Chair and “Very Good” to rest.)

As an alternate only available for the last meeting, please note my comments reflect a very small portion of this process. I typically grade towards the middle unless something sways me towards one of the sides of the spectrum. (Designated “Good” for all sections, except Your Communications with Your Interest Groups, Chair, and Facilitator which were designated “Very Good”) **Dan Doepker**

I am troubled by the accusations from pilots and other users of the facility that they were not sufficiently notified. While I feel the Port worked well with the PAC, I have my doubts about the level of communication with other stakeholders, which severely affects the legitimacy and efforts of the past two years. (Designated “Poor” for Public Involvement, “Fair for Pacing, “Excellent” for Materials, Chair and the Facilitator, “Very Good” for Interactions, Presentations, and Port Staff, “Good” for rest.)

While the process worked very well, too much time was given to a very few/very vocal members who continued to say the same thing each time. I understand the need for due process and the mediator

TROUTDALE AIRPORT SHAPING OUR FUTURE



having to make sure everyone who wanted to be heard, was heard, but there should have been some process to limit the discussion that had already been discussed and taken into consideration by the PAC. (Gave “Excellent” scores to Chair, Facilitator, and Overall Process, “Fair” to Public Involvement and “Very Good” to the rest.)

Additional outreach prior to PAC meetings to “key vocal members” could have helped in a more smooth and focused PAC meeting(s) at times. I understand that it is time consuming and an extra effort, but it felt like the “voice of few” was sometimes driving the meeting... Maybe their concerns could have been handled before the meeting. (Thought Materials were “Excellent,” “Very Good” for Interactions, Presentations, Port Staff, Chair, Facilitator and Overall Process and the rest received a “Good.”)

The challenge that I had with the overall process was that the PAC was presented with certain information by the consultants based on their analysis and in some cases this analysis was contradicted by anecdotal information from PAC members and public comment. At times it felt as if the anecdotal information was ignored or not really addressed by Port staff and consultants. As a PAC member and without expertise in aviation, I felt I was left having to trust the information from the consultants who I looked to as the experts. I leave this process with some questions unanswered but overall I think the process went well. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to participate and hope my input was valuable to the process. Based on all information provided, I feel very good about the final recommendation. (Thought the Pacing was “Fair,” the Materials, Presentations, Port Staff and Consultants were “Very Good” with the rest getting a “Good” with the exception of the Overall Process that got a “Good to Fair.”) **Erika Fitzgerald**

Not process, but make-up: appointing 22 people to consider the future of an airport, with only 5 members with any aviation background, suggests a direction was clearly thought. (In terms of Port staff, ranked “Very Good”) though occasionally misleading. (In terms of Chair, ranked “Good”) Suggest a wee bit more chairing. Struck me as too often either inexperienced or biased. (In terms of Consultants and Public Involvement, “Fair,” “?” on Website, “Very Good” to Interactions, Port Staff, and Facilitator with “Good” to the rest.) **Joe Smith**

We could have given the PAC more advanced input into the alternatives development. Many PAC members felt they were fed the alternatives rather than collaboratively developed them. (Pacing was “Good” and the rest were “Very Good.”) **Travis Stovall**

Marv Woidyla did not provide any comments. No “Excellent” categories, “Very Good” to Pacing, Interactions, Chair and Facilitator, “Good” to Communications, and Overall Process, “Poor” to Public Involvement, and “Fair” to the rest.

- I really appreciated the large, diverse stakeholder group. I also thought the extended timeline of ~1.5 - 2 years was helpful to sift through all the technical analysis. I think there could have been better facilitation and off-line discussions between staff and some of the stakeholder groups who were the most vocal during the SAC meetings. It seemed like the SAC meetings were the only opportunities these stakeholders had to vent concern which took up a lot of time, and also created some tension. Lastly, I would've like to have seen more public involvement for the project. I think the Port could have been more proactive about reaching out to existing community groups and attending their events or meetings. (Pacing, Materials, and Presentations were “Very Good,” Group Interactions and Public Involvement were “Fair,” and the rest were “Good.”)
- Presentations by Port sometimes seemed to try to “lead the jury” (take an implicit or explicit position). Consideration of possible alternative uses of the airport were excluded from the process, in spite of repeated requests to consider those at an appropriate point in the process. (Such considerations

TROUTDALE AIRPORT SHAPING OUR FUTURE



remained outside the TTD process, and were relegated to work by a possible follow-on committee.) This gave short shrift to an important facet of planning for the Airport's future. (Materials and Your Communications with Your Interest Groups were "Excellent," Pacing, Public Involvement, and Overall Process were "Good," and the rest were "Very Good.") **Claude Cruz**

- There were times that the process felt disingenuous. The Port's desire to shrink the airport to create more commercial/industrial development space was pretty clear from the outset. I think this created some suspicion of the process that might have been better dealt with if the Port had been more forthright with its intentions. That being said, I think the Port's willingness to consider option C is commendable, given the economic forecasts. I think some more robust public involvement or survey efforts would have been great. Ultimately, I think the outcome was good, and was an accurate representation of the common ground that existed in the PAC. (Your Communications with Your Interest Groups was not rated, Port Staff, Facilitator, and Consultants were "Excellent," Materials and Presentations were "Very Good," Public Involvement was "Fair," and the rest were "Good.")
- **Steve Gaschler** did not provide any comments. Presentations, Project Website, Port Staff, Consultants, Chair, and Facilitator were "Very Good" and the rest were "Good."