

Esteemed Ctte Members—

In this packet you will find information that brings you closer to the end of Recon:

- A schedule of the final MCDS progression (separate attachment)
- The third draft of the MCDS Recon model, with changes from the 2nd draft highlighted (separate attachment)
- A discussion of roles and commitments for this final stretch (below)

At the end of this screed there is a series of questions for you. If you are skimming, please skim that far. Let me know your answers by e-mail.

First, the highlights of the schedule:

- ‘Finalize’ the model for purposes of Recon in the November meeting (quotation marks because you may want to fiddle with it at the December meeting) and agree on simplified scenarios and a decision-space-exploring sample of proposals to apply the model to
- Within days of your November meeting the City provides preliminary, highly guesstimated technical ratings
- Starting on the 29th of November, you engage in a series of small meetings to test and discuss the model with Nicholas or me. (Remember when Mark talked about how his ratings assumptions changed as he worked through the proposals? The idea here is to take the kind of internal dialog Mark found himself in but do it in small groups.)
- Question for below: how you engage with your constituents in this time...
- After your group meetings you’ll have until December 5th to channel your constituents, complete your inputs to the MCDS model and press the ‘I’m done for this round’ button that Philip is coding for you. (Why so little time? Because we need to give Philip a few good days for making the interim report, upon which so much in the December meeting hinges-- and I want the report to be timely in the packet.)
- Because you haven’t done enough work yet I would like to ask you to fill out a survey focusing on “to what extent have we met our Recon goals?”
- Philip prepares an interim report for your December packet. (See draft outline below.)
- Meanwhile the consultant team prepares slightly more thorough ratings for some of the criteria and some of the proposals, which we can toss into the MCDS Recon model at the December meeting (it will be interesting to see how much these will improve the power of the model).
- At the December meeting make sure we have met the Recon goals (greater collaborative capacity, keener understanding of the overall problem, greater understanding of processes/time constraints/tools and uncertainty, deep understanding of proposals and how they might fit in portfolios... in short, readiness for the Real Deal).

- At or shortly after the Dec meeting (or after the final report?) you fill out the same “have we met our Recon goals” survey.
- Philip prepares a final report.

So now in the final stretch, these are your roles and commitments—do you agree?

- Committee
 - Appreciate the courage and transparency the city staff is showing in providing preliminary ratings for the model. When they do this they will be giving you a rare insight into their perspectives and rationales. This is a gift. Be kind. On the same note, they are making estimates, as required for Recon. This requires a great deal of trust. Please never quote these ratings except in the context of Recon.
 - You will be doing the non-technical ratings; eventually it is your job to evaluate and weigh these factors—please be willing to take the same leap of faith as the city is in rating the following subcriteria (or let me know if you think these are really technical ratings that you ought not to originate):
 - Political Feasibility
 - Legal Feasibility (or ask lawyer?)
 - Traditional Landscapes
 - Climate-Adapted Landscapes
 - Preserves Future Choices
 - Look over City ratings with a keen eye and, if you change them in the MCDS model, *use the comment button to explain your rationale*
 - Weigh the criteria and subcriteria, check the ‘see why’ page, fiddle around with the weights and gut check them, seriously now...
 - Coordinate with your constituents
 - Answer the two “did we get the job done in Recon” surveys
- City-- do initial ratings
- Consultants—provide some refined ratings and participate in the spirit of Recon adventure in ‘what ifs’ at the December meeting.

And now the questions—please e-mail Nicholas or me with your thoughts.

- Yes to the Committee items above?
- How do you want to involve your constituents in the Recon MCDS exploration?
- Are you available for MCDS model get-togethers late Nov/early December? (We’ll be scheduling those at the November meeting.)

Thank you.

Carie

Preliminary report draft outline

Most useful insights gleaned from Philip's direct analysis of MCDA data

Gleaned from Philip's analysis but lower priority;

City collates and does basic analysis

Things to be gleaned directly from Ctte about their experience

Focus on what is needed to set up for December meeting!

- Looking for strengths and weaknesses in the model
 - too much lumping or too much splitting
 - correlation and double dipping
 - “natural weights” meaning that people have an easy time getting their weights to shine through
 - catches the tensions
 - are people using the full breadth of the scales?
- Report on comments (city or consultant does with input from Carie and Philip)
 - comments (ready organized by criterion
 - types (e.g., website, model structure, alternatives ratings, alternatives uncertainty)
 - formats and sends out
 - look at rationales for ratings changes
 - comments about uncertainty
- Committee Involvement:
 - activity level for ratings changes (from City origin) at gross level
 - activity level for ctte-originated ratings
 - activity level for putting in the rationale
 - degree of contrasts in weights and ratings and where they occur for different futures
 - did they look at the ‘see why’ screen? [Did it resonate?](#)
- What pops out just at the single future level:
 - [weights portraits](#)
 - [simple stuff about areas of tension and agreement](#)
 - city-originated ratings changed and comments about ratings—which criteria?
 - [analysis of ctte-initiated ratings](#)
 - thoughts (graphics) about uncertainty related to ctte-initiated ratings
 - [simple stuff about sensitivity to ratings](#)
- Comparisons of futures: what pops up
 - [Which weights and criteria were most affected by the different simplified scenarios?](#)
 - [Which alternatives shift \(in terms of both ratings and decision scores\) most across simplified futures](#)
 - Look at how uncertainty changes across futures, [as indicated by variation in decision scores](#)
- What's Next—meeting focus based on these results