

Discussion Paper
Public Involvement in the Model Forest

Prepared for: Management Group

Prepared by: Tracy Freeman
on behalf of the
Public Awareness and Involvement Working Group

7 June 1994

Project No: 0-404-001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Introduction	1
B. Diagram: "A Ladder of Citizen's Participation"	2
C. Three rungs of that ladder in more detail:	
Consultation	3
Extended Involvement	4
Partnership	5
D. Decision-Making in the Model Forest	
Chart of the Decision-Making Process	6
Written Description of Decision-Making Options	7
E. Case Study	
Extended Involvement and Partnership in the San Juan National Forest, Colorado USA	9

INTRODUCTION

TO THE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT WORKING GROUP:

This group aims to encourage public involvement in the integrated forest resource management planning and decision-making process.

Before PAIWG can design a public involvement process, four important factors must be confirmed: purpose, involvement, decision-making, and accountability. Commitment from the Management Group supporting these factors will be required. This discussion paper provides a brief overview of these factors to be considered at the Management Group meeting next week.

The publics of concern in this discussion paper include, but are not limited to: subsistence users, loggers, paperworkers, NF Forest Service personnel, naturalists, recreationalists, tourist outfitters, cabin owners, sawmillers, domestic cutters, and their respective associations.

TO THIS DISCUSSION PAPER:

This paper is not an exhaustive account of all aspects of public involvement. On page 2, you will find "A Ladder of Citizen's Participation." Only three of its "rungs" -- consultation, extended involvement and partnership -- are discussed further. These rungs are pertinent to the functions of the Public Awareness and Involvement Working Group.

A case study is provided for your interest.

DISCUSSION POINTS:

1. Purpose

The Management Group is interested in:
(a) hearing how people value and use the forest; and
(b) integrating additional forest users in the Model Forest process.

2. Involvement

Levels of public involvement in the Model Forest vary. Working groups and the Management Group are examples of partnerships. The question we must address now is how other forest users, such as recreationalists, can become involved.

(Consult the "Ladder of Citizen's Participation.")

3. Decision-making

How can these additional publics and their views be integrated in the decision-making process?

(Page 6 contains a "working" chart of the Model Forest decision-making process. Page 7 is a brief outline of two possible routes for decision-making. Both may prove helpful in answering this question.)

4. Accountability

Mechanisms must be in place to ensure that ongoing feedback is provided to the public.

ALADDER OF

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

8 Citizen Control

7 Delegated Power

6 Partnership

5 Extended
Involvement

4 Consultation

3 Informing

2 Therapy

1 Manipulation

**DEGREES OF
CITIZEN POWER**

7 & 8. Citizens obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power.

6. Citizens negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional powerholders.
Technique for 6-8: Power is delegated to local citizen's committees.

5. The Ground rules allow the public to advise, but retain for the power-holders the continued right to decide.
Technique: A mediation session held at the initiative of decision-makers and attended by citizen representatives.

3 & 4. This type of participation allows people to hear and have a voice. The public lacks power to ensure that its views will be heeded by the power-holders.
Examples of techniques include:
3 - posters and pamphlets; 4 - questionnaires, polls, community meetings and public hearings.

**DEGREES OF
TOKENISM**

NONPARTICIPATION

1 & 2. The aim here is to "educate" or "cure" people. Citizen representatives may be named to an advisory committee for the purpose of engineering their support.

** Please note that not all levels of public involvement will be discussed here. Ideas for informing the public can be found on pp.43-45 of the Model Forest Proposal. The levels discussed here -- consultation, extended involvement and partnership -- are those most pertinent to the Public Awareness and Involvement Working Group. **

CONSULTATION

EXAMPLES OF WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

WHAT COULD BE DONE

- 1991 Survey of Public Attitudes undertaken by the Protected Areas Association and the Newfoundland Forest Service.

The opportunity to express views is extended to all users through a variety of methods.

WHY? To answer these questions: "How do you value and use the forest?" & "How would you like to become further involved in this process?"

- Survey of Newfoundland Attitudes to the Environment by Bonnie Hill.

- Provincial Department of Forestry and Agriculture:

1. Surveys

1. public meetings with sawmillers and town councils regarding roads and cutting areas;

- surveys of bus tour participants
- general telephone / door-to-door survey conducted by PAIWG

2. meetings to present management plans to public;

- surveys of "affected publics" conducted by new Working Group(s).

3. recent "adaptive management" meetings to discuss public involvement in the forest management planning process.

2. Meetings

- meetings conducted by facilitator:
with communities and individuals
with special interest groups
with "internal publics", such as loggers, paperworkers, NF Forest Service personnel, City Hall employees...

- Atlantic Coastal Action Program: kitchen table discussions and visioning sessions.

- meetings conducted by Working Groups with individuals and organizations

- Wilderness Ecological Reserves Advisory Council (WERAC): public meetings regarding Serpentine / Lewis Hills area.

- meetings conducted by interested publics at which members of the Model Forest are invited to observe.

- Meeting of Rural Development Councils in summer 1993 included forestry session.

3. Field tours led by special interest groups to express views to PAIWG or another working group.

- Surveys of domestic wood cutters in winter 1994, conducted by technicians who were hired by Development Associations in conjunction with the Model Forest Domestic Cutting Group.

4. Discussion papers to solicit public input.

EXTENDED INVOLVEMENT

EXAMPLES OF WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

- Adventure Tourism workshop in Gander, 1991, with discussion sessions combining members of adventure tourism industry with government departments, funding institutions and other tourism-related agencies and associations.
- Strategic Planning Workshop of Atlantic Coastal Action Program in May 1994.

WHAT COULD BE DONE

- Conduct a workshop of affected forest users who were not included in the IRM workshop to discuss:
 - (a) other avenues of involvement in the Model Forest
 - (b) IRM planning and process
 - (c) direction for the future (the mapping of values would provide a helpful visual aid).

** For consultation and extended involvement to be considered forms of participation, rather than degrees of tokenism, monitoring and follow-up must be included, if not subsequent delegation of power -- partial, sectorial, or complete.

PARTNERSHIP

EXAMPLES OF WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

(At this stage an attempt is underway to *integrate* concerns, as opposed to *hearing* them in the consultation stage.)

- Creation of Working Groups and the Management Group in the Model Forest
- Humber River Watershed Monitoring Committee
- Cox's Cove Watershed Monitoring Committee
- Corner Brook Stream Development Committee

WHAT COULD BE DONE

- Creation of a Public Advisory Committee (call on stakeholder groups to select their own representatives for this committee).
- Expand the Integrated Resource Management Working Group and / or Management Group.
- Add additional Working Groups.

This concludes the discussion of levels of public involvement. The next two pages address decision-making and accountability in the Model Forest. Page 6 depicts a working chart of where public input may be integrated in decisions. Page 7 is the range of options which decision-makers may have.

WHAT IS THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN THE MODEL FOREST?

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>WHO IS CURRENTLY INVOLVED</u>	<u>POSSIBLE ADDITIONAL INVOLVEMENT</u>
1. Issue identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Group - Working Groups - People surveyed for Domestic Cutting report - IRM Workshop participants - Interested publics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recreational and subsistence forest users who do not align themselves with an organization - "Internal publics" of Forest Service and industries
2. Options generated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Group - Working Groups - Technicians for Domestic Cutting survey - WNMF researchers - Proposal proponents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism Division - Internal publics - Interested people
<i>Feedback / Response</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintain contact with those involved above 	
3. Options analyzed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Group - Working Groups - Affected Individuals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional resource agencies and organizations
4. Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Group - Board of Directors 	
<i>Feedback / Response</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notification to proposal proponent and / or pertinent Working Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual report of Management Group
5. Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working Groups - Affected publics - Resource Agencies 	
6. Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Group - Working Groups - Affected publics 	

OPTIONS FOR DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

A. MANAGEMENT GROUP

Member of the Management Group or General Manager receives public comment.

separate options:

1. Member to bring public comment to a quarterly meeting.
2. Member to bring idea to pertinent special-interest Working Group.
3. Member suggests that comment be directed to particular resource agency.
4. Individual presents comment in proposal form to Management Group.
5. Member decides to not put forward comment at meeting and gives explanation to public.

decision-making:

Management Group makes decision at meeting or decision is deferred until Members discuss comment with their respective constituencies. Unresolved decision may go to Board of Directors.

Member maintains contact with public and informs public of decision.

Annual report compiled by Management Group.

Comments and decision may be recorded in a "central inventory of public comment" to be easily accessible to all.

B. WORKING GROUP EXAMPLE

This is an example based on the Domestic Cutting Working Group in the Model Forest.

In the winter of 1994, five technicians were hired to survey domestic cutters in the forest. These technicians wrote summaries of comments received and the coordinator compiled all into a final report.

Member of the Domestic Cutting Working Group (composed of the district forester, development association coordinators, and representatives of CBPP, Gros Morne Park, and the Centre for Forest and Environmental Studies, West Viking College) will receive the final report.

options for decision-making:

1. Domestic Cutting Working Group reviews recommendations and decides which will be presented to the Management Group.
2. Management Group decides on recommendations.
3. Working Group provides public with feedback.
4. Management Group accountable in annual report.
5. Public involvement may be solicited by working group in planning, implementation and monitoring of accepted recommendations.

Martha A. Tableman, "Case Study 1: San Juan National Forest Mediation," in ed. James E. Crowfoot and Julia M. Wondolleck, Environmental Disputes: Community Involvement in Conflict Resolution (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1990), pp. 32-65.

The Forest Service was preparing an environmental assessment of an area to be logged, according to a 1980 law that allocated the area to be cut. Earlier Forest Service notices in the newspaper had gone unnoticed. Consequently, the Forest Service was caught by surprise when people became upset at the proposed logging scheme.

Local interests were concerned that tourism, wildlife and slope and soil stability would be endangered by logging. An intense letter-writing campaign to public officials increased negative reaction to the proposal. The Forest Service held a public comment period followed by a public meeting, which left people outraged.

At the suggestion of a lawyer representing a local rancher, two professional mediators were brought in for a two-day planning session to help resolve this problem. Originally, the mediators were uncertain: if this was the traditional "wilderness versus non-wilderness" conflict, then people would not have enough time to move beyond their stated positions in two days.

Before the meeting, the mediators met with the participants on an individual basis, either in person or by telephone. After explaining their role, questions asked to each participant were:

1. What were the real issues, not just the ones being appealed?
2. What did they need out of this piece of land?
3. How did they want the meeting run?

Each individual was encouraged to think about specific needs and possible solutions.

Although the final decision authority rested with the Forest Service, there was reason to believe that the consensus of the group would receive serious consideration. The Forest Service would take it as a recommendation, yet one that carried extra weight because it was a consensus from many different interests.

After this initial round of contacts, the mediators agreed to chair the two-day meeting. The Forest Service representative was not a participant but instead a resource person to provide maps, aerial photographs and additional information. There were 26 participants the first day, but this number was decreased on the second day as interests were identified and brought together. The parties identified were Wildlife Division, off-road recreational users, cattle ranchers, environmental groups, chamber of commerce / homeowners, a small timber company and the federal Forest Service.

A compromise was reached. The Forest Service representative said he had no problems with 80 per cent of the report, but had to mull over 20 per cent. Thus, further discussions and field trips occurred shortly thereafter. An advisory group was established to represent local, multiple interests; it served also as a balance between interest groups and the Forest Service. As well, a three person geotechnical team was created to study the suitability of certain areas for logging.

The success of the San Juan Colorado forest case can be attributed to three characteristics of this process:

1. Strong ties were maintained between the participants and their respective constituents;
2. Efforts were taken to bring expertise to bear in settling differences and in building a common understanding of issues at stake; (A main interest group hired a geotechnical expert who would understand the technical jargon of the Forest Service.)
3. Attention was given to the implementation of the final agreement.