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INTRODUCTION

The Canadian Model Forest Network, established in 1992 now has ten model forests in operation across the country. The network is leading the world in developing and implementing alternative forest management strategies. The Model Forests also want to take a leadership role in involving the public in the Model Forest management and integrated resource management initiatives.

The role and level of public participation varies with each Model Forest. And, the Model Forests have recognized the importance of using a wide range of options for public and stakeholder involvement in resource management, including various ways of enabling public input into the planning process.

The Model Forest Network held a workshop in Ottawa on October 4 and 5, 1995. Nine Model Forests (all except the Forest Modele Du Bas-Saint Laurent) and the Canadian Forest Service were represented with 35 - 40 people in attendance over the two days. The Workshop agenda is presented in Appendix A. The workshop identified to the Model Forests the key public participation issues, the approaches used by each Model Forest and public participation techniques available. It resulted in a sharing of public participation and decision-making experiences among the Model Forests.

The purpose of this report is to:

- address the key public participation issues identified by the Model Forests;
- document the influences, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and constraints to public participation identified in the workshop;
- provide advice on developing a public participation plan; and,
- identify networking opportunities and resources for the Model Forests on public participation.

The report, along with the workshop experience, can provide the basis for developing and revising public participation plans for the Model Forests.

Section 2 of the report provides an overview of public participation, its role and importance in planning and decision-making, and principles and objectives that should guide development of a public participation plan.
Section 3 presents an overview of the workshop by organizing the discussion on the key influences, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and constraints to public participation in the Model Forests. This overview is intended to assist each of the Model Forests in their public participation evaluation and planning.

Section 4 captures the discussion from the workshop on 12 key questions. Section 5 then addresses one aspect on the workshop that participants requested more information on - developing a public participation plan and the techniques that can be used in a public participation program.

One of the benefits of the workshop was that the public participation coordinators were able to share their experiences 'in the field'. This sharing of experiences can continue on a regular basis with greater networking. Therefore, Section 6 identifies networking opportunities for the Model Forest public participation coordinators. Section 7 provides a brief summary of the workshop.
WHAT IS PUBLIC PARTICIPATION?

Model Forest Network participants asked a number of questions about the basis of public participation, including:

- How do we define public participation?
- Who is the public? Are they different from stakeholders, and interest groups?
- How do you engage the public?

This section addresses these questions and provides additional background information on the public participation principles and objectives.

A Word on the Terms

The terms public participation, public involvement and public consultation have all been used to describe various ways of addressing the public and including them or their views in decision-making. Over the last two decades, the terms have come to be used interchangeably and the same term is often used to describe different levels of participation. Although the various uses of the term are accepted, it creates confusion when two people think they are talking about the same thing.

The key is to accept and be clear on a definition of the term. Let others know what you mean by it.

What is Public Participation

Public participation is...

"the process by which the views of interested and/or affected individuals and organizations are integrated into a decision-making process." It is not limited to informing the public. It is an ongoing process of communication and interaction between the decision-maker(s) and everyone else: the general public, interest groups, non-government organizations, government, property owners; anyone interested in or affected by a decision.

Public participation doesn’t just happen. It is a planned process, designed to meet the needs of a specific project, program or policy; and, to address the needs of the public. The ultimate goal
is to improve decisions on projects, programs and policy. An effective public participation program is more likely to make those decisions more acceptable.

Public participation is an interactive two-way process. It:

- involves consensus building;
- is objective, open and fair and is carried out in a responsible manner;
- is explicit - allowing people to know where, when and how they can be involved in advance;
- is legitimate, so that results of the participation effort can be incorporated into the decision-making process; and,
- is traceable - participants should know how their involvement affected the decision.

Who is the Public

Society is comprised of many different publics. The public can be the general public - concerned or interested individuals who are not representing any group; people and groups who have a stake in your decisions (stakeholders); community organizations; environmental groups; special/public interest groups; business groups and organizations; and, employee groups. The public can be from any community whether it is geographically based (e.g., local, regional, provincial) or based on an idea, philosophy or interest (e.g., many NGOs).

Although no one should be denied an opportunity to participate in your program, you will need to make sure that you identify those who must be provided with an opportunity to participate. These are likely to be people and organizations who may be directly affected; those who will be indirectly affected; and others who have an interest in the activity. Each of these target publics may warrant a different public participation approach or technique.

In the workshop, participants discussed the difficulties in defining the terms "stakeholder" and "partner", and that some publics do not like the terms. Terms that are not acceptable to the public do not have to be used. In addition, you should recognize that not all publics need or want to be involved in the same way for all projects. Some publics may be involved with you on one program or project and other publics may participate on other programs or projects. In preparing your public participation plan, you must define who your publics are, clearly state their role, and ensure that the plan provides for their input in a way that meets their needs.

Why do you want to engage the public?

Why you want to engage the public requires careful consideration. You need to know why you want the public to participate with you before you can describe how you want them to be involved in your decision-making process. And, you need to determine who the public is that
you want to work with. This is the strategic aspect of public participation planning.

- to provide feedback on your goals and objectives;
- to collect additional data and to obtain local knowledge or other expertise;

When well done, public participation is valuable as it:

- informs and educates the public;
- promotes good planning by including the public in the identification and consideration of alternative ideas and approaches;
- to provide feedback on your goals and objectives;
- helps to promote understanding of differing perspectives and viewpoints;
- helps to identify a broad range of opinions, preferences and creative solutions to issues before deciding on a course of action;
- has the potential to reduce conflict (although there are no guarantees) by identifying and addressing issues, ideally before they reach a point where all sides are firmed up and positions are hardened; and,
- improves credibility of the process and the credibility of the decision-makers.

Levels of Public Participation

The public can be involved in different ways and at different times in project, program and policy decision-making through the public participation program. Different descriptions of the levels public participation are available.\(^1\) The levels can be simplified and collapsed into the following three broad categories.

\(^1\) One of the first attempts to identify the levels of public participation was undertaken by Sherry Arnstein in 1969. Her classification was later called the Arnstein ladder. It was developed specifically for 'urban America' and is not wholly transferable to the Model Forest situation. However, it provides a useful overview of power relationships and structural differences among groups. See Arnstein, Sherry, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, July 1969, pp. 216-224.
Informing and Educating the Public

At this level, the decision-maker provides information to the public on what they intend to do, why they intend to do it and the benefits of the proposed program or activity. There is little meaningful two way flow of information. It is generally accepted that public participation programs must provide greater opportunities for the public to provide comment and advice. However, informing and educating the public is a necessary component of a public participation program.

Informing the Decision-maker

The public can have an "informing role" only or "informing and advising". Access to decision-makers is provided either directly or indirectly to inform them of concerns, opinions and issues; and advise them of what they should do. The decision-maker can choose to incorporate the views of the public into the planning process.

Collaborative Decision-making

Collaborative decision-making involves partnerships in which planning and decision-making responsibilities are shared. These range from joint planning, delegated power, and finally citizen control. For citizen control, the public directly undertakes the planning function or has a veto in the process.

The role of the public in your public participation program is dependent on a number of factors, including how you want the public involved, and how they want to be involved or are able to be involved. To determine how the public want to be involved or to determine if they have the time and resources required, you may need to ask them. You can meet with them to explain what you have in mind and to ask if and how they would like to be involved (often prompted by a list of participation opportunities).

Broad Principles To Guide the Public Participation Program

A good participation program should be founded on sound principles. Public participation principles are the overall guidelines that influence both the design of the participation program and the critical decisions that must be made when the program is underway.

---

For an example, see Hardy Stevenson and Associates Ltd., Draft Public Participation Program for the Forest Values Project. Prepared for Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, 1992. This document is the result of a "Pre-Consultation" exercise where all potential stakeholders were identified and asked if they wanted to be involved in the Project and how they wanted to be involved.
The *National Forest Strategy*, prepared by the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, adopted the following three “Principles for Public Participation in Forest Planning”:

- The public is entitled to participate in forest policy and planning processes, recognizing that this carries with it obligations and responsibilities.
- Effective public participation requires an open, fair and well-defined process, with generally accepted procedures and deadlines for decisions.
- To participate effectively, the public must be aware and informed, with access to comprehensive and easy-to-understand information on forest resources.\(^3\)

At the workshop, *Henry Lickers of the Mohawk Council of Akwesasne*, provided an overview of the basic principles of the concept of Naturalized Knowledge Systems: Respect, Equity and Empowerment. He emphasized that a balance of these three principles is required among the participants in a process if acceptable joint decisions are to be made. On Figure 1, Mr. Lickers presented these three principles and the tools required to ensure that they are implemented.

Both sets of principles are good, broad principles that provide sound direction for the development of a good participation plan and decision-making structure. Additional more specific principles can provide more direction for designing an effective public participation program. These are outlined below.

**Principles for Designing an Effective Public Participation Program**

The broad principles (above) and specific program design principles must be articulated and accepted by your Model Forest to provide the support your program will need through the design, approval and implementation stages. The specific program design principles that should be considered are listed below.

---

Naturalized Knowledge Systems

The Zeal to Deal

is generated by a balance of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honour</td>
<td>Social Power</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Henry Lickers 1994
• Ensure that the role of participation in decision-making is understood by all participants, that it is a well defined process:
  . Do not create unrealistic expectations, either internally or externally;
  . Clearly define the ground rules;
  . Define the access to decision-making and the extent of shared decision-making responsibility.

If you have clear idea of how the public will be involved in the decision-making process, let them know at the outset. Will they be informing and advising the decision-makers or will they be involved a collaborative decision-making process?

• Maintain Respect.

  Respect is the key ingredient for the success of any program.

• Foster a fair process with open disclosure and an open sharing of information.

• Participation should be on-going and integrated into the decision-making process.

• Participation should begin early, before key decisions are made.

  It is no longer acceptable to tack a public participation program onto a planning process that is essentially complete.

• Be flexible.

  You may be required to adapt your program as you go because:
  . The process may be different in different circumstances and at different times;
  . Different groups may need/want to be involved differently; some may have a special status (e.g., Aboriginal groups); and,
  . Different levels of involvement may be desired at different stages in the project/program.

Don't "finalize" the perfect Public Participation Program, keep it open. You are often under pressure to stay within budget and to meet certain schedules; you may have to be creative and persuasive within your organization. Specific timeframes are helpful, but recognize that you may not be able to stick to them.

• Listen and hear.

  All parties to the participation should be willing to listen to the others and hear what they
are saying. This can generate the respect required and enhance the flow of information and dialogue.

- Talk.

All parties, including the Model Forest, must be willing to raise their concerns and discuss the issues important to them.

- Probe/Respond.

You should explore the points made and you should be willing to respond to the public on how their information and the opinions they provided were used. The public took the time to consult with you. They should learn how you dealt with their advice.

- Recognize linkages to other projects/programs you have underway.

Interested members of the public often receive a broader range of information on issues than people working on a single aspect of the issue. Therefore, they are often able to point out linkages to and implications for other programs or policies. The public may have a better appreciation of how your program fits with or affects other programs underway in your Model Forest. Evaluate their suggestions. For example, it may be that your program should be dove-tailed with other initiatives.

- Do not let conflict stop your process.

Conflict will occur in forest and corporate policy and planning. For example, there may be conflict among parties based on the values they attribute to the forest. However, conflict resolution approaches are available.

**The Public Participation Objectives Must be Understood**

Once you've agreed on the principles that should guide your participation program, you need to think about your specific objectives. What is that you intend to accomplish? What do you want out of the program?

It is important that the objectives of the public participation program be clearly defined, understood and accepted within your organization, and, then in partnership with your external audience. However, based on your discussions with your external audience your objectives may require adjustment. You will have to work this out as you initiate your participation program. Examples of objectives of public participation plans are included in Appendix C.
OVERVIEW OF THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WORKSHOP

The Public Participation Workshop was designed to maximize the sharing of experiences with Public Participation among the ten Model Forests. It was evident that there are key influences on the Model Forest public participation programs, and that the Model Forests possess many strengths, some weaknesses, opportunities and constraints with respect to public participation. These are summarized below. Key public participation questions and issues identified during the workshop are discussed in the Section 4.0. The techniques used by the Model Forests and others are included in Section 5.0.

Influences on Public Participation

Influence of the Social and Political Environment

During the round table discussion at the workshop, it became clear that the social and political environment in which the Model Forests operate can influence the choice and success of public participation approaches and techniques. Techniques used to create greater awareness of Model Forests in large predominantly urban populations may not be appropriate for Model Forests with small populations in largely rural areas. Therefore, each Model Forest must ensure that the public participation approaches and techniques it uses are appropriate to their social environment.

In addition, the provincial policy and political circumstance can provide opportunities for the Model Forest public participation program. Provincial forest and resource management policy and initiatives (e.g., Forest Conservation Strategy in Alberta, Forest Renewal of British Columbia, and the Ontario Community Forest Program) can provide opportunities for the Model Forests to coordinate their public participation efforts with the public participation initiatives of the provincial programs. They may also benefit from the public awareness created by those initiatives.

Influence of Land Tenure

The workshop raised the prospect of different approaches to public participation being required where private land makes up a large proportion of the Model Forest land base. In these cases, the Model Forest may attempt to foster integrated resource management with many different land owners rather with the Province (Crown land holder) and the licensee. This requires the development of a different public participation strategy to bring the private land owner into the resource management process.
Influence of Management Structure

The Model Forests have unique partnerships and different types of partners. Some, such as the Eastern Ontario Model Forest, have an open membership and open Board policy. Anyone can become a member and have the opportunity to be elected to the Board of Directors. Others, such as the Prince Albert Model Forest, have a fixed partnership representing the land tenure arrangements in the area. These partnership structures and the partners influence the role of public participation in decision-making. The Eastern Ontario Model Forest structure provides the opportunity for more direct public input to decision-making.

Strengths of the Model Forest Network

The Model Forest should build on their strengths in developing and implementing their public participation programs. The following strengths were identified at the workshop.

Diversity among the Model Forests and Their Public Participation Experiences

The Model Forest Network offers 10 different situations in which to extend public participation in resource management and partnership decision-making. Each Model Forest environment and structure is unique, requiring adaptation of approaches and techniques. The diversity and the decentralized structure of the Network allows for greater innovation on all aspects of the Model Forest program, including public participation.

One of the main strengths of the Model Forest Network is the different public participation experiences across the Network. The continued sharing of these experiences will benefit all of the Model Forests in evaluating, planning and implementing their public participation programs.

Commitment to Public Participation

Each of the Model Forests understands the value of good public participation. They all appreciate how it can contribute to better Model Forest decisions and to improved integrated resource management. And, they are committed to expanding their public participation efforts.

Desire to Provide Leadership

Each Model Forest is acutely aware of the need for greater public participation and they want to provide leadership in public participation in resource management and partnership decision-making.

Improved public participation will also help them to achieve their objectives of applying "innovative approaches, procedures, techniques and concepts in the management of the forests".

Hardy Stevenson and Associates Ltd.
and accelerating 'the implementation of sustainable development in the practice of forestry and the concept of integrated resource management'.

**Knowledge of Local Issues**

The Model Forests are part of the local communities. Generally, the partnerships include people from the area who understand the local issues. They are aware of the socio-political environment in which they operate. This provides an excellent basis for developing the successful public participation plans.

**Weaknesses in the Model Forest Network**

The following weaknesses which emerged during the discussion at the workshop should be addressed to maximize the public participation opportunities.

*Low Public Awareness of the Model Forest Concept, Sustainable Development and Integrated Resource Management*

Workshop participants confirmed that in most parts of the country, the public is not aware of the Model Forest Concept and does not understand what the Model Forests are trying to do. In some areas, the public believes the Model Forest is part of the forestry industry and that it is trying to implement an industry agenda. The lack of awareness and misunderstanding of the Model Forest objectives are seen to be serious impediments to public participation. They have contributed to a lack of trust in at least one Model Forest, creating another hurdle for public participation.

Some Model Forests pointed out that the low public awareness of sustainable development goals has also hindered their public participation efforts. People are not interested in getting involved in something they do not understand or do not see how it affects them.

The Model Forests do not appear to have a clear idea of what their role and the role of the Federal Model Forest Secretariat should be to remedy the lack of awareness and misperceptions. The Network needs to address this issue as soon as possible.

**Definition of the Public**

It appears from the workshop that, in some cases, the public has been narrowly defined and that a profile of the communities, people and organizations of the Model Forest area has not been prepared. Such a profile would assist the Model Forest in understanding the communities, people and organizations in the area and help in developing a public participation plan which would identify the publics and target the techniques to be used to enable them to participate effectively.
Level of Formal Public Participation Training and Use of the Social Sciences

A critical component of any successful public participation program is the knowledge and ability of the public participation coordinator. As was pointed out in the workshop, Model Forest staff who work with the public need to be selected with care to ensure that they can generate and maintain trust, and respond personally and knowledgeably to questions and issues raised. In part, this requires that the public participation coordinator understand public participation theory and practice.

It also appears as though the emphasis of the Model Forests has been on the natural sciences. The best available social science may not have been applied in all Model Forests to address public participation and the social issues confronting the Model Forest. For example, methods of alternative dispute resolution, evaluation and planning for multiple objectives do not appear to have been applied consistently among the Model Forests.

Forestry Not a Major Public Concern in Some Areas

In Manitoba, forestry is not seen to be a major public issue, making it difficult to generate public participation in the Model Forest and its planning and programs. The public generally are more interested in other issues. The workshop did not explore whether resource management was also a low priority on the public agenda in Manitoba.

Opportunities for Greater Public Participation

The workshop highlighted the following opportunities for the Model Forests to engage the public in their policy, program and project planning and decision-making.

Public Participation and Sustainable Development

The Model Forests have an opportunity to offer the public a greater role in their decision-making. At the present time, the public role in each of the Model Forests appears to be advisory; generally providing advice through advisory committees. However, some Model Forests have moved to a more collaborative decision-making structure where some publics are represented on the Board and are part of the decision-making process. The Eastern Ontario Model Forest has the broadest representation of the public on its Board of Directors. However, it still has the difficulty of obtaining input from other members of the public and other groups not represented on the Board.

The Model Forests recognize that there can be a continuum of involvement of the public; that some individuals and groups may participate as advisors or as decision-makers on some programs and projects but take on a less active role on others.
The Model Forests have the opportunity to influence the approaches to sustainable development through public participation. They have greater flexibility than other organizations and agencies because they are not burdened by regulation and authority. They can contribute to improved public participation because:

- they can develop new approaches, techniques and options that best suit integrated resource management, Model Forest decision-making and individual project and program activities; and,
- they can create change in the way partnership decisions and integrated resource management decisions are made.

One of the key issues at the workshop was how to create greater awareness of the Model Forest and gain greater public participation in its activities. Sound advice came from the participants:

- keep it simple.
- focus on specific issues, don’t be too general or too vague because people will not take the time to become involved. The bigger the issue is, the great the participation is likely to be.
- build on other initiatives in the area or province (e.g., in British Columbia, the Model Forests can participate in Forest Renewal BC, Timber Supply Review, Forest Practices Code, and the British Columbia Treaty Commission).
- look for ways to contribute to the community. The Prince Albert Model Forest slogan "Maw Wechehetowin - Working Together Helping Each Other" captures this spirit.

First Nation Participation

First Nations partnerships in resource management decision making are generally accepted throughout Canada as an important initiatives to improve decision-making. The Model Forest Network has an opportunity to lead by example on how this can be done. Six Model Forests are addressing First Nation participation. Each appears to have taken a somewhat different approach. The workshop demonstrated that First Nation resources are available within the Network.

In his short presentation, Henry Lickers of the Mohawk Council of Akwasasne (Eastern Ontario Model Forest) provided an overview of: the Basic Principles of the concept of the Naturalized Knowledge Systems, the human/community structure of Naturalized knowledge Systems, and his "Zeal to Deal" which is generated by a balance of Respect, Equity and Empowerment. The Eastern Ontario Model Forest has adopted these as basic principles of the Model Forest. Mr. Lickers also identified the tools required to attain Respect, Equity and Empowerment (See copies of his presentation overheads in Appendix B).
The other Model Forests also have experiences with First Nations participation at the Board and project level. For example, The Long Beach Model Forest has developed a consensus decision making approach, strongly influenced by the First Nations. These experiences can be shared on a regular basis, providing support from within the Network.

**Network Support**

The Model Forest Network provides opportunities for mutual support among the public participation coordinators and resource support from the Model Forest partners. As part of the Model Forest Network, the public participation coordinator of each Model Forest can obtain advice or discuss activities with his/her counterpart in other Model Forests. This allows a greater sharing of knowledge and information on topics such as: techniques that have worked, where they worked and how they were implemented; designing or evaluating public participation programs; First Nations participation; and, on the key public participation issues identified in Section 4.0.

Public participation requires staff and financial resources. Public participation requires staff and resources. The number of partners in each Model Forest partnership varies. However, each partner can bring resources (e.g., in-kind and financial resources) to the Model Forest to support the public participation program. If there is strong Board support for public participation, it more likely additional resources will be available when they are needed.

**Conflict Resolution**

The Model Forests can and do contribute to the resolution of contentious issues (e.g., land use conflicts) by acting as an 'honest broker'. Some of the Model Forests provide a forum to resolve issues because they are removed from the conflicts, particularly land use conflicts, and can act as a neutral party, respected by all the players. No only is this an important and legitimate role for the Model Forest, but acting as an honest broker role can also foster greater awareness of the Model Forest and its value within the community.

**The Role of Communication**

Each Model Forest understands that communications at all levels is an essential element in the delivery of public participation programs. Many have developed communications plans which should support the participation efforts.

**Coordination of Public Participation with Other Programs**

There are a number of forestry and integrated resource management initiatives underway throughout Canada involving public participation. The Model Forests are seizing the opportunities to coordinate their public participation efforts with other initiatives. For example, the Foothills and McGregor Model Forests have coordinated their efforts with provincial
initiatives. They are likely to continue to benefit through a sharing of resources with these programs, reducing their costs and expanding their public participation initiatives.

**Constraints to Public Participation**

The Model Forests face many of the same constraints with their public participation programs that are faced by public participation practitioners in other sectors and programs. The workshop participants identified both internal constraints (constraints to public practitioners within the Model Forest), and external constraints (constraints imposed from beyond the Model Forest).

**Internal Constraints**

The key internal constraints are:

- limitations on financial resources when there may be increasing demand with increasing public participation;
- personnel ability and availability of time;
- allocation of resources within the Model Forest;
- reaching agreement within the Model Forest. There can be different issues among Board and prospective Board members;
- Model Forest Board of Directors may represent other organizations but may not inform those organizations of the Model Forest activities.

**External Constraints**

The key external constraints identified in the workshop are:

- participant fatigue due to long processes and/or other demands on the public;
- lack of interest by the public. In some Model Forests, forest issues are not visible and there is little public interest;
- lack of trust by the public in Model Forest partners;
- short term perspective taken by some public groups limiting the value of their advice to the Model Forest;
- lack of final decision-making authority of the Model Forest; they can only recommend; Board members are not getting a clear message on broad values.

Each of the constraints must be addressed. For example, complete financial resources may not be available and other more cost effective options may have to be explored. In some Model Forests, public participation training or Native awareness training may be required. For participant fatigue, discussion may be undertaken directly with the participants on how they can be involved in the process. An acceptable means of becoming involved may be determined (e.g., submitting briefs, commenting on reports).
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ISSUES IN THE MODEL FOREST NETWORK

Prior to and during the workshop a number of public participation issues were raised by representatives of each Model Forest. Some of the issues are common to each Model Forest, while others are specific to a few. The key issues are described below. The ideas discussed at the workshop on how the issues could be addressed and some general comments on the direction that can be taken to address the issues in public participation planning are included. Table 1, at the end of this section, provides an overview of the key issues each of the Model Forests is addressing or expecting to address in the future.

Two types of Public Participation are required: 1) participation in Forest Management planning and projects, and 2) participation related to decision-making about broad issues and policies germane to each Model Forest.

Each Model Forest must define its own needs for involving the public. The public can participate in forest and resource management planning and activities that the Model Forest is undertaking; and/or, the public can be involved in the partnership decision-making and policy development of the Model Forest. The situation can arise where stakeholders are at odds with how the Model Forest is being managed. And, at times local Board members may have different shorter term perspectives on the issues than non-local Board members and members of the public who may take a longer term view of programs.

Both options for participation are currently underway within the Model Forest Network. In addition, some Model Forests intend to expand their efforts in either or both areas. This should be addressed in the public participation plan for the Model Forest. The plan would identify the publics that should be involved in each activity, and the ways that they should be involved.

How do you prepare the Model Forest for Public Participation? How do you build Corporate/Partnership support for public participation?

Some workshop participants felt that they may have difficulty obtaining Board support for an expanded role for the public. There was some discussion on the development of approaches within the corporate/partnership structure to gain greater acceptance of a change in public participation direction. In these cases, the public participation program should start with obtaining Board acceptance and approval. This may require strategic thinking and discussion with the Model Forest partners to determine how best to obtain full Model Forest Board approval of a change in the role of the public. Implementation of your public participation program may first require addressing:
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the particular circumstances and Board interests;
the Board’s understanding of the importance of and need for an expanded role for the public;
the benefits to the Model Forest;
the relationship of the expanded role to the mission and goals of the Model Forest.

How can you ensure that representatives of the public who participate in your program actually represent their constituents?

An important issue raised by the Model Forests was whether the groups and individuals participating in the public participation programs actually represent the public. A related concern was whether the views and positions expressed by representatives of organizations are endorsed by the organization.

In the first issue, the primary goal of a public participation program is to involve the members of the public who are likely to be: directly affected; indirectly affected; and/or interested in the policy, program or activity. Typically, rather than attempting to involve the general public, these publics are targeted in the participation program as representing a range of views of the general public.

The public involved in a public participation process ranges from people representing groups and organizations to individuals participating on their own out of interest or because they are affected in some way. The groups often have one or more members representing them in the process while individuals represent only themselves (although often they can be considered to provide input from the broader public).

Often, over the course of the public participation program, some participants leave the process and are replaced by others due to a number of factors including other personal commitments and changes in the organization the individual represents. In addition, those representing organizations may take on a different function within their home organization but remain involved out of personal interest.

Therefore, it is necessary to periodically check with the public participants to ensure that they continue to represent the organization they originally represented and that they continue to confirm their input to your process with their organization. It may be necessary to go back to the organization for clarification on the role of their representative. For example, you may meet with the representative and the Executive Director/Manager of the organization that he/she represents to discuss whether the views being expressed by the representative are the views of the organization and how the representative can best ensure that the views and positions expressed are endorsed by the organization.
How do you get the public involved in forest policy discussions and broad issues such as defining sustainable development? What grabs their attention?

Some Model Forests noted the difficulty in initiating public participation in forestry policy discussions and broader issues the Model Forest must address (e.g., sustainable development). This is a common problem both within and outside of the forest sector. Public participation is more likely to be successful in generating public interest and public participation if the issue or activity is one which may directly affect residents, communities or organizations or is a "hands-on" experience for the public. The more directly the public, community groups or other organizations are likely to be affected, the more eager they are to participate in the process.

Two solutions may be apparent. The first originates from the observation that in some cases the Model Forest Concept is not well known or understood by the public. This lack of awareness and understanding hinders public interest and the public’s desire to participate. As a basic prerequisite for successful public participation, the Model Forest Concept must be better defined and communicated.

Second, it is important to make the policy, program or issue relevant to the public you want involved. This may mean that you have to broaden your program to address other issues that are more immediately relevant to the public. This is often called a "Give to Get" Strategy. You can offer to assist the community and/or some of the groups with a similar or relevant issue they are facing. Then, they are more likely to find the time to work with you on the issues that are important to your Model Forest. Some of the Model Forests use this strategy (e.g., assisting other parties to resolve conflict and chairing or facilitating meetings for other organizations). In addition, you should ensure that the public understands how and why the issues you want to address are relevant to them. At times, it is helpful to advise the public of the implications of the broad policies and concepts for future generations. Many people become more interested in policy when the implications to their children and grand children are apparent to them.

What different approaches to public participation apply to the different Model Forests and their activities? What techniques and approaches are available for public participation in resource management?

The Model Forests recognize that different approaches to public participation are required to address different activities and situations. And, that some of the standard public participation techniques do not work for some of their activities. What works for one Model Forest with its own management structure and its own socio-political environment may not work for another Model Forest. For example, the Eastern Ontario Model Forest has a high proportion of private lands, a large population and a large proportion of interest group participation in the decision-making. Based on this, the approach and techniques used by this Model Forest may not be as
useful to the other Model Forests that have a high proportion of Crown lands, a lower, more rural population, and, a different management structure.

Therefore, the approach to public participation and the selection of techniques need to be tailored to each situation. Specific techniques are addressed in Section 5.0, Developing a Public Participation Plan.

Should you empower the public in Model Forest decision-making?

Empowering the public means providing them with decision-making responsibility, described as Collaborative Decision-Making in Section 2.0. It can include: joint planning, delegated power, or citizen control.

Each Model Forest has a specific partnership structure which influences the level of public participation in decision-making. Each Model Forest should determine the role of the public in decision-making on all of its activities including resource management plans and partnership decision-making. That will determine whether the public is to have an advisory role; be a partner in joint planning; or, be the decision-maker on specific projects and programs and/or in all board activities.

At present, the public has largely an advisory role in the Model Forests. Some Model Forests have provided direct public input and voting on the Model Forest Board. However, they recognize a need to involve other public groups and individuals in their planning.

What are the options for First Nations’ participation? How do you increase participation in a multi-cultural environment, particularly with First Nations?

The Model Forests operate in a diverse socio-political environment with different cultural groups and different levels of government to be addressed in their programs. Within this environment, some Model Forests experience difficulty in knowing how to involve First Nations and other groups.

As a basic principle, due to Constitutional changes, land settlements and self-government discussions, First Nations in Canada should not be viewed as a 'public' or 'stakeholder'. First Nations are to be treated as having the same status as a government. As such, they are likely to require a voice in decision-making of the Model Forest equal to government.

As a second principle, public consultation programs are expected to be inclusive; to be sensitive to and respect other cultures; and, to provide the tools to encourage fair participation.
For the public participation practitioner, this may require cultural awareness training; in particular, training and understanding of the approaches and customs of Native people. Henry Lickers of the Mohawk Council of Akwesasne identified the three requirements for effective understanding of First Nations expectations for policy decision-making: a balance of Respect, Equity and Empowerment. The tools Henry Lickers identified for each are shown on Figure 1 in Section 2.

Workshop participants identified the need to achieve an equity balance between the First Nations community and Model Forest to establish a situation where equal partners are participating to develop and to achieve the Model Forest goals and objectives. To begin to establish the 'equity balance', the public participation practitioner must understand that during Model Forest and First Nation dialogue the Model Forest representatives must be aware that their involvement is underpinned by resources, time and knowledge. As a contribution to balancing power levels, First Nation's participants bring time and knowledge to the participation exercise, but not the same level of resources. Therefore, in some circumstances, further consideration of financing First Nations participation may be necessary to balance power levels. Ultimately, the equity balance must be transparent.

The type of participation and liaison seen to be appropriate for Model Forest activities within each Aboriginal community should be discussed in advance with that community. Essentially, the Model Forest must gain an understanding of the protocol in each Aboriginal community. Workshop participants discussed the possibility of working with an individual Native person to help to understand the protocol. This person might also assist in introducing the Model Forest participation opportunity to the community.

In terms of initial approach, Workshop participants identified the need to recognize that there may be a requirement for the Model Forest and Native community to begin the consultation process with the discussion of a common understanding of historic events including any outstanding grievances. This may be an important step that helps to define the beginning, recognizes differences and helps to establish dialogue.

An additional question that must be addressed by Model Forest public participation participants is: who speaks for the Native community. Once protocol and dialogue have been established, First Nations can choose who will participate in the decision-making process of the Board and/or in the program initiatives of the Model Forest. Different 'models' of First Nation involvement in Model Forest decision-making have been used: from providing First Nations with seats on the Model Forest Board to the provision of a veto over Model Forest decisions.
To what extent should urban residents be involved in decisions about the Model Forests vs rural/local residents? What is the role of Provincial groups vis a vis local groups? How do you increase participation in rural areas vs urban areas?

All of the Model Forests are dealing with local and provincial groups (or are influenced by them) and have noted a difference in the willingness and ability of the two groups to participate. Often, the urban or Provincial groups are better able to and more interested in participating in policy discussions. Although both urban and rural groups and residents are important participants in a participation program, the concern is that one or the other group may dominate the public discussion and obtain greater input to the decision. Some Model Forests are concerned that Provincial groups are or will be "calling the shots" and that more local involvement is required.

The role of the groups is defined generally by the groups themselves on the basis of how important the issue is to them and if they have the time and resources to participate. Often, provincial groups have a broader perspective on an issue, are more familiar with participation in programs, and have more resources available to them than local groups. Where there appears to be an imbalance between the provincial and local interest, the public participation coordinator should discuss the issue with the local groups to determine if they want to be more involved and what they require to participate more effectively.

The extent of involvement of each group is likely to depend on how important the issue is to them and on their capability to become involved (i.e. resources and time to participate). The public participation program needs to recognize that the different publics can be addressed differently, and they can be provided with different participation options and tools. The goal of the program is to encourage participation of all those who may be affected by or who have an interest in the policy, program or project.

How do you customize Provincial policies for local delivery?

The Model Forests operate under provincial policies affecting resource management and involvement of the public. In most Provinces, policies affecting forestry and resource management have been changing over the past five years. The policy changes are generally broad, are intended to apply to a large area (e.g., the Province), and may place restrictions on some existing activities (e.g., the type or extent of harvesting a certain species or extent of clear cutting). Although the changes may be acceptable at the Provincial level, and acceptable to Provincial organizations, at the local level, these changes could cause concern (e.g., loss of jobs).

This is an area where the Model Forest Board, representing many stakeholders, can be particularly effective. The public participation program will identify these concerns and a strategy can be developed to address them. Generally, the public participation strategy selected
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will foster discussion of the different perspectives on the provincial policy among the key stakeholders (e.g., local community and local interests affected by the policy, and Provincial government, groups and organizations which support the policy). In some cases there can be a good deal of tension among the groups.

If the relationships among the groups are favourable, joint meetings can be arranged and facilitated to discuss the local difficulties with the policies. If the relationships are not favourable, separate local and provincial meetings can be held initially so that each group can become better informed and discuss the views of the other group. Subsequent joint meetings are then likely to be possible to discuss the issues and work to toward a resolution. The resolution may involve customizing the provincial policies to suit the local socio-economic or natural environment conditions.

**How do you increase public participation in the management of forests on private land vs crown land?**

Two of the Model Forests have a significant portion of private lands within their Model Forest territory: Eastern Ontario Model Forest and Fundy Model Forest. The others are comprised predominantly of Crown lands. These two Model Forests have recognized that the public has greater difficulty in influencing resource management on private lands. They intend to develop public participation approaches to increase the influence of the public and the Model Forest on the private land owners/operators.

The public participation program developed by these Model Forests could develop a strategy to bring the private landowners into the Model Forest activities. In the workshop, participants suggested roles for the Model Forests which could increase their profile and influence the management of forest on private lands. The Model Forest strategy could include: acting as an honest broker and assisting others in articulating the issues and in resolving land use conflicts involving private lands; and, developing codes of conduct or codes of responsibility for private land management.

**How do you measure the effectiveness of a Public Participation Program?**

There was discussion on what is meaningful participation and how each Model Forest should evaluate its public participation efforts so that it can revise its approach if necessary. Although none of the Model Forests have undertaken an evaluation of their public participation programs they recognize the importance and benefit of such an evaluation.

A major component of a good public participation program is an evaluation of its effectiveness. An evaluation of whether the Model Forest public participation programs are meeting their
objectives is required:

- to effectively monitor the success of the public participation programs;
- to respond to changing needs and desires of the public and the Model Forest; and,
- to demonstrate to its partners and others that its programs are providing the desired outcomes.

The evaluation of a program should occur periodically throughout the program, and upon its completion. The evaluation determines the success of meeting the objectives of the program, the level of participant satisfaction with the program and its results, and the effectiveness of the public participation techniques used. It also reviews the suggestions for improvements in the program made by participants.

The fundamental first step in an evaluation is to begin with a comparison of the actual program and its results with the original goals and objectives of the program. When a new public participation program is developed, it is useful to consider evaluation criteria and indicators that can be used throughout the program to monitor and evaluate whether the program is meeting its objectives. The evaluation can also signal whether changes are required in the program to address changing needs and circumstances.

Due to the nature and objectives of public participation programs, the evaluation must include qualitative and quantitative measures. The evaluation measures could address the following criteria of success (suggestions only):

- level of interest and participation in the program;
- change in knowledge about the Model Forest, integrated resource management and sustainable development;
- changes in behaviour and attitudes as a result of the public participation program.

Examples of public participation program evaluation measures are provided below. Specific evaluation measures would be developed to evaluate each objective of the program.

**General Public Participation**

- number of people participating on a regular basis
- number of people attending events
- number of new participants
- number of volunteers for programs and events
- results of interviews or surveys of the general public
- results of Evaluation Suggestion or Comment Forms completed by the public
- results of periodic questions in Omnibus (general) public opinion survey in Province
Awareness of the Model Forest

- personal/telephone interviews or surveys of general public, groups and organizations
- number of media appearances creating awareness of Model Forest
  - number of press citations
  - number of radio and television interviews
- number of calls in response to media appearance
- number of people listening or watching media coverage
- media response to the Model Forest and how Model Forest was perceived by media
- frequency of telephone calls
- number of questions and requests for information

Individual events and techniques can also be evaluated. An example of quantitative and qualitative measures for public workshops are presented below.

Public Workshops

Quantitative measures could include:

- Pre and post workshop evaluation and suggestion forms completed
- Random follow-up telephone or mail survey of workshop participants.

Qualitative measures could include:

- immediate observed impacts of program on the public (people tell you that they have learned and how they feel about what they have seen);
- relevance to community, and the awareness that has been raised in the community - people feel the information is important and they take it back to the community.

For long term programs, periodic program evaluations could be undertaken to provide advice based on other experiences and to ensure that the program objectives are being achieved.

What is the difference between public participation and communication?

During the Workshop, there was some interest in the role of public communications within and as a support to public participation programs.

Public communications is an important part of a public participation program. However, public communications is not public participation. The goal of public communications is to inform, advise, tell, educate and enlighten; and, to assist in providing feedback. In contrast, the goals
of public participation include: listening, hearing, providing feedback, making changes to programs, adjusting goals, etc. The main difference between public communications and public participation is that public communications generally provides information to others, while the public participation expands the opportunities to bring information in, to allow the exchange of views and opinions, and to enable input into the planning and decision-making process.

Communication within public participation is intended to provide enough information to the participant so that the participant can provide effective input to the decision making process. Public communications plans are often developed as part of the public participation program. However, 'communications' as it is typically defined does not replace public participation.
### TABLE 1

**KEY PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ISSUES BEING ADDRESSED IN THE MODEL FOREST NETWORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>W.N</th>
<th>F.</th>
<th>B.S.L</th>
<th>E.O.</th>
<th>L.A.</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>P.A.</th>
<th>F.H.</th>
<th>Mc.</th>
<th>L.B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. First Nations Participation in multi-cultural setting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participation of urban &amp; rural residents; role of Provincial groups vis a vis local groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation in resource management planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participation in Model Forest decision making</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participation in Model Forest policy decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Customize provincial policies for local delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Participation in resource management on private lands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Representativeness of the public participants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Addressing internal and external constraints to public participation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Preparing for public participation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What is effective participation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Abbreviations for Model Forests: W.N. = Western Newfoundland; F = Fundy; B.S.L. = Bas-Saint Laurent; E.O. = Eastern Ontario; L.A. = Lake Abitibi; Man = Manitoba; P.A. = Prince Albert; F.H. = Foothills; Mc = McGregor; L.B. = Long Beach.

Note 2: X indicates that the issue is being addressed or of interest to the Model Forest.

---
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DEVELOPING A PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

The need to develop a well thought through public participation plan is well documented. The more time and energy available for the preparation of a plan, the better the public participation program is likely to be, and the more likely it is to accomplish its objectives. The plan should clearly describe the requirements, resources and responsibilities for all activities.

The elements of a good program are provided in earlier sections of this report. This Section addresses the purpose of the public participation plan, steps that can be taken in developing the plan, and public participation techniques that can be used to implement the plan.

Purpose of a Public Participation Plan

The purposes of developing a public participation plan are to:

- ensure that the Program meets your needs and the needs and interests of the public;
- ensure that the Program is understood by the Model Forest and the public;
- ensure that the public has the opportunity to contribute to the development of the plan;
- ensure that the role of public participation in decision-making is clear, understood and acceptable to the Model Forest and the public; and,
- help guide the activities and actions of the Model Forest.

Steps to Developing a Public Participation Plan

Developing a plan is not a complex task, but it takes focused thought and discussion. There are four key steps to preparing a public participation plan:

---
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Step 1: Scope the Plan

In this first step, you scope out the what, why, when, where, who and how of the Program. It confirms that public participation is important to the Model Forest and defines the Plan by: reviewing the principles of participation and carefully defining your needs, goals and objectives for the program. You should state your objectives clearly, examine them, and ensure that they are acceptable to the Model Forest.

You address questions such as: Why do you want the public involved? To what extent do you think they should be involved in your planning? What are the issues that need to be addressed? When should the public participation occur? Who should you consult with and how?

In this step, you confirm support for the public participation program with your Model Forest Board of Directors.

Step 2: Prepare the Draft Plan

Draft is an important word. The Public Participation Program must be flexible and responsive to internal and external needs that may change over time. The draft plan will include: the purpose, including the issues or programs you want to address; the objectives of the plan; the detailed schedule of activities; and, an explanation of how the activities tie into the overall decision-making process. The plan must be sensitive to the needs and desires of different groups in the community.

The Plan should contain:

- the principles and objectives;
- an analysis of the major issues to be addressed in your decision-making and how the public will be consulted before each major decision;
- an evaluation of the level of public interest and the constraints to public participation;
- identification of the publics likely to be interested in participating and the publics you want to be involved;
- identification of the techniques to be used for each public. (A number of different techniques will likely be required);
- identification of the public participation expertise required and how it will be provided;
- the timing and extent of the public participation activities to show how they will be
integrated with the decision-making process; and,

evaluation mechanisms.

Step 3: Review the Plan with the Public

You should discuss with people who may be involved in the process how they want to be involved, and what they need to participate effectively. The public may not want to participate in the ways you felt were best. They may have other concerns that they want on the table or they may be over-whelmed with other activities. This will become apparent when you review the plan with the public. Be prepared to revise the draft plan so that it still accomplishes your needs and offers your public the opportunities and resources they need to be involved.

Step 4: Revise the Draft Plan

The Plan should be revised based on the input you receive from the public. However, it should remain in draft form as there are likely to be changes required over time.

You should talk to the public early about your intentions. This can happen as soon as you are comfortable with presenting your draft participation plan to the public. It can happen in the Scoping step, in the Draft Plan step or in the Review step.

One of the main goals as you proceed with your Public Participation Plan should be to accomplish your objectives through a process that does not penalize the individual participants by placing heavy demands on their time, energies and resources.

Public Participation Techniques

The approaches to public participation and the techniques required depends, to a large extent on:

whether you already have proactive, ongoing public participation mechanisms;

whether you, on an ongoing basis, provide the public with opportunities to understand and influence your activities; and,

the roles and relationships between your Model Forest and the community at the point that you want to engage the public on a specific matter (e.g., develop an integrated resource management plan or seek to have a change in policy).
Depending on the level of participation in decision-making, there are a number of different ways for the public to be involved. These are largely determined by the nature of the project or program (e.g., how contentious it is and whether there is a regulatory review), the level of shared decision-making acceptable to the Model Forest and the willingness of the public to be involved.

**Techniques Used by Model Forests**

Many public participation techniques used by the Model Forests were identified at the Workshop. Collectively, the Model Forests have used common and innovative public participation techniques and approaches. These are summarized in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Participation Techniques and Approaches Used by the Model Forests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification of Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- from directories, telephone books, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- use the referral/reputational technique (ask people in the community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- approach all groups with a letter inviting their participation (minimal response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- personal contact (better response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification of Attitudes and Perceptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- baseline telephone survey of awareness of the Model forest (also communications vehicle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Communications Material</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- appropriate media use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- press releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- newspaper ads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- &quot;insert&quot; in newspaper (cheaper than Newsletter and more readers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- community TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Contacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- telephone calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- personal discussions at other events and places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Meetings and Displays</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presentations/slide shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- display booths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- theatre performances (targeted to specific issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- different types of meetings for different topics and different audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- meetings in shopping malls - go where the public is when they have the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- meetings at different times (e.g., AGM on Saturdays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- interpretive centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intensive Discussion Sessions
- focus groups
- evening seminars and other ways to continually involve existing members and attract new ones
- establish consultative or stakeholders committee to provide advice to the Board
- workshops (with external facilitator, when required)
- facilitation of other sessions

Circulation of Discussion Papers

Direct Input to Decision-making
- joint Board/committee meetings
- empty chair in management group open to anyone
- open door policy for public and members
- sectoral approach to Board representation (eg. women and youth)
- provide public with seats on Board

Process Approaches
- develop trust
- respect the need for a continuum of participation
- respectful education process for government, industry and public
- start with participation on specific issues
- develop a communications plan
- take specific projects to the public, make it hands-on (eg., workshops, field trips...)
- cooperate with others in the delivery of programs and information (eg. MNR, landowner groups)
- use existing committees in the area, where possible
- responded to all who took time; if issue respond with implications (eg., clear cut)
- address issues through projects and communications
- avoid becoming embroiled in short term issues, take a longer term view
- establish temporary groups with specific mandate and timeframe (eg., conflict resolution groups)
- become involved with other issues not directly related to Model Forest

Commonly Used Techniques

Table 2 provides an overview of many public participation techniques commonly used by proponents. For each technique, the table identifies the relative number of people reached, the expertise required, the level of communication, conflict resolution potential, and relative costs.

Regardless of which technique you use, you must manage them well. This may mean:

- Setting rules for events and ensuring people follow them. On a contentious issue the majority of participants will be happier with a meeting if it sticks to the agenda and does not deal with an issue held by a minority.
Ensuring the program and events are accessible. You must ensure that events are held in a convenient place and time, and for those who can't attend provide other ways for them to provide input.

Communicating effectively at all levels. You must ensure that adequate notice is provided and appropriate materials are available. Different levels of detail for different audiences is appropriate, but the material must be clear (free of jargon) and easy to understand.

Using sensitive, knowledgeable staff. It was pointed out at the workshop that the right person is required to deliver the program with sensitivity to the local issues and sensitivity to local people. They also need to have and to maintain the respect of the community.

Example of Techniques Selected by Stakeholders for One Program

Table 3 presents an example of the techniques that were selected by Provincial organizations to participate in the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources Forest Values Project. The selection of techniques was made during a Pre-Consultation exercise, designed to identify the constraints of the various groups and how they felt they could effectively participate. Each group evaluated their constraints (e.g., time and resources available) and the importance and nature of the project within the context of declining financial resources available to the Ministry. They then selected the most appropriate technique(s) for their organization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Impact of People Reached</th>
<th>Expertise Required</th>
<th>Conflict Resolution</th>
<th>Quality Communication</th>
<th>Possible Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Printed Materials             | small to large           | medium to high     | low                 | medium to high         | • level of information conveyed can range from general to detailed depending on type of printed material used  
• provides the same accurate information to a large number of people |
| - Brochures/Fact Sheets       |                          |                    |                     |                       |                                                                                                                                            |
| - Newsletters                 |                          |                    |                     |                       |                                                                                                                                            |
| - Publications/Reports        |                          |                    |                     |                       |                                                                                                                                            |
| Open Houses                   | medium to large          | medium to high     | medium              | low                   | • publicity is key to success  
• opportunity for informal discussion  
• can tailor information to needs of groups |
| Public Meetings               | medium to large          | medium to high     | high                | low                   | • publicity is key to success  
• can use large group/small group format to increase usefulness |
| Small Group Meetings          | small to medium          | medium to high     | medium to high      | medium to high         | • informal forum where information can be tailored to group's needs  
• less intimidating than public meetings |
| Presentations to Organized Groups | small to large          | medium to high     | medium to high      | low                   | • can tailor information to audience needs  
• information can be passed on to others in community |
| Workshops                     |                          |                    |                     |                       |                                                                                                                                            |
| Brainstorming Sessions        | small to medium          | medium to high     | low                 | medium to high         | • provides an atmosphere for innovation and creativity |
| Nominal Group Process         | small to medium          | medium             | low                 | medium to high         | • emphasis on number of ideas generated not on evaluation  
• highly structured |
| Samoan Circles                | medium to large          | medium             | low                 | medium to high         | • more effective for controversial topics  
• may be uncomfortable for those not familiar with the method |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Number of People Reached</th>
<th>Experience Required</th>
<th>One-Way Communication</th>
<th>Two-Way Communication</th>
<th>Conflict Resolution Potential</th>
<th>Relative Costs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Delphi Process        | small to medium          | medium              | low                    | medium to high         | medium to high               | medium to high | - may be time consuming  
- reduces negative effects of group dynamics  
- traditionally involves experts or stakeholders not the general public                                                                 |
| Focus Group           | small                    | medium to high      | low to medium           | medium to high         | medium                       | medium         | - less expensive than attitude surveys  
- full range of interests should be represented                                                                                           |
| Advisory Committees   | small (if constituent groups are also reached, the number would be large) | medium to high  | high                   | high                   | medium to high               | high           | - full range of interests must be represented  
- mandate, procedures, timeframe must be determined  
- if committee is too large, effectiveness is limited |

**Use of Media**

| Paid Advertising     | large                     | low to medium       | low to medium           | low                    | low                          | low to high     | proponent has control over message to broad audience                                                                                      |
| News Releases        | large (varies with if and how the story is carried) | medium to high | medium                   | low                    | low                          | low            | effective way to obtain publicity and stimulate further media interest  
- must be 'newsworthy' for media to cover                                                                                             |
| News Conferences     | large (varies with if and how the story is carried) | medium to high  | low to medium           | low                    | low                          | low            | requires advance planning/ coordination  
- useful only if 'newsworthy'  
- editing may distort the message intended                                                                                              |
| Media Features       | potentially large         | medium to high      | low to high             | low                    | low                          | low            | audience reached may not be representative of the general public  
- editing may distort the message intended                                                                                               |
| Community Calendars/ Public Service Announcements | potentially large | low to medium | low                    | low                    | low                          | low            | increase awareness of specific public participation activities  
- media will respond if event is 'newsworthy'                                                                                              |
| Media Content Analysis | not applicable           | medium to high      | medium (provides information to proponent) | low                    | low                          | low            | monitoring the opinion/ editorial pages, letters to the editor, features, radio call-in shows, etc., provides indications of public sentiment  
- views expressed may not be representative of the general public                                                                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Number of People Reached</th>
<th>Experience Required</th>
<th>One-Way Communication</th>
<th>Two-Way Communication</th>
<th>Conflict Resolution Potential</th>
<th>Relative Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>medium to large</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low to medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium to high</td>
<td>can provide quantitative indication of the range and proportion of public sentiment can allow exploration of issues and concerns information obtained is only as good as the survey instrument used significant cost differences between mail-out and telephone/personal surveys degree of two-way communication can vary significantly with the survey type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion Polls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contests/Events</td>
<td>medium to large</td>
<td>low to medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low to medium</td>
<td>may not generate public comment directly applicable to the planning or decision making process good for generating public interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits/Displays/Kiosk</td>
<td>medium to large</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>reaches those not usually participating in the program may generate interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Office</td>
<td>medium to large</td>
<td>medium to high</td>
<td>medium to high</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>visible, convenient location in community justified where there is high level of local interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Line</td>
<td>medium to large</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>provides direct access to relevant personnel skills of staff important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Briefs/Submissions/Letters</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>medium to high</td>
<td>medium to high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>allows privacy and thoughtful consideration of material/issue may represent only the views of an active minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trips/Site Visits/Tours</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>medium to high</td>
<td>medium to high</td>
<td>low to medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium to high</td>
<td>can provide a reference point for comparison or discussion of the issue may not be feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENTS</td>
<td>FIRST NATIONS</td>
<td>BUSINESS PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>LABOUR</td>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>GENERAL PUBLIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NATIONS CONSULTATION</td>
<td>consultation options to be further defined, aboriginal-led consultation process</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-SECTORIAL MEETINGS, REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES</td>
<td>to be involved if appropriate</td>
<td>involved in all of the multi-sectorial meetings, assist to establish timetables, agenda etc</td>
<td>involved in all of the multi-sectorial meetings, assist to establish timetables, agenda etc</td>
<td>to potentially sponsor location and support meetings through intellectual and technical input</td>
<td>involved in all of the multi-sectorial meetings, assist with agenda, timetable etc.</td>
<td>involvement through municipal umbrella organizations</td>
<td>not involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNR DISCUSSION PAPERS</td>
<td>presented for comment to First Nations</td>
<td>to comment on paper, on issues and approaches important to business</td>
<td>to comment on paper, on issues important to environmental organizations</td>
<td>to comment on paper, provide intellectual and technical</td>
<td>to comment on paper, on issues of concern to labour</td>
<td>to be informed of paper and comment on request, on issues important to municipalities</td>
<td>paper available to support public information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSLETTER</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive on request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMAL COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>as required</td>
<td>as required, contact documentation to support multi-sector process</td>
<td>as required, contact documentation to support multi-sector process</td>
<td>as required</td>
<td>as required, contact documentation to support multi-sector process</td>
<td>as required, contact documentation to support multi-sector process</td>
<td>significant informal contact not anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTATIONS</td>
<td>initial presentations to support information required to development of consultation approach, as required after that</td>
<td>as required</td>
<td>as required</td>
<td>as required in support of symposia and workshops</td>
<td>as required, possibly to take advantage of union management meetings</td>
<td>as required, to be coordinated with other meetings in municipality, focus on forest intensive communities</td>
<td>information centres, open houses as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
<th>FIRST NATIONS</th>
<th>BUSINESS PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>LABOUR</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL</th>
<th>GENERAL PUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS MATERIAL</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>to receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE EXISTING NETWORKS</td>
<td>as appropriate</td>
<td>take advantage of business association communications and professional networks</td>
<td>articles in newsletters and communication with opinion leaders</td>
<td>articles in newsletters, journals, circulation of calls for papers</td>
<td>articles in newsletters and communication with labour officials</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTATION COORDINATION FUNCTION</td>
<td>senior appropriate person from MNR to lead government to government discussions, involvement with study principles</td>
<td>MNR support for business involvement in multi-sector advisory committee</td>
<td>MNR assistance with communications and travel on request, support for involvement in multi-sector advisory committee</td>
<td>MNR support and liaison for workshops and symposia, specify call for papers, liaison with faculty and staff</td>
<td>liaison function with labour and support involvement in multi-sectoral advisory committee</td>
<td>liaison function</td>
<td>to support all general public communication efforts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALL FOR PAPERS AND BRIEFS</td>
<td>if appropriate to aboriginal consultation, may need financial support</td>
<td>as appropriate to multi-sector advisory committee, input on values required from professional organizations</td>
<td>to be requested as a part of multi-sector process</td>
<td>request to universities and community colleges for papers and briefs</td>
<td>position papers to support multi-sector process</td>
<td>request for reports and council resolutions</td>
<td>letters, briefs etc to be encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRES AND SURVEYS</td>
<td>if appropriate to the defined consultation approach</td>
<td>surveys to identify positions on values and tradeoffs</td>
<td>surveys to identify positions on values and tradeoffs</td>
<td>possible university and community college involvement in design and implementation of surveys</td>
<td>surveys to identify positions on values and tradeoffs</td>
<td>views on values and tradeoffs to be handled through council resolutions</td>
<td>if appropriate to supplement and compare views of interest groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NETWORKING OPPORTUNITIES AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RESOURCES

The workshop participants identified two important recommendations to support their public participation activities: that other opportunities should be available to the public participation coordinators in each of the Model Forests to share ideas and information; and, that the coordinators should be aware of additional resources to help them in developing public participation plans. Suggestions for improving the networking among the practitioners and recommended resource material are offered below.

Networking Opportunities within the Model Forest Network

The Model Forests have many issues in common. And, as can be seen by the listing in Section 5.0 of public participation techniques used by the Model Forests, there is considerable experience within the Network. The public participation coordinators of the Model Forests are likely to benefit from an exchange of information on a regular basis on these common issues.

Electronic Information Exchange

The Network should establish and encourage the use of a Home Page or another "file" on the Internet on public participation in the Model Forest. The file could be divided into topics which could include the issues facing all Model Forests. On a regular basis, the public participation coordinator for each Model Forest could review and update the file based on his/her experiences. This would also provide an opportunity for each coordinator to add to the file other questions, difficulties, opportunities and experiences.

In addition, the coordinators should be encouraged to exchange information and support each other through e-mail. Questions and comments could be made efficiently. Those with successes or those who have experimented with a new approach or technique could offer advice to others.

Other Networking Opportunities

The public participation coordinators should meet annually to share their experiences and discuss their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and constraints.

The coordinators for each Model Forest should also consider joining organizations and associations that address public participation. For example, the International Association of Public Participation Practitioners (IAP3) has Chapters in Alberta, British Columbia, Ottawa, and Toronto, and offers good networking and training opportunities for practitioners.
Public Participation Resources

Public participation has been an active field of theory and practice for many years. A vast literature base is available to support learning and training of Model Forest staff, and to support public participation planning, design, implementation and evaluation. A selected listing of these resources is presented below in five categories: public participation theory and practice, training, facilitation/mediation, conflict resolution and other resources.

Public Participation Theory and Practice


Case Studies


Public Participation Resources

Public participation has been an active field of theory and practice for many years. A vast literature base is available to support learning and training of Model Forest staff, and to support public participation planning, design, implementation and evaluation. A selected listing of these resources is presented below in five categories: public participation theory and practice, training, facilitation/mediation, conflict resolution and other resources.

Public Participation Theory and Practice


**Case Studies**


Conflict Resolution

CCH Canadian Ltd. ADR Forum: The Canadian Journal of Dispute Resolution. CCH Canadian Ltd., 6 Garamond Court, North York, Ontario M3C 1Z5 (phone 1-800-268-4522).


Facilitation and Mediation


Training

Public Consultation in the 90's and other resource material, Connor Development Services Ltd. 5096 Catalina Terrace, Victoria, BC, V8Y 2A5 (phone (604) 658-1323).

International Association of Public Participation Practitioners (IAP3), 1995-1996 Training Directory, IAP3, PO Box 82317, Portland, Oregon, 97282, USA (phone: (503) 236-6630). For Canadian training programs listed in this Directory see Appendix D.

Other Resources


APPENDIX A

AGENDA

Model Forest Network

Public Participation Workshop

October 4 and 5, 1995
Rideau Room, Monterey Inn
Highway 16, Ottawa, Ontario

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4

8:30 - 8:45  Registration

8:45 - 9:00  Welcome and Opening Remarks

- Why we are here
- review agenda
- structure of the workshop

9:15 - 10:00  Public Participation, Involvement or Consultation? What does it all mean?
Mark Stevenson, Principal, Hardy Stevenson and Associates Ltd

Definition
Principles and Objectives
Tools

10:00 - 10:15  Break

10:15 - 12:00  Round Table on Public Participation in the Model Forests: Sharing Ideas, Finding Solutions
Short overview of the experience by five Model Forests followed by discussion: Fundy Model Forest, Eastern Ontario Model Forest, Manitoba Model Forest, Prince Albert Model Forest, MacGregor Model Forest

12:00 - 1:15  Lunch

1:15 - 2:30  Round Table on Public Participation in the Model Forests: Sharing Ideas, Finding Solutions (cont’d)
Short overview of the experience by remaining Model Forests followed
2

by discussion: Western Newfoundland Model Forest, Lake Abitibi Model Forest, Foothills Model Forest, Long Beach Model Forest.

2:30 - 3:00
Summary of Lessons Learned, Successes, Difficulties, Opportunities
Plenary discussion

3:00 - 3:15
Break

3:15 - 4:30
Specific Public Participation Situation: Small Group Analysis
Each breakout team is presented with a different situation to analyze

4:30 - 5:00
Plenary Discussion: Group Report
Summary of suggestions
Discussion
Wrap up; What will happen tomorrow
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5

8:45 - 9:00 Welcome Back
   - outline the agenda for the day
   - Summarize the previous day

9:00 - 9:25 Introduction of the Elk Lake Community Forest Case Study
   (Paul Tufford, Elk Lake Community Forest)

9:25 - 10:15 Plenary Discussion of Elk Lake Community Forest Case Study

10:15 - 10:30 Break

10:30 - 10:45 Introduction to Bull Moose Planning Exercise Case Study
   Prince Albert Model Forest

10:45 - 11:30 Group Discussion of Bull Moose Planning Case Study

11:30 - 12:15 Plenary Discussion: Group Reports
   Applicability of case study approaches to Model Forests, lessons learned

12:15 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 3:00 Public Participation Action Plan Small Group Discussion
   Each group will develop a plan to address the issues raised.

3:00 - 3:15 Break

3:15 - 4:30 Plenary Session
   Presentation from breakout groups
   Summary of suggestions, the needs of each Model Forest and public participation approaches and techniques
   Wrap up; What happens next
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WORKSHOP: PRESENTATION OVERHEADS
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OVERVIEW

- PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IS ...
- LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION
- WHY ENGAGE THE PUBLIC
- PRINCIPLES THAT CAN GUIDE PARTICIPATION
- THE OBJECTIVES OF PARTICIPATION MUST BE UNDERSTOOD
- DEVELOPING A PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN
A WORD ABOUT TERMS

- Confusion

- Result of changing role of public in project and policy planning

- Search for new term to distinguish improved version from previous attempts

- Define your terms - keep expectations reasonable
Public participation is...

the process by which the views of interested and/or affected individuals and organizations are integrated into a decision-making process.
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IS:

- A Planned Process

- Designed to meet project, program or policy needs

- Improved Decisions
LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION

- Informing the Public
  - Information out

- Informing the Decision-maker
  - Informing
  - Informing and Advising

- Collaborative Decision-making
  - partnerships
  - delegated power
  - citizen control
WHY DO YOU WANT TO ENGAGE THE PUBLIC?

- to improve planning before key decisions
- to identify and address issues early
- to improve understanding
- to hear a broad range of opinion
- to reduce conflict
- to improve credibility of the process
NATIONAL FOREST STRATEGY PRINCIPLES

- The public is entitled to participate in forest policy and planning processes, recognizing it has obligations and responsibilities

- Effective participation requires an open, fair and well-defined process

- Public must be aware and informed, with access to comprehensive and easy-to-understand information
PRINCIPLES FOR AN EFFECTIVE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

- Be clear on the role of participation in decision-making.

- Be flexible.

- Full, open disclosure.

- On-going process, integrated into decision-making

- Begin early

- Specific timeframes are helpful
• Listen and Hear.

• Talk.

• Probe/Respond.

• Respect linkages to other projects/programs.

• Address conflict
THE OBJECTIVES MUST BE UNDERSTOOD, cont’d

- Joint problem solving

- Conflict resolution with a goal of consensus building

- More complete information for decision makers

- Acceptance of proposal/policy
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DEVELOPING A PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

- Scoping

- Draft the Plan

- Review the Plan with key Stakeholders

- Revise the Draft Plan
HOW YOU ENGAGE THE PUBLIC DEPENDS ON:

Why you want to consult the public in the first place?

What is the public policy environment in which public participation will occur?

What is the nature of the issue that requires public participation?

When?
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THINK STRATEGICALLY ABOUT THE 'NATURE OF THE ISSUE'

- some issues involve information and process

- some issues may be policy issues

- 'systemic' issues

- need to understand what issues you are facing
Systemic Issues

- moral and ethical issues
  - risks
  - rights
  - future generations

- complexity and breadth

- questions of social institutions and long term planning

- fundamentally different views of the future debated

- personal and political power

- whose values and what value system should prevail

- non-standard approaches required - who should address?
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FIGURE 1

HOW WILL THE DECISION BE MADE?

WHAT DO YOU HOPE TO ACCOMPLISH WITH THE PUBLIC?

WHAT DOES THE PUBLIC NEED TO KNOW TO PARTICIPATE EFFECTIVELY?

WHAT DO YOU NEED TO LEARN FROM THE PUBLIC?

WHO IS THE PUBLIC FOR THIS ISSUE?

WHAT SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST?

SELECTION OF TECHNIQUES
Public participation programs must provide:

- ways for people to communicate and interact
- meetings for expressing views and dealing with issues and conflict
- opportunities to participate in project and program decision-making and policy formulation
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION TOOLS

- pre-consultation exercises
- communications material (eg., newsletters, brochures)
- existing communications networks
- existing groups
- briefings
- information centres/open houses
- informal contacts
- government to government discussions
- focus group sessions
- circulation of discussion papers for comment
- liaison/advisory committees
- facilitation
- conflict resolution
- public meetings
- meeting on their turf
- workshops
- tours
- surveys and questionnaires
SUMMARY

- Develop a Public Participation Plan.

- Incorporate Principles that can guide your participation process.

- Be clear on your Objectives and ensure that the public understands/accepts them.

- Different participation programs for different projects, programs or policies and for different publics.
Naturalized Knowledge Systems

The Zeal to Deal

is generated by a balance of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools:</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honour</td>
<td>Social Power</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Henry Lickers 1994
Conceptual Presentation

F. Henry Lickers 1994
# Naturalized Knowledge System

\[ C = E + E^1 + E^2 + E^3 + E^4 + E^5 + E^6 + E^7 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcellular</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Confederacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cellular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sperm/Egg</td>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>Aunties/Uncles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embryo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microseconds</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>&lt;10k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;\text{um}</td>
<td>&lt;\text{mm}</td>
<td>&lt;1km</td>
<td>&lt;100km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty decreases</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaos increases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RATIONAL FOR COMMUNITY FORESTS

Government

- link community development & natural resource management
- develop partnerships in resource management planning and implementation
- prepare for down-sizing - Alternative Delivery agents

Township of James (Elk Lake)

- Development frozen for 22 years
  - Native land caution, Red Squirrel Road, Lady Evelyn-Smoothwater Park
- More local decision-making authority.
- Greater economic opportunities locally.
- Increase public awareness, and participation, knowledge, and satisfaction.
- Increased consultation; better conflict resolution.
- Improve database information and maintenance
- Improve planning
- Produce a better forest
# DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COMMUNITY FORESTS AND MODEL FORESTS

## Model Forests
- No direct connection to local communities.
- Technology development and transfer.
- Showcase these new techniques and technologies.
- Proponents primarily corporate.
- Proponents have tenure over a landbase.
- Financial self-sufficiency is not an issue in most cases.

## Elk Lake Community Forest
- Linked to community development ~ town is investing.
- Interested in resource sustainability, economic & employment stability and/or growth.
- Local decision making and implementation a goal.
- Public awareness and education a priority.
- Issues management ~ conflict resolution a priority.
- Interested in managing all resources in an integrated fashion.
ELCF STRUCTURE

Volunteer board of directors - ELCF Partnership

Comprised of 10 stakeholder groups

- business
- education
- forest industry
- mining industry
- Communities of Elk Lake, Matachewan and Gowganda
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and the Teme-Augama Anishnabai (TAA) sit as resource people.

Operates as a Committee of Council of the Township of James.

Decisions usually based on consensus
- if an impasse, voted taken ~ majority rules ~
  Quorum is 6.

ELCF has autonomy ~ books and budget separate from the town.

Reports to Town Council at least once per year.
Meetings held twice a month ~ open to public.
Current Resource Management and Decision Making

Potential Resource Management and Decision Making with a Collaborative Partnership
PUBLIC CONSULTATION & AWARENESS

A number of initiatives were undertaken to increase public awareness of resource use and management.

Input was also provided to other planning initiatives in the area on behalf of the ELCF's constituents.

- Participation in public input phases for the Treaty of Co-Existence Negotiations, Comprehensive Planning and Wendaban Stewardship Authority.


- Hold three seats on the 1996-2016 Elk Lake FMP (decision making capacity).

- Administer the Public Consultation process for the above plan.

- Prepared discussions papers on viewscape values, culture & heritage values and the maintenance of traditional access.

- Hosted an extra Open House/Town Hall meeting re. the FMP.
PUBLIC CONSULTATION & AWARENESS

- Arranged and hosted an extra open house for the Comprehensive Planning Council regarding land use proposals.

- Hosted a workshop with an environmental coalition regarding planned activities north of Lady Evelyn Lake.

- Hosted numerous follow-up meetings with various other groups after the above meeting.

- Translated FMP tech-talk into plain language for open houses.

- Developed a Q & A board explaining commonly asked questions about the FMP components and process.

- Participated in a Socio-Economic Impact Analysis being done for MNR.

- Helped fund development of a link between HSG and a Moose Habitat Suitability Matrix with LAMF and Dendron Surveys Ltd.
PUBLIC CONSULTATION & AWARENESS

- Conducted preliminary visibility analyses on a potential harvest area north of Lady Evelyn Lake.

- Hosted a public presentation by NOTO and NEST on Remote Tourism.

- Made numerous presentations to area service clubs and schools about community forestry.

- Provided incentive to found the TERRA course at an area high school.

- Developed a Cultural Heritage Inventory via field surveys, interviews of elders and predictive modeling.
MAP 1: Location of the Elk Lake Community Forest in the Province of Ontario
MAP 2: Location of the Elk Lake Community Forest in relation to other Crown Units
APPENDIX C

TYPICAL OBJECTIVES OF A SOUND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

Typical objectives of a sound participation program are:

- Inform and educate (among all stakeholders and interested parties and the agency) about the relevant information and you must provide access to it
- about the decision-making process
- about the program and the technical/scientific basis

- Discuss/Dialogue among all interested and affected parties

- Build trust
  - Foster full, open disclosure and an open sharing of information. If your company is considering changes that could affect your consultation upfront

- Identify issues, problems, needs and values, particularly the values people hold for the forest

- Joint problem solving - do you want to tap into the creative forces out there to help solve a problem

- Conflict resolution with a goal of consensus building (for some projects/programs)
  - Consensus although desirable may not be achievable on all projects and programs; and it takes time

- More complete information for decision-makers
  - within your organization
  - to regulatory review bodies

- Develop acceptance of proposal/policy which is sensitive and responsive to public concerns and values
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Introduction

Welcome to the IAP3 Training Directory

The Board of Directors of IAP3 is pleased to present this second edition of our training directory. There has been an increasing need for training as the public involvement profession grows. IAP3 receives many requests for training opportunities. While our annual international conference fulfills some of this need, we developed this training directory to assist you throughout the year. Whether you are a novice or a seasoned practitioner, there should be at least one offering in this book that suits your needs. This is a tool meant to help all of us succeed in the profession.

This directory was compiled from submissions by members and non-members. It is a resource directory and does not represent an endorsement by IAP3 of course quality or content. If you have a training course to offer for inclusion in this directory, please contact IAP3 Headquarters Office.

IAP3 Headquarters Office
PO Box 82317
Portland, OR 97282
Telephone: 1-800-644-4273 (North America)
    or 503-236-6630
Telefax: 503-233-0772
E-mail: iap3hq@novalink.com

We hope this tool is a useful one to you.
Canada

Managing Public Consultation

-Course Location: National

Contact Name: Peter Sterne

Company: Canadian Centre for Management Development
646 Principale St.
Gatineau, Quebec K1N 8V4
Canada

Phone: (819) 997-4105
FAX: (819) 953-6240

Course Description

Length of Session: 3 Days
Class Size: 24
Target Audience: Government Officials

Restrictions: For executives of the Federal and Provincial Governments

Workshop focuses on all aspects of public consultation using simulations, cases and exercises.
Canada and International

Involving Interest Groups

Course Location: National/International
Contact Name: Bill McMillian
Company: Equus Consulting Group Inc.
1010-10050 112 St.
Edmonton, AB T5K 2J1
Phone: (403) 488-1182
FAX: (403) 488-1440

Course Description

Length of Session: 1 Day
Class Size: 12-18
Target Audience: Agency representatives who need to consult with interest groups
Restrictions: None

Decision makers and project managers will learn how to organize and manage community involvement opportunities in which interest group representatives may play a significant role.

Participants will discuss the role interest groups should play, and learn:
- How to determine who should be involved
- How to make the involvement process fair and satisfying
- How to build an effective communication/involvement process
- Ways to avoid arguments and the "NIMBY" (Not In My Back Yard) response
- How to balance interest group involvement with involvement by the local public
Canada and International

Opening the Door

Course Location: National/International
Contact Name: Bill McMillian
Company: Equus Consulting Group Inc.
1010-10050 112 St.
Edmonton, AB T5K 2J1
Phone: (403) 488-1182
FAX: (403) 488-1440

Course Description

Length of Session: 2 Day
Class Size: 12-18
Target Audience: Project managers/facility managers who have been asked to involve external communities
Restrictions: None

Program and project managers will learn how to organize public consultation and how to manage the public consultation process in a manner that will maximize benefits and satisfaction. The session focuses on public consultation as part of the decision process in an effort to make better decisions.

Participants will learn how to:
- Make the process efficient
- Define stakeholder communities and identify their needs
- Reduce conflict and anxiety
- Build agreement during the process
- Ensure that decisions are made
- Avoid common problems in public consultation
- Keep the process on track
- Evaluate and communicate results
Canada and International

The Power Pack-Public Consultation Tools for Regulation Industries

Course Location: National/International
Contact Name: Bill McMillian
Company: Equus Consulting Group Inc.
1010-10050 112 St.
Edmonton, AB T5K 2J1
Phone: (403) 488-1182
FAX: (403) 488-1440

Course Description

Length of Session: 2 Day
Class Size: 12-18
Target Audience: Project managers/ facility managers in regulated industries
Restrictions: None

Workshop covers methods to improve relationships between government and industry. Provides strategies to gain decisions without a public hearing. Helps prepare for public hearings and advisory panels. Methods of instruction include lectures, team workshops, and group discussions.
Canada and International

Public Consultation: Toward More Effective Decision Making

Course Location: National and International
Contact Name: Richard Roberts
Company: Praxis Inc.
2215 19th St. SW
Calgary, AB T2T 4X1
Canada
Phone: (403) 245-6404
FAX: (403) 229-3037

Course Description

Length of Session: 1/2 Day - 1 Week
Class Size: 25
Target Audience: There are three levels of the workshop
• Senior Management/Decision Makers
• Managers/Staff/Implementors
• Public/Students
Restrictions: 20-30

Often such workshops are done in concert with other public involvement instructors and local participants from the local area/region. This makes workshops more practical, efficient and fitting to the local context.
Canada and the United States

Preventing and Resolving Public Controversy

Course Location: Canada and the United States
Contact Name: Desmond M. Connor
Company: Connor Development Services Ltd.
5096 Catalina Tce.
Victoria, BC V8Y 2A5
Canada
Phone: (604) 658-1323
FAX: (604) 658-8110

Course Description

Length of Session: 1 or 2 Days
Class Size: 12-25
Target Audience: Corporate and government planners, managers, and technical specialists who must deal with the public as part of their position.
Restrictions: Maximum of 25 people

Our one-day workshop provides a strategic understanding of constructive citizen participation. On request, we add a second day in which project teams of 3-4 design public involvement programs for their upcoming projects during a 2-hour practicum. They then present their designs for peer and instructor review. This usually increases enthusiasm and commitment.

This course is held annually in Vancouver, Victoria, Toronto, Ottawa and Halifax as well as throughout Canada and the United States upon request.
Eastern Canada

Public Consultation - Not An Add On!

Course Location: Ontario, Eastern Canada
Contact Name: Bob Henderson
Company: RCH-Communications
1227 Willow Brook Dr.
Oakville, ON L6L 2J9
Canada
Phone: (905) 827-5172
FAX: (905) 827-5172

Course Description

Length of Session: 1-2 Days
Class Size: 15-20
Target Audience: Practitioners, planners, managers, project managers, communications staff, community activists
Restrictions: Maximum of 20 per session


Many of the techniques and processes can be used in internal corporate programs such as strategic planning, reorganization and team processes, and client relations.
Eastern Canada

Managing Public Consultation

Course Location: Eastern Canada
Contact Name: Bernard Maltais
Company: 3 Rue Buade C.P. 6060
Haute-Ville, Quebec G1R 4V7
Canada
Phone: (418) 648-4296
FAX: (418) 649-6971

Course Description
Length of Session: 3 Days

This three day course will help improve the consultation skills of executives who are called upon to consult on policy or program options with other governments, special interest groups, communities of clients and other organizations.
Western Canada

Introduction to Environmental Negotiations/Multi-Party Mediation Institute

Course Location: Whistler, BC
Contact Name: Jennifer Crawford, Vice President
Company: Whistler Centre for Business & the Arts
           PO Box 1172
           Whistler, BC
Phone: (604) 932-8310
FAX: (604) 932-4461

Course Description

Class Size: 30-40
Target Audience: The general target audience for this course is government professionals, private practice, industry, planners, lawyers, resource industry personnel, aboriginal groups, and public interest groups.

Restrictions: Experience and/or prior conflict resolution training is preferred.

This course covers various topics in mediation, such as design and management of multi-party process for land use, aboriginal disputes, and local development. Instruction is participatory, using simulations as well as some lecture and discussion.
Western Canada

Public Involvement: A Primer

Course Location: Vancouver, BC
Contact Name: Brian Johnson
Company: Context Research, Ltd.
            #201 - 12837 - 76th Ave.
            Surrey, BC V3W 2V3
Phone: (604) 596-3531

Course Description

Length of Session: 6-7 Hours
Class Size: 20-25
Target Audience: This course is aimed at project managers, planners, and general management.

This course covers such topics as when and how much public involvement to use how to design a public involvement program, and which techniques to use. Instruction includes lecture, small group work, case studies and videos.
Western Canada

Aboriginal Cross-Cultural Awareness

Course Location: British Columbia
Contact Name: Patrick Kelly
Company: B.C. Hydro
14th Floor, 333 Dunsmuir St.
Vancouver, BC V6B 5R3
Phone: (604) 623-3769
FAX: (604) 623-3716

Course Description

Class Size: 25
Target Audience: B.C. Corporate Managers and Staff
Restrictions: None

B.C. Hydro offers a unique Aboriginal Cross-Cultural Awareness training program to individuals, groups and organizations. Developed in collaboration with aboriginal people, it is delivered by competent trainers who are members of First Nations and familiar with community, corporate and government operations. There are three levels to the program. Participants progress from one level to another.
Western Canada

Mediation Dispute Resolution

Course Location: Vancouver/ Bellingham, WA

Contact Name: Cameron W. Lipp

Company: Consensus Plus, Associates
          205 9101 Horn St.
          Burnaby, BC V3N 4M3

Phone: (604) 421-9807
FAX: (604) 325-7121

Course Description

Length of Session: 4-5 Days
Class Size: 5-10 People
Target Audience: Public participation/legal/environmental/ insurance/ etc.
Restrictions: None

Mediation - a voluntary method of settling disputes in which a neutral mediator, with no decision-making authority, assists the parties in negotiating a mutually beneficial settlement. It has been called "no fault conflict resolution" because the goal is to reach an equitable solution, not to decide who is right or wrong in a costly courtroom battle.

Benefits of Mediation:
• confidentiality & privacy
• informal setting
• fast & inexpensive
• resumption of cordial relations

Training - CP+ A, in cooperation with field offices throughout the USA and in Canada, provides regular training courses, internships and certification training.

Benefits of Training:
• increases the potential for promotion in your current occupation
• provides tools useful for your work, at home & in you neighborhood
• lays the groundwork for team building, partnering & other facilitative procedures
• demystifies many processes of a society based on law, by explaining the pros & cons of litigation, arbitration & many alternative dispute resolution techniques.

Methods include: lectures, multi-media, and role play
Western Canada

Creating Collaborative Opportunities for Success

Course Location: Western Canada

Contact Name: Dr. Donald Miskiman

Company: Dr. Donald Miskiman
107 McKinley Rd., SE
Calgary, AB T2Z 1W1
Canada

Course Description

This workshop focuses on leading projects in the re-thinking, reinventing and reshaping of organizations. The session creates and sustains high performance and high involvement teams; guiding people and organizations through change and transition; and implements effective career development and renewal programs.
APPENDIX E

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WORKSHOP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Summary of Results

The evaluation questionnaire was circulated to each of the Model Forests at the workshop. A total of twelve responses were received. Most people stated that the workshop was a worthwhile experience. They valued the opportunity to network and learn how other Model Forests are approaching public participation. Many commented that they would have liked some documentation which outlined a 'real world' approach to increasing public participation. While some felt that the issues were not dealt with deeply enough, others commented that more time and opportunity for informal discussion would have been helpful.

The specific results are provided below. Bracketed numbers indicate number of similar responses to each question.

1. Did the Agenda for the two days allow you to share your ideas and experiences on Public Participation with other Model Forests and hear of their experiences?

   yes 11            no 1

   Comment:

   . More time for discussion on each Model Forest presentation and more informal discussion time to chat about things, share ideas, and get pointers from different Model Forests - time for this was too short. (2)
   . Participants spent a great deal of time on tangents rather than public participation issues (2)
   . Not all aspects of the public participation problem were on the table
   . Would like to see examples of public participation actually put into practice along with evaluation of the whole process. Perhaps a case study several years old.
   . It helped to identify common interests that may lead to more cooperative development.

2. Were the public participation issues/topics covered, those you were most interested in?

   yes 9            no 4

   . Issues were raised but not necessarily resolved. (2)
   . Not sure that I learned more ways but discussion helped me relate what I know to model forest situation

3. Did you learn more about ways to increase public participation in resource management and corporate/partnership decision-making?
9. The report to be prepared to support your public participation activities will include: A short summary of the Workshop; list of the Public participation issues raised in the Model Forest Network; discussion of the similarities and differences among the Model Forests; description of how to prepare an Public Participation Plan; and a list of Public Participation Resource material.

Are there other topics that the report should address?

- How to evaluate a Public Participation Plan
- An evaluation of some of the most successful public participation attempts, pointing out what was accomplished and what more might have been done and how. Or include some resource material which does this.
- Compare each Model Forest approach to public participation
- The interface between raising awareness levels (communication) and getting meaningful input.
- Case histories - more focused than examples used -n working relationships.