Research Committee Vision

IAP2 harvests, generates and disseminates knowledge to improve the practice of public participation.

Our broad goals are to improve the practice of public participation by:

1) Framing the state of P2-related knowledge (including practice and related theory), and identifying/prioritizing knowledge gaps and needs;
2) Building on international networks for communicating and sharing information among P2-related knowledge holders (i.e. scholars, practitioners, decision-makers and “the public”);
3) Supporting the development and dissemination of educational and skill building tools, techniques, strategies and materials, for participants (“the public”), decision-makers and practitioners.
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Introduction

Each year the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) seeks nominations for the Core Values Award to recognize excellence and innovation in the field of public participation. Two awards are presented annually - for the project and the organization that best exemplify the spirit and purpose of public participation. Winning projects demonstrate the use of innovative techniques, provide solutions to problems that face the field of public participation, involve the public in new areas and show how public participation has affected decisions. While only two awards are presented each year, all of the entries present a wealth of information about the state of public participation worldwide and showcase excellence in practice.

The IAP2 Research Committee determined that it was important to share these stories with our membership in the form of a State of the Practice Report. This is the second year that this report has been published. The descriptions submitted for these awards are a valuable tool for learning about others’ experiences. We can learn from their stories to inform our own practice. The projects presented here are exemplars of good practice. They support IAP2’s core values, and exhibit creative ways to engage the public. The studies provide a range of proactive to reactive examples of engaging the public. They range from local to national levels and from 300 to 25,000 participants. They cross topical areas such as health care, regional economic revitalization, transit, public education, community visioning, water management, energy conservation, cultural change, wastewater treatment facility development and city budget decision making. They all result in benefits for the agencies, stakeholders, communities and citizens.

The studies provide useful examples of creative techniques, management or governance structures for participatory processes, methods to engage diverse groups or agencies, and reflections on lessons learned. The Core Value submissions also can be used for promoting or “making the case” for participatory approaches. Initially, the projects were judged against the IAP2 core values award criteria. Each submission is peer-reviewed by 3 or more members of the Research Committee for inclusion into the State of the Practice Report.

The report is organized for easy access:

- The first section is a summary of the Core Values applications in table form to help identify which projects may be of interest to you. These summaries have been prepared by the State of the Practice report authors.
- The second section contains the full submissions as written by the person or agency applying for the Core Values Award. These applicants have agreed to publication of their applications.

I encourage you to read these stories and consider your own public participation opportunities, challenges and lessons. Next year, consider submitting an application for a Core Values Award or present at an IAP2 Conference and showcase the creative, meaningful work you have done. As always, engage with practitioners, colleagues and friends in the IAP2 community, and continue to learn and share ways to improve the practice and the quality of the democracies we live in.

Kind Regards,
Stephani Roy McCallum
President 2008

1The 2007 report is available on the IAP2 website, www.iap2.org.
Core Values Awards Program Criteria

Project of the Year Evaluation

Judges background: Evaluation focuses on how the P2 process was conceived and implemented and how each core value was used to contribute to the success of the project itself.

What we asked entrants to provide:

Project of the Year Award

1. Describe the challenge or problem faced and how each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation.
2. Describe the methods used to implement public participation.
3. Describe what makes this project special. Did public participation significantly improve the decision made? Were innovative participation techniques used? Did it solve a problem that faces the field of public participation? Did it spread the practice of public participation into a new area?
4. Describe the project's effectiveness or results and explain the role that the public participation process played.
5. Describe how the IAP2 core values were met.
6. Name two individuals, outside of the organization, who were participants in the project or program.

Organization of the Year Evaluation

Judges background: Evaluation focuses on how the organization implements P2 and how they

Organization of the Year Award

1. Describe the mission of the organization and its challenges with regard to internal and external stakeholders or public entities.
2. Discuss the rationale or impetus that led the organization to embrace the principles and values of public participation.
3. Give examples of specific ways that public participation has impacted decisions. Show the connection between the public participation processes and the shape of the decision(s).
4. Describe how the core values were met.
5. Tell how the organization is evaluating how well it is fulfilling the spirit of the IAP2 core values.
6. Name two individuals, outside of the organization, who were participants in any of the organization's participation projects or programs.

Every year the IAP2 Core Values judging team have a hard time in separating the stellar applications. This year was no exception and as a result special recognition was offered to a number of entries. Past President Scott Russell convened the judging panel and they were impressed by the high calibre and diversity of applications received.
IAP2 Core Values

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

5. Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.
2008 Core Values Winners Circle

2008 Organization of the Year Winner
Southern Nevada Water Authority, Nevada, USA

2008 Project of the Year Winner
Strategic Quest: Capital Health Nova Scotia, Canada

2008 Special Recognition Winners
Canadian Blood Services, Canada (organization)
Toi te Taio: the Bioethics Council, New Zealand (project)
Woodlands Governance, Texas, USA (project)
Since its formation in 1991, the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) has actively engaged the public in its decision making processes. For the SNWA, public participation means more than simply paying “lip service;” it means developing processes where citizens and stakeholders can participate in a meaningful way. Over the last 17 years, we have established eight such public processes. Some of which were designed to address specific, time-sensitive issues such as drought, while others – like the Advisory Committee for Groundwater Management and the Youth Advisory Council – are ongoing processes, allowing for long-term public involvement.

While the SNWA has a long track record of public engagement, it is the concrete and tangible results of these efforts that are the true measure of our success. Our commitment extends beyond the duration of the committee, as evidenced by the continued influence of past recommendations on SNWA actions today.

| Title Organization | Southern Nevada Water Authority: History of Public Participation
| *Organization of the Year 2008*
| Organizing Group | Southern Nevada Water Authority |
| Location | Las Vegas Valley |
| Key Question/Problem | Eight projects are reviewed to demonstrate the extent to which public engagement processes have been incorporated into the decision-making processes. |
| Results | Recommendations and results are discussed briefly for each of the projects. The initiatives are regional scale general public participation and include cooperation of 7 local water and wastewater agencies. |
| Impact Level | These projects originate from a variety of locales along the Colorado River and the Las Vegas Valley |
| Time Frame | 17 years, 1991 to present |
| People Engaged | Local residents, large and small businesses, gaming, seniors, environmental interests, financial interests, developers, and stakeholders outside of the Las Vegas area |
| Web Link | http://www.swna.com |
2008 Project of the Year Winner

Strategic Quest: Capital Health Nova Scotia, Canada

The Strategic Quest process used as its strategic planning framework the U-Theory approach developed by Otto Scharmer, a senior lecturer at MIT (http://www.ottoscharmer.com/). U-Theory is based on over eight years of scientific research into innovation and leadership through interviews with 150 thought leaders. There are five stages in the U-process: Initiating, Sensing, Presencing, Creating and Evolving. Strategic Quest engaged citizens and stakeholders in the sensing, presencing and creating phases of the process. The U-process provided Capital Health a deep, reflective journey into its work and role in the community. Between April and November 2007 the Strategic Quest engaged over two thousand citizens, stakeholders, patients/client families and staff using a variety of methods, including: World Café (www.theworldcafe.com); Conversation Circle technology (www.conversationcircle.com); Open Space technology (www.openspaceworld.org); Scenarios; One-on-one interviewing; Promise Councils (in Alignment with IAP2 Core Values); Patient-family waiting room journals; Quantitative and qualitative public opinion research and “Quest on a Cart” (a mobile toolkit for engaging people in Strategic Quest discussions which was used inside the organization and with some external stakeholder organizations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Project</th>
<th>Strategic Quest *Project of the Year 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Capital Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Nova Scotia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>How to shift the province from an illness model of health care to a wellness model, creating a haven for people-centered health, healing and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>“Sensing teams” to scope the issue, World Café, Conversation Circles, Open Space technology, scenarios, one-on-one interviewing, Promise Councils, waiting room journals, quantitative and qualitative public opinion research, “Quest on a cart” mobile toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Planning process evolved into Our Promise, a strategic plan for health care transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Public Participation resulted in change and citizen engagement was built into the new structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Thousands of citizens, stakeholders, patients and families, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://ourpromise.ca/">http://ourpromise.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canadian Blood Services, Canada  (Organization)
“The strength of Canadian Blood Services is largely due to the engagement of stakeholders and the public in our decision making. To gain and maintain trust, it is critical that our Board and our executive management are open, available and attentive to the people that we serve.”  Dr. Graham Sher, Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Blood Services.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, thousands of Canadians received blood and blood products that were contaminated with two infectious viruses, Hepatitis C and HIV, resulting in many deaths and Canada’s largest public health crisis.  A commission of inquiry was launched, led by Justice Krever from which a comprehensive report called for a new, national blood operator in Canada.

Justice Krever made many recommendations for the new blood system in Canada; including safety, finance, research and development and blood utilization.  In addition, he made recommendations on public confidence and accountability, “The public must have access to information about the policy, management and operations of the blood supply system and be represented in the decision making.”  These recommendations set the stage for a new blood system that would be safe, open, inclusive and accountable to the public from that point forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Canadian Blood Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>*Special Recognition 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Provincial and Territorial Ministers of Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Rebuilding public trust with Canadian Blood Services new operator after a health crisis due to contaminated blood and blood products in the late 70s / early 80s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Town Hall meetings, Brown Bag Lunches, “Ask EMT” (anonymous electronic question forum), National Liaison Committee, Regional Liaison Committee, Consensus Conferences, Blood Clinic comment cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Stakeholder surveys to determine satisfaction with engagement processes and their understanding of how their input affected decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Initiated 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Government officials, health workers, general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bloodservices.ca/">http://www.bloodservices.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council, New Zealand (project)**

*Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council* was established after New Zealand’s Royal Commission of Inquiry on Genetic Modification. Its purpose is to consider the cultural, ethical and spiritual issues raised by biotechnology. In this role, the Council provides information, promotes and participates in public dialogue, and gives advice to Government.

The Council was scheduled to report to the New Zealand Government in May 2008 on the issue of pre-birth testing. Because pre-birth testing is an issue which touches the lives of so many men, women and children, the Council opted for a very public and participatory approach to framing the issue and developing its recommendations. The end goal was to ensure that the views and values of New Zealanders were reflected in the recommendations that the Council will make to government – while ensuring that these recommendations were just, reasonable and practical.

Read more about the work of Who Gets Born and how this project undertook public participation using a range of deliberative techniques on a highly controversial issue in our time in their submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Project</th>
<th>Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Recognition 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Ensuring that emerging policies about pre-birth genetic testing reflect the views and values of all New Zealanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Eighteen face-to-face deliberative events around the country; online deliberation hosted by the <em>dialoguecircles.com</em> platform; public issue framing using the “Who Gets Born? Pre-Birth Testing Choicebook”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Results | Because the dialogue moved beyond polarized positions, policy makers say they had a “much richer understanding of where people are on these difficult issues, and what people would be prepared to do or not” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Informed the Bioethics Council’s decision; has been cited internationally as a best practice in engaging the public on complex issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Nationwide participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Woodlands Governance, Texas, USA (project)

Begun in 1974 by businessman George Mitchell, The Woodlands is a master-planned community of today, nearly 90,000 residents (at the time of Phase II of the project, 85,000 residents.) The Woodlands has approximately 26,000 jobs, making it a strong employment area. The great majority of the 27,000 acres of land included within The Woodlands lies in the unincorporated areas of Montgomery County, with approximately 3,000 acres extending south of Spring Creek into unincorporated Harris County. Approximately 160 acres of The Woodlands are located in the corporate limits of the City of Shenandoah, and some 375 acres are located in the City of Conroe.

Having essentially all of The Woodlands within the ETJ of a single city effectively prevented fragmentation of the planned community and its services through partial annexations initiated by other nearby cities of through multiple, separate incorporations that could have taken place on a piecemeal basis. Having included most of his landholdings for The Woodlands into Houston's ETJ, Mitchell and his development team, utilizing consultants experienced in community governance, set about the task of establishing a fragmented service delivery system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Project</th>
<th>The Woodlands Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>The Woodlands Community Service Corporation, The Woodlands, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Woodlands, Texas. Population 90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>This was a governance project brought on by the need to protect the Woodlands from annexation by Houston while at the same time addressing the requirements that predicted rapid growth &amp; development would place upon the changing governing structure of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>The process involved 3 phases: 1) exploratory study on issues 2) creation of the Woodlands Governance Steering Committee, 3) action - legislators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>“In November, 2007, Woodlands voters endorsed the course of action, making the Woodlands the first community of its size and circumstance to determine their own governance future in the State of Texas”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Clearly, the project would, and did, have a significant impact on the entire community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>The project was initiated in 2003 and the new governance structure was approved by 86% of residents in November 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Multiple opportunities were provided to residents to get involved in Phases 1 &amp; 2. Ultimately, the entire community voted for the final draft of the new governance structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thewoodlandsgovernance.org/">http://www.thewoodlandsgovernance.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2008 Nominees

| **Title Project** | **Access Transit**  
South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority (TransLink) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>TransLink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Metro Vancouver, BC. Population 2,116,581 (2006 census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>This was an extensive review of transportation accessibility designed in response to feedback from people with disabilities, demographic predictions for rapid growth, and need for a broader analysis of entire system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Sample Methods** | 1) Internal consultation – staff, management, formation of various working groups and steering committees, reps from 22 metro municipalities  
2) External consultation – a broad range of users and user groups were asked to commit to a 3-year process. |
| **Results** | A ‘Vision for Accessible Transportation’, set of Principles for Public Consultation & Community Engagement |
| **Impact Level** | Urban city |
| **Time Frame** | 2005 - 2007 |
| **People Engaged** | Externally -100 people committed to the 2 year project |
| **Web Link** | [www.translink.ca](http://www.translink.ca) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title Project</strong></th>
<th><strong>BC Hydro Electricity Conservation &amp; Efficiency Advisory Committee</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Organizing Group** | BC Hydro  
British Columbia, Canada |
<p>| <strong>Location</strong> | British Columbia, Canada |
| <strong>Key Question/Problem</strong> | Fostering a conservation culture that leads to customers choosing to make a dramatic and permanent reduction in electricity usage |
| <strong>Sample Methods</strong> | Advisory committee, independent facilitator |
| <strong>Results</strong> | The utility adopted the committee’s proposed Strategic Framework and its recommended codes and standards. While these recommendations led the utility in a different strategic direction than originally intended, they enabled it to take a stronger position in creating a conservation culture. |
| <strong>Impact Level</strong> | Province-wide |
| <strong>Time Frame</strong> | Initiated 2002, completed 2007 |
| <strong>People Engaged</strong> | 23-member committee included First Nationals, environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs), academia, independent power producers, trade allies, commercial customers, building owners and managers, trade allies, other utilities, and local, federal, and provincial governments |
| <strong>Web Link</strong> | <a href="http://www.energyplan.gov.bc.ca">www.energyplan.gov.bc.ca</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>City of Edmonton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>City of Edmonton Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Edmonton, Alberta, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Guide cultural change within the organization as the city grows from a small to large population and foster consistent use of public involvement across the city government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Office of Public Involvement to craft policy, training, assists with outcomes evaluation development and stakeholder networking. <em>Consultation Manager</em> software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Public participation policy, resource dedication and oversight implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Initiated 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Government officials, general citizens, Aboriginal community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Future Forward Fort McMurray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Gabinet &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Fort McMurray, Wood Buffalo Municipality, Alberta, Canada, pop. 90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Create a community driven, supported and sustainable city-wide vision. Rapid population growth, industrial expansion, infrastructure pressures. Limited past citizen participation opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Luminary Speaker Series, steering committee, Future Forward Summit, citizen interviews (what works and issues), facilitation training modules for staff and community leaders, 14 Powerful Questions Sector Workshops, World Cafes, online survey, Citizen asset team workshops, mini-forums (youth, seniors, business, education etc), curriculum links in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Stakeholder teams' vision and goals unanimously approved by Regional Council. Basis for larger planning process, Envision Woods Buffalo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>March 2006 – July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>General public and government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.woodbuffalo.ab.ca/futureforward/">http://www.woodbuffalo.ab.ca/futureforward/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hinze Dam Stage 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Organizing Group</strong></th>
<th>Hinze Dam Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia, Gold Coast City, pop. 480,000 Hinze Dam, yearly visitation 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Need to increase water storage capacity by raising embankment 15 meters. Community levels of technical knowledge. Project managers knowledge of community values and issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Enquiry-by-Design approach, community advisory committee, design optimization workshops, instructional scaffolding (technical issues).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Able to fast track design to construction with community support. Developing a common language. Enhanced design solution and sustainability. Reduced tensions from impacts of construction process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>Designers, engineers, environmentalists, elected representatives, community and sporting groups, residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kansas City Wet Weather Solutions Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Organizing Group</strong></th>
<th>Kansas City Missouri Water Services Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Sustainable water resource management to minimize loss due to flooding, improve water quality and maximize economic, social and environmental benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Wet Weather Community Panel, Basin Coordinating Committees and Wet Weather Fairs, Road Show Presentations, Green Solutions Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Increased citizen knowledge, increased participation levels and participation venues, impacted sister agencies in the city to include sustainable initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Urban City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>Initiated 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>General public, 650,000 waste water consumers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Public Participation Strategy for the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area Plan Amendment

**Organizing Group**  
Portland Development Commission

**Location**  
Portland, Oregon, United States

**Key Question/Problem**  
Whether and how to amend the existing Urban Renewal Plan. Confictive relationship of local residents and Planning Development Commission and mistrust of government. Lack of interest from a key stakeholder.

**Sample Methods**  
Citizen Advisory Committee collaborative with the PDC, public meetings, mailings, web page, FAQ, outreach at local events, and citizen input survey.

**Results**  
Breaking down of citizen mistrust of the PDC, increased perception of PDC openness and willingness to listen. Proposed amendment with broad public support.

**Impact Level**  
Neighborhood

**Time Frame**  
July 2007 – April 2008

**People Engaged**  
General public and neighborhood associations

**Web Link**  
[http://www.pdc.us/four/lents/default.asp](http://www.pdc.us/four/lents/default.asp)

---

### Stakeholder Engagement Case Study: Bus Priority Consultation Project

**Organizing Group**  
Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury

**Location**  
Christchurch, New Zealand, pop. 348,000

**Key Question/Problem**  
Create priority bus routes (over other traffic), previous scheme rejected. Include economic and social needs with engineering needs.

**Sample Methods**  
Community Engagement Team, local community engagement advisors, brochures, web site. Interactive displays, open forums and seminars targeted to stakeholder groups (youth, teenagers, elderly, people with disabilities, people with small children, migrant and refugee groups).

**Results**  
Increased information relieved concerns, decisions reflected economic and social needs, Community Engagement Team created venue for local voice and communication.

**Impact Level**  
Metropolitan City

**Time Frame**  
2007-2008

**People Engaged**  
City wide – see sample methods.

**Web Link**  
### Tay River Advisory Committee (TRAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title Project</strong></th>
<th><strong>Tay River Advisory Committee (TRAC)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Shell Canada Ltd. &amp; Mancal Energy Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Tay River, Alberta Foothills northeast of Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholder engagement project for which the TRAC was established “to provide guidance to ensure gas development in the Tay River area of interest is undertaken in a manner that balances social, environmental and economic benefits and minimizes negative impacts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>A broad range of stakeholders with different perspectives led to 23 TRAC meetings over a 2 ½ yr project. Stakeholders included the public, other petroleum companies, local government s &amp; authorities, First Nations, environmentalists, special interest groups, recreational users, community/youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Very successful process and although the development was eventually cancelled due to the smaller than expected pool, TRAC ’s decision-making process led to regulatory approvals and no hearings were required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>2005 - 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>See sample methods for list of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.shell.ca/home/content/ca-en/society_environment/social/dir_social.html">http://www.shell.ca/home/content/ca-en/society_environment/social/dir_social.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### US 127 North Roadway Improvements, Cumberland and Fentress Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title Project</strong></th>
<th><strong>US 127 North Roadway Improvements, Cumberland and Fentress Counties</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>TN/Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Tennessee: From Interstate 40(Crossville) and north 14 miles to US 127 (Clarkrange). Population 2323(Clarkrange/Fentress); 46,802 (Cumberland); 8900 (as of 2000, in Crossville).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>A change in administration (2003) led to a review of this project along with 14 others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>CSS – context sensitive solutions approach. Public information meetings/forums, Citizen’s Resource Team (CRT), project database, Toll-free information line, Project info booths at community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Shift of public opinion to support of the project and of the TDOT (Tennessee Department of Transportation). Adoption of CSS approach for all future projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Residents of the counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>2003 – 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>General public, engineers, administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/us127n/library.htm">http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/us127n/library.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vision for Queensferry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Community-led team composed of 16 residents and a facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Queensferry, Edinburgh, Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>With the 2003 decision of the newly emerged Scottish government (previously known as the Scottish Executive) to give local communities a say in what they envision for their future and to contribute to the 2007 local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>The over-arching approach was called ‘participatory analysis’ (PA) and the goal of that process included ensuring that public opinion was drawn from beyond just the middle class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>The Vision was utilized in several contexts with significant success as defined by the participants and PA team: preventing local development that did not meet with the Vision criteria, helped with grant applications, and the Vision for Queensferry group became involved in another planning project called ‘Queensferry Ambition’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>The estimated population of South Queensferry is 12,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>2003 – 2006/2007 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>1400 people were consulted in this participatory process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Web Link** | [http://www.twomid.freeserve.co.uk/NEWwebsite/VISION.htm](http://www.twomid.freeserve.co.uk/NEWwebsite/VISION.htm)  
Nomination Descriptive Reports
| Title Organization                                      | Southern Nevada Water Authority : History of Public Participation  
|                                                      | *Organization of the Year 2008 |
| Organizing Group Location                            | Southern Nevada Water Authority |
| Key Question/Problem                                 | Las Vegas Valley |
| Sample Methods                                        | Eight projects are reviewed to demonstrate the extent to which public engagement processes have been incorporated into the decision-making processes. |
| Impact Level                                          | Recommendations and results are discussed briefly for each of the projects. The initiatives are regional scale general public participation and include cooperation of 7 local water and wastewater agencies. |
| Time Frame                                            | These projects originate from a variety of locales along the Colorado River and the Las Vegas Valley |
| People Engaged                                        | 17 years, 1991 to present |
| Web Link                                              | Local residents, large and small businesses, gaming, seniors, environmental interests, financial interests, developers, and stakeholders outside of the Las Vegas area |
|                                                      | [http://www.swna.com](http://www.swna.com) |
Since its formation in 1991, the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) has actively engaged the public in its decision making processes. For the SNWA, public participation means more than simply paying “lip service;” it means developing processes where citizens and stakeholders can participate in a meaningful way. Over the last 17 years, we have established eight such public processes. Some of which were designed to address specific, time-sensitive issues such as drought, while others – like the Advisory Committee for Groundwater Management and the Youth Advisory Council – are ongoing processes, allowing for long-term public involvement.

While the SNWA has a long track record of public engagement, it is the concrete and tangible results of these efforts that are the true measure of our success. Our commitment extends beyond the duration of the committee, as evidenced by the continued influence of past recommendations on SNWA actions today. We submit this nomination to the International Association of Public Participation with these results in mind and with the firm belief that the best decisions are made when the public is involved in the decision-making processes.

**Background**

The Colorado River is the lifeblood for an urbanized West that few dreamed possible a century ago. This new West is still growing; meanwhile its resources are being tested by severe drought. Meeting water demands in such an environment is a daunting challenge that requires innovation and a willingness to step beyond old approaches. Along the Colorado River, there is one place that underscores most dramatically the challenges facing the western United States, as well as the solutions that are leading the way to a sustainable, long-term future for local communities. That place is Southern Nevada.

The SNWA is an innovative partnership among seven local water and wastewater agencies. Its mission is to manage the region’s water resources and develop solutions that will ensure adequate future water supplies for the Las Vegas Valley. This is no small task in a community that has doubled in population in just over 10 years. Today, the region boasts nearly two million residents; much of this growth has occurred during a period of historic drought on the Colorado River that has drained reservoirs, which provide over 90 percent of the region’s water supply, to levels never before experienced.

Southern Nevada is comprised of diverse stakeholder groups, each with different needs and often competing interests. Providing safe and reliable water service in such an environment has required the SNWA to make difficult decisions regarding water quality; infrastructure; financing; water resource development, management and conservation; and environmental stewardship. Engaging the public in meaningful dialogue and providing a forum for participation has allowed the community to reach consensus-based recommendations that serve as a foundation for major SNWA policy initiatives.

**Results Based Interactions**

Uninformed decision making can have serious consequences including project delays, cost and the erosion of public trust. To this end, the SNWA invests the up-front commitment necessary to ensure that public engagement is successful and the outcomes can be acted upon. This involves providing sufficient time to educate the public on the often interrelated issues of the industry, and allowing for discussion, deliberation and consensus building. It also means bringing all affected stakeholders to the process. Doing so ensures that decisions account for the voice of the community as a whole and do not exclude important minority views that are necessary to help balance the needs of our diverse community. While the process can move slowly at times, the value of participation outweighs these drawbacks.

The following section provides a brief overview of the eight major public and stakeholder processes undertaken by the SNWA. For brevity, we have included only a sample of major recommendations offered by these processes. A heading titled “Results” follows each major process to help illustrate how participation has influenced our decision-making processes this year.

**Integrated Resource Planning Advisory Committee (IRPAC), 1994 – 1998**

The SNWA formed this committee to develop recommendations on future water resources and funding for new regional facilities.
Key Recommendations

• Construct additional infrastructure on an as-needed basis to avoid overbuilding.
• Implement ozonation and direct filtration treatment at planned and existing treatment facilities.
• Pursue sales tax and a reliability surcharge to increase revenue stability and fund diversity.
• Pursue conservation as a critical and cost-effective resource.

Results

The SNWA has constructed major water facilities as demands required including a second water treatment plant, raw water intake and major pumping facilities. Both water treatment facilities are equipped with ozonation and direct filtration water treatment processes to protect and enhance regional water quality. Acting on the advice of the advisory committee, the SNWA successfully constructed “just in time” facilities, which reduced the financial obligation of existing residents and helped to ensure that facilities were not built in excess of customer demand. To help offset capital improvement costs, the SNWA implemented a reliability surcharge, increased connection charges and worked with the Nevada Legislature to impose a quarter-cent sales tax to fund the $2.8 billion project. In addition, SNWA pursued and received a portion of proceeds from the sale of public lands in Southern Nevada to further offset costs. This diverse revenue stream continues to provide stability, even during today’s difficult economic conditions. Work on a third intake deep in Lake Mead demonstrates that the SNWA continues to be guided by the IRPAC recommendations to construct additional infrastructure on an as-needed basis.

One of the most measurable results of the IRPAC process is the success of SNWA’s water conservation program. As discussed below, the SNWA – and later advisory committee processes – have continued to build upon this recommendation. As a result of this specific process, the SNWA achieved the recommended goal of 25 percent conservation by 2010 – four years ahead of schedule, and continues to set more aggressive goals.


This process was formed to develop recommendations on the management of groundwater within the over-appropriated Las Vegas Valley.

Key Recommendations

• Work with legislature to establish a Groundwater Management Program to provide oversight to management activities.
• Comprehensive, phased Groundwater Management Program is intended to meet additional recommendations for education, conservation, aquifer protection and groundwater management.
• A fee assessed by the Groundwater Management Program should fund programs/outreach.

Results

In 1997, the SNWA supported legislation to establish the formation of a Groundwater Management Program, including an advisory committee on groundwater management. Once the law was enacted, the SNWA implemented the program and advisory committee that oversaw the development of a well conversion program, completed a comprehensive inventory of wells in the valley and implemented extensive groundwater education and conservation efforts. These efforts were recognized through a special citation by the IAP2 in 1998.

Advisory Committee for Groundwater Management, 1997 – Present

This committee was formed as a result of the legislative action initiated by the CAC on Groundwater Management (above). This ongoing 9-member committee was tasked to oversee the SNWA’s actions to provide education and to protect, manage, and conserve groundwater resources of the Las Vegas Valley.

Key Recommendations

• Develop an artificial recharge program and aquifer protection plan.
• Implement a well conversion grant program and well plugging/abandonment program for well users in the Las Vegas Valley.

Results

The SNWA has developed and implemented the largest direct-injection artificial recharge program in the nation. To date over 9,000 acre-feet of water has been stored in the Las Vegas Valley Groundwater Basin as permanent
recharge to protect the aquifer. In addition, the SNWA provides financial assistance to help individuals with revocable permits connect to the municipal water system. With proceeds collected through the Groundwater Management Program fee, the SNWA funds 85 percent of the costs to extend (up to 180 feet) water service to a customer’s property (offsite costs), 100 percent of the well plugging and abandonment process, and $500 toward costs related to the water service connection at the customer’s property (onsite costs). To date the SNWA has helped fund over 423 conversions and plugged and abandoned 260 wells. The Advisory Committee continues to provide input on groundwater issues, recommending in January that a program be implemented to provide rebates to well owners who wish to install a submeter to measure their groundwater use.

The SNWA took the lead within the community in convening this committee to address water quality issues as they relate to the Las Vegas Wash, Las Vegas Bay and Lake Mead.

Key Recommendation
- Development of a Comprehensive Management Plan to address major water quality and environmental concerns in the Las Vegas Wash and Lake Mead.

Results
In 1997, local, state and federal entities recognized that increased wastewater flows were creating significant issues of erosion and pollution in the Las Vegas Wash. The SNWA took the lead in addressing these issues by forming the Water Quality Citizens Advisory Committee (WQCAC). The WQCAC made nine major recommendations, including a recommendation to create a comprehensive management plan by an interagency and community-wide effort. The SNWA, subsequently convened the Las Vegas Wash Coordination Committee to develop this plan and oversee actions to address the remaining WQCAC recommendations.

Las Vegas Wash Coordination Committee, 1998 – Present
The Las Vegas Wash Coordination Committee (LVWCC) is comprised of local, state and federal agencies, business owners and members of the public. The group formed nine task groups to review the issues and work together to develop a Comprehensive Adaptive Management Plan for the Las Vegas Wash and recommended activities to restore its ecological functions.

Key Recommendations
- Reduce flows in the Las Vegas Wash through reuse and conservation.
- Rehabilitate the ecological function of the Las Vegas Wash through revegetation, construction of flow-control weirs and redevelop wetland habitats.
- Develop a program to regularly perform water quality and biological monitoring.

Results
Since 1998, the SNWA has constructed 10 erosion control structures (reducing total suspended solids by more than 50 percent), stabilized more than 5.5 miles of bank, revegetated more than 175 acres of wetland, removed more than 200 acres of invasive species, implemented extensive wildlife inventories, implemented comprehensive water quality monitoring programs and participated in numerous public outreach and education events. The LVWCC continues to meet quarterly to address operational issues related to the management of the Las Vegas Wash.

Youth Advisory Council, 1999 – Present
This council provides opportunities for youth to participate in the ongoing planning, policy development, and evaluation of water conservation. This council is made up of local high school students that develop and implement water-related projects each year and make formal recommendations to the SNWA Board of Directors.

Key Recommendations
- Develop a Water Smart Home program to certify new homes and neighborhoods as water smart.
- Various conservation-based projects within the community
Results
The SNWA launched the nation’s largest new home water efficiency program, Water Smart Home. To date, 7,000 water smart homes have been constructed and certified under this program. The council has helped the SNWA to serve the community in other projects such as creating a xeriscape demonstration garden at an Elementary school, developing a recycling program for valley high schools and, earlier this year, hosting the first World Water Day event in Southern Nevada.

Drought Citizens Advisory Committee, 2003
This committee was convened to provide input into the SNWA’s draft Drought Plan and conservation strategic planning process.

Key Recommendations
- Measures targeted to achieve additional conservation of outdoor water use to extend existing Colorado River resources.

SNWA Results
Severe drought struck the Colorado River in the early part of this century. Following Colorado River flows of 25 percent of normal in 2002, the SNWA member agencies were required to act quickly to draft a Drought Plan (Plan) outlining specific measures to reduce local water demands. Although it was necessary to implement the Plan immediately, consideration for public involvement in issues impacting its customers remained a priority for SNWA. In January 2003, the SNWA Board of Directors adopted the Plan and appointed the Drought Citizens Advisory Committee to provide input and make recommendations to further develop and refine the Plan.

Consistent with the committee’s direction, the SNWA enhanced its comprehensive conservation programs with a focus on outdoor water use. As a measure of success, Southern Nevadans have consumed 15 billion gallons less water in 2007 than in 2002, despite the addition of 400,000 new residents during that span and more than 40 million annual visitors.

Integrated Water Planning Advisory Committee, 2004 – 2005
The SNWA convened this committee to develop recommendations on how best to integrate in-state resources into its existing water resource portfolio. Committee membership included representatives from the rural Nevada counties as well as various Southern Nevada stakeholders. The committee proceedings were simulcast to seven rural locations to allow for attendance by those in the rural communities.

Key Recommendations
- Pursue additional conservation to achieve 250 GPCD by 2010 and 245 GPCD by 2035.
- Provide additional safeguards for communities and the environment in areas where in-state groundwater resources are developed.
- Work with the Colorado River Basin States to implement full-consumptive use for in-state, non-Colorado River resources and additional flexibility for Colorado River resources.

SNWA Results
To achieve the new regional conservation goals recommended by the committee, the SNWA increased incentives to encourage participation in its successful Water Smart Landscape program. The change prompted the conversion of more than 13 million square-feet of landscaping under this program. Due to the success of this and other efforts, the community is on-track to achieve the established conservation goals as early as this year. As a result, technical staff from the SNWA member agencies are working to define a new conservation goal consistent with a committee recommendation to pursue additional conservation if possible.

To ensure the protection of the environment in rural Nevada, the SNWA has conducted hydrologic, biological and other environmental research in the region and entered into stipulated agreements with federal and local agencies to develop a Biologic Monitoring, Management and Mitigation Plan in the area. The SNWA also acquired several ranch properties in Spring Valley, along with the associated surface water rights, to help protect the wildlife and aesthetic values and to support the basin’s natural recharge. To support the full use of Colorado River resources,
the SNWA successfully negotiated with other Basin States during a time of drought to increase its flexibility on the Colorado River, culminating in the signing of a Record of Decision by the Secretary of the Interior in December 2007. In spite of historical precedence, the SNWA will be able to withdraw some Virgin and Muddy River resources as Colorado River credits through its existing infrastructure at Lake Mead. The SNWA will also receive Colorado River credits for any in-state groundwater resources returned to Lake Mead as waste water, extending the in-state resource by approximately 70 percent.

Application of Core Values
The SNWA embraces each of the IAP2 Core Values. The following section describes how the agency’s efforts work to implement these values.

SNWA public participation and stakeholder processes are designed to engage diverse stakeholders to ensure the voice of the community as a whole is heard. Committees typically include representation from the following stakeholder groups: local residents, large and small businesses, gaming, seniors, environmental interests, financial interests, developers and stakeholders outside of the Las Vegas area as applicable.

SNWA public participation processes are facilitated, consensus based processes. Facilitation is used to help ensure the needs and interests of all participants are well understood and reflected in process reports. As part of the process, participants are provided an overview of goals and expectations and provided with a sense of how their recommendations will influence the organization’s actions. Following this orientation, participants receive extensive education regarding the complexities of issues and perspectives relating to the committee’s purpose. Following the conclusion of the public process, recommendations are presented to the SNWA Board of Directors for action. The SNWA’s track record for implementing process recommendations is well demonstrated in the proceeding narrative. Additionally, the result of SNWA public involvement is widely evident in key agency documents. Principal examples of how the public has informed decision-making includes the SNWA Drought Plan, SNWA Water Resource Plan, Strategic Plan, SNWA website (www.snwa.com) and SNWA board actions.

Conclusion
Public Participation shapes nearly every policy decision considered by the SNWA. Even though some of these processes concluded several years ago, the recommendations and policy direction continues to guide the SNWA today. The numbers of citizens processes, and the diversity of process missions, demonstrate the SNWA’s continued and substantial commitment to public participation. The SNWA continues to act on the recommendations received from its numerous public processes. This can be observed in every major area of the SNWA’s efforts: reducing water use by billions of gallons despite continued growth, fulfilling commitments to improve and safeguard the environment within and outside the Las Vegas Valley, continually pursuing innovative management to extend Colorado River resources and constructing multi-billion dollar infrastructure projects just-in-time and under budget.

This ongoing commitment, not only to involve the public – but to execute the recommendations they provide – demonstrates SNWA’s dedication to the Core Values of public participation. These tangible results are the evidence that demonstrate the SNWA is qualified and deserving to receive recognition as an IAP2 Core Values, Organization of the Year.
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| Title Project | Strategic Quest  
*Project of the Year 2008* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Capital Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Nova Scotia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>How to shift the province from an illness model of health care to a wellness model, creating a haven for people-centered health, healing and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question/Problem</td>
<td>“Sensing teams” to scope the issue, World Café, Conversation Circles, Open Space technology, scenarios, one-on-one interviewing, Promise Councils, waiting room journals, quantitative and qualitative public opinion research, “Quest on a cart” mobile toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Planning process evolved into Our Promise, a strategic plan for health care transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Public Participation resulted in change and citizen engagement was built into the new structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Thousands of citizens, stakeholders, patients and families, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td><a href="http://ourpromise.ca/">http://ourpromise.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 Core Values Award Nominees
IAP2 Core Values Award Submission

Title: Strategic Quest
Award Category: Project
Organization: Capital Health
Nominee: Chris Power, President and CEO
Contact: Geoff Wilson, Senior Strategy Advisor, 362 Bethune Bldg. VG Hospital, Halifax, NS, Canada, B3H 2Y9, Phone (902) 473-7020, Fax (902) 473-4183, Email: geoff.wilson@cdha.nshealth.ca

The Problem and Challenge
Capital Health is the largest adult health service provider in Nova Scotia. Through a network of hospitals, health centres and community-based programs spread across the Halifax Regional Municipality, Capital Health’s 10,000 staff delivers medical and surgical care, mental health care, public and community health programs, addiction prevention and treatment, and environmental health to 400,000 residents. It also provides specialist services to rest of Nova Scotia, and within the Atlantic provinces. In addition, Capital Health, Dalhousie University and the Nova Scotia Community College partner to provide both academic and clinical learning experiences for physicians and health professionals. Capital Health also conducts health research.

Health care continues to consume an ever-increasing share of public funds. As it does the public demands a better return on investment: more accountability, better access to care and services, and better results from investments in drugs, equipment and expertise. The situation at Capital Health in Halifax, Nova Scotia reflects a national reality.

In spite of Capital Health’s $670 million annual investment in care and services each year, the health of the population is not improving, demand for service is increasing, and access to care and services is declining. System sustainability is a serious concern. A low political tolerance for increased public spending, a lack of evidence that more funding will improve health status, aging infrastructure, a globally competitive market for skilled health professionals, and burden of disease and demographic pressures on future health services has created a perfect storm for the health system in this community.

In March 2007 Capital Health launched Strategic Quest in an attempt to bring about a fundamental change to health care in this community. Starting from the belief that a different outcome required a different process, Capital Health applied an unconventional approach to strategic planning. The district was seeking a shift from an illness model of health care to a wellness model. To make this shift the district knew it would need to rebalance resources, but more importantly, it would take a change in the attitudes and accountabilities on the part of health providers and citizens alike. Making this shift will require citizens to shift their attitude from dependency on a system of illness care to shared accountability for their personal health as well as the health of the system in general. Strategic Quest brought together participants from within Capital Health and citizens and stakeholders in the community to address the question: “What would it take to create a world-leading haven for people-centred health, healing and learning?”

The Role of Public Participation
From the outset, public involvement in creating a new future for health care and services in the Capital Health district was paramount. Some of the impetus for making the strategic planning process inclusive and transparent was evidence gathered through a key stakeholder study undertaken on behalf of the incoming CEO in late 2006. The qualitative study conducted on behalf of Capital Health by Corporate Research Associates interviewed 50 local business, political, and public sector leaders. Among other issues, the study found Capital Health to be lacking in the area of openness, transparency and accountability. Among key community leaders, there was a clear message to Capital Health that it needed a strategy to become more welcoming of external input into its decisions and priorities.
In the early phase of Strategic Quest, a series of “sensing teams” (see Participation Methods below) were created to conduct in-depth inquiries in a number of key areas, including a team dedicated to the exploration of a new role for Capital Health within community. Thousands of conversations took place with stakeholders, community organizations, patient families, and staff in pursuit of a more complete understanding of Capital Health’s role and relationship within the community. Capital Health learned six “Inconvenient Truths” about itself from this exploration:

- Capital Health’s approach to health is not holistic.
- Capital Health is not people-centred.
- Capital Health is complicit in the politics of health care.
- Capital Health is not prepared to engage our partners and citizens.
- Capital Health does not empower people or communities.
- Capital Health has lost sight of our academic mission.

(see Project Results below for more information about the ‘Inconvenient Truths’ and their impact.)

Public Participation Methods
The Strategic Quest process used as its strategic planning framework the U-Theory approach developed by Otto Scharmer, a senior lecturer at MIT (http://www.ottoscharmer.com/). U-Theory is based on over eight years of scientific research into innovation and leadership through interviews with 150 thought leaders. There are five stages in the U-process: Initiating, Sensing, Presencing, Creating and Evolving. Strategic Quest engaged citizens and stakeholders in the sensing, presencing and creating phases of the process. The U-process provided Capital Health a deep, reflective journey into its work and role in the community. Between April and November 2007 the Strategic Quest (see sensing teams above in Role of Public Participation) engaged over two thousand citizens, stakeholders, patients/client families and staff using a variety of methods, including:

- World Café (www.theworldcafe.com)
- Conversation Circle technology (www.conversationcircle.com)
- Open Space technology (www.openspaceworld.org)
- Scenarios
- One-on-one interviewing
- Promise Councils (see item 5 in Alignment with IAP2 Core Values below)
- Patient-family waiting room journals
- Quantitative and qualitative public opinion research
- “Quest on a Cart” (a mobile toolkit for engaging people in Strategic Quest discussions which was used inside the organization and with some external stakeholder organizations)

Uniqueness of the Project
Within the Canadian health care context, there are few examples of this scale of public engagement in strategic planning, priority-setting and decision making at the level of health care organizations. Capital Health looked to the BC Conversations on Health project (www.bcconversationonhealth.ca) for guidance in engaging the public on the issue of health care. As well, Capital Health examined the engagement work undertaken by the National Health Service in the U.K. to help guide its public engagement work through the Strategic Quest process.

This project was demonstrably unique from any examples we were able to research in several ways:
1. We were not able to find instances of health care organizations that employed public participation techniques in the development of strategic plans.
2. The engagement of citizens and a diverse array of community stakeholders helped bring focus to the needed shift from an illness to a wellness model in the delivery of health care and services.

3. Including citizens and stakeholders in the Strategic Quest process has spread a public participation/citizen engagement ethos into decision-making and priority setting inside a health care organization.

4. The Strategic Quest process led to the creation of the Citizenship Promise Council within Capital Health whose mandate has been the development of principles of citizen engagement, research into engagement process and techniques, the development of an engagement framework, and the establishment of a new strategic direction for Capital Health (“Citizen and Stakeholder Engagement and Accountability”).

5. Staff and physicians were engaged both as stakeholders in the system and as citizens in our community. Citizens and stakeholders were engaged as both users and owners of the system.

**Project Results**

Strategic Quest had a number of important results. Capital Health’s “Inconvenient Truths” came from an extensive sensing process (see above in Public Participation Methods) in which citizens and stakeholders in the health system were engaged in dialogue through the range of engagement techniques noted earlier. These truths were also the impetus for the creation of a Declaration of Health (www.ourpromise.ca) for our community and for Capital Health staff and care providers. This Declaration acknowledges a broader role for Capital Health within community beyond its role as an acute care provider. It was citizen and community input throughout the Strategic Quest process that helped renew the district’s focus on wellness and to articulate a broader definition of health.

With the adoption of the broad directions and findings of the Strategic Quest process by the Capital Health Board of Directors in October 2007, Strategic Quest evolved into Our Promise (www.ourpromise.ca), a unique strategic plan for health care transformation that is focused on health (wellness and promotion), healing (care and service) and learning (creation of knowledge networks to ensure future sustainability and promote innovation).

One of the five strategic directions that emerged as part of Our Promise was solely focused on engaging citizens, stakeholders and our community. As part of its work, the Citizenship Promise Council researched and defined citizen engagement principles (public involvement; participatory decision-making; clarity of purpose and intent; citizen and community capacity building; commitment and accountability; and equity and inclusion). This council also created a framework for engagement that aims to integrate the principles into the day-to-day work of the organization.

**Alignment with IAP2 Core Values**

The Strategic Quest project aligns with the IAP2 Core Values in a variety of ways:

1. **The public should have a say in decisions about actions that could affect their lives.** To honour this value, Capital Health actively engaged citizens and stakeholders in creating a new direction and strategy for health care and wellness in this community. It was felt that if citizens were going to play a role in and take responsibility for their health and transforming the system, they would need to be part of dialogue and decisions that created this new strategic plan. To sustain this value as Our Promise is implemented, a new strategic direction focused on citizen engagement has been embedded into the long-term strategy of the organization, a citizenship framework with guiding principles has been adopted, and initiatives to develop and integrate engagement processes into daily work have been undertaken.

2. **Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.** The public contributed directly to the new strategic direction for Capital Health through a series of large-scale public world cafes and other events. These community-level conversations contributed
As Capital Health moves forward with this strategic plan, citizens and stakeholders are being involved in making decisions and setting priorities for health care services and wellness initiatives in this community. For example, the outcome of the engagement strategic direction means Capital Health is designing a public input process to inform the placement and development of Community Health Teams that support local health and wellness. Capital Health is also planning for citizen involvement in the development of future health facilities through a Master Facilities Planning process set for the fall 2008.

3. **Public participation supports sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.** One of the significant drivers behind the Strategic Quest process is the growing need to create a healthier population in our community and a health system that is sustainable in the long run. The Strategic Quest sensing teams spent a great deal of time and effort gathering information and perceptions from the many stakeholders and citizens who would potentially be affected by the transformation. The intent of this work was to understand the views and perspectives of patients, families, staff, the community, government, business, and many other interest groups. Experiencing and understanding the unique realities faced by these many stakeholders in their interactions with Capital Health was critical in the development of a strategic plan that was humane, compassionate, and that will ultimately be sustainable.

4. **Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in the decision.** Capital Health actively engaged thousands of citizens, stakeholders, patients, and families, and staff in a myriad of ways. There were large scale open, public events organized at different locations and during different times of the day to ensure that a broad spectrum of participation. Transportation was provided for some sessions. Patients, families and staff were engaged through a variety of face-to-face meetings, journaling in “Open Me” journals that were placed in public waiting rooms throughout the district, formal meetings, conversation circles, “Quest on a Cart,” surveys, and email submissions. Great care was taken to ensure that “hard to reach” audiences (such as mental health consumers, addictions clients, homeless citizens, people living in poverty, new Canadians, African Nova Scotians, etc.) were encouraged to participate in the Strategic Quest opportunities, and to raise issues and concerns relevant to their respective situations. This was done through one-on-one interviews as well as group events held in locations and at times more convenient for the needs of each audience.

5. **Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.** Citizens and stakeholders were able to join a series of six “Promise Councils” that were responsible for engaging in conversations with citizens for the sake of exploring discreet components of Capital Health’s strategic future, and for building strategies and a network to move them forward. The various methodologies for engaging citizens in these conversations was designed within each Promise Council and supported (logistics, tools, etc.) by Capital Health. These were:
   - **Health and Healing:** This stream focuses on strategies to directly address health outcomes, and the design and delivery of interventions and supports to help people realize and sustain changes toward healthy behaviours.
   - **Citizenship:** This stream explores the foundational role of citizenship in relation to health and health care, and addresses the collective rights and responsibilities of citizens focused on our quality of life as a society.
   - **People, Relationships and Well-being:** This stream addresses strategies that sponsor people as the essence of the change Capital Health needed to undertake in pursuit of Our Promise. Its function is to create and sustain the human conditions that support healthy behaviours and healthy living. People hold the power to develop the relationships and strategies that best support their changes in beliefs and behaviour leading to well-being.
Performance Excellence: This stream involves strategies that establish and offer stewardship for organizational excellence, patient safety, fiscal effectiveness and technological enablement required by Our Promise.

Innovation and Learning: This stream focuses on strategies that establish and reward the beliefs, principles, processes, practices and structures associated with the spirit of inquiry, the discovery of new methodologies, the performance of evidenced-based practice and the development of competencies and specialties.

Leadershift: This embodies the strategies directly dedicated to the meaningful transformation of Capital Health, and the underlying shift in beliefs, behaviours, assumptions, values, roles and functions that drive the cultural transformation.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way. Capital Health created a standard presentation that was used at the engagement and scenario events which laid out the demographic, fiscal, population health, resource and system sustainability challenges facing the organization and the health system in the community. This presentation, entitled Tough Medicine, was the burning platform for the dialogue around change. Capital Health also created a web microsite during the Strategic Quest process where information compiled through the sensing process was held for public review. A second generation of the original microsite (www.oupromise.ca) continues to provide information and offers opportunities for citizens to participate in ongoing dialogue about Our Promise.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input influenced the decision. The most visible evidence of participant influence on the decision and outcome of Strategic Quest is Our Promise (www.ourpromise.ca) and the Declaration of Health which articulate the shared accountability and commitment to transformation. In April 2008, Our Promise Strategic Directions further reflected a focused response to the citizen input. Ourpromise.ca is also a vehicle for disseminating information about the strategic plan work and it provides a blog space for residents to comment on the plan and to discuss issues relevant to the plan. The President and CEO of Capital Health has presented the findings of Strategic Quest and the new strategic directions of Capital Health at a number of high profile forums in the community, including a Chamber of Commerce event, a health care leadership forum, and a local forum undertaken by an innovation interest group. These major forums, and other smaller presentations, have reached thousands of key stakeholders, citizens and health interests in this community with Capital Health’s transformation message. Follow-up forums are being planned for autumn 2008.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Provincial and Territorial Ministers of Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario, Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Key Question/Problem | Rebuilding public trust with Canadian Blood Services new operator after a health crisis due to contaminated blood and blood products in the late 70s / early 80s. |

| Sample Methods | Town Hall meetings, Brown Bag Lunches, “Ask EMT” (anonymous electronic question forum), National Liaison Committee, Regional Liaison Committee, Consensus Conferences, Blood Clinic comment cards. |

| Results | Stakeholder surveys to determine satisfaction with engagement processes and their understanding of how their input affected decisions. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Initiated 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Government officials, health workers, general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bloodservices.ca/">http://www.bloodservices.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“The strength of Canadian Blood Services is largely due to the engagement of stakeholders and the public in our decision making. To gain and maintain trust, it is critical that our Board and our executive management are open, available and attentive to the people that we serve.”

Dr. Graham Sher, Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Blood Services

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, thousands of Canadians received blood and blood products that were contaminated with two infectious viruses, Hepatitis C and HIV, resulting in many deaths and Canada’s largest public health crisis. A commission of inquiry was launched, led by Justice Krever from which a comprehensive report called for a new, national blood operator in Canada.

Justice Krever made many recommendations for the new blood system in Canada; including safety, finance, research and development and blood utilization. In addition, he made recommendations on public confidence and accountability, “The public must have access to information about the policy, management and operations of the blood supply system and be represented in the decision making.” These recommendations set the stage for a new blood system that would be safe, open, inclusive and accountable to the public from that point forward.

It Started Early and it Started at the Top
In the words of our CEO, Dr. Graham Sher, “Our mission was clear from day one, we had to turn the ship away from the iceberg and regain the trust that had been completely eroded.” The stage for rebuilding trust was set with our mission statement, developed by the Provincial and Territorial Ministers of Health; “Canadian Blood Services operates Canada’s blood supply in a manner that gains the trust, commitment and confidence of all Canadian by providing a safe, secure, cost-effective, affordable and accessible supply of quality blood, blood products and their alternatives.” However, the Board of Directors and Dr. Sher knew that it would take more than words to bring the commitment to life. It would take shared values, developed by our staff; “We believe in: Safety, Integrity, Quality, Respect, Excelling, Accountability and Openness” and it would take a commitment to live these values in all of our business practices.

Embracing the Principles and Values of Public Participation
The incoming executive team was committed from the beginning to engaging the entire range of stakeholders in the blood system, including staff, volunteers, patients, hospitals, health care professionals, advocacy groups, and the public. To begin with, members of the executive management team, including the CEO and board members, travelled across the country to meet with staff and volunteers. Ongoing mechanisms for employee involvement were set up that include Town Hall Meetings across Canada, Brown Bag Lunches with Dr. Sher, CEO and Ask EMT, an anonymous electronic question forum that is responded to by executive management. In addition, editorial board meetings were set up with every major newspaper in Canada, outlining the organization’s plan for rebuilding the blood system. Two board meetings per year were opened to the public, public presentations were encouraged at all board meetings and two positions on the Board of Directors were designated to represent consumers of blood products.

Of equally critical importance to Canadian Blood Services was the early establishment of an ongoing stakeholder engagement strategy. One of the key mechanisms is the Liaison Committees. The National Liaison Committee (NLC) is made up of external stakeholders, acts as an advisory committee to the Board of Directors and is co-chaired by the two Consumer Representative Members of the Board. In addition to their regularly scheduled meetings, the committee also meets on a yearly basis with the full Board of Directors. Members include representatives from national organizations such as consumer groups, patient groups, health care professionals, hospitals, partners, sponsors and delegates from each of seven Regional Liaison Committees.

The Regional Liaison Committees (RLCs) ensure that Canadians have an opportunity to raise concerns and contribute to decision making on issues affecting the blood system on a local or regional basis. One member from each RLC represents their committee’s interests on the NLC. The RLCs meet biannually and report jointly to the Director Donor & Clinic Services of the respective catchment area and the Office of Public Involvement at Canadian Blood Services’ Head Office. Members on the RLC include blood donors, volunteers, sponsors, health care professionals and blood patient groups.

In addition to the standing liaison committees, Canadian Blood Services regularly schedules consultations and consensus conferences on issues of importance to the Canadian public, blood donors, patients and health care professionals. Past consultations have included a review of donor deferral policies, Transfusion Related Acute Lung Injury, plasma protein products, umbilical cord blood banking and organ and tissue donation and transplantation in Canada.

Canadian Blood Services has also implemented mechanisms that allow the public to directly communicate with and provide feedback to the organization; one electronic format and one through comment cards that are provided at the blood clinics across the country. Feedback and issues that are directed to the CEO, or members of the board are responded to by them allowing the public access to the decision makers at Canadian Blood Services.

**Examples of the Impact of Public Participation on Decisions**
Inclusive decision-making at Canadian Blood Services has evolved to the point where the decision-makers of the organization consult at every feasible opportunity. In fact, examples of the impact of public participation are evident in most major decisions the organization makes. Following are some examples:

1. As a result of the tainted blood tragedy in the 1980s, blood operators around the world implemented a policy that did not allow donations from any man who answered yes to the question: have you had sex with a man even one time since 1977? This policy was implemented prior to the establishment of Canadian Blood Services, is still in effect and is highly controversial. As part of an ongoing policy review, Canadian Blood Services established a consensus conference in 2001 to consult with patient groups, health care professionals, human rights activists and others on the policy. The outcomes of this consensus conference, Optimizing the Donor Selection Process were published in *Vox Saguine* in 2002 and recommended no change to the policy with future re-evaluation as science evolved. In 2007, in keeping with the outcomes of the conference, Canadian Blood Services began a second review of the policy. As part of this review, the Board of Directors commissioned an independent risk assessment, reviewed international policies, and examined surveillance data. In addition, a comprehensive consultation strategy was launched with members of the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered community (GLBT), student groups, human rights activists and others who felt marginalized by this policy. In addition, patient groups, advocates for safety, health care professionals, donors, volunteers and community members were consulted to gather their views and input as well. The outcomes of the consultations, which identified a number of gaps in knowledge, were presented to the board for consideration. After careful review of the stakeholder input, the Board of Directors agreed with the stakeholders that further research was required before a change could be considered to the current deferral policy. In direct response to the input of stakeholders, that research is now underway.

2. Plasma Protein Products Vendor Selection – Recently, Canadian Blood Services determined that an additional vendor for the production of plasma/blood based products was necessary to protect against a potential supply interruption. Patients who use these plasma based products were engaged to participate in the vendor selection. These patients had full input into the entire selection process and could ensure that whatever vendor was chosen, their interests and concerns were addressed prior to finalizing the new contract.

3. Diversity Liaison Committees – Canadian Blood Services has recognized that the demographic of Canada is changing and that there is an immediate need to increase participation in the blood program and the OneMatch Stem Cell Network of people from diverse ethnic backgrounds. In keeping with our commitment to involving stakeholders in the decisions, we have established Diversity Liaison Committees in three major Canadian cities to advise the organization as to how to proceed. These Committees developed their own Terms of Reference and have been empowered to determine the methods and approach for outreach into their communities.

**How Canadian Blood Services Lives the Core Values**

The public should have a say in decisions about actions that could affect their lives: This document has outlined some of the ways Canadian Blood Services involves Canadians in the
decision-making. Early on, the decision to involve Canadians was driven by public scrutiny and mistrust. Since then, public involvement has been driven by a need for effective decision-making. As such, consultation strategies are part of all decisions that could affect the lives of Canadians.

Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision: There are four critical elements to the public promise: 1. Timing – Canadian Blood Services will involve the public at a point when their input can influence the outcome. 2. Honesty – the public will be informed of the level of influence their input will have on the decision. 3. Openness – the public will be provided with all relevant information on the topic. 4. Commitment – Canadian Blood Services will advise the public how their input was used.

Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers. Decision makers at Canadian Blood Services understand that to make good decisions, they must be fully informed of all the needs and interests of the public. All public participation strategies ensure that feedback from all interested parties is gathered and considered, including assenting and dissenting views.

Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision. For major decisions, the Public Relations team develop comprehensive public engagement strategies. Within these strategies all affected stakeholders are identified, analyzed and the level of involvement (per the IAP2 spectrum) is determined. Stakeholders are engaged to identify additional participants and engagement techniques are used to facilitate the involvement of those affected by, or interested in, the decision.

Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate. The National and Regional Liaison Committees regularly determine their own participation levels in various issues. From designing the Terms of Reference for their own committee to determining appropriate representation. In addition, all committee members receive regular updates of upcoming issues at Canadian Blood Services, whereby they are able to identify upcoming issues that they would like to have input on and the level of input they wish to have. Canadian Blood Services ensures that their interests are heard on any topic they bring forward.

Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way. Prior to any consultation or engagement activity, participants are provided with all the information available on the issue, including what is available to the Board of Directors. Additionally, information is often posted on our website to further contribute to openness, transparency and an informed public. Participants are welcome to suggest or request additional information that they deem appropriate. Presentations are provided by subject matter experts to set the stage for discussions and input. The decision makers at Canadian Blood Services believe that transparency is the cornerstone of trust and that the public and stakeholders have a right to be fully informed on issues affecting the blood system.
Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision. Informing participants of the impact of their input is entrenched within each standing committee and every public consultation strategy. Participants are kept informed through e-mail communications and/or follow-up meetings and teleconferences. Further, each year stakeholders are surveyed to determine not only their satisfaction with the engagement process but also their understanding of how their input affected decisions. This measurement allows us to monitor our closing the loop mechanisms and make improvements as necessary. In 2007, 91% of stakeholders rated Canadian Blood Services as effective in ensuring they have the opportunity to provide input into the decision making.

**Evaluating Public Participation**

Canadian Blood Services evaluates public participation in a number of different ways. At the completion of each public participation initiative, participants are asked to complete evaluation forms which are then reviewed by the public participation practitioners, communicated to the decision-makers and shared with the participants. In addition, following each strategy, a de-brief takes place between the decision makers and the P2 practitioners to ensure that the level of involvement and the promise to the public were met. Regular measurement allows us to continue to enhance our public participation initiatives, so in addition to consultation evaluations, regular comprehensive surveys of participants are conducted. These surveys measure the performance of the stakeholder committees against the Terms of Reference which reflect the IAP2 Core Values. Further, the evaluations also measure Canadian Blood Services’ public participation activities against other public participation leaders and other non-profit agencies. Results of all evaluations are communicated to the participants as well as to the Board of Directors and the Executive Management Team. The public is also polled quarterly to determine impact on overall trust measures, which our most recent poll indicates that 7 out of 10 Canadians are more confident in the blood system than they were ten years ago when Canadian Blood Services was launched. All formal measures are tracked on our Balanced Scorecard under the key objective of “Involve Canadians in our decision making and tell them our story” and reported to the public through our stakeholder committees, website and annual report.

From inception, Canadian Blood Services has actively operated in an open and collaborative manner with Canadians. The organization believes that this commitment is essential to ensuring a safe and effective blood system that is trusted by the public that it serves.

**References:**

David Page, Executive Director Canadian Hemophilia Society – dpage@hemophilia.ca
Michael Whelan, Canadian Immunodeficiencies Patient Organization - miwhelan@telus.net
Title: Toi te Taiaro: the Bioethics Council  
*Special Recognition 2008*

| Organizing Group | Toi te Taiaro: the Bioethics Council  
New Zealand |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Ensuring that emerging policies about pre-birth genetic testing reflect the views and values of all New Zealanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question/Problem</td>
<td>Eighteen face-to-face deliberative events around the country; online deliberation hosted by the <em>dialoguecircles.com</em> platform; public issue framing using the “Who Gets Born? Pre-Birth Testing Choicebook”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Because the dialogue moved beyond polarized positions, policy makers say they had a “much richer understanding of where people are on these difficult issues, and what people would be prepared to do or not”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Informed the Bioethics Council’s decision; has been cited internationally as a best practice in engaging the public on complex issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Nationwide participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **The Challenge for the Bioethics Council and the Role of Public Participation**

**Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council** (the Council) was established after New Zealand’s Royal Commission of Inquiry on Genetic Modification. Its purpose is to consider the cultural, ethical and spiritual issues raised by biotechnology. In this role, the Council provides information, promotes and participates in public dialogue, and gives advice to Government.

The Council was scheduled to report to the New Zealand Government in May 2008 on the issue of pre-birth testing. Because pre-birth testing is an issue which touches the lives of so many men, women and children, the Council opted for a very public and participatory approach to framing the issue and developing its recommendations. **The end goal was to ensure that the views and values of New Zealanders were reflected in the recommendations that the Council will make to government – while ensuring that these recommendations were just, reasonable and practical.**

1.1 **About the Issue**

During pregnancy, a woman and/or her unborn baby may undergo tests for various reasons. The term ‘pre-birth testing’ applies both to relatively common antenatal procedures, such as ultrasound examinations, and also to more specialised tests, such as those used to detect rare genetic conditions or illnesses. Another kind of pre-birth testing is preimplantation genetic diagnosis (PGD), where cells from embryos created outside a woman’s body through in-vitro fertilisation (IVF) are tested for certain conditions and illnesses.

Some forms of pre-birth testing are already commonly used in New Zealand. However, certain emerging forms of pre-birth testing, particularly those involving PGD, are not yet permitted there. Others are permitted only with oversight by the government-appointed Ethics Committee on Assisted Reproductive Technology (ECART). New guidelines covering the use of PGD are currently being developed. Meanwhile, the range of conditions and illnesses that can be tested for is expanding all the time. Overseas, the uses of PGD (potential and actual) are broadening as knowledge of genetics develops.

In light of these developments, important questions arise: How far might we go with pre-birth testing? What might the consequences be? Who decides whether to test a foetus, and in what circumstances? Who decides what to do once test results are known, and what choices are acceptable? The Council strongly believed that these very complex questions were not only for the Government, medical and scientific communities to consider, but that they also had significant cultural, ethical and spiritual dimensions that concern all of society. As such, during 2007 and early 2008, Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council talked with New Zealanders to find out what they thought about pre-birth testing.

2. **The Approach: Public Participation Methods**

The Council made a commitment to make its public engagement processes more deliberative and more focused, while enabling open and frank dialogue and deliberation on the issues – and yielding usable and informed citizen input. The decision to adopt a participatory deliberative approach for this initiative was a strategic one, motivated by a number of key objectives:

1. To increase the public's general awareness of issues related to pre-birth testing, primarily through the media and Council communications initiatives;
2. To raise awareness and understanding among participants of pre-birth testing issues and of possible policy approaches to this question;
3. To obtain informed and useable input that would help shape the Council’s recommendations to Government on pre-birth testing;
4. To develop the Council's internal capacity and skills in the areas of public deliberation, both online and in-person;
5. To increase the perceived value of deliberative approaches, both within the Council and by third parties (e.g., Government, policy and decision makers, the general public, the media);
6. To establish the foundation for an ongoing dialogue between and amongst the Council and interested individuals on the issue of pre-birth testing and other bioethics issues.

2.1 **Design, Delivery and Evaluation**

*Design: Framing the Issues*

A comprehensive information gathering exercise was undertaken to inform the Council's thinking and contribute to the understanding of the issues. This included a literature review, expert briefings, and interviews with thought leaders and subject matter experts in various fields related to pre-birth testing. The result was a brochure outlining pre-birth testing's important scientific, cultural, ethical and spiritual aspects.
Fifty-six participants — each of whom had interviewed at least five other people beforehand — attended what were referred to as ‘framing days’. Six sessions were held around the country during July and August 2007. The goal of the issue-framing exercise was to bring ordinary members of the public together so they could create a document that expressed the basic concerns behind the way they viewed the issues.

From the issue framing sessions, four distinct approaches emerged that reflected different and competing ways of dealing with pre-birth testing. These approaches — and the issues associated with them — were presented in a document referred to as the Choicebook.

The ‘Who Gets Born? Pre-Birth Testing Choicebook’ was completed by participants before the face-to-face and online deliberative dialogue events and served as a focal point for the conversations. In addition to the four distinct approaches, the Choicebook also contained background information on the scientific, ethical and social aspects of pre-birth testing, targeted at laypeople.

To the left is a screen capture that illustrates one of the four perspectives presented in the online Choicebook.

**Delivery: The Deliberative Events**

The Council delivered a mix of in person and online public participation events. The goal was to encourage large-scale participation that included citizens and stakeholders by providing multiple opportunities to participate.

The Council recruited people for a series of face-to-face deliberative events around the country, identifying potential participants with help from NGOs, organizations and community groups with an interest in pre-birth testing and also using the Council’s own databases. In some areas, participants self-selected by responding to newspaper advertisements. Eighteen events were held, including four hui and a Pacific fono (events specifically designed for New Zealand’s Māori population), with 256 people attending. Each event lasted three hours and was guided by an independent facilitator; Council members also attended. Participants worked their way through the Choicebook, discussing the advantages, disadvantages and consequences of each approach. They were encouraged to examine positions different from their own views, and to identify any common ground for policy recommendations. Sometimes, groups found it easy to make explicit recommendations; at other times, this was more difficult and discussion focused mainly on people’s responses to issues posed by the different approaches to pre-birth testing.

From November 2007 to February 2008, those who could not attend the face-to-face events had the option of taking part in an online deliberation — moderated online conversations that aimed to further explore the issues and approaches presented in the Choicebook in a similar way to the face-to-face deliberative events. The goal was to broaden the reach of the deliberative process, enabling new voices to be heard in new ways.

Before they deliberated online, people were asked to complete an electronic version of the Choicebook; 406 began doing this and 281 completed all the questions. Participants also contributed more than 60 personal stories and ideas about pre-birth testing, and a further 58 people took part in three online deliberation groups. Those who participated in the online processes were recruited by several methods, including high-profile online advertisements on New Zealand’s popular TradeMe website (see “click-through” web ad at left).

The online deliberation was hosted using the dialoguecircles.com™ platform, an internet-based toolkit developed by Ascentum Inc., custom-built for online deliberation.

To the left is a “click-through” web ad posted on New Zealand’s popular TradeMe website, to drive traffic to the online deliberation website.

**Evaluation: Examining the Results**

The pre-birth testing project showed that the nature of engagement generated through deliberative methods is different from that created by more traditional forms of public participation. Clearly, deliberation has an important part to play in a continuum of possible participatory techniques. Some of the key results and lessons learned from this experience, as documented through an independent third-party evaluation process, include:
Participants rated the planning and principles underpinning the deliberative events highly, and were very positive about representation at the events, their lack of bias, clear purpose and resourcing. They said the events provided the chance for open and free discussion, and allowed them to meet interesting and diverse people. However, some expressed frustrations about time constraints, the structure or facilitation of events, and a lack of diversity in some groups.

Participants were clearly enthusiastic to be involved. As well as being keenly interested in the topic of deliberation, pre-birth testing, they had also become interested in the deliberative process itself. Some compared it favourably with other public consultation processes they had been involved in, and said deliberation was a better way to get the public involved in decision-making about important issues.

The evaluators noted that the capacity of the public to participate in such events also needed to be developed. This could likely be achieved with more opportunities to tackle public issues through deliberation, and with tangible evidence that the effort is worthwhile.

Recruiting participants for deliberative events is challenging. For example, recruiting Māori and Pacific participants, and people from new migrant communities, was a particular challenge. Community groups were extremely helpful in recruiting participants, but with this approach comes the challenge of achieving sufficiently diverse representation.

The online deliberation forums attracted participants who had not previously been involved with the Bioethics Council. Placing online advertisements generated considerable interest. Participation in online deliberation is most available to people who have access to computers and familiarity with accessing information online.

Many participants in the face-to-face events felt the time allowed was too brief, especially for exploring the trade-offs inherent in various approaches. This was in contrast to the online forums where, over several weeks, participants’ positions and attitudes visibly moved. However, even online participants felt frustrated by time constraints.

Participants and those running deliberative events need good information, both about the topic under discussion (material presented in everyday language that is still technically accurate) and about the deliberative process itself. Facilitators need to have a good understanding of the principles of deliberation, and must be able to adapt and use them in a range of situations.

3. What Made This Project Special

Over the course of a year, Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council engaged New Zealanders through a process of intensive deliberation, encouraging people to move beyond individual preferences to consider the needs of the whole community. More than 700 joined in – both in person and online. This was the first time such an approach had been used to inform New Zealand policy makers on public opinion.

While few participants changed their thinking about pre-birth testing, they did acknowledge some shifts in outlook — more compassion for people facing difficult decisions associated with pre-birth testing, more openness to the views of others (although this did not necessarily mean willingness to change their own), and a greater interest in public dialogue in general.

Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council considers that the public deliberative approach used to produce this report could be a model for government agencies interested in involving citizens in the development of public policy and regulation in many different fields. This initiative was a first of its kind for the Council in many ways:

- Members of the public helped develop the public deliberation framework by participating in a public issue framing exercise (56 citizens contributed to identifying the issues and approaches that were outlined in the ‘Who Gets Born? Pre-Birth Testing Choicebook’);

- A series of 18 ‘in-person’ public deliberative dialogue events were organized to gather input from New Zealanders on the approaches under consideration (including in-person events specifically for Māori: an issue framing event and four deliberative dialogue events);

- A parallel online deliberation process was created to create further opportunities for public deliberation.

- Combining online and in-person events greatly expanded the reach of the public deliberation process, allowing new voices to be heard in new ways. It created an opportunity for the public to deliberate and offer its informed views on what is a complex and sensitive issue in a way that proved positive, productive and avoided the pitfalls of polarization.

Pre-birth testing is a complex issue, fraught with an explosive mix of science, values and emotions. Presenting this issue in a way that was both accessible to the average citizen, yet didn’t over-simplify and polarize it, was necessary – but challenging. Considerable time and effort was therefore invested in framing the issues, with great care being taken to ensure accessible language and the provision of balanced information and perspectives. The inclusion of multiple perspectives was also a means to make the consultation materials more inclusive — an effort to ensure that everyone could see a little bit of themselves in at least one of the approaches under consideration.
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4. Project Results and the Role of Public Participation

This was the first time Toi te Taiao: the Bioethics Council had used deliberation to engage the public. People came together face-to-face or online to identify the issues raised by pre-birth testing, to reflect deeply, to explore their own and others’ thinking, and to develop common ground that could form the basis of future policy. The deliberations provided valuable input into the development of recommendations to Government in key areas:

- The challenges of decision-making about pre-birth testing;
- The need for equitable access to testing for all New Zealanders;
- The need for high-quality, appropriate and diverse information about pre-birth testing for parents and the wider community;
- The need for people with disabling conditions (including those detected through pre-birth testing), and their families, to be supported; and
- The need for an administrative and legislative framework that can respond to new and challenging developments in PGD in ways that balance individual freedoms with wider cultural, ethical, spiritual and social concerns.

The Council plays an advisory role to government and as such, does not have binding authority. However, as it embarked on this journey, the Council actively – and successfully – sought assurance from the Government that it would provide formal response to its report and recommendations. Following the launch of the Council’s final report on June 18 2008, the Honourable Nanaia Mahuta, Minister for the Environment (and minister responsible for the Council), stated the following in her media release:

> It is often difficult for people to move beyond their personal views and beliefs. As a result, dialogue may end up polarised and adversarial. Many New Zealanders gave up their time to engage with others on the issue of pre-birth testing. I’d like to publically acknowledge those of you in this room and beyond who took part [...]. The [Council’s] report shows that there are ways to work through these sorts of issues constructively, ways which offer policy and decision makers a much richer understanding of where people are on these difficult issues, and of what people would be prepared to do, or not. This allows the public to make a genuine contribution to more robust and sustainable decision making. I certainly applaud the work of the Council and intend to initiate a process whereby report findings can contribute to policy work in this area, and better inform the Government’s decision making process. To that end, I look forward to the ad-hoc ministerial group meeting to consider the report findings and the framing of a Government response.

5. Attitudes and Actions that Reflect IAP2 Core Values

5.1 A Right to be Involved in the Decision-Making Process

The Council demonstrated its strong belief that not only do ordinary citizens have the right to express their views about developments that affect them, but that they can also offer insights and knowledge that complement and enlarge the knowledge of experts. In this regard, the Council was motivated by the conviction that science and technology are not just specialist and technical forms of knowledge — they have social, cultural and spiritual dimensions as well, which need to be reflected in policy decisions. For all these reasons, public deliberation was identified as an effective way for decision-makers, experts and the public to approach especially challenging problems, including those linked to biotechnology. Deliberative forms of engagement require people to learn about the issues, explore and compare a range of viewpoints or approaches, and find courses of action that work in the best interest of many different people.

5.2 Public’s Contribution Will Influence the Decision

The process was open, participatory and transparent, from start to finish. Participants shaped the deliberation framework through issue framing sessions and their contributions made during both the face-to-face and online deliberations informed the Council’s final recommendations. Assured listening was demonstrated through the development of personalized participant reports for online Choicebook respondents (personalized reports that highlighted how each individual’s responses to questions in the online Choicebook linked to the Council’s final recommendations), and proactive distribution of the Council’s final report to other participants and the general public. In addition, the Minister’s commitment to formulating a formal response to the Council’s report and to ensuring that this public input finds its way into the policy making process signal that this report is not destined to remain on a shelf.
5.3 Sustainable Decisions

While the recommendation contained in the Council’s report did generate some criticism by certain stakeholder groups, feedback on the value of the deliberative process itself was generally positive. The issue framing exercise was designed such that the resulting framework reflected participant voices. This is a key to developing sustainable decisions as participants are able to help shape the conversation, making the deliberation open, transparent and respectful of their positions.

5.4 Involvement by Those Affected or Interested

The mix of online and face-to-face deliberations was key to extending the opportunity to participate to a broad range of stakeholders, allowing hundreds of people to participate who may normally not have participated. There were additional sessions customized to include and accommodate unique needs of Māori population (language and culture). An extensive recruitment process was also undertaken to extend the invitation to participate to as many citizens and stakeholders possible. To begin engaging the public and initiate the issue framing process, a mailing list was compiled to identify interested parties. A wide range of government and non-government organizations were also asked to publicize the project and the opportunity to participate at this stage of the project. A brochure was prepared outlining the scope of the topic and details around a day-long ‘framing’ meeting in their town or city. Those receiving invitations were also provided with a questionnaire to gather the views of friends, family and colleagues that could be shared at the issue-framing session.

5.5 Input from Participants in Designing How They Participate

In the first stage of this project, the Council led members of the public in an issue framing exercise. The purpose of the framing was not to ‘solve’ pre-birth testing, but to create a framework for public deliberation. To this end, participants were asked to share their perspectives on and experiences with pre-birth testing. Together, they then developed distinct approaches to pre-birth testing that reflected the underlying values and principles expressed by the group. They also began to identify the benefits, drawbacks, actions for implementation and (unintended) consequences for each approach. The issue framing exercise ‘framed’ the deliberations, both face-to-face and online. The project also included a comprehensive evaluation that will help guide the design of future initiatives by incorporating participant feedback.

5.6 Information Participants Need for Meaningful Participation

In order to ensure access to the information required to enable a meaningful, rich dialogue, participants worked their way through the Choicebook, learning about the advantages, disadvantages and consequences of each approach. The Choicebook was developed based on the work undertaken in the issue framing sessions, expert contribution and a comprehensive literature review. Participants were encouraged to examine positions different from their own views, and to identify any common ground for policy recommendations. The focus – both in-person and online – was on evaluating (and augmenting) the alternatives that had been developed during the participatory issue-framing process. In this regard, citizens were being called upon to validate ideas (checking them against on-the-ground reality) and reconcile ideas (weighing values, making tradeoffs, and prioritizing).

5.7 Communicating How Input Affected the Decision

The Council undertook a number of activities to communicate the results to participants. A personalized participant report was prepared for participants who completed the online Choicebook. It is a powerful way to report back to participants and close the feedback loop. The report contains customized excerpts for individual participants based on their responses to specific questions. The Council also compiled a comprehensive mailing list to which a copy of the final report was sent to. The initiative was also covered by a number of media outlets in New Zealand, including the country’s leading radio programs, newspapers and magazines. Council members were often available to discuss results, including how public participation shaped their final recommendations.

A Final Word...

This was a first for the Council, but the Pre-birth testing project is already cited in New Zealand government circles – and abroad – as a best practice in engaging the public on complex issues, and an example to learn from. For example, members of the Council’s Secretariat who led this project have already been invited to share their experience and lessons learned in high profile public engagement conferences sponsored by the Canadian Conference for Dialogue and Deliberation (C2D2 2007) and the OECD (“Building Citizen Centred Policies and Services” Conference, Slovenia, 2008), among others. Over the course of this project, the Council has built significant in-house capacity and expertise which they will now be able to apply to subsequent initiatives. Their energy, enthusiasm and commitment are infectious and their contribution to pushing the limits of and continuously enriching the public participation process cannot be celebrated enough. In every way, in their attitudes to public participation and in their actions, the Council and its Secretariat staff have embraced and live by IAP2’s core values.
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| Organizing Group       | The Woodlands Community Service Corporation, The Woodlands, Texas |
| Location               | Woodlands, Texas. Population 90,000                            |
| Key Question/Problem   | This was a governance project brought on by the need to protect the Woodlands from annexation by Houston while at the same time addressing the requirements that predicted rapid growth & development would place upon the changing governing structure of the community. |
| Sample Methods         | The process involved 3 phases: 1) exploratory study on issues 2) creation of the Woodlands Governance Steering Committee, 3) action - legislators |
| Results                | “In November, 2007, Woodlands voters endorsed the course of action, making the Woodlands the first community of its size and circumstance to determine their own governance future in the State of Texas”. |
| Impact Level           | Clearly, the project would, and did, have a significant impact on the entire community. |
| Time Frame             | The project was initiated in 2003 and the new governance structure was approved by 86% of residents in November 2007. |
| People Engaged         | Multiple opportunities were provided to residents to get involved in Phases 1 & 2. Ultimately, the entire community voted for the final draft of the new governance structure |
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Background: The Challenge

Began in 1974 by businessman George Mitchell, The Woodlands is a master-planned community of today, nearly 90,000 residents (at the time of Phase II of the project, 85,000 residents.) The Woodlands has approximately 26,000 jobs, making it a strong employment area. The great majority of the 27,000 acres of land included within The Woodlands lies in the unincorporated areas of Montgomery County, with approximately 3,000 acres extending south of Spring Creek into unincorporated Harris County. Approximately 160 acres of The Woodlands are located in the corporate limits of the City of Shenandoah, and some 375 acres are located in the City of Conroe.

As Mr. Mitchell was considering a plan for The Woodlands in the 1960’s, many major United States (U.S.) cities were experiencing an out migration of people from declining inner city to thriving suburbs. City dwellers escaped into small, incorporated towns that encircled many larger cities, leaving the core city unable to grow and vulnerable to future decline. Mitchell traveled extensively and witnessed the plight of some U.S. cities. He held the view that the Houston region would be stronger if the central city retained the ability to grow its tax base. A stronger city, in his view, would produce stronger suburban growth. He wanted The Woodlands to be a part of Houston’s solution, not a part of its problems. Therefore, by agreement with Houston, all of his landholdings that would become The Woodlands (and not already within another city’s extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ)) were included in Houston’s ETJ. An ETJ, as will be explained later, is the area adjacent to the corporate limits of the city and may be unilaterally annexed.

Having essentially all of The Woodlands within the ETJ of a single city effectively prevented fragmentation of the planned community and its services through partial annexations initiated by other nearby cities of through multiple, separate incorporations that could have taken place on a piecemeal basis. Having included most of his landholdings for The Woodlands into Houston’s ETJ, Mitchell and his development team, utilizing consultants experienced in community governance, set about the task of establishing a fragmented service delivery system.

Annexation and The Woodlands? In Texas, larger cities have strong powers of annexation. Within their extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ), that is, the area adjacent to the corporate limits of the city, these cities have limited authority to regulate land development, but have exclusive authority to annex land into their corporate limits. A new city may not be incorporated within the ETJ of an existing city without the city’s consent. At the city’s sole discretion, and after following required notice and hearing procedures, it can annex territory within its ETJ. Approximately 95% of The Woodlands is included in Houston’s ETJ, with the balance being in the city limits of ETJ of the Cities of Shenandoah or Conroe.

Why do cities annex? There are three principal reasons cities want to annex land. First, annexing land—especially commercial land—captures sales tax and property tax revenues for the city. Second, a city may seek out natural resources, such as surface water sources, which it may need. Finally, cities sometimes annex for political or socioeconomic reasons, depending on their current circumstances.

Why was it important for The Woodlands to study governance now? Four principal reasons led The Woodlands to facilitate the Governance process:

1. The role of the community developer, The Woodlands Development Company, would change in a significant way as development nears conclusion within the next 10 years. The Woodlands Development Company had played a major role in organizing and coordinating the delivery of public services in the community since the beginning, but this involvement would eventually diminish, and a new approach be established to fill this void.
2. Under current Texas law, a city operating under a home-rule charter, such as Houston or Conroe, has the power to annex portions of The Woodlands without the consent of the voters or property owners of The Woodlands. While an existing annexation moratorium agreement prohibited Houston from currently talking this action, it would expire in 2011. According to Texas law, annexation could occur beginning in 2014.
3. Significant growth and development was occurring around The Woodlands which impacted the community. In order to participate in and influence regional planning and policy, The Woodlands needed a clearly defined governmental structure and presence.
4. The sheer size and population of The Woodlands (which at build-out is estimated to be 125,000) would necessitate changes in local governmental structure.

For these reasons, it seemed appropriate to consider how the community could best govern itself in the future and reach a long-term, working relationship with Houston, as well as Conroe, since many of the possible governance options would take several years to implement.

What was the hurry? While 2011 seemed like a long way off, it was anticipated that a new governance structure could take many months if not years to be put in place and become operational. In addition, it was anticipated that any new structure would require some type of action by the Texas Legislature. In Texas, the Legislature only meets every other year. Only the sessions in 2007 and 2009 would occur before the first potential annexation proceedings.

IAP2 Core Values and The Woodlands Governance Process

The three-phased Governance project exemplified the Core Values of IAP2. The following briefly describes how each of the Core Values were met over the course of the nearly decade-long project, though this application read in its entirety better reflects the importance these Core Values played throughout the process.
1. The public should have a say in decisions about actions that could affect their lives. While Mr. Mitchell originally wanted The Woodlands to be annexed by the City of Houston, it had become apparent that the nearly 85,000 residents living in The Woodlands did not share this same desire. Texas law, however, did not provide a way for Woodlands residents to have a say in their own governance; Texas law gives existing cities, like Houston, the unilateral legislative authority to annex a community without their consent. This legislative reality meant that The Woodlands would have to do something different in order to “have a say” in an action that would affect their lives.

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision. While it was clear by the mid- to late-1990’s that Woodlands residents were less enthusiastic about being annexed by Houston, it wasn’t clear exactly why they didn’t want to be annexed, nor how Woodlands residents wanted to be governed. The three-phased project set forth not just to determine what was possible for Woodlands residents, but what those residents wanted. The final phase would implement the desires of Woodlands residents, and in this particular case, ended with a vote by the entire community.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers. The public (residents of The Woodlands), stakeholders (community organizations and agencies), and legislators (most notably the state representative and senator for The Woodlands) were key throughout the process. Phases I and II of the project concentrated on engaging the public as to what they wanted their governance future to be, while Phase III delivered that message to The Woodlands legislators who implemented it.

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision. Public education and involvement was paramount, especially in Phase II of this project. All residents of The Woodlands were encouraged to engage in the various public involvement activities, with specific invitations to participate delivered to each household several times throughout the process. The process also sought feedback from non-traditional populations—Phase II of the Governance project specifically solicited the input of youth; knowing that these same participants would ultimately be disenfranchised by a vote at the end of the process, it was important that the future residents of The Woodlands had a venue where they, too, could contribute to the decision.

5. Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate. While a public involvement plan was developed, it was the public themselves who helped to craft the nuance of the process. Whether it was feedback on what was useful information to provide on a web site, or when best to hold committee meetings or public events, the process knew it was important to ask the public they were serving for this guidance.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way. As stated, education was a principal task in the process. While it was important to steward an ongoing education process in the community, it was critical to ensure that participants in public involvement activities had the information they needed to participate in a meaningful way. Focus groups were used to examine and polish all information produced, and event information packets were developed and mailed in advance of public involvement activities so that participants could review the material and attend the event, contributing to the process in the most meaningful way. The most unique demonstration of this Value was the position taken by the organization leading the decade-long governance effort in Phase III: while the Community Associations supported the ongoing governance efforts for The Woodlands, specifically sponsoring all three phases of the governance project, they did not take a position on the November ballot issues themselves, and instead, carried out an educational program in which every Woodlands voter would adequately be prepared with information when he or she entered the voting booth.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision. In the transparent Governance process, it was important to ensure the public understood the role of their input, as well as how, before/during/after each stage, their input affected the decision. No more pivotal was this Value when the residents of The Woodlands saw the results of their input in Phases I and II placed on the November 2007 election ballot, (aka Phase III); residents validated the initiatives by an overwhelming margin.

**The Process**

**Phase I**—In 1999, a group of community leaders initiated a local governance dialogue which ultimately led to an annexation moratorium agreement with the City of Houston. The City of Houston and the Municipal Utility Districts (MUD’s) are parties to the agreement, with The Woodlands Development Company and the Community Associations of The Woodlands being third party beneficiaries. Subsequently, in April of 2003, the Phase I Governance Process was initiated that prepared an action plan and range of governance alternatives to explore with the public and stakeholders.

**Overview**

Phase I of the Governance Process was in essence an exercise of “planning to plan.” It explored issues facing the community, identified key stakeholders, provided public involvement options, and explored the universe of governance alternatives that should be researched. The objectives for Phase I was to:

- Communicate the importance of everyone coming into the discussions with an open mind about governance options.
- Determine the best governance options for the community to discuss and debate.
- Develop a timetable of potential solutions and the pros/cons of each of the governance options.
- Ensure that all stakeholder interests are heard and protected through the community dialogue regarding governance.
- Design a comprehensive educational process about governance so that the residents and stakeholders are able to make an informed decision.
- Define a process for comprehensive involvement by the community to include residents, landowners, businesses, and other stakeholders.
- Create a planning process that includes an educational and involvement component for the next working group to utilize during Phase II.
Develop a mechanism to receive feedback that is gained in a “fair” way (i.e., questions need to be asked properly and not in a way to produce predetermined results) and a system to track the process (i.e., input an decisions made).

Ensure that enough information is collected so a decision can be made about governance through a public input process.

Conclusion
The rest of Phase I was an Action Plan that identified eleven governance alternatives and outlined a structure and methodology (Phase II) to identify the preferred, viable governance alternative(s) through a comprehensive public and stakeholder involvement process in concert with study and research.

Phase II—In April 2004, a Phase II committee of stakeholders called the Governance Steering Committee (GSC) was organized. The GSC was an ad hoc committee comprised of elected and appointed individuals from eleven community stakeholder groups including The Woodlands Community Association, The Woodlands Association, The Woodlands Commercial Owners Association, The Woodlands Community Service Corporation, Joint Powers Agency/Municipal Utility Districts, Town Center Improvement District, Economic Development Partnership, Village Associations, Chamber, and The Woodlands Development Company as well as representation from at-large residents. Each stakeholder had two representatives with one alternative. Many of the GSC members had held leadership positions in The Woodlands for many years and had an intimate knowledge of how the community worked, as well as knowledge of the regional political situation. The GSC had no political or legal authority. It could not call for an election and had no ability to change the governance structure.

The GSC’s basic responsibilities were to gather information, present it to the citizens, receive feedback, and based on their knowledge of the community and the data and input collected, recommend a logical and thoughtful course of action to the community.

Mission Utilizing a public and stakeholder education and feedback process, the community’s preferred viable governance option(s) for The Woodlands will be determined and an action plan for implementation developed.

Operating Structure The Woodlands Governance Committee (GSC) established the Governance Project Operational Structure Policy for the purpose of guiding the implementation of the Phase II Governance Process.

Three Tiered Governance Process The GSC adopted the three tiered governance process that provided direction to the GSC in their decision making and project management. This process was followed to ensure that a preferred governance option(s) was selected by August 2006. By adopting the three tiered governance process, the GSC created a strong process framework that minimized “backtracking”.

Public and Stakeholder Engagement The following describes the 21 different public involvement events held during Phase II to discuss and evaluate the governance alternatives. Over the 14 month process of Phase II, the GSC and community moved from 11 initial governance options to two preferred alternatives. The IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum is also identified.

Focus Groups on Community Values [Consult]—seven focus groups held to understand the community’s values, priorities, issues, and concerns related to local governance.

Public Workshops on Evaluation Criteria [Involve]—four workshops held to provide the public an opportunity to learn more about the Governance process and the GSC’s accomplishments, review and provide input on the identified governance alternatives, and review and comment on the Core Governance Values as identified by the committee.

Governance Forum 1 [Collaborative]—a large interactive event where the public utilized evaluation criteria to further discuss and analyze the governance alternatives.

Open Houses on Remaining Two Governance Alternatives [Consult]—three open houses to facilitate educational opportunities for residents to learn about the remaining governance alternatives: incorporation and public service district. The open houses gave residents an opportunity to see preliminary research on these two options.

Focus Groups on GSC Data and Information [Consult]—four focus groups were held to review various work products formulated by the GSC and to help refine the information and presentation for discussion to the public. Youth were specifically included as a stakeholder and reviewer.

Governance Forum 2 [Collaborate]—an interactive event that allowed participants to:
- Review and discuss the legal, political, and financial data assembled by the GSC;
Review governance alternatives’ adherence to the evaluation criteria prioritized by the public in Governance Forum 1; and,
Discuss and provide feedback on the GSC’s preliminary recommendations.

Stakeholder Governance Forum [Collaborate]—like Governance Forum 2, this interactive event allowed representatives from stakeholder agencies and organizations to:
• Review and discuss the legal, political, and financial data assembled by the GSC;
• Review governance alternatives’ adherence to the evaluation criteria prioritized by the public in Governance Forum 1; and,
• Discuss and provide feedback on the GSC’s preliminary recommendations.

Other forms of public involvement:
• Comprehensive project website: www.TheWoodlandsGovernance [Inform]
• Online comment and question submittal [Consult]
• Monthly updates communicated to each household in The Woodlands [Inform]
• Presentations to organizations [Consult]
• Monthly committee meetings [Consult]
• Monthly subcommittee meetings [Consult]

Outcome Based on the feedback from the public involvement process, the public asked the GSC to deliver the following directive to its Texas legislators in the fall of 2006:
• Avoid annexation.
• Take action now.
• Strive to eventually obtain the broadest scope of local control.
• Work with, not against the cities of Houston and Conroe to create a positive working relationship.

Weeks later, the Texas legislative delegation announced a Regional Participation Agreement, which upon successful initiation in the state legislature and vote by the residents of The Woodlands, would relieve The Woodlands from the threat of annexation and allow The Woodlands the opportunity in the future to gain the broadest scope of local control: incorporation. This was done in partnership with the cities of Houston and Conroe.

Phase III—After Phase II completed in late 2006, The Woodlands legislators took action, introducing bills into the Texas House and Senate that initiated an interim governance structure (a public service district), and, at a date in the future, would allow The Woodlands to incorporate and become their own city. It is important to note that this outcome specifically reflects the desires of the public:
• Avoid annexation—the Regional Participation Agreement made with the cities of Houston and Conroe prevented the legal act of annexation of The Woodlands without their consent.
• Take action now—the legislators immediately acted weeks after being delivered the final results of Phase II.
• Strive to eventually obtain the broadest scope of local control—the action legislated and endorsed by Woodlands voters incorporates both preferred governance alternatives identified early in Phase II: initially in a public service district (to be later called The Woodlands Township), and ultimately, the ability to incorporate into a city.
• Work with, not against, the cities of Houston and Conroe to create a positive working relationship—the agreements reached with Houston and Conroe enable them and The Woodlands to be partners in regional development.

Public and Stakeholder Involvement The Woodlands Decides Public Engagement Committee was a working group of The Woodlands Community Association, The Woodlands Association, and The Woodlands Commercial Owners Association to oversee the public engagement and educational program for the November 6, 2007 governance election. The educational effort sponsored by The Woodlands Decides was non-biased; while the Community Associations supported the ongoing governance efforts for The Woodlands, they did not take a position on the November ballot issues themselves, and instead, carried out an educational program in which every Woodlands voter is adequately prepared with information when he or she enters the voting booth. Phase III of the governance project meant implementation. IAP2 inform and empower techniques were utilized.

Inform techniques:
• Comprehensive public education website: www.TheWoodlandsDecides.org
• Voter guide pamphlets produced and delivered to each household in The Woodlands outlining what a “yes” and “no” vote would mean for each ballot initiative.
• DVD voter guide produced and distributed for individuals, outlining the history of Governance and what a “yes” and “no” vote would mean for each ballot initiative; this video was also played on the local cable channel on the half hour in the weeks leading up to the election.
Empower technique:

- Woodlands voters went to the polls November 6, 2007, and voted on the governance ballot initiatives.

In November 2007, Woodlands voters endorsed the course of action, making The Woodlands the first community of its size and circumstance to determine their own governance future in the State of Texas.

What Makes The Woodlands Governance Project Special

The Woodlands Governance project is special not just because of its historic nature, but because of the historic way its citizens employed democracy. As noted earlier, the 85,000 residents of The Woodlands were not provided a democratic route to voice or implement their desires for governance—Texas law allowed existing municipalities the right to unilaterally annex communities without the consent of the community or its residents. A grassroots effort that changed Texas law or provided a different legislative solution was the only option afforded to Woodlands residents.

On November 6, 2007, 86% of voters approved a governance structure developed in response to their feedback provided in Phase I and Phase II of the Governance process. The Houston Chronicle wrote November 7, 2007: “Woodlands residents celebrate ‘David and Goliath’ vote.” The Chronicle went on, proclaiming The Woodlands “now has a new form of governance and the freedom to become a city without the threat of annexation.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Access Transit South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority (TransLink)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>TransLink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>This was an extensive review of transportation accessibility designed in response to feedback from people with disabilities, demographic predictions for rapid growth, and need for a broader analysis of entire system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sample Methods | 1) Internal consultation – staff, management, formation of various working groups and steering committees, reps from 22 metro municipalities  
                   2) external consultation – a broad range of users and user groups were asked to commit to a 3-year process. |
| Results        | A “Vision for Accessible Transportation”, set of Principles for Public Consultation & Community Engagement |
| Impact Level   | Urban city                                                                      |
| Time Frame     | 2005 - 2007                                                                     |
| People Engaged | Externally -100 people committed to the 2 year project                           |
| Web Link       | [www.translink.ca](http://www.translink.ca)                                      |
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ACCESS TRANSIT - PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Overview:

Vancouver, British Columbia (BC), Canada is consistently identified as one of the most livable cities in the world based on safety, education, cleanliness, recreation, political-economic stability and public transportation. The South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority (TransLink) is responsible for providing all public transportation services in the Metro Vancouver area. This includes transit, rail, ferry and major roads and bridges.

In early 2005, TransLink started one of the most extensive reviews of transportation accessibility ever undertaken in North America. The review became known as the Access Transit project. The project was driven by three related factors:

1) Feedback from users with disabilities on the significant inadequacies of the system, such as:
   - Physical barriers within the fleet and facilities;
   - Inadequate wayfinding and signage;
   - Poor navigation and accessibility of the TransLink website, and
   - Inefficiencies within the custom transit (para transit) system, known as HandyDART.

2) Demographic predictions in the Metro Vancouver region forecast a dramatic increase in the number of seniors expected over the next thirty years. This anticipated increase in senior travelers will substantially boost demand for accessible transportation.

3) The need to review the entire transportation system through a broader lens of accessibility and consider all factors affecting the ease of using and understanding the system in the region.

In order to create a plan for fully accessible transit, TransLink consulted with the experts – transit users. This comprehensive consultation process included people with physical, cognitive or other disabilities, agency and community representatives, who all worked together with TransLink staff to identify key issues and develop a framework for making the complete transportation system more accessible. All parties involved had to reach a consensus on a vision and plan for all modes of accessible transportation in the Metro Vancouver region. Through a series of three consultations with a variety of stakeholders, over two years, the vision was created and strategies to reach it were defined.

1. Challenges faced and how each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation.

Internal Challenges: TransLink had to ‘consult’ within itself before it could take the Access Transit project to the public. Staff and management needed to develop a level of trust in a truly open public consultation process. A process that let the public, some who in past had had negative experiences with the system, set the vision,
identify gaps and suggest solutions. In other words, TransLink staff needed to feel comfortable engaging the public in a new, more in-depth consultation process.

The internal consultation process required TransLink departments and divisions to develop an improved understanding of each other’s roles. This was accomplished by forming various internal working groups and steering committees on accessible transportation that had membership from across all business lines.

**External Challenges:** TransLink’s public perception was poor which was evident through protests and the presence of dissatisfied users at TransLink Board meetings (pre 2005). To resolve this distrust and frustration and gain the confidence of the public, TransLink embarked upon a new type of consultation process focused on the input provided by the users of the system.

Over one hundred participants, representing a broad spectrum of disability groups, participated in this consultation process over a two-year period. The planning phase required a commitment from the participants for the entire two years. The three-workshop consultation process involved the development of 1) a vision for accessible transportation, 2) implementation strategies and 3) review of the final implementation plan. The process kept both internal and external participants fully engaged over the two-year period.

Three main challenges were identified by users through the consultations:

**I. Custom Transit:** The vast majority of TransLink’s vehicle fleet was found to be among the most accessible in the world (in fact, 100% of the fleet was declared wheelchair and scooter accessible in June 2008); however, there were some areas flagged for improvement, the most noticeable being the custom transit (HandyDART) operations.

For the past twenty years TransLink’s custom transit service had not changed in spite of growing demand in all areas (foremost was the growth in the seniors population who wanted to maintain a sense of mobility within their community) resulting in many discouraged users. Challenges faced included:

- Capacity of the service not meeting demand.
- Service inconsistencies throughout eight distinct service areas within Metro Vancouver.
- Little integration between HandyDART and the conventional transit system, both at the policy and operational levels.
- Routine medical travel comprised nearly 70% of capacity. There was limited service available for users to engage in social and recreational activities.

**II. Customer Support:** Several features of TransLink’s customer support system were identified as not meeting the needs of the users. TransLink’s website was acknowledged as difficult to access, especially for persons using specialized adaptive software. Customer Service Representatives were seen as having a limited understanding and sensitivity to people with disabilities. And the transit system signage was highlighted as inadequate in terms of visibility and comprehension.
III. Infrastructure: Participants raised concerns over the system’s infrastructure accessibility. This was seen as especially critical on the original rapid transit line (SkyTrain – Expo Line) that was built in the early 1980s with a lack of down escalators at some stations and poorly located elevators at others.

2. Methods used to implement Public Participation, Communications and Consultation included:

TransLink developed a two way consultation plan designed to fully understand the users perspective on the issues as well as provide the participants with an overview of the opportunities and challenges related to creating a fully accessible transportation system. The plan involved both internal (TransLink infrastructure, customer support and municipal participants) and external groups.

TransLink began the process by inviting a small group of external stakeholders to recommend a list of user groups, agencies and/or advocates who should be included in the workshops. Once identified, TransLink invited the individuals or agencies to participate in the development of the Access Transit plan. The plan was shaped through three consultations:

a) “Vision” Workshop (June 15th 2005) - this workshop gathered ideas about what a fully accessible Metro Vancouver transportation system might look like and what kinds of issues needed to be addressed in order to achieve that vision.

b) “Alternatives for the Future” Workshop (November 28th, 2005) - This workshop updated users and stakeholders on the progress achieved since the first workshop. This update was followed by comments and feedback from the group. The group identified whether they felt their concerns and ideas were heard and whether TransLink had successfully identified the groups’ priorities accurately.

c) Review of Draft Access Transit Plan (May 9th, 2007) - TransLink presented the participants with a draft of the Access Transit plan and requested comment from the group.

Over one hundred people participated in the process, representing a spectrum of users, community groups, mobility advocates and agencies working with TransLink staff, subsidiaries and contracted employees.

Internally, various working groups and steering committees were formed. Representatives from the 22 member municipalities within the Metro Vancouver were invited to participate and provide input based on the needs of their particular communities.

All of the participant’s comments were compiled into the final report where comments and concerns were documented verbatim. A unified “Vision for Accessible Transportation”, based on the feedback received, was created as well as strategies to achieve it. The final report was formally presented to, and unanimously endorsed by, the TransLink Board of Directors and provided to those who were involved in the process.
3. Describe what makes this project special. Did public participation significantly improve the decision made? Were innovative participation techniques used? Did it solve a problem that faces the field of public participation? Did it spread the practice of public participation into a new area?

This project was unique because it provided users of the TransLink transportation system, especially those persons with disabilities, the opportunity to define the issues, develop alternatives and recommend solutions. The decision making process was extended beyond the traditional corporate structure to include the public as a valued stakeholder. TransLink offered the public an open and honest process, outlining the organizations parameters (financial impacts, competing interests and priorities) and sharing all information to arrive at fully informed, collaborative solutions.

The success of the Access Transit consultation process took TransLink’s public participation in decision making to a new level. The process has since been used for other major TransLink projects, such as the BC Long Range Bike Plan.

As a result of the Access Transit public consultation process, TransLink created a set of Principles for Public Consultation and Community Engagement to ensure that TransLink properly engages each of its stakeholders. ([http://www.translink.bc.ca/files/board_files/meet_agenda_min/2006/05_24_06/4.4report.pdf](http://www.translink.bc.ca/files/board_files/meet_agenda_min/2006/05_24_06/4.4report.pdf))

4. Describe the project’s effectiveness or results

The final Access Transit Implementation Plan was approved and unanimously endorsed by the TransLink Board of Directors in June 2007. The results of the consultations have proven to be an unqualified success. Some of TransLink’s most vocal opponents have now become great supporters through their involvement in the process and input into the final plan.

A “Vision for Accessible Transportation” was based on user feedback and the overall Access Transit Strategy was created to realize the vision. Implementation of the strategy is currently underway, including:

- The formation of the Access Transit Office in the fall of 2007 to ensure the implementation of the Access Transit Project recommendations.
- The restructuring of the HandyDART service delivery model to improve seamless mobility throughout the region. (An RFP for the service deliver model was issued on April 21st, 2008 and the new model will come into effect in January 2009.)
- Phase 1 of the Access Transit website upgrades were completed in May 2008 with phase 2 scheduled for implementation in the fall of 2008.

Public input continues to be a critical element throughout the implementation process. As a result, the Access Transit Users’ Advisory Committee (UAC) was formed to ensure implementation of the Access Transit Plan and provide ongoing advice on all plans, programs and initiatives that TransLink funds. The UAC is comprised of
nineteen members of the disability community and one non-voting TransLink executive.

5. Describe how the IAP2 core values were met.

Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.

The users of the TransLink transportation system were involved in all aspects of the decision-making process over a two-year period and their participation resulted in a new transportation model where everyone felt a level of ownership of the solutions.

Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.

As mentioned previously, TransLink created a set of Principles for Public Consultation and Community Engagement to ensure that TransLink properly engages each of its stakeholders. (http://www.translink.bc.ca/files/board_files/meet_agenda_min/2006/05_24_06/4.4report.pdf)

Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.

- The decision maker’s needs and interests were communicated through suggested topics of discussion and the presentations in the second consultation.

- Municipal representatives were invited to internal working groups to provide input on behalf of the needs of their communities.

- All information presented at the public consultations and information received through the sessions was shared with the general public through TransLink’s website.

Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

A disability expert from the community was hired to help provide a balanced approach to the process. The consultant was able to identify potential participants to create equal representation for the consultation process. In addition, several other user groups’ whose accessibility was restricted due to limitations of TransLink’s system, such as new immigrants (English as a second language), were selected to participate. As all participants were users of the transportation system they were affected by the results and outcomes of the consultation process.
Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.

The initial targeted group of external stakeholders designed the format for the consultations based upon input provided from potential participants prior to the sessions. Throughout the process, the participant group was periodically requested to share their view of the format and identify any need for change. The group provided ongoing confirmation of the format’s effectiveness.

Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

In the second consultation, TransLink reported back to the participants with a series of presentations that were built upon the original vision workshop. TransLink staff and consultants presented their findings on what concepts would work, what ones would not work and the reasons why, on five separate topics: Training, Signage, Website, Customer Support Systems and Fleet and Facilities.

TransLink transportation experts were onsite to further expand on the presentations and respond to questions, when asked. This expert information provided participants with the necessary knowledge to develop balanced and meaningful comments on the issues under consideration.

Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

At the final consultation, the TransLink team presented the group with a draft of the Access Transit Plan. This was an opportunity for the participants to see how their input shaped the Access Transit Plan.

In addition, a comprehensive communication plan was created and implemented to showcase the work of the Access Transit consultation project. This included a brochure titled “You Spoke, We listen”, outlining areas that were addressed in the consultations; what TransLink learned from the public on each area and the public’s recommendations in overcoming the challenges currently presented.

6. Name two individuals, outside of the organization, who were participants in the project or program and who can serve as references. Please include email addresses for each reference.

Rob Sleath  
Canadian National Institute for the Blind  
puppypower@telus.net

Patrice Pratt  
Chair, Vancity Board of Directors  
patricep@shaw.ca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title Project</strong></th>
<th>BC Hydro Electricity Conservation &amp; Efficiency Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>BC Hydro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>British Columbia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Fostering a conservation culture that leads to customers choosing to make a dramatic and permanent reduction in electricity usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Advisory committee, independent facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>The utility adopted the committee’s proposed Strategic Framework and its recommended codes and standards. While these recommendation led the utility in a different strategic direction than originally intended, they enabled it to take a stronger position in creating a conservation culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Province-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>23-member committee included First Nationals, environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs), academia, independent power producers, trade allies, commercial customers, building owners and managers, trade allies, other utilities, and local, federal, and provincial governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.energyplan.gov.bc.ca">www.energyplan.gov.bc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IAP2 PROJECT OF THE YEAR:

BC HYDRO’S ELECTRICITY CONSERVATION & EFFICIENCY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THE PUBLIC TACKLES A MULTIFACETED CHALLENGE TO HELP BC HYDRO DRIVE ENERGY CONSERVATION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

INTRODUCTION

BC Hydro is the largest electric utility in British Columbia, serving 95 per cent of the province’s 1.7 million customers. Due to population and economic growth, electricity demand is estimated to grow by 25 to 45 per cent over the next 20 years. BC Hydro’s vision is to ensure that the province’s electricity consumption in 20 years is equal to today’s levels of consumption.

BC Hydro’s three strategies to meet the province’s growing electricity demands are to conserve more, build more generation infrastructure and buy more electricity from independent power producers (IPPs). The company believes that the first and best opportunity to meet its demand-supply challenges is through conservation and energy efficiency measures, also known as demand-side management (DSM). More specifically, conservation includes behavioural changes which reduce the consumption of electricity, while efficiency includes using more energy efficient end use technologies such as compact fluorescent lights lights and Energy Star® appliances.

Recognizing that conservation and efficiency are a multifaceted challenge, BC Hydro formed the Electricity Conservation and Efficiency (EC&E) Advisory Committee in September 2006.

DESCRIBE THE CHALLENGE OR PROBLEM FACED AND HOW EACH OF THE PARTIES INVOLVED VIEWED THE ROLE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

The Challenge

BC Hydro’s challenge to stakeholders was: how can BC Hydro develop and foster a conservation culture in British Columbia that leads to customers choosing to make a dramatic and permanent reduction in electricity usage?

The Parties Involved

- Stakeholders

All stakeholders were interested in BC Hydro’s conservation challenge, for a range of reasons, and wanted to influence BC Hydro’s approach. Some stakeholders were interested in conservation for conservation sake, while others believed that conservation would result in lower electricity rates. Each group realized that public participation would be necessary and important to reconciling stakeholder perspectives and meeting BC Hydro’s ambitious conservation goals. It was also recognized that the successful strategies and actions needed to achieve this goal would require the pooling of ideas and expertise from other stakeholders to build a common understanding of the issues and initiatives that would be required to inspire a conservation culture within the British Columbia.

- Government

Through the policy actions of the BC Energy Plan: A Vision for Clean Energy Leadership, the Provincial Government is aiming to promote greater conservation throughout the province to meet growing energy demands. More specifically, the Provincial Government has mandated:

- That British Columbia must become electricity self-sufficient by 2016; and
- That 50 per cent of the province’s incremental electricity demand must be achieved through conservation measures by 2020.

As a result, the Provincial Government supported BC Hydro’s efforts to establish the EC&E Advisory Committee despite the fact that potential outcomes of a public participatory process of this nature were uncertain.

- BC Hydro

As a Crown corporation, BC Hydro shares the Provincial Government’s vision to reduce incremental electricity growth and mitigate environmental and social impacts through creative and responsible approaches. Recognizing that it does not have all the answers, BC Hydro actively sought the participation of stakeholders as it believes that their intellectual capital can help generate new ideas and solutions to meet the challenge.

DESCRIBE THE METHODS USED TO IMPLEMENT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

Method

At the outset challenges included lack of trust between BC Hydro and stakeholders, varying levels of stakeholder knowledge in relation to the highly technical subject matter of Demand Side Management (DSM), the business constraints within which BC Hydro operates, and geographic and financial barriers to stakeholders’ participation.

The public engagement methods that proved to be instrumental in overcoming these challenges included convening an independently facilitated, collaborative, public participation process with a high degree of executive support and a commitment to maintaining flexibility around the process and outcomes.

Advisory Committee

In order to simultaneously foster public participation while dealing with tough technical, lifestyle and behavioural challenges, BC Hydro decided...
that an Advisory Committee model would be the most appropriate engagement technique for the conservation challenge. The Advisory Committee approach allowed BC Hydro to focus feedback from a broad range of stakeholders, as well as their constituencies, and benefit from the collective expertise of this highly informed and determined group over time.

Independent Facilitation
Jointly selected by the EC&E Advisory Committee and BC Hydro, an independent facilitator assisted in building trust between BC Hydro and stakeholders. Independent facilitation encouraged dialogue amongst stakeholders as well as between stakeholders and BC Hydro. By taking a seat at the table, rather than at the head of the table, BC Hydro set the stage for collaboration. As a result, the Committee was empowered to take ownership of its work, believing in its ability to influence how BC Hydro conducts its business in the future.

Senior Executive and Management Sponsorship and Participation
Strong organizational support signalled to the Committee that BC Hydro decision-makers were positioned to take the members’ input and advice seriously. Internally, the EC&E Advisory Committee was sponsored by the Senior Vice President of Customer Care and Conservation. This high level of endorsement was demonstrated externally through BC Hydro representation on the Committee, which included the Senior Vice President of Customer Care and Conservation, the Director of Power Smart, and the Senior Manager of Strategic Planning. These senior BC Hydro staff members participated on the Committee as members focusing on observing and providing insight on BC Hydro programs, plans and activities.

Strong process support was delivered through BC Hydro’s Stakeholder Engagement department. In addition to designing, implementing and directing the EC&E Advisory Committee initiative, the Stakeholder Engagement department provides a coordination function throughout BC Hydro. The high level of cross company coordination enabled the department, and BC Hydro members of the Committee, to direct the feedback received to a number of internal project teams increasing the impact and influence of stakeholders.

Removal of Barriers to Participation
It was recognized at the outset that, in order to facilitate the participation of a diverse group of stakeholders from across the province, financial and geographic barriers related to participation would need to be addressed. BC Hydro’s approach to removing barriers included the following:

- Meeting locations were selected based on general accessibility to all members;
- Meetings were scheduled up to 12 months in advance, to enable members to coordinate around other commitments; and
- Honoraria, travel and childcare expenses were paid to qualifying participants.

Process Governance
With Committee members and BC Hydro on a level playing field, process governance began with the development of a terms of reference document. The collaboratively developed terms of reference defined and provided a foundation for the stakeholders’ participation including the level of engagement, objectives, mandate, decision-making process, committee structure, members’ responsibilities, and public communication of the engagement. The terms of reference laid the groundwork for respectful dialogue despite varying values, perspectives, positions and clarified the commitment expected from all parties. By proactively addressing concerns, the terms of reference created credibility and transparency within the process and assisted in building trust between stakeholders and BC Hydro and among stakeholders themselves.

As the EC&E Advisory Committee increased its understanding of the challenges associated with DSM, the group initiated five Working Groups to expedite the completion of tasks and address technical subject matter in greater detail between Committee meetings [see Figure 1].

These Working Groups meet between regularly scheduled meetings of the EC&E Advisory Committee and develop information and recommendations for consideration by the Committee as a whole.

Process Flexibility
From the beginning, BC Hydro remained open to hearing new ideas to support the success of the EC&E Advisory Committee process and challenge. The Committee has provided feedback through both formal and informal means including:

- Periodic process “check-ins” held during Committee meetings;
- Discussions with the independent facilitator, who acted as a neutral party conduit between Committee members and BC Hydro;
- Ongoing email, personal conversations and telephone calls with BC Hydro; and
- The Committee’s Annual Report.

Ongoing feedback enabled BC Hydro to continuously improve the Advisory Committee process through a series of adjustments in response to the feedback provided.

Process Documentation
Summary notes are produced after each meeting to document the ideas, feedback and concerns raised by stakeholders. These notes continue to provide a written record of the discussion and feedback received to date and assist in the application of that feedback by project teams throughout the company.
The EC&E Advisory Committee has been instrumental in helping BC Hydro begin to develop a strategy that will support the development of a conservation culture throughout British Columbia. To date, there have been five key results produced from the Advisory Committee’s discussion and dialogue: a recommended Strategic Framework for conservation; Codes and Standards recommendations; the 2007 Annual Report; the 2008 Project Concepts and a new model for aligning business strategy with sustainable solutions.

Strategic Framework Recommendation
As part of the initial information-sharing process, BC Hydro presented its seven strategic areas of focus a framework for addressing the conservation challenge. The Advisory Committee believed that if BC Hydro wanted to achieve its conservation goals, then the seven areas of strategic focus were inadequate. The result of ongoing collaborative discussion was a recommendation from the Committee to adopt a new Strategic Framework for conservation that depicted three levels influencing people’s decisions and behaviour: individual, market and society. These levels were applied against six factors that need to be considered in any change strategy: options; information; culture; economics; implementation; and feedback. In addition, the Advisory Committee’s Strategic Framework suggested that, in order to be successful, BC Hydro would need to become an advocate or catalyst to lead change and would need to work with other organizations in partnership to affect the level of change needed.

Codes and Standards Recommendations
The EC&E Advisory Committee’s second recommendation to BC Hydro related to the role the company should play with regards to establishing and supporting codes and standards required to achieve its long-term electricity conservation and efficiency goals. These recommendations encompassed how codes and standards should be applied within the context of the Strategic Framework, and how they would be applied across all sectors in British Columbia, particularly the building sector.

2007 Annual Report
The 2007 Annual Report2 jointly produced by the EC&E Advisory Committee and its facilitator was finalized and distributed to the public on March 27, 2008. This report was a significant milestone in terms of publicly reporting the results of engagement process to date. The report detailed the achievements realized after the Committee’s first year of discussion and dialogue, and included the formal recommendations made to BC Hydro as well as the organization’s response to those recommendations.

2008 Project Concepts
In early 2008 the Advisory Committee generated a suite of project concepts. Building on the new Strategic Framework, the Projects Concepts shift the work of the Committee from higher level discussions of principles to more detailed input into key BC Hydro strategies, specifically, where BC Hydro needs to concentrate its efforts to effectively implement the Strategic Framework; how all parties can take leadership in this regard; and the resources required to facilitate action.

A Special Project
The EC&E Advisory Committee is special for a number of reasons. First, it contributes to addressing the challenges of energy conservation and efficiency as the world faces an energy and climate crisis fuelled by fossil fuel energy consumption. This engagement process acts as a model for other energy utilities and provides them with a road map on how to address issues that have no precedent, no clear solutions, and cannot be solved by a single individual, organization or segment of society.

Secondly, the Advisory Committee builds on the power of networks in three ways:

- Pooling Collective Knowledge and Experience: The Advisory Committee forum has enabled BC Hydro to combine internal expertise and experience with the varied and diverse intellectual capital of external stakeholders. Bringing together stakeholders with significantly different backgrounds and experiences has generated incremental value, knowledge, ideas and solutions that would not be generated through one-on-one conversations with stakeholders individually. This pooling of collective knowledge is providing a great deal of valuable cross-sector information on how to inspire a conservation-oriented society in the province of British Columbia.

- Information Exchange: EC&E Advisory Committee members are able to convey information to, and present information and feedback from, their constituencies and other organizations, opening up valuable channels of communication. Information-sharing between stakeholders has led to partnerships being formed outside of the Advisory Committee which deal with important environmental matters both related and unrelated to energy conservation (see Figure 2).

- Creating Synergies: The Committee is generating synergies with other institutions with important roles to play in supporting the development of solutions such as the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources and the Building Owners and Managers

2 To view the complete 2007 Annual Report of the EC&E Advisory Committee, visit bchydro.com/rx_files/info/info55746.pdf
Association. These organizations have taken the lead in promoting elements of the conservation challenge that are best led through their organizations.

Thirdly, BC Hydro adopted a “One Hydro” approach by coordinating efforts within the company to avoid duplicating efforts and to reduce conflicts. Internally this was achieved through the creation of ongoing subject matter based forums rather than project specific forums. For example feedback from the Rates Working Group has informed several internal projects related to rates. Externally synergies were sought with other organizations such as the Climate Action Team and the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources to avoid unnecessary overlap, making the process more efficient for all parties involved.

Lastly, what makes this project special is that the EC&E Advisory Committee was not an innovative method or new stakeholder engagement tactic. BC Hydro simply sought to create a fair, transparent, inclusive and responsive engagement forum and placed responsibility with the Advisory Committee on how this process should unfold. By placing the Committee on equal ground and embracing a participatory role, BC Hydro has benefitted from a number of extremely valuable recommendations and new strategies that will not only help the organization achieve its vision of conservation but will support defining sustainability at a societal level.

DESCRIBE HOW THE IAP2 CORE VALUES WERE MET.

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.

In addition to believing that those who are affected by a decision have the right to be involved in the decision-making process BC Hydro has demonstrated the belief that stakeholders provide a source of intellectual capital and perspective that can lead to socially responsible, technically feasible and environmentally sustainable solutions that no single party could generate alone.

2. Public participation sought and facilitated the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

BC Hydro demonstrated this core value by seeking diverse representation, and actively facilitating the involvement of those potentially affected by, or interested in, decisions and operations relating to electricity conservation and efficiency. Specific actions included:

- Invitations to participate in helping shape a conservation culture throughout the province were sent to impacted and/or affected organizations and individuals by BC Hydro President and Chief Executive Officer Bob Elton;
- The Committee was formed with 23 members, representing a diverse range of gender, age, geographical regions, technical and/or academic experience, customer classes and perspectives including First Nations, environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs), academia, independent power producers, industrial, residential and commercial customers, building owners and managers, trade allies, other utilities and local, federal and provincial governments;
- Barriers to participation were proactively identified and addressed through participant resourcing;
- Representation from traditionally under-represented groups, including youth and residential customers was actively sought; and
- Broad participation was also facilitated through Working Groups, which included additional members who do not reside on the EC&E Advisory Committee, further widening the range of stakeholder perspectives at the table.

3. Public participation sought input from participants in designing how they participate.

BC Hydro believes that effective engagement must add value to both stakeholders and the company. Advisory Committee members have provided ongoing feedback that has facilitated the design of the advisory committee process; the evolution of the Committee’s mandate; and the level of engagement offered. For example, initially the mandate of the Committee was to provide advice and input to BC Hydro with respect to DSM programs that could assist in achieving BC Hydro’s conservation and efficiency goals. As discussions progressed, it became increasingly obvious to the EC&E Advisory Committee that it was important to consider the broad role that BC Hydro could and should play in relation to energy conservation. This increased the level of awareness of the challenge at hand, resulted in broadening the initial mandate of the Advisory Committee to not only improve upon BC Hydro’s existing individual and market-oriented conservation programs, but to initiate change at the societal level as well. This significant shift in the Committee’s mandate was deliberated and decided upon through ongoing dialogue among members.

4. Public participation provided participants with the information they needed to participate in a meaningful way.

As requested by the stakeholders, significant time at the outset was devoted to building a common knowledge base amongst Committee members in a number of areas to ensure that all future discussions and dialogue were informed. The common knowledge base included: the core business of BC Hydro, including long-term strategies and short-term deliverables; alignment with the 2007 BC Energy Plan; the business and regulatory context of BC Hydro as a Crown Corporation operating under the authority of the British Columbia Utilities Commission; and the wide
range of perspectives and experience each of the Committee members brought to the discussions. Advisory Committee members were invited on an ongoing basis to identify their information needs to BC Hydro and, where possible, BC Hydro responded with background reading material and, in some cases, presentations at subsequent meetings. Supplemented information was sent one week in advance of the meetings to ensure time for learning and preparation, which enabled Committee members to participate in an informed and meaningful way during meetings.

5. **Public participation promoted sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision-makers.**

Recognizing that First Nations and stakeholders could provide valuable feedback to assist in meeting the conservation challenge, BC Hydro communicated its needs and interests to the public through an invitation to participate in the Advisory Committee process. BC Hydro demonstrated its openness to new ideas through framing the conservation challenge as an inquiry: How can BC hydro develop and foster a conservation culture in BC that leads to customers choosing to make a dramatic and permanent reduction in electricity consumption?

This approach confirmed that the company was open to hearing all potential solutions and set the stage for inclusive dialogue that could accommodate a broad range of stakeholder needs and interests.

First Nations and stakeholder needs and interests were recognized and communicated through ongoing dialogue, meeting documentation, Terms of Reference, participant funding and the informal and formal recommendations provided to BC Hydro and the utility’s commitment to provide a response detailing how it will incorporate those recommendations into its conservation strategy.

A combination of the broad First Nations and stakeholder input to the EC&E process, the environmental nature of conservation and efficiency, the resultant economic benefits to BC Hydro and its customers, and the adoption of a long term iterative approach to solving this problem have resulted in the generation of sustainable recommendations for the company and the jurisdictions within which it operates.

6. **The public’s contribution influenced the decision.**

To date the public’s influence has had a significant impact on BC Hydro’s DSM strategy. Bob Elton responded to the Committee’s recommendations directly, confirming the utility’s adoption of the Committee’s proposed Strategic Framework, and its recommendations with regards to codes and standards. While these recommendations led the utility in a different strategic direction than originally intended, they enabled the organization to take a stronger position in effectively meeting its vision of a conservation culture (see Appendix 1 for official response from Bob Elton). Other organizations, such as the BC Chamber of Commerce, are now recognizing BC Hydro’s leadership in the areas of conservation and efficiency and have chosen to follow its example by adopting the Strategic Framework themselves.

In addition to formal recommendations, the Advisory Committee has generated numerous suggestions and ideas through dialogue at the Working Group level and at the Committee level. BC Hydro’s participatory role enabled both formal and informal input and advice to be heard at a very senior level within the organization. The result is that the EC&E Advisory Committee’s feedback is reflected in the newly released BC Hydro Residential Inclining Block Application and Long-Term Acquisition Plan. These plans provide additional evidence that public participation had a direct effect on the corporate strategy of BC Hydro.

7. **Public participation communicated to participants how their input affected the decision.**

Bob Elton issued a formal letter to the EC&E Advisory Committee outlining the organization’s response to the Committee’s recommendations in relation to the Strategic Framework and Codes and Standards. The response confirmed BC Hydro’s agreement with all but one of the Committee’s recommendations and provided feedback on how BC Hydro was, or had planned on acting on each recommendation. Where the Committee’s recommendation was not accepted a rationale was given as to why not. Bob Elton’s response provides unmistakable evidence of how the public’s input has affected BC Hydro’s business strategy.

**CONCLUSION**

BC Hydro’s EC&E Advisory Committee demonstrates the level of stakeholder engagement required to address the tough technical, environmental, social and economic challenges that no single individual, organization or segment of society can solve alone.

By aligning its business strategy with conservation and efficiency at the individual, market, and societal level, BC Hydro has demonstrated leadership in public participation, providing a straightforward example for other utilities and institutions who must engage their own stakeholders over complex, multidisciplinary and multi-institutional challenges.

**NAME TWO INDIVIDUALS, OUTSIDE OF THE ORGANIZATION, WHO WERE PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROJECT OR PROGRAM AND WHO CAN SERVE AS REFERENCES**. PLEASE INCLUDE EMAIL ADDRESSES FOR EACH REFERENCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Robinson</th>
<th>Dan Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Institute of Resources, Environment and Sustainability</td>
<td>Chief Negotiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>Hamatla Treaty Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:johnr@ires.ubc.ca">johnr@ires.ubc.ca</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dansmith@island.net">dansmith@island.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 See Appendix 2 for testimonials from EC&E Advisory Committee members.
Dear EC&E Advisory Committee,

Re: BC Hydro Response To 2007 Recommendations From Electricity Conservation And Efficiency (Ec&E) Advisory Committee:

Thank you for your work over the past year in helping BC Hydro achieve our ambitious conservation and efficiency targets. The Committee’s work and recommendations are of great value to BC Hydro.

As you know, the Provincial Energy Plan target set a goal for BC Hydro to acquire 50 percent our incremental electricity resource needs through conservation by 2020. One of our long-term goals is to develop and foster a culture of conservation in British Columbia that will motivate our customers to make a dramatic and permanent reduction in electricity intensity. The long term goal has always been to decrease electricity intensity such that consumption in 20 years is equal to today’s levels. Demand Side Management is the best opportunity we have to achieve our conservation goal and, in turn, provide energy for generations. However, we recognize that BC Hydro doesn’t have all the solutions and we need to work with First Nations, Stakeholders and committees such as yours to achieve our goals.

The Committee’s recommendations have been deliberated at great length across BC Hydro and I am pleased to provide our response and course of action. For the Committee’s reference, a copy of these recommendations is attached.

Responses to Strategic Recommendations

Strategic Framework – BC Hydro has adopted the recommended strategic framework. We believe that the strategic framework that you have created is better aligned with meeting BC Hydro’s vision than our original seven areas of strategic focus. The Strategic Framework has already improved the execution of our vision by contributing to the creation of a new context for identifying, discussing, and assessing diverse issues and ideas in relation to energy conservation and efficiency. Further, we anticipate that this framework has portability to other jurisdictions and other parts of the energy sector, and we will be bringing it to their attention in due course. Concepts from the framework are currently in use, guiding the discussions regarding demand-side management strategies, to identify more comprehensive conservation techniques. We believe that this framework, when fully executed, will be a key factor in realizing our vision for conservation and efficiency. We look forward to receiving further recommendations from the Committee for additional refinement to the strategic framework.

Codes & Standards – BC Hydro agrees with all of the Committee’s recommendations with the exception of recommendation 8(h), which calls for BC Hydro to advocate fuel-neutral codes and standards. BC Hydro will await guidance from Provincial policy on this particular matter.
The following are BC Hydro’s responses to each recommendation:

Recommendation 7(a) – BC Hydro will focus work in a number of areas in its commitment to advocating and supporting the implementation of the most stringent, cost-effective codes and standards in the province;

Recommendation 7(b) and 7(c) – BC Hydro will coordinate and align its codes and standards work with the design of its marketing programs. Higher energy efficiency levels will be continuously identified to ensure that program offers can accelerate market transformation;

Recommendation 7(d) – Research has been conducted on building labeling programs in other jurisdictions. A labeling pilot for new and existing commercial buildings is due to launch in early 2008 and a program is being developed for labeling of residential homes. BC Hydro will continue to support these efforts where appropriate;

Recommendation 7(e) – BC Hydro will provide ongoing consideration to the potential impact of codes and standards to achieve energy savings. To inform BC Hydro’s new long term Demand Side Management (DSM) plan, work has been initiated to estimate the potential savings impact of codes and standards;

Recommendation 7(f) – To inform best practices for B.C., research is being conducted on codes and standards in other jurisdictions across Canada, the United States and Europe;

Recommendation 7(g) – BC Hydro will continue to play a key role in setting long and short term priorities for the development of federal and provincial energy efficiency standards, by working closely with government and interest groups such as Natural Resources Canada, Ministry of Energy Mines and Petroleum Resources, and the Canadian Standards Association. BC Hydro will advocate and support the implementation of the most stringent, yet cost-effective codes and standards in BC.

Recommendation 7(h) – BC Hydro has joined the Standing Committee responsible for updating the Model National Energy Code for Buildings and will continue to be represented on that Committee. BC Hydro will continue to advocate the highest energy efficiency standards in the Model National Energy Code for Buildings and in the 2010 update to the BC Green Building Code. BC Hydro plans to undertake research with respect to the “Merton Rule”, in coordination with a distributed generation strategy.

Recommendation 8(a) – BC Hydro will continue to actively support market transformation and changes to codes and standards through joint funding and collaboration on priorities with other utilities and engagement with other stakeholders. BC Hydro also will continue to provide funding and technical support on standards development through its representation on Canadian Standards Association committees;

Recommendation 8(b) – To achieve a high level of compliance with, and enforcement of, codes and standards, and in particular the Green Building Code, BC Hydro will work closely with the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources, Building and Safety Policy Branch and other stakeholders to support industry and municipalities in addressing their education and training needs, and to ensure necessary capacity is built;
Recommendation 8(c) – BC Hydro will advocate for and support the implementation of stringent, yet cost-effective energy efficiency codes and standards in British Columbia, including the Green Building Code;

Recommendation 8(d) – As identified in the response to recommendation 7(h), BC Hydro has joined the Standing Committee responsible for updating the Model National Energy Code for Buildings and will continue to be represented on that Committee;

Recommendation 8(e) – Research of stakeholder issues and strategies for pilots and implementation has been undertaken to consider the best approach to mandatory building labeling. A labeling pilot for new and existing commercial buildings is due to launch in early 2008 to inform this effort;

Recommendation 8(f) – BC Hydro will work with municipalities to explore how they can go beyond minimum regulated efficiency levels through various policy instruments;

Recommendation 8(g) – BC Hydro, through the Aboriginal Sector within its Key Account Management group, will develop a strategy to align with the standards developed during the First Nations Treaty Process;

Recommendation 8(h) – BC Hydro will await Provincial policy guidance on this particular matter;

Recommendation 8(i) – BC Hydro will continue to provide funding and technical support to standards through representation on Canadian Standards Association (CSA) committees;

Recommendation 9 – BC Hydro has estimated the potential electricity savings from roughly 30 changes to codes and standards, to inform BC Hydro’s new Demand Side Management Plan. Our Evaluation, Measurement and Verification Group is also developing a process and consistent methodology for tracking and reporting energy savings from codes and standards.

In closing, I commend you on your innovative work and your unconstrained creativity. BC Hydro looks forward to continuing to work with you to achieve our vision. We know we can’t do it alone and we will continue to need committed people like you to generate new ideas that will help us to achieve our ambitious conservation targets through action. I look forward to your continued and valued input in 2008.

Yours truly,

Bob Elton
President and Chief Executive Officer
APPENDIX 2 - TESTIMONIALS

Getting the BC Chamber of Commerce to buy-in to the vision and goals has been an important part of linking the EC&E activity to a broad-based customer public. I am hoping we can make even stronger links as the strategies develop. More importantly I think the potential benefits of continuing to strengthen the EC&E and BC Hydro’s DSM efforts are enormous and enormously important. The evidence is available in the current long-term acquisition process versus the prior long-term acquisition process (lower revenue requirement costs of acquisition and lower portfolio present values). We really need to develop this documentation to support the public interest and merit of the direction BC Hydro is moving.

- David Craig, Executive Director, Commercial Energy Consumers

In my opinion, the manner in which BC Hydro brings together its various key stakeholders with its Electricity Conservation and Efficiency Advisory Committee is a fine example of stakeholder engagement that other firms would be wise to emulate.

By clearly communicating their plans associated with major issues, they are able to get invaluable feedback on issues and impacts from leaders in their stakeholder groups that may not have been considered in their plan development and are able to adjust their plans and avoid serious problems or unintended consequences.

With this committee, BC Hydro goes one step further and encourages working subcommittees to develop proposals for serious issues they face – an unheard of approach in most corporations. The result is the development of practical proposals that are based on the experience and knowledge of the stakeholders that likely would not have been developed by any other means.

Since many of BC Hydro’s electricity conservation initiatives are ground-breaking in terms of approach, creativity, and potential impact, I would expect that their approach will be a model for other electric power utilities in North America and possibly globally.

- Len Horvath, Building Owners and Managers Association of BC (BOMA BC)

I have learned many things from BC Hydro and the many stakeholders who represent their respective organizations and interests. As an Aboriginal person on the EC&E for BC Hydro representing the interests and concerns of First Nations in BC, the lessons I’ve learned are rewarding for me in terms of facilitating EC&E information to First Nation communities. It is a pleasure working with BC Hydro staff and EC&E Advisory Committee members.

- Dan Smith, Chief Negotiator, Hamatla Treaty Society

BC Hydro’s Electricity Conservation & Efficiency Advisory Committee provides a hopeful example of how stakeholders can contribute the kind of deep, strategic thinking and examine different options that will be increasingly critical to finding the right direction on energy policy, as we move into a future where the challenges will be very different than the ones we are used to.

- Thomas Hackney, Sierra Club of Canada

I think the BC Hydro EC&E Advisory Committee is an example of an extremely progressive approach to community engagement on the part of BC Hydro. What is most exciting to me about the process is the very ambitious goals we have identified, which go significantly beyond the targets mandated by the province, but have been publicly endorsed by senior management. This means that we are grappling with transformative levels of electricity efficiency and conservation. Equally striking is the strong staff support for the Committee, which includes undertaking internal activity, and also commissioning external consultant work, in support of the committee’s deliberations. The result of these factors is that the committee has been asked to go well beyond conventional thinking about how to achieve higher levels of electricity efficiency and conservation, and is being provided a level of support which makes this very ambitious mandate possible. I am excited about our work and believe that we may be able to make a significant contribution to BC Hydro’s goal of achieving a ‘conservation culture’ in British Columbia.

- John Robinson, Professor, Institute of Resources, Environment and Sustainability, University of British Columbia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>City of Edmonton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>City of Edmonton Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Edmonton, Alberta, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Guide cultural change within the organization as the city grows from a small to large population and foster consistent use of public involvement across the city government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Office of Public Involvement to craft policy, training, assists with outcomes evaluation development and stakeholder networking. Consultation Manager software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Public participation policy, resource dedication and oversight implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Initiated 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Government officials, general citizens, Aboriginal community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IAP2 Award Submission

Organization of the Year

Nominee: City of Edmonton

Submission contact:

Jill Bradford-Green
Director, Office of Public Involvement
700 Scotia Place (Tower 1)
10060 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, AB
E-mail: Jill.Bradfordgreen@edmonton.ca
Phone: (780) 944-0300
Web: www.edmonton.ca/publicinvolvement
Background

As a major municipality in Canada, the City of Edmonton is charged with delivering programs and services that directly affect quality of life for its citizens. These include everything from delivering ambulance services to ensure people can access emergency and hospital care, to building and maintaining transportation systems and sewer/drainage systems, picking up garbage, providing recreational programs, and ensuring services are in place to support the disabled and disadvantaged. Municipal governments in Canada are the closest to the people and have the most direct impact on how they live, work and play.

With such a broad mandate, it’s critical that the decisions made by our political leaders put the right framework in place to guide municipal service delivery. As the City of Edmonton transitions from a small to a big city, the issues and challenges we face must ensure promote and sustain a high quality of life for future generations.

We are impacted by a global economy that influences everything from the promotion and success of Edmonton businesses, our ability to attract new citizens and with talent to fuel our labour market, and our ability to build capital construction projects within available financial resources. At the same time, social circumstances have become more complicated and more diverse, and services are more difficult to deliver. Within this context, decisions must include and consider the range of voices and needs amongst a diverse number of impacted citizens to ensure the resources available are used in the best way possible. This will ensure these decisions are sustainable, balance varied interests, and transcend time and political cycles.

Engaging citizens in the municipal decision-making process is not new, and the City of Edmonton has included embarked on engagement processes for many years. Over time, our citizens have become more sophisticated and demanded a greater role in the decision-making process. How their voices have been included was not consistent, as different areas within the organization valued and pursued public involvement processes within projects differently. Some took extra steps to reach out and include voices that were difficult to hear and include, while others either didn’t pursue or value public involvement.

In 2004, our City’s political leaders took action. They wanted to ensure decision-making processes engaged and involved the right people, in the right way, at the right time. They directed administration to develop a public involvement initiative
to provide decision makers, administration, and citizens and stakeholders with a consistent and genuine approach for public involvement processes.

The Involving Edmonton public involvement framework was approved and enshrined into policy by City Council in 2005. The framework builds capacity within the organization to deliver effective public involvement processes that provide decision-makers with perspectives from different points of view based on different experiences and knowledge. It makes discussion richer and solutions more effective and easier to implement.

The framework includes a continuum of public involvement, standards of practice based on core IAP2 values, and a roadmap to help project managers define how to develop effective processes. By policy, it ensures that within these processes
- Everyone’s time and input is respected
- People know what to expect, how to participate and how their input will contribute to the decision
- Clear and forthright two-way communication is valued as a cornerstone of effective process, and
- The discussions and recommendations reflect a full range of perspectives.

The framework revolves around driving a cultural change within the organization. Beyond enshrining core commitments, standards of practice, requirements for public involvement plans, and a continuum of public involvement into Council-approved policy and within an administrative directive; an Office of Public Involvement has been created to provide coaching and tools to guide effective implementation of the framework.

The Office is involved in providing ongoing training and advice to project managers, developing tools and a handbook to help develop public involvement plans, providing tools such as Consultation Manager software to help project managers track process and share information about engagement within the City, and to provide a calendar of events for external stakeholders. The Office also maintains a mentorship network within each City department to provide ongoing training and advice. It also maintains a list of external consultants who have demonstrated they have had success developing and implementing public involvement processes within the policy and/or in a means that is consistent with IAP2 core values.

Commitment to IAP2 Core values

1. Public Participation is based on the belief that those are effected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.
   - The City of Edmonton has enshrined this value into policy as a commitment to citizen engagement. The commitment states: “The City of Edmonton believes that a key element of representative democracy is that people have a right to be involved in decisions that affect them.”
   - As a standard of practice, public involvement processes must be developed for all projects that have impacts on stakeholders and the public. These plans must include processes that are designed to involve the appropriate people at the appropriate time in the appropriate way through the completion and communication of a public involvement plan for all processes.
   - The administrative directive has included a standard of practice to state that processes must be appropriately resourced to ensure effective implementation.
2. **Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision**
   - The City of Edmonton has enshrined this value into policy as a commitment to honouring people. The commitment states: “The City of Edmonton Public Involvement process design will ensure people are treated with respect, honesty and integrity.”
   - As a standard of practice, public involvement processes must define and communicate the goal of the involvement at the outset of the process. These processes must ensure participants know what is included in the discussion and what isn’t, what decisions will be made or have been made, and who will make the final decision.
   - This information must be included in a public involvement plan, which must be available at anytime to anyone who requests it.

3. **Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs of all participants, including decision-makers.**
   - As a standard of practice, a continuum of public involvement has been enshrined into city policy to ensure processes are designed to align with the scope, complexity and outcomes of the decision that is being made.
   - From the outset, each process must communicate what’s on the table and what’s off the table. This is a standard of practice. It must be included and communicated in a public involvement plan, which must be available at any time to anyone who requests it.

4. **Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.**
   - A driver of developing the policy was the need to move issues beyond vested interest by eliciting a balanced range of opinions. The policy seeks to give a voice to people – balancing the voices of those who speak constantly and loudly with those who might have a difficulty being heard.
   - Standards of practice include ensuring a balanced range of public perspectives are provided to decision makers for consideration in the decision process, ensuring the timing, location and format for public involvement reflects considerations for effective participation, and ensuring that where appropriate, outreach processes are used to include the public who need support to participate. This includes providing interpretation services, services to the deaf or hard of hearing, accessible facilities, or other forms of outreach if they are necessary.
5. **Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate**
   - The City of Edmonton worked with stakeholder groups, decision-makers and administration to develop the overall *Involving Edmonton* public involvement framework before it was presented to Council and enshrined into City policy.
   - Further, involving stakeholders in process design is a key component of the framework. Each project will vet plans with stakeholders to ensure the process aligns with the scope and complexity, and to ensure appropriate people are involved in the appropriate way at the appropriate time.

6. **Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.**
   - The City of Edmonton has enshrined this value into policy through its commitment to accessible involvement. The commitment states: “The City of Edmonton will ensure public involvement processes are accessible to the public.”
   - Information sharing is a key component used at all stages within the public involvement continuum.
   - As standards of practice, information must provided in the simplest form possible – in plain language or understandable graphic formats. And information must be readily available so the public can participate in informed discussion.

7. **Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.**
   - As a standard of practice, a balanced range of public perspectives must be provided to decision-makers for consideration in the decision-making process.
   - Each report to Council on a project that includes a public involvement component must include a section describing the process and outcomes of public involvement. This information is publicly available in advance of each Council meeting.

**Evaluation**

Evaluation is continually required as part of the each public involvement process. As part of the design process, project managers must define and communicate how they will evaluate the outcome and/or success of the process to the participants and the decision-makers.

The City of Edmonton’s strategy relies on creating systematic cultural change throughout the organization to deliver effective public process. It believes that if process is to be effective and if the information it gleans is to be used appropriately, public involvement processes must be inherently linked to project and service delivery. The people who are conducting and accountable for delivering the projects must be directly involved in and accountable for delivering effective public process.

Change will take time. In 2009, the Office of Public Involvement will begin to measure and track key indicators to determine how well the organization is responding to and embracing change.

**Number of citizens involved in public processes**

- While the City recognizes that involving the right people in the right time in the right way can not necessarily be measured by numbers alone, it also recognizes that as we seek to involve a broader range of people on a broader range of projects that will increasingly impact more people in their daily lives, opportunities to participate will grow. As participation processes become more inclusive and reduces participation barriers, more people will participate. On an
organizational level, there should be a growth in the overall number of participants in involvement processes.

- Each project is required to record the number of participants on each project in Consultation Manager, over time this number is expected to grow.
- Also beginning in 2009, a random telephone survey will be conducted to collect baseline data. The survey will solicit information as to the percentage of citizens who were aware they had opportunities to participate in a public involvement process, and those who report they participated in a process. Over time, these percentages are expected to increase.

**Number of projects that report public involvement processes**

- An administrative directive requires all projects to report and track public involvement processes using Consultation Manager software. Organizationally, it will take time to fully implement this directive because it involves all project managers to take on a new responsibility.
- The number of projects is being tracked from baseline data collected in 2007. By 2012, this number should go up by 100% to ensure all projects are being appropriately tracked.

**Trust and credibility in public involvement and government decision-making processes**

- While the City of Edmonton recognizes that participants often correlate satisfaction with public involvement processes with whether their desired outcome was achieved through a political process, it believes it is critical to measure credibility of public involvement processes.
- Over time, if information about the goal, scope and use of information to be solicited through the public involvement process is effectively communicated to participants, and if it is respectfully and appropriately considered and reported by project managers and decision-makers, the trust and credibility of public involvement processes and the overall government decision-making process will increase.
- Beginning in 2009, a random telephone survey will be conducted to collect baseline data. The survey will solicit information as to the percentage of citizens who indicate they are satisfied that information gleaned through public involvement processes have appropriately influenced government decisions. They will also be asked to indicate a level of interest in participating in future public involvement processes. Over time, satisfaction levels and interest in future involvement opportunities should increase.

**Project Managers’ satisfaction with the tools and support available to effectively conduct public involvement.**

- The City of Edmonton’s policy relies on creating a systematic cultural change within the organization.
- A number of tools and support mechanisms are in place. To ensure these are providing the desired impact, it is important to check in with project managers to ensure these tools provide them with the information and means to design effective process.
- Beginning in 2009 and repeated annually, a random selection of project managers will be asked to participate in a focus group to discuss their experiences with the policy and tools, and to identify if the tools need to be modified or if additional tools need to be created to provide the information they need to implement the policy effectively.
Continuum of Public Involvement for the City of Edmonton

THE INCREASING LEVEL OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN AND INFLUENCE ON DECISION MAKING

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT BUILDING BLOCKS

INFORMATION SHARING

Sharing information to build awareness

CONSULTATION

Testing ideas or concepts to build knowledge
Collaborating to develop solutions to build commitment

ACTIVE PARTICIPATION

Sharing decision making to build ownership
Delegating decision making to build responsibility

THE PURPOSE OF THIS TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT IS:

To present information to the public about issues that may affect them
To provide information and receive feedback or comments
To involve stakeholders in the development of solutions
To partner with stakeholders in the development of recommendations
Stakeholders have the responsibility for making the decision

INFORMATION SHARING IS A KEY COMPONENT OF THE ENTIRE CONTINUUM

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CITY

Information
Provide complete, objective, reliable, timely and easy to find and understand information

Consultation
Define goals and processes clearly state the purpose and limits of the exercise and the City’s commitment for the use of the public input

Active Participation
Provide time and flexibility to facilitate a dialogue between City representatives and the public and a defined process for integrating decisions into the process
Case Study: Aboriginal Edmonton

The Aboriginal population in Edmonton, at more than 5% of the city’s total population (2006), is the second largest urban Aboriginal population in Canada. Its local growth rate is approximately 2.8 times the general population growth rate, which is characterized by a large, growing youth cohort. In Edmonton, more than half the population is Métis; however, there are more than 70 diverse Aboriginal identity groups in the city.

Aboriginal peoples’ social and economic challenges have been the focus of many studies and the media. However, the progress of the community on addressing these challenges has received comparatively less attention. Traditionally, municipal governments have avoided broad-scale engagement with Aboriginal residents on the premise that responsibilities for work with these communities fall within federal and provincial mandates. However, the realities are that nationally more than half of the Aboriginal people now live in cities and the well-being and capacity of urban Aboriginal people affect the quality of life for all urban residents.

In 2004, the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Accord Initiative was established on the recommendations of the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Affairs Committee (EAUAC) and senior administration. The initiative was supported by Federal and provincial governments, and the Edmonton Housing Trust Fund, who became partners. For the City of Edmonton, goals of the partnership were to:

- Build relationships between the City of Edmonton and the Aboriginal people living in Edmonton
- Improve hiring and retention of Aboriginal staff
- Improve program and service delivery to better serve Aboriginal residents in Edmonton.
- Communicate awareness of the Aboriginal community’s progress towards its goals to the broader City of Edmonton population.

The initiative was supported by City Council, which approved and funded a two-year project, with City Councillor Ron Hayter taking the initiative on as a special portfolio.

To facilitate the project, the City of Edmonton opened its first Aboriginal office to house the Accord project team and EAUAC and support staff, and provide a focal point for the City of Edmonton on Aboriginal matters. A committee that included City of Edmonton staff, EAUAC members, a provincial government representative, a federal government representative, and the Executive Director of the Edmonton Housing Trust Fund was established.

---

1 The Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Affairs Committee (EAUAC) was established in 1994 to advise City Council and administration on matters of importance to the Aboriginal community. EAUAC includes members from specific Aboriginal political organizations.
An Elders Circle was established in Spring 2005 to provide advice and guidance. The Elders ensured cultural traditions and protocols were followed and provided insight into urban Aboriginal cultures. Eleven Aboriginal Elders were identified, including First Nations, Métis, and Inuit.

In 2005, Councillor Hayter consulted with Aboriginal community leaders and organizations to create the August 30, 2005 Edmonton City Council Declaration *Strengthening Relationships Between the City of Edmonton and Urban Aboriginal People*. It is a ground-breaking declaration because it recognizes past injustices, celebrates past and current contributions by Aboriginal people, and calls for shared responsibility in working towards strong Aboriginal involvement in Edmonton’s future.

**Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Dialogue Process**

The Declaration also paved the way for the *Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Dialogue* process. Using Aboriginal consultants and the City’s *Involving Edmonton* Public Involvement Framework, a culturally appropriate process were designed that engaged over 1,800 people in identifying Aboriginal community priorities and desired new ways to work together on those priorities.

Throughout the process, the Elders Circle provided guidance to ensure proper cultural and spiritual protocols were followed. Community members also participated in the formation and design of the process, and consultants with Aboriginal backgrounds were engaged. Through these discussions, a broad range of tools and tactics were used to reach out and reach a diverse group of participants.

*Open Houses*

Five open house information sessions were hosted at various Aboriginal agency locations in Edmonton in October 2005. A total of 510 participants attended.

*Web Site*

The Accord initiative website was an important way to communicate with urban Aboriginal communities throughout the process.

*Talking Circles*

Four Talking Circles were hosted at the Canadian Native Friendship Centre in October 2005. The Talking Circles engaged staff members of organizations that serve urban Aboriginal people. Each Talking Circle had a specific focus: youth, women, street issues, seniors/disability issues. There were a total of 162 participants at the sessions.

*Executive Forum*

In November 2005, leaders and executive-level staff from Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal organizations (non-profit, business and government) were invited to a one-day forum to discuss opportunities for building successful working relationships. Over 119 participants representing 78 organizations participated.
Visitations
From July to the end of November 2005, formal presentations were made to over 40 Aboriginal
groups, stakeholders and partners. An estimated 880 individuals participated in these
presentations.

Aboriginal City Life Teas
Four gatherings were held throughout the year for Aboriginal people and City employees to learn
about the initiative and Aboriginal issues. A total of 120 participants attend the sessions.

“Your City, Your Voice” Workbook Surveys
Approximately 1,000 workbook surveys were distributed throughout the course of the Dialogue
process. Over 500 were completed and returned for tabulation and analysis.

Outcomes
The Your City, Your Voice report was released and presented at a celebration at City Hall in 2006.
At the ceremony, Elders encouraged the community to take time and carefully consider the next
steps.

Community members and organizations initiated Community Action Circles to focus on the urban
Aboriginal community’s priorities, which were identified in the Your City, Your Voice report.

Community leaders initiated a year long process that led to the creation of Wicihitowin: Circle of
Shared Responsibility, a new inclusive urban mechanism for bringing Aboriginal and non-
Aboriginal organizations together to work on community priorities.

Aboriginal community volunteers, members of the Elders Circle, members of EAUAC, and
senior City managers developed the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Accord relationship agreement
on the basis of community endorsement of specific principles from the Dialogue process. The
Accord is celebrated by the community and Administration at City Hall.

Subsequently, the Aboriginal Relations Office was established by the City of Edmonton to
provide ongoing City capacity for building relationships with the Aboriginal community,
establishing a welcoming single point of contact with the City on Aboriginal matters, linking
Aboriginal community members and organizations with relevant City work units, and supporting
City service improvements.

An Aboriginal Workforce Participation Initiative was signed by the City Manager and Mayor
Stephen Mandel. A new Aboriginal Employment Human Resources Outreach Consultant has
been established within the City of Edmonton to establish working contacts, job fair
engagements, and more effective City hiring within the broader community.
Next steps

The principles in the Edmonton Urban Aboriginal Accord require ongoing support and discussion to make the principles a reality in practice. The City of Edmonton continues to work with the urban Aboriginal community to develop and flesh out shared solutions to address issues and concerns that were highlighted through the process. A priority has been to ensure there are appropriate resources in place, and to continue discussions with Aboriginal and community leaders to review progress and ensure initiatives continue on the right track.

Commitment to IAP2 Core values

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.
   - The Dialogue process was inclusive in utilizing different tools and methodologies to encourage participation from a broad range of the Aboriginal community, and the organizations and communities that are impacted or strive to support these programs.

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.
   - Relationships were highly important to the success of the process and success of the project. Ensuring the process and the content reflected true priorities is essential to ensure the results were meaningful. Reporting back to validate and check on the next steps are key to the process.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.
   - Aboriginal community leaders and respected Elders repeatedly noted that an Indigenous/Aboriginal approach would be needed to reach Aboriginal communities. An Aboriginal space and process of communication to engage Aboriginal people was followed, reflecting traditional or indigenous Circle.
   - City Council provided strong support for the initiative and played an active role in the consultation process and in working with the community. Councillor Ron Hayter adopted the initiative as a special portfolio, to promote and provide leadership on behalf of City Council.

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
   - A wide variety of tactics were used to ensure a broad range of the urban Aboriginal population was aware of and involved in the dialogue process. It’s important to note that the community is very diverse, so a great deal of effort and advice that was sought on how to reach the appropriate people in a traditional way.
   - Credibility was very important. Beyond seeking continual advice from community leaders and the Elders’ Circle. Aboriginal consultants were contracted as and facilitators and contract process experts.
5. Public participation seeks input from participations in designing how they participate.
   • Traditional Aboriginal approaches and processes were used. Aboriginal consultants helped tailor the City of Edmonton public involvement process in a way that would be meaningful for the Aboriginal community.
   • Elders and community leaders were continually approached for advice and input on the process design. Ensuring collaborative approaches to engagement were highly important to the success of the project, as it was recognized that shared solutions and ownership would be needed to meet the project goals.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
   • Presentations, workbooks and the project website included comprehensive information about the process and the statistical profile of the Aboriginal population. It was important to ensure participants could provide informed input.
   • The high number of participants speaks to the success of the initiative and to the ability of the participants to feel they could provide meaningful input.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.
   • Reporting back was integrated at each step of the process. Reports with findings from the consultation process were shared, and celebrations were held at key milestones.

Reference:

Lewis Cardinal
Email: LewisCardinal@gmail.com

Website: www.edmonton.ca/ARO
Case Study – enVision Edmonton (City Vision)

Edmonton is one of Canada’s most rapidly growing and changing cities. While many initiatives have developed long-term strategies in specific areas, the City did not have an overarching and holistic vision to guide and integrate overall planning efforts.

In March 2007, City council passed a motion calling for administration to consult with the public, select stakeholders, and subject matter experts to develop a draft vision for City Council’s review and approval.

The Vision provides a 30-year outlook to guide planning and operational decisions for the City’s future. It provides a general description of the characteristics and ideals that we want the city to look like and embrace in the future. The destination must be clear, but the statement itself must give sufficient leeway to allow innovative thinking to take place on how the organization can take action towards achieving its overall goals.

To ensure the vision transcends political lifecycles and can be sustained for many years to come, the process used to develop it must reflect the needs, desires, and attributes of the citizens of Edmonton. The process embraced commitments to collaborate within and among citizens to harness their collective wisdom and experiences in developing recommendations for the City Vision.

The process used to develop the vision was designed to harness local community resources and involve a broad range of participants in many different ways. Along the way, the information gleaned through the process and the steps taken to move the project forward were validated with political leaders and the participants.

Process

The public involvement process was designed using both the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA TOP™ method) concepts and methods - and the City’s Involving Edmonton public involvement framework. A public involvement plan was developed and a workshop was held with key stakeholder groups to obtain feedback on process design. This played a critical role in the project’s execution and design, as it underscored the need to ensure information from various stages of public involvement was validated along the way. It also helped manage participants’ expectations, as identify additional audiences that needed to be reached through the process.

The process used a broad range of tools and tactics to reach the Edmonton community. Over 2,200 Edmontonians were consulted in the Fall of 2007 using a variety of methods (phone survey, workshops, meetings, online survey).
Public Workshops
Six workshops were held in the months of October and November 2007 to give the public an opportunity to participate in the process. These workshops were held in local community league facilities across the city to make it easier for participants to attend; thus ensuring a balance amongst the geographic areas. Also, they were held on several nights to be flexible for those who could not attend a session in their community by allowing them to attend an additional workshop on an alternate night. Workshops were open to the broad public and were advertised. In addition, the envisionEdmonton project team hired the University of Population Research Lab (PRL) to recruit citizens through a random, stratified recruitment process so participants represented all ages and genders in the City. As well, letters were sent to individuals and stakeholder groups that have been actively involved in City involvement processes, encouraging these groups to attend and participate in the process.

The workshops began with a visual presentation to provide context and background for the process, detailing how the information would be gathered and used over the coming months to develop the vision. Facilitators utilized the ICA TOP method to operate the sessions, helping focus the discussion to bring out actionable information. Also, an artist attended each workshop session to create a visual image of the discussion, and a playwright and actors attended the youth and children events to capture the dialogue in a play form. A local professional writer attended a couple of the sessions to get a feel for the discussion.

Reporting back was very important. Within five working days of each public session, participants were mailed the summary notes of what was documented and heard from their session. It was important to vet and validate what was heard along the way.

Inclusive Communities - outreach
The process included a commitment to the belief that the success of a City is predicated on how well it reaches out to those most disadvantaged and those who have difficulty being heard. Inclusive communities included: reaching young children from grades 4 to 5, the Youth or next generation (ages 18-30), Persons with developmental disabilities (PDD), Aboriginals, multicultural, seniors, low income and single parents/hard to reach.

To reach these groups, the project team utilized the existing local agencies and support networks that plan and deliver services to these groups. City staff took the lead and executed facilitating the inclusive communities. Team leads were identified for each of the inclusive communities, and training sessions were held to train the teams in the ICA method. However, recognizing that these audiences have special needs and circumstances, it was left to the teams to identify the best means to reach out and get the right information from the participants. It was important that the process that was used would work. The project provided support to help break down participation barriers in many ways, including providing food, child care, taxi or bus fare, facility rentals or a very small honorarium ($20 or less). Team leads were given a blank template and a completed template to guide them on how to capture the information derived from their sessions. Standard completion of the template ensured the information was analyzed quickly, since the turn-around time was at a premium.
Synergy Group
A number of other initiatives were underway to develop long-term visions for specific areas of the City, including a group that was developing a long-term Transportation Master Plan (Moving Edmonton), a long-term Municipal Development Plan (Focus Edmonton), a long-term Environmental Strategy (EcoVision), and a long-term Economic Vision. To ensure information was coordinated and fed into groups as required, an internal synergy group was created to share information and coordinate planning efforts.

Online and phone survey
To further strengthen the information gathered through the workshops, interviews and other sessions, a random telephone survey was completed, and an online survey was posted on the City of Edmonton website. Questions were developed using the ICA TOP method, to engage participants in a deeper conversation.

Bringing it together
At each session, participants had the opportunity to volunteer to participate in future sessions to develop the vision; approximately three participants from each workshop attended the plenary sessions. Input from all the workshops, phone survey and the web were brought together into two plenary sessions that were attended by these participants. At the end of each session, a draft “vision” was completed.

In mid-November, a separate and independent session was held with City Council to develop themes representing the areas that encompass Council’s vision for the future.

In February 2008, City Council held a second session, building on the first session results and adding themes from key City planning efforts and previous public process. A draft vision statement was then crafted to encompass the outcomes of this meeting. The statement was passed by Council on March 25, 2008. While the form or style of the final version of the vision was refined, the content developed by the public and by Council was integrated into a singular and representative vision for all. The uniqueness was that both the public and Council owned the process and end results.

A final ceremony was held to unveil the statement city-wide on May 25, 2008. Participants were invited to attend and celebrate the completion of their hard work.
Commitment to IAP2 Core values

1. **Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.**
   - Developing a city-wide vision statement impacted a significant and broad range of people, internally and externally. There were significant efforts undertaken to ensure a broad range of views and participants were able to contribute to the visioning process.
   - As well, the ICA process was used – a rigorous tool to ensure groups, communities and decision-makers could reflect together.

2. **Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.**
   - Steps were taken along the way to communicate how the information from the involvement steps would be used to develop the vision. As well, the strong commitment to reporting back on what was heard, validating it was accurate, and involving participants as the process moved forward ensured information was not lost.

3. **Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.**
   - Every involvement opportunity began with an introduction to set context, manage public expectations, explain how the information would move forward, and a reminder that while public input was important to the process, the ultimate decision-maker must be City Council as per the *Municipal Government Act*.

4. **Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.**
   - Significant efforts were made to ensure opportunities were available for participation. Public workshops were held in communities and on different nights to allow flexible participation. A random, stratified recruitment method was used to ensure broad representation was invited to the general workshop sessions, as well as invites went out to the city’s key stakeholder groups via letters inviting them to participate. Inclusive community strategies were undertaken to reach hard-to-reach groups that traditionally have difficulty participating. A telephone survey was used to randomly reach the general public and individuals who may not extend the effort to
get involved by attending a meeting or visiting a web site. An online survey was used to reach those who wanted to participate, but did not want to attend a meeting.

- Support services were made available, such as interpretation, taxi/bus fare, child care, small honorariums, and food was provided to reduce barriers for participants.

5. **Public participation seeks input from participations in designing how they participate.**
   - The overall public involvement plan was vetted by stakeholders and individuals before it was put into practice. Also, advice on the process was continually sought as it continued through implementation.

6. **Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.**
   - Efforts were made to be creative and harness local community resources. Information was shared about how to participate, and different ways were used to encourage participants to help people express in means that are comfortable for them. For example, local artists, playwrights and actors were used to write and act out play for children and youth. Artists were used to pictorially paint the picture of Edmonton in 2040 by capturing discussion in the workshops and meetings session. And a local “next gen” writer was used to transform the bureaucratic language into a creative statement that had meaning for participants.

7. **Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.**
   - Reporting back and validating every step of the way in a timely manner helped ensure the process was on the right track.
   - In the end, there was a final celebration attended by members of Council, administration and participants to celebrate the completion of the City Vision process.

**Reference:**

Djordje Srnic
Email: srnic@absa.ca

Website: [www.edmonton.ca/enVisionEdmonton](http://www.edmonton.ca/enVisionEdmonton)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title Project</strong></th>
<th>Future Forward Fort McMurray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Organizing Group Location** | Gabinet & Associates  
Fort McMurray, Wood Buffalo Municipality, Alberta, Canada, pop. 90,000 |
| **Key Question/Problem** | Create a community driven, supported and sustainable city-wide vision. Rapid population growth, industrial expansion, infrastructure pressures. Limited past citizen participation opportunities. |
| **Sample Methods** | Luminary Speaker Series, steering committee, Future Forward Summit, citizen interviews (what works and issues), facilitation training modules for staff and community leaders, 14 Powerful Questions Sector Workshops, World Cafes, online survey, Citizen asset team workshops, mini-forums (youth, seniors, business, education etc), curriculum links in schools |
| **Results** | Stakeholder teams’ vision and goals unanimously approved by Regional Council. Basis for larger planning process, Envision Woods Buffalo. |
| **Impact Level** | City |
| **Time Frame** | March 2006 – July 2007 |
| **People Engaged** | General public and government officials |
| **Web Link** | [http://www.woodbuffalo.ab.ca/futureforward/](http://www.woodbuffalo.ab.ca/futureforward/) |
Attention: IAP2 Core Values Committee

It gives the consulting team of Gabinet & Associates Inc. great pleasure in submitting “Future Forward Fort McMurray”, a community-wide visioning process in a remote city in Northern Canada in the vast Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo. The 15 month long process culminated in July 2007 with the unanimous and enthusiastic approval by the local council. It has now been almost a year and we have gone back to the client to determine whether or not the city is acting on the vision and goals, and what the impacts have been.

Two months after the approval was given, “Envision Wood Buffalo” was launched to conduct a visioning and sustainability planning process using the Future Forward model across the balance of the region. This process is about planning for every sector over which the municipality has responsibility, and it appears that the results of Future Forward inside Envision are starting to be acted upon. We have documented what has happened in the months since the approval in our submission.

What is especially rewarding to us is that the practice of public participation is firmly rooted in the municipality, with planners, engineers, social service personnel, educators, politicians and many others advocating for the practice where it did not exist prior to Future Forward. With the capacity that was built during Future Forward in areas like facilitation and the use of participatory techniques, the people that live there report that they have been able to move along successfully, engaging people throughout the region in the new over-arching planning process. Future Forward’s vision and goals are indeed alive and well, and appear to have a good chance of living on into the future to help guide the growth of the entire region.

We have two stakeholder participant references for you to contact:
- Larry Pana, Govt. of Alberta, Economic Development, (larry.pana@gov.ab.ca)
- Jim Foote, President Keyano College, (jim.foote@keyano.ca)

As for contacting publications we suggest the following:

**Calgary Herald:**
Phone: (403) 235-7433
email: submit@theherald.canwest.com

**Globe and Mail:**
Phone (416) 585-5000
Email: ROB@globeandmail.com

Gabinet and Associates, Inc. thanks you for the opportunity to submit for the IAP2 Core Values Award and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely:

Lonny Gabinet, Terry Williams, & Blair McNaughton
Email: lgabinet@telus.net
Fort McMurray in Context

The city of Fort McMurray (latitude 56° 39’ 0” N) is the urban centre of the larger remote Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo (RMWB) in northern Canada. The area of the RMWB exceeds that of Switzerland. It is densely covered in forest and is accessible only by air or the one road into and out of the region. The nearest city is Edmonton, a 456km drive south and there are a dozen small hamlets and communities that dot the vast region. Apart from abundant forest there is another natural resource that focuses the global spotlight on the region: oil sands deposits, second only in oil production to Saudi Arabia. For the first 12 years of the new millennium, industrial expansions of the dozen or so plants north and south of the city will exceed $110 Billion as the world’s demand for a safe, secure supply of oil continues to grow.

Pressures on the city’s social, cultural, economic and environmental infrastructure has been enormous as people move into the region from all over North America and the world to find jobs to fill the growing shortage. Explosive population growth of 9% annually since 2000 has meant relentless wear and tear on the roads, overflowing schools, long waits in emergency rooms, skyrocketing housing prices along with zero vacancy rates and a very high cost of living. The massive industrial expansions and collateral impacts were taking over the city like a tidal wave; the future was out of control and the problems associated with keeping up with the growth were becoming insurmountable. The population of a boom town turned cosmopolitan city by 2006 is just shy of 90,000. Public participation was nowhere to be seen; this project would be the first brush with the community coming together to build a common vision.

Enter the community visioning process called Future Forward – taking back their future!

It was against this backdrop that during the 2003 municipal election campaign, a young council woman ran for her first term as mayor on a platform that would engage the citizens in taking hold of their future to create a collective vision. In March 2006 the consulting team of Gabinet & Associates Inc. (G&A) was awarded the contract to design and implement Future Forward, a city-wide visioning process. To capture people’s imaginations and stimulate the desire to dream, the regional municipality started a Speaker Series of luminaries in community building and futuristic trends. They came into the community, challenging and evoking bold aspirations. And at the conclusion of the final series of four, the speaker summed up the challenges that lay ahead as the community comes to grips with what it wants to become: “You are at a crossroads,” he declared. “You can become an economic powerhouse, or a world class community... you have the power to do either, but you must choose.”

What made Future Forward special?

A whole community came together for the first time in a public participation process to take control of their future, becoming involved in ways that span the entire IAP2 spectrum and incorporate all of the IAP2 Core Values. They made a conscious decision to become a world class northern community despite the extraordinary growth pressures that were threatening their quality of life; affordable living; environmental, economic and social sustainability. Without Future Forward’s collaborative approach to involve stakeholders in working with the citizens’ dreams and aspirations, a vision may have been created but it would have been owned by no one. Now they have the capacity in place to implement the goals and vision inside the Envision Wood Buffalo regional sustainability planning process, and keep the light shining on community conversations that live because they have been empowered and they have seen the strength of their collective voices.

Future Forward’s alignment with IAP2 Core Values

Core Value #1

The client (Mayor and Council) recognized long before the process was designed that if a vision was going to be embraced and sustained by the community over time, it had to be the community’s vision and not the mayor’s.

Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have the right to be involved in the decision-making process.

She attracted and convened a 20 member Future Forward Steering Committee of community leaders from across the spectrum to help engage their communities: housing, education, commercial, service clubs, youth, seniors, health care, economic development, social services, the environment and so forth. The first “event” was to be the “Future Forward Summit”, a full day event designed by the consultant to which citizens would be invited to attend and provide input, some by personal invitation and others by self selection upon becoming aware of the event through the media and other sources.
Core Value #5

Recognizing this core value, the consultants maintained that sustainability of a 20 year vision would not emerge from a one-time event and that capacity would need to be built inside the community to fully equip people to refine, change, update and progress the vision over the years, G&A persuaded the client that coming up with a lasting community-built and owned vision would need to come from the ‘inside out’, requiring that it be a process not just an event, and that local intelligence would need to be gathered on how to create a successful process design. A simultaneous process was created to do the following:

a) conduct individual and group interviews to gather feedback on “what works in this community” (process) and what are the issues (content);¹
b) develop facilitation training modules for city staff and community leaders to learn how to successfully convene and facilitate groups. The modules were custom tailored to meet the needs of this community to sustain them over time and to prepare them for being full participants as trained facilitators through the entire Future Forward process.

Core Value #4

Armed with intelligence from across the community on process and content, a series of Sector Workshops were arranged by invitation² in May 2006 to explore a series of 14 powerful questions which were developed from the content input provided by the citizens. The workshops piloted the asset-based approach and participants provided extensive input that was the subject of our researcher’s Structured Qualitative Analysis (SQA). From that analysis a report was done that created the basis for refining the 14 questions and going out to the general public for their input. (To see the Future Forward Sector Workshop report, go to http://www.maze.ab.ca/Share/FileShare.html) Over a period of three months (September – November 2006) the consultants and newly minted community facilitators hosted numerous World Cafes for multiple audiences of all demographics³, culminating in a full day Future Forward Summit in late October. During this period the Future Forward process, together with an on-line survey was advertised through matching funding by local newspaper, radio and television outlets. An enormous amount of input was recorded around the 14 questions by the facilitators and sent to the consultants for analysis and reporting. During this time the consultants raised the profile of public participation values, ethics, tools and techniques as well as IAP2.⁴

Core Value #6

By late November the consultants had analyzed and synthesized all of the input of the many world cafes and surveys and made a recommendation to the Steering Committee that a stakeholder process aligning with the 14 questions be developed to take all the input and work with it to develop high level goals for Fort McMurray. The stakeholder volunteer process was initiated through the World Cafes and Summit; through December over 50 people self selected onto seven stakeholder teams that represented seven pairs of categories derived from the 14 questions (housing and community design; economy and labour; transportation and infrastructure, health and safety, etc.). A series of back to back evening workshops were held every three weeks from January through May: the three ‘Social Assets’ teams met on Tuesdays and the four ‘Physical Assets’ teams met on Wednesdays. Their instructions were to work with the consultant’s analyses and survey information to create a) community values; and b) high level goals for Fort McMurray. They worked with the assistance of tailor-made tools and techniques developed by G&A for the process to help them truly work with the community input, avoiding serving their own interests. At the same time, there were resource people in the room and on-call so that the stakeholders could access subject matter expertise as they formed their goals.

¹ G&A utilizes an asset-based rather than problem identification and solving –based approach, in which participants are encouraged to identify what is working in their community and how it can be built upon in the future, similar to the principles of Appreciative Inquiry.
² The sign-in list from the Future Forward Speaker Series was used to create the invitation list for the sector workshops.
³ Most World Cafes were woven into a part of existing meetings/gatherings of groups, clubs, schools, etc.
⁴ Mayor Blake was the keynote speaker at the Wild Rose IAP2 Signature Event (Conference) in Canmore, Alberta, Canada May 2008, speaking passionately about the Future Forward process and the need to fully involve anyone that may be affected, using many ways and means, as well as how critical it is that it be the created and owned by the community.
Core Value #7

By May, 26 2006 high level goals and some realistic targets had emerged from all seven teams and those goals formed the basis of a vision for Fort McMurray, drafted initially by the consultants. It was discussed and vetted by the Steering Committee and stakeholders over a period of six weeks and ultimately became the final version.

Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants including decision makers.

Core Value #3

The vision and goals, along with sustainability recommendations for embedding the vision and goals in all future planning were approved by the Regional Municipality Council on July 10, 2007 as truly the citizen’s vision; they clearly have chosen to work toward becoming a world class community and progress toward this aspiration is well underway! The vision begins with:

“Fort McMurray 2030 is an exciting and diverse world class community of over 200,000 citizens and growing. A progressive city in the vast Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo (RMWB), our finest assets are our citizens — proud, caring, giving, welcoming, with a strong sense of community and local autonomy.” See Fort McMurray 2030 www.woodbuffalo.ab.ca/futureforward.

Value #2

Many of the City’s planning processes were put on hold pending the outcome of Future Forward, but planning for embedding the goals and vision into the Region’s over-arching Sustainability Plan (Envision Wood Buffalo) were simultaneously ramping up. The new sustainability planning process which began in September 2007, “Envision Wood Buffalo – Toward 250K (population)” is a regionally based planning process that takes into consideration a dozen or so, small aboriginal hamlets and villages throughout the region, with Fort McMurray as it’s urban centre having a solid vision to guide its growth and protect and enhance quality of life. Many of the staff and community people working on Envision are graduates of the facilitation modules created for them in Future Forward over the past year by G&A.

The IAP2 Spectrum & Future Forward

The Future Forward process utilized all five levels of the IAP2 Spectrum. The table below shows how each level of the spectrum was incorporated into the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spectrum Level</th>
<th>Future Forward Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>The following Future Forward activities were extensively marketed and advertised on radio and in newspaper ads:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Future Forward Speaker Series (Feb./06 – Sept./06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 Sector Workshops (May/06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forums (Oct./06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other informative strategies and techniques included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• E-invites to Summit (869)-March/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 7 E-newsletters to approx. 900 people since Oct./06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FF on-line survey (Oct./06 – Feb./07) 350 returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Postcards, flyers, hand outs (Fall/winter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FF Website on RMWB (&amp; links from other sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>Online Survey completed by several hundred Fort McMurray residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve</td>
<td>Hands-on citizen participation in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sector workshops, Forums and Summit answering 14 powerful questions spanning the economy of FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mini-forums involving youth, seniors, business, industry, education, not-for-profits, service clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Curriculum links in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On line Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Seven different stakeholder teams collaborated to utilize community input and develop a single high level vision with goals for the following areas:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ongoing Commitment and Outcomes

Envision Wood Buffalo

As of this writing, Envision Wood Buffalo has undertaken the following to align the vision for the RMWB with the Future Forward (Fort McMurray) vision and goals:

- **Step 1. Process Review**: Conduct an analysis of similarities and differences in project processes. **COMPLETE**.
- **Step 2. Gap Analysis**: Comparison of Envision Wood Buffalo expected project outputs (e.g., Theme Areas) to Future Forward outputs. **COMPLETE**.
- **Step 3. Filling in the Gaps**: Survey developed to capture additional input from residents of Fort McMurray (e.g., Additional theme area success statements, action planning). **UNDER DEVELOPMENT**.
- **Step 4. Integration into Envision Wood Buffalo**: Findings from the survey will be included in the Regional Sustainability Plan as part of the Fort McMurray component of the project

Accomplishments

In May 2008, Mayor Melissa Blake of Fort McMurray delivered a keynote address at the Wild Rose IAP2 Signature Event. In her presentation she directly credited the Future Forward process and the goals that emerged with the following accomplishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
<th>Future Forward Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Regional Solid Waste Master Plan</td>
<td>Goal 1: To have the best diversion rate in the province to eliminate recyclables from landfill facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opened recycling depot in six locations</td>
<td>Goal 7: Ensure Water Quantity by reducing use and withdrawals needed: Educate and obtain support of people on water conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Conservation Education and Awareness program (Albian Sands Energy Inc., chose to initiate and to sponsor the program based on FF goals)</td>
<td>Goal 20: Ensure the community is a safe place to live by addressing the physical, environmental, and socioeconomic needs of the residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Peace Officers hired in February 2008 (the number and immediacy of the hires were impacted by FF)</td>
<td>Goal 21: The RMWB must take a leadership role to aspire to create a better work/life balance (quality of life) for its residents in order to create a better and “new” sense of community: The RMWB will undertake an awareness campaign for new and existing residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Spirit campaign launched locally in 2007.</td>
<td>Goal 23: Fort McMurray will have a wide range of accessible educational, cultural, social, and recreational services that encompass all ages and socio-economic groups: Develop a new Arts &amp; Culture centre by 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008, partnership between the Separate School District and RMWB to build a new performing arts theatre. The business sector will also contribute.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout Future Forward, unique and creative multi-sector partnerships were identified as an important tool for bringing the vision to life. Many of the achievements listed have emerged from new partnerships. Other partnerships include:

- **University of Calgary, Faculty of Environmental Design**: graduate students take on research projects that the regional municipality needed to undertake, e.g. accessing provincial grant funding, development issues, etc.
- **Local School Districts**: local youth projects create a box city planning project to learn about sustainability, planning, and other civic issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Project</th>
<th>Hinze Dam Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Hinze Dam Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia, Gold Coast City, pop. 480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hinze Dam, yearly visitation 300,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Need to increase water storage capacity by raising embankment 15 meters. Community levels of technical knowledge. Project managers knowledge of community values and issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Enquiry-by-Design approach, community advisory committee, design optimization workshops, instructional scaffolding (technical issues).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Able to fast track design to construction with community support. Developing a common language. Enhanced design solution and sustainability. Reduced tensions from impacts of construction process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>Designers, engineers, environmentalists, elected representatives, community and sporting groups, residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pre-Amble

South-East Queensland in Australia has suffered the worst drought in recorded history. Gold Coast City, a rapidly developing area is seeing an unprecedented growth in population and tourism and is under substantial pressure to secure increased water storage capacity. To counter the impending water crisis the Gold Coast City Council decided to raise their primary water storage facility (the Hinze Dam) embankment wall by an additional 15 metres by the end of 2010.

History is replete with examples of projects that have been delayed or terminated due a failure in gaining stakeholder approval. The importance of completing this project on time cannot be overemphasised as South-East Queensland was (and still is) in danger of running out of water. The social and economic impacts of such an occurrence would be catastrophic. Given the desperate situation South-East Queensland found itself in, delays or interruptions to this project was not option. To that end the State Government has also mandated that the project is to be complete by the end of 2010.

Project Background

The Hinze Dam is located approximately 20 minutes drive south-west of Surfers Paradise on the Gold Coast, Queensland Australia. Gold Coast City has a population of around 480,000 people which is expected to increase to 635,000 by the year 2021. As one of Australia’s main tourist destinations, Gold Coast City attracts over 10 million overnight and daytrip visitors each year.

As well as supplying Gold Coast City with its potable water supply the Hinze Dam is a major recreational facility used by the community, sporting groups, tourists and educational groups. Visitors to the dam are estimated at 300,000 people per year. A key feature of the dam and its surrounds is that it is located in a relatively pristine environment that provides an alternate attraction to the commercialised tourist strip of Surfers Paradise.

The Hinze Dam Alliance (HDA) consisting of Gold Coast City Council, Thiess Pty Ltd, Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM) and URS Asia Pacific was tasked with the job of raising the embankment wall.

The delivery of Hinze Dam Stage 3 occurred in three phases:

1) Phase 1- Preliminary design and Environmental Impact Study (EIS)
2) Phase 2- Detailed design and budget
3) Phase 3 - Construction Phase

The project is currently in its final phase – construction.

The Challenge

Phase 1 of this project was highly complex with a number of key activities to be conducted and key milestones achieved within a clearly defined timeframe if the project was to be delivered on time. Specifically the milestones to be achieved in less than twelve months for phase 1 were:

1) An approved spillway and embankment design
2) A completed Environmental Impact Statement and project approvals
3) Construction road network design
4) Post-construction recreational facility design

---

1 Gold Coast City Council is the local government authority responsible for a planning, services and water supply for Gold Coast City.
The challenge that confronted the Alliance was to concurrently develop the design of the spillway, embankment, road network and the post-construction recreational facilities with an unparalleled level of community influence.

From this perspective the four Alliance partners recognised that involving the community from the outset would raise the awareness of the principles of best practice and sustainable design. Developing the designs with community involvement would allow all parties to explore and demonstrate how these principles could be applied, through an iterative and interactive process that would develop ideas, solutions and outcomes in real-world planning and design situations.

**Methodology**

The HDA successfully employed an ‘enquiry-by-design’ approach to the major design components of Phase 1 of Hinze Dam Stage 3. Instead of developing designs then subjecting them to extensive modifications to accommodate a wide range of stakeholder concerns, the Alliance implemented a collaborative community programme to facilitate the design progress. This process continued during Phase 1 one until designs were finalised.

The process developed by the HDA was designed ultimately to arrive at one single design option for the spillway, embankment wall, road network and post-construction recreational facilities. In general the process included:

- Forming the Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
- “Scaffolding”2 community members (see Innovations section)
- Obtaining regular advice from the community on options and priorities
- Develop concept designs
- Consultation workshops
- Short listing options
- Reviewing and modifying designs based on feedback
- Select final designs

To facilitate the design process during Phase 1 a Community Advisory Committee consisting entirely of community representatives was formed. Each member of the committee represented different segments of the community including lay-persons, technical, environmental, recreational, and business.

Three design optimisation workshops were programmed into the project plan as a reiterative process of developing, reviewing and modifying designs from a technical, engineering and community perspective.

---

2 Scaffolding Theory or Instructional Scaffolding (1950), Jerome Bruner
perspective. These workshops were in addition to the monthly CAC meetings that were held where
the HDA made detailed presentations to the members on the progress of the project. These
meetings were highly advantageous as they provided the Alliance with continuous feedback and
suggestions on design concepts.

Uniqueness of the Project
The initial phase of the Hinze Dam Stage 3 project was a complex one with project delivery to be
completed by the end of 2010 as deemed under Queensland’s Water Act (2000). As a result, the
designs and environmental assessments had to be completed within nine months, otherwise the
project would not be delivered in time. Ever present in the background was the real danger of
severe water shortages due to the severity of the drought.

What made this project particularly special was that for the first time in Australia the community was
directly contributed to the spillway and embankment design, a process usually left to the purview of
design engineers as it is often assumed that the community cannot make a meaningful input into
such a complex area of design. The involvement of the operator of the final asset was also carried
out in parallel so that the technical and usability requirements were also being considered in
iterative community consultation process.

Innovations
To address this particularly complex phase of the project, a planned approach to community
engagement was adopted and involved a number of innovative techniques.

Instructional Scaffolding
To ensure that members of the community and the project team were able to understand the
different aspects and complexities of the project including design, engineering, environmental and
community concerns a program of “scaffolding” the community was implemented.

Scaffolding is a process by which participants are provided with a foundation or framework of
knowledge in areas in which they are unfamiliar. The purpose is not to turn people into experts but
to provide them with a fundamental understanding of terminology, basic engineering and design
knowledge and constraints, social and economic issues. This allowed participants to build
knowledge within this framework of fundamental knowledge, hence provide them with
“scaffolding”.

This process included:
- Information sessions on:
  - geotechnical studies, their purpose and the implications of substrate samples taken
  - possible post-construction recreational facility sites, design constraints and possible design
    options
  - road design, purpose of construction roads and the challenges of road design
  - community values and impacts
- Opportunities for views and ideas to be exchanged
- Tours of the Hinze Dam site pointing out the geological features and engineering constraints
  and to obtain community views and opinions
- Building physical models to explain design issues

Design Optimisation Workshops
Optimisation workshops were programmed into Phase 1 of the project to select the optimal designs
for the spillway and embankment. While highly technical in nature the community was invited to
participate as different design options would have significant impacts on cost, the environment and
public amenity. In this way social, environmental, economic and engineering concerns were
addressed.
**Continuous Community Participation**

A process of continuous community participation was adopted where the CAC was engaged at every step of Phase 1. This included:

- Fortnightly workshops and meetings
- Detailed briefing kits and presentations
- Regular site visits to obtain community input on particular design aspects or challenges as they arose.

This process of continuous participation allowed all parties to be well informed and created an environment where issues could be addressed quickly and efficiently.

**Improving Decision Making**

The decision making process significantly improved the decisions made in the three key areas of phase 1.

1) **Spillway and embankment design.** The option chosen for the spillway and embankment design resulted in a solution that provided significant benefits to the community and environment. Specifically the final option used less material, hence lowered costs, decreased the impact on the environment as a result of a decreased requirement to quarry and transport material and provided for the suitable development of the new recreational facilities that had to be relocated because of construction.

2) **Road Design.** Involving the community in the process of designing the road system for construction and post-construction proved immensely valuable as this aspect of the project could have had severe impacts on the local residents. Working with participants a road network was designed that met the needs of the project and the post-construction needs of the community.

3) **Recreational facilities.** The community had a strong emotional attachment to the dam as it provided for significant recreational activities that included walking/hiking, mountain biking, rowing and fishing. In one specific example where the HDA worked with the fishing community, the Alliance was able to design and build new boat ramps that were suitable for use by fishers. These designs were based almost entirely on community input and resulted in an outcome that had 100% acceptance.

Further, the final post-construction recreational design process intimately involved the community and now has resulted in a design that has taken into account nearly all of the community needs and concerns.

**Public Participation Solution**

One of the challenges of public participation in projects such as this one is the different levels of knowledge members of the community have in the areas of design, engineering, environment and economics. Equally, project managers often have little understanding of community values and issues.

The process of instructional scaffolding and continuous community participation allowed all parties to develop a level of knowledge where an environment of reasonable decision making was created. The community engagement team also provided education and training to the engineering and design team on the collaborative enquiry-by-design method of engagement. One of the clear benefits was that everyone was able to speak a common language, a key factor in successful communication.

Specifically this process allowed all parties “to walk a mile in each other’s shoes”.

---
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New Areas

While this particular project involved the community in the spillway and embankment design it demonstrates that the public can participate in the broader area of structural engineering and design. The engagement process also allowed the public to see a number of options and divergent solution requirements that have to be considered for the most optimal outcome to be achieved. This was most evident in the road network solutions were the engagement of the public allowed the varying agreement within their group to be observed and how solutions are a compromise that best suits all feedback being considered.

Project Results

Public participation in this project was critical both from a community engagement perspective and project delivery. The successful completion of Hinze Dam Stage 3 – Phase 1 was critically important as this was fundamental to the completion of the project on time.

As a result of the community engagement process the Alliance was able to develop designs that had the full support of the community as well as meeting project requirements. According the lead dam design engineer this process resulted in a superior design outcome.

The high level of public participation allowed the Alliance to proceed to Phase 2, detailed design and budget, the full confidence that the cost of delivering this project could be determined without any delays or alterations arising from community dissatisfaction.

Post-Phase 1 market research revealed 93 percent of the community was very satisfied with the way the Alliance engaged participants. Members of the Community Advisory Committee were particularly pleased with the process as they felt that were always fully informed and that their input into the process was both welcomed and valued.

IAP2 Core Values

The Hinze Dam Alliance is confident that the core values have been upheld during the delivery of this project and is continuing to engage the community in meaningful way. Specifically:

1) **The public should have a say in decisions about actions that could affect their lives.**
   The community was able to contribute to the decision making process and resulting actions affecting their lives through the scaffolding and continuous engagement process that included regular meetings, site visits, presentations and optimisation workshops.

2) **Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.**
   The community’s contribution directly influenced the design of the spillway, embankment wall, road network and recreational facilities.

3) **Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognising and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.**
   All stakeholders, including a representation of a cross-section of community interests were involved in the decision making processes. Designers, engineers, environmentalists, elected representatives, community and sporting groups and residents were all provided with the opportunity to have input and have their issues heard.
4) **Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by, or interested in, a decision.**

The HDA made a concerted effort to identify all those segments of the community who may have been affected by, or interested in, the project from the outset. The opportunity to participate in the project was promoted through a number of channels including advertising and community networks.

5) **Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.**

The community was involved from the outset on this project and were given the opportunity not only to influence project decisions, but also influence how they could be involved. Many of the suggestions such as site visits and topics of project presentations came directly from the community itself.

6) **Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.** The community was always provided with the fullest and latest information through a number of channels including the monthly CAC meetings, site visits, workshops, detailed briefing kits, fact sheets and website.

7) **Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.**

Suggestions from the community were always recorded as action items for the Alliance to address. At subsequent meetings the Alliance always reported back how these items were addressed hence communicating to participants how their inputs affected decisions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Kansas City Wet Weather Solutions Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Kansas City Missouri Water Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Sustainable water resource management to minimize loss due to flooding, improve water quality and maximize economic, social and environmental benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Wet Weather Community Panel, Basin Coordinating Committees and Wet Weather Fairs, Road Show Presentations, Green Solutions Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Increased citizen knowledge, increased participation levels and participation venues, impacted sister agencies in the city to include sustainable initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Urban City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>Initiated 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>General public, 650,000 waste water consumers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Submission for the Organization of the Year Award
Kansas City, Missouri Wet Weather Solutions Program

The Kansas City Missouri Water Services Department’s Wet Weather Solutions Program is a large scale public participation process that resulted in significant changes to the culture of an entire city organization, introducing and promoting sustainability, starting with management of water resources and moving throughout all aspects of the Department. As a result of the public participation process, Kansas City is destined to be one of the greenest cities in the United States over the next 25 years. Through the use of core values, public participation efforts brought about the integration of Kansas City’s wastewater and stormwater programs.

Founded with the mission to manage the City’s water resources in a sustainable way, the Wet Weather Solutions Program’s strong, creative leadership and stewardship ethic have met diverse citizen expectations. The City’s Water Services Department had previously never involved the public until this Program demonstrated successful public participation efforts. Now, several committees work on policy issues and participation at the project level.

Born out of the regulatory and financial crisis faced by the Overflow Control Program (OCP), a division of the Kansas City Missouri Water Services Department, the Wet Weather Solutions Program established desired outcomes and guiding principles to meet the following challenges:

- Minimize the loss of life, injury and property damage due to flooding;
- Improve water quality; and
- Maximize economic, social, and environmental benefits.

Beginning in 2003, the OCP made a decision to develop a plan that would directly impact over 650,000 wastewater customers and produce the largest infrastructure project in Kansas City’s history. The OCP staff created a public participation plan that embraced many of the core values through leadership, stewardship and action. Three of the specific components of the program are:

- Wet Weather Community Panel
- Basin Coordinating Committees & Wet Weather Fairs
- Road Show Presentations
- Green Solution Initiatives
Wet Weather Community Panel

The heart of the Program, the Wet Weather Community Panel, first began meeting in September 2003. The mayoral-appointed Panel consisted of local technical experts, council district representatives, environmental group representatives, and neighborhood/citizen representatives. Initially, the Panel was charged with giving feedback on a plan for the Overflow Control Program. As the group became more educated, however, they requested that their scope be expanded. They wanted to see how stormwater impacted the sewer problems in Kansas City which led to formal creation of the Wet Weather Solutions Program in the summer of 2005. This group's work has truly resulted in a regulatory-driven plan that, once implemented, will go beyond meeting regulations and is certain to achieve community values and goals.

To date, the Wet Weather Community Panel has met 41 times. Membership of the Panel has fluctuated during the 5 years of meetings, however a core group of around 20 individuals has continued to attend the meetings and provide meaningful input. In January 2006, a successful effort was made to invite business leaders to become involved in the Panel as well.

The central interest for the Panelists over the years is the importance of creating a plan that is beneficial for all of Kansas City. Through this interest and input from the public, subcommittees were created to discuss particular issues in more detail. In addition to the monthly Community Panel meetings, the Guiding Principles, Goals & Objectives, Public Participation, Sewer Back-up Program, and Green Solutions Subcommittees meet independently to discuss specific issues that allow for more meaningful participation.

Throughout the entire process, the Community Panel has constantly encouraged the program staff to educate the public. The Community Panel provided valuable feedback into the public participation plan that was developed by staff and helped brainstorm some ideas for further outreach. Some of the major educational components of the public participation plan that have been carried out include a wet weather video, water bill newsletter inserts that are distributed to over 450,000 persons, television programming on the local access channel, a 10,000 Rain Gardens Campaign that was advertised through television and radio media, two public opinion surveys that were randomly distributed throughout Kansas City, and a Wet Weather Solutions Program website that contains information on what citizens can do as well as information on meeting dates and materials.

Basin Coordinating Committees & Wet Weather Fairs

The Wet Weather Community Panel was tasked with providing a city-wide view of what the plan should look like, but some smaller basin decisions needed to be made as well. As laid out
in the public participation plan, in July 2006, 12 Basin Coordinating Committees were formed throughout Kansas City so participants could provide more basin-specific information to the staff.

Four planning meetings and a Wet Weather Fair, an open house, were held for each basin. A total of fifty-seven basin public meetings, including the Wet Weather Fairs, were held in 2006 and 2007. By seeking out and facilitating citizen involvement, more than 200 participants were involved in the basin planning meetings, and over 400 participants attended the Wet Weather Fairs. Basin Coordinating Committees members included Community Panelists, local and regional government representatives, community representatives from neighborhood associations or other interested organizations, and representatives from City departments.

Basin Coordinating Committee meeting participants and over 500 other interested persons continue to be informed about the Wet Weather Solutions Program by receiving email notifications.

**Road Show Presentations**

The Community Panel meetings and Basin Coordinating Committee meetings were not enough in the eyes of the program staff. There still needed to be a way to reach the average citizen to keep the promise that the public’s contributions would influence decisions. In April 2006, the Wet Weather Solutions Program staff sent a letter to nearly 300 neighborhood groups in Kansas City asking to make a presentation at one of their organization’s meetings. The response was well-received with over 58 presentations made to almost 1,400 people since December 2007. In April 2008, an additional letter was sent to the same groups asking to give an updated presentation. Again, the response has been well-received with 20 presentations made to nearly 600 people, to date. Community Panelists have also recently become involved in the road show presentation process and often accompany a staff person at presentations to give provide a different perspective to citizens. When making a presentation, program staff show a 7-minute video on the program and distribute Citizen Action Kits which contain handout information on how citizens can make a difference.

**Green Solution Initiatives**

Another Community Panel subcommittee, the Green Solutions Subcommittee, began to meet in January 2007 to discuss how more green solutions could be incorporated into the plan—particularly the Overflow Control Plan. The Panelists on that subcommittee created a position paper that was fully embraced by the entire Wet Weather Community Panel as well as unanimous support from the City Council and Mayor of Kansas City. The Panelists’ work has led to a green movement in Kansas City far beyond the reach of the Wet Weather Solutions Program.
The Green Solutions Subcommittee and Wet Weather Community Panel have become so passionate about green solutions that it has become a central focus of concern over the past year. Along with the City Council’s encouragement, the Wet Weather Solutions Program staff began to look at ways to revise what were typically considered plans for grey solutions that involved mostly concrete and pipes and to include more green solutions such as rain gardens and rain barrels. As a result, the KC-One Stormwater Management Plan, as well as the Overflow Control Plan, have enhanced their plans to include a significant amount of green solutions.

Part of the City’s green movement was the KC Green Summit held in April 2008. Over 450 interested stakeholders from a variety of backgrounds attended the one-day workshop that focused on opportunities for citizens to learn how the City plans on being a truly green city. The summit included professional presentations about green solutions and green infrastructure and featured over 30 exhibits by local companies and corporations that currently utilize green solutions. An afternoon interactive session allowed participants the chance to work with elected officials, environmental professionals, and other interested citizens to help shape the future of some of the City’s largest green projects.

The green movement also has spread to individual city departments. On June 2\textsuperscript{nd} & 3\textsuperscript{rd}, the Assistant City Manager held an interdepartmental city workshop for administration-level employees and other City staff who are active in creating and overseeing projects that seek to incorporate sustainability (a triple bottom line) to simultaneously promote social equity, economic vitality and environmental quality. City staff, sustainability experts and municipal employees from across the country who have implemented successful programs in their communities presented at the conference. City staff then worked in breakout sessions to develop strategies for implementing sustainability in capital projects, purchasing, water, energy and codes/permits/plans. The City will implement ideas generated at the workshop in accordance with the City’s Green Solutions Policy, which directs departments to incorporate green solutions into projects, programs and policies.

Public Participation Evaluation and Results
The Wet Weather Solutions Program has been greatly impacted by the public participation efforts since it was formed, particularly over the last year. The Wet Weather Solutions Program itself was created as a result of stakeholder requests, which meets core values #5 and #7 As the stakeholders became more educated and invested in the Program, they were able to provide meaningful input to the program staff so that the right plan was developed for Kansas City, as described in core value #6. As each event or action was planned, the Program staff and consultants sought ways to include more citizens, especially people experiencing flooding who were affected by water management decisions, as core value #1 describes.
As part of the Wet Weather Community Panel, the Guiding Principles and Goals & Objectives Subcommittees created principles and goals that stakeholders expected the program staff to uphold, meeting core value #2. The principles and goals are displayed and discussed at each Community Panel meetings to ensure that they are considered and incorporated into the plan, as core values #3 and #4 express. When the Panelists felt they were not, the program staff found ways to better incorporate the principles and goals.

References
- Carol Grimaldi, Wet Weather Community Panel Chair: carolg@bccp.org
- Ginny Moore, Green Solutions Subcommittee Chair: gmoore@marc.org

Contact Person:
Sheila Shockey - Shockey Consulting Services, LLC
Sheila@shockeyconsulting.com
7611 Park St.
Lenexa, KS 66216
913-248-9585
913-248-9581 (FAX)

Award Category:
Organization of the Year Award

Project Name & Sponsoring Organization:
Wet Weather Solutions Program of Kansas City Missouri Water Services Department

Three Publications to receive notification of winning entry:
1. Yael Abouhalkah, Kansas City Star, 1729 Grand Blvd. Kansas City, MO 64108
2. Editor Brian Kaberline, Kansas City Business Journal, 1100 Main St., Suite 210, Kansas City, MO 64105-5123
3. Millie Crossland, Kansas City Missouri City Clerk’s Office, 414 E. 12th St., 25th Floor, Kansas City, MO 64106
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Project</th>
<th>Public Participation Strategy for the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area Plan Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organizing Group Location | Portland Development Commission  
Portland, Oregon, United States |
| Key Question/Problem | Whether and how to amend the existing Urban Renewal Plan.  
Confictive relationship of local residents and Planning Development Commission and mistrust of government.  
Lack of interest from a key stakeholder. |
| Sample Methods | Citizen Advisory Committee collaborative with the PDC, public meetings, mailings, web page, FAQ, outreach at local events, and citizen input survey. |
| Results | Breaking down of citizen mistrust of the PDC, increased perception of PDC openness and willingness to listen.  
Proposed amendment with broad public support. |
| Impact Level | Neighborhood |
| Time Frame | July 2007 – April 2008 |
| People Engaged | General public and neighborhood associations |
| Web Link | [http://www.pdc.us/four/lents/default.asp](http://www.pdc.us/four/lents/default.asp) |
Application for the IAP2 Core Values Award

Project Name: Public Participation Strategy for the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area Plan Amendment
Applicant Organization: Portland Development Commission (PDC)
Award Category: Project of the Year Award
Contact Person: Juan Carlos Ocaña-Chíu, Public Participation Coordinator, Portland Development Commission, 222 NW Fifth Avenue, Portland, OR 97266, USA. Telephone: (503) 823-3218. Fax: (503) 865-3712. E-mail address: ocana-chiujc@pdc.us
Individuals Nominated: Joleen Jensen-Classen, Bob Alexander, Amy Miller Dowell, Kevin Cronin, Juan Carlos Ocaña-Chíu, all from PDC; and Diane Hale, Bureau of Planning, City of Portland (formerly with PDC).
References: Cora Potter, Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Advisory Committee Chair, cora.potter@gmail.com; and Jess Laventall, Lents Neighborhood Association Transportation Chair, j.laventall@gmail.com

Description of the project and challenge: The Portland Development Commission (PDC) is pleased to nominate the Public Participation Strategy for the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area Plan Amendment project and staff for the 2008 IAP2 Core Values Award in the Project of the Year category. This project focused on engaging a wide range of stakeholders in the decision whether and how to amend the existing Urban Renewal Plan in the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area in Portland, Oregon. The Public Participation Strategy started in July 2007 and extended through April 2008.

PDC is the urban renewal, economic development and affordable housing agency of the City of Portland, Oregon. Oregon law allows cities and counties to designate urban renewal areas (URAs) to eliminate blight, as defined by the law, and “freeze” the property taxes in those areas that go to schools and other taxing jurisdictions. Property taxes generated by new development or rising property value go to the urban renewal agencies like PDC. PDC then sells bonds to pay for improvements in the URAs, and uses the property taxes to pay off the bonds. Once the bonds are fully paid off, URAs expire and the benefits of enhanced property values flow to local taxing jurisdictions that did not receive the tax increment revenue while the URAs were active. This financial mechanism is known as “tax-increment financing”. Physical improvements in URAs attract new businesses to, and retain existing enterprises in, these areas, which helps generate new jobs and economic vitality in the URAs.

Urban renewal has been a controversial practice in Portland since it was first implemented in the 1950s. Urban renewal boosters point out to the success of the URAs in the downtown/northwest Portland districts, where blighted, mostly industrial areas have been transformed into vibrant urban neighborhoods through the construction of condos, high-end retail, mass transit systems, and public amenities. Critics of urban renewal point out to the unintended consequences of this practice, which include the gentrification of neighborhoods and the related displacement of the communities that lived in those areas prior to urban renewal. Another key criticism is the temporary loss of revenue by taxing jurisdictions, which reduces the money to pay for social services, public safety, and schools.
The Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area (LTCURA) spans most of the Lents neighborhood, plus a significant portion of the Powellhurst-Gilbert neighborhood. The Lents neighborhood was originally an autonomous town settled by white pioneers in the 19th century. Lents had its own thriving downtown district with many local businesses, and was connected to Portland and other towns to the east by streetcar lines and roads. The majority of the Lents residents were blue-collar families. Lents was annexed by the City of Portland in the early 20th century, but the local community maintained a strong identification with Lents, more so than with Portland. The event that changed Lents forever was the construction of Interstate 205, which runs from north to south through the neighborhood, despite strong local opposition. The freeway created a physical and psychological barrier divided the neighborhood in two parts, and created a deep mistrust of government by the local community who felt their priorities were ignored by its elected officials and other government decision-makers.

The distrust of government by Lents residents extended also to PDC and urban renewal in general. When the Portland City Council and PDC created the LTCURA in 1998, the community agreed to go along only with the condition that PDC would not use eminent domain in order to carry out the urban renewal plan. Eminent domain had been used extensively to acquire the land where I-205 sits. Even after the LTCURA was created, with community support, the relationship between local residents and PDC was mostly conflictive. The Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Advisory Committee (LTCURAC), the main citizen advisory body to PDC regarding the implementation of urban renewal in the area, had many disagreements with PDC staff during the early years of this district.

The relationship between the Lents community and PDC staff improved slightly over time, but it has always had many ups and downs. When the PDC Board of Commissioners directed staff to initiate the LTCURA Plan Amendment Study in April 2007, the Lents Neighborhood Association, which has two representatives in the LTCURAC, went on the official record as being opposed to this study which, in their opinion, would dilute the focus on urban renewal in the Lents Town Center and open the door for the construction of more rental housing for low-income tenants, which is an issue opposed by many people in the community.

Another challenge for the project was the initial lack of interest from a key stakeholder: the Powellhurst-Gilbert Neighborhood Association. This neighborhood is adjacent to Lents on the east side, and a significant portion of its territory was included in the original urban renewal area. The Powellhurst-Gilbert Neighborhood Association has two representative seats on the LTCURAC, but at the beginning of the project only one was filled. When PDC staff approached the neighborhood association chair about naming an official representative for the citizen advisory committee that would be the primary mechanism for public participation, he declined citing a low level of interest on urban renewal among neighborhood residents.

**Description of Public Participation methods used:** Following the PDC Public Participation Policy, staff developed a public participation plan (PPP) for the LTCURA Plan Amendment Study. The PPP followed very closely the IAP2 methods for effective public participation. The project was:

- Values-based: it identified and considered the values of all parties involved (the local community, neighborhood and business associations, and government entities involved);
• Decision-oriented: it clearly identified the decision to be made (whether and how to amend the LTCURA urban renewal plan); and
• Goal-driven: it identified specific outcomes to be achieved throughout the life of the project. In the IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum, the LTCURA Plan Amendment project reached mostly the “Involve” level, with some elements of the project reaching the “Collaborate” level.

The PPP identified the public participation goals; the primary, secondary and additional stakeholders; and the tools, timelines, and an evaluation component. The two public participation goals of the PPP called for:
1. Informing and educating stakeholders and the general public about the study on the future of the LTCURA, including both maintaining the original plan and amending it.
2. Providing opportunities for comment and feedback from both stakeholders and the general public.

The main public participation tool for this project was a seven-member citizen advisory committee (CAC) that was charged with answering three key questions for the LTCURA Plan Amendment Study:

a. Should the boundary of the LTCURA be expanded, and where?
b. Should the financial capacity of the LTCURA be expanded?
c. Should the expiration date of the LTCURA be extended? (a corollary of literal [b.])

PDC staff created a charter for the CAC in order to have a consistent understanding of the CAC’s scope of work and authority. Staff also recruited potential CAC members and forwarded their names to the LTCURAC for official appointment. The CAC was instrumental in bringing the community and stakeholder perspective to the decision-making process. PDC staff incorporated this perspective as much as possible in order to make mutually-agreeable decisions. The project reached the “Collaborate” level in its decision-making thanks to the CAC.

Other public participation tools used by the project staff were: public meetings; mailings to stakeholders and the general public; the creation of a project-specific web page; outreach at public events; creation and distribution of a fact sheet to easily explain the project; and mass e-mail distribution to people interested in the project. PDC staff also designed a survey to collect the public’s input on the project in a standard manner. The survey contained both close- and open-ended questions. The CAC and staff considered the public’s aspirations and concerns throughout their work on the project, thus reaching the “Involve” level in the IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum. The PPP also included a timeline for implementation and an evaluation component.

What made the project special? There are two elements that made the Public Participation Strategy for the LTCURA Plan Amendment special:

1. The breadth of outreach in the community in order to ensure meaningful public participation. Portland is known as a city with above-average public participation in civic processes, either in grassroots efforts or those initiated by government entities. Portland has an officially-sanctioned structure for public participation: the neighborhood association system. There are 97 official neighborhood associations (NAs) that cover the city. Membership is open to
anyone who lives or owns property in the neighborhood. The NAs are expected to facilitate their members’ participation in civic life, and to advocate for their needs and aspirations. However, the NAs tend to represent a narrower segment of the community than originally intended. People of color, people who do not speak English or speak it as a second language, low-income people, and renters tend to feel excluded from their NA and not participate in it.

The majority of City government agencies rely on NAs and public meetings to fulfill their public participation requirements. PDC staff decided to go beyond these two mechanisms and get public input where the public is. PDC staff conducted outreach at nine community events, including a farmer’s market, two community fairs, three crime prevention events, and two open-air concerts. Staff made eight presentations to four NAs affected by the project, as well as four presentations to two local business associations (one presentation to each entity before the CAC created their recommendations, and one after the recommendations). Finally staff organized one open house to present the project to the community at-large.

2. The flexibility in implementing the PPP. PDC staff was quick to recognize challenges in the implementation of the original PPP, and to make changes to respond to those challenges. For example, staff faced challenges collecting sufficient information from residents of the Powellhurst-Gilbert neighborhood. This was not a surprise, given the lack of interest by the neighborhood association to have an official representative in the CAC. Staff decided to do a special mailing of the survey to residents of that neighborhood in order to generate more responses. Staff was able to both create and send the mailing quickly, and also to extend the original information collection deadline. In the end, the total number of survey responses from the Powellhurst-Gilbert neighborhood was the second highest of all neighborhoods included in the project.

**Description of the project’s effectiveness:** The Public Participation Strategy for the LTCURA Plan Amendment was most effective in two areas: improving and strengthening the relationships between PDC and key stakeholders and the community in general; and creating a proposed amendment that has broad support.

1. **Improving and strengthening relationships between PDC and key stakeholders and the general community.** Through the implementation of the PPP, PDC staff was able to demonstrate to the public that the organization is truly committed to hearing from as many people as possible prior to making decisions such as the LTCURA Plan Amendment. This demonstration of commitment to public participation helped break down the mistrust of PDC by people who had been vocal opponents of the project. During his testimony in favor of the adoption of the proposed LTCURA Plan Amendment to City Council in June 2008, a member of the Lents Neighborhood Association candidly admitted to his initial opposition to and apprehension about the project, and credited the PDC staff’s openness to work collaboratively and listen carefully to his change of mind. At outreach events, staff also heard many community members express appreciation for the efforts that PDC was making to inform the general public about the project and solicit their input.

2. **Creating a proposed amendment that has broad support.** Thanks to the breadth and depth of the public participation strategy, the LTCURA Plan Amendment project generated
recommendations that have broad local support. The CAC met once a month for five months (August through December 2007) to come up with answers to the three questions identified in their charter. The CAC considered the technical information provided by staff and consultants and the community input gathered through the PPP. By relying on these two sets of data, the CAC and staff were able to reach agreement on the answers to the three questions, which collectively became known as the proposed amendment. Once the CAC and the LTCURAC approved the proposed amendment, it was forwarded to the final decision-making bodies (PDC Board of Commissioners, City Planning Commission, and City Council). Members of the public have requested changes to the proposed amendment, but so far it has not been changed due in large extent to the fact that decision-makers recognize that the proposed amendment is the product of a meaningful public participation process that enjoys broad support.

**How were IAP2 Core Values met?** The Public Participation Strategy for the LTCURA Plan Amendment Project clearly identified the decisions regarding the URA plan amendment, and gave the public several ways for having a say on the decisions, such as CAC meetings, presentations to neighborhood and business associations, and outreach at public events (Value 1). The project honored the promise that the public’s input will influence the decision by appointing a CAC in charge of that task. PDC public participation staff is also committed to observing the IAP2 Code of Ethics and respecting and taking into consideration the public’s input (Value 2).

PDC staff was also committed to considering the input from all participants in the public participation process for this project. Staff did not choose what perspectives to present to the CAC for decision-making. The CAC members brought forth a diversity of points of view about PDC and the project itself, which ensured that they considered the diversity of input from the public (Value 3). Recognizing challenges in the implementation of the original PPP, staff made special efforts to reach out to residents of the Powellhurst-Gilbert neighborhood and facilitate their participation in the process (Value 4). Staff listened to and implemented ideas from the participants about how to engage more folks. For example, after the CAC completed the proposed amendment, a new member of the Powellhurst-Gilbert NA Board approached staff to request that we made a presentation to that NA about the plan. Staff was happy to do so, especially given the initial lack of interest from that NA (Value 5).

As part of the public participation strategy, PDC staff created a short and easy-to-read set of frequently-asked questions about the LTCURA Plan Amendment. Staff also made available to the public all the technical and public participation documents related to the project, either online or in hard copy (Value 6). Finally, PDC made efforts to communicate the results of the project back to all stakeholders and community members who had expressed interest in the project. Staff made presentations to all the affected neighborhood and business associations. Also, following State law, staff sent a notice about the proposed changes to the Lents Town Center and other URAs to every postal customer in the City of Portland (Value 7).

The Public Participation Strategy for the LTCURA Plan Amendment project gave the public the opportunity to participate meaningfully in a decision that affects their lives, and also gave PDC the opportunity to increase its visibility in the community and break down some of the mistrust of government that has hindered its work in the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Project</th>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement Case Study: Bus Priority Consultation Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Christchurch, New Zealand, pop. 348,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Create priority bus routes (over other traffic), previous scheme rejected. Include economic and social needs with engineering needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Community Engagement Team, local community engagement advisors, brochures, web site. Interactive displays, open forums and seminars targeted to stakeholder groups (youth, teenagers, elderly, people with disabilities, people with small children, migrant and refugee groups).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Increased information relieved concerns, decisions reflected economic and social needs, Community Engagement Team created venue for local voice and communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Metropolitan City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>City wide – see sample methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Stakeholder Engagement Case Study: Bus Priority Consultation Project

1. The challenge or problem faced
Christchurch is the largest metropolitan centre in the South Island of New Zealand and the second largest local authority in New Zealand. With a population of 348,000, 30% of the city is in some form of urban land use and accommodates 97% of the city’s residents.

Forecasts suggest that there will be a 14% population increase by the year 2021 and traffic congestion will have grown by 160%. Christchurch is then, faced with more traffic, more congestion and more pollution. It has therefore been considered vital that a range of transport measures are implemented to quickly and cleanly move large numbers of people around the city. One approach is to encourage more people to use buses.

The Bus Priority Project was initiated as a part of the Public Passenger Transport Strategy, a joint strategy between the Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury (regional authority). Bus Priority measures give buses priority over other traffic along key corridors throughout the city, thus making bus travel more attractive to citizens.

There was a considerable amount of sensitivity around this project. A bus priority scheme had previously been attempted by the Council and rejected. Furthermore, Christchurch residents love their cars. As a consequence it was decided that a considerable amount of effort should be put into the marketing, consultation and communication of the project. The Community Engagement Team was brought in to work alongside the project’s engineers during the consultation phases.

The primary public participation aim was to inform and involve the wider Christchurch community in the development of proposals for achieving bus priority along elected routes, whilst minimising the effect on other road users, residents, and business operators along the routes.

How each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation
Local Community Engagement Advisers maintained a neutral position, facilitating discussions and allowing space for residents to share their views and local knowledge with technical project staff.

The project manager and key technical staff focussed on the details and constraints of the project.

Elected officials used the information gathered from public participation in the decision making process.

Affected parties who engaged in participation opportunities were initially sceptical of the value in doing so. Ultimately it was seen by those who participated as a worthwhile process which resulted in local views being considered in the decision making process.

2. Methods Used to implement Public Participation
A wide variety of methods were used. Over 40,000 route specific brochures were delivered into the community. A bus priority website displayed specific and detailed
information and provided an opportunity to feedback to Council. Information was displayed at libraries and shopping malls. Eighteen seminars and open forums were held across the city, each targeting different groups with different demographics and areas of interest. Local media were used extensively with the project leader ready to commit to interviews at will.

Much attention was given to those who were considered hard to reach. An inner city display space was specifically used to target school groups. Older youth were targeted via bill bollards at skate parks and central city hangout spaces. Additionally, temporary staff were brought on board to target and inform youth and commuters at the central city bus exchange, as well as those on buses along the selected routes.

Disability and elderly interest groups were specifically consulted, and individuals identified with special needs, such as mothers with young children, were targeted at shopping malls, medical centres, libraries and council service centres. Interactive displays at these sites were staffed to enable greater opportunities for participation. Refugee and migrant groups were reached using local contacts as well as the Council's Multicultural advisor.

3. What made this project special?
The Community Engagement Team is a team of seven based at each service centres around the city. The team advise on and deliver local public participation opportunities. Advisers were brought in to work alongside the project’s engineers during the public participation phase

Locally based advisers have the advantages of being able to build and develop key relationships, both with the community and other local staff. This has enabled trust to be built and has ensured local accountability. The Community Engagement Team were brought in for stage one of the project – which focussed on three key routes.

How public participation significantly improved the decision made

The team tailored a number of solutions to meet the needs identified by the public. In one area, where there are a number of heritage buildings, the fear of losing these was allayed by the creation of a heritage plan which would enhance the historic nature of the area. Alternative funding for a distinct parking bay was found further down the road where a group of businesses relying on short term early morning parking were facing the loss of key parking. In another high socio-economic area where businesses were expressing a high level of anxiety over the potential loss of their parking, a parking strategy was initiated that would benefit the whole area, not just street side businesses.

Innovative participation techniques used?
As mentioned in the methods above: Interactive displays, open forums and seminars targeted towards specific stakeholder, high level of media exposure sought and was followed up with and open and regular interviews. Inner city exhibition/display space targeting school groups, older youth targeted with bill bollards at skate parks and central city hangout spaces. A tactile display was created for the inner city exhibition to enhance the interaction between temporary staff and those at the central city bus exchange and on buses. Stakeholder groups were specifically targeted at shopping mall, medical centres, libraries and service centres. Migrant groups were reached using local known contacts as well as the Council’s Multicultural Adviser.
Internal co-ordination and understanding of the importance of early public participation in the project was important. Early in the process it was decided to set up a cross-Council project team which would focus on the non-technical aspects of the project. Community Engagement Advisers working in the areas where residents were to be potentially affected by the pending decision actively participated in these meetings and gave advice on best practice approaches and appropriate public participation techniques for their areas. They also took responsibility for targeting local stakeholders along the specific routes. These included residents associations and neighbourhood groups, businesses, educational institutions, land owners and occupiers and other community organisations. In assessing the needs of the stakeholders their environmental, economic and social needs were taken into account. This early local engagement enabled identification of the biggest issue, which was businesses along these routes potentially losing parking for their customers. The engagement process ensured they were heard and addressed in an effective and timely manner.

**Spreading the practice of public participation into a new area**

The Community Engagement Team is a relatively new dedicated resource for increasing public participation at Christchurch City Council. This project illustrated the effectiveness of using local resources in a large.

4. **The project’s effectiveness or results and the role that the public participation process played**

The public participation process used was flexible and responsive to community views. The process enabled the final decision to be acceptable to residents. Feedback received indicated that participants felt that it was a genuine process. For example, a participant was quoted in the *Community News* newspaper on Sunday 13th January 2008 said “Mr Rothschild believed that the Council had been “quite receptive” to their concerns.”

The project manager, Richard West had the following to say about the role of the Community Engagement Team in the public participation process.

*The Community Engagement Team has provided the local knowledge and the vital link into the community stakeholders to enable effective consultation to take place. The project team have held in excess of 40 seminars and open forums around the city. We have also held mall displays and distributed over 42,000 documents. This would not have been possible without the Community Engagement Team. The Team stepped up to the challenge and met it head on both in the office and on the streets in what can only be described as a sometimes less than friendly environment. I genuinely thank the Community Engagement Team for their overwhelming support and proactive approach to the challenges. I am extremely proud of their performance as part of the Bus Priority Communications Team.*

*Richard West*

*Project Manager - Transport.*

5. **How the IAP2 Core values were met**
1. **Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.**

Project manager Richard West was very committed to public participation which was evidenced by the range and breadth of public participation techniques which were supported. For example, the interactive displays and the central city exhibition which included an interactive game designed to appeal to children.

Community Engagement Advisers are all trained in IAP2 and have as the core purpose of their role as enabling people to participate in decisions making processes which affect their lives.

2. **Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.**

The consultation plan very clearly stated the consultation aim, the project constraints, those areas that could not be influenced, the project changeables, and areas that could be influenced. The promise to the public was very clear about how their contribution could influence the decision making. For example, installation of the parking bay outside one suburban business as a response to their concerns re loss of short-term parking.

3. **Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.**

The consultation process involved assessing the economic, sustainable and social needs of all participants, including early and ongoing engagement with elected members and key stakeholders. The variety of methods used ensured that hard to reach groups had the ability to participate in the decision making process.

4. **Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.**

Groups which are considered hard to reach such as youth and people with disabilities were sought out through network meetings and contacts. Those directly affected such as shop owners along Papanui Road route were visited personally.

5. **Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.**

When it became apparent that there were wider issues around parking in one specific suburb, an additional group was appointed. Participants were able to design how they would meet and progress this further. A limited number of people could join the group so they appointed representatives to speak on their behalf and meet with the designers, project leader and consultation staff to workshop solutions to the parking issue. The result was the establishment of a suburban parking strategy.

6. **Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.**
The wide variety of consultation methods and materials enabled people with differing learning styles the opportunity to participate in the process accordingly. For example, an interactive display with a game designed to appeal to children helped them to understand the concept of bus priority.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

Letters were sent to everyone who made a submission. The letter addressed how the information that they had provided was being incorporated into the plan. If it had been decided that it was not going to be incorporated this was communicated with the reasons why it was not being included. The final decision on all bus routes affected was communicated via the news media.

6. Two individuals, outside the organisation, who were participants in the project or program and who can serve as references. Addresses for referees:

Rex Mason
Mason and Carter Goldsmiths
186 Papanui Road
Phone: 355 3352
Fax: 355 3354

Tony Rothschild
Haralds
470 Papanui Road
Phone: 352 6763

Name of contact person: Clare Quirke
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Phone: 03 941 8755
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### Tay River Advisory Committee (TRAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Shell Canada Ltd. &amp; Mancal Energy Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Tay River, Alberta Foothills northeast of Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholder engagement project for which the TRAC was established “to provide guidance to ensure gas development in the Tay River area of interest is undertaken in a manner that balances social, environmental and economic benefits and minimizes negative impacts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>A broad range of stakeholders with different perspectives led to 23 TRAC meetings over a 2 ½ yr project. Stakeholders included the public, other petroleum companies, local governments &amp; authorities, First Nations, environmentalists, special interest groups, recreational users, community/youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Very successful process and although the development was eventually cancelled due to the smaller than expected pool, TRAC ’s decision-making process led to regulatory approvals and no hearings were required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>2005 - 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>See sample methods for list of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.shell.ca/home/content/ca-en/society_environment/social/dir_social.html">http://www.shell.ca/home/content/ca-en/society_environment/social/dir_social.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Name: Tay River Advisory Committee
Award Category: Project of the Year
Sponsors: Shell Canada Limited and Mancal Energy Inc.
Nominees: Norm Wiens, Byron Lutes, Stuart Wilson and Gay Robinson
Contact Person: Gay Robinson
163 Woodpark Circle S.W., Calgary, AB T2W 6G1
Phone: 403.281.8849    Fax: 403.281.8945
Email: gerobinson@shaw.ca

Our Project

Background
In December 2004, Shell Canada Limited and Mancal Energy Inc. discovered a natural gas pool in Alberta, Canada. The Tay River pool was estimated to contain over 500 billion cubic feet (BCF) of raw gas and thought to be one of the largest gas discoveries in recent years.

Early in the process of developing the pool, Shell and Mancal sought to engage stakeholders within the general area. It was determined that an advisory group comprised of a wide representation of stakeholders could provide a forum for informed discussion and input on the development of the Tay River pool. To this end, Shell and Mancal formed the Tay River Advisory Committee (TRAC) in March 2005.

Mission Statement
TRAC’s overall purpose was to provide input on the development of gas reserves in the Tay River pool. The group adopted the following mission statement:

TRAC’s mission is to provide guidance to ensure gas development in the Tay River area of interest is undertaken in a manner that balances social, environmental and economic benefits and minimizes negative impacts.

Promise to the Public
Shell and Mancal demonstrated their commitment to public participation from the beginning by developing the following promise to the public:

The Project Proponents will partner with the public, through the TRAC process, to develop and discuss options and recommendations for well locations, gas processing options, gathering system routing and operating performance measures and will incorporate these into their development plans to the fullest extent possible.

Challenges & Different Perspectives
As Shell and Mancal planned for the development of the Tay pool, they faced a number of challenges. Stakeholder buy-in was key in order to receive regulatory approval to proceed. This meant developing the field in a manner that was publically acceptable and environmentally compatible, while at the same time dealing with technical and economic realities. Some specific challenges included:

• Public Safety – The Tay pool contained “sour gas”, which is raw natural gas that contains hydrogen sulphide (H2S), a highly toxic substance. The Tay pool was estimated to be 32% H2S, which is considered to be a high concentration. Public safety was a key concern.
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- **Location** - The Tay pool is located under public lands in a wilderness area on the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains. This area is considered “Traditional Lands” by some First Nations groups and potentially contained sacred sites. There is high recreational usage, including camping, fishing and mountain biking, registered trap lines and the area is also popular with outfitters operating horseback hunting expeditions. Environmental impacts, particularly surface disturbance, were important issues.

- **Industry Practices** - The petroleum industry is often accused of having little regard for stakeholder concerns or environmental impacts. This generalization presents challenges for any new project. Furthermore, the regulators and special interest groups were putting pressure on industry to create area development plans, rather than consulting on one well at a time. Engaging the public in decisions regarding the whole project was important.

- **Technical Nature** - Not all stakeholders have the knowledge base to understand the technical issues associated with development of a gas field. This is not, however, a reason to not engage them in the decision process. Efforts needed to be made to ensure stakeholder had the information they needed to participate in a meaningful way.

- **Multiple Stakeholders** - Because of the location and type of project, there were a wide range of potential stakeholders, all with a desire to be actively engaged in project decisions.

Shell and Mancal sought to include a wide range of stakeholders in TRAC. Each came to the table with a different view of the project and the role of public participation:

| Shell & Mancal                                    | • Due to the nature of the project, saw the need for consultation that exceeded regulatory requirements.  
|                                                   | • Believed that public input could benefit project design and give it a better chance of regulatory approval. |
| Other Petroleum Companies                         | • Brought to the table by public pressure. Community wanted an area development plan including all companies wanting to drill in the area.  
|                                                   | • Some companies viewed consultation as an onerous obligation. |
| Provincial Regulators                             | • Knew the level of consultation required by regulation and wanted to monitor how this was met or exceeded. |
| Local Governments & Authorities                   | • Wanted to be involved to protect the interests of their citizens.  
|                                                   | • Needed to ensure that regulations were followed and the public had input into decisions. |
| First Nations                                     | • Believed treaty rights required they be engaged in development plans. |
| Environmental / Special Interest                  | • All felt the nature of the project and potential impacts required a high level of public participation in development plans.  
|                                                   | • Alberta’s leading environmental activist, Martha Kostuch, felt members should have right to veto decisions and influence regulatory process. |
| Recreational & Other Users                        | • Because of the impact the project could have on their livelihoods or use of the area, felt a high level of public engagement was needed. |
| Community / Youth                                 | • Community wanted involvement in something that had potential for both positive and negative impacts on quality of life.  
|                                                   | • Representative from the local high school was sought to provide a youth perspective. |

**Our Process**

While the advisory committee was not the only technique used by the sponsors to consult on the development of the gas field, it was key to ensuring collaboration. TRAC met 23 times over a two and a half year period. Dinner meetings were held in Rocky Mountain House, the community closet to the project, and lasted about three hours, depending on the agenda and the need for continued discussion. Over TRAC’s life-span, relationships were formed and strengthened and a sense of team emerged. Despite the serious nature of the project, efforts
were made to make the meetings enjoyable; one of the meeting ground rules was “Have Fun”. While there was lots of healthy debate, there were also lots of celebrations and inside jokes. TRAC's name (as in helping the sponsors to keep the project on the right “TRAC”) was the first of many group acronyms and members had fun coming up with new ones.

**Advisory Committee Terms of Reference**
Much of TRAC’s processes and procedures were outlined in the draft Terms of Reference (TRAC TOR). This document included the scope of the project; vision, mission and purpose of the committee; decision-making process; membership; logistics and operation; roles and responsibilities; and documentation. The terms of reference were accepted in principle, but never actually ratified by the group. This was partially because of the group's request to move away from a consensus decision-making process to one based on recommendations and substantial agreement. Once this shift was made, the group wanted to focus more on the development and the terms of reference were put on the back burner.

**Core Values**
The group developed the following set of core values, which not only shaped the group process, but also helped guide the creation of decision criteria and analysis of options.

The members of TRAC believe the Tay River field should be developed in a manner that:
- Ensures public and worker safety and utilizes a synergistic approach to emergency response;
- Ensures environmental responsibility and stewardship;
- Optimizes social and economic benefits;
- Incorporates an open, honest and transparent process that encompasses cultural diversity and respect for all stakeholders; and
- Provides a legacy for the community and industry together.

**Sub-Committees & Tools**
As the need arose, sub-committees and special initiatives were created. It was through these subcommittees that TRAC did its most creative and collaborative work.

**TREE** - Surface disturbance and impacts to wildlife habitat were key issues. While TRAC members understood the need for a particular segment of pipeline, they were concerned about the loss of wildlife habitat. The group discussed the concept of “zero net loss of habitat”; a practice of reclaiming habitat in one area to offset the loss of habitat in another. TRAC members, community and sponsors alike, saw this as a win-win solution; the pipeline would be built and habitat in other areas would be reclaimed. The sponsors established the Tay River Environmental Enhancement (TREE) Fund; a $300,000 commitment to finance habitat enhancement projects put forward by third-party organizations. The sponsors wanted the community to select the projects to be funded, so a sub-committee was struck. The TREE committee was empowered to create an application process and selection criteria for potential projects and to make recommendations to TRAC on grants from the TREE Fund. Approved projects ranged from grizzly bear habitat enhancement and stream-bed restoration to a cougar tracking project and wilderness access management.

**TRIP** - Another of the stakeholders' concerns was proliferation of infrastructure. Where possible, they wanted industry to use existing infrastructure or share pipelines and right-of-ways. This became particularly important with regard to where the gas would be processed. The Tay River Infrastructure Planning (TRIP) Committee was formed to look at options for gas processing. This group collaborated on creation of decision criteria and options and ultimately made a recommendation to TRAC. The data required to evaluate the options was highly technical and detailed. The six community members on TRIP worked hard to ensure they understood the data and could make an educated assessment of the options. The evaluation of
the TRIP process indicated participants felt they understood the information, appropriate options were considered and relevant decision criteria were used.

The Matrix - To simplify the analysis of options, TRIP came up with a matrix and colour-coding system. The nine options were across the top of the matrix and the 12 decision criteria were listed down the side. Each square on the matrix was assigned a colour based on the impact the option would have relative to the decision criteria. Green was low impact / no major issues; yellow was some impact and/or issues; orange was moderate impact and/or significant issues; and red was high impact, major issues and show-stoppers. Despite the large amount of data to be distilled to come up with the colour code, participants indicated it was not usually difficult to gain agreement on the assignment of colours. The colour-coded matrix provided a visual explanation of the option selected and TRAC as a whole accepted the recommendation.

What We Accomplished
After a number of wells were drilled it was determined that the Tay River pool was smaller than originally estimated and development was halted. However, the group had been a great success:

- TRAC was engaged in the decision process for siting four wells and routing one pipeline that eventually received regulatory approval. The group was also engaged in decisions regarding a number of other wells and pipelines, as well as the gas processing options.
- Community members encouraged industry members to work together and there was a noticeable shift from competition to co-operation by the petroleum companies.
- Because of TRAC's success, the regulator did not call any hearings. Furthermore, the regulators used TRAC as an example of a successful area development planning process.

What Made Us Special
Those involved were proud of the TRAC process and what it accomplished. It was a special process in so many ways: the wonderful people and their drive and commitment; the willingness of the sponsors to go beyond the regulatory requirements; the caliber and sustainability of the decisions because of stakeholder input; the willingness to collaborate despite the tough issues and technical nature of the project; the innovative approaches, techniques and solutions; and the feeling of camaraderie we shared. This project was cutting-edge in the Alberta petroleum industry and because of TRAC the public participation bar has been raised.

Living the IAP2 Core Values
IAP2’s Core Values were top-of-mind for TRAC’s sponsors and facilitator from its inception.  
1. TRAC was created so that those who would be affected by project decisions could be engaged in those decisions. It was established as a collaborative process, allowing community and industry to work together on the development of the gas field.
2. The sponsor’s promise to the public indicated that TRAC’s recommendations would be incorporated into the development plan to the fullest extent possible, thus having significant influence on the decisions. The Terms of Reference took this promise even further by specifically outlining the circumstances that would prevent the sponsors from implementing recommendations.
3. One of TRAC’s core values was to have an open, honest and transparent process that encompasses cultural diversity and respect for all stakeholders. Members, including the sponsors, helped set the meeting agendas and ensured that the interests and needs of all participants were address. The core values were also used to formulate decision criteria and to analyze options. The group produced a draft terms of reference, yet tried to remain flexible and responsive to the needs of its members.
4. As previously outlined, a wide variety of stakeholders were identified early in the process and invited to participate in TRAC. Once the community learned about TRAC, other individuals asked to participate. The community also identified petroleum companies that they wanted at the table and these companies eventually joined as well. Other stakeholders, such as the elders of a neighbouring First Nation, were engaged separately with site tours related to specific issues.

5. The TRAC process evolved based on input from participants. As mentioned, TRAC members collaborated on the creation of the group’s core values and terms of reference. After about a year of operation, the members chose to move away from a consensus decision making model, though efforts were still made to ensure participants were largely in agreement before any regulatory applications were submitted. The group also created some subcommittees, which allowed certain stakeholders to work on specific issues without being involved in TRAC as a whole.

6. TRAC’s written vision includes the term “mutual education”, which acknowledged that the sponsors had as much to learn as the other stakeholders. Because of the technical nature of petroleum exploration and development, a number of speakers and sessions were arranged to provide information on geology, drilling practices, construction techniques and safety precautions. A number of tours of specific areas were conducted both on foot, by road and in the air. The group also learned about animal habitat and habits from the trappers and outfitters, about air and water issues from the special interest representatives and about treaty rights and traditional land use from our First Nations participants.

7. The sponsors and other industry companies regularly updated TRAC on how participant input affected decisions. A company which was proposing a well site or pipeline route one meeting would come to the next meeting with a different route or site, demonstrating that group input had been taken into consideration. Well locations were changed, pipeline routes were altered, project timing and activities were modified and special initiatives were created because of the input of TRAC members.

Leaving a Legacy

TRAC’s core values called for the project to leave a legacy for community and industry and that was accomplished:

- An air monitoring program and SO2 modeling initiative were undertaken because of TRAC.
- An industry mutual aid co-operative was also formed through TRAC’s encouragement.
- TREE Fund projects are still working to restore habitat.
- TRAC is used as an example by regulators and stakeholders alike as an example of collaborative consultation and area development planning.
- The TRIP matrix has been included in the Synergy Alberta Toolbox as a best practice for collaborative decision making.

References

The following individuals were participants in the TRAC process and can serve as references:

- Judy Winter, community member and representative of a special interest group focused on water-related issues. jwinter@telusplanet.net
- Jim Bague, Mayor of Rocky Mountain House, Alberta; the community closest to and potentially most impacted by the proposed development. mayor@rockymtnhouse.com
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Project</th>
<th>US 127 North Roadway Improvements, Cumberland and Fentress Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group Location</td>
<td>TN/Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) Tennessee: From Interstate 40(Crossville) and north 14 miles to US 127 (Clarkrange). Population 2323(Clarkrange/Fentress); 46,802 (Cumberland); 8900 (as of 2000, in Crossville).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>A change in administration (2003) led to a review of this project along with 14 others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>CSS – context sensitive solutions approach. Public information meetings/forums, Citizen’s Resource Team (CRT), project database, Toll-free information line, Project info booths at community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Shift of public opinion to support of the project and of the TDOT (Tennessee Department of Transportation). Adoption of CSS approach for all future projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Residents of the counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2003 – 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>General public, engineers, administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/us127n/library.htm">http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/us127n/library.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Challenge Faced**
The US 127 North highway improvement project is located in rural Cumberland and Fentress counties in Tennessee. The project begins at Interstate 40 at Crossville and extends 14 miles north to the US 127/State Route 62 intersection in Clarkrange. The project was initiated in 1999 at the request of local elected officials and involves widening the existing two-lane road. The public initially expressed concern when the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) dropped the proposed alternative that basically followed the existing roadway in favor of an alternative located to the west of the existing roadway. Many members of the affected community felt that they had not been listened to and expressed a belief that the preferred alternative had been selected before public meetings were ever held.

During this time (2003), TDOT’s administration changed following the inauguration of a new governor. One of first priorities for the new administration was to improve TDOT’s credibility with the general public. The Center for Transportation Research at the University of Tennessee (UT) in Knoxville was commissioned to conduct a comprehensive, independent study examining 15 highly controversial proposed roadway projects. The US 127 North project was one of the 15 projects halted by the new administration pending completion of the independent study. According to the study results, the US 127 North highway project was “an excellent candidate for the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) approach.”

When the project was restarted, TDOT faced a number of challenges, not the least of which was the lack of trust that the public had in TDOT and its public involvement process. The CSS approach was also new, not only to the public as well as the resource agencies responsible for environmental review and permitting, but also to TDOT staff. The Department needed to gain the trust of the public and resource agencies, work in a collaborative manner to develop a solution that was acceptable to the community, and keep the project on schedule.

**Methods Used to Implement Public Participation**
A Citizens’ Resource Team (CRT) was appointed by TDOT Commissioner Gerald F. Nicely in Spring 2004 to represent the project community and work closely with the multidisciplinary TDOT and consultant project team to develop acceptable project alternatives. The ultimate goal of the CRT was to recommend a preferred alternative route to the Commissioner. Another team, the Clarkrange Working Group (CWG), was established to represent the town of Clarkrange. Establishment of the CWG was important since the project terminated at Clarkrange and there...
were issues concerning the transition back to a two-lane roadway north of the US 127/SR 62 intersection. In addition, residents of Clarkrange did not want their town bypassed.

CRT and CWG members were an invaluable resource for getting the word out to the public and keeping the public informed and involved. The CRT and CWG worked closely with the TDOT project team and its consultant team to develop a new format for public information meetings that was well received. Instead of the usual hostility between the Department and the citizens potentially impacted by the road project, the meetings were positive and earned praise from the public for all involved. The focus of the meetings was education. At the start of the meetings, one or two citizen team members would talk about their experience working on the team and candidly discuss how they felt about the process. The project concept plans were not displayed until the formal presentation was over, allowing the attendees to focus on the information being presented rather than the fact that their house may have been shown within the proposed right-of-way.

The CRT and CWG members also worked closely with the TDOT team to develop the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the project. Resource team members worked with local radio stations and business owners to develop a wide range of methods for getting the word out to the rural community.

Other methods used to implement public participation included:

**Development of a Project Database:** A large mailing list was created for the project using county tax information and input from the citizen team members. Everyone who owned property along US 127 North and the adjacent roads was entered into the database.

**Toll-Free Information Line:** A toll-free information line was set up and staffed so that callers could request information and make comments.

**Project Newsletters:** Newsletters were distributed at key project milestones. The newsletters were intended to be easy to understand and were geared toward the general public who may or may not have attended any of the project meetings. The newsletters were mailed to everyone in the project database and also distributed by citizen team members, available at several local stores and available upon request.

**Meeting Flyers:** Prior to the public information meetings, a meeting flyer detailing the time and location of each meeting was mailed to everyone on the mailing list. The meeting flyers were also distributed by citizen team members and available at several local stores.

**Meeting Announcements:** In addition to the meeting flyers, meeting announcements were published in the local newspapers. Because many people in the community listened to the local radio station, the TDOT project manager participated in radio interviews prior to the public information meetings to inform listeners about the project and encourage them to attend the meetings.

**Project Website:** The project website provided a wealth of information about the project. In addition to general project information and meeting announcements, all CRT/CWG meeting summaries were posted. Summaries of meetings with resource agencies were also posted. People could also sign up to be included on the project mailing list via the website.

**Community Events:** During 2006, the project's public information meetings were held several days prior to the start of the Cumberland County Fair and two weeks prior to the start of the Fentress County Fair. Because of the timing, the CRT/CWG members suggested that the project team staff a project information booth at both fairs. It was a great suggestion: many people stopped by to chat about the project and pick up a project questionnaire.
What Makes This Project Special

A number of things make this project special, the citizens who donated two years to this project, the resource agency's (i.e. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Tennessee Valley Authority, US Army Corps of Engineers, etc.) staff who devoted a great deal of time and effort to the project, along with a local utility company representative, TDOT staff, the focus on dialogue, commitment to the collaborative process and the commitment to knowledge sharing and education.

First, the citizens involved in the process helped to make the project special. Although progress on this project was initially stopped by concerned citizens and a change to a new administration, the community supported the need for the project. The CRT and CWG members represented the community well and throughout the process were able to openly and honestly discuss their concerns about the project and the new process. Gradually, as they began to see their concerns addressed and the commitment of the TDOT staff, their initial skepticism was replaced with a belief in the process and a growing trust in TDOT.

Although it was evident early in the process that all involved cared about the community, different citizen team members had differing opinions about potential solutions/alternatives. The team members were able to lay their concerns on the table. Once this step had been taken, discussions that resulted were based on addressing the issues and not on defending positions. The team members worked collaboratively to develop a vision statement for the project, something that had not been done before for a Tennessee road project. The statements were displayed and discussed at the first series of public information meetings that were held in October 2004 and posted on the project website.

When it came time for the CRT and CWG members to make a recommendation to the TDOT Commissioner, they evaluated the alternatives based not only on the required environmental impacts, but also on input they received from the public information meetings, questionnaire results, as well as the degree to which each alternative met the intent of the project vision statement.

Another item that made this project special was the inclusion of resource agency staff and local utility representatives early and often during the process. They were actively involved in the project workshop held with CRT/CWG members to develop potential project alternatives. During the workshop, they were available to answer questions about potential impacts to resources, permitting issues and other items of concern. The resource agency's staff and local utility representatives stayed involved throughout the project and helped to ensure that any alternative recommended by the CRT and CWG could be permitted.

The public involvement with its focus on dialogue and collaboration between the public, resource agencies, local utilities and TDOT significantly improved the project development process and the ultimate decision that was made. It helped an agency that was distrusted and viewed as the “bad guy” turn that image around by fostering open communication and a collaborative approach to a mutually acceptable solution that all parties could embrace.

Role That Public Participation Played in the Success of This Project

The US 127 North project would not have moved forward successfully without the implementation of a CSS approach and a dedication to meaningful public participation that is inherent in that approach. Through the CSS/public participation process, the public was given a wide variety of ways to provide meaningful input that helped to shape the project alternatives. The CRT/CWG helped to foster grassroots support for the project and the ultimate development of an alternative that supported the community's vision, which focused on much more than just a transportation solution.

The commitment to knowledge sharing and education formed a significant part of the public involvement effort and also played a major role in the success of the project. In the past, public meetings were set up as open houses (i.e. here are the project maps, now ask questions). The
new approach of involving the members of the CRT/CWG opened a two-way dialogue that was necessary to gain public support and trust. At the public information meetings for this project, TDOT actively sought input from the public and other stakeholders. With help from the CRT and CWG, TDOT was able to gather important information concerning community issues and values and the identification of important natural and cultural resources. The public information meetings, in addition to being used as forums to solicit information, were used to provide the public with information about the project development process and where the project was in that process. Topics included an explanation of the Federal environmental review process, a walk through of the right-of-way acquisition process, a discussion of how the decision would be made for the selection of the preferred alternative, and a discussion of how all of the different pieces of the puzzle (i.e. different resource impacts, public input, etc.) needed to fit together to get to that decision.

**How IAP2 Core Values Were Met**

The project applied a Context Sensitive Solutions approach to the project development process. Context Sensitive Solutions is a collaborative, inter-disciplinary approach\(^1\) which:

- involves all stakeholders;
- provides a facility that fits its setting;
- preserves and enhances scenic, aesthetic, historic and environmental resources; and
- improves or maintains safety, mobility, and infrastructure conditions.

There are five core CSS principles\(^2\):

- Strive towards a shared stakeholder vision to provide a basis for decisions.
- Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of contexts.
- Foster continuing communication and collaboration to achieve consensus.
- Exercise flexibility and creativity to shape effective transportation solutions.
- Preserve and enhance community and natural environments.

Inherent in the CSS approach is the belief that those affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process and that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.

The following demonstrates how the US 127 North project meets the IAP2 Core Values:

- TDOT, in implementing a CSS approach to the US 127 North project (and later developing a CSS Statement of Commitment for all projects undertaken by the Department), demonstrated its commitment to the belief that those affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process. Also, inherent in that process is the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision. The fact that the Commissioner recently selected the alternative recommended by the CRT and CWG and supported by the community demonstrates that the public’s involvement and contribution helped to influence the decision.

- The formation of the CRT and CWG and the responsibility the members were given to develop a recommendation to present to the TDOT Commissioner concerning a community preferred alternative also illustrates the belief that those affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process and the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.

- The needs and interests of all participants, including the decision-makers were recognized throughout the project process. This is particularly evident during the project alternatives

\(^1\) AASHTO-FHWA Task Force 10 Second Definition of Context Sensitive Solutions

\(^2\) AASHTO-FHWA Task Force, 2007
development workshop with the CRT and CWG. The CRT and CWG members, representing community concerns; resource agency staff representing agency concerns (i.e. permitting, environmental, etc.); local utility representatives, representing utility concerns about the relocation their facilities/potential disruptions of service, etc.; and TDOT staff representing concerns about engineering issues, constructability, and cost all worked together during the workshop to ensure that any alternatives developed would be acceptable to the community and would be reasonable and feasible to build.

- The public participation process for the project included a variety of methods for seeking out and facilitating the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in the project decision. Examples of this include the staffed information booths at the county fairs, distribution of project newsletters and meeting notices not only by mail but also locally via CRT/CWG members and available in local businesses, and posting of all project information, including meeting dates, meeting minutes and presentations on the project website. The process also involved the creation of a reader-friendly Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) so that participants could easily understand potential project impacts without having to comb through a maze of often incomprehensible technical information.

- The CRT and CWG members were actively involved in the development of the Public Involvement Plan for the project. The plan was revised as necessary to reflect what was working well in order to get other stakeholders potentially affected by the project involved.

- The participants were provided with information about all aspects of the project. Information that was provided included:
  - Notices of meeting locations, dates and times (mailed, placed locally and on the project website);
  - Summaries of meetings (posted on the project website);
  - Meeting presentations/handouts-supplemental information (available at meetings and on the project website);
  - Presentation on land use controls (the need for the presentation arose due to community concern about preserving the rural character of the area in a place where there are currently no zoning regulations); and,
  - A step by step walk through of what happens when property is acquired by the State for a roadway project (the project will require both residential and business relocations).

- Throughout the project, participants were informed of how their input affected the decisions made. The best illustration of this is the selection by the TDOT Commissioner of the alternative recommended by CRT and CWG and supported by the community at large.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Project</th>
<th>Vision for Queensferry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Community-led team composed of 16 residents and a facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Queensferry, Edinburgh, Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>With the 2003 decision of the newly emerged Scottish government (previously known as the Scottish Executive) to give local communities a say in what they envision for their future and to contribute to the 2007 local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>The over-arching approach was called ‘participatory analysis’ (PA) and the goal of that process included ensuring that public opinion was drawn from beyond just the middle class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>The Vision was utilized in several contexts with significant success as defined by the participants and PA team: preventing local development that did not meet with the Vision criteria, helped with grant applications, and the Vision for Queensferry group became involved in another planning project called ‘Queensferry Ambition’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>The estimated population of South Queensferry is 12,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>2003 – 2006/2007 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>1400 people were consulted in this participatory process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Web Link**          | [http://www.twomid.freeserve.co.uk/NEWwebsite/VISION.htm](http://www.twomid.freeserve.co.uk/NEWwebsite/VISION.htm)  
IAP2 Core Values Award -- Submission

Project of the Year Award

Our definable outcome for this project was to change the way a community thinks when it comes to making decisions which affect it, and in this we have undoubtedly succeeded.

In 2003, when the Scottish Executive (now Scottish Government) announced their wish to make changes to local government, they effectively began the process of handing back responsibility for local communities to local communities themselves. This was with particular regard to local opinions and information helping form the next local plan due in 2007 (now 2008).

Who knows a community better than the people who live there? The challenge was to get all that local information into the open, and look at it collectively. Queensferry people were not slow to recognise what this meant for them, and there was a sense of excitement in the air. While some kept an eye on where Queensferry might be placed in the grand new scheme of things, others set about gathering information from the community, which might be helpful for anyone making decisions about Queensferry's future. Thus began one of the biggest participation exercises ever carried out in South Queensferry.

1. The challenges and how each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation.

The first challenge was to convince those involved in the community planning process that Participatory Appraisal (PA) approaches and methods offered a better way of doing things. In the early stages, the Community Council had already held a meeting to which “the usual suspects” were invited, and they favoured a questionnaire as a means of reaching the wider community. The “movers and shakers” who attended an introductory meeting were a competent and confident bunch of individuals, well-educated, articulate, and able to handle the paperwork. But did they represent anyone beyond the middle classes from which generally came? We thought not. We were keen to make sure the wider community, local experts, knowledge and opinions were better represented.

Selling the idea of a participatory approach wasn’t easy. We made three attempts to convince the chair of the Community Council. Never having heard of PA, she was understandably sceptical. Only when we took a laptop computer and the trainer to her house to SHOW the possibilities, was there a major breakthrough. She invited us to present our ideas for this new, alternative approach to the entire Community Council and they were soon convinced too. Shortly after that, in February 2005, we created “Vision for Queensferry” as an independent community group and the scope of whole project was suddenly widened to involve more people in the community.

It was a challenge in itself to rustle up a team of local people to train in PA methods but this we did with the help of adverts in the local press, a poster campaign, notices in local shops, and word of mouth. We “sold” it by appealing to the sense of giving to your community, and by suggesting that the skills learned in training were transferable to other areas. Soon we had 16 people raring to go. Happily, our team contained a good gender mix, and an age range from 15 to 80.

Funding was the next challenge. The team applied for a council grant from the Local Development Committee and ran into trouble straight away. Wasn’t there a council department which could oversee this work? Couldn’t it be funded more cheaply? Should it be funded at all? Wouldn’t it set a precedent? Patiently, we answered all these questions convincing the Council that we were offering something different, exciting and worthwhile. We were happy to set a precedent.

It was a surprise to find that we were to be charged for accommodation facilities, and (some) articles in the community magazine but we negotiated our way through these too, to get these services free, or at low cost.
As soon as the training was complete, the fieldwork began. We engaged with 1400 people, surprising even ourselves with the response and recording over 7,000 comments. We began collating the information. This created a new challenge – how to bring it all together, and continue to involve the community in the feedback process. Eventually we created a spreadsheet to hold all the data, and took additional volunteers on to the team, to type it all up. This, together with another grant and some additional support from a local business, helped us produce two reports, both in printed and electronic format, which have been widely circulated in the community.

2. The methods used to implement public participation. Were innovative participation techniques used?

Participatory appraisal approaches and methods were essential to this project. We firmly believed that we had the knowledge and skills within our own community to do the job for ourselves. Using the open question “What do you think of the Queensferry area?” and visual methods enabled people to share their ideas, opinions and solution around issues that concerned and interested them – things that affected the community and they had solutions to. This is very different to a questionnaire that concentrates on the issues the designers of the questionnaire think are important. Our approach encouraged the diversity of interest and wealth of local knowledge.

We trained in a wide variety of innovative participatory methods and plumped for an “H” diagram and mapping technique for fieldwork which we were able to use with individuals, and also collectively with groups. We also used charts to map where people lived, to track their ages, and a smiley-face voting system to evaluate the process. We created, cut out and glued together venn diagrams to do a stakeholder analysis. When the work was done, the team met again to take the project forward. We fed back the information quickly to the community on display boards with diagrams and photographs. We then used timelines to review our work so far, and wrote (literally) on paper tablecloths in a café-style event to help us in the design of the final reports. In this way, we kept ourselves in touch with the participatory process throughout. And even in creating this report, we have continued the process by creating a communal graphic representation of our journey so far.

3. What makes this project special? Did public participation significantly improve the decision? Did it solve a problem that faces the field of public participation? Did it spread the practice of public participation into a new area?

It is hard for us to talk about “significantly improving the decision” since there is no single decision to improve. However, what we can say is that we have significantly influenced the decision-making process in our community. We have changed the way people think and encouraged decision-makers as well as local groups and other organisations to engage with the community in ANY decision which affects them.

The fact that this project was driven by the community, and carried out using the skills within the community, speaks volumes. There was a clear commitment in term of time and energy which the team gave over an 18-month period.

Our work has clearly influenced other areas. For example, it is now regularly used as a model for community engagement by the Community Council. (This came about precisely because key decision-makers became involved and trained alongside the community team.) They used PA methods in a community engagement process to gather views about a proposed housing development at Port Edgar; and in a (successful) attempt to fend off over-development in another housing estate.

The council has also engaged with young people at the High School to explore the possibility of a skateboard park following their comments about lack of recreation facilities. The High School are very keen to promote good community relationships and have begun a Strategic Provision of Youth Services (SPYS) programme in conjunction with local police who also took an interest in the results and set out specifically to engage young people in the community.
The Haven is a not-for-profit organisation created to meet the needs of the elderly and frail in a Day Centre which they also run. In the course of the Vision project, one of the Vision team became involved in a new participation project, separately-funded, to find out how they could improve their service.

Finally, two local environmental groups were inspired by the use PA approaches. For example, they used PA to find out what the community wanted to do with an abandoned woodland; to help site a bench for the community in Dalmeny village nearby; and to improve public gardens.

So the initial “project” to change the way the community makes its decisions is in one sense “finished” but, the processes clearly live on. The results and energy created during the process still influences and informs on-going decisions.

4. Describe the project’s effectiveness or results and explain the role that the public participation process played.

Vision for Queensferry solved a specific problem at the time – it met the requirement of government and city council policy to involve local people in the planning process – but its reach has gone well beyond that.

Apart from embracing the methodology, the community has also made use of the data gathered from the original project. The Community Council has used it to help inform the new Local Plan which is currently being drawn up. The Vision work has provided a significant input into this.

The Community Council also referred to the data in an appeal against a new housing project (beside Aglient Technologies) because the planners had ignored the need for recreation facilities which our report had specifically drawn attention to.

Local environmental groups such as GreenFerry and Friends of the Ferry Glen frequently refer to the Vision report in grant applications. The fact that such an extensive participation has been done seems to sit well with grant-givers.

As a group, Vision for Queensferry has also taken on the responsibility to ensure that the information collected is used in other areas. We have been invited to participate in a new project for Queensferry, called “Queensferry Ambition” led by the local Business Association.

All told, we engaged 1400 in our original project and we got people thinking and talking about the area, and enjoying the fact that they had a voice.

5. Describe how the IAP2 core values were met.

It should be noted that we answered this question first by creating, in a participatory activity, a large visual mapped timeline to show how the process developed and to show the core values. Coloured “flags” along the way showed clearly that our project met every single one of the core values, in some cases more than once. We have tried to detail these more specifically here:

**Core Value 1: Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.**

This underpinned everything. Our project was driven by the belief that there was a better way – to make sure everyone was engaged, not just the “usual suspects”. The team undertaking the work met regularly to share and evaluate the process, revisit the objectives, clarify and verify stakeholder involvement and check and modify our time line.

**Core Value 2: Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.**
We knew that if we could run the project ourselves, we could engage better with a wider audience. So we did everything from the stakeholder analysis to providing feedback, and ensured that decision-makers were brought in to hear the community’s voice. We continue to promote the work of the project and feed it into new initiatives such as Council feedback events, or Community Planning Partnership meetings. Members also use it in other groups such as environmental projects. Projects run in collaboration between the Police and the High School have built on this.

Core Value 3: Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognising and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.

We have involved many groups and organisations as seen above. This was not a one-off project. It has become a way of operating.

Core Value 4: Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

A timeline which we created shows this, but the key points are as follows:
- The 16 people who trained in PA all lived in the community
- The facilitator lives in the community
- We had our official launch event on 28 May in the community. 140 people attended.
- We organised follow-up outreach work with specific groups, businesses, organisations and individuals.
- We tracked everyone’s involvement to make sure we had a good cross section of views.
- We kept the team and the community engaged through the feedback and report-writing stages.
- We even used PA to put this award proposal together.

Core Value 5: Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.

From within training, the group planned the community engagement process, what methods to use, the communication strategy and all stages of the process. They verified this with other decision-makers and community members as the process evolved. There were frequent team meetings to verify the process. And the PA process continues to inform meetings individuals have, for example with council representatives. We also asked the community to evaluate the events/meetings and process as we went along.

Core Value 6: Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

Our participatory exercise was widely promoted locally via posters, leaflets, lamppost advertising, numerous articles in the local Gazette. We provided feedback sessions at 2 key events, the community “Ferry Fair” in 2005 and a final feedback session in 2006. In additional after both these events the display was put up in the 2 local supermarkets, the library and at other community events such as a local “It’s a Knockout” Competition. There is also a permanent link to the short report on the Queensferry Community Council’s Website: http://www.twomid.freeserve.co.uk/NEWwebsite/VISION.htm

Core Value 7: Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

The fact that the PA process is an on-going approach and the methods used in other areas is evidence that this method has been judged a useful way of engaging with the community. It has also enabled the community to engage with decision makers in a more meaningful way.
More specifically, Vision for Queensferry produced two written reports, 1 newsletter style and one much more detailed, with all the comments made which key stakeholder make use of. We also published the results electronically on the Community Council website and 1000 copies of the short report were distributed throughout the community. Apart from this, we displayed the results in Tesco’s and Scotmid supermarkets, the library, Agilent Technologies, and in the local schools. More importantly, we ensured that key stakeholders KNEW that this project had been done – and that they took an interest in the results.

And happily, when we refer to this piece of work now, most people recognise it.

Contact details:

Vikki Hilton (contactable only by e-mail or mobile until July 5th)
Public Participation Practitioner, Trainer and Facilitator. Life Member of IAP2
3 Priory Grove,
South Queensferry,
Scotland EH30 9LZ
United Kingdom
Phone +44 131 331 1523 Mobile: +44(0)7803930972
Email: Vikki@hiltonassociates.com

Alternative contact: Joyce Faulkner joycejim@btinternet.com 07931 901115

Award category: Project of the Year

Project name: Vision for Queensferry – a community-led project set up to engage local people in the community planning processes.

The names of all individuals being nominated for the award

The Vision for Queensferry team consisted of 17 people:

Andrea Howe, Beth Howe, Blyth McLucas, Frank Hay, Gareth Wilkinson, Georgina Craig, Mike Craig, Jimmy Brown, Joyce Faulkner, June Jansen, Karen Miller, Tommy Miller, Moira Sinclair, Marina Shaw, Noreena Brown, Tom Martin, Vikki Hilton: Facilitator

Sponsoring Organisation

This project was part funded by the City of Edinburgh Council, The Health Care Co-operative (North West Edinburgh), Forward Scotland, and by Agilent Technologies as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) policy.

Up to three publications to receive notification of winning entry.

The Queensferry Gazette, High Street, Linlithgow
The Scotsman/Evening News, Edinburgh

Name of two individuals, outside of the organisation, who were participants in the project or program and who can serve as references. Please include email addresses for each reference

George Grubb (Lord Provost of Edinburgh & Queensferry District Councillor):
george.grubb@edinburgh.gov.uk

Keith Giblett (Queensferry Community Council) giblett@btinternet.com
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