IAP2

2010

State of the Practice Report

Core Values Award Nominees
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. 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 “winners” are selected 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 fourth edition of the report. Previous editions of the State of the Practice reports are available at www.IAP2.org. 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 public is engaged in a variety of methods and media, from town hall meetings and world cafes to design charrettes and digital social networking sites. They range from local to national levels and from 800 to over 8,000 participants. They cross-topical areas such as health care, transportation, education, community visioning, strategic planning, cultural change, and re-visioning democracy. 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 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.

The International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) uses the Core Values Awards to recognize excellence and innovation in public participation practice around the world. These awards are made annually. Winning entries and finalists are selected by a panel of judges who are experienced public participation practitioners in their own right. The seven Core Values are used as the basis for the evaluation of the entries.
Core Values Awards 2010

The annual Core Values Awards recognize excellence and innovation in public participation practice internationally. They are founded on the seven Core Values of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2).

This year’s awards competition garnered 24 entries from around the world, the highest number of entries in any Core Values Awards competition to date. The quality of all this year’s entries was also exceptional. The continuing efforts of the Core Values Awards co-chairs to streamline and improve the awards processes, for both participants and judges, has clearly paid dividends this year.

In 2009 we reported on some significant changes in the entire Core Values Awards process, including a standardized style guide for entries. We continued to build upon this success in 2010 by making some additional modifications. We enhanced the guidelines for the Project of the Year category to make them clearer and easier to understand. The Project category remains the most popular category in our awards program, with 12 entries competing for the winning spot.

We made significant changes to the Organization of the Year category. Entries in this category were asked to show how IAP2's Core Values have influenced the culture of their organization. We asked for examples of specific ways that public participation has impacted decisions, leveraged or created opportunities for the organization, and we asked for evidence of how the Core Values have shaped organizational strategy, policy, and practices. Adding this level of clarity and focus to the Organization category produced four extremely competitive entries this year.

The Innovation Award, introduced last year, has also proved to be a sought after prize. This category seeks our innovative public participation practices. The theme changes year-to-year, and for the 2010 Innovation Award the theme was: “Addressing wicked problems through public participation.” We defined wicked problems as social, economic, environmental and/or political problems that are considered to be difficult to solve (i.e. climate change, health care, deficits, poverty, etc). Intractable or wicked problems require many people to change their minds and their behaviors before they can be addressed. Entries had to show how innovative P2 strategies, approaches, techniques and methods were employed in an attempt to address a wicked problem.

Choosing the best entry from among the many outstanding entries is a challenge that our international judging panel once again stepped up to. The pride and enthusiasm of the international public participation work represented in the 2010 entries is self-evident and truly wonderful to see. This 2010 State of Practice Report continues the tradition by presenting a diverse and robust array of public participation practice around the world. This Report is evidence of the growing importance of P2 in communities everywhere, and for addressing an abundance of challenging public issues.

On behalf of the IAP2 Board and our membership worldwide, I congratulate all of the winners and finalists, and applaud the efforts of those who took the time to chronicle their work and make an entry to the 2010 Core Values Awards.

Geoff Wilson
Co-Chair
Letter from the IAP2 Board

The volunteer commitment of a Core Values Award judge is significant. There is a huge amount reading – 24 entries in this year’s competition alone. Each of these must be carefully reviewed against the award criteria and the quality compared to other entries in the category. The judges also do this challenging work across international boundaries and time zones. For some, it meant early morning conference calls. For others, late evening calls.

It is for these reasons that we must acknowledge the hard work and dedication of our volunteer judging panel in 2010, and thank them for their contribution to advancing the practice of public participation around the world. This year’s international judging panel is comprised of public participation experts from academia, practitioners and past Core Values winners. Our judges are:

Allison Hendricks, Darzin Software, New South Wales, Australia
Amanda Newbery, Managing Director, BBS PR, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia
Kristin Shields, Senior Consultant, Planning and Community Engagement, North West Local Health Integration Network (LHIN), Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada. Kristin was Innovation Award winner in 2009
Simon Wilson, Director, Wilson Sherriff, Welwyn Garden City, UK

On behalf of the IAP2 Board and membership, you have our sincere thanks for your commitment and dedication to advancing and promoting international best practice in the field of public participation.

Sincerely,
Dr. Lyn Carson
2010 Core Values Awards Co-chair
Director, IAP2 Board

Geoff Wilson
2010 Core Values Awards Co-chair,
Vice-president, IAP2 Board
International Judging Panel Members

Geoff Wilson, Canada  
Lyn Carson, Australia  
Simon Wilson, United Kingdom  
Kristin Shields, Canada  
Amanda Newbery, Australia  
Allison Hendricks, Australia

Geoff Wilson  
Co-Chair

Geoff Wilson is the Senior Strategy Advisor (Citizen and Stakeholder Engagement) for Capital Health in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada. He has nearly two decades of public sector communications expertise, including experience managing public issues in political environments, government and media relations, issues management and risk communications. He began his career at the House of Commons in Ottawa as a Legislative and Research assistant, and has spent most of his work life as a communication advisor in the government and not-for-profit sectors. Geoff holds a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Master of Public Administration degree from Dalhousie University in Halifax, and has studied public relations at Algonquin College of Applied Arts in Ottawa.

Geoff is active in both his local and professional communities. In addition to his membership in IAP2, he is a member of the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, and has recently completed a five year term as vice president of communications on the national board of the Health Care Public Relations Association of Canada. He is currently vice-chair of the Halifax Peninsula Community Health Board, a member of Citizens for Halifax, and is a citizen representative on a municipal advisory committee in his community.

For the past two years Geoff has been focused on promoting an engagement culture within Capital Health. He has provided leadership and been an advocate for public participation in his organization. Geoff is the 2008 Project of the Year winner.
Lyn Carson  
Co-Chair

**Professor Lyn Carson** is a Professorial Fellow with the Centre for Citizenship and Public Policy at UWS. Prior to her arrival, "Carson" was Academic Program Director in the United States Studies Centre at The University of Sydney. For over a decade she taught in the Department of Government and International Relations at the University of Sydney on topics relating to public administration, citizen engagement and deliberative democracy.

Carson is on the executive board of the International Association for Public Participation and on the editorial board of the Journal of Public Deliberation. She was involved in convening or facilitating Australia's first Consensus Conference, Australia's first two Deliberative Polls, Australia's first Citizens' Parliament, numerous Citizens' Juries and Community Summits and a host of other public engagements related to public policy exploration and improvement at local, state and national levels. Carson's introduction to formal politics and the challenges of active citizenship began in the early 1990s as a local councillor in Lismore, NSW.

---

Simon Wilson, MBA

**Simon Wilson** is director of Wilson Sherriff, a facilitation consultancy company based in the United Kingdom. Wilson Sherriff facilitates consultations, research projects, and learning and development. He has facilitated groups ranging from the board members of a government department to schoolchildren, and from focus groups to events of a thousand people. Simon holds an MBA degree. He is a Certified Professional Facilitator and member of the global Board of the International Association of Facilitators, and a member of the International Association for Public Participation.

With his business partner, Carol Sherriff, he has contributed chapters to the IAF handbooks on *Creating a Culture of Collaboration* and *Working with Difficult Groups*. He has trained facilitators and presented at conferences in Europe, North America, Asia and New Zealand.

He has served as the Chair of Trustees of two UK-based charities.
Amanda Newbery

As Managing Director of one of Australia’s largest strategic communications consultancies, Amanda Newbery is also a weekly panellist on ABC Queensland Radio and a sought-after public speaker, providing expert commentary on public affairs. Amanda’s comprehensive public relations background further heightens the impact of her community engagement strategies. Proactive media relations and a strong understanding of tactical communications activities enable Amanda to devise campaigns that are inclusive, transparent and successful.

Additional information:

- Major projects in public participation include:
  - $550m South Bank Institute of TAFE redevelopment – Queensland’s first Public Private Partnership
  - $1b Maroochydore golf course redevelopment
  - $300m Millennium Arts Project – Queensland’s new State Library and Gallery of Modern Art
  - Brisbane City Council’s CityShape Conference – an Asia Pacific Award winning event
  - $1b St Mary’s master-planned community – a highly controversial Delfin Lend Lease Sydney project.

Kristin Shields

Kristin Shields is a Senior Consultant for Planning and Community Engagement with the North West Local Health Integration Network (LHIN) in Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada. Kristin completed a Masters of Public Health and Graduate Diploma in Health Services and Policy Research from Lakehead University, Bachelor of Sciences (Life Sciences) from Queen’s University and Certificate in Public Engagement, Dialogue and Deliberation from Fielding Graduate University. Kristin led the Share your Story, Shape your Care initiative that won the 2009 IAP2 Core Values award for Innovation using Technology.
Allison Hendricks

**Allison Hendricks** worked in the community engagement field for 14 years prior to setting up Darzin Software in 2004. As a consultant in the field she designed and managed numerous large and complex projects ranging from infrastructure to strategic planning, as well as training and writing guidelines in community engagement for a number of agencies. She has put all her experience and passion for community engagement, data management and evaluation in the design of Darzin – a data analysis software package for the stakeholder engagement industry. Allison is a passionate believer in the critical role evaluation can play in driving good practice.

In her role at Darzin Software, Allison provides strategic advice to organisations in relation to community engagement project design, data management and evaluation. She has been an active IAP2 member and continues to contribute to the learning and development of the industry. She regularly delivers workshops, training and guest lectures in order to contribute to the professional development of practitioners.

Allison was one of the key architects of the United Nations Brisbane Declaration on Community Engagement. She has created a framework for evaluating community engagement based on the United Nations Charter in an effort to encourage more meaningful evaluation through a simple and easy evaluation process. If you would like to know more about Darzin or the evaluation framework, please contact Allison on +61 2 94169413 or **Allison@darzin.com**.
Core Values Awards Program Criteria

Project of the Year

The Problem and Challenge
Describe the problem and challenge faced.

The Role of Public Participation
Briefly describe the role of public participation in addressing the problem or challenge.

Public Participation Methods
Describe the methods used to implement public participation.

Uniqueness of the Project
Describe what makes this project special. Some questions to consider in this section include:
• In what way(s) did public participation improve the decision?
• How did public participation contribute to the resolution of the problem?
• Describe the innovative participation techniques that were used.
• Was the project able to solve a problem that faces the field of public participation?
• How did the project spread the practice of public participation into a new area?

Project Results
Describe the project's effectiveness in achieving results. Provide a brief summary of the project evaluation.

Alignment with Core Values
Describe how the IAP2 core values are reflected in the project outcomes. Specifically:
• How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?
• How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public's contributions?
• How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?
• How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?
• How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?
• How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?
• How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?

Organization of the Year

Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities
Describe the mission of the organization and its challenges with regard to internal and external stakeholders or public entities.
Rationale for Public Participation
Discuss the rationale or impetus that led the organization to embrace the principles and values of public participation.

Impact of Public Participation on Decisions
Give examples of specific ways that public participation has impacted decisions, and leveraged or created opportunities for your organization. Show the connection between the public participation processes and the shape of the decision(s).

Alignment with Core Values
Describe how the core values were met.

Evaluation against Core Values
Tell how the organization is evaluating how well it is fulfilling the spirit of the IAP2 core values.

Innovation
The content of some of the sections must address the use of interactive technologies and web-based applications in engaging the public:

The Problem and Challenge
Describe the challenge or problem faced.

The Role of Public Participation
Describe how each of the parties involved viewed the role of public participation.

Public Participation Methods
Describe the interactive technologies and/or web-based applications that were used to implement public participation.

Uniqueness of the Project
Describe what makes this project special. Did public participation significantly improve the decision made? Why were interactive technologies and/or web-based applications used to engage the public? Did the project overall solve a problem that faces the field of public participation? Did it spread the practice of public participation into a new area?

Project Results
Describe the effectiveness or results of the project and explain the role that the public participation process played, with emphasis on the interactive technologies and/or web-based applications that were used.

Alignment with Core Values
Describe how the IAP2 core values were met.
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.
2010 Core Values Winners Circle

2010 Project Winner

OutLOUD Consultation for Airds Bradbury Renewal Project
Australia

2010 Organization Winner

Building the Designer Democracy
United States of America

2010 Innovation Winner

“It’s Your Move” – Translink’s 10-Year Plan
Canada

2010 Runner Up Recognition

ADD Water – Acquire, Develop, Deliver Water to Central Arizona
United States of America

Establishing A Culture of Engagement Within A Local Government
Australia

Moving Transit Forward
United States of America
Nomination Summaries

2010 Project Winner
OutLOUD Consultation for Airds Bradbury Renewal Project
Australia

The Project entry by Housing NSW and Straight Talk stood out among the entries in this awards category. While it addressed a relatively routine issue, community planning and development, it is significant to note that this project was operating in a complex and challenging socio-economic environment. It is clear from the entry that the project sponsors created a process that had an absolute focus on the unique needs of the people living in the Airds-Bradbury community, many of whom may have been disenfranchised from such processes. There were complex social issues and barriers to participation. The project used these to its advantage to engage people “where they were.” This work speaks to the very essence of IAP2 core values around involving people in decisions that will affect their lives. Housing NSW and Straight Talk created a celebratory and future-positive atmosphere around the work. Residents were involved in a positive, hopeful and affirming manner. From a purely human perspective, reading about this project was a moving experience that reveals the potential transformative power of public participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>OutLOUD Consultation for Airds Bradbury Renewal Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Housing NSW in partnership with Straight Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Airds Bradbury, NSW, Australia (population = 4,770 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>How to invite and support meaningful engagement and input of local public housing tenants into a new master plan to shape improvements to physical infrastructure including housing, streets, open space and the town centre, as part of comprehensive community renewal process. Engagement activities needed to contribute to and complement community capacity building activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>OutLOUD (modelled on SpeakOut), Design OutLOUD (modelled on enquiry by design), OutLOUD bus trips (experiential learning excursions), Walk OutLOUD (walking and place based consultation), newsletters, flyers, participatory workshops, focus groups, community reference group, precinct barbeques, health expo, ‘community change maker’ working groups (resident-led action groups), school outreach, technical workshops, household survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The engagement process successfully built broad awareness of the project and its aims with public housing tenants. Through engagement, key community aspirations have been incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as a major focus of the master plan, particularly safety, community cohesion and how physical planning can influence and shape an existing and changing community. Through engagement, a large, skilled and confident group of residents has emerged who are eager to participate in further detailed design and are committed to leading and creating change ‘from the bottom up’.

Suburb level (geographic impact) Collaborate level (IAP2 spectrum)
Approximately 18 months (ongoing)
4,770 people
n/a

2010 Organization Winner

Building the Designer Democracy
United States of America

The Centre for Communities by Design (American Institute of Architecture) demonstrated most of the fundamental qualities that IAP2 was seeking in an Organisation of the Year winning entry. This organization has an impressive forty-year history engaging people in urban design and sustainable communities. It integrated public participation work that was clearly not required of the architecture profession. This demonstrates a true cultural shift in how the AIA came to understand the work of architects as truly “public work,” which meant giving up a measure of professional control in pursuit of public participation values. The AIA entry showed public participation as an organizational value, and provided clear evidence of organizational commitment to this value. It has created policy guidance on public participation, and over the past four decades, has slowly built community, professional and organizational capacity for public participation work in the context of urban planning and sustainable community design. The AIA entry epitomized the development of a deep and enduring public participation culture within an organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Building the Designer Democracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>The Center for Communities by Design/American Institute of Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Washington, D.C., USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>How can the organization make a contribution that will support the sustainable development of our communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Community Charrettes, surveys, world cafes, workshops, focus groups, youth workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A replicable set of values and a process that can be broadly applied to urban design and sustainable communities. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TransLink entry caught the attention of the judging panel because it clearly spoke to the guiding theme of the 2010 Core Values Innovation Award: Addressing wicked or intractable problems through public participation. This public sector body was faced with addressing complex issues in their long term strategic plan, and in a politically charged context. Rather than taking a traditional approach to strategic planning, TransLink opted for a riskier but ultimately more transparent approach to tackling the long term transportation challenges of this region. In the process, TransLink ably demonstrated a deep level of commitment to IAP2’s seven core values. Community knowledge and capacity-building was a clear objective and outcome of this work, and the population was effectively engaged with the right amount of education and information to support participation and stimulate broad engagement. The process also employed unique approaches, using scenarios and a game to encourage dialogue and facilitate informed choice-making. This entry also included well-documented evaluation that clearly showed community learning and understanding resulted from their public participation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>“It’s Your Move” – Translink’s 10-Year Plan 2010 Innovation of the Year Winner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>TransLink (South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>CANADA, METRO VANCOUVER, population 2.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>TransLink in developing its 2010 10-Year Plan needed to understand the public’s vision for how public transportation should be provided and paid for over the next ten years. The type of vision would determine the financial impact e.g. “moving forward” equaled an additional $450 million per year. The challenge was to bring together complicated issues, distilling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them down to digestible chunks without losing important content.

### Sample Methods

**Interactive exercise: “It’s Your Move”**

**Offline board ‘game’ exercise: “It’s Your Move”**

Background documentation provided along with real time comparison with input from other citizens

### Results

TransLink in developing its 10-Year Plan carried out a broad-based public consultation which included both offline and online. This blended public consultation featured the tool “It’s Your Move.” Of the 3000 that played the game online, its simplicity of design served to make it accessible and its consistency with the offline version which involved 700 participants enable results to be compared and tabulated.

“It’s Your Move” engaged citizens in a three-step process:

- **Step 1: Identifying priorities – their transportation vision**
- **Step 2: Funding Priorities: How can we fund priorities given current revenue streams?**
- **Step 3: Future Funding: What additional funding methods should be used?**

Online and offline findings were consistent. Citizens selected rapid transit as a priority, identified transit fares and fuel taxes as key funding mechanisms and carbon pricing and road user fees as future funding options.

“It’s Your Move” successfully engaged participants in a complex transportation and funding discussion that will impact over 2 million people in the region.

### Impact Level

Over 3000 citizens engaged with the tool online and many of these participants would not have participated in the offline events. Those affected by the transit plan felt they had a better understanding of the issues after participating in the “It’s Your Move” Exercise.

Market research indicates that 70% of those that played “It’s Your Move” increased their knowledge of the issues and 67% viewed the exercise as a positive. While in the end, findings were largely consistent from both offline and online versions.

Thousands of residents were engaged in the development of the 2010 10-Year Plan both online and offline. The inclusion of the “It’s Your Move” consultation exercise allowed the consultation process to engage and hear from a broader audience. The development of “It’s Your Move” and subsequent communication materials allowed the public to focus on potential investment scenarios and revenue options and provide specific feedback to the decisions that TransLink and others had to make. This input was included in the final report to the transportation authority’s Board of Directors and the Mayor’s Council was instrumental in informing executive and political decision-makers about public financial and service investment priorities.

### Time Frame

May – June 2009

### People Engaged

Over 4500+ citizens offline and online completed a range of
## 2010 Runner Up Recognition

| Title | ADD Water-Acquire, Develop, Deliver Water to Central Arizona  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2010 First Runner Up – Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Organizing Group Location** | Central Arizona Project (CAP)  
| **Key Question / Problem** | Long-term water demands in CAP's service area are projected to exceed currently available supplies. Assuming CAP is to be the primary entity that acquires, develops and delivers new water supplies for its service area, how should the water be shared and paid for? |
| **Sample Methods** | At the core of Project ADD Water was the IAP2 six-step decision making model which was followed throughout. A wide variety of hands-on, interactive techniques were creatively used:  
| | • Technology of Participation or ToP® methods  
| | • Creative Strategic Thinking® coaching sessions  
| | • Electronic decision-making tools  
| | • Appreciative inquiry  
| | • Using analogies, metaphors and imagery  
<p>| | Groups of 80 to 100 people typically generated work products in smaller groups, then reviewed and combined them at larger group levels. The process also incorporated case study research for like organizations and problems. |
| <strong>Results</strong> | 100 diverse stakeholders agreed to over 85 points regarding how specifically to share and pay for a new water supply for existing and future residents and businesses in central Arizona. Based on this consensus, the CAP Board unanimously agreed to implement the ADD Water Program. The Board did not modify the consensus at all. |
| <strong>Impact Level</strong> | Over five million people or 80% of state’s population including over 100 cities, towns, communities, and Native American Tribal nations. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Approximately 2 ½ years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>ADD Water accumulated a list of nearly 500 stakeholders. Approximately 100 of those people actively participated in more than 50 public meetings totaling 250 hours of actual meeting time and 15,000 hours of cumulative individual time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.projectADDwater.com">www.projectADDwater.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Establishing A Culture Of Community Engagement Within A Local Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Logan City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Australia, south of Brisbane, population 270,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>Local government amalgamations throughout the Australian state of Queensland saw, in one case, parts of three Councils merged to form the sixth biggest local government area in Australia. The challenge -- how to stay in touch post-amalgamation with an expanded population of 270,000 residents and 1,500 staff by building a culture of community engagement within the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Introducing an advisory service across Council's 25 branches, writing and adopting a community engagement policy, strategy, training of 72 staff and 25 Managers, surveys, tools, resources, open houses, projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A culture of community engagement has been fostered within Council from elected representatives to managers to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Local government area with 63 suburbs in 957 sq km, with a local economy worth $19.2 billion and 185 ethnicities represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>About 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>A proportion of 1,500 staff and 270,000 residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Moving Transit Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>In 2009, Metro, the St. Louis region’s public transit agency, reduced its services due to escalating budget constraints. Part of the problem was that non-riders did not link the importance of transit to the region’s quality of life and future overall growth. Furthermore, a light rail extension that was built a few years earlier had resulted in cost overruns. If the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transit agency were to sustain and grow, it needed additional sustainable revenue. Otherwise, services would have to be cut by 50 percent. St. Louis County voters had twice rejected a half-cent sales tax referendum, most recently in 2008, resulting in service cuts. The problem the agency faced was how to get citizens to understand the importance of transit regardless of whether or not they used the system and to encourage them to participate in a long-range planning process. If the public’s sentiment for transit improved, St. Louis County officials would then consider putting the sales tax referendum to voters again for the third time. As a result, Metro launched a long-range planning process with extensive public participation that educated, involved and collaborated with citizens on the future of transit and eventually empowered them to decide whether they wanted to invest in its future.

**Sample Methods**

Survey, focus groups, stakeholder advisory committee, presentations, community workshops, webinars, social media, interactive website and street teams.

**Results**

In December 2008, 43.3% of media stories about Metro were negative but by May 2010, it dropped to 25%. Also, St. Louis County officials decided to put a ½ cent sales tax referendum on the April 2010 ballot and it passed with more than 62% of the vote.

**Impact Level**

St. Louis metropolitan region, including Missouri and Illinois.

**Time Frame**

January 2009-March 2010

**People Engaged**

5,000 plus citizens

**Web Link**

www.movingtransitforward.org

---

### 2010 Nominees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Be Part of the Plan – Translink’s 10 Year Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>TransLink (South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>CANADA, METRO VANCOUVER, population 2.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question / Problem</strong></td>
<td>In developing its 2010 10-Year Plan TransLink needed to understand the public’s vision for how public transportation should be provided and paid for over the next ten years. The type of vision would determine the financial impact e.g. “moving forward” equaled an additional $450 million per year. The challenge was to bring together complicated issues, distilling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them down to digestible chunks without losing important content.

Sample Methods

- Key stakeholder engagement through round tables and one on one meetings
- Presentations and question and answer periods throughout the regions
- Be Part of the Plan website
- Social media tools
- It’s Your Move interactive consultation game (offline board game developed and online game developed)
- Front Room Forums
- A Livability Forum
- Local Government Forums
- Community Consultation Workshops
- Employee Consultations

Results

Of the 2000 people that attended the 60 presentations from February to May of this year and the 700 residents that attended public consultations held throughout the region in June, in addition to the thousands that participated in our first ever online consultation, it was clear that people are engaged in participating in the future vision of transit and transportation in the region. Their participation can best be described as thoughtful, reflective and substantive. To be sure there were concerns expressed about existing services and the increased costs to continue to keep pace with regional growth, but the vast majority of the input was constructive and supportive of the Transport 2040 goals and strategies and a Plan to achieve them.

The consultation findings were incorporated as recommendations and presented to the Board of Directors and then to the Mayors’ Council for approval.

Impact Level

In June there were approximately 45,000 visits to the “bepartoftheplan” website, there were more than 1,000 posts in 144 new topics in 9 online forums, more than 3,000 people played “It’s Your Move” online, there were over 80 external blog discussions, 491 Twitter subscribers following TransLink tweets with TransLink following 1,243 subscribers who had referred to TransLink in their messages, and 700 people participated in community workshops and forums. The media buy (created awareness of the consultation process) reached 95 per cent of adults 18+ at a frequency of 69.2 times over the entire campaign period.

TransLink issued 5 news releases and 2 backgrounders on the 2010 10-Year Plan and received substantial coverage in print (125 articles), radio (467:12 air-time minutes) and television (143:46 air-time minutes).

Time Frame

September 2008 – June 2009

People Engaged

- 2000 people attended presentations and Q&A sessions
- 700 citizens attended offline workshops
- 3000 completed the online consultation exercise “It’s
Your Move.”
- 40,000 citizens visited the online consultation space to review background documents, the challenges and key issues to be determined in the 10-Year Plan consultation in the region


This website now serves as a reporting out mechanism the consultation activities are no longer available online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Census 2010 – Make it Count Today for Generations of Tomorrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Southern Nevada Counts 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Clark County, Nevada, U.S. A. Population: 1.99 million (75% of entire State of Nevada population).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>Develop a culturally sensitive and meaningful public outreach and engagement program that both educates Clark County residents about the importance of the 2010 Decennial Census and motivates them to participate in the process. The public outreach program must qualify for the astonishing growth rate in Clark County during the past decade, while addressing the unique challenges associated with counting residents during a full-scale economic recession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>A broad-based committee, Southern Nevada Counts 2010, consisting of community stakeholders and organizations, collaborated monthly to design an outreach program emphasizing methods that reach hard-to-count communities in Clark County. Identifying and leveraging the influence of known and trusted voices at grassroots community meetings, neighborhood events, and rallies. The production of a series of vignettes with Clark County families demonstrating the real world impacts of 2010 Census participation, culminating in a PBS television program that aired locally with 100% donated resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Nevada’s 2010 census form mail-back participation rate matched that of 2000, one of only two states in the 11-state Denver Region to meet or exceed their 2000 mail-back participation rate. In Clark County, despite having to count 600,000 more residents with less resources than were available in 2000, considering our second-highest in the nation unemployment rate and dubious distinction as “ground zero” of the national foreclosure crisis, came within 1% of our 2000 mail back participation rate. The most dramatic census form mail back participation rate increases were observed in our urban core, described historically as “hard-to-count”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Clark County and State of Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>In one outreach program activity alone, we managed to reach 8,480 residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>In one outreach program activity alone, we managed to reach 8,480 residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.snvcounts2010.com">www.snvcounts2010.com</a> ; <a href="http://www.strategicsolutionsnv.com">www.strategicsolutionsnv.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title**: Clean Rivers Healthy Communities

**Organizing Group**
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District

**Location**
St. Louis, MO (includes 600K ratepayers, three watersheds and 9,600 miles of pipe)

**Key Question / Problem**
Key objective was to gain informed support and consent for reducing combined sewer overflows (CSOs), one of the largest water pollution issues in the United States. Depending on the control option scenario chosen, the multi-decade, multi-billion dollar infrastructure improvement project could cost from $2 to 10 billion for the St. Louis Community.

**Sample Methods**
Key informant interviews, project branding, stakeholder advisory committee, telephone survey, community presentations and briefings, open house events, project video, project website, Eblasts, reminder phone calls and roving project displays

**Results**
- MSD recommended a CSO reduction alternative that reflected the public’s priority for reducing overflows in high residential and recreation areas, rather than along the Mississippi River because it was the most cost effective and operationally feasible strategy. In the past, regulators preferred greater controls along the Mississippi River.
- MSD committed to being a leader in green sewer infrastructure improvements, especially along the Mississippi River.
- Success of public participation convinced engineers to include the public early and often in other planning projects.

**Impact Level**
MSD Service Area (1.4 million residents)

**Time Frame**
August 2007 to September 2009

**People Engaged**
Over 2,200 directly engaged; and tens of thousands informed via media, municipality websites and mailings

**Web Link**
www.cleanriversstl.com

---

**Title**: Dorothy's Story: Seniors, Families and Professionals – Partners in Care

**Organizing Group**
Community Engagement Team of Vancouver Coastal Health

**Location**
Vancouver Coastal Health Region, British Columbia, Canada

**Key Question / Problem**
How can the patient, family and public help to improve outcomes for seniors who come into hospital?
### Sample Methods

**Results**

The development and launch of two resource packages consisting of a DVD and supporting materials. One package specific to the learning needs of VCH staff and one for the public in VCH area communities. The staff-oriented package utilizes a case study to generate discussion among staff to facilitate practice change towards enhanced partnerships with patients and family members. The public-oriented package provides capacity development for individuals to better partner with health professionals in order to increase their chances for recovery.

### Impact Level

**Region of Vancouver Coastal Health**

Staff and residents

Spreading to province of BC

### Time Frame

**Open Space Forum held October 2008**

Planning and development completed September 2009

Launched January 2010

### People Engaged

In initial forum 49

In development phase 28

In implementation and launch 2500 and counting

### Web Link

[http://www.vch.ca/get_involved/community_engagement/community_partnerships/transforming_seniors_care](http://www.vch.ca/get_involved/community_engagement/community_partnerships/transforming_seniors_care)

**Title**

Empowering Communities for Greater Participation in Wetland Conservation Issues

### Organizing Group

Millennium Challenge Account (MCA-Lesotho)

### Location

Lesotho: Botha Bothe, Mokhotlong & Quthing districts

### Key Question / Problem

Widespread overgrazing and degradation of alpine wetlands.

### Sample Methods

Training workshops, video presentations, poster presentations, indigenous products displays, role-playing exercises and lectures.

### Results

Helping stakeholders understand the importance of wetlands made them render their support to the Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Project. Herders assumed the responsibility of protecting the rangeland. Livestock Owners and Traditional Doctors now understand that taking care of rangeland resources is not just the role of Rangers and Local Authorities (Chiefs and Community Councilors) but requires a collective effort from the entire community. Youth and Women’s groups also gained understanding on the concept of sustainable use of wetlands resources. Therefore, using a methodology that facilitated engagement with different stakeholder groups with varying literacy levels facilitated a move towards changes in the attitudes of the local communities towards the Wetlands Project. It is anticipated that this change in attitude will translate into changes in behavior and practices towards wetlands and natural resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>3 districts in northern Lesotho: 1 central district and 1 district in the southern parts of Lesotho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The Evolution of a Public Participation Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Capital District Health Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Halifax, Nova Scotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>~ 375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>How do we create a public participation culture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Telephone surveys, community conversations, focus groups, web based questionnaires, stakeholder interviews, world café, U-Theory, graphic facilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Broad organizational commitment to public participation. Establishment of Citizen Engagement and Accountability Portfolio with a mandate to lead public participation. Development of engagement policy. Extensive citizen input in development of two pilot community based health teams and all (43) community health plan recommendations approved by Board of Directors. Development and implementation of leadership development program with over 300 formal leaders on self directed learning journeys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>5000+ citizens, staff, volunteers and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cdha.nshealth.ca">www.cdha.nshealth.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>City of Austin: Planning and Development Review Department, Communications &amp; Public Information Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Throughout Austin, Texas, USA, and its extraterritorial jurisdiction, with a total population of approximately 1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>What aspects of our life today in Austin do we value and wish to retain and enhance? What are our aspirations for the future of Austin? What are we willing to do to achieve this future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>“Speak Week” mobile kiosks; “Meeting-in-a-Box” portable community conversations; interactive exercises to plan future growth; survey; task force meetings; blogs; web chats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results

Thousands of Austinites have helped shape the future of the City, including historically underserved and excluded populations. Ultimately, the Imagine Austin comprehensive plan will provide a guide for the management of change, a reflection of community values and aspirations, the foundation for policies, strategies, and actions, the community's to-do list, and a catalyst for community consensus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Metropolitan city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>About 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>&gt;10,000 citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.imagineaustin.net">http://www.imagineaustin.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Montgomery College: A Steward of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery College: A Steward of Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Montgomery College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rockville, Maryland, student enrollment 60K; 1500+employees; 160+ countries represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>What is Montgomery College’s social impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>25 Discovery Dialogues/Focus Groups and Social Impact Survey. Taken together 1,200 students, faculty, and staff participated in the dialogues and the survey and submitted just over 3,700 responses to the survey questions. Both the dialogues and survey were designed to learn about all the wonderful things already happening at Montgomery College that should be acknowledged, celebrated, and promoted in the area of social responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A comprehensive, inclusive and deliberative public participation process; final report with recommendations; promotional (in-house designed) Social Responsibility and Public Policy Authentic Dialogue Lifesavers candy; and Social Impact promotional DVD produced. The public participation process discovered and acknowledged and the DVD demonstrates and celebrates that through faculty, staff, administrators, and students the College’s social impact is broad and far-reaching inside and outside of the classroom, within Montgomery County, throughout the region, and across the globe. Several College units are proactively engaging, both formally and informally, in a variety of activities and projects with more than 150 nonprofit civic and community-based organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>College, County, Region, State and Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>1,200 plus faculty, staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.montgomerycollege.edu/Departments/OED/responsibility.htm">www.montgomerycollege.edu/Departments/OED/responsibility.htm</a> <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T9mRKSMot2I">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T9mRKSMot2I</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IAP2 State of the Practice Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Palos Verdes Shelf Superfund Site Public Outreach Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Fish Contamination Education Collaborative (FCEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>U.S.A, Los Angeles and Orange Counties, CA, Pop. 13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question / Problem</strong></td>
<td>110 tons of DDT and 11 tons of PCB currently lie on the ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>Over 300 citizens, representatives of various community and public interest groups, health and wellness managers, academics, health professionals, provincial government representatives and municipal officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nbhc.ca">www.nbhc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
floor off of California’s Palos Verdes Shelf, contaminating fish for up to 40 miles in each direction. Some of these fish have been found to be so contaminated that the State has recommended that they should not be consumed. Since the contamination is water-based, there are no means to physically restrict the coastline, rendering containment impossible. Furthermore, the populations who utilize the site as a resource are comprised of low income ethnic subsistence fishermen and community members who rely on these marine resources to feed themselves and their families. Key objective is to involve the public in modifying risky fish consumption behaviors through direct community outreach and peer-to-peer messaging.

| Sample Methods | On-the-ground field testing of all surveys, collateral materials and messages; behavior change monitoring surveys (conducted in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese); pier & shoreline angler outreach; health clinic outreach; educational workshops; multilingual messaging materials (i.e. tip cards, brochures, recipe booklets); peer-to-peer Facebook campaign; website; program blog; Flickr page; YouTube Channel; professionally self-produced instructional videos; interactive GIS mapping system aggregating all outreach results; community partnerships. |
| Results | Results from the community-focused program demonstrate that the number of participants who reported eating a contaminated fish species dropped from 10% to 0% in the Chinese community, and from 39% to 3% in the Vietnamese community after outreach. Results from the angler-focused campaign demonstrate that the strategic intervention reduced the number of contaminated fish leaving piers and entering the community by 93%. Collectively, the program has reached well over 20,000 at-risk community members in the past three years. |

| Impact Level | Health region |
| Time Frame | 2007-2010 (present) |
| People Engaged | Over 20,000 participants |
| Web Link | www.pvsfish.org |

| Title | Portland Metropolitan Urban and Rural Reserves |
| Organizing Group | Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation – Long Range Planning |
| Location | Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties – Portland, Oregon Metropolitan Area – population approximately 2.5 million |
| Key Question / Problem | Provide outreach and engagement to designate urban reserves (areas where urban growth can occur to meet population increases for a 50-year period) and rural reserves (areas where no urbanization can occur to protect agriculture, forests and natural resources.) Design and implement over two years with... |
### Sample Methods

Build stakeholder networks, create advisory groups, reframe technical analysis to citizen-friendly language, convene 21 open houses, provide dozens of presentations, place low-cost literature racks in more than 100 gathering places, produce videos, websites, on-line questionnaires, and develop media relations.

### Results

Starting with more than 400,000 acres in the metropolitan area, designate approximately 28,615 acres as urban reserves for possible future growth accommodation and 267,000 acres as rural reserves to protect against urbanization. All for the next 50 years.

### Impact Level

Metropolitan Portland, Oregon, surrounding counties and cities

### Time Frame

More than two years starting with an Oregon State Legislative Action in late 2007 and concluding with designations in June 2010

### People Engaged

Regional population of 2.5 million+ residents. Primary focus on urban unincorporated areas outside the existing Urban Growth Boundary and rural areas.

### Web Link

[www.co.washington.or.us/reserves](http://www.co.washington.or.us/reserves)

---

### Title

River City Blueprint: ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stands

### Organizing Group

Brisbane City Council and Queensland Government

### Location

Australia, Brisbane, population 1.52 million

### Key Question / Problem

**Key Question: ‘What is ‘Your Bright Idea’ for the City?’**

**Key Problem: How do we talk to members of the public who live, work and use the inner city, particularly people who would not normally participate in city planning projects, while ensuring their input is broad, long term and strategic when communicating their aspirations for the future of the inner city?**

### Sample Methods

Textural interactive activity, one-on-one discussion, postcards, on-line discussion and website

### Results

An eye catching, travelling interactive display that provided an opportunity for a unique, spontaneous engagement that fit into the daily routine of those who passed it and encouraged input from a wide audience.

Participants successfully communicated their aspirations for the long-term future of the inner-city by building their own 3-dimensional ‘Blueprint’ for inner-Brisbane using colourful foam blocks on an aerial photo of the city. The three metre by three metre floor was an aerial photograph of the Blueprint study area (inner 5 kilometres) which helped to set the spatial context of the plan. The colourful 3-dimensional foam blocks assisted participants to communicate complex ideas and provide practical solutions in a simple, non-technical, fun way.

The stands were successful in engaging a diverse range of ages and residents, workers and users that reflect the regional...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>5 kilometre radius from Brisbane’s central business district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Three months (February 2010 – May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>1600 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/BCC:BASE::pc=PC_6159#ideas">http://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/BCC:BASE::pc=PC_6159#ideas</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Shaping the Future of Nahʔą Dehé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Parks Canada (Nahanni National Park Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Nahanni National Park Reserve, Northwest Territories, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>How to involve a diverse array of people, including new stakeholders, local communities, interested Canadians and an international audience in the development of a management plan – the first to provide strategic direction for the newly expanded Nahanni National Park Reserve, a UNESCO World Heritage Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Collaboration with the Nahʔą Dehé Consensus Team (a mechanism for co-operative management between Dehcho First Nations and Parks Canada), multi-stakeholder workshops, Aboriginal Chief and Council meetings, community open houses, newsletters, videos and an on-line discussion forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Consultations shaped the development of Nahanni’s management plan, providing strategic direction for over 30,000km² of Canada’s protected wilderness. Consultations mixed traditional techniques with on-line engagement (Web 2.0) to reach geographically dispersed audiences and allow all interested Canadians and international visitors to shape the management direction for this iconic park. Positive relationships were built, setting the foundation for continuing dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Management direction of Nahanni has local impacts for surrounding communities and business operators, national impacts for Canadians and international impacts for international visitors and the achievement of UNESCO World Heritage Site goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>The planning scope was developed with the Consensus Team during spring and summer 2009. The consultation program began in fall 2009 and continued until mid-February 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Through local meetings with Aboriginal Chief and Councils, community open houses, stakeholder workshops and the on-line forum, nearly 3000 partners, stakeholders, residents, visitors and interested Canadians participated in the planning program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nahanniplan.ca">www.nahanniplan.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sharing, Listening, Learning and Engaging Communities to Shape Community Health Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Primary Health Care, Capital District Health Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Canada: Halifax, Nova Scotia. Population: 400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Key Question / Problem | Capital Health is implementing new Community Health Teams (CHT) focused on health and wellness. As every community has different needs and may require different programs, supports, and team members the following questions need to be addressed for each CHT:  
  - What is the scope and design of the CHT?  
  - What do the citizens and providers think about the CHT model?  
  - What are the perceived opportunities, barriers and supports of the CHT?  
  - How will the providers work together – both within the system and in the community?  
  - How will we ensure ongoing communication with citizens and community partners? |
| Sample Methods | Open conversations and world cafés with citizens and health providers; targeted focus groups with youth, family physician practices, community groups and organizations; and kitchen conversations with rural/suburban/hard-to-reach citizens |
| Results | A detailed engagement framework document and engagement plan supported the CHT planning group to engage multiple stakeholders in meaningful conversations. This framework was based on the IAP2 principles and processes of public participation. Significant input and perspectives were heard from a wide range of stakeholders. Findings were corroborated through a validation session with representative stakeholders. CHT programs and services, principles for working with the community, staff competencies, human resource requirements and future directions were developed in direct response to the engagement findings. |
| Impact Level | High - Neighbourhoods of regional municipality (urban and suburban) |
| Time Frame | About 12 months per CHT |
| People Engaged | 600+ citizens and stakeholders at local community level |
| Web Link | www.communityhealthteams.ca |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Site C Clean Energy Project (Site C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>BC Hydro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>British Columbia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>The provincial government directed BC Hydro to initiate consultations and determine whether Site C – a third dam on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peace River in northeast B.C. – should continue to be pursued if conservation, upgrading existing equipment, and investing in new sources were insufficient to meet the future electricity needs of the province.

**Sample Methods**

Three rounds of comprehensive public and stakeholder consultation. Two community consultation offices, discussion guides and feedback forms, stakeholder meetings, open houses, website and online feedback form, submissions, and toll-free information line.

**Results**

More than two-thirds (69%) of provincial consultation participants agreed with the key question. Overall, 57% of consultation participants agreed with this, while in the Peace Region, consultation participants were evenly split (47%/47%) on their level of agreement.

Based on the Stage 2 key findings of a multi-stage process, including extensive public and stakeholder input, BC Hydro recommended proceeding to the next stage. On April 19, 2010, the B.C. government announced Site C would proceed to Stage 3, Environmental and Regulatory Review.

**Impact Level**

Province-wide benefits through a clean and renewable energy source. Physical impact in the Peace River region by the creation of a reservoir.

**Time Frame**

Fall 2007 – Fall 2009

**People Engaged**

More than 2,500 public and stakeholder participants in three rounds of consultations. Broad and extensive public notification program, including newspaper and radio advertisements, thousands of emails, phone calls and household mailers, and bill inserts. More than 1,700 public inquiries about the project.

**Web Link**

www.bchydro.com/sitec

---

**Title**

Tidal Dee and Clwyd Flood Risk Management Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Environment Agency Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Northeast Wales coastline and inland tidal areas around the River Dee and River Clwyd estuaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question / Problem</strong></td>
<td>Flood risk management strategy to help Environment Agency Wales and its partners (including local authorities, the Welsh Assembly Government, and local people), understand how to best manage tidal flooding from the Dee and Clwyd estuaries for the next 100 years. The strategy presents short, medium and long term solutions designed to take into account climate change predictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Workshops, community planning events, supermarket drop-in exhibitions, community interviews, questionnaires, consultation documents, response forms, website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>A comprehensive community engagement programme was central to the development of the strategy and the only one of its size and scope to have been undertaken in Wales to date. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
views of local people underpinned the strategy in a way that has never been attempted before by Environment Agency Wales. Local businesses, communities and individuals (as well as statutory bodies and local authorities) are influencing decisions they will live with for the next 100 years. The most affected / vulnerable people were targeted through specific activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Wide area covering main centres of population around Rhyl and Prestatyn (for the Clwyd), and Chester and Flint (for the Dee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Approximately 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Over 1500 stakeholders and local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/clwyd">www.environment-agency.gov.uk/clwyd</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/dee">www.environment-agency.gov.uk/dee</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>A Trio of Books on “Community Planning”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Dr Wendy Sarkissian, nine co-authors and Earthscan publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Nimbin and other locations in Australia; Sweden; Canada; publisher in London, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Research, writing, publishing and marketing of three books on community engagement in the “Tools for Community Planning” suite from Earthscan, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Together, these new books fill major gaps in the “practice” literature for engagement practitioners and community organizers, especially when dealing with intractable problems. Kitchen Table sustainability offers techniques that promote education, action, trust, inclusion, nurturing and governance in engagement processes. SpeakOut provides step-by-step guidance for designing and managing the innovative SpeakOut engagement model pioneered in Australia in 1990, now used internationally. Creative Community Planning provides poems, stories and wide-ranging practical guidance for those seeking more creative and visionary engagement processes to appeal to a wide range of community audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>International publisher with wide distribution. Two books currently used as textbooks in planning courses in Canada and Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>Book research and writing began in mid-2007. All books available internationally by February 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>Wendy Sarkissian, Wiwik Bunjamin–Mau and Dianna Hurford, (co-authors); “with” authors: Yollana Shore, Nancy Hofer, Steph Vajda, Cathy Wilkinson, Kelvin Walsh, Andrea Cook and Chris Wenman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Web Link**     | www.kitchentablesustainability.com  
www.speakoutplanning.com  
www.creativecommunityplanning.com |
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## Case study summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>OutLOUD consultation for Airds Bradbury Renewal Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Housing NSW in partnership with Straight Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Airds Bradbury, NSW, Australia (population = 4,770 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>How to invite and support meaningful engagement and input of local public housing tenants into a new master plan to shape improvements to physical infrastructure including housing, streets, open space and the town centre, as part of comprehensive community renewal process. Engagement activities needed to contribute to and complement community capacity building activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>OutLOUD (modelled on SpeakOut), Design OutLOUD (modelled on enquiry by design), OutLOUD bus trips (experiential learning excursions), Walk OutLOUD (walking and place based consultation), newsletters, flyers, participatory workshops, focus groups, community reference group, precinct barbeques, health expo, ‘community change maker’ working groups (resident-led action groups), school outreach, technical workshops, household survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>The engagement process successfully built broad awareness of the project and its aims with public housing tenants. Through engagement, key community aspirations have been incorporated as a major focus of the master plan, particularly safety, community cohesion and how physical planning can influence and shape an existing and changing community. Through engagement, a large, skilled and confident group of residents has emerged who are eager to participate in further detailed design and are committed to leading and creating change ‘from the bottom up’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Suburb level (geographic impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborate level (IAP2 spectrum)</strong></td>
<td>Collaborate level (IAP2 spectrum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 18 months (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>4,770 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The problem and the challenge
Airds Bradbury is a public housing estate in the south west of Sydney recognised as a seriously disadvantaged area. Weekly household incomes in the area are less than the half the Sydney average; unemployment rates are five times the Sydney average; nearly 70% of the population have no formal qualifications and 40% of households are single parent families.

There is commitment to redress the physical and social imbalance in the area. The Airds Bradbury Renewal Project (the project) aims to turn Airds Bradbury into a place of opportunity with a mixed and integrated community and a sustainable future. A new master plan is being developed to shape improvements to physical infrastructure including housing, streets, open space and the town centre as part of a comprehensive community renewal process. This renewal process is being underpinned by meaningful community engagement.

An inherent challenge in working with such disadvantaged communities is the high level of disengagement from participating in community life. For a number of reasons, this was the case in Airds Bradbury.

Residents have a deep distrust of government which has arisen after years of broken promises and negative experiences of regulatory institutions. A draft master plan for part of the area was prepared in 2002 with limited consultation, was never adopted and improvements were not delivered. Consequently, residents were dubious that the current master planning process would bring about positive change and were unmotivated to step forward and participate.

Significant physical and social barriers exist in Airds Bradbury which has comparatively poor facilities and services as a result of poor planning and underinvestment. Lack of basic amenities and access to services limit opportunities for residents to meet and interact which generates feelings of isolation and exclusion. Furthermore, residents have increased stress levels produced by higher levels of crime, violence and antisocial behaviour which further inhibit their willingness to participate in community life.

There is an entrenched ‘victim mentality’ in the area produced by low levels of control residents feel they have over their lives. Consequently, there is a culture of blaming others, finding excuses and being pessimistic about the future. The majority of residents feel powerless to influence change, which limits their motivation to take responsibility for their circumstances or contribute to community life.

The role of public participation
Tackling social disadvantage requires more than fixing up or selling off old houses. Successful community renewal brings residents on a transformational journey and builds connectedness in the community, giving residents hope for the future and building momentum for change. Renewal cannot be a top down process. To generate sustainable outcomes the process has to be owned and driven by residents to ensure local issues are priorities and dealt with in a relevant, creative, and effective way to directly benefit the community.

For this reason, community renewal in Airds Bradbury had to be a resident ‘owned’ process. Accordingly, the engagement process was intrinsic to the renewal project and was designed and delivered to strengthen the community’s ability to take action that leads to positive change at the local level. Through participation, residents were empowered to take an active role in the delivery of services and management of change.

Public participation methods
Over the last eighteen months, Housing NSW in partnership with Straight Talk undertook a comprehensive engagement process that involved a range of activities including:
• **Community Reference Group (GRG)** – a representative group of about 15 residents who meet monthly to provide advice on all aspects of the project and input to decisions

• **Precinct barbeques** – approximately 40 small community BBQs involving over 500 residents to promote and invite participation in the master planning and renewal process

• **OutLOUD** – a large scale community celebration of people and place involving nearly 1,500 residents with a range of consultative activities to gather resident ideas and aspirations about the future of the area and to introduce the master planning process

• **OutLOUD bus trips** – a series of bus trips involving approximately 200 residents to provide opportunities for experiential learning and capacity building to input to the master planning process

• **Walk OutLOUD** – a large scale consultation involving 150 residents focused on ‘walking and talking’ with pedestrian circuits and designated stopping points for residents to explore, share stories, talk and reflect about ways to improve the area

• **Resident visioning workshop** – a creative, participatory workshop attended by almost 60 residents who formally presented their ideas and vision for the future of the area to inform the master planning process

• **Design OutLOUD** – a participatory design workshop involving approximately 300 residents to test and develop design concepts for the master plan.

Other activities included a health expo, resident led action groups that have driven a number of local projects to act on community priorities for change, a household survey, technical workshops and dozens of meetings, briefings and regular informal contact with stakeholders.

**Uniqueness of the project**

The project stands out as unique from other community renewal projects due to the scale and breadth of the engagement activities that underpinned the renewal process and the unprecedented level of engagement with residents, in what was a very disengaged community. Never before have residents in Airds Bradbury been so engaged and hopeful about the future of the area. A number of key elements prompted the high level of participation:

• The project deliberately started with a ‘big bang’ event – ‘OutLOUD’ - to alert residents to the renewal process and encourage engagement. Around 1,500 people attended significantly exceeding the target of 400 people

• All large scale events were staffed by teams of people who had been trained in event logistics, but also in skill development. This training helped staff empower participation and supported resident engagement

• Participation incentives were provided for residents to ensure active and sustained resident participation

• Proactive stakeholder management and promotion was used to encourage resident participation in events, including tailored invitations and repeated personalised follow ups from a team of residents, highly visible variable message signs and badges handed out at BBQs

• Events were designed to:
  o Combine consultation with fun and celebration
  o Focus on community strengths, assets and resources – not just issues
  o Build capacity
  o Support relationships and partnerships
  o Provide diverse opportunities to participate
  o Be respectful, empowering and purposeful.

• Resources were used strategically to generate momentum and encourage continued involvement with an emphasis on directing the bulk of effort towards the ‘sometimes’ and...
‘often’ engaged residents and not the ‘very’ engaged residents who were already motivated to participate.

Project results
The project led to an unprecedented level of ‘engagement’, as distinct from ‘consultation’, with residents, which has built trust, goodwill and respect.
The project outcomes have been influenced in a range of ways as a result of public participation:

- Several well resolved concept designs were developed at Design OutLOUD and are now being refined into the master plan
- Funding commitment and work started on a number of resident-led initiatives to improve the area and provide increased opportunities for residents. For example monthly markets, weekly fruit and vegetable co-op, graffiti removal campaign, park clean ups, landscaping and seniors housing developments have been established or are underway.

While the master plan has not yet been developed and adopted, the preferred concept design is based directly on the outputs of the iterative planning process and is broadly supported by residents and key stakeholders.

Alignment with core values
Core value 1 – How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?
The engagement process recognised that those with the greatest interest or stake in the future of Airds Bradbury were existing residents and they needed to input to the master plan. With input from the CRG, an open process was designed that provided for inclusive participation to ensure no one was left out. An effort was made to tailor engagement activities that were appropriate and appealing to children, young people, men, women, private owners and tenants, public tenants, Aboriginal people, South Pacific Islander people, seniors and people with low literacy.

Examples of how the engagement activities were tailored included:

- At OutLOUD, there was an ‘Aboriginal dreaming’ zone that included indigenous food and opportunities to learn didgeridoo and traditional painting as well as space for participants to tell stories about Aboriginal culture, identity and experiences living in the area. ‘Brother Black’, an Aboriginal hip hop artist also performed at OutLOUD, engaging young Aboriginal residents and also appealing to other young people in the area
- At OutLOUD, a ‘sistahood tent’ was established to provide a safe place for women to come together and talk about issues affecting them. Participants were encouraged to share stories which encouraged discussion about issues such as ‘belonging’, ‘identity’ and ‘wellbeing’. From this activity, a cultural values statement was developed for women
- Other activities and events were organised at appropriate times to enable carers with young and school aged children (who are mainly women) to participate as well as having qualified childcare workers available at all events to ensure that lack of childcare did not present a barrier to women participating
- Outreach work with schools to run creative writing classes with primary and high school students to write stories about the future of the area; master planning classes with high school students to teach urban planning and sustainable design concepts
- At OutLOUD, a ‘kids zone’ and a ‘youth zone’ were established with a focus on providing activities for young people of all ages.
Core value 2 – How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contribution?

Prior to commencing work on the master plan significant energy was directed towards generating energy and momentum within the community and building resident capacity to input to the planning process. This meant consultation was undertaken when the community had the most opportunity to influence outcomes – not when residents were ill-equipped and disengaged and not as a token gesture at the end of the process.

Core value 3 – How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?

The diversity of local needs, issues and concerns were understood, considered and addressed through the planning process. All engagement activities sought to set out and reinforce the positions of different participants.

An example of this approach was the Design OutLOUD which provided opportunity for all stakeholders to come together to test assumptions and explore the implications of different development opportunities and constraints through a transparent, objective, collaborative and integrative design process. Residents, regulators, local government, services providers and Housing NSW worked side-by-side to workshop creative and practical responses to real issues.

Key stakeholders, including residents, were given the opportunity to provide a design brief to outline specific requirements and desired outcomes or conditions for the master plan. The briefs served as essential points of reference that guided the design workshop. This open process helped build trust and understanding and emphasised the need for integrated problem solving.

The outcome of Design OutLOUD was several well resolved design concepts that are now being refined into the master plan. It is expected that the master plan will be broadly supported because it will reflect an integrated response to stakeholder needs and will have been developed through an inclusive process where stakeholders had opportunities to put their issues on the table upfront.

Core value 4 - How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?

To ensure sustainable outcomes, the community had to be actively engaged in the planning for the area so that the master plan could respond to priority issues. The process needed to invite participation, empower residents and overcome the significant barriers around talking to government. Incentives included provision of childcare, food and participation competitions with prizes. Similarly, engagement activities needed to be energetic, inviting and fun to attract and sustain participation.

All activities were designed to be creative and were facilitated at a pace that empowered residents to participate. At Design OutLOUD, traditional engagement processes were modified to meet the need of the residents by offering shorter sessions with dynamic activities, providing lots of breaks, having visual recording and limiting the number of formal presentations.

All activities were extensively promoted via different mediums such as newsletters and flyers, posters displayed around the area, large variable message signs at the gateways to the area, a shopfront in the town centre, personalised invitations, random follow up phone calls and barbeques outside schools. This blanket approach to promotion meant that it was easy for residents, who had the most to gain from the renewal process, to be aware of the opportunities to participate.
Core value 5 – How did the project seek input from participants on how they wish to participate?
A flexible approach was taken to provide residents with the power to influence how they participated in the project. There was an emphasis on using a range of techniques and mixing the scope and intensity of engagement activities. For example, there were a number of one-off events that residents could participate in ad-hoc and there were a number of groups that they could join for more formal ongoing involvement.

The CRG enabled residents to input to core project elements, including the design of engagement activities. The CRG emphasised that accessibility was critical. In response, activities were designed to be accessible to all demographic groups; be physically accessible, particularly for those with mobility impediments; be appropriate for the target groups they were aimed at; be warm and welcoming for everyone to participate to the extent that they wished and be clear in intent, fun, rewarding, inspirational and educational in outcome. The CRG played an ongoing role in providing feedback on what was and was not working which enabled the approach to be continually refined.

The engagement process included:

- A mix of activities at OutLOUD for people interested in different issues and specific needs and allowed participants to go to activities that interested them. Activities were participatory and fun so that consultation was relatively effortless
- Customised invitations for Design OutLOUD in response to feedback from residents that a formal letter would not generate interest
- Establishment of informal working groups of residents, called ‘Community Change Makers’, that meet regularly to set their own agenda and act on local priorities.

Core value 6 – How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?
The marked and concentrated levels of disadvantage in the area meant that mainstream consultation processes, geared towards the educated and articulate, would have been intimidating and disempowering. Activities had to be designed to ensure that residents felt good about themselves, the future and their ability to control and influence change.

There was a focus on capacity building to empower residents by equipping them with the knowledge to participate meaningfully. Experiential learning techniques such as the OutLOUD bus trips provided opportunities for residents to visit a range of different planned urban spaces in south western Sydney. These bus trips helped residents learn about what works in other places and to expand their vision of what was possible in Airds Bradbury. Residents also developed their ability to articulate what was needed to deliver positive change. This equipped them with information and knowledge to enable them to comprehend planning and design concepts and participate in the process in an informed way.

Core value 7 – How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?
A number of methods were used to report how participants have influenced project decisions and help shaped parameters for the master plan. The CRG was regularly updated on how and why decisions were made. This provided an important check and balance mechanism, ensuring the project team was kept accountable for outcomes.

Broad-based reporting back included regular distribution of newsletters to keep residents informed about the renewal process. A shop front in the town centre was established to provide an accessible venue for residents to get information and updates on upcoming events and to talk about how issues of interest had been addressed.
Residents wearing participation passports.

Emphasis on fun and celebration combined with consultation at all events

Use of graphic recorders at workshops supported dynamic facilitation for participants with low literacy and limited attention spans

Participation passports were a project innovation to encourage residents to get involved. Stamps given as proof of participation. Minimum number of stamps required to be eligible for prize draw.

One of 17 creative, hands-on participatory activities at OutLOUD, modelled on ‘speakOut’ technique

Bus trips to ‘good’ parks and town centres and community hubs provided opportunity for experiential learning

Residents and agencies working together in three day Design OutLOUD, modelled on ‘enquiry by design’ technique

Providing free transport to enable participation

Using food to bring residents together. Food supported process as a celebratory component of all events
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Building the Designer Democracy Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>The Center for Communities by Design/American Institute of Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Washington, D.C., USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>How can the organization make a contribution that will support the sustainable development of our communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Community Charrettes, surveys, world cafes, workshops, focus groups, youth workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A replicable set of values and a process that can be broadly applied to urban design and sustainable communities. The development of a participatory culture and applied values that explicitly recognize the central place of the public in the design of the built environment which has influenced how the organization, its members, and the profession approach its work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Hundreds of communities across the United States, including almost 200 in the last five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Program inception: 1967. Project timelines: 6 months to 1-year. Charrette lengths: 3-6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Over 100,000 total. Between 60-1,000 per community. (average: 300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aia.org">www.aia.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities

Forty years ago, the profession of architecture wasn’t viewed as a public craft, but one made for an exclusive group of professionals. It also wasn’t traditionally associated with community design — in fact, most people still think of architects as the designers of individual buildings, rather than larger systems. Many architects didn’t regard themselves as intermediaries between public aspirations and the built environment either. The designer democracy movement is the story of how a chance meeting led to the development of a 43-year tradition of public work at the American Institute of Architects that has assisted hundreds of communities, changed an organization, and altered the way the architectural profession approaches public participation in its craft.

The Rationale for Public Participation

In 1967, the American Institute of Architects began its design assistance programs, pioneering the early forms of the modern charrette process. In 1985, Architects Peter Batchelor and David Lewis described the early development of the program in Urban Design In Action, a history of the R/UDAT program:

“Called Regional/Urban Design Assistance Teams, or R/UDATs, they began in 1967 in response to a citizen’s chance perception that the American Institute of Architects could help resolve the problems of his community. The first team discovered that the city is a living organism, embodying within prototypical problems the local culture, history and aspirations of its citizens. They sensed its continual evolution, from past to future forms. Most of all, they realized that the citizens wanted to help shape their own destinies, to participate in the formulation of policies whose implementation would result in a new sense of community.” – Peter Batchelor and David Lewis, Urban Design in Action

Following the first project in Rapid City, South Dakota, the R/UDAT program expanded dramatically, working in over 80 communities during its first 20 years. As the program matured, it established the following principles for operation in its projects:

- An interdisciplinary approach to community design. Design Assistance teams included not only architects, but a diverse collection of professionals in teams of 6-10 professionals, designed to fit the local community context.
- An Enhanced Professional Credibility. The program was based on the notion that a fresh set of outside perspectives provided a creative spark to local discussions. Therefore, no team members came from the local community or the region. Each team represents a diverse national makeup of geographies and professions. All team members are required to serve pro bono, and are barred from accepting any work as a result of a project. There is no ‘client’ other than the public interest.
- An inherent and expressed sense of the value of public participation. Today, the AIA has a four decade tradition of designing community-driven processes that incorporate substantial public involvement through a multi-faceted charrette format that includes public workshops, World Café sessions, surveys, focus groups, stakeholder interviews, formal meetings and presentations. This approach allows the national team to build on the substantial local expertise present in a community and leverage the best existing knowledge available in representing community ideas. The AIA is always invited by the community. It does not solicit projects from host communities.
Through its design assistance programming, the AIA has leveraged millions of dollars in pro bono public service work and engaged thousands of participants in community-driven planning processes that address urban design and sustainability issues. Through the Design Assistance Team program, over 1,000 professionals from over 30 disciplines have provided millions of dollars in professional pro bono services to more than 180 communities across the country.

**Impact of Core Values on the Organization**

The design assistance experience has had a profound impact on both the organization, as well as the profession more broadly. Today, the American Institute of Architects boasts over 300 state and local chapters and over 80,000 members. It has transcended the traditional membership association to take on a public role in society. The design assistance experience has dramatically altered the organizational culture and identity of the AIA. Today, the organization’s slogan reflects the public nature of its identity – the AIA “serves as the voice of the architecture profession and the resource for its members in service to society.” The impact of a participatory culture on the organization has also led to the dramatic expansion of its commitment to public service. In 2002, it created the Center for Communities by Design, which serves as “a catalyst, convener, and information center that helps AIA members work with citizens and other stakeholders to envision and create more sustainable, healthy, safe and livable communities.” The Center houses AIA’s participatory service programs and has led design assistance processes across the country and provided technical expertise and resources to members and other organizations about charrette processes and public participation in general. In one case, the design assistance process was modeled in West Virginia to provide free technical assistance to needy communities. As one local architect described it, “Our idea was: if we could listen to the wants and needs of the community and visually represent them in a conceptual way, all the while implementing the AIA’s principles of livable, sustainable communities, then community leaders would have a powerful tool to pursue funding and otherwise gain momentum for their efforts.”

The AIA’s commitment to the Core Values is expressed in its staff as well. Center staff are trained in public participation and have received training from organizations that include the IAP2, as well as the National Charrette Institute, the International Association of Facilitators, and other organizations. Center staff have conducted dozens of charrettes across the country, and have provided training to AIA members and other organizations such as the Mid-Atlantic Facilitators Network on “Designer Democracy”.

**A Typical R/UDAT Project – Boerne, Texas, 2008**

The Boerne, Texas, R/UDAT typifies the manner in which AIA applies core values and its principles to a community process:

- Formation of a broad-based local steering committee, submittal of a formal request for AIA’s help, and the creation of a project website (http://rudatboerne.com/).
- A Multi-disciplinary team of architects, urban designers, historic preservationists, housing experts, civic health experts, green developers, and planners.
- A community process that included a community-wide survey; an integrated, semester-long effort by university students to survey and describe issues that resulted in a book; a community-wide building identification contest; a grade-school visioning process; a two-day initial visit that included meetings with community leaders, a broad-based steering committee, local business representatives, and over 100 local residents and stakeholders to design the five
day charrette process and get input on the professional makeup of the team; a five-day community charrette process that included town hall events, a World Café event, focus groups, stakeholder interviews, a two day studio workshop with dozens of local design professionals and students, formal presentations to the city council and a public meeting of residents to explain what the team heard from the community and the priority recommendations they had informed, and the delivery of a formal 92-page report summarizing the community conclusions and team’s recommendations.

This project has had the following results so far:

- It involved over 700 residents (in a city of 6,178) in the formulation of a long-term plan for the community;
- As a result of the community enthusiasm from the charrette, the local steering committee formed Boerne By Design, a non-profit organization guiding implementation of the charrette outcomes;
- The community hired a professional media company to produce a documentary of the process, and created a gallery of the dozens of design graphics, graphic facilitator recordings, and student work from the charrette process that kept the public conversation going for months after the charrette;
- The project won several state awards for planning processes from the Texas Society of Architects, the American Planning Association, and others;
- It resulted in the design and initial construction (broke ground 2010) on a civic campus complete with a LEED-certified public library and civic buildings, and the formulation for a portfolio of community investments and improvements (streetscapes, bridges, etc) that continue to guide the community today.

The Boerne R/UDAT is illustrative of the 143 other processes implemented around the country. During the last two years, the Center for Communities by Design has digitized all of the project reports and posted them on the AIA website, providing a resource available to practitioners around the world.

In 2005, in response to the growing national interest in community sustainability, the AIA launched a companion program called the Sustainable Design Assessment Team (SDAT). Like the R/UDAT program, the SDAT brought interdisciplinary teams together to work with communities in intensive charrette processes. It also represented a major institutional investment in participatory sustainability plans by the AIA. The organization underwrote 75 percent of the project costs, requiring host communities to contribute only $5,000 to the costs. All team members served pro bono. As a result, the program represented a unique opportunity for communities across the country to access technical assistance. In 2006, the organization increased its investment in public visioning processes even further. To mark the 150th anniversary of the organization, AIA announced the Blueprint for America initiative, a year long effort by members to “mark the AIA’s 150 years of service to the profession and the nation by working with their communities to create a better future by design.” AIA leaders described the Blueprint process in clear terms: “The Blueprint for America is an initiative in which AIA architects engage fellow citizens, mayors, other professionals, and local government officials to collaborate on a community service program that addresses a community’s distinct needs with the goal of producing a shared vision for a more livable future.” The Blueprint for America community service program facilitated 156 community processes in support of their community visioning initiatives. A website was created to house all of the Blueprint projects as a resource for the future. In addition, during the last 5 years the AIA
has held SDAT projects in over 40 towns, cities and regions across the country. In 2009, *Eco-Structure Magazine* wrote a feature story on the program ("Communities Sharpen Their Sustainable Futures") that provided profiles of several communities which illustrate the power of the community design process. All of the SDAT project communities can be found through the Center’s website.

**A Typical SDAT - Indianapolis, October 2009**

The Indianapolis SDAT project is illustrative of how AIA applies the Core Values to its work. The process included the following elements:

- The formation, and refinement, of a representative local project steering committee to guide outreach, organization, and communications in the community, as well as develop a formal application for assistance;
- An initial consultation visit from staff and a team leader, including meetings with the steering committee and resident stakeholders, that informed the selection of a multi-disciplinary team of 10 and the dates for the full charrette;
- The creation of a project website - [http://www.smartgrowthindy.org/](http://www.smartgrowthindy.org/)
- A pre-charrette workshop and consultation two weeks before the event with over 100 residents, covered live on local television, in which the process was outlined, and participants designed the team’s driving tour of the area, selected the meeting times and venues, and designed a door-to-door outreach campaign for the community;
- A **3-day charrette process** involving hundreds of residents and local stakeholders, as well as several design studios involving 87 local design professionals and professors and 83 students from Ball State University, which received significant local media coverage before, during, and after the event;
- A public presentation (covered live on local TV) of the team’s conclusions, explaining what they heard from the community and how that led to the formulation of the plan reflected in a 122-page final report.

The outcomes of the event thus far have included the following:

- The residents of the community proclaimed the charrette an unconditional success, and pledged to work together on implementation.
- After seeing hundreds of residents developing a consensus around key issues for the first time in years, and working hand in hand with city staff and local partners, Mayor Greg Ballard reversed his earlier reluctance to support major city investment tools and announced plans for two Tax-Increment Financing (TIF) districts to contribute major public funds to revitalization work in the area.
- During the October event, **EPA Asst. Administrator Mathy Stanislaus attended the opening public workshop** and pledged the federal government’s support for collaborative community initiatives like the design assistance process. In February, 2010, the EPA announced that the Smart Growth Redevelopment District was one of 6 national pilot communities that will receive tens of millions of dollars over a two year period to help address brownfield redevelopment, housing, and transportation.
- Community development organizations have already begun follow up master planning work with local design firms, and site selection for the city’s first light rail line is in its final stages.

The AIA’s organizational culture has changed in profound ways as a result of incorporating public participation as an organizational value. In 2006, the AIA’s strategic plan was updated to include a goal to “Strengthen Communities through Architect
Involvement,” and “Serve as a catalyst, purveyor, and source of information to enable members, components, and citizens to create healthy, sustainable, safe, and livable communities.” In 2008, the AIA’s Strategic Plan was updated to include 4 key strategic components – members, organization, profession, and society. Within this key strategic component, the organization has defined a set of goals and metrics to expand its success and impact. In addition, the AIA Leadership mandated a ‘Legacy policy’ to contribute public work regularly when the organization is holding a meeting. Most recently, the AIA organized a Legacy charrette project in conjunction with its annual convention in Miami, Florida. From June 5-9, 2010, a design team worked with local partners and hundreds of citizens on plans for the Miami River Corridor, delivering a 45-page final report with recommendations. At the conclusion of the process, the chair of the city council delivered a formal proclamation of gratitude to the AIA during the AIA Convention.

Evaluation against Core Values
From the inception of the design assistance programs, the AIA has embraced the value of public participation, affirming that citizens and other stakeholders have a right to be involved in the decision-making process about their community future. Its programs have held as a core principle the commitment to partnering with the public on visions for the future, holding that citizens represent the best “local experts” who have the most experience in their own neighborhoods, towns, and cities. The charrette process has promoted collaboration among diverse interests and parties, identifying points of consensus that meet the needs of a variety of participants, including local decision makers. The organizational approach to community involvement has built the capacity for local community engagement which has resulted in robust participation that often goes beyond what a community has experienced previously. The AIA’s method of assessment and its initial visits to communities have directly involved stakeholders in designing the scope of the projects, identifying key issues and professional expertise required, and designing schedules, venues, and formats for public participation that fit within local traditions and culture. Throughout the process, participants are given information about the process and program, their role and contribution to it, and the necessity of building the collective civic capacity of a community to achieve success. Finally, the charrette presentations and final reports have communicated explicitly how community involvement and input has influenced the final product, resulting in shared ownership of the implementation process and significant results over the long-term.

Conclusion
The last 40 years have witnessed nothing short of the birth of a collaborative design movement. The architectural profession now engages in community design as collaborative public work on a regular basis. The charrette process has become synonymous with visioning and planning, and both public and private sector organizations utilize its format to engage in participatory, community-driven processes in thousands of jurisdictions every year. The AIA design assistance model has been exported abroad, most notably in Britain, where it has been applied to engage dozens of communities in long-term planning. The designer democracy movement represents the result a 43-year tradition of public participation and public service in the pursuit of livable and sustainable communities. In the process, it has transformed an organization and the profession it represents. The profession has moved ever closer to the mantra expressed by Jane Jacobs 40 years ago, that “cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>“IT’S YOUR MOVE” – TRANSLINK’S 10-YEAR PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZING GROUP:</td>
<td>TransLink (South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>CANADA, METRO VANCOUVER, population 2.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY QUESTION/PROBLEM:</td>
<td>TransLink in developing its 2010 10-Year Plan needed to understand the public’s vision for how public transportation should be provided and paid for over the next ten years. The type of vision would determine the financial impact e.g. “moving forward” equaled an additional $450 million per year. The challenge was to bring together complicated issues, distilling them down to digestible chunks without losing important content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SAMPLE METHODS: | Interactive exercise: “It’s Your Move”
Offline board ‘game’ exercise: “It’s Your Move”
Background documentation provided along with real time comparison with input from other citizens |
| RESULTS: | TransLink in developing its 10-Year Plan carried out a broad-based |
public consultation which included both offline and online. This blended public consultation featured the tool “It’s Your Move.”

Of the 3000 that played the game online, its simplicity of design served to make it accessible and its consistency with the offline version which involved 700 participants enable results to be compared and tabulated.

“It’s Your Move” engaged citizens in a three-step process:

- Step 1: Identifying priorities – their transportation vision
- Step 2: Funding Priorities: How can we fund priorities given current revenue streams?
- Step 3: Future Funding: What additional funding methods should be used?

Online and offline findings were consistent. Citizens selected rapid transit as a priority, identified transit fares and fuel taxes as key funding mechanisms and carbon pricing and road user fees as future funding options.

“It’s Your Move” successfully engaged participants in a complex transportation and funding discussion that will impact over 2 million people in the region.

**IMPACT LEVEL:**

Over 3000 citizens engaged with the tool online and many of these participants would not have participated in the offline events. Those affected by the transit plan felt they had a better understanding of the issues after participating in the “It’s Your Move” Exercise. Market research indicates that 70% of those that played “It’s Your Move” increased their knowledge of the issues and 67% viewed the exercise as a positive. While in the end, findings were largely consistent from both offline and online versions.

Thousands of residents were engaged in the development of the 2010 10-Year Plan both online and offline. The inclusion of the “It’s Your Move” consultation exercise allowed the consultation process to engage and hear from a broader audience. The development of “It’s Your Move” and subsequent communication materials allowed the public to focus on potential investment scenarios and revenue options and provide specific feedback to the decisions that TransLink and others had to make. This input was included in the final report to the transportation authority’s Board of Directors and the Mayor’s Council was instrumental in informing executive and political decision-makers about public financial and service investment priorities.

**TIME FRAME:**

May – June 2009

**PEOPLE ENGAGED**

Over 4500+ citizens offline and online completed a range of consultation activities

Online: 40,000 citizens visited the online consultation space

**WEB LINK:**


This website now serves as a reporting out mechanism the consultation activities are no longer available online.
THE PROBLEM AND CHALLENGE
TransLink in developing its 2010 10-Year Plan carried out a broad-based public consultation which included both offline and online. The challenge was to bring together complicated issues, distilling them down to digestible chunks without losing important content. Another challenge was creating a consultation initiative that would engage citizens in a dialogue about transportation investments during an economic recession, following a provincial election and in the midst of an exploding 2010 Olympic price tag for taxpayers.

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
The broad public consultation process featured offline and online initiatives all designed to increase the level of engagement, reach new audiences in the process and provide multiple opportunities for residents to have input. Public Consultation constantly looks for new ways to engage people in the process of discussion, dialogue and ultimately decision-making.

TransLink for the first time in its organizational history designed and implemented a blended (offline and online) public consultation featuring the tool “It’s Your Move.” This consultation tool was developed by TransLink for the purpose of engaging citizens in a complicated discussion to inform transportation planning recommendations to be implemented in the next decade. Objectives of “It’s Your Move” were:
1. To raise awareness about the transit and transportation challenges facing the region and increase understanding about these challenges and possible solutions
2. Engage stakeholders in the discussion in such a way that we can see that this is our collective future we are creating together.
3. Increase engagement and provide an opportunity for everyone who wishes to participate in the consultation process.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS
This blended consultation while it featured the design and development of the customized consultation experience “It’s Your Move” also included:
- Key stakeholder engagement through round tables and one on one meetings
- Presentations and question and answer periods throughout the regions
- Be Part of the Plan website
- Social media tools
- Front Room Forums
- A Livability Forum
- Local Government Forums
- Community Consultation Workshops
- Employee Consultations

Three things needed to be accomplished during the consultation process TransLink had to:

i. determine the general appetite for programs and investment in roads, goods movement, and transit, cycling and pedestrian improvements in relation to how much people are willing to pay for it.

ii. inform the discussion with an exhaustive list of available and "new" funding sources to provide a broad based spectrum of sustainable revenue to enable TransLink to meet the region's needs for the next seven to 10 years. Specify the programs and projects that would be undertaken at various levels of investment and provide a summary of the pros and cons of these with nominal dollar amounts.

iii. facilitate an inclusive dialogue to review the plan and the funding sources with the public and stakeholders.

UNIQUENESS OF THE PROJECT
Of the 3000 that played the game online, its simplicity of design served to make it accessible and its consistency with the offline version which involved 700 participants enabled results to be compared and tabulated. “It’s Your Move” engaged citizens in a three-step process:

- Step 1: Identifying priorities
- Step 2: Funding Priorities: How can we fund priorities given current revenue streams?
- Step 3: Future Funding: What additional funding methods should be used?

Online and offline findings were consistent. Citizens selected rapid transit as a priority, identified transit fares and fuel taxes as key funding mechanisms and carbon pricing and road user fees as future funding options. “It’s Your Move” successfully engaged participants in a complex transportation and funding discussion that would impact over 2 million people in the region.

**PROJECT RESULTS**

Online and offline findings were consistent. Citizens selected rapid transit as a priority, identified transit fares and fuel taxes as key funding mechanisms and carbon pricing and road user fees as future funding options. “It’s Your Move” successfully engaged participants in a complex transportation and funding discussion that would impact over 2 million people in the region.

It aimed to clarify issues, present challenges and provide a series of options for participants to work through in order to inform the 10-Year Plan. “It’s Your Move” sought to engage participants by making key issues in the Plan a collective challenge not just a TransLink problem. Many noted that the game also served to increase their understanding of the mandate of TransLink. Offline the game served to create a frame for deliberative dialogue and worked to garner substantive and thoughtful input from participants.

Input gathered from “It’s Your Move” was integrated into the final report presented to the TransLink’s Board of Directors and Mayor’s Council for review. This input was instrumental in informing officials where the public stood on financial investments and transportation service priorities for the next ten years in the region. Awareness of TransLink and the public consultation process grew with specific data available to indicate:

- Awareness of “bepartoftheplan.ca” increased over time.
- Awareness of TransLink in context of Roads and Bridges/Bike Paths and Walking Routes also increased over time.
- Perceptions of TransLink on attributes related to proactivity, public involvement in planning and responsibility for more than transit improved over time.

Market research determined that understanding of the issues and challenges facing TransLink was increased and slightly more than six-in-ten say they have a favourable impression of TransLink following the presentation of funding options. Media relations coverage was impressive with 125 published print articles and hundreds of radio and television air-times minutes in coverage.

**ALIGNMENT WITH CORE VALUES**

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. From the beginning this particular exercise was developed to support a consultation that called upon citizens to “collaborate” in the decision-making process. Developing a blended consultation featuring the “It’s Your Move” participatory tool increased the reach and broadened the engagement of people in a decision-making process. Over 3000 citizens engaged with the tool online and many of these participants would not have participated in
the offline events. Those affected by the transit plan felt they had a better understanding of the issues after participating in the “It’s Your Move” exercise.

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

“It’s Your Move” served to increase the transparency of the consultation. Each participant online could see how their feedback compared with thousands of their fellow residents from all over the region. The offline version provided a unique opportunity for all participants to experience meaningful dialogue, to increase their understanding of the issues and to provide informed input as a result of the exercise.

The consultation process was designed to allow TransLink, the Board, the Commissioner, the Mayors’ Council and the public to hear from a variety of different sources. To that end, TransLink implemented activities that would provide feedback from three separate but important groups: key stakeholders, an active public (participation in online and offline events) and non-participants (market-research surveys). Thousands of residents were engaged in the development of the 2010 10-Year Plan both online and offline. The development of “It’s Your Move” and subsequent communication materials allowed the public to focus on potential investment scenarios and revenue options and provide specific feedback to the decisions that TransLink and others have to make.

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

Sustainability was at the forefront of TransLink’s 10-Year Plan public consultation. Citizens selected rapid transit as a priority, identified transit fares and fuel taxes as key funding mechanisms and carbon pricing and broad user fees as future funding options. There was strong support for funding sources that influence behavioural change for example, kms travelled, fuel tax, tolls, efficiency of vehicles, etc. This was identified as an important economic, social and environmental aspect of options moving forward. Participants consistently indicated that carbon pricing and road user fees should be considered as the top two options. These were preferred because people understood the relationship between the impact on the environment and the transportation network and the need to pay for sustainable alternatives. This will have an important impact on financial planning for future expansion of the regional public transportation system.
The above graph is a sample of one of three graphs (e.g. online, offline and market research) of data available for each key question. The design of “It’s Your Move” proved to be quite remarkable in gathering data which was consistent from both offline and online versions. It was truly innovative that TransLink could design this tool resulting in consistent data findings which allowed for a broad measurement of public input on the three key questions of funding priorities, investment levels and current and future funding mechanisms.

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

“It’s Your Move” online allowed TransLink to:

- Quickly reach a wide and diverse audience;
- Provide another avenue for access: an opportunity for feedback that is convenient and accessible to those who cannot participate in a face-to-face forums;
- Gather information more quickly;
- Generate feedback to respondents automatically and to provide email alerts about future consultations;
- Decrease cost per participant;
- Communicate to multiple stakeholders internally and externally;
- Engage in a discussion that could stimulate new ideas; and
- Data can be gathered, compiled and organized more readily.

One participant commented: “Thank you for doing this public consultation, I think it’s incredibly important to talk to the public and gauge their needs.”

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

“It’s Your Move” was developed initially as a prototype in response to a demand for broader engagement in the consultation process and to providing citizens with an entry point that was more flexible and conducive to their own schedules. The exercise was tested with key internal and external stakeholders as part of its development process. This input was then incorporated into the final design of this consultation exercise.

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

“It’s Your Move” included opportunities for participants to review key background documents, participate in dialogue with fellow citizens and to compare input both offline and online.

Market research indicates that 70% of those that played “It’s Your Move” increased their knowledge of the issues and 67% viewed the exercise as a positive. While In the end, findings were largely consistent from both offline and online versions.

Here is what participants in the “It’s Your Move” interactive consultation exercise viewed their experience:

“Informing us before asking our opinion was helpful; our answers were based on information rather than how we feel.”

“It is a great exercise because we can see what did and seeing how others vote after we submitted our choice.”

“I thought it was very good, it gave me more information about what the issues are. Also made me feel I might have some contribution.”

“it was very elegant, yet extremely informative tool. Any user should be able to use and understand it.”
Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

All of the information received from governments, stakeholders and the public was provided to TransLink's Planning and Finance Divisions as advice as they completed the draft Plan. A summary of everything heard was presented to the TransLink Board, Commissioner and the Mayors' Council as well as being made available on TransLink's Be Part of the Plan website.

PHOTOS

Below please find examples of participants in the Be Part of the Plan 2010 10-Year Plan consultation using the "It's Your Move" TransLink consultation tool both online and offline. As well, there are sample invitations to join the discussions through TransLink Listens and our Buzzer Blog. This tool helped set the context for deliberative dialogue and provide a meaningful entry point for citizens to discuss key challenging issues and provide key feedback into the 10-Year Plan.
Title: Project ADD (Acquire, Develop, and Deliver) Water

Award Category: Project of the Year

Organization Name: Central Arizona Project
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"It's only been two years and we've reached all these agreements. In water years, that's a very short time. I am very impressed with staff and the stakeholders and all the work that went into this. The process has produced something that is worthwhile and a good start."

- ADD Water Stakeholder and CAP Board member -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Project ADD Water-Acquire, Develop, Deliver Water to Central Arizona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>CAP’s service area totals around 24,000 square miles. Centrally located, CAP’s service area includes Arizona’s largest cities: Phoenix, Mesa, Tucson and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Long-term water demands in CAP’s service area are projected to exceed currently available supplies. Assuming CAP is to be the primary entity that acquires, develops and delivers new water supplies for its service area, how should the water be shared and paid for?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sample Methods | At the core of Project ADD Water was the IAP2 six-step decision making model which was followed throughout. A wide variety of hands-on, interactive techniques were creatively used:  
- Technology of Participation or ToP® methods  
- Creative Strategic Thinking® coaching sessions  
- Electronic decision-making tools  
- Appreciative inquiry  
- Using analogies, metaphors and imagery  
Groups of 80 to 100 people typically generated work products in smaller groups, then reviewed and combined them at larger group levels. The process also incorporated case study research for like organizations and problems. |
| Results | 100 diverse stakeholders agreed to over 85 points regarding how specifically to share and pay for a new water supply for existing and future residents and businesses in central Arizona. Based on this consensus, the CAP Board unanimously agreed to implement the ADD Water Program. The Board did not modify the consensus at all. |
| Impact Level | Over five million people or 80% of state’s population including over 100 cities, towns, communities, and Native American Tribal nations. |
| Time Frame | Approximately 2 ½ years. |
| People Engaged | ADD Water accumulated a list of nearly 500 stakeholders. Approximately 100 of those people actively participated in more than 50 public meetings totaling 250 hours of actual meeting time and 15,000 hours of cumulative individual time. |
| Web Link | [www.projectADDwater.com](http://www.projectADDwater.com) |
The Problem and Challenge

Central Arizona Project (CAP), a multi-county water conservation district, with an elected Board, manages and provides water to 24,000 square miles in central and southern Arizona. The largest supplier of renewable water in Arizona, CAP annually delivers an average of 1.5 million acre-feet of Colorado River water to more than 50 municipal and industrial customers, nine tribes and a dozen irrigation districts. The canal system stretches 336 miles across the state.

Long-term water demands in CAP's service area will eventually exceed available water supplies. Whether current supplies will last 20 years or 50 is a matter of debate, but it makes sense to develop a comprehensive strategy for the acquisition and delivery of water to meet future demands. “Project ADD Water” is the Acquisition, Development and Delivery of Water.

Project ADD Water is a public participation process, created in response to CAP's 2006 Strategic Plan. This Plan called to establish “a collaborative process addressing the issue of developing new water supplies for CAP's service area—one that encourages fair competition and eliminates unfair advantage”. The Plan presumed the most efficient and cost-effective way to develop new water supplies would be for CAP to be the single point of acquisition.

Population is projected to grow in communities that are "water poor" and are less experienced in competing for water supplies. To meet the needs of all stakeholders, a transparent, open public process was demanded. To meet this mandate, CAP chose to use IAP2's five-steps for public participation planning as well as IAP2's six-step decision-making model. Consistent with Step 1 for public participation planning, Gain Internal Commitment, CAP clarified the problem. This problem was fully vetted by stakeholders in the first step of the IAP2 decision-making model.

**Problem statement:** Long-term water demands in CAP's three-county service area are projected to exceed currently available supplies. A comprehensive strategy may be desirable for the acquisition and delivery of water to meet these future demands.

**Focus Question:** Assuming CAP is to be the primary entity that acquires, develops and delivers new water supplies for its three-county service area, how should the water be shared and paid for?

While simple on the surface, agreement about the problem statement and focus question took several internal and external meetings. The well-conceived, fully vetted problem statement kept the process on track and the participants focused. Both the problem statement and focus question were posted at all stakeholder meetings.

The Role of Public Participation

Public participation created an emotionally safe environment for stakeholders to collectively answer the focus question. While CAP was tasked with developing an equitable solution for its customers, CAP could not define “equity or fairness” for them. If the stakeholders could agree on an answer to the focus question, then CAP could decide if it was willing to do what stakeholders were asking. If stakeholders could not agree, then CAP would decide independently and run the risk of being sued.

In addition to gaining internal commitment, CAP also identified the decision maker as CAP's Board, determined the organization’s tolerance for involving its public meaningfully, and identified a list of potential stakeholders. Consistent with Step 2, Learn from the Public, CAP
interviewed stakeholders about the decisions CAP had made internally in the first step. Next (Step 3), CAP agreed that the Spectrum of Participation™ level would be collaborate, detailed the decision process (Step 4) and wrote the Public Participation Plan (Step 5). This took about four months of weekly meetings. In a special session of the CAP Board in January of 2008, several CAP customers demanded a more prominent role in the public participation process. As a result of this request, the CAP Board created a Project Team that included internal CAP employees, three Board members and nine outside stakeholders.

Not surprisingly, each stakeholder group had a "correct" answer to the focus question, and each stakeholder was certain its correct answer was the "real" correct answer. So, the first obstacle in solving the overall problem was, in fact, to unwind the idea of a single correct answer.

Public Participation Methods

To shift stakeholders and CAP away from positions (the "correct" answer) and toward common interests, public participation needed to have a structural role in the process. To do this, CAP selected IAP2’s six-step decision-making model: 1) identify problem, 2) gather information, 3) establish criteria, 4) develop alternatives, 5) evaluate alternatives and 6) make decision.

CAP also hired experts in the IAP2 process to design and implement the Public Participation Plan. A deliberate decision on its part, CAP knew it could not be both stakeholder and process caretaker concurrently and serve either role well. CAP also wanted the IAP2 caché to provide credibility to this approach. From the onset, each IAP2 step was intentionally followed. Stakeholders, who perceived the process as a threat, attempted to divert the process from this core decision-making model, but CAP resisted these attempts and did not abandon the model.

Uniqueness of Project

In what way(s) did public participation improve the decision? The IAP2 model was a pivotal tool used to shift stakeholders from positions to interests. Without this shift, no solution would have been possible. Before ADD Water began, one core stakeholder group (the three largest cities in the service area) had agreed upon how to share and pay for a new water supply. This group began advocating its position using isolation techniques to gain two strategic outcomes: 1) to minimize, as much as possible, any “gives” to another stakeholder and, 2) to ostracize stakeholders who did not agree by creating a fear that only through cooperation with them could a stakeholder hope to gain anything. This group eventually met with CAP. CAP was uncomfortable with a closed process and publicly stated its intent to conduct an open and transparent public participation process. This was both a departure from past practices and a turning point for the project. Statements made by participants at the final Board meeting clearly demonstrated support for an open public participation process over back room politics.

While the focus question sounds simple, the ultimate solution will be quite complex. Another unique aspect of the project was the creation, by stakeholders, of a complex framework for developing and communicating potential solutions. The framework included 28 clarifying questions to be answered for each potential solution. These questions were organized into nine components ranging from participation eligibility, capital and operational costs, need determination to governance. Because it was so well thought out, the framework helped yield over 85 points of consensus.

Describe the innovative participation techniques used. CAP decided all decisions or recommendations would be made in the large stakeholder group, a significant departure from
how CAP and the water industry made decisions in the past. This change was challenged frequently. If possible, CAP also wanted all work products to be prepared by stakeholders too. To be effective, this meant that the broad stakeholder group (around 100 people) would have to move in an accordion-like fashion, back and forth between small and large group work.

To accomplish this goal, the facilitation team used a variety of techniques to achieve results at each step. Specifically, facilitators relied primarily on ToP® methods and electronic decision-making tools. ToP® methods included the root group facilitation methods (i.e. consensus workshop and focused conversation methods) organized in constantly changing ways. In all cases, facilitators followed the ToP® four stage thinking process: objective, reflective, interpretive and decisional. Also called ORID, this four-stage process allows facilitators to take groups through these important phases of thinking, thus enabling groups to process their experience as a whole and make decisions together instead of independently. Using facilitative methods was a huge shift for participants who typically accomplished goals through adversarial approaches like negotiations, lawsuits and legislative changes. Specific techniques included:

- Cooperative study for gathering research on relevant case studies
- Consensus workshop to create arenas of criteria evaluation spectra for paying and sharing
- Focused conversation for all review and work activities
- Appreciative Inquiry
- Electronic polling to understand outcomes and prioritize criteria
- Motivational speaker to inspire creativity in creating alternatives
- Multiple teams tackling same problem simultaneously, each coming up with their best solution
- Survey all stakeholders online through Survey Monkey
- Using analogies, metaphors and imagery to describe complex decision processes and continuous use of graphic facilitation in small and large groups

Another challenge was to help stakeholders suspend their biases and think creatively about how to solve this problem. Decision step 3 began with a workshop led by a renowned organizational change expert, Dr. George Land. He explained how neuroscience research provides insight into adult creativity. His Creative Thinking Strategy™ workshop was fun and trained participants how to change their patterns of thinking and become more creative. Ten stakeholder teams took this coaching to heart and formed ten alternatives. Similarities and differences were identified by the full stakeholder group. Areas of disagreement were dealt with in a smaller group which met weekly for eight weeks and reported back to the full group.

Was the project able to solve a problem that faces the field of public participation? A challenge faced by public participation practitioners and facilitators in the water industry is the belief that only water managers and engineers understand water issues, so water issues cannot be facilitated by a neutral third party. While there are probably some hard-core "water buffalos" who might still say that, no one can say this effort failed to accomplish its goal. As one seasoned irrigation district manager put it to the CAP Board:

"Every one of us has been asked to work together, and we've done so admirably. You can't just walk away and say we didn't accomplish anything. I was very leery about being able to come together...I think we're there. We've finally figured out how to work together."

How did the project spread the practice of public participation into a new area? CAP is maintaining its commitment to use public participation for the implementation phase of ADD
Water which began in June of 2010. CAP appreciates the importance of nurturing the work already done. CAP is also using public participation methods in developing its Integrated Resource Plan. But perhaps more importantly, through ADD Water as an example, CAP has set the gold standard for how stakeholders want to and will expect to influence decisions in the water industry irrespective of the sponsoring agency. The days of smoke-filled back room politics are gone…smoke and all.

Project Results

Countless work products were produced by stakeholders, including a problem statement and focus question, 90 data requests and responses, an exhaustive list of interests, concerns and expectations, two sets of evaluation criteria, ten potential alternatives to evaluate and two 30-page reports. These intermediate products ultimately culminated into a Summary of Emerging Consensus documenting 85 points of agreement.

The most important result was the Board’s decision to implement ADD Water. And in fact, this decision was a huge shift for CAP representing a completely new function—not one contemplated by the visionaries who forged the CAP. Such a decision could bring anywhere from 300,000 to 700,000 additional acre-feet of water into CAP’s service area—enough water to serve two cities the size of Phoenix. CAP likens this decision to a fork in the road…a place we would and could not come back to again. Either CAP would develop a new water supply, move forward, and never look back, or CAP would let others assume that role.

In March of 2010, based on the Summary of Emerging Consensus, CAP decided to assume that role. Going forward, the question is no longer will CAP assume this role, but how. This was a very important distinction for CAP and its customers. There will be no turning back. As CAP enters implementation, the Summary of Emerging Consensus has become the foundation for the current phase of the ADD Water Program.

Alignment with Core Values

How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved? The issue is so important to the future of Arizona that most stakeholders knew about the project long before the first meeting. However, CAP made an exhaustive invitation list for the kick-off meeting. Stakeholders soon realized CAP was serious about an open process…a true paradigm shift was occurring in how these decisions would be made. Stakeholders rarely missed a meeting – they knew the importance of having their voice included.

How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions? Completely! The CAP Board unanimously accepted the final product and agreed to begin implementation. Internal and external stakeholders were involved throughout.

How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated? Providing a reliable water supply is a basic underpinning of a stable society. Decades can pass between when you decide to acquire a supply and when you actually deliver it. A decision that fails to "stick" is not acceptable. CAP’s decision to use the IAP2 models was foundational to CAP’s theory about making the decision "stick". CAP’s decision to have stakeholders make all decisions and recommendations and prepare all work products was also foundational to that theory.

Since stakeholders prepared all their work products and because everything was documented
using video and still pictures, stakeholders had a strong sense that their interests and needs were being communicated to the Board. In addition, we had three Board champions who attended meetings with almost perfect attendance. One Board member summed it up for the Board as decision day approached in response to another Board member suggesting the stakeholder process should come to an end.

"If you haven't been there, you can't understand all the expertise and hard work that went into this product. You have to understand how important it is to the State and all of us to try to work together because water is a scarce resource. I've learned so much from all of these people and I respect them so much. For us stop at this point would be a real disservice to everyone who has put in all this hard work. I just can't accept that."

How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?
CAP developed a stakeholder list while preparing the initial Public Participation Plan. This list was later vetted with the Project Team. E-mail lists were compiled from multiple sources and used to notice the first stakeholder meeting. From there, interest has been by word of mouth. Many new stakeholders came to the table throughout the process. Even as we've entered implementation, new stakeholders call us regularly.

How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?
During the early planning, approximately 20 stakeholders were interviewed by the CAP Planning Team. Specifically, they were asked how they wanted to participate and this helped form the initial Public Participation Plan. The Board then created a Project Team who was solely focused on providing input for how to facilitate broad stakeholder meeting. At the one-year mark, facilitators spoke with every member of the Project Team to assess how the process was going for them. Several mid-point corrections were made to accommodate concerns. At the end of the second year, stakeholders completed an online evaluation survey and these results were used to design the implementation phase.

How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?
Because stakeholders prepared the information needed to answer the focus question, such information contributed strongly to meaningful participation. Facilitators did an excellent job making sure all work and decisions were made by stakeholders. CAP even allowed stakeholders to manage a contract to develop 13 case studies for organizations from around the world that had struggled with the same problem.

How did the communication of the project results ensure the participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?
CAP made a decision early on to document the ADD Water process through audio, video and still pictures. This turned out to be on the best decisions made. Not only was this information available on line for stakeholders to watch meetings they did not attend, it also served other purposes as well. For example, at CAP Board meetings and large stakeholder gatherings, photos and videos were interwoven into presentations, amplifying that this was really a human decision and not a technical one. Decision-makers could literally see how much time and care stakeholders were giving to this process. Because meetings occurred so frequently, the web site was the most efficient way to ensure communication and feedback. The website was very well received by participants.
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Case Study Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>ESTABLISHING A CULTURE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WITHIN A LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Logan City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Australia, south of Brisbane, population 270,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Local government amalgamations throughout the Australian state of Queensland saw, in one case, parts of three Councils merged to form the sixth biggest local government area in Australia. The challenge -- how to stay in touch post-amalgamation with an expanded population of 270,000 residents and 1,500 staff by building a culture of community engagement within the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Introducing an advisory service across Council's 25 branches, writing and adopting a community engagement policy, strategy, training of 72 staff and 25 Managers, surveys, tools, resources, open houses, projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A culture of community engagement has been fostered within Council from elected representatives to managers to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Local government area with 63 suburbs in 957 sq km, with a local economy worth $19.2 billion and 185 ethnicities represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>About 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>A proportion of 1,500 staff and 270,000 residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESTABLISHING A CULTURE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WITHIN A LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities

The key challenge for Logan City Council is the sheer size of its expanded workforce and the community it is seeking to engage with.

In March 2008, local government amalgamations saw Logan City Council in Queensland's South East grow four-fold to become Australia's sixth biggest local government. Logan City now covers 63 suburbs in 957 sq km, with a local economy worth $19.2 billion and 185 ethnicities represented, making it one of the most multicultural districts in Australia. It is also a young city with a median age of 33 years.

Council's CEO Chris Rose saw a need to establish a dedicated community engagement program to provide avenues for Council to stay in touch with the new city's 270,000 residents and the Council's 1500 plus staff.

At the same time, Council entrenched its commitment to community engagement by overhauling its Corporate Plan and adopting the goal of building "strong and cohesive communities by developing better ways to engage our communities in those issues that affect them".

A dedicated Community Engagement Program Leader was appointed. This officer established the community engagement program and recruited two more staff to run the advisory service to help Council's 25 branches run successful engagements. A 12-month action plan was adopted to start achieving these goals, including the establishment of Have Your Say mechanisms for the community. To spread a culture of community engagement throughout Council, 72 staff from across the Council branches were trained in IAP2, receiving the full accreditation and certificate. Separate training was offered to Managers.

The challenges have been many:

a) Community engagement was a new concept for Council

b) The amalgamation of staff, management and Councillors from three Councils into one saw many competing priorities for their time and workload and funds.

c) Traditional thoughts that community engagement cost time, money and only attract whinges, and lack of awareness and expertise in how to do it successfully.

d) Providing tools, resources, knowledge and an advisory service to overcome these challenges.
However the opportunities have been tremendous:

a) Established advisory role for CE team, offering services in training, support, monitoring, resources, survey drafting, facilitating group discussions and CE needs analysis and assessment.

b) The amalgamation of planning policies and local laws for three Councils provided the opportunity to consult the public on these tangible projects to find a way forward.

c) Managers embraced the community engagement advisory service and within 12 months had placed community engagement within their top 10 priorities for the coming four years.

d) The number of community engagement projects within Council grew from about three to 60 within six months.

e) About 72 staff were trained in IAP2 in eight months to increase awareness about public participation, overcome the challenges and provide them with skills and confidence.

f) A monthly Community Chat was introduced, taking the Mayor and a different Councillor each month out into the community to meet informally with residents at different local coffee shops.

g) A series of Open Houses were conducted for Council’s new local town plans so residents could talk one-on-one with a planner in their community hall to provide feedback on preferred planning options and ask questions.

h) Young school leaders, working with Council's youth officers, chose a topic that was important to them and a strategy to address it, resulting in a sticker campaign to counter binge drinking.

i) Truck drivers, residents and Council formed an advisory group to address issues of neighbourhood noise, resulting in an overhaul of Council bylaws for parking of heavy vehicles.

j) “Survey adventure” held where 30 staff from across the organisation took paper surveys to shopping centres to get feedback from a cross-section of residents to supplement on-line surveys.

k) Established community engagement procedures and templates – development phase and communication worksheet, community engagement consultation report, CE venue schedule, CE outcomes and actions worksheet and evaluation form.

l) Developed a new intranet site offering information on resources, tools, project register, CE planner and helpful links.

m) Website developed at www.logan.qld.gov.au/LCC/council/haveyoursay

n) Developed community engagement tools – A-frames, tear-drop banners, workshop aids (sticky wall, travelling kit).

o) Provide professional in-house staff as facilitators for internal and external forums to harness ideas from staff across branches and from external attendees.

p) Collaboration with other Queensland Councils to establish a community engagement network that embraces best practice, professional development and maximises resources.

q) Program Leader appointed to Local Government Association of Queensland steering committee on community engagement, working to develop a policy guide for Councils throughout Queensland.

r) On-line public forum “Bang the Table” trialled and adopted.

s) Annual awards established to recognise great community engagement projects within Council, with the first "Human Factor Innovation Award" winners announced in March 2010 in line with IAP2 Australia award criteria.
Rationale for Public Participation

In March 2008, local government amalgamations saw Logan City Council in Queensland’s South East grow four-fold to become Australia's sixth biggest local government. The CEO Chris Rose saw a need to establish a dedicated community engagement program to stay in touch with the new city's 270,000 residents and the Council's 1500 plus staff.

Changes to Queensland's Local Government Act which take effect from July 1, 2010, make it a requirement for local Councils to have a community engagement policy in place and for Councils to conduct "meaningful engagement". This is a forward-thinking move, as staff working in Councils in some other Australian States do not have this legislative backing and impetus for their work.

Logan City Council adopted the IAP2 framework for its community engagement program. This allows staff within Council to all "speak the same language" in terms of community engagement and to work within a coordinated framework.
Impact of Core Values on the Organization

Corporate Plan
Council entrenched its commitment to community engagement by overhauling its Corporate Plan and adopting the goal of building "strong and cohesive communities by developing better ways to engage our communities in those issues that affect them".

The new 2009-2013 Corporate Plan pledges: "We encourage greater participation from our communities in understanding issues affecting them via community engagement and research activities. Through continuous engagement, feedback and advice we can better deliver and plan for the future needs of our communities and become a city reflective of our people. We will develop and implement initiatives that will encourage the community to become more actively involved in issues that may affect them. We will manage and govern our city to ensure transparency and responsiveness to the needs and views of our communities in decision making practices."

Policy and Strategy
Council adopted a Community Engagement Policy and a Community Engagement Strategy in June 2009, which "provides a set of guidelines for the conduct of community engagement activities to align with Council's required standards and the expectations of the community."

Council adopted the IAP2 principles of integrity, inclusion, deliberation, and influence as part of its own policy.

1. The policy is designed to encourage practices within Council that can result in:
   (a) Residents in Logan City knowing when and how Council will consult them and when Council needs to make decisions on their behalf.
   (b) The Logan community being well-informed about issues, strategies or plans that may directly or indirectly affect them.
   (c) Councillors, Council staff and consultants engaged by Council consulting effectively and appropriately within the community when making decisions or forming policies and plans.
   (d) Community engagement being coordinated and integrated in a consistent manner across all areas of Council.
2. Community engagement does not replace the decision-making functions of Council.
3. Community engagement is defined as "a way to improve communities by identifying and addressing local ideas, concerns and opportunities by involving the public in certain processes that affect them and their community".

4. Logan City Council aims to be recognised as a Council which is open and honest with the community it represents and has a willingness to listen to and value what residents have to say about an issue. On a daily basis, Council makes decisions which affect the lives of its residents. One of the mechanisms Council uses from time to time to interact with its community is community consultation.
   5. While it is not possible to consult with the community on every issue, Council would like to ensure that the community is as well informed as it can be on major issues, plans and projects, and has opportunities through community consultation to enhance Council's decision-making.

From an administrative point of view, the planning, implementation and reporting of community engagement activities must be conducted by staff in accordance with Council's community engagement policy and procedures. The principles and values outlined in the policy and strategy should be diligently applied to community engagement processes. All Council community engagement activities, including all internal and external surveys plus activities conducted by external consultants on Council's behalf, must be coordinated through Council's Community Engagement and Marketing Branch.
Training
Council trained 72 staff in the IAP2 Certificate of Public Participation and 25 Managers. They range from HR staff who use their skills to engage with other staff, to parks, governance, planning, customer service, and community services staff who use their skills in the community. They have learned about best practice community engagement principles in an internationally-recognised framework.

Internal Frameworks
Council staff use templates based on the IAP2 Core Values to plan community engagements. These templates have been made into an electronic format and are also available in a paper format. Groups of four to five staff get together to brainstorm the planning of an engagement and complete the template, which is signed off by a Manager before the engagement begins. For large projects, Council endorsement is sought before the project starts, to get buy-in from the decision makers.

A management directive has been endorsed by Council's senior management team to reinforce the Community Engagement policy and the need for Managers/branches/staff/Councillors to consider the impact on residents when proposing changes to Council policies/laws or when planning activities and projects. The aim is to encourage staff to liaise with Community Engagement staff at the earliest stage in the project so that Council can create well-planned and executed consultations and get the best outcome for the community.

Managers are encouraged when writing reports to Council to report briefly on internal/external consultation conducted so far and any proposed internal/external engagement. This is intended to prompt staff to think about what needs to be done, before seeking Committee sign-off on any project.

Evaluation
Monthly reports on community engagement are forwarded to Council and community engagement is reported against in the annual operation plan and annual report. A report is also submitted to the State Government once a year. In the State Government's Annual Return of the Status of Community Engagement 2008/09, Logan City Council is one of nine councils in the category of 'very large councils' with a current community engagement policy and program in place. In reviewing the annual return in July 2009, Colin Jensen, Director-General of the Coordinator General, said it was "evident that a robust community engagement process was in place" at Logan City.

Conclusion
In November 2008, Council appointed its first dedicated community engagement officer to establish and set up the program. This submission outlines the extensive efforts made since then to nurture a culture of community engagement within Council and outlines how with management support and assistance, community engagement can be a successful tool for building better relationships with staff, residents and other stakeholders.
Share a cuppa with the Mayor and your local Councillor

Here today
10am to 12noon

Greater Springwood
LOCAL PLAN
June 2009

Have your say on these three options

It's time, with Logan City Council seeking your views so it can finalise the planning for Springwood this year.

We've asked many years to see the project come to fruition and now it's time to bring the project to a close.

Before we do, we'd like you once again for your valuable input. Council has released three draft development options for area town centre and planning models. I strongly encourage you to see your model by July 31. We need to gather your views and make a final decision this year on the Springwood model.

As a member of the community, your comments are sought on these draft options for the town centre. This is your chance to have your say on what Springwood looks like in the next ten years to become a viable and active centre, as described in the South East Queensland Regional Plan. Choose your preferred option or combination of various options that you would like to see:

All of the draft options seek to:
- retain the Springwood Central State School site long-term for educational purposes
- extend the Creeklea Drive and Rockwood Road, north of Fyshwick Avenue, to become four lanes
- extend Springwood Park by four blocks to the north westage along Creeklea Drive
- extend the western part of South Springwood from Centre south of Vineyard Boulevard by adding a future road and a pedestrian walkway
- extend site to the north of Creeklea Drive and by removing a small area southward to create Springwood Boulevard
- identify areas in and around the Greater Springwood Area for higher density residential areas
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## Title

Moving Transit Forward

### Organizing Group

Metro

### Location

St. Louis, Missouri, USA

### Key Question/Problem

In 2009, Metro, the St. Louis region’s public transit agency, reduced its services due to escalating budget constraints. Part of the problem was that non-riders did not link the importance of transit to the region’s quality of life and future overall growth. Furthermore, a light rail extension that was built a few years earlier had resulted in cost overruns. If the transit agency were to sustain and grow, it needed additional sustainable revenue. Otherwise, services would have to be cut by 50 percent. St. Louis County voters had twice rejected a half-cent sales tax referendum, most recently in 2008, resulting in service cuts. The problem the agency faced was how to get citizens to understand the importance of transit regardless of whether or not they used the system and to encourage them to participate in a long-range planning process. If the public’s sentiment for transit improved, St. Louis County officials would then consider putting the sales tax referendum to voters again for the third time. As a result, Metro launched a long-range planning process with extensive public participation that educated, involved and collaborated with citizens on the future of transit and eventually empowered them to decide whether they wanted to invest in its future.

### Sample Methods

Survey, focus groups, stakeholder advisory committee, presentations, community workshops, webinars, social media, interactive website and street teams.

### Results

In December 2008, 43.3% of media stories about Metro were negative but by May 2010, it dropped to 25%. Also, St. Louis County officials decided to put a ½ cent sales tax referendum on the April 2010 ballot and it passed with more than 62% of the vote.

### Area

St. Louis metropolitan region, including Missouri and Illinois.

### Time Frame

January 2009-March 2010

### People Engaged

5,000 plus citizens

### Web Link

www.movingtransitforward.org
The Problem and Challenge
In 2009 during its 60th anniversary year, Metro, the St. Louis metropolitan area’s (Missouri and Illinois) nationally-recognized, award-winning public transit agency, was at a crossroad. After carrying more than 53 million passengers the year before on its MetroLink light rail system, MetroBus and Metro Call-A-Ride paratransit van services, the agency faced increasing budget constraints. For fifteen years, there had been no new revenue source for the agency, and limited support from the State of Missouri. Often Missouri is viewed as a “road-first” state as evidenced in the large discrepancy between how much Missouri contributes to transit versus other states. For instance, Metro receives $1.4 million annually from Missouri compared to $20 million a year from neighboring Illinois. Furthermore, St. Louis County, Missouri voters had twice rejected a ballot referendum – most recently in 2008 – calling for a half percent sales tax increase for transit that would have generated $80 million a year. They cited that Metro could not be trusted with money given its past cost overruns in the building of a recent light rail extension and that transit in St. Louis was a poor use of taxpayer dollars. Because of the ballot defeat, Metro officials had to reduce services by 30 percent in March 2009. These reductions negatively impacted thousands of riders and the system’s overall geographic coverage. Even before these cuts, the system was unable to meet all of the region’s diverse and growing transportation needs. If Metro did not obtain sufficient additional sustainable funding in the future, it would be forced to cut its MetroBus and Call-A-Ride services by 50 percent and run its light rail trains less frequently.

To secure a more stable future for transit operations and expansion, Metro officials decided to undergo a long-term planning process with an extensive public participation component. This was the first time in the agency’s history that it would develop its own long-range plan. The goal was to educate and involve citizens in creating a comprehensive policy, financial, and operational plan that would: restore service; expand the system; grow the region’s economy; and garner long-term support for transit as a critical component to St. Louis’ quality of life. Thus in 2009, Metro began its long-range planning process that would create a 30-year vision for transit.

The Role of Public Participation
To generate understanding of the importance of transit and to garner future support for it, Metro realized that it could not conduct its long-range planning process in isolation. It was important not only to engage customers, but also non-customers. The latter especially needed to understand that even if they do not use transit, their lives were affected by it. For instance, thousands of area healthcare workers and service employees depend on transit to get to work. Other target audiences included civic, business and elected leaders and the elderly/disabled, young professionals, students and green advocates.

During its long-range planning, Metro guided citizens through the various steps of public engagement: inform; consult; involve; collaborate; and empower. One of the initial steps was conducting a random survey and four focus groups with riders and non-riders, which combined reached nearly 600 people. From this research, Metro developed a name for its long-range planning process, Moving Transit Forward. It indicated that despite its current budget constraints, Metro still needed to move ahead with providing a valuable community service and hopefully expanding it. Moving Transit Forward was built on a community vision for guiding the growth of the region’s transit system together with solid technical planning. It provided a set of options from which regional leaders, acting through the area’s metropolitan planning organization, could choose to build in phases.
when and/or if adequate financial resources became available.

Public Participation Methods
Metro’s public participation included both direct and indirect methods. The former involved face-to-face meetings with citizens to create meaningful and lasting relationships. The indirect methods involved communicating via a website and social media to achieve broad audience exposure and involvement. Both methods were necessary because information alone is seldom a compelling motivational force. However, when presented in the context of relationship building, information usually inspires and produces action.

The direct methods included: more than 150 business, civic and neighborhood presentations; four focus groups; 22 public meetings; a Moving Transit Forward Advisory Group; and an Executive Committee. The Advisory Group consisted of regional elected officials, business leaders, community organizations and representatives from other local and regional agencies who met three times during the planning process. The Executive Committee engaged regional leadership in the planning process. It consisted of various local elected officials and regional leaders from both Missouri and Illinois. Their role was to advise Metro on political considerations, communications and public engagement and to provide feedback on proposed projects for inclusion in the plan.

To generate more participation and to garner third-party endorsement for the agency’s planning process, Metro officials asked respected community groups to “host” their public meetings. Thus, such groups as the Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club, the St. Louis Urban League, Washington University, and advocacy organizations for the disabled, sponsored many of the community workshops.

“Street Teams” were also used to “hit the streets” to spread the word about the planning process and to encourage people to get involved. Before each round of public meetings, Street Team members wearing bright yellow t-shirts with the Metro logo and the question, “How did you get here today?” were deployed to various street festivals and public events to talk to people about Metro, transit and Moving Transit Forward.

The indirect methods used as part of the public participation initiative included an interactive website (www.movingtransitforward.org) where visitors could view the latest information. Materials from the live public presentations, including the informational display boards, were also available to people online. Visitors could offer their input online and it became part of the public record. During the 266 days the site has been live, there has been an average of 68 daily visitors with nearly 50,000 page views. In addition, Metro created its first ever blog (www.nextstopstl.org) with commentary, video and pictures. The blog provided another way to reach out to more people, to get their feedback and to talk about the importance of Metro and its long-range plan. During the past 391 days of activity, the average number of daily visitors has been 81, with nearly 60,000 page views.

Metro also created a Facebook page and used Twitter. Currently, Facebook has 616 friends and Twitter has 556 followers. Both encouraged friends to talk and think about transit by asking such questions as “why do you ride transit?” The Internet and social media provided techniques for Metro to engage the broader community about transit. Both continue to be used even though the planning process is completed.
Webinars were held as part of the second and third rounds of meetings when the draft and final long-range plan were presented. These were hosted by Metro and included the same information presented at the public meetings. After the presentations, participants could ask questions. The webinars allowed the planning team to reach more people who were unable to attend a public meeting, but could sit at their computer and participate via the Internet.

Metro used its web site to make available video interviews with Metro planners and the CEO who also updated the community on the planning process. The final task of the public participation process involved the production of a half-hour television program with an audience that aired on cable access. The program explained the recommended long-range plan components and included questions from the audience. This, along with traditional media relations, such as press releases and newspaper editorial briefings, were other methods for getting people involved in the long-range planning process.

Innovation
The long-range planning process was the first one Metro had ever conducted and the public participation was the most robust and extensive in the agency’s 60-year history. Plus, it was conducted at a time when it was questionable whether the region’s transit system would remain a viable transportation option or be forced to reduce to half its size due to lack of adequate funding. This process was undertaken at the same time many citizens viewed the agency and its executives as ineffective, overpaid and poor stewards of taxpayer money. There was also public concern about the low percentage of people actually riding public transit. Thus, public participation had to address not one, but several critical issues: the future of transit in the region; Metro’s image; the importance of transit even for people who do not use it; and the development of a long-range plan. What made the approach unique is not only did officials have to educate citizens about transit, but they also had to gain their trust and support and improve its image, while engaging them in the long-range planning process.

Project Results
There were several indicators that proved that the public participation process was successful in creating understanding of transit’s importance to the overall community and a shared community vision for transit. First, the long-range plan that Metro created with the help of the public received wide-ranging support. It has been approved by the agency’s board and sent to the region’s metropolitan planning agency for its review and to decide the specific projects that will be implemented dependent on funding. Secondly, the negative comments about Metro and transit in local media outlets dropped significantly. Each quarter, the agency compiles news stories (print, broadcast and online) and analyzes them. One component measures the percentage of stories that were favorable/neutral or negative. In October–December 2008 before the public participation process began, the negative coverage was at 43.3% and 56.7% favorable/neutral. However in April–May 2010, after the long-range planning process, negative coverage was down to 25% with favorable/neutral up to 75%.

Once the public participation process was completed, St. Louis County officials recognized the public’s changed attitude toward transit and Metro and decided to put to voters for a third time, a ½ cent sales tax referendum in April 2010. This decision did not and could not involve Metro. Furthermore, Metro could not participate in the sales tax campaign. The third time was the charm. The referendum, known as Proposition A,
passed with 62% of the vote. It now triggers the ¼ cent sales tax that was passed by St. Louis City voters in the 1990’s but could not be collected until the County passed its own transit sales tax. Therefore, Metro will now receive an additional $80 million in annual revenue. On June 28th, the agency began restoring services that were cut last year. Proposition A was the first successful sales tax initiative in St. Louis County in 16 years! Since 1994, two other tax initiatives failed in St. Louis County as well as one in St. Charles County that would have expanded light rail in the region.

Alignment with Core Values

Moving Transit Forward was successful because the public participation process created a shared community vision for growing the region’s transit system. The process was designed to reach those most affected and beyond. To do that, first a random baseline survey plus four focus groups were conducted reaching nearly 600 people. The focus groups involved two with Metro customers and two with non-customers. Both tools not only provided insight on effective methods for informing and engaging the public about transit, but also initial thoughts on potential system improvements and what people valued when it came to transit. For engaging the public, participants suggested: conducting public meetings at more convenient times and on the weekends, which Metro officials did during the long-range planning process; using the Internet, though the project had its own interactive website and blog; and conducting small group meetings, which Metro officials also did. The agency also learned what people valued in a transit system and how it could be used more effectively. This information was used to create a plan and an engagement process that addressed the community’s vision for a system that would: move thousands of people to work everyday; stimulate job growth and economic development; reduce pollution and traffic congestion; and improve the quality of life for all citizens, regardless of whether they use the system.

The process reached those most affected by making more than 150 presentations to area business groups, universities, hospitals, civic organizations, neighborhood groups and advocacy groups representing the disabled, senior citizens and environmentalists. Presentations were also made at various city and county council meetings. These meetings allowed citizens to meet the “faces” of Metro, to explain the long-range planning process and to get their initial thoughts. By going to where the people were, Metro showed that it valued the public’s input in creating its long-range plan.

Officials also reached those most affected by conducting several “Metro Days” where agency executives and senior staff greeted and talked with passengers at various light rail stations and bus transfer centers. This allowed officials to hear directly from citizens about their experience riding the transit system and their improvement suggestions.

Since the long-range planning process was critical to Metro’s future sustainability and financial vitality, the public first needed to understand the importance of transit, how it is financed and what it costs. During the first round of 10 public meetings, attendees were given information on employment and population trends, various types of services including lower-cost options and potential passenger amenities and service improvements. Then the attendees broke into small groups and participated in a facilitated planning exercise called “You Be the Transit Planner” where they drew lines on maps identifying the geographic corridors they thought the agency should serve. However, participants faced a challenge when selecting their preferences. Facilitators gave them a predetermined “budget” intended to reflect the agency’s realistic financial
constraints. This led to a greater understanding of transit and the importance of sufficient funding. Participants then had to dot vote for the types of transit and general system enhancements they thought should be included in the long-range plan. As another way to educate the participants about transit, Metro officials conducted a trivia contest with 12 agency-related questions. Participants who got eight of the twelve questions correct were eligible for a free one-month transit pass. Two important themes were consistently heard from workshop participants – Metro should prioritize service restoration and enhancement of the existing system and it should provide better connections to residential areas, employers and activity centers.

From the initial round of community workshop input, Metro narrowed the full range of possible system enhancements into a draft plan. This draft, along with a financial capacity analysis, was presented during a second round of public meetings and a webinar. To help ensure that Metro heard what the public had said, officials first reviewed the community’s values before presenting the plan’s components. Before presenting to the general public, Metro first met with the Moving Transit Forward Advisory Group and the Executive Committee where it outlined the community-preferred alternatives and asked for feedback. This process helped promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated.

With public input, Metro created a long-range plan that addressed citizens’ values. The plan was financially reasonable and recommended phased projects over the next 30 years, depending on available funding. Projects were decided into three achievable phases: a short-range (1-5 year) component, outlined investments such as service restoration and passenger amenities; mid-range (5-10 years) - MetroLink construction and expansion; and long-range (10-30 years) – construct and operate second MetroLink extension.

To ensure that citizens knew about the final plan, Metro once again met with the Advisory Group and the Executive Committee before conducting the final series of public meetings and a webinar. The plan was also put on the project’s website for comment.

Metro officials also produced a half-hour television program outlining the plan with a studio audience that was shown on cable and community access television. Because the public participation process involved citizens from the beginning, the long-range plan was met with overwhelming support. The majority of respondents indicated that it would indeed meet the needs of both their individual communities and the region as a whole.
Region-wide community engagement played a significant role in Moving Transit Forward. To give you an idea of how significant, check out the Google map below to view the public activity. **Pushpins:** Red = community workshops, Blue = city council meetings, Yellow = webinars, Green = chambers of commerce, schools, businesses, community and professional groups, etc.

Here are pictures from the “You Be the Transit Planner” workshop.
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**TITLE:** BE PART OF THE PLAN – TRANSLINK’S 10-YEAR PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZING GROUP:</th>
<th>TransLink  (South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
<td>CANADA, METRO VANCOUVER, population 2.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY QUESTION/PROBLEM:</td>
<td>In developing its 2010 10-Year Plan TransLink needed to understand the public’s vision for how public transportation should be provided and paid for over the next ten years. The type of vision would determine the financial impact e.g. “moving forward” equaled an additional $450 million per year. The challenge was to bring together complicated issues, distilling them down to digestible chunks without losing important content. Three things needed to be accomplished during the consultation process:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determine the general appetite for programs and investment in roads, goods movement, and transit, cycling and pedestrian improvements in relation to how much people are willing to pay for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inform the discussion with an exhaustive list of available and &quot;new&quot; funding sources to provide a broad based spectrum of sustainable revenue to enable TransLink to meet the region’s needs for the next seven to 10 years. Specify the programs and projects that would be undertaken at various levels of investment and provide a summary of the pros and cons of these with nominal dollar amounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate an inclusive dialogue to review the plan and the funding sources with the public and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE METHODS:</td>
<td>• Key stakeholder engagement through round tables and one on one meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentations and question and answer periods throughout the regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be Part of the Plan website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social media tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It’s Your Move interactive consultation game (offline board game developed and online game developed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Front Room Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A Livability Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Government Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Consultation Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employee Consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS:</td>
<td>Of the 2000 people that attended the 60 presentations from February to May of this year and the 700 residents that attended public consultations held throughout the region in June, in addition to the thousands that participated in our first ever online consultation, it was clear that people are engaged in participating in the future vision of transit and transportation in the region. Their participation can best be described as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thoughtful, reflective and substantive. To be sure there were concerns expressed about existing services and the increased costs to continue to keep pace with regional growth, but the vast majority of the input was constructive and supportive of the Transport 2040 goals and strategies and a Plan to achieve them.

The consultation findings were incorporated as recommendations and presented to the Board of Directors and then to the Mayors’ Council for approval.

**IMPACT LEVEL:** In June there were approximately 45,000 visits to the “bepartoftheplan” website, there were more than 1,000 posts in 144 new topics in 9 online forums, more than 3,000 people played “It’s Your Move” online, there were over 80 external blog discussions, 491 Twitter subscribers following TransLink tweets with TransLink following 1,243 subscribers who had referred to TransLink in their messages, and 700 people participated in community workshops and forums. The media buy (created awareness of the consultation process) reached 95 per cent of adults 18+ at a frequency of 69.2 times over the entire campaign period.

TransLink issued 5 news releases and 2 backgrounders on the 2010 10-Year Plan and received substantial coverage in print (125 articles), radio (467:12 air-time minutes) and television (143:46 air-time minutes).

This input was included in the final report to the transportation authority’s Board of Directors and Mayor’s Council was instrumental in informing decision-makers about citizens’ financial and service investment priorities.

**TIME FRAME:** September 2008 – June 2009

**PEOPLE ENGAGED**

- 2000 people attended presentations and Q&A sessions
- 700 citizens attended offline workshops
- 3000 completed the online consultation exercise “It’s Your Move.”
- 40,000 citizens visited the online consultation space to review background documents, the challenges and key issues to be determined in the 10-Year Plan consultation in the region


- This website now serves as a reporting out mechanism the consultation activities are no longer available online

**THE PROBLEM AND CHALLENGE**
TransLink in developing its 2010 10-Year Plan carried out a broad-based public consultation which included both offline and online. The challenge was to bring together complicated issues, distilling them down to digestible chunks without losing important content. Another challenge was creating a consultation initiative that would engage citizens in a dialogue about transportation investments during an economic recession, following a provincial election and in the midst of an exploding 2010 Olympic price tag for taxpayers.
THE ROLE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
The Consultation Plan consisted of three broad levels of engagement:

**STEP ONE: DEFINING THE CHALLENGE (SEPTEMBER TO DECEMBER 2008)**
This step involved the participation of the Stakeholder Roundtable, the Mayors’ Council and government relations’ initiatives. Guidance and leadership were provided in developing the key substantive elements for public consideration during the consultation phase. The importance of underscoring the value of the transit and transportation regional services and infrastructure was identified as a central message to provide the public with the context necessary to consider all options.

Key elements to present to the public were identified as:
- Raising awareness of the Transport 2040 goals and strategies;
- Underscoring the importance of the transportation and transit system for the region;
- Outlining TransLink’s accomplishments to date;
- TransLink efficiencies and effectiveness; and
- Articulating the challenges and opportunities.

**STEP TWO: DEVELOPING THE APPROACH (JANUARY TO APRIL 2009)**
During this period those involved in Step One continued to inform the process; in particular, there was considerable debate and dialogue on revenue sources both current and future. Final decisions on potential investment scenarios and funding options were identified for public consideration.

Sixty presentations to a wide range of constituencies (approximately 2,000 people) also took place. During this phase the recognition for the expansion of the transit and transportation infrastructure and services was being recognized and supported by key stakeholders.

“Through our work together we have come to appreciate the complexity of the issues and the importance of the choices from many points of view. How we respond to the transit and transportation challenges that confront our region will be a decisive factor in determining whether we can live up to how we see ourselves (and how others around the globe see us) as one of the most livable regions of the world. … The choices we make now about how people and goods move across the region in the future will impact the region’s economic prospects, our environment, and every other aspect of our quality of life. Funding and investing in that infrastructure will yield multiple benefits; not funding it appropriately will create a growing burden that we will all bare. … What we believe is critical at this stage is constructive dialogue with engagement at all levels – from senior political leadership to the public at large – on how best to fund this infrastructure. The stakes are too high to take any other course of action. Our conversations at the Roundtable have convinced us of the imperative of “getting this right”.” (Letter from the Stakeholder Roundtable)

**STEP THREE: FRAMING THE DISCUSSION (APRIL TO JUNE 2009)**
The broad public consultation process featured offline and online initiatives; all designed to increase the level of engagement, reach new audiences in the process and provide multiple opportunities for residents to have input. One of the ways that input was solicited was through the online and offline consultation exercise “It’s Your Move” which was developed to showcase the decisions that TransLink will have to make. Participants were asked to provide advice to TransLink on the levels of investment and how to pay for it.

The consultation process focused on engaging the public and consisted of two phases spanning April to June. The consultation process was suspended during the provincial election period. The first phase sought to raise awareness of the 2040 vision and strategies;
the second phase, which began after the provincial election, focused on a broad public process to inform the development of the 2010 10-Year Transportation and Financial Plan.

The objectives of the Consultation Plan were:
- To determine general government, stakeholder and public support for the proposed 2010 10-Year Transportation and Financial Plan;
- Adhere to TransLink’s Principles of Public Consultation and Public Outreach and
- Meet the requirements of the Act.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS:
Once a consensus was achieved on the scope and funding mechanisms of the 10-Year Plan, the final step in the process was to determine public support for the complete package. The people of Metro Vancouver were provided an opportunity to comment on the potential content of the draft plan. TransLink used a combination of face-to-face and Information and Communications Technology (ICT) methods to determine public support for the plan.

Outreach Activities included:
Greater Vancouver’s Livability Forum
E-consultation
The tool-kit included:
- A mobile platform – e.g. polls and surveys – to allow for review and interaction;
- Social media – using Facebook and Twitter;
- Share comments on-line as well as via SMS, provide document commenting;
- Tagging – identify popular items and classifications of content
- Communications – promotion of process, e-bulletins and updates, meeting notifications and reminders.
- Online Interactive consultation Tool – an online version of the interactive consultation tool “It’s Your Move” was produced and incorporated into the online consultation space www.bepartoftheplan.ca.

Front-Room Forums
- Participants invited family, friends, co-workers, etc. to work through the information, consultation exercise and feedback form together, encouraging discussion and discourse on TransLink’s 2010 10-Year Plan and funding options in a comfortable and familiar setting; and the feedback sheets were then sent back to TransLink for review and advice to the Plan.

Community Consultation Workshops
TransLink and family employee consultation

UNIQUENESS OF THE PROJECT
“At TransLink, public consultation drives everything that we do – our transportation plans, policies and financial strategy. We consult with the public through a variety of ways, including open houses, forums, interactive online panels, discussion groups and more.”

For the first time in TransLink’s history a “blended” consultation was designed and delivered. Stakeholders, governments and members of the public told TransLink that they must be involved in reviewing plans and determining options. They do not want to be told about a solution after it has already been decided. Taking this to heart, a blended consultation was developed to ensure citizens had multiple entry points to have their voices heard. The process in many cases provided participants with the opportunity to see how their opinions compared with those of fellow-citizens.
The Be Part of the Plan consultation was supported by an initial pre-consultation awareness campaign which included: media interviews, community information sessions, a website, monitored discussion blogs and printed background materials.

**PROJECT RESULTS**

Of the 2000 people that attended the 60 presentations from February to May 2009 and the 700 residents that attended public consultations held throughout the region in June of that year, in addition to the thousands that participated in our first ever online consultation, it was clear that people are engaged in participating in the future vision of transit and transportation in the region. Their participation can best be described as thoughtful, reflective and substantive. Participants recognized the challenges facing the region with the need to expand to keep pace with the region’s continued growth while at the same time ensuring the livability of the region; they also acknowledged the challenge of funding the 10-Year Plan. A sample of comments from consultation participants includes:

> “Thanks for giving me a voice. I support enhanced transportation services. The future of our city/region is important and we need to maintain and create a sustainable infrastructure for future generations.”

> “Thank you for doing this public consultation, I think it’s incredibly important to talk to the public and gauge their needs.”

> “Following a careful review of the funding options, meeting with TransLink Representatives, and discussions with Municipal elected representatives the LMCTP (Lower Mainland Chambers’ Transportation Panel) supports the goal of $450M to allow for future demand and expansion of transit services throughout the region, and that funding solutions is a municipal, provincial and federal responsibility.”

**ALIGNMENT WITH CORE VALUES**

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. TransLink over the last few years has adopted a “consult”, “involve” and occasionally a “collaborate” approach to public participation. Given the significance and magnitude of this Plan a collaborative public consultation was approved.

In November of 2008, the Office of the Auditor General of British Columbia issued its report on Public Participation: Principles and Best Practices for British Columbia. TransLink was identified in the report as one of a small number of organizations in the province that demonstrate expertise in public consultation; citing TransLink’s Principles of Public Consultation and Community Engagement. The TransLink principles of public consultation have guided the development of the 10-Year Plan consultation process and plan.

Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision. Stakeholders, governments and members of the public told TransLink that they must be involved in reviewing plans and determining options. They do not want to be told about a solution after it has already been decided. Taking this to heart, a blended consultation was developed to ensure citizens had multiple entry points to have their voice heard. The process in many cases provided participants with the opportunity to see how their opinions compared with those of fellow-citizens. All comments were provided to the decision-makers for their consideration.

Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.
Sustainability was at the forefront of TransLink’s 10-Year Plan public consultation.

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

Be Part of the Plan was designed to create multiple entry points for citizen input. Specifically, offline events were located throughout the regions at various times attempting to accommodate diverse scheduling needs. The online consultation was available 24/7 to all citizens who wished to participate as well. For example, the Livability Forum included 200 residents from specific stakeholder groups such as: the environment, business associations, housing associations and so on.

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

All public consultation exercises were either directly informed by stakeholder input: shaping agendas, inviting stakeholders, making presentations etc. or in some cases members of the public tested in the prototype stage the consultation activities. For example, “It’s Your Move’ consultation ‘game’ was tested by members of specific target groups.

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

Concurrent with the discussions with key decision makers on the scope and instruments to fund expansion of the public transportation system, TransLink implemented the comprehensive communications strategy “be part of the plan.” This included a significant media relations and marketing campaign.

In order to address our region’s imminent transportation challenges, TransLink needed to raise awareness about the costs, rationale and consequences of inaction. Subsequent media and marketing activities directed people to the bepartoftheplan.ca website to learn and participate in the conversation about transportation in Metro Vancouver, Transport 2040 and to participate in the 10-Year Plan process.

The media buy reached 95% of adults 18+ in Metro Vancouver at a frequency of 69.2 times over the entire campaign period. Over phase 1 and 2, there were 121,987,000 impressions generated. Media Relations provided 5 press releases, 2 backgrounders, a media resource guide and an interactive .pdf map showing TransLink’s Major Roads Network projects. In earned media TransLink received over 125 print articles including 43 spot news, 7 features, 45 letters to the editor, 21 opinion pieces, 3 Op-Ed (opposite the editorial page), 1 TransLink Op-Ed and 5 TransLink responses. There were 467:12 air-time minutes of radio time including 36 spot news, 27 features and 4 talk show call-ins. There were 143:46 air-time minutes of television on air-time including 43 spot news, 21 features and 1 interview.

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

All of the information received from governments, stakeholders and the public was provided to TransLink’s Planning and Finance Divisions as advice as they completed the draft Plan. A summary of everything heard was presented to the TransLink Board, Commissioner and the Mayors’ Council as well as being made available on TransLink’s Be Part of the Plan website.

Be Part of the Plan throughout the process and following the consultation informed people through emails, TransLink Listen’s e-newsletter, Be Part of the Plan website, media releases and most importantly during the consultation events how input was to be incorporated into the decision-making process. Participants were aware that their input was to be correlated with that of other consultation channels and presented in the form of a Final Board Report. This Report was to be reviewed by the Board of Directors and then presented to the Mayor’s Council for approval.
# IAP2 Core Values Award Nomination Submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Census 2010: Make it Count Today for Generations of Tomorrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award Category</td>
<td>Innovation Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Southern Nevada Counts 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nominee Name | Jason Gray, Strategic Solutions  
Public Outreach Coordinator for the 2010 Census |
| Contact Information | Strategic Solutions  
Jason Gray, Vice President  
516 South 6th Street, Suite 100  
Las Vegas, NV. 89101  
Email: jgray@strategicsolutionsnv.com  
T: (702) 889-2840  
F: (702) 889-3215 |
| Participant References | Richard Wassmuth  
Planning & Development, City of Las Vegas  
T: (702) 229-2080  
Email: rwassmuth@lasvegasnevada.gov |
| | Veronica Meter  
Vice President, Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce  
T: (702) 586-3805  
Email: vmeter@lvchamber.com |
| Publication Contact | Las Vegas Review-Journal  
Reporter: Richard Lake  
Phone: (702) 383-0307  
Email: rlake@reviewjournal.com |
| | Las Vegas Sun  
Senior Editor: Tom Gorman  
Phone: (702) 259-2310  
Email: tom.gorman@lasvegasun.com |
| | KLAS TV-8 (CBS affiliate)  
Assignment Desk Manager: Richard Martinez  
Phone: (702) 792-8870  
Email: newsdesk@8newsnow.com |
Title | Census 2010 – Make it Count Today for Generations of Tomorrow
---|---
Organization Group | Southern Nevada Counts 2010
Location | Clark County, Nevada, U.S. A. Population: 1.99 million (75% of entire State of Nevada population).
Key Question/Problem | Develop a culturally sensitive and meaningful public outreach and engagement program that both educates Clark County residents about the importance of the 2010 Decennial Census and motivates them to participate in the process. The public outreach program must qualify for the astonishing growth rate in Clark County during the past decade, while addressing the unique challenges associated with counting residents during a full-scale economic recession.
Sample Methods | A broad-based committee, Southern Nevada Counts 2010, consisting of community stakeholders and organizations, collaborated monthly to design an outreach program emphasizing methods that reach hard-to-count communities in Clark County. Identifying and leveraging the influence of known and trusted voices at grassroots community meetings, neighborhood events, and rallies. The production of a series of vignettes with Clark County families demonstrating the real world impacts of 2010 Census participation, culminating in a PBS television program that aired locally with 100% donated resources.
Results | Nevada’s 2010 census form mail-back participation rate matched that of 2000, one of only two states in the 11-state Denver Region to meet or exceed their 2000 mail-back participation rate. In Clark County, despite having to count 600,000 more residents with less resources than were available in 2000, considering our second-highest in the nation unemployment rate and dubious distinction as “ground zero” of the national foreclosure crisis, came within 1% of our 2000 mail back participation rate. The most dramatic census form mail back participation rate increases were observed in our urban core, described historically as “hard-to-count”.
Impact Level | Clark County and State of Nevada
Time Frame | 12 months
People Engaged | In one outreach program activity alone, we managed to reach 8,480 residents.
Web Link | www.snvcounts2010.com ; www.strategicsolutionsnv.com
The Problem and Challenge
The United States Constitution mandates that a full count of all residents, citizens and non-citizens, within its borders be conducted every ten years. These data are used to reapportion state representation in the U.S. House of Representatives and to allocate funds for various federal programs based on population characteristics. Residents are counted through a series of intricate processes depending on their living situation, although most are reached through a mailing of the census form directly to their housing unit. Those who do not respond during the census form mailing process receive visits to their home from U.S. Census Bureau employees during what is referred to as the “non-response follow-up process”.

As the 2010 Census approached, there was arguably no community in the continental United States for which the stakes were higher than Clark County, Nevada. A community comprised of 1.9 million residents spread across approximately 8,000 square miles, Clark County has been among the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the United States over the course of the last decade, adding more than 600,000 residents (45%) from 2000 to 2010. These figures suggested that Nevada was well positioned to gain another seat in the U.S. House of Representatives and to claim a greater share of federal funds for vital community programs and services. But the outcomes would depend on a complete count of all state residents, and as home to 75% of state residents, all eyes turned to Clark County.

However, Clark County could not have been in a more challenging position to get all of its residents counted. As a result of the global financial crisis and ensuing economic recession, Clark County and Nevada became widely recognized as “ground zero” of the national foreclosure crisis; families became displaced, fiscal deficits swelled, and the unemployment rate quickly rose to the second highest in the nation. In June of 2009 alone, when local public outreach planning efforts for the 2010 Census began, there 15,885 homes either in foreclosure or listed for auction. Many described Clark County as a community in peril and the constitutionally-mandated national decennial census was only months away. It was clear that many Clark County residents were suffering and that their day-to-day focus was not on the long term benefits derived from a full census count as much as it was on simply surviving. There was a very small chance of achieving a complete census count without a localized, inclusive, and broad-based community outreach program. The $100,000 Clark County public outreach budget for the 2010 Census, reflecting the cruel realities of municipal finances, equated to a 5¢ allocation per resident.

To pave a clear path to a complete count, our approach to public outreach emphasized the essence of partnership and commitment to a common purpose, and strategically leveraged our most precious asset: Clark County families.

The Role of Public Participation
Public participation was the cornerstone of our efforts to generate awareness of the 2010 Census. To help our community better understand the risks associated with an undercount, we began the partnership development process with an eye to organizations and stakeholders with specialized knowledge about Clark County families. Armed with data produced by the Nevada State Demographer, State Data Center, and State Legislative Counsel Bureau showing that approximately $10,000 in federal funds for Nevada would be lost during the next decade for every one resident not counted during the 2010 Census, we conducted two regional workshops with representatives in the fields of education, organized labor, non-profits and social services, government, business, faith-based groups, and media. More than eighty organizations attended our workshops to learn about the risks associated with an undercount of Clark County residents.
From these workshops grew a standing committee of community stakeholders and volunteers that would guide the local 2010 Census public outreach process over the coming months. Within thirty days a complete count committee was formed, adopting the name “Southern Nevada Counts 2010” and the tagline “Make it Count Today for Generations of Tomorrow”.

Southern Nevada Counts 2010 identified several core challenges that would function as the barriers we would need to overcome in order expect a complete count of all residents. The committee also generated several strategies and action steps to help overcome these barriers, most of which relied heavily on volunteers and donated resources. The most significant barriers included; reaching hard-to-count population groups, including ethnic and racial minorities and new immigrant communities, accessing distressed and displaced families struggling to survive the recession, overcoming ideological skepticism and privacy concerns, mitigating the effects of geographic isolation in outlying areas, and addressing unfamiliarity with the process and nuances of the 2010 Census. The strategies and action steps focused on outreach activities that could be conducted in safe and familiar environments, especially when communicating with groups for which trust and privacy may be a concern. Additionally, particular emphasis was placed on developing a culturally sensitive and meaningful dialogue with immigrant communities, partnering with recognized and trusted voices within specific population groups, and sharing the real world, every day impacts of 2010 census outcomes through the eyes of Clark County families.

Public Participation Methods
Following the formation of “Southern Nevada Counts 2010”, several micro workshops were held with stakeholders in outlying rural communities. These community planning sessions allowed local residents to share ideas to generate awareness of the census and inspired a sense of ownership in the process. These planning sessions also conveyed to residents that there was no community too small to participate in the outreach planning process and that the concerns, beliefs, and apprehensions they held were just as significant as those held by residents in our more densely populated urban areas. These planning sessions gave rise to outreach advocates who helped plan student artwork contests, trade association briefings, and business partnership programs that were integrated to the public outreach program. Public outreach methods began to holistically coalesce around activities and events that were relevant and meaningful to particular constituent groups, increasing the trust quotient and demonstrating a strong commitment to collaboration and inclusion. These events and activities also provided educational and speaking opportunities for “Southern Nevada Counts 2010” committee members, many of whom are considered known and trusted voices within their particular associations, neighborhoods, and industries. This multi-method approach captured the essence of public participation by bridging disparate philosophies, converting challenges to motivations, and demonstrating that a common cause at its core can withstand fear, complacency, and apathy. A sampling of events, activities, and speaking engagements planned and coordinated to educate and motivate residents with respect to the 2010 Census include:

- 2010 Census presentations at more than twenty budget town hall briefings, showing residents they can have a positive impact on municipal finances simply by filling out their census form
- A 2010 Census “Portrait of America Road Tour” partnership with local Hispanic and Latino leaders at a high volume local market servicing Hispanic and Latino residents, sharing that the census process is safe, easy, and confidential. This event was made possible by space and food donations from the market and allowed patrons to receive information in Spanish, critical to ensuring undocumented residents know they count just as much as U.S. citizens
• Attendance at the Nevada Commission on Minority Affairs “Make a Difference Day”, where 2010 Census materials, such as coloring books, hats, mugs, and other collateral materials were shared with approximately 2,000 low income families
• Attendance at a three-day “Veterans Stand Down”, where shirts, hats, and other 2010 Census informational materials were distributed to homeless veterans
• Neighborhood canvassing with Hispanic and Latino civic participation groups, going door-to-door in high incidence Hispanic and Latino neighborhoods with Spanish language materials encouraging participation in the 2010 Census
• University of Nevada, Las Vegas student leadership partnership to canvass student apartment complexes and distribute 2010 Census informational materials
• Meetings with numerous concerned citizens groups, neighborhood watch groups, and social service coalitions

Southern Nevada Counts 2010 committee members also donated resources to help promote participation in the 2010 Census through macro communication processes like utility bill inserts, employee newsletter editorials, intranet e-mail blasts, and trade association publications. The universal message, consistent among all of the communication processes, speaking engagements, activity and event participation was “Make It Count Today for Generations of Tomorrow”. More specifically, this message imparted that now is the time to fight for your share of federal resources to support local schools, roads and highways, community centers, and social service programs, and that the fight can be won simply by filling out your census form.

Innovation
The Southern Nevada Counts 2010 committee strongly believed that the most powerful means through which to educate the public about the impacts of the 2010 census, and to motivate them to participate by filling out their census forms, was to show how Clark County families will be directly affected by the 2010 census. The concept grew into a comprehensive, highly integrated series of vignettes that were produced entirely with resources donated by our local Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) affiliate, a Southern Nevada Counts 2010 committee member. Five vignettes were produced over the course of two months, each intended to convey a particular aspect of the 2010 Census. Southern Nevada Counts 2010 members collectively identified the theme for each vignette, identified the families that would be interviewed and profiled, and assisted with video production and voice over recordings. The vignettes were then released to the general public at key intervals throughout the 2010 Census process and were posted to YouTube, Facebook, the Southern Nevada Counts 2010 website (www.snvcounts2010.com), and the websites of other Southern Nevada Counts 2010 member organizations, including municipal governments.

• **Vignette #1**: Produced in partnership with S.A.F.E. House, a local domestic violence shelter and Southern Nevada Counts 2010 member. The journey of a mother of two young children from a domestic violence situation to safe shelter is shared, showing how she accessed programs and services that are funded by formulas accounting for 2010 Census data. The programs include emergency shelter grants, food vouchers, jobs training, and public transit.
• **Vignette #2**: A focus on jobs creation by sharing the story of one woman who will work as a 2010 Census canvasser. The woman was previously unemployed, like many other Clark County residents. The vignette includes information about how to apply to work as a 2010 census canvasser in your neighborhood.
• **Vignette #3**: Highlights the impacts of the 2010 Census on rural & outlying areas, particularly the importance of counting seasonal residents. The vignette featured a seasonal resident
family and shared how the rural areas will be impacted by an undercount through less federal dollars for senior centers and rural area health grants.

- **Vignette #4**: Produced in English and Spanish, this vignette profiles a Hispanic immigrant and her quest to ensure her children receive a quality education. Information about the direct funding impacts of the 2010 Census on our education system is shared. These programs include Title I funds for needy families, nutritional programs, and ESL (English as a second language) programs.

- **Vignette #5**: A small business owner shares how economic development and business planning processes are affected by 2010 Census data, particularly when businesses need accurate information to target specific demographic and cultural groups.

The series of vignettes came to be known as the Southern Nevada Families Program, an integral component to the overall outreach program that truly captures the intricacies of the 2010 Census process while at the same time demonstrating its complex and often misunderstood impacts on families. The five vignettes were eventually merged into a one-hour live television call-in program “Make It Count: Census 2010” aired by KLVX Vegas PBS, during which members of the public watched the vignettes and were able to phone in their questions about the 2010 Census. The questions were fielded by Southern Nevada Counts 2010 members, who had grown into locally recognized experts on the 2010 Census. “Make It Count: Census 2010” was re-aired on local municipal television stations for an additional two months, providing additional conduits for sharing the educational and inspirational value of the five vignettes just as official census forms were arriving in the mailboxes of Clark County residents.

**Project Results**

Southern Nevada Counts 2010 members were able to convert their unique knowledge and skill sets, as well as their dedication to a common cause into long term educational value for all Clark County residents. The immediate impacts and results from the committee’s public outreach activities can be quantified by turning to the 2010 Census form mail-back participation rates in Clark County. Nevada’s 2010 census form mail-back participation rate matched that of 2000, one of only two states in the 11-state Denver Region to meet or exceed their 2000 mail-back participation rate. Clark County, despite having to count 600,000 more residents with less resources than were available in 2000, considering its second-highest in the nation unemployment rate and dubious distinction as “ground zero” of the national foreclosure crisis, came within 1% of its 2000 mail back participation rate. The most dramatic census form mail-back participation rate increases were observed in our culturally diverse urban core, described historically as “hard-to-count”. In 2000, there were several census tracts in our urban core with less than a 50% mail-back participation rate. There were no census tracts in our urban core with less than a 50% mail-back participation rate during the 2010 Census. In outlying areas, such as the City of Mesquite, where one of the families that participated in our Southern Nevada Families program calls home, the mail-back participation rate increased by 20% over 2000.

**Alignment with Core Values:**

- *How did the project ensure that those most affected by the problem were involved?* An aggressive recruitment effort to bring community advocates and leaders to the table led to the formation of Southern Nevada Counts 2010. Once the committee was formed, their unique insights and ideas were parlayed into action items and strategies for reaching hard-to-count residents. This includes non-profits and social service providers, the frontline of contact for displaced families and residents who rely on the social safety net – often the most difficult residents to access for purposes of education and awareness of the census.
How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions? The core challenges and barriers that were identified early on by stakeholders became the areas of greatest focus for outreach efforts. The amount of resources donated, time committed, and volunteers enlisted would not have been possible without the public’s participation. Their unique insights with respect to the constituencies they serve, the organizations the work with, their employees, and even their neighbors were critical components to forming our public outreach program.

How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated? There were multiple methods employed to create opportunities for participation, including targeted events, activities, and speaking engagements. Sustainable decisions were arrived at through collaboration among Southern Nevada Counts 2010 committee members during monthly meetings. The committee determined early on that with a scope as large as the 2010 Census, sustainable planning would not be possible in a highly structured environment. Therefore, the committee did not elect a Chairman and made most decisions based on consensus and accountability to the common goals.

How did the project seek out and involve those most affected? We leveraged the partnership development process and actively sought advice and assistance from known and trusted voices within key communities, particularly ethnic and racial minority communities and immigrant communities. These communities will be highly affected by the 2010 Census and their support would not have been possible without first establishing trust and demonstrating commitment.

How did the project seek input from participants on how they wish to participate? Partnership forms were distributed, asking members their level of interest, associations, possible resource commitment, and unique insights about how the public outreach should be conducted. A project website was also constructed, allowing the public to submit questions, comments, and partnership opportunities.

How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation? Information about the federal funding impacts, particularly that $10,000 in federal funds to Nevada would be lost for every one person not counted, was an incredible motivator. When taken further and actually drilling those dollars down to the program level for such things as education, senior centers, emergency shelter grants, roads and highways, and health care programs through mediums such as the family vignettes, participants become very motivated and especially interested in making sure their community gets their fair share.

How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem? There is very little to be excited about in Clark County right now. Although we are home to the fabulous Las Vegas Strip, and in years past have celebrated all that is has brought to our community in the form of jobs, entertainment, and leisure, there is a malaise that has set in due to the economic recession. Against that backdrop, Southern Nevada Counts 2010 came together to fulfill a purpose and to make a statement that civic participation is alive and well in Clark County and that despite our challenges, there are things we can do to regain a sense of optimism and that sometimes those things can be as simple as filling out your census form. The mail-back return rates confirm their dedication.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Clean Rivers Healthy Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO (includes 600K ratepayers, three watersheds and 9,600 miles of pipe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Key objective was to gain informed support and consent for reducing combined sewer overflows (CSOs), one of the largest water pollution issues in the United States. Depending on the control option scenario chosen, the multi-decade, multi-billion dollar infrastructure improvement project could cost from $2 to 10 billion for the St. Louis Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Key informant interviews, project branding, stakeholder advisory committee, telephone survey, community presentations and briefings, open house events, project video, project website, E-blasts, reminder phone calls and roving project displays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Results        | MSD recommended a CSO reduction alternative that reflected the public’s priority for reducing overflows in high residential and recreation areas, rather than along the Mississippi River because it was the most cost effective and operationally feasible strategy. In the past, regulators preferred greater controls along the Mississippi River.  
|                | MSD committed to being a leader in green sewer infrastructure improvements, especially along the Mississippi River.  
|                | Success of public participation convinced engineers to include the public early and often in other planning projects. |
| Impact Level   | MSD Service Area (1.4 million residents) |
| Time Frame     | August 2007 to September 2009 |
| People Engaged | Over 2,200 directly engaged; and tens of thousands informed via media, municipality websites and mailings |
| Web Link       | www.cleanriversstl.com |
The Problem and Challenge

Problem Facing Many North American Sewer Districts
In the mid-1950’s, the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District (MSD) became responsible for a patchwork of combined and separate sewer systems, which were maintained previously by more than 70 municipalities. Through its annexation of publicly owned wastewater and storm drainage facilities and its purchase of private sewer companies, MSD developed a metropolitan-wide sewer system that serves all of the City of St. Louis and close to 90% of St. Louis County – an area roughly 524 square miles. By miles of pipe, MSD is the fourth largest sewer district in the country. The District’s service area includes 1.4 million people, encompasses the Mississippi, Missouri and lower Meramec watersheds, and covers 9,630 miles of sewers and seven wastewater treatment facilities that process almost 300 million gallons of sewage per day.

Like many mid-western and northeastern cities, St. Louis’ sewer infrastructure dates back to the early 1850’s when combined sewers, which carry both waste and storm water to treatment plants, were an effective alternative for disposing of residential and industrial sewage. Over 700 communities in 32 North American states have combined sewers and during dry weather, these sewers transport wastewater directly to the treatment plant. However, during heavy rainstorms or snowmelt, the wastewater volume can exceed the capacity of the sewer system and overflow into nearby streams, rivers and lakes. Combine sewer overflows (CSOs) contain not only storm water but also untreated human and industrial waste, toxic materials, and debris. This is a major water pollution concern for cities with combined sewer systems.

Federal and state regulations required that MSD (along with other U.S. municipal sewer districts) to devise a Long-Term Control Plan (LTCP) as part of the Capital Improvement and Replacement Program (CIRP). The plan should outline a clear course of action on how the District would resolve the system’s biggest problem, combined sewer overflows. As part of the planning process, MSD conducted an intensive public involvement effort with its consultant, Vector Communications. The effort ensured that area stakeholders and residents were aware of the system’s existing conditions; understood its capital improvement needs; and provided input that helped the District develop the best solutions for the community.

Public Participation Challenges
With past large-scale projects, the District had been unsuccessful in its outreach and involvement efforts because residents were not concerned about the invisible infrastructure until it became visible in the form of basement back-ups, flooded streets and noisome odors. With the multi-decade, multi-billion dollar investment looming in the future, it was critical that impacted ratepayers understood the challenges facing the District and provide input to guide MSD’s selection of combined sewer overflow control alternatives.

MSD’s service area includes outer-ring municipalities that are serviced by separate sewers, not combined sewers; and these residents felt that the issue was not a concern for them. However, CSOs negatively impact watersheds, which are necessary to support the habitat for plants and animals, and provide drinking water for people and wildlife. Protection of the natural resources in our watershed is essential to maintain the health and well being of all living things, both now and in the future. Therefore, the reduction of overflows, both separate and combined, improves water quality for the entire service area.

In addition to ratepayer disinterest, sewer improvement discussions are complex and technical. Therefore, MSD was faced with communicating the issue and its alternatives in a clear and
understandable manner. This was no easy feat for engineers who were accustomed to using acronyms and terminology among their technical cohorts and peers.

The Role of Public Participation

Ultimately, the role of the District's public participation plan was to secure informed consent and support for CSO reduction. Generating public support required MSD to raise the public's awareness of and interest in sewer overflows, their water quality impacts, and various overflow controls. The District also sought to deepen the public's understanding of the environmental benefits and rate implications of the different control options. These efforts helped to make the public more informed, which enabled MSD to solicit constructive public input on the most appropriate wet weather controls for the St. Louis community.

Public Participation Methods

1) Stakeholder Interviews
MSD’s project team conducted face-to-face interviews with 21 stakeholders representing business, community, environmental, municipal, public health and regional planning entities. Usually an hour in length, these interviews gave the team an opportunity to explain existing sewer conditions, sewer overflows – both CSOs and SSOs (separate sewer overflows), the District’s long-term planning efforts, and the need for public involvement. Although the interviews were partly informative, their focus was on obtaining stakeholders’ responses to 12 questions that covered six major topics or themes. These included:

- Concerns about the region’s water quality
- Popular waterway uses and desires
- Expectations of MSD
- Facilitators of planning success
- Barriers to planning success
- Generating public interest and involvement

2) Project Branding
Vector Communications developed a graphic identity for the program that made use of compelling visual cues and resonant messages to appeal directly to community members’ values. A number of considerations influenced the development of MSD’s program brand. The District wanted a unique identity that concisely communicated: 1) the regional nature of its planning activities i.e. multiple communities are impacted; 2) the program’s focus on people and the environment, not just underground infrastructures; and 3) the quality of life improvements that would ensue as a result of planning. MSD also wanted to draw attention to the public’s desired outcomes like clean waterways, working sewers and healthy communities.
The District’s branding efforts led to the creation of the Clean Rivers Healthy Communities Program (simply referred to as Clean Rivers). The program’s logo and tagline were designed to convey its environmental significance, positive human impact and infrastructure focus.

3) Printed and Electronic Collateral Materials
With a clear brand in place, Vector developed and disseminated collateral materials that explained the Clean Rivers Program, sewer overflows, and the public’s role in water quality protection. Materials like the FAQ (frequently asked questions), program fact sheet and brochure served as key sources of project information and thousands were circulated throughout the planning process at public meetings, presentations and open houses.

Vector produced a ten-minute video to help the public understand combined sewer overflows and the long-term planning process. It featured members of Clean Rivers’ stakeholder advisory committee and MSD’s leadership talking about CSOs’ causes and effects as well as the need for stricter stormwater and pollution controls. It was shot in a digital format so that it could be shown on DVD at community presentations and open houses, and uploaded to the website for independent viewing. A copy of the video was also posted on YouTube to help reach a wider audience.

The Clean Rivers website (www.cleanriversstl.com) was launched as the electronic home for the Long-Term Control Plan – a cyber address that anyone could visit to learn about the planning process. With 44 pages of content, visitors used the site to review the program’s background information and collateral materials; watch the project video; find out about public engagement events and presentations; access meeting records; and contact the project team. At the project’s conclusion, they were also able to read and download the final control plan.

4) Community Presentations
MSD and its consulting team made 58 presentations on the Clean Rivers Program to municipal officials, stakeholder organizations and community groups. By going into the community to conduct these presentations, the District’s team was able to share important project information with the public, answer pressing questions, and obtain feedback on the program’s activities and impacts. It was also able to gain exposure to a wider group of people than those who would normally self-select to attend one of its project meetings or open houses.

5) Media Relations
For MSD, ensuring the media understood the need for sewer improvements and CSO reduction was important to the success of the public participation program. As one of the District’s stakeholders, the media served as a key connector to various population segments and the community at-large. To enhance the media’s understanding, Vector and MSD hosted two sewer tours and four editorial briefings.
6) **Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)**

While the stakeholder interviews and community presentations enabled MSD to have intermittent interactions with groups and individuals affected by sewer overflows, the District wanted a public participation vehicle that would foster long-term stakeholder involvement in the Clean Rivers Program. To help it achieve this goal, MSD established a 12-member Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) comprised of municipal, public health, environmental, regional, business and community representatives. Meeting six times, members worked with the project team to:

- Review program data and technical findings;
- Increase awareness of and support for the Clean Rivers Program;
- Advance the team’s knowledge of stakeholder groups’ interests and priorities; and
- Serve as points of connection to the larger community.

In short, the SAC was a critical sounding board for the project team, helping to inform its understanding of not only the community’s values, but also its quality of life concerns and aspirations.

7) **Telephone Surveys**

Prior to MSD’s hosting of the open houses, a research firm conducted a public opinion survey of slightly more than 900 households in the region. The 17-question survey was designed to measure ratepayers’:

- Perceptions about the quality of St. Louis area waterways;
- Knowledge about pollution sources and those responsible for waterway protection;
- Willingness to perform stormwater and pollution control activities; and
- Tolerance of rate increases associated with implementing the control plan.

To measure the change in attitudes and perceptions regarding stormwater and pollution controls and rate affordability, the research firm administered a follow-up opinion survey four months later.

8) **Open Houses**

MSD hosted thirteen open houses over a three-month period. Each three-hour open house was designed to:

- Acquaint the public with the Clean Rivers Program;
- Educate residents about overflows, the sewer system, and environmental conditions; and
- Solicit priorities for different CSO reduction options.

Since the sewer system is a mostly invisible utility that rarely commands widespread public attention, MSD’s project team employed a host of other outreach and education vehicles to drive open house attendance. The team’s activities included: paid newspaper and radio advertising; E-blasts; emailed invitations, traveling project displays (5); targeted appeal letters to municipal mayors and city administrators; and personal telephone reminder calls.
Project Uniqueness

Although the public participation tools and techniques implemented for this project were not unique, wide-reaching outreach, issue complexity and the sheer number of control alternatives being considered made the project unique for the District, especially because MSD was highly scrutinized by federal and state regulators during the planning process.

Knowing that complete elimination of CSOs was too costly (estimated at $9.6 billion) and invasive for the St. Louis community, residents balanced their priorities by examining affordability, environmental remediation and social impact of six major waterways. One would think that the public would have preferred equitable treatment among all waterways or would have considered the Mississippi River of highest priority because of the downstream impact, but they didn’t.

The public felt the waterways that had relatively large CSO volumes compared to the waterways’ overall volume and the waterways that were in close proximity to residential and recreational areas should be of greatest concern. These preferences were different from the regulators who preferred greater CSO reduction along the Mississippi River at a cost of approximately $3.2 billion. In the end, MSD chose the scenario which consisted of controlling CSOs to the urban streams to the point where further expenditures yielded significant returns, known as “knee of the curve”, coupled with an enhance green infrastructure program along the Mississippi River. The scenario was among the least costly (approximately $1.9) and it provided the most impact per dollar invested and per customer payment.

Additionally, by choosing this alternative, the District committed to ongoing public participation and education around “green” behaviors and policies. Since baseline data is limited regarding “green” strategies, MSD also committed itself to becoming a major partner in implementing environmentally sustainable sewer practices and measuring the efficacy of various strategies.

Project Results

The Long-Term Control Plan engagement effort yielded the following outcomes:
- Presentations and briefings to nearly 2,000 residents and over 212 elected officials;
- Extensive media (television and radio) coverage through ten outlets;
- Co-marketing and outreach using more than 50% of St. Louis’ municipality websites (St. Louis has more than 90 individual municipalities); and
- Nearly 2,800 unique visitors (and 175,000 hits) to the project website over a six month period, with a 300% increase during the open house period.

For MSD, the effort yielded more lasting outcomes. As evidenced by the telephone survey, the public’s confidence in MSD’s ability to address flooding and overflows increased by 20% during the planning process. Additionally, during the LTCP process, MSD initiated a rain barrel program that surpassed all expectations by selling almost 1,600 rain barrels over a four-week period. This was more than five times the expected number of sales.

MSD is becoming a leader in green infrastructure as evidenced by its partnerships with:
- City of St. Louis and the green alley pilot program;
- Soil and Water Conservation District of St. Louis and the Missouri Botanical Gardens and the ShowMe Rain Gardens program; and
- Stream Teams.
Finally, the success of the public participation process convinced MSD engineers of how important it is to have the public involved early and often in the decision-making process. In the past year alone, Vector Communications has served as the public engagement specialists for several smaller capital improvement projects, such as the Harlem-Baden Sewer Separation Project, the Black Creek Stream Restoration Project and the Comprehensive Solids Handling Master Plan for the Lemay and Bissell wastewater treatment plants.

Alignment with Core Values

**Core Value 1** – MSD was committed to reaching out to all residents and stakeholders because combined sewer overflows is an issue that directly and indirectly impacts people, wildlife and natural habitats. While the subject matter was complex, the District and its consultants, Jacobs Engineering and Vector Communications, made the material understandable to non-engineers.

**Core Value 2** – Even when the public’s preferences did not align with the regulators preferences, MSD transparently reported the results and selected a scenario that best represented the public’s priorities.

**Core Value 3** – From the information gained during the LTCP planning process, MSD has put a greater public participation emphasis on all of its existing and future projects.

**Core Value 4** – With the mixture of outreach and participation tools used, the process touched residents and stakeholders throughout the service area. At the process’ conclusion, two of three residents had heard of the Clean Rivers Healthy Communities program.

**Core Value 5** – Early in the process, stakeholder interviews provided a clear understanding of how the public wanted to participate in the program. As a result, the public participation plan was revised and expanded to include more public participation vehicles, such as the virtual open house with an electronic comment form.

**Core Value 6** – At the first round of open houses, an engineer or communications professional from MSD staffed each one of the seven stations to answer residents’ questions directly. Additionally, the project video was shown at every open house to ensure that the public had a full understanding of the issue prior to meeting with engineers at the respective stations. Typically, open house guests stay about 20-30 minutes at an event. However, with the Clean Rivers open houses, the average visit was approximately 60-90 minutes in duration.

**Core Value 7** – At the conclusion of the planning process, MSD hosted a second round of open houses where attendees were informed how their input influenced MSD scenario choice for the Long-Term Control Plan. The complete LTCP can be found on MSD’s website and the Clean Rivers website. While it is a daunting document of over 900 pages, the website also includes a short synopsis of the results.
# IAP2 Core Values Award Nomination Submission

| Title: | Dorothy’s Story: Seniors, Families and Professionals - Partners in Care |
| Nomination category: | Innovation Award |
| Organization name: | Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) |
| Nominee name: | Vancouver Coastal Health: Transforming Seniors Care |
| Contact person: | Lucie McNeill, Director Community Engagement |
| | 200-520 West 6th Ave |
| | Vancouver, BC |
| | Canada |
| | Phone: 604.875-4817 |
| | Fax: 604.875-4388 |
| | Email: lucie.mcneill@vch.ca |

## Participant references:

1. Nancy Breton  
   g.n.breton@shaw.ca

2. Louise Donald  
   lddonald@telus.net

3. Barb Greenlaw  
   bgreenlaw@dccnet.com

## Publication Contact Information:

Vancouver Sun newspaper  
Pacific Newspaper Group Inc.  
200 Granville Street, Ste. #1  
Vancouver, BC V6C 3N3

Globe and Mail newspaper  
444 Front Street West,  
Toronto, Ontario, M5V 2S9

Canadian Policy Research Network  

## Vancouver Coastal Health at a glance:

Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) is a large, public agency providing health services to 25% of BC’s population, over 1 million people including the residents of Vancouver, Richmond, the North Shore and Coast Garibaldi, Sea-to-Sky, Sunshine Coast, Powell River, Bella Bella and Bella Coola. VCH has an annual budget of 2.8 billion dollars, employs 27,000 staff and benefits from the contributions of over 5,000 volunteers. Our organization provides a range of health services, including 14 hospitals, 15 community health centres, mental health and addictions programs, residential care facilities among others. Every year we provide 3 million+ patient days of care, see 308,000+ people in our emergency departments, provide 116,000+ surgeries, conduct 79,000+ inpatient discharges and provide 2.3 million+ residential care days.

## VCH mission:

The mission of VCH is: “We are committed to promoting healthy lives in healthy communities with our partners through care, education and research.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Dorothy’s Story: Seniors, Families and Professionals - Partners in Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Community Engagement Team of Vancouver Coastal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Vancouver Coastal Health Region, British Columbia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>How can the patient, family and public help to improve outcomes for seniors who come into hospital?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Open Space, interviews, advisory committee, reference group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>The development and launch of two resource packages consisting of a DVD and supporting materials. One package specific to the learning needs of VCH staff and one for the public in VCH area communities. The staff-oriented package utilizes a case study to generate discussion among staff to facilitate practice change towards enhanced partnerships with patients and family members. The public-oriented package provides capacity development for individuals to better partner with health professionals in order to increase their chances for recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Region of Vancouver Coastal Health Staff and residents Spreading to province of BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>Open Space Forum held October 2008 Planning and development completed September 2009 Launched January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>In initial forum 49 In development phase 28 In implementation and launch 2500 and counting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.vch.ca/get_involved/community_engagement/community_partnerships/transforming_seniors_care">http://www.vch.ca/get_involved/community_engagement/community_partnerships/transforming_seniors_care</a> <a href="http://www.vch.ca">www.vch.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge: Seniors have very specific health care requirements when in acute care. The fragility of their condition can be compared to that of children experiencing acute episodes. Seniors are especially at risk in acute care, a small change in blood chemistry or fluid intake can have a big impact on the health of an older adult. Treatments that are effective on younger people may be less predictable on older patients. Approximately one-third of older adults will experience decline in function during an acute care (i.e. hospital) stay. They are hospitalized three times as often as their younger counterparts. At discharge, one-third will never recover to their previous level of independence, increasing the risk of further decline in activities of daily living (ADL) (i.e. dressing, bathing, walking, eating). In the 65+ age group, 5% die during hospitalization, and 20-30% die within a year after discharge. As such it is imperative that all involved in their care are communicating and working together.

The Community Engagement team of VCH facilitated an innovative forum bringing together VCH staff and members of the Community Health Advisory Committees to discuss how to transform seniors care in acute circumstances through the active, deliberate partnering of patients and their family members with health professionals.

Dr. Janet McElhaney, Head of Providence Health Care, Division of Geriatric Medicine, states that one in three seniors who come into acute care are discharged at a higher rate of disability than before they were ill and 50% never recover at all. She believes that if we change the system 50% of that disability is preventable. Innovative changes that include leaning to practice collaboratively and involving the patient and their family as partners are needed to effect that change and improve outcomes.

Typically within health care, practice change in acute care has focused on clinical improvements and use of research based evidence to inform change. Dorothy’s Story is an innovative project that focused instead on the intrinsic value and effectiveness of the partnership between the senior patient, their family members and health professionals. By providing learning opportunities and training tools to seniors, family members and health professionals this project moves all involved from a typical model of professional directed care to an innovative approach in which senior patients, their family members and health professionals partner in the care of the senior.

Members of the public are concerned about the health care system and its ability to support delivery of services that meet the needs of individuals. Often there is fear associated with acute stays; hospitals can be intimidating for individuals. Seniors are especially vulnerable as a generation that concedes to the direction and control of health care professionals. When in hospital, individuals are unsure of their role within the health care system and are often not aware that they can play an active part in their recovery. Dorothy’s Story addresses this challenge by providing education and empowerment for senior patients and their families.

The Role of Public Participation: The project objectives included:

- Dialoguing with members of the public on ways to improve outcomes for seniors who are in hospital
- Determining priority initiatives to bring about a change in behaviour and current practice.
- Developing the priority initiatives into practical tools that support improved health outcomes and increase the recovery rate for seniors admitted to acute care
In order to understand the specific needs of seniors and their family members in acute care and how to improve their chances for recovery, the Community Engagement team in partnership with the Community Health Advisory Committees (CHAC’s) of VCH and the Transforming Seniors Care team of VCH, led the planning of an Open Space forum. This forum was facilitated by the members of the VCH CHAC’s and brought together CHAC members, VCH Transforming Seniors Care team members and senior VCH leaders.

Following the forum the distilled ideas formed the basis for further participation by staff and members of the CHAC’s to determine which of the ideas to implement. The powerful story shared by a CHAC member of her experience with her mother Dorothy, while in acute care, was selected by the planning team.

**Public Participation Methods:** In order to ensure all ideas were considered and no preset agenda confined or limited participation, this question was posed in an Open Space forum:
- How can the patient, family and public help to improve outcomes for seniors who come into the hospital?”

Once the purpose of our gathering was introduced and the process of Open Space explained, the participants were invited to name the issue they wished to discuss related to the broad topic. Each individual participant that identified a topic then assumed responsibility for posting the topic on our topic board, assigning it a space and time to meet, and then arrived at that space and time to begin the conversation, and take notes. There were 15 separate discussion groups and the feedback from each group was compiled into a proceedings document that was posted for all participants to view. The reports were then prioritized by the group to determine which should be addressed first by the Transforming Seniors Care team. Senior staff committed to taking these reports to their planning tables and involving the Community Engagement Team and members of the Community Health Advisory Committees in identifying the next steps.

In evaluating the consultation 100% of participants felt that the process was satisfying and 86% felt the objectives of the meeting were met. Many commented on their experience of the day:

“*I really enjoyed the open space technology. I didn’t think I would feel qualified to contribute but very quickly felt comfortable and valuable.*”

“*Open concept is very positive strategy and worked well for this forum.*”

“*Very well organized – nice that we were able to set agenda items that were directly of interest to the group.*”

“*Idea’s were falling from the sky like apples from a tree.*”

“*I appreciated the framework of the meeting, it allowed for opportunities of participation and being new, I thought I had nothing to offer and I discovered I did.*”

**Uniqueness of the Project:** This project represented the first time members of the public were invited to participate, in conjunction with senior leadership of Vancouver Coastal Health and Providence Health Care, in changing outcomes for patients in acute care. The purpose of the project was to improve care and outcomes for older adults, age 70+ years.
The goal is to reduce length of hospital stay, and to promote discharge home instead of other levels of care (i.e. assisted living or residential care).

Changing clinical practice should be easy, since all healthcare professionals want to do the best for the patients in their care. Unfortunately, heavy workload and competing priorities in the daily schedule of many health care providers create a disincentive to changing the way they have always delivered care. This project sought to engage staff and the public with the same message delivered in a way that would uniquely support each population group to utilize tools to effect change and to understand the benefit of partnering. The development of a resource package containing a DVD that related the story of Dorothy sought to engage viewers in a way that typical learning tools could not. By introducing the viewer to Dorothy Margaret Donald and sharing her journey through acute, viewers were compelled to consider the value of partnering in order to improve patient and family experience, and if possible also improve health outcomes for the elderly patient.

**Project Results:** The lead priority of establishing partnerships for care resulted in a resource package which consists of three DVD versions; a 2 minute public service announcement, a 5 minute public version and a 7 minute staff version. As well a brochure was developed by the planning team as a companion to the public version. For the staff version a case study was developed that provided greater details of Dorothy’s stay in acute care and the challenges she encountered. It asks staff to consider what their practice decisions would be at each stage of Dorothy’s care and to consider how the outcome may have been different if they had listened to what Dorothy and her daughter were telling them. For both the staff and the public versions, an evaluation form was developed to capture the viewer’s reaction to the story and how they will use the message and tools. Since the launch of Dorothy’s Story in January 2010, the resource package has been shared with 22 VCH teams, been added to the regional online orientation for all VCH staff, featured on the VCH public website for Seniors Week June 2010, distributed and viewed by 14 external agencies or groups within BC and other provinces, delivered in workshops by the Council of Senior Citizens Organizations, distributed through a public health care quality improvement website (Impact BC) and sent to VCH region libraries and community centres. Due to public demand, the DVD and brochure are being translated into simplified and traditional Chinese. Of particular note, the resource has now been seen and adopted by VCH’s Interprofessional Practice Councils (the groups that determine clinical practice guidelines for frontline staff who deal with patients); it is now mandatory viewing for our new employees as part of their online orientation process; it is also part of the BC Medical Association’s Practice Support Program for physicians – these are educational modules to support improved clinical practice.

As Dorothy’s Story continues to be shared throughout our area, we look to gathering feedback on the resource and how it has affected clinical practice for staff, and patient and family experience.

**Alignment with Core Values:**

*The public should have a say in decisions about actions that could affect their lives:* This project would not have happened without the experiential stories and input of members of the public. Vancouver Coastal Health sought the input of public to deal with a serious issue, the outcomes of care of seniors in hospital, which required public input to determine approaches that would indeed impact outcomes positively. Members of the
Public (CHAC’s) led the way to determine which topics would be discussed and which priorities to focus on going forward.

**Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision:** The reports generated from the open space forum were the basis for the project and directly influenced the decision to develop a resource that was infused with the public view that partnership in care was necessary to improve outcomes. The collective decision to use Dorothy’s story as the focus came from the public view that a personal story would demonstrate the journey of a senior through acute care in a way that would influence and challenge seniors, families and health professionals to change behaviour and practice.

**Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision-makers:** The commitment of VCH to improve care of seniors in hospital was the jumping off point for this project and the direction of the project was determined by members of the public together with VCH leadership. This collective decision to use Dorothy’s Story to affect change reaffirms the sustainability of the decision. The commitment of resources to carry the project to completion, resulting in a learning tool, further supports the sustainability of the decision to have a long term impact on behaviours of the public and practice of health professionals. Commitment to have the resource package available and accessible through a number of mechanisms, including easy access through the VCH internet (public package) and intranet (staff package) has further ensured sustainability and has resulted in a swell of interest with several public organizations and internal teams championing the message in Dorothy’s Story and taking it out to audiences throughout the VCH region and the province of British Columbia.

**Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision:** The members of the Community Health Advisory Committees are members of the public residing in VCH and are directly affected by the decision to improve outcomes for seniors in acute care. In fact many of the members had experiences they shared that directly influenced the direction of the project.

**Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate:** For the initial consultation the choice to use an open space method allowed members of the public to determine within the broader question what would be discussed. Subsequent decision on direction and prioritizing next steps came directly from participants who determined the lead initiative, the development of Dorothy’s Story. The decision to develop this as a tool, for learning and empowerment to change behaviour and practice of seniors, family members and health professionals, was directly influenced and guided by participants.

**Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way:** The care of seniors in acute care is a complex issue and the support of experts in the field was paramount in preparing participants to have understanding of the issues. Background documents were provided to all participants prior to the forum in order to share the necessary data and statistics to understand the depth and urgency of the issue. Participants were also provided with information about systems and practice protocols that are utilized in acute care that can unintentionally impact negatively on seniors care and their rate of recovery. This information was crucial for all participants as was the method of participation which allowed participants to freely share their own experiences which were integral to the discussion.
Public participation communicates to participants on how their input affected the decision: The forum activity was captured in a comprehensive report that gathered all discussions held that day and the subsequent priorities that participants determined should move forward. The report was sent to all participants and an invitation to continue as members of the working group, that would go on to develop the priorities, was extended to all participants. The working group continued to keep the larger group of participants informed at each stage of the project development. Participants and other members of the public who subsequently became members of the Community Engagement Advisory Network (combined network of initial Community Health Advisory Committee members) were kept involved as development took place and invited to participate in the process. Once the resource package was completed CEAN members were integral in determining where and how the package should be shared with the broader public.

Dorothy’s Story
Seniors, Families and Professionals
Partners in Care

This is a companion brochure for the Vancouver Coastal Health video – Dorothy’s Story

Dorothy’s journey through the health care system highlights why it is important for patients, families and professionals to become partners in care.

We can all learn from Dorothy’s story.

www.vch.ca/ce

http://www.vch.ca/media/CE_DorothysStory.pdf
INNOVATION AWARD THEME 2010:
ADDRESSING “WICKED PROBLEMS” THROUGH PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry title:</th>
<th>Empowering communities for greater participation in wetland conservation issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award category:</td>
<td>Innovation Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization name:</td>
<td>Nonyana Hoohlo &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominee’s name:</td>
<td>- Ms. Duduzile Hoohlo; - Ms. Nozipho Hoohlo-Nonyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information:</td>
<td>+266 2832 8672; <a href="mailto:admin@nhabiz.com">admin@nhabiz.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 participant references:</td>
<td>- Ms. Limphe Motanya: +266 2231 5710; <a href="mailto:motanyal@wetlands.org.ls">motanyal@wetlands.org.ls</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ms. Ntsatsi Sefali: +266 5890 6574; <a href="mailto:safalin@wetlands.org.ls">safalin@wetlands.org.ls</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 publications to be notified if our entry is selected:</td>
<td>- Destiny Magazine: +27 11 300 6700, <a href="mailto:destiny.editor@ndalomedia.com">destiny.editor@ndalomedia.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Eye Newspaper: +266 2232 1414, <a href="mailto:publiceye@telkomsa.net">publiceye@telkomsa.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visions Magazine: +266 2232 4031; <a href="mailto:info@visions.co.ls">info@visions.co.ls</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonyana Hoohlo & Associates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Empowering communities for greater participation in wetland conservation issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Millennium Challenge Account (MCA-Lesotho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Lesotho: Botha Bothe, Mokhotlong &amp; Quthing districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>Widespread overgrazing and degradation of alpine wetlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Training workshops, video presentations, poster presentations, indigenous products displays, role-playing exercises and lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Helping stakeholders understand the importance of wetlands made them render their support to the Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Project. Herders assumed the responsibility of protecting the rangeland. Livestock Owners and Traditional Doctors now understand that taking care of rangeland resources is not just the role of Rangers and Local Authorities (Chiefs and Community Councilors) but requires a collective effort from the entire community. Youth and Women’s groups also gained understanding on the concept of sustainable use of wetlands resources. Therefore, using a methodology that facilitated engagement with different stakeholder groups with varying literacy levels facilitated a move towards changes in the attitudes of the local communities towards the Wetlands Project. It is anticipated that this change in attitude will translate into changes in behavior and practices towards wetlands and natural resources in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>3 districts in northern Lesotho; 1 central district and 1 district in the southern parts of Lesotho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The Problem and Challenge

Describe the overall problem and challenge.

The United States of America, acting through the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), and the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho have entered into a Millennium Challenge Compact to the tune of US$362 million to help facilitate poverty reduction through economic growth in the Kingdom of Lesotho. Over half of the population in Lesotho is living below the poverty line, mainly due to unemployment and lack of alternative sources of income. Coupled with the foregoing, there is also chronic food insecurity because of, among others, continued land degradation and the impact of HIV and AIDS. Strategies to redress the food security challenges in Lesotho therefore involve facilitating effective and sustainable use of natural resources.

Based on the realization that the unique palustrine, lacustrine and riverine wetlands that Lesotho contains are facing numerous threats, the Wetlands Restoration and Conservation Project (WRCP) was initiated within the Department of Water Affairs. The Wetlands Project, which is a US$4.9 million component of the Lesotho Compact, is intended to help Lesotho address widespread overgrazing and degradation of these alpine wetlands. The Project thus essentially aims to support the Government of Lesotho’s National Poverty Reduction Strategy by identifying means of enhancing rural livelihoods through improved watershed management.

The Wetlands Project, through financial assistance from the Millennium Challenge Account-Lesotho (MCA-L), therefore, commissioned the training of communities within the Project areas of Koti-se-Phola (Mokhotlong), Lekhalo-la-Lithunya (Botha-Bothe and Letša-la-Letsie (Quthing) on the sustainable use of wetlands resources.

2. The Role of Public Participation

Briefly describe the role of public participation in addressing the problem or challenge.

Public participation was applied in this regard to address the challenge of food insecurity through improved land management. Thus, in the bid to curb land degradation and the resultant loss of income from livestock and livestock products, public participation was used to foster understanding among communities that there is a critical link between healthy rangeland and livestock products such as wool, milk and meat.

3. Public Participation Methods

Describe the public participation methods and techniques used in the project.

In order to foster meaningful participation and information sharing, the training program took into account the varying literacy levels of the participants. The method used to engage with the stakeholders was essentially through training workshops, which comprised different techniques such as video presentations, poster presentations, indigenous products displays, and role-playing, as summarised in Figure 1.
For the homesteads group, a manual containing some reading material and pictures was the main tool used. Considering that some of the participants could not read and write, the manual was supplemented with the use of posters displayed around the training venue, as well as video footages and sample displays of indigenous products. Herders’ training mainly used pictures and field visits to foster more meaningful participation, as literacy levels among the herders community are generally low.

4. Innovation

*Describe the innovative nature of the project in addressing the problem.*

- What made the strategy and/or approach unique? How was public participation used to address the complexity or difficulty of the problem?

Poverty is a multi-dimensional phenomenon that encompasses various factors such as unemployment, food insecurity, access to basic resources and many others. In Lesotho, poverty is more severe among *de facto* female-headed households. Therefore, the “wicked problem” being addressed in this project was multi-faceted, as it included social issues, economic challenges, environmental management and political challenges at the local governance level.
The training thus aimed to create awareness on the threats to wetlands and benefits of restoring them, with the view to ultimately changing people’s behavior, attitudes and practices towards proper land use, and securing support of all stakeholders. Since the principal aim of the training was to ultimately foster changes in attitudes, behavior and practices of the communities living within and around the Wetlands Project sites, the public participation approach was pitched at the empowerment level of the public participation spectrum, so that affected communities would ultimately become active and effective players in the overall attainment of the Wetlands Project objectives.

Since gender inequality can be a significant constraint to economic growth and poverty reduction, issues of gender equality were integrated into the project. Design of the training recognised that the differences between men and women are mediated by culture and social structure, such that such that female and male persons are taught what the appropriate behaviour and attitudes, roles and activities are for them. The strategy adopted therefore provided females an equal platform for participation as their male counterparts. While Lesotho is a patriarchal society, wherein most factors of production and livelihood are still in the hands of men, such that livestock is mostly owned by males, and herders are also males, as far as was reasonably possible, female representatives were invited to the training. In addition, gender distribution within the small group discussions also aimed to have representation of both males and females, with the training sessions promoting equitable participation of both gender groups.

**HIV AIDS** is another element of the “wicked problem" that was entrenched in this project. Due to the nature of their occupation, herders become a vulnerable group because they generally live on the fringe of general society and thus tend to have limited access to information and services. This state of affairs thereby renders herders vulnerable to HIV infection. The training thus encompassed HIV and AIDS issues, with the trainer frequently encouraging the participants to know their HIV status, just as much as they should know the status of their wetlands. The link between good health in an HIV positive person and the need for clean water provided by healthy wetlands was also highlighted.
The training also encompassed innovative tactics to include alternative livelihood strategies as a means of addressing poverty. Using the time trends developed by the participants, such as the one depicted in Figure 5, the trainer helped the participants realize that water resources are being depleted, which in turn is affecting the livestock that so many of them depend on. This then served as the basis for the participants identifying alternative means of livelihood that could be used to supplement the ailing livestock industry.

This approach is viewed as being innovative in the sense that the alternative livelihoods were not imposed on the communities, but they were rather encouraged to realize why they needed to come up with other strategies to improve their own livelihoods. Any viable options that will be pursued would thus stand a better chance of success and sustainability as there would be buy-in from the affected communities.

Furthermore, in line with the realization that intractable challenges require a change in the mindset of people, the training aimed to foster this much needed paradigm shift by instilling a sense of accomplishment in the selected participants. Most of them have very limited formal education or none at all, and awarding them with certificates of attendance had that added on effect of letting them know that they are capable of effecting positive change in their communities.

Their certificates were seen as very prized achievements that had empowered them to take a stand in mobilizing local chiefs, community councilors, livestock owners and all other stakeholders at the community level to implement strategies geared towards improved range management.
5. Project Results

Describe the project’s effectiveness in achieving results.

Helping stakeholders understand the importance of wetlands made them render their support to the Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Project. Herders assumed the responsibility of protecting the rangeland. Livestock Owners and Traditional Doctors now understand that taking care of rangeland resources is not just the role of Rangers and Local Authorities (Chiefs and Community Councilors) but requires a collective effort from the entire community. Youth and Women's groups also gained understanding on the concept of sustainable use of wetlands resources. Therefore, using a methodology that facilitated engagement with different stakeholder groups with varying literacy levels facilitated a move towards changes in the attitudes of the local communities towards the Wetlands Project. It is anticipated that this change in attitude will translate into changes in behavior and practices towards wetlands and natural resources in general.

Provide a brief summary of the project evaluation.

The numbers of villages in and around the Project sites that depend on the resources are approximately 72. The number of villages represented was 64 (89%) from 5 districts (Mokhotlong, Thaba-Tseka, Leribe, Botha-Bothe and Quthing). The District Project Officers (DPOs) worked very closely with the Consultant throughout the assignment in order to foster skills transfer to the counterpart personnel. In general, the trainees rated the training as satisfactory, with all the variables being rated as such by over 80% of the participants.

Provide evidence of any changes in public opinion, or widespread behavior or attitude change about the issue or problem attributable to the public participation project.

Prior to the training, the participants generally did not link the condition of rangelands with the health of their animals. This crucial relationship was somehow divorced in the minds of the livestock owners and herders, especially. The linkage between rangeland health and livestock health was a real eye opener to many of the trainees, as the training helped them realize that when rangelands (including wetlands) improve then their animal products will also improve.

The groups also came to a realization that animals and farming are not enough, and that their land is stressed. Awareness has therefore been created among the individuals that took part in the trainings on the threats to wetlands and benefits of restoring these habitats. The anticipation is that this awareness will ultimately translate into changes in people’s behavior, attitudes and practices towards proper land use. It is also anticipated that better understanding gained on the significance of the Wetlands Project towards improved health of the three Project site areas will foster greater support of all stakeholders towards the Project.

6. Alignment with Core Values

Describe how the IAP2 core values are reflected in the project outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAP2 Core Value</th>
<th>How reflected in the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The project ensured that those most affected by the Wetlands Project were involved by engaging with them to ensure that their input was taken into account when developing Project-implementation strategies, particularly as they relate to alternative livelihoods and future rangeland management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAP2 Core Value</td>
<td>How reflected in the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.</td>
<td>The training promoted sustainable decisions and ensured that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated. The Wetlands Project’s interests of improving the state of Lesotho’s degraded wetlands and addressing widespread poverty were clearly articulated. The communities were also provided with various platforms to air their needs, which mainly included improvement of the effectiveness of local governance structures and establishment of community-based income generating projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.</td>
<td>The training sought out and facilitated the involvement of those most affected by the Wetlands Project, who were mainly communities in the 5 districts within the vicinity of the three wetlands falling under the Project. Various community groups, including livestock owners, herders, traditional doctors, tourism groups, handicrafts groups and Community Liaison Workers were contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.</td>
<td>The information provided to participants supported or contributed to meaningful participation by ensuring that all the issues to be discussed were neatly compiled in a user-friendly manual for the literate participants. Illiterate participants were also considered through the use of other media such as video footages, pictures and posters, field visits and role-playing exercises. Meaningful participation was therefore promoted by acknowledging that there are different learning styles and literacy levels within the broad spectrum of participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Case Study Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The Evolution of a Public Participation Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Capital District Health Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Location | Halifax, Nova Scotia  
Population ~ 375,000 |
| Key Question/Problem | How do we create a public participation culture? |
| Sample Methods | Telephone surveys, community conversations, focus groups, web based questionnaires, stakeholder interviews, world café, U-Theory, graphic facilitation. |
| Results | Broad organizational commitment to public participation. Establishment of Citizen Engagement and Accountability Portfolio with a mandate to lead public participation. Development of engagement policy. Extensive citizen input in development of two pilot community based health teams and all (43) community health plan recommendations approved by Board of Directors. Development and implementation of leadership development program with over 300 formal leaders on self directed learning journeys. |
| Impact Level | High  
Urban, suburban and rural communities  
Halifax Regional Municipality and Town of Windsor |
| Time Frame | 2 years |
| People Engaged | 5000+ citizens, staff, volunteers and stakeholders |
| Web Link | [www.cdha.nshealth.ca](http://www.cdha.nshealth.ca) |
Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities

Our Promise – to be a world leading haven for people centered health, healing and learning. It’s a bold statement that requires courage, innovation and leadership to state publicly as an organizational mission. Turning the statement into reality requires another element, public participation.

Our Promise poses significant challenges and opportunities both internally and externally. A summary list is below.

Challenges
- Lack of citizen engagement policy
- Organizational commitment
- Staff resources and training
- Apathy and distrust of large organizations
- Vested interests, rigid hierarchy and cultural resistance to change

Opportunities
- Societal dissatisfaction with health system and community desire to be involved.
- Strong leadership belief that people need to be involved in decisions that impact them
- Development of engagement policy and portfolio focused on citizen engagement
- Dedicated staff resources and training opportunities
- Development of internal leadership development program – My Leadership
- Positive relationships in community via 7 Community Health Boards
- Community Health Plan recommendations aligning with multi year business planning process
- Introduction of Community Health Teams designed to help citizens improve self confidence in managing chronic health conditions

Rationale for Public Participation

In 2008, Capital Health was honoured to win an IAP2 Project of The Year award based on our work on Strategic Quest. During Quest, we learned how important it is to involve others in our decision making processes. In fact, some of the “Inconvenient Truths” we learned about ourselves as an organization is that we were perceived as not prepared to engage our partners and citizens and we were not empowering people or communities. This was a wake up call and those words did not fall on deaf ears.

As a result of Quest, we began to appreciate the depth to which patients, citizens, staff, volunteers and community stakeholders all have an interest in decisions which impact healthcare. We also learned we needed to continue our public participation efforts if we were to bring to life the input from the two thousand people who had a say in helping us shape our future through Strategic Quest.

Capital Health spends two million dollars a day to serve the healthcare needs of 375,000 people. We face huge challenges as we consider demographic pressures, poor health status of our population, aging infrastructure, and sustainable resource demands. Decisions need to be made and we can’t, and shouldn’t, make those decisions alone.
We realized we need to create a public participation culture throughout our organization if we are to create a different today and a better tomorrow.

Impact of Core Values on the Organization

In the past two years a number of public participation/citizen engagement initiatives were implemented, often simultaneously. Those initiatives were being guided by an emerging citizen engagement policy. The policy is currently in draft format and an engagement strategy to support the policy is underway. Formal presentation and adoption of the policy is expected early in 2011. The IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation and Core Values are strongly reflected in the draft policy.

A new portfolio, Citizen Engagement and Accountability, was created a year ago. With it came a new title for the senior executive in charge of the portfolio, Vice President, Citizen Engagement & Accountability. This creation reflects our organizational commitment to translate a vision and strategy into day-to-day operations. Capital Health’s commitment to public participation has been recognized at two national events. We were selected for two of the three presentations on citizen engagement at the National Healthcare Leadership Conference and one at the Canadian Public Health Conference.

Staff is becoming well versed in public participation values and methods. Six people have completed the IAP2 Certification program with another 12 receiving partial IAP2 training.

Involving citizens in decision making has become part of Capital Health’s Milestones for 2013. There are 6 specific citizen engagement goals with a focus on health status/increased wellness and prevention. (http://www.cdha.nshealth.ca/default.aspx?page=DocumentRender&doc.Id=8004)

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. A robust, statistically sound and public participation focused process was used to connect to our citizens in the development of our new community health plan – Our Healthy Future...Realizing Our Promise. 3000 citizens were surveyed in a statistically relevant survey stratified by age and gender. 1000 additional citizens participated in community conversations and stakeholder interviews. When analysis of the original survey results showed missing points of view, specific perspectives were intentionally sought out. It was important that our health plan reflect the diversity of our community. (http://www.cdha.nshealth.ca/default.aspx?page=DocumentRender&doc.Id=7491)

The design and development of Capital Health’s first-ever leadership development program was the result of contributions from hundreds of people inside and outside the organization. We believe the 11,000 people who work at Capital Health are all leaders and to further develop their leadership they need development opportunities that they have self-identified. We also believed that people outside Capital Health who are impacted by our leadership should have a say in our leadership program. The result is a transformational, self-directed learning journey that is grounded in our vision and definition of transformational leadership. Its early rates of satisfaction and sustainability remind us once again that people take responsibility for that which they’ve created.
Core Value 2 - Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.

While developing the new community health plan, staff and volunteers worked diligently to complete the plan to align with Capital Health’s business planning process. This was done to ensure approved recommendations would receive funding. All 43 recommendations were approved by the Board of Directors.

Community engagement for the Community Health Teams was undertaken prior to any staff or program decisions were made. Engagement findings directly informed staff complement and competencies along with setting program and service directions. New positions were created to accommodate community priorities.

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

Although Capital Health’s core business is not retail food service, providing food to our patients, staff and visitors is a significant cost to the organization. This service has been a loss of up to 1 million dollars a year. There was also concern about the type of food offered in our cafeterias. A citizen stakeholder group was formed to look at what’s possible in providing healthy food while considering financial sustainability. Citizens and staff worked together resulting in the elimination of deep fryers from our cafeterias, the reduction of salt in retail food prepared on site, and healthy food guidelines which hope to inform a formal policy in the future.

As result of our CEO’s breakfast engagement series with community leaders, it was identified that post-secondary institutions have both an opportunity and obligation to contribute to improved health. As a starting point we are collaborating to determine purchasing power with food suppliers to offer healthy food only options to our combined and captive audiences of 100,000+.

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

Patients and former patients have been involved intermittently in accreditation and quality improvement initiatives in the past. This year, an intentional public participation approach was developed to recruit and encourage the patient perspective. All forty accreditation/quality improvement teams now have interested patient voices helping to inform decisions. Orientation sessions were held at different times to accommodate and respect participant schedules.

Citizens were also invited to focus groups on Point of Care research. A series of conversations were held throughout Capital Health in urban, suburban and rural communities. Participants were informed about how research is conducted, and consulted on how potential research participants could be better informed and supported.

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

During the development of the Citizen Engagement and Accountability (CE&A) portfolio, external consultants were brought in to facilitate team building, development of a group purpose statement and guiding principles. Portfolio members were very active partners in that process, going beyond a traditional needs assessment role. Based on feedback...
from the portfolio, significant changes were often made to the design of the facilitated sessions creating a more meaningful experience.

Capital Health had an opportunity to partner with another health organization to apply for a significant grant to conduct a citizen engagement project. While this was exciting and important to both organizations, it became evident that the application process did not allow for a thorough and appropriate public participation process that would honour our values and principles of engagement. The decision to decline the opportunity had risks. However, it was a pivotal moment in standing up for what was right and ultimately defining a more authentic and collaborative relationship with the other health organization.

**Core Value 6 - Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.**
Community Health Boards and Community Health Teams both shared local survey results and other health data with citizens throughout their individual public participation initiatives. Participants were able to use the information to inform their decisions on priority health issues and service delivery options. Participants were able to contribute in person and online. In addition, volunteers who were involved in hosting small group discussions received basic facilitation training.

Capital Health has been using increased social media (Facebook and Twitter) to inform citizens on a number of issues. A dedicated email address (participate@cdha.nshealth.ca) has been set up to invite citizens to comment on specific issues and to express their interest in being involved in future decision making processes.

**Core Value 7 - Public participation communicated to participants how their input affected decision.**
Community Health Teams completed a full report of engagement findings and subsequent planning directions which was posted on the web. A summary document was posted online and distributed throughout the community (physician offices, community organizations, schools, etc.)

Community Health Boards (CHB’s) invested significantly in communicating and sharing the community informed results and recommendations in their health plan. Full reports and summary documents were mailed and emailed through the CHB distribution network, posted online, and made available through local libraries. A radio campaign throughout the health planning process invited citizens to community conversations and promoted the online posting of information. The Board of Directors response to the health plan is also being posted online with follow up community conversations being planned.

**Evaluation Against Core Values**
Capital Health has conquered many obstacles in the pursuit of developing a culture of engagement. People are noticing that Capital Health has opened the doors to listening - really listening.
After consulting various stakeholders in the community, their responses to our questions about our evolving culture of engagement were very encouraging. Excerpts from these conversations are below.

“Capital Health has broadened its understanding of the meaning and value of engagement, and its ability to do good work with more than lip service to the people who participate. They are taking input from citizens and connecting it to, and informing organizational goals. Capital Health is aware that engaging the public means it will be better able to deal with the demands on the health care system. There is a deeper quality of engagement that comes from a place of willingness to learn from it and how to do it well. Chris Power’s pragmatic messages on videos posted on the website and also in other presentations, speak to the long term commitment on engagement. It’s what enables the Citizen Engagement and Accountability Portfolio to do its work. There is still work to be done, but the level of commitment and support to engagement is evident, and I can’t see how it won’t transform the culture of engagement within the organization.”

(Kathy Jourdain: Consultant)

“I feel the last year in particular, more was accomplished by the chairmen of the Capital Health committees and committee members made a more concentrated effort in attending meetings; getting involved with committee work; getting to meet the public in the area covered by each board. I would like to see far more involvement with the public in general as so many are not even aware of the community health boards and that an individual’s opinion does count. If the community health board progresses in the upcoming year with the same determination as this past year I really feel much can be accomplished.” (Barb Mulrooney: Former Community Health Board member)

“Starting with Strategic Quest I was amazed at the genuine interest to invite anyone-public, physicians, internal system people, etc. to voice their opinion, help brainstorm solutions, etc. Capital Health seemed to bend over backwards to get you there. I have been following health since the early 90’s and it was the first time the provider, not Department of Health, was asking for input.” (Marjorie Willison: Community Stakeholder)

In 2009 an employee survey was conducted with staff, (similar to 2004 and 2006 surveys), and we were able to measure the perception of staff in regards to engagement and decision making. With a response rate of 32% (3531 respondents / 10,935 employees), 43% responded favorably to the statements that indicated they felt engaged and 47% responded favorably in regards to feeling they were consulted in decision making.

When measuring the knowledge of formal leaders of the organization about citizen engagement, we were excited with the results. 81% were aware of the newly created portfolio Citizen Engagement and Accountability, 77% were aware of specific citizen engagement targets in our 2013 Milestones and 19% are using P2 tools to inform/influence their work and decision making.

Guided by our draft engagement policy and the IAP2 Spectrum and Core Values, we are going to great lengths to involve the public in many areas of our work. We know it’s having an impact. We are continually learning and trying new ways to involve citizens in what we do. There is tremendous commitment to change the way we think about public participation to create a better today and a different tomorrow.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>City of Austin: Planning and Development Review Department, Communications &amp; Public Information Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Throughout Austin, Texas, USA, and its extraterritorial jurisdiction, with a total population of approximately 1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>What aspects of our life today in Austin do we value and wish to retain and enhance? What are our aspirations for the future of Austin? What are we willing to do to achieve this future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>“Speak Week” mobile kiosks; “Meeting-in-a-Box” portable community conversations; interactive exercises to plan future growth; survey; task force meetings; blogs; web chats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Thousands of Austinites have helped shape the future of the City, including historically underserved and excluded populations. Ultimately, the Imagine Austin comprehensive plan will provide a guide for the management of change, a reflection of community values and aspirations, the foundation for policies, strategies, and actions, the community's to-do list, and a catalyst for community consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Metropolitan city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>About 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>&gt;10,000 citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.imagineaustin.net">http://www.imagineaustin.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge
The City of Austin, Texas is expected to grow dramatically in the next generation—doubling in population and adding a comparable level of jobs within roughly the same geographical borders that currently exist for the City. That underscored the critical need for an update to the City’s comprehensive plan for managing growth. The current general plan for Austin was adopted in 1979. In 2006, the City Auditor called attention to the lack of coordination in the City’s policies for growth and development. The first result of the auditor’s report was an interim update to Austin Tomorrow, recognizing all of the city policies on growth and development adopted since 1979. After that interim plan was completed, the Austin City Council concluded that an entirely new comprehensive plan was needed, known as Imagine Austin. It would be an expression of the Austin community’s shared values, aspirations, and vision for the future; the policy foundation for decision-making by the City and its partners to proactively manage growth and change; and the City’s “to-do” list defining a citywide action program and priorities to be implemented over time to achieve the vision.

Although the initial 1979 plan contained themes that are as relevant today as they were in the 1970s, such as neighborhood and environmental protection, much of the plan is outdated and a product of the time in which it was written. In addition, since the plan’s initial adoption, a number of issues have emerged that were not foreseen in the 1970s. Homelessness, increased traffic suggestion, climate change, and a critical shortage of affordable housing are among the issues of concern for current and future Austinites.

The Role of Public Participation

Build understanding of the project and credibility for the process.
Strategy: A variety of outreach and educational tools will help create public understanding of the planning process and the important role the community will play in that process. Credibility will be built by a number of actions, including program transparency, effective branding, community ambassadors (e.g., Comprehensive Plan Citizens Advisory Task Force members, community leaders, and even local celebrities), media coverage, and an obvious connection between input and outcomes.

Provide numerous and varied opportunities for public participation and input.
Strategy: In order to maximize participation, and meet the community at times and places convenient to their schedules, the program will offer a variety of participation methods, hold events in geographically diverse locations, partner with diverse individuals and organizations to expand opportunities to participate, and encourage community members to engage with one another. Dialogue will be decentralized.

Understand the needs and interests of the City’s diverse constituency.
Strategy: Attention will be given to both those traditionally involved audiences as well as to groups who are traditionally less involved. While typically underrepresented groups can be challenging to reach, there are tools built into the planning process to ensure diversity of input. Citizens representing these groups, including those who live in Austin’s extraterritorial jurisdiction, young adults, ethnic and racial minorities, and those without a college education will be recruited to participate in focus group discussions. Additionally, these groups will have representation on the Comprehensive Plan Citizen’s Advisory Task Force, and community leaders within these populations will be recruited to serve as “relayers,” spreading the word about public participation opportunities and collecting hard-copy comment forms at meetings and events.
Carefully consider input and show a clear connection between input and outcomes.

Strategy: A well-structured system of documentation and transparency will keep the public informed about the development of the plan as it unfolds, using regularly updated printed materials, social media and the Imagine Austin website (www.imagineaustin.net) to account for how public input is collected and how that input is used in the subsequent phase of the planning process. Graphic representations of the process and timeline will be displayed in public facilities and online allowing the community to tangibly see how the plan evolves.

Public Participation Methods
On August 5, more than 70 Austinites attended a Participation Workshop, to help City staff and the consultants develop a Participation Plan. The Workshop was conducted as a "conversation cafe," where participants worked around tables in small groups on four questions, changing tables and who they were working with for each question.

Participants were asked to brainstorm answers to each question on small sticky notes, then decide on two priority answers to represent the table as a whole. Any answers that were not included as priorities, but which participants nevertheless felt were important could be marked with a star. This produced three levels of priorities.

"Who's Here?" posters helped track demographic information about who was participating. Based on the results, the Participation Workshop was followed by two focus groups, scientifically selected to engage groups who were not involved at the Workshop.

The Participation Plan was developed based on the results of the Workshop and focus groups, as well as comments from the public from earlier in the process.

The City Council also created a Comprehensive Plan Citizens Advisory Task Force to:

- Work with the consultant team and City staff to help all members of the community articulate the common values that will guide Austin into the future
- Champion the planning process as an ongoing venue for reaching out to Austin and bringing its many perspectives together where they can amicably engage one another
- Assess how well all parts of the community are participating
- Provide community contact to bring concerns about the plan direction and content to the consultant team and City staff; and
- Collaborate with the consultant team and City staff in assessing common ground based on community input.

Out of more than 230 applicants, 33 were appointed by Council, representing diverse areas of the City, cultures, socioeconomic status, professional background and other important demographics.

Imagine Austin formally launched the public process at a Kick-Off Open House.
Austinites who attended browsed through 10 booths’ worth of information and input activities, while listening to great music (a key “identifier” in Austin’s social culture), studying Austin’s history and geography, and describing their Austin of the future. More than 230 members of the public, plus another 40 children (mostly lower-income) from Austin recreation centers, attended the October 12 public kick-off of Imagine Austin. The evening included 10 information and activity booths, including a trivia game for kids. We had a fun night of music and planning, and laid a foundation for the first Community Forum Series and community Vision for Austin’s future.

The first task in Phase 2 was the first Community Forum Series, consisting of six public meetings held across the City the week of November 9. The input gathered at these meetings, as well as the first citizen survey and Meeting-in-a-Box, served as the foundation for the Vision, to guide the development of the rest of the plan.

The first Imagine Austin Community Forum Series was held November 9 - 12, 2009, and consisted of six meetings in different locations and times. After a brief introduction by the consultants from WRT, more than 300 participants worked in small groups to identify the things that make Austin great, and that need to be preserved or enhanced in the future; the things that Austin must overcome as it moves into the future; and the vision of what Austin would be like in the future, if the results from these meetings result in positive changes.

The Kick-Off Survey was launched on October 13, 2009, (after the Kick-Off Open House) and was kept open to the public through March 1. Surveys were available online and at Austin Public Libraries.

The Meeting-in-a-Box was introduced following the first Community Forums in November 2009. In paper or digitally, meeting hosts were provided with all the materials necessary to host the equivalent to a break-out session from the November public meetings, for five to 10 friends, coworkers, neighbors, or whomever else. These mini-meetings resulted in “visioning parties” across the city – in homes, places of worship and workplaces – that have been critical to the project’s success thus far. See the Meeting-in-a-Box contents.

Both the survey and the Meeting-in-a-Box were designed to follow the questions asked in the first Community Forums: What are Austin's strengths? What are Austin's challenges? Tell us what Austin is like in 2039 if this plan achieves everything you hope it does.

Both of these tools allowed us to target parts of the Austin community who did not attend the Open House or Community Forums. In particular, dozens of Meetings-in-a-Box were distributed within the Asian community, and volunteers took meetings in a box to homeless shelters, drug/alcohol rehab facilities, and community college campuses. This helped ensure that Imagine Austin reflects the broad Austin community. At the January meetings of the Citizens Advisory Task Force and Comprehensive Plan Committee, staff presented a mid-point review of the demographics of Community forum participants, survey respondents, and Meeting-in-a-Box participants, noting that the Asian-American results are an example of the success of this strategy. Results from the survey and Meetings-in-a-Box helped shape A Vision for Austin's Future, providing direction for the rest of the Comprehensive Plan, in order to ensure that all of the elements of the plan, such as land use, transportation, and health and human services, are working toward a common goal. The Vision statement is based
on input gathered during Community Forum Series #1; draft components of the Vision are being reviewed by the public during Community Forum Series #2. **Read about the role of the Vision and how it was created, then review the draft components.**

**Community Forum Series #2**

The second round of Community Forums consisted of four meetings, in two parts: (1) a review of the Components of a Vision Statement and (2) a chip exercise, where participants allocated Austin's future growth across the city and in different forms. In addition to the meetings, a second round of surveys and Meetings-in-a-Box occurred.

The second Imagine Austin Community Forum Series was held in Spring 2010, and consisted of six chip game sessions at four locations. Participants rated components of a Vision statement for Austin's future. After a brief introduction by the consultants from WRT, 200 participants completed 29 chip exercise maps, showing where new population and jobs should be located in Austin. Those maps, in turn, have generated four “growth scenarios” that citizens will subsequently discuss and vote on as the foundation for the Imagine Austin plan.

In addition to the on-site forums, **the City of Austin launched a unique project known as “Speak Week,” where staff and volunteers took dozens of mobile kiosks to high-traffic locations across the city to receive public input. Nearly 1,000 people visited the kiosks, where they answered questions about where to target future growth in Austin by residential type (single-family detached homes, large multifamily condominium buildings, etc.) and how to manage increased traffic by designing their ideal transportation corridor (for cars, transit, bikes, pedestrians, etc.). This endeavor marked the first time the City of Austin had taken community engagement “on the road” to discover the thoughts of citizens disinclined to attend a forum but still interested in giving their input.**

In addition, more than 1,500 citizens received information about the Imagine Austin planning process and gave input through a “Speakers Bureau.” City of Austin personnel visited numerous community groups to share how the process works, the plan’s significance, and how citizens can contribute to it.

**Uniqueness of the Project**

As described above, the input of more than 10,000 citizens over the course of less than a year makes the Imagine Austin project uniquely successful.

Public participation ensured that the elements of the Imagine Austin plan, including the Vision and growth scenarios, truly reflect the diverse interests among Austin citizens. The unique methods utilized—especially Speak Week and Meeting-in-a-Box—took the plan into the community, reaching previously excluded audiences like the lowest-income citizens, minority communities, high school and college students, and the like. The open house kickoff event also deviated from the traditional community meeting concept to create “safer” and more inviting participation opportunities(where citizens were not intimidated from giving input; where citizens of all ages could participate; and where citizens could sense, in tangible and visible ways, the assets and challenges of Austin.

To a great extent, this project helped address a problem that faces the field of public participation: including the traditionally excluded. Too often, public participation techniques favor well-educated, well-connected citizens with easy Internet access and
high levels of literacy and prior engagement. Imagine Austin has placed a high priority on reaching previously excluded populations by lowering or removing barriers to entry—empowering staff and volunteer facilitators with mobile strategies that don’t require literacy, lots of time, or lots of background in the subject.

In so doing, the project has both made good use of modern technology through a robust website and social media, including live web chats, while at the same time taking a “back to basics” approach to reach people face-to-face in their part of Austin, rather than expecting their attendance at a specially called forum.

**Project Results**
Imagine Austin has achieved tremendous results in engaging a wide, diverse cross-section of Austin citizens. This summary provides additional background on results achieved and how the project has been evaluated. Built into the public participation planning process are a variety of mechanisms to monitor the efficacy of outreach and participation tools. Feedback from these mechanisms can be used to alter methods as necessary to bridge gaps, ensure meaningful input, and maximize reach and diversity. The modular design of the Participation Plan allows for the flexibility to adapt to feedback and refine methods to elicit more salient results. Monitoring and feedback mechanisms include: feedback from the Comprehensive Plan Citizen Advisory Task Force, feedback from partners, evaluation forms collected at all public events, media coverage, and the staff team’s self-evaluation.

**Alignment with Core Values**
As described above, the project has been designed to ensure that all Austinites can engage during one or more phases of this process—both by attending events in person, attending mobile events in the community, connecting through social media, completing a survey, and the like. The vast portfolio of public participation opportunities has ensured that those most affected by the Imagine Austin plan have been involved.

In terms of how the outcome of the project was influenced by the public’s contributions, The Participation Plan was developed based on the results of the Workshop and focus groups, as well as comments from the public from earlier in the process. The Participation Plan laid out, first, the overall structure for taking public input in creating Imagine Austin. Second, the Participation Plan expressed community expectations for the process. Last, the Plan detailed the range of tools to be used in engaging the public, both for outreach and involvement.

The input gathered at community meetings, as well as the first citizen survey and Meeting-in-a-Box, served as the foundation for the Vision, which will guide the development of the rest of the plan.

The input gathered at second phase community meetings, Speak Week, and Meeting-in-a-Box, has helped create growth scenarios which will form the foundation of the land use plan.

Frequent public updates, including televised meetings of City Council, media stories, and website and social media notes have communicated to the public through charts and graphs the ways in which their input has affected the creation of the Imagine Austin plan.
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## Case Study Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Montgomery College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Montgomery College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rockville, Maryland, student enrollment 60K; 1500+ employees; 160+ countries represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>What is Montgomery College’s social impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>25 Discovery Dialogues/Focus Groups and Social Impact Survey. Taken together 1,200 students, faculty, and staff participated in the dialogues and the survey and submitted just over 3,700 responses to the survey questions. Both the dialogues and survey were designed to learn about all the wonderful things already happening at Montgomery College that should be acknowledged, celebrated, and promoted in the area of social responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A comprehensive, inclusive and deliberative public participation process; final report with recommendations; promotional (in-house designed) Social Responsibility and Public Policy Authentic Dialogue Lifesavers candy; and Social Impact promotional DVD produced. The public participation process discovered and acknowledged and the DVD demonstrates and celebrates that through faculty, staff, administrators, and students the College’s social impact is broad and far-reaching inside and outside of the classroom, within Montgomery County, throughout the region, and across the globe. Several College units are proactively engaging, both formally and informally, in a variety of activities and projects with more than 150 nonprofit civic and community-based organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>College, County, Region, State and Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>1,200 plus faculty, staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.montgomerycollege.edu/Departments/OED/responsibility.htm">www.montgomerycollege.edu/Departments/OED/responsibility.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T9mRKSmt2I">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T9mRKSmt2I</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

A core value inherent in Montgomery College’s mission statement, “We are the community’s college...” is its commitment to being a socially responsible corporate citizen within our local and global communities. Montgomery College’s social impact is mission driven and rooted in a philosophy and commitment of relating to and with our communities to pursue what is universally possible together for the public good. However, there has been no institutional evidence of or participatory process to discover and determine the College’s social impact footprint. As a result, members of the internal College community have been on an introspective and reflective yearlong journey to discover, identify, and understand its social impacts. Through an inclusive and deliberative process, the College sought to discover answers to the question—what is Montgomery College’s social impact?

The Role of Public Participation

The role of the public participation process, through Discovery Dialogues, was to provide an inclusive and participatory internal mapping process of social responsibility here at Montgomery College. Among the goals and objectives of the Discovery Dialogues were to (a) gain insights and perspectives about social responsibility that reflect the social impacts, values, and interests of the College’s many and diverse internal stakeholders and (b) determine the strategic and tactical next steps for exploring and implementing a comprehensive College plan of action for ensuring sustainability. Moreover, the public participation process was designed and implemented to (a) discover and appreciate what we already are doing at Montgomery College that currently demonstrates the scope and depth of our social impact and commitment to social responsibility and public policy; (b) dream and imagine together what Montgomery College might do to demonstrate the scope and depth of our social impact and our commitment to social responsibility and public policy; and (c) determine and design what needs to be done further to demonstrate the scope and depth of our social impact and commitment to social responsibility and public policy.

The College established a Social Responsibility Internal Advisory Committee to guide the public participation process. The committee was comprised of a diverse cadre of faculty, staff and students who worked to identify an inclusive and open pedagogical and public participation process to discover the principles of excellence that the Montgomery College community values for embedding a culture of social responsibility. The College engaged our students, faculty, and staff in a public participation process through a series of Discovery Dialogues and a Social Responsibility Survey. A cadre of 42 faculty, staff, and student volunteers was trained to facilitate and record the Discovery Dialogues. Both at the College and within Montgomery County, this cadre of volunteers was representative of the College’s diverse cultural and ethnic communities and diverse languages. Since Montgomery College is one of the most diverse colleges in the country, the Social Responsibility Internal Advisory Committee determined that it was important to identify a multicultural and multilingual team to facilitate the Discovery Dialogues.

Public Participation Methods

A key to determining the College’s social impact was identifying its relationships and partnerships with and services to the community. Within the context of our social impact, this is the first time that our College community members have taken the time to specifically and comprehensively identify the types and varieties of its community relationships, community
partnerships, and services within the community. This journey has been an introspective prerequisite for developing and prioritizing a comprehensive College plan of action to successfully achieve an institutional agenda for social responsibility. Within an eight-month period, the College committee conducted 25 public participation dialogues that were hosted across the College to facilitate the participation and input of faculty, students, and staff; distributed a paper and Web survey; and reviewed institutional documents and reports. Although the committee recognizes that there are generally no monolithic perspectives even among affinity groups, the dialogues were set up exclusively for faculty, students, staff, and administrators groups. Taken together, roughly 1,200 students, faculty, and staff participated in the dialogues and the survey and submitted just over 3,700 responses to the survey questions. Both the dialogues and survey were designed to learn about all the wonderful things already happening at Montgomery College that should be acknowledged, celebrated, and promoted in the area of social responsibility.

Of the Social Responsibility Surveys that were sent out, 472 students, 302 faculty, 291 staff, and 37 administrators replied. Student voices constituted a significant portion of the survey participants—43% of the sample. The next largest participant group was that of our faculty, comprising 27% of the sample. These faculty participants represented 24% of the College faculty roster. Staff participants were 26% of the sample. These staff participants represented 22% of the College full-time staff. Finally, administrator participants constituted roughly half of the College administrators. The dialogue and survey participant responses provide a seminal picture of the College’s current level of commitment to creating a positive social impact, as well as the challenges that lie ahead to sustain the College’s social impact footprint. Figure 1: Discovery Dialogue Questions identifies the seven dialogue questions; Figure 2: Social Impact Survey Questions identifies the six survey questions.

**Figure 1: Discovery Dialogue Questions**

1. How is social responsibility a part of Montgomery College’s mission and educational purpose?
2. What does social responsibility mean to you?
3. How do you improve the quality of life for your community and beyond?
4. How does your organizational unit demonstrate commitment to social responsibility? (Example: The Rockville Campus MC Green Student Club and the Facilities Energy Management unit promote ecological consciousness and responsibility.)
5. How does Montgomery College educate students about/for social responsibility?
6. How do campus and community partnerships promote the cause of social responsibility? (Please share examples of ways in which MC works with others.)
7. What inspires you to participate in socially responsible activities?

**Figure 2: Social Impact Survey Questions**

1. What does being socially responsible mean to you?
2. What inspires you to participate in socially responsible activities or to volunteer?
3. How is social responsibility a part of Montgomery College’s mission?
4. If you are employed at Montgomery College, how does your department demonstrate its commitment to being socially responsible? (Example: The Rockville Campus MC Green Student Club and the Facilities Energy Management unit within the Office of Facilities promote ecological consciousness and responsibility.)
5. In what ways does Montgomery College educate students/employees about being socially responsible?
6. In what ways do Montgomery College campus and community partnerships promote the cause of being socially responsible? (Please share examples of ways in which MC works with others.)
Uniqueness of the Project

There was no specific funding targeted to achieve the goals and objectives of this institutional project. Notwithstanding, this project represents the undocumented collaborative spirit and commitment of members of the entire College community, through their individual and collective volunteerism and service, to discover and understand the College’s current level of commitment to creating a positive social impact, as well as identify the challenges that lie ahead to sustain that commitment. This is the first time that our College has taken the time to specifically come together, as a community and through a participatory process, to comprehensively identify the types and varieties of its community relationships, community partnerships, and services within the community. The Social Responsibility Internal Advisory Committee’s Discovery Phase process generated notable interest and enthusiasm among the members of the internal College community. There were also frequent expressions of appreciation for facilitating a process that invited open dialogue about the College’s social responsibility activities and social impact.

A uniqueness of the project includes the creation of a promotional Social Responsibility and Authentic Dialogue Lifesaver candy; the candy wrapper motto states Service and Authentic Dialogue Are Lifesavers. The candy wrapper also lists as its active ingredients: Inviting The Broadest Participation, Listening, Communicating Openly, Seeking Individual Understanding, Creating New Public Knowledge, Genuinely Impacting or Influencing the Outcomes, and Judging Our Results Together. Another uniqueness is the production of a social impact promotional DVD that features the College faculty, staff and students engaged in service, describing the importance of demonstrating social responsibility through public participation, dialogue, service and volunteerism.

This public participatory process and its results are serving as a model that is currently being replicated by other Maryland community colleges and other higher education institutions.

Project Results:

As a result of an inclusive and deliberative process, the Social Responsibility Internal Advisory Committee discovered that through our faculty, staff, administrators, and students the College’s social impact is broad and far-reaching inside and outside of the classroom, within Montgomery County, throughout the region, and across the globe. Many of the College’s social responsibility-related activities are decentralized. However, a survey revealed that our faculty, staff, students, and several College units are proactively engaging, both formally and informally, in a variety of activities and projects with more than 150 nonprofit civic and community-based organizations. Furthermore, the relationships developed with these non-profit civic and community-based organizations are critical markers of Montgomery College’s social impact footprint, and providing public space to the community has distinguished the College as a generous corporate citizen within Montgomery County. Collectively, these activities and projects connect the College and community and positively impact the quality of life within our diverse and global communities. Much of this activity happens, however, with considerable anonymity, without faculty and staff incentives or rewards, and without faculty and staff expectation of formal recognition from the College. This activity seemingly occurs because there is a stewardship of service culture at the College among our faculty, staff, and students; and their common goals are helping others, enriching the community, and thinking of and acting for the greater good.

The social impact of the College’s faculty, staff, and student activities and projects are observable through multiple lenses, including intellectual, environmental, social, cultural, health
and wellness, political, geo-political, scientific, volunteerism and service, community/civic engagement, and financial. These activities and projects epitomize our internal College community’s unwavering personal and professional commitment to advancing social justice, building stronger communities, and championing service. The College’s social impact has positively distinguished this institution and its relationships with the community. Moreover, these activities and projects are not only cornerstones of the College’s mission, but also exemplary examples of the College and community’s commitment to collaboratively create occasions for authentically engaging to make decisions about the world we share—as it will be, not as it is.

Through the dialogues and survey, members of the College community offered a range of perspectives about Montgomery College’s social responsibility activities and social impacts. Among the committee’s key findings is the fact that the faculty, staff, students, and several College units are already engaged in a variety of socially responsible activities, although much of the College’s social responsibility-related commitments are decentralized. Faculty and staff favor an organizational structure that centralizes, reports, and assesses the College’s social impacts and socially responsible activities, projects, and programs. Most members of the internal College community believe that the College has an obligation to make a social impact that reaches far beyond the classroom, but there is a wide array of socially responsible activities and philosophies at the College.

A report was prepared and a promotional DVD produced that summarizes Montgomery College’s internal community’s voice about our social impacts, and the report provides recommendations that represent some standards of excellence for sustaining and expanding the College’s social impact footprint. The data used for the report are from the Social Responsibility Discovery Dialogues, Social Responsibility Survey, and institutional reports and documents. The committee recognizes the Discovery Phase and this report as the beginning of an authentic engagement process that will allow all of us, working together, to continue formulating and implementing ideas that will enhance the College’s social impact.

In brief, there were 12 key findings from the Discovery Dialogues, Social Responsibility Survey, and a review of institutional documents and reports.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Although social responsibility language is not in the current College mission statement, the College is already engaged in a variety of socially responsible services and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The faculty, staff, students, and several College units are engaging, both formally and informally, in a variety of activities and projects with more than 150 nonprofit civic and community-based organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The full-time faculty are more engaged in volunteerism activities and reported more volunteerism hours per month than any other group surveyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The words most frequently used by members of the College community to define social responsibility are “helping others,” “community enrichment,” and “thinking of and acting for the greater good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Much of the College’s social responsibility-related commitments are decentralized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>There is no specific College policy for employees supporting or advocating volunteerism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The faculty and staff participants favor an organizational structure that centralizes, reports, and assesses the College’s social impacts and socially responsible activities, projects, and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>There is a wide array of socially responsible activities and philosophies at the College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Faculty, staff, and students do not confine their involvement in socially responsible activities to those organized and hosted solely by the College, nor do they confine their involvement to formally organized activities or community-based organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Most members of the internal College community believe that the College has an obligation to make a social impact that reaches far beyond the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Recycling or other acts of environmental and ecological stewardship are the most commonly known and cited acts of the College-instituted socially responsible activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. The College has not broadly targeted communication about its social impact and socially responsible activities, projects, and programs. As a result, there is limited individual and collective knowledge among faculty, staff, and students about the College’s social impacts or opportunities for participation in socially responsible activities and volunteerism.

Alignment with Core Values:

The theme for the 2010 Innovation Award is: “Addressing wicked problems through public participation.” As such, the problem of understanding Montgomery College’s Social Impact was structured keeping in mind the necessity of utilizing various public participation methods. These methods required discovery dialogues, thoughtful listening tours and the gathering of data across the college community. The strategy employed took into account that no one method or one population within the College could have effectively addressed the problem and thus, a very comprehensive and collaboration approach was best suited for the ability to answer the question. The results of the study bear out the significance of total inclusion of the College and the College community. Meaningful and thoughtful deliberative dialogues suggest that a complex organization can indeed address difficult social questions.

Several of the IAP2’s core values are reflected in the purpose and process of this project. As an authentic engagement practice, the Discovery Dialogues were planned and the survey structured with an understanding that there is no prevailing self-interest that determines an institution’s best direction and strategy. Therefore the dialogues and survey were designed as an inclusive process and based on the premise that no one individual, institution, or organization has all the information or facts about an issue, concern, or strategy. Fundamental to enhancing the nature of the Montgomery College internal community’s discourse about social responsibility, the dialogue participants had an opportunity to:

- Share their personal stakes (i.e., self-interest and what is of value to them) about social responsibility and the College’s social impact and their preferences for a specific direction or policy direction
- Discuss the benefits, opportunities, challenges, and consequences of the College’s current approaches to social responsibility with other members of the College community
- Identify common interests or common directions for sustaining the College’s social impact through social responsibility activities, projects, and programs

The dialogue and survey process was used to seek understanding, create new public knowledge, and explore with the College community decisions that must be considered regarding social responsibility and sustaining social impact. A final report was prepared that prominently features the voices and perspectives of the participants; communicating the College social responsibility mission and social impact as a strategic priority in the College’s public communications (e.g., Web sites, public letters, press releases, official publications) has been implemented; and a social impact promotional DVD featuring the College faculty, staff and students engaged in service has been produced. The public participation process and allowing participants to define and describe the importance of social responsibility further legitimize the authenticity of the College’s interests in listening to and learn from it constituents.
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Case Study Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Our Health. Our Perspectives. Our Solutions. Establishing a Common Health Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>The New Brunswick Health Council (NBHC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Province of New Brunswick, Canada (Pop: 750,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>The NBHC is mandated by the Government of New Brunswick to formulate recommendations to the Minister of Health on how to strengthen the province’s health system. It aims to formulate recommendations that respond to the needs and expectations of citizens and help ensure the system’s long-term sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Three successive phases of public dialogues brought together citizens (randomly recruited) and health system stakeholders, in four regions of the province. The same participants attended all three phases so as to refine their understanding of the issues and options, learn from each other’s experiences, and build on the work of the previous phases. Phase I (Perspectives) and Phase II (Solutions) were highly generative in nature, and designed to seek participants’ informed perspectives on the current and desired state of the health system. Phase III (Common Ground) was a deliberative dialogue during which participants engaged in choicework to prioritize the ideas generated in Phases I and II. The work of each phase was supported by detailed Conversation Guides, which provided a wealth of accessible information on the New Brunswick Health System (e.g., structure, costs, services), as well as a detailed summary of the findings from previous phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Clearly articulated set of guiding values, principles and priorities that form the basis of a common health vision for the province, and which rest on a strong, province-wide consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>High – Engagement outcomes are shaping the NBHC’s workplan for the next year and serving as the foundation for its recommendations to the Minister of Health. Initial reactions from government officials to the initiative, as well as participant evaluations, have been extremely positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>January – August 2010 (Engagement Period: March-June 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Over 300 citizens, representatives of various community and public interest groups, health and wellness managers, academics, health professionals, provincial government representatives and municipal officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nbhc.ca">www.nbhc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Public Participation Challenges and Opportunities

Created during the 2008 provincial health reform as an independent and objective organization, the New Brunswick Health Council (NBHC) is mandated to measure, monitor and evaluate population health and health service delivery in the province of New Brunswick. This involves an obligation to provide regular and accurate updates on the province’s state of health and on the health care system’s performance, and to formulate recommendations to the Health Minister.

However, the creation of the NBHC was also driven by the recognition that citizens are the health care system’s most important stakeholders. As such, the organization was also mandated to make citizen engagement a core part of its work, with a view to engaging New Brunswickers in a meaningful and ongoing dialogue on population health and health care.

The NBHC sees citizen engagement as a way for people to have a say in how health policy is shaped in New Brunswick: this requires that citizens be well informed about the issues, and that they be provided with meaningful opportunities to share their views. It also requires that governments be open and attentive to the voices of citizens. For the NBHC, this means reporting to New Brunswickers on the performance of the health system in a systematic and transparent manner, seeking their informed input on the policies that guide the health system and affect the health of the province’s population, and ensuring that these perspectives are duly reflected in its recommendations to the Minister of Health and health system partners.

2. Rationale for Public Participation

In 2008, the New Brunswick Government published a 4-year provincial health plan (2008-2012), in which it clearly expressed the view that the province’s health system needed to become a “citizen-centered health system,” that is to say: “A system that meets the needs and preferences of individuals and communities, rather than expecting people to adapt to what the system has to offer.”

Our Health. Our Perspectives. Our Solutions. was the NBHC’s first large-scale citizen engagement initiative, and its purpose was to inform the NBHC’s recommendations to the Minister and health system partners on what citizens believe is required to achieve this vision of a citizen-centered health system.

It consisted of a three-phased process, whereby:

---

1. "Citizen-centered health system."
• **Phase I** focused on exploring the perspectives and concerns of citizens with respect to the current state of New Brunswick’s health system, with a view to identifying what they see as the system’s greatest strengths and most important challenges, and what they would value most in an “ideal” health system.

• **Phase II** looked to the future, to envision the kind of health care system New Brunswickers want to have, and identify possible solutions to the challenges identified in Phase I. Participants explored where and by whom health care, services and supports should be delivered; what the health system should do more of and less of; and what incentives and supports might incite New Brunswickers to make healthy/healthier choices.

• **Phase III** explored the areas of common ground and points of divergence that emerged in the first two phases, and prioritized the ideas that emerged from Phases I and II, in order to identify elements of a common vision for health care that can in turn inform and guide decision and policy making.

The work of each phase was supported by detailed *Conversation Guides*, which provided a wealth of accessible information on the New Brunswick Health System (e.g., structure, costs, services), as well as a detailed summary of the findings of previous phases.²

The NBHC’s three-phase approach brought together a mix of citizens and stakeholders and was designed to provide them with an opportunity to engage in an “iterative” learning and dialogue process: inviting the same individuals to attend multiple dialogue sessions meant that participants could deepen their understanding of the issues as they progressed, reflect on and integrate what they heard between phases, and thus offer richer and more informed perspectives throughout the dialogues.

*Small Group Report-Back, Phase III Plenary*

Four dialogue sites were selected for Phases I and II, in each of New Brunswick’s four corners: Moncton, Bathurst, Edmundston and Saint John. These locations were selected to ensure that any New Brunswicker could attend an event, without having to travel more than 200 kilometres.

In total, 310 participants attended the Phase I daylong dialogues, roughly half of which were randomly recruited citizens, while the other half was comprised of stakeholders who work in, or have an influence on, various components of the health system (representatives of various community and public interest groups, health and wellness managers, academics, health professionals, provincial government representatives and municipal officials). During Phase II, each of these groups reconvened in the same locations for another full day of dialogue, to continue their work together. Phase III consisted of a single provincial day of dialogue, held in Fredericton, which brought together 111 participants drawn from each of the four locations.

---

² Phase I and II conversation guides are available at: http://www.nbhc.ca/citizen_engagement.cfm
While this initiative was driven by the practical need for citizen input into the NBHC’s recommendations, it was also a critical milestone for the fledgling organization: this was the NBHC’s first foray in the realm of citizen engagement, and the team was well aware that it only had one chance to make a good first impression. In addition, a number of challenges needed to be overcome: the NBHC was new and relatively unknown to the general public; the creation of the NBHC was a controversial issue in the province and many health stakeholders saw this process as a litmus test for the organization’s ability to “deliver”; the timelines for planning and implementing such a large-scale, province-wide effort were very tight; and the NBHC citizen engagement team was small and inexperienced.

3. Impact of Core Values on the Organization

As previously highlighted, “citizen engagement” in an integral dimension of the New Brunswick Health Council’s legislated mandate. Article 3 of the New Brunswick Health Council Act (Objects and Purpose of the Council) lists “to develop and implement mechanisms to engage the citizens of New Brunswick in meaningful dialogue for the purpose of improving health service quality in the Province” as the Council’s second purpose (out of nine). Moreover, the official statement regarding the creation of the Council read:

The health care system must be trusted by New Brunswickers. It must be open and transparent, while delivering the best and most efficient care possible. New Brunswickers have a right to be aware of what decisions are being made, to be part of the decision-making process, to be aware of what dollars are being spent and what outcomes are being delivered by the health system.

To achieve this end, the Government of New Brunswick will be establishing the New Brunswick Health Council to promote and improve health system performance through a dual mandate. The first part of this mandate will be to engage citizens in meaningful dialogue to bring the citizen/patient experience back to health service providers and policy makers in an effective, timely and objective manner.

The NBHC was structured to reflect this mandate, with three Executive Directors reporting to the CEO – one responsible for Performance Measurement, one for Planning and Operations, and the third, for Citizen Engagement.

In the first few years following its creation, the Council was inwardly focused: under the leadership of its CEO, Stephane Robichaud, it gradually built its team and invested close to two years collecting and analyzing data on the state of the New Brunswick health system and the population’s health; introducing itself to, and building relationships with, health stakeholders inside and outside government; and developing its team.

Throughout this period, the Council maintained a laser-like focus on its twin mandates of citizen engagement and performance measurement. The Executive Directors responsible for these two areas worked in close collaboration to ensure that their respective objectives and deliverables complemented each other.

---

5 NBHC: http://www.nbhc.ca/nbhc_team.cfm
It is noteworthy that the position of Executive Director, Citizen Engagement, was awarded to Shirley Smallwood – a woman who had no previous experience as a public engagement practitioner. Rather, she was an active community volunteer, and a front line health worker with close to twenty years of service as an oncology nurse in one of the province’s most prominent hospitals. She brought to her work a solid understanding of how the health system functions, strong ties to the community and most importantly – a very profound respect for patients and their families, and a passionate commitment to making their lives better.

It was not without trepidation that Shirley entered her new role, recognizing that citizen engagement could “make or break” the public’s perception of the NBHC. She therefore invested herself in learning about citizen engagement best practices by reviewing the literature on the subject, exchanging with fellow practitioners, participating in conferences, and contacting leading academics. While she could not become an overnight expert, she wanted to ensure she “knew what she didn’t know,” was able to ask the right questions, and surrounded herself with the right team to get the job done. In this, she was unwaveringly supported by both the NBHC CEO and her colleagues.

When work on *Our Health. Our Perspectives. Our Solutions.* began, the NBHC put out a call for proposals for a firm that could assist in designing, implementing and reporting on this initiative. The Executive Director for Citizen Engagement stated that the consultant would not only help deliver this project, but would also be expected to help build internal capacity at the Council. As such, the consultant would be held to the highest standards of excellence and would work in close collaboration with the NBHC team to maximize organizational learning. The NBHC also elected to use Health Canada’s evaluation criteria to guide and assess the preparation, design, implementation, synthesis, feedback/follow up, and evaluation of the initiative, and closely followed this framework from the outset. At the end of the project, the Executive Director for Citizen Engagement led a “lessons learned” meeting during which successes and challenges were discussed and carefully documented for future reference.

Ascentum was awarded the contract and can attest to the integrity of the NBHC’s team, and its willingness to “walk the talk”: every single member of the NBHC team, from the Executive Directors to its analysts and receptionists contributed to the *Our Health. Our Perspectives. Our Solutions.* initiative, at every stage of the process. For example, the NBHC CEO took on the role of moderator for each of the nine dialogues, thus becoming the “public face” of the NBHC throughout this process. The Performance Measurement team participated in the issue framing process to ensure that the input collected would address key research questions they were tackling, and provided a wealth of data and analytical support to ensure the *Conversation Guides* were both accurate and accessible. The Executive Director for Planning and Operations took on all aspects of event planning and logistics. In addition, every member of the NBHC team attended at least half of the dialogue events.

Respect of participants, transparency and remaining true to the commitments made to participants from one phase to the next emerged as fundamental principles, which guided every team members’ decisions and actions. For example, if participants in the dialogues wished to raise issues that were clearly “off topic,” or if they wished to obtain responses to specific questions, they could at all times write down their comment or question on a “post-it” note and then place it in the “Parking Lot.”

*The “Parking Lot”*
These “parking lot” items were collected at each session, and included in the data analysis. Furthermore, participants could provide their name and table number to allow for an NBHC team member to follow up with them during the day and/or provide their phone number or email for follow up after the event. In the latter case, the Executive Director for Citizen Engagement personally followed-up on each of these requests during the week following each event. In addition, an entire section of the Phase II Conversation Guide was developed to specifically respond to questions posed by Phase I participants during plenary discussions and in the Parking Lot. Summary findings from each Phase were also communicated to participants and posted on the NBHC website prior to the beginning of the subsequent Phase.

The Final Report for this initiative will be released publicly in the Fall of 2010, and will present a summary of “What Was Said.” It has been drafted by Ascentum (who provided neutral, third party analysis of the dialogues) and reviewed by the NBHC. The NBHC has committed to, and is in the process of, drafting a companion public response to this report that will include its recommendations, and which will be equally informed by the findings of this process and by health system performance measurement data collected by the NBHC over the past three years.

4. Evaluation against Core Values

i. 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 is the foundation upon which the NBHC has been created; it is included in its legislated mandate; and is fully embraced by every member of the NBHC team. The NBHC’s mandate to monitor and report on the performance of the health-care system is similar to the role that health councils play in other Canadian jurisdictions. However, its citizen engagement mandate is considerably stronger than the public consultation role of other health councils.

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

The NBHC’s website states that “citizen engagement goes beyond conventional public consultation by enabling citizens to do more than simply voice an opinion – it also allows them to participate in the deliberation process leading to decisions.”6 The NBHC’s ability to fulfill this commitment is due to the fact that it reports directly to the Minister of Health, and has been vested with the power to make recommendations and hold government to account.

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

The NBHC carefully constructed its recruitment framework, to ensure that citizens, health system stakeholders and government decision-makers were all at the table. It invested heavily in helping citizens “get up to speed” on health care issues (e.g., through the Conversation Guides and Learning Sessions during the dialogues). However, the NBHC leadership placed an equal amount of emphasis on duly briefing partners and stakeholders prior to the launch of this initiative to ensure they were aware of it, and had an opportunity to prepare for their participation.

6 NBHC: http://www.nbhc.ca/faq.cfm
iv. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

Many efforts were made to ensure the full participation of citizens: a public opinion research firm was hired to conduct the random recruitment of citizens to ensure this group was as representative of New Brunswick’s population as possible; simultaneous interpretation was provided at all dialogues, along with necessary accommodations for persons with disabilities; and individuals for which travel expenses were a barrier to participation were provided with financial assistance. Adjustments were also made in the process to facilitate the participation of individuals with low literacy levels.

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

While the initial framework of the process was established at the outset, the design of each phase was “emergent,” that is, it was largely based on what was learned during the previous phase. As such, the issue framing and the structure of the exercise where informed by participants’ conclusions on each topic, as well as by their feedback on the process as collected by their table facilitators, in their evaluation forms and in the “Parking Lot.”

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

As previously highlighted, every effort was made to ensure participants – particularly members of the “lay public” – were equipped to have an informed discussion on the state of the New Brunswick health system: the NBHC team led Learning Sessions during each dialogue event; the Conversation Guides provided pertinent information and data in an accessible, plain language format; and the NBHC team was available during and after each event to address participants’ questions or concerns. Moreover, the NBHC placed a great deal of importance on the notion of dialogue throughout this process: participants were reminded that the goal in a dialogue is to work together to explore and understand different points of view. As such, there are no “right” and “wrong” answers – only individual experiences and points of view, each of which carry equal weight and legitimacy in the eyes of the NBHC. In support of this, the “Ground Rules for Dialogue” were highlighted at the beginning of the day, and prominently displayed at the centre of every table. Table facilitators were also assigned to each table and were responsible for both facilitating the table conversations and for note-taking. Prior to each phase, facilitators were provided with and trained on a detailed process guide, note-taking templates, and the principles of dialogue.

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

Transparency was a critical dimension of this process and it was integrated in its design in many ways: interactive keypad voting allowed participants to vote on key questions and instantly see the room’s response on the big screen; during Phases I and II, a “Theme Team” summarized the input provided by each table during the opening exercise, and reported these results to the room after the lunch break; findings from each phase were reported on and integrated into the work of the following phase; Conversation Guides were posted on the NBHC website. During the dialogues, the CEO himself (in his role as moderator) responded to participants’ questions (and at times criticism) with respect to what would come of this process, with transparency and humour. In particular, he was very clear on what the NBHC could and couldn’t commit to by virtue of its mandate, how it would use the input collected during the dialogues, and how it would hold government to account. The Final Report and the NBHC’s response and recommendations will also be made available on the NBHC Website, and communicated directly to all participants.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Palos Verdes Shelf Superfund Site Public Outreach Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Fish Contamination Education Collaborative (FCEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>U.S.A, Los Angeles and Orange Counties, CA, Pop. 13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>110 tons of DDT and 11 tons of PCB currently lie on the ocean floor off of California’s Palos Verdes Shelf, contaminating fish for up to 40 miles in each direction. Some of these fish have been found to be so contaminated that the State has recommended that they should not be consumed. Since the contamination is water-based, there are no means to physically restrict the coastline, rendering containment impossible. Furthermore, the populations who utilize the site as a resource are comprised of low income ethnic subsistence fishermen and community members who rely on these marine resources to feed themselves and their families. Key objective is to involve the public in modifying risky fish consumption behaviors through direct community outreach and peer-to-peer messaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>On-the-ground field testing of all surveys, collateral materials and messages; behavior change monitoring surveys (conducted in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese); pier &amp; shoreline angler outreach; health clinic outreach; educational workshops; multilingual messaging materials (i.e. tip cards, brochures, recipe booklets); peer-to-peer Facebook campaign; website; program blog; Flickr page; YouTube Channel; professionally self-produced instructional videos; interactive GIS mapping system aggregating all outreach results; community partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Results from the community-focused program demonstrate that the number of participants who reported eating a contaminated fish species dropped from 10% to 0% in the Chinese community, and from 39% to 3% in the Vietnamese community after outreach. Results from the angler-focused campaign demonstrate that the strategic intervention reduced the number of contaminated fish leaving piers and entering the community by 93%. Collectively, the program has reached well over 20,000 at-risk community members in the past three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Health region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>2007-2010 (present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Over 20,000 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pvsfish.org">www.pvsfish.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

The Palos Verdes Shelf (PVS) Superfund Site is among the most contaminated sediment sites in the nation as a result of historic DDT and PCB contamination. Certain species caught within proximity to this site has been found to be contaminated with such high levels of contaminants that “do not consume” fish consumption advisories were recommend for local anglers. Further exacerbating the human health risks associated with the site, a 1997 study conducted by the local environmental organization Heal the Bay revealed the elevated consumption of contaminated fish by low income ethnic communities. This finding demanded an immediate solution to reduce health risk among these communities.

To address the contamination, EPA explored various solutions and selected Institutional Controls (ICs)—public outreach and education, monitoring and enforcement—to mitigate immediate risk exposures associated with the consumption of contaminated fish from the site. Largely in response to the 1997 study, EPA pursued the unconventional approach of applying non-engineering controls (ICs) while studying the engineering-solution to ensure the immediate protection of public health. The public education and outreach component of the ICs program is carried out by the Fish Contamination Education Collaborative (FCEC), a comprehensive consortium of nonprofit, private sector and local, state and federal governmental agencies.

The unique nature of the PVS Superfund Site posed a number of difficult challenges to the effective protection of public health. Due to the expansiveness (17 miles) and degree of contamination (110 tons of DDT, 11 tons of PCBs), an engineering solution would take decades to complete. The application of a community outreach approach is just as riddled with difficulties: since the contamination is water-based, there are no means to physically restrict the coastline, rendering containment impossible.

Furthermore, the populations who utilize the site as a resource are difficult to reach. As revealed by the 1997 Heal the Bay study, low income ethnic populations were found to be the most at-risk populations. A decade later, the Consumption, Attitudes and Beliefs (CAB) study further refined these difficulties, revealing that Chinese and Vietnamese women were the most at-risk due to their culturally-driven fish consumption habits. These habits included tendencies to consume fish at a greater frequency, preparing fish in a way that retained the chemicals, and consuming parts of the fish that retained the chemicals. Changing the behaviors of the 402,000 marine anglers in Los Angeles and Orange County is equally challenging, as the majority of the area’s pier anglers are comprised of low income subsistence fishermen who rely on marine resources to feed themselves and their families.

The Role of Public Participation

FCEC’s outreach approach is predicated on direct public participation as the program goal is to engage community members to reduce risk by changing their fish consumption behaviors. In support of this goal, the program aims to provide the community with the resources necessary to protect their health. In reaching these sensitive populations, FCEC conducts targeted outreach to at-risk populations, ensuring a sustainable process of community involvement in the protection of public health.

In working towards this goal, FCEC developed a process of utilizing behavior modification strategies to reduce risk within target populations. Using CAB survey information, the program identified a roll-out process of community outreach efforts beginning with the most “at risk” communities: local fishermen (anglers), as well as Vietnamese and Chinese communities.

To reach these target populations, FCEC developed partnerships with prominent community-based organizations belonging to or associated with each respective...
audience. It was important for the program’s messages to come from established sources within each community so credibility was already established. For the Community Outreach Program, the collaborative partnered with BPSOS and St. Anselm’s Cross-Cultural Community Center to reach the local Vietnamese population, and later with Herald Community Center and the Asian Youth Center to reach the Chinese Community. For the Angler Outreach Program, FCEC partnered with the respected environmental non-profit Heal the Bay and Cabrillo Marine Aquarium.

Finally, the program also formed the Community Resource Council (CRC) to provide recommendations and insight to maximize the effectiveness of community outreach efforts. Acting as a bridge between FCEC and affected local ethnic populations, the CRC provides critical feedback as to how to most effectively reach at-risk communities. The involvement of these community organizations and individual community members through the CRC not only builds trust within affected populations, but directly involves them by allowing the public to become their own advocates.

Although the primary mechanism in reaching the affected community relies on in-person outreach, the magnitude of the problem limits the program’s ability to provide face-to-face outreach to every single community member. In meeting this challenge, FCEC has implemented several innovative social media platforms, such as a Facebook Page, Blog and YouTube Channel to directly engage its target audience.

Public Participation Methods

In implementing public outreach, FCEC drew from Community Based Social Marketing (CBSM), an approach that aims to not only raise awareness, but change behaviors. FCEC followed CBSM’s step-wise process by first conducting formative research to identify the barriers and motivators associated with the target behaviors. Based on formative research results, FCEC developed unique outreach strategies for both the Community and Angler Outreach programs.

For the Community Outreach Program, FCEC’s Chinese and Vietnamese community-based organizations conducted outreach through one-on-one interactions with patients in the waiting rooms of community health clinics. Outreach was also conducted as classroom-style educational workshops delivered in groups and in conjunction with existing community classes, such as English as a Second Language and citizenship classes. Through these methods, FCEC reached approximately 700 community members a year. To evaluate efforts, outreach workers first conducted a pre-intervention survey to assess the participant’s baseline fish consumption habits, then an intervention, followed by a post-intervention survey a month later to determine the effectiveness of the outreach.

For the Angler Outreach Program, FCEC teamed with the local organizations Heal the Bay and Cabrillo Marine Aquarium to educate and collect data from anglers at nine piers in proximity to the pollution area. The campaign consisted of targeted in-person educational outreach as well as the concurrent administration of behavior change monitoring surveys, reaching over 1,000 anglers a year. In the survey, the respondent was asked whether or not an outreach worker had reviewed the messaging material to determine who had received outreach and who had not for evaluation purposes.

FCEC integrated the barriers and motivators identified in the formative research period into the campaigns of both programs. For example, formative research carried out to inform the Angler Outreach Program revealed that approximately 73% of anglers reported that a health official directing them to release contaminated fish would be a very strong motivator; 70% said protecting the health of their family would be a very strong motivator; and 53% reported a lack of awareness regarding the contamination as being the strongest barrier preventing them from releasing contaminated fish. The program
utilized this insight in the development of program materials. For example, one of the program’s outreach materials illustrates a young child being treated by a physician. The child image reinforces the urgency to protect the health of the angler’s family while the image of the physician reinforces the legitimacy of the message. To overcome the barrier associated with a lack of contamination knowledge, this card also contains a large, clearly visible image of a white croaker (the most contaminated local fish species).

The Community Outreach program’s campaign was also tailored to the barriers and motivators influencing the target population. For example, during the formative research period, FCEC discovered that Vietnamese community members tend to eat the whole fish, especially the fatty, highly contaminated parts. To surmount this culturally-driven practice—and encourage the target behavior of fish fillet consumption—outreach workers distributed culturally relevant fish fillet samples and recipes featuring recommended preparation methods to participants during outreach sessions. By providing a flavorful example of how to safely prepare the fish, and distributing recipes, FCEC addressed the perceived barrier that the skinless fillet was bland and at-odds with traditional Vietnamese cooking. This tactic helped overcome participant’s tendency to abandon fish consumption practices in general, as the CAB study revealed.

Innovation

Uniqueness of Approach

As mentioned earlier, to ensure the immediate protection of public health, EPA took the unconventional approach of applying non-engineering controls while carefully studying the engineering solutions for the site. The implementation of this creative strategy is not only a highly innovative approach, but a practical and effective mechanism in reducing the human health risks associated with the site.

In implementing this unconventional public outreach approach, FCEC continued this legacy of “outside the box” thinking by focusing on behavior change through the application of Community-Based Social Marketing (CBSM). In contrast to most public health programs which rely heavily on information-driven campaigns, CBSM’s innovative approach aims to influence voluntary behavior changes within a target population to create sustainable risk reductions.

In addition to the application of direct community outreach, FCEC has also implemented the use of innovative web-based technologies to increase access to information and encouraging community involvement, which include:

- **FCEC Website** ([www.pvsfish.org](http://www.pvsfish.org)): the program website includes a calendar that provides a comprehensive overview of current FCEC activities. Community access to FCEC information is also sustained by the website’s in-language capabilities, which is available in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese.
- **FCEC e-Newsletter** ([http://pvsfish.org/resources-newsletter.html](http://pvsfish.org/resources-newsletter.html)): This quarterly edition seeks to foster community involvement by increasing the user’s access to FCEC developments and information.
- **Flickr** ([http://www.flickr.com/photos/44510682@N02/](http://www.flickr.com/photos/44510682@N02/)): This image and video hosting website has allowed the program to increase interest in the program by sharing photographs highlighting FCEC’s many community outreach events.
- **Interactive GIS Mapping System**: The program’s interactive GIS mapping system is linked from the FCEC homepage ([www.pvsfish.org](http://www.pvsfish.org)) to the host site ([http://public.itsi.com/](http://public.itsi.com/)), and displays an aggregate of all community outreach and enforcement results carried out by a number of organizations and agencies working...
under the umbrella of FCEC. This management system allows users to interpret and visualize thousands of data sets in the form of singular maps and reports.

- **Facebook Fan Page** ([www.facebook.com/fcecporg](http://www.facebook.com/fcecporg)): The page acts as a place where stakeholders and community members can communicate and connect.
- **FCEC Blog** ([www.pvsfish.org/blog/](http://www.pvsfish.org/blog/)): The blog is a weekly-updated content-driven forum, where users comment on entries and directly engage with the program.
- **YouTube Channel** ([http://www.youtube.com/user/FCECvideos](http://www.youtube.com/user/FCECvideos)): The program produced a series of contaminated fish identification preparation “how-to” videos, which have been uploaded to the program’s YouTube Channel.

**Role of Public Participation**

FCEC has utilized public participation to address the complexity of the problem in order to identify relevant channels and approaches to reach the target audiences. Successfully modifying culturally-driven behaviors, especially within several disparate and linguistically isolated communities, is a formidable challenge. To reach these populations, FCEC activated public participation by directly enlisting community members as messengers. For the on-the-ground outreach program, FCEC involved local community groups to directly conduct outreach to their fellow community members. For the electronic outreach campaign, the public is also empowered to spread FCEC’s messages by directly soliciting their input and engagement through social media.

**Project Results**

**Community Outreach**

Follow-up results from Community Outreach Program surveys indicate that outreach has been extremely successful in modifying risky fish consumption habits within the local Chinese and Vietnamese populations. For the Community Outreach program, the 2009 year-end survey analysis found:

- After outreach, the number of community members who reported eating contaminated fish dropped from 10% to 0% in the Chinese community, and from 39% to 3% in the Vietnamese community.
- After outreach, the number of community members who reported abandoning certain risky fish preparation behaviors decreased by 26% in the Chinese community and by 19% in the Vietnamese community.

**Angler Outreach**

Surveys from 2007-2008 indicate that anglers who received outreach from FCEC were 50% more aware of local fish contamination and were 30% more likely to catch and release contaminated fish than those anglers who did not receive outreach. In order to measure the effectiveness of our Angler Outreach efforts, FCEC developed and implemented a Take Home Fish Assessment (THFA) that helped form program strategy as well analyze specific angler fish consumption habits and behaviors. For the THFA program, a 2009 statistical analysis and evaluation of the survey results was published in *Social Marketing Quarterly* and achieved the following:

- There was a 93% decrease obtained at the test site in the amount of contaminated fish that anglers took home from the piers. This would bring the excess incidences of cancer due to ingesting DDTs and PCBs in the contaminated fillets down by 28%, based on EPA risk assessments. Thus, if the
THFA reached the entire marine angling population in LA and Orange County (402,490 anglers), on average eight people could potentially be saved from developing cancer. (1)


Alignment with Core Values

Core Value 1: The program’s primary concern is to ensure protection of the most-at-risk populations. To do so, FCEC conducted the Consumption, Attitudes and Beliefs (CAB) study which identified Chinese and Vietnamese women and low-income angling populations as the most at-risk populations. Since then, all outreach efforts have been targeted toward ensuring the participation on these groups. In support of this effort, program messages are communicated in a culturally appropriate manner with high scientific integrity in multiple languages.

Core Value 2: Public contribution forms the backbone of FCEC. The most significant public contribution has been the participation of local community groups via program outreach. By delivering messages directly to affected communities through these trusted local sources, the target population is more likely to adopt the sought-after behavior.

Core Value 3: EPA and FCEC ensure the meaningful participation of all groups, especially community groups, in the decision making process. The project has continued to utilize a neutral facilitator in its strategic planning process to ensure every member has an equal voice. FCEC regularly convenes participating community organizations through stakeholder meetings to obtain feedback as to how to more effectively meet the needs of the target audience.

Core Value 4: The program has sought out and facilitated the involvement of those most affected through a variety of mechanisms. For example, the program is currently forging relationships with local angling organizations to establish an additional channel to distribute program messages.

Core Value 5: All collateral materials are pilot-tested within the community and later modified based on the results to ensure that all messaging materials speak to the unique needs of the target audience. Additionally, formative research is conducted within each target population to identify key barriers and motivators to inform program strategy.

Core Value 6: The program is based on the principle of informed participation. To this end, FCEC provides an array of information – from comprehensive fish advisory facts, to user-generated views through social media platforms – so that individuals can make informed choices about their fish consumption habits to better protect their health.

Core Value 7: EPA and FCEC ensure transparency. To this end, a near real-time project data GIS map is available on the website, in addition to full project reports, meeting presentations and project summaries. FCEC and EPA are accountable to all stakeholders, specifically the community members.
**Angler Outreach Tip Card:** Reduced the amount of contaminated fish leaving piers by 93%

**FCEC Website:** Information hub & social media gateway
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### Case Study Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Portland Metropolitan Urban and Rural Reserves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation – Long Range Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties – Portland, Oregon Metropolitan Area – population approximately 2.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Problem</strong></td>
<td>Provide outreach and engagement to designate urban reserves (areas where urban growth can occur to meet population increases for a 50-year period) and rural reserves (areas where no urbanization can occur to protect agriculture, forests and natural resources.) Design and implement over two years with budget of less than $20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Build stakeholder networks, create advisory groups, reframe technical analysis to citizen-friendly language, convene 21 open houses, provide dozens of presentations, place low-cost literature racks in more than 100 gathering places, produce videos, websites, on-line questionnaires, and develop media relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Starting with more than 400,000 acres in the metropolitan area, designate approximately 28,615 acres as urban reserves for possible future growth accommodation and 267,000 acres as rural reserves to protect against urbanization. All for the next 50 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Metropolitan Portland, Oregon, surrounding counties and cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>More than two years starting with an Oregon State Legislative Action in late 2007 and concluding with designations in June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>Regional population of 2.5 million+ residents. Primary focus on urban unincorporated areas outside the existing Urban Growth Boundary and rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.co.washington.or.us/reserves">www.co.washington.or.us/reserves</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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The Problem and Challenge
The State of Oregon established urban growth boundary (UGB) land-use laws beginning in the 1970’s. Every city in the state is required to do a periodic review of their UGB and assess if there is sufficient land supply for the successive 20 years housing and jobs growth. The population center for Oregon is a three-county region containing and surrounding Portland. Early in the land-use law development it was acknowledged that a regional government would be appropriate to manage the UGB and attendant issues for these three counties. Metro is the regional government providing those services to Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties.

In late 2007 the Oregon Legislature enacted new criteria to establish a "reserves" process providing Metro with an inventory of lands that, if needed over the next 50 years, will be drawn upon for urbanization. These urban reserves are lands that are logical extensions of existing cities to provide infrastructure and local governance. The reserves process went a step further and sought identification of rural reserves. These reserves would protect the valuable agricultural, forest and natural resources that nourish the region. Rural reserves will provide farmers with certainty that their lands will not be brought into the UGB and they can make needed investments for the next 50 years.

Urban and rural reserves, on this scale and for this time-frame, are unprecedented. Recent UGB expansions (which are considered every five years) have been highly contentious and have brought in lands that are difficult to develop. A major roadblock in most recent cases has been a lack of an adjacent city to provide the governance and services. The new regulations directed reserves to be logical extensions of existing communities.

Our challenge and opportunity was to build awareness and solicit input from the potentially affected 550,000 residents living in Washington County and the more than 2.5 million residents of the Metro area. Experiences with existing UGB expansions, concerns about projected growth impacts and generalized concerns about regional governance issues were among the red flags raised, hindering discussions of this new approach to growth management.

Early in January 2008 the four jurisdictions decided to collaborate on regional public involvement efforts, as well as individually conduct community engagement processes within the respective jurisdictions (the three counties and Metro.) The public involvement team consisted of one specialist from each jurisdiction. We worked diligently and creatively together to forward our common interests.

The collaboration of four jurisdictions ensured that common objectives were identified and expanded the potential resource base to accomplish those objectives. None of the four jurisdictions had an identified budget, each was directed to maximize the return on all expenditures. For Washington County, in addition to staff salaries less than $20,000 was expended over the life of the project (and much of that was on printing and postage.)

The Role of Public Participation
Oregon State land use laws have a series of goals guiding policy decisions. Goal 1 is citizen participation. To ensure that the citizens within the three-counties were involved a coordinated public involvement plan was created and approved by the state’s Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee at the beginning of the reserves process. Each jurisdiction subsequently developed a public involvement plan using the coordinated plan as its foundation.
The Washington County Public Involvement Plan and addendum Communications Plan added significant detail to the regional effort. This plan was endorsed by the county’s advisory committee (including the 13 largest cities), the Washington County Board of Commissioners and the county’s Committee for Citizen Involvement in April 2008.

In addition to the State Goal 1, Washington County partners with the Oregon State University Extension Office in the formation of a Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) which provides training and facilitates coordination of 17 Citizen Participation Organizations (CPO) throughout the county. CPOs provide rural residents a voice in county policy discussions through monthly meetings and presentations back to the Board of Commissioners. Many of the cities have urban equivalents to CPOs, two have their own CCIs in addition to numerous Neighborhood Advisory Committees.

Citizen engagement is an important element to policy discussions within Washington County and a number of existing communications channels are available. The Board of Commissioners seeks public input to inform their decision-making and supports public involvement efforts.

Throughout the process public input opportunities were available at every advisory committee meeting, continually solicited through the website, through a series of printed and online surveys, 21 regional open houses, and public hearings before both the advisory committee and the Board.

Several goals were established for public involvement. The ultimate goal would be that every community member understands this new process, provides suggestions for implementation and helps develop a durable outcome. The practical goals included:

- Providing a multitude of communication channels to build awareness and capture feedback
- Promoting engagement from a broad spectrum of social, political and economic interests
- Creating accessible avenues of information that could be updated frequently to respond to the dynamics of the process
- Reframing much technical information to be understandable (or dare say enjoyable) to a mostly non-technical audience
- Providing decision-makers with multiple perspectives
- Adding a touch of levity to the process

**Public Participation Methods**

Reaching more than 550,000 people within the county (and more than 2.5 million region-wide) required utilizing and expanding existing resources. With minimal budget and limited staff resources public engagement focused on leveraging available resources. A Communications Plan provided the structure with a number of equally important endeavors including:

- Enhancing and expanding county and regional partner relationships
- Enhancing and expanding media relationships
- Identifying and engaging stakeholder organizations
- Developing (and reframing technical information into) presentations
- Creating and frequently updating the project website
- Creating, distributing and compiling feedback from online and printed questionnaires and surveys
- Hosting strategically located public events at critical decision points
Identifying community gathering places and events to distribute information and solicit feedback
- Developing and distributing printed materials providing project background, goals and anticipated timelines
- Providing a point of contact for questions and comments
- Convening public hearings
- Providing opportunities at advisory committee meetings for input
- Developing, printing and distributing postcards and meeting notices (including a mailing list of 13,000)
- Updating and providing email blasts to interested parties lists

Substantial return on effort was achieved early on (and throughout the process) through relationship building with partner organizations. Within the first couple of months more than 54 organizations agreed to distribute information to their constituents, solicit input and provide that input back to the public involvement coordinator. They included environmental groups, developers, builders, cities, chambers of commerce, the farm bureau, forestry-based groups the CPOs and CCI, school districts, and business groups among others.

Working closely with the regional and local media was significant. Over the life of the project, more than 250 articles were published with many on the front page, or front section pages providing high visibility, building awareness and highlighting involvement opportunities.

Recognizing that property owners in close proximity to the existing UGB would be among the most impacted by the process strategic outreach to those people was important. More than 13,000 postcards notifying them of upcoming public events, the project website and opportunities for input were sent. The 21 open houses were located to draw heavily on the rural and urban unincorporated populations. (The resulting “Where do you live” map illustrated a good balance of all population groups.)

The website was among the most valuable tools. This was a very dynamic process, with information changing on a weekly basis. Updates to the website provided the community the latest in information. With much of the analysis being a technical in nature, the website provided a venue to reframe the technical language into more understandable terms.

A primary tool remained just getting out and talking to people. Presentations and discussions with groups from 1 to 100 were common. For instance, at the county fair, going through the barns talking with small groups, having farm equipment suppliers agree to have counter displays with information and hosting a table under the county banner to talk about reserves resulted in dozens of conversations.

Support of grass-roots groups was particularly interesting. Several ad-hoc interest groups developed around specific issues. Supporting these groups included background education to the local, regional and state planning processes, helping them understand many of the technical analysis tools and identifying efficient ways to provide input (recognizing their resource limitations.)

Uniqueness of the Project
Cows, Bulldozers, Yodeling and Stories
So what does a toy cow, a bulldozer that says "Coming Soon", a yodeling resident and a 10-year old who brings a commissioner to tears have in common? The toy cow went "Moos" and
was used to open meetings that focused on urbanization. The Mooo... brought participants back to the reality that half the discussion concerned rural issues. The bulldozer with "Coming Soon" was worn on a sandwich board to open presentations - it addressed a common fear that this unknown concept of "urban reserves" meant that development would start the next day. A resident yodeled at a Board of Commissioners' hearing to underscore her roots in a rural community founded by her Swiss ancestors. And a 10-year old boy recited why he loved his home on a farm to a somber group of 22 officials and the Board of Commissioners. He was so compelling he brought one of the commissioners to tears.

Urban and rural reserves designation as a public policy process has no precedent that could be identified anywhere in the world. Add two challenges: requiring four jurisdictions to collaborate on the process and reach consensus in the outcome; and separating a new land use policy direction (40 – 50 year designations) from existing UGB expansion processes (producing much confusion over the distinctions and carrying forward a burden of distrust of the regional government and contentious previous expansion decisions.)

Decision makers wanted feedback to inform their decisions and wanted it throughout a continually evolving, dynamic process. Awareness building was the first necessity. Only after a base of understanding was laid could the public begin to provide meaningful feedback.

The discussion throughout the first two years focused on technical analysis of various lands. A series of state-generated criteria needed to be responded to. Public input was invaluable in providing local knowledge to compliment the technical aspects. In particular supporting and encouraging grass-roots groups provided contrasting input to those business groups seeking extensive expansion of the UGB.

Participating in panel discussions and conversations with a broad range of interest groups provided opportunity to build awareness and capture the communities' aspirations for the future. Key to much of the public engagement work was going where the public gathers. Chambers of Commerce luncheons, CPO meetings, Water District presentations and discussions, walking through the barns at the county fair or meeting with small groups of neighbors, each interaction contributed to the process transparency and resulted in feedback for decision making. And the toy cow almost always brought a smile.

**Project Results**
Ultimately, elected representatives of the four jurisdictions reached consensus (yes, unanimous) on 28,615 acres of urban reserves to accommodate future homes and jobs if needed and 267,000 acres of rural reserves protected from urbanization for the next 50 years. Public engagement resulted in more than 10,000 pages of input and testimony, more than 1,800 people attended open houses and more than 11,000 website hits were counted in one month. How much involvement that represents from a regional population of 2.5 million is hard to assess. More directly public input reduced the number of acres of urban reserves in Washington County substantially.

In the staff recommendation of September, 2009 approximately 34,000 acres were recommended for urban reserves. Public input to decision makers reduced that to about 13,800 acres. In particular one grass-roots group organized, worked diligently to understand the appropriate policies and argued effectively before the county and regional governing bodies. Other smaller organized groups also succeeded in influencing the outcomes, mostly in favor of rural protection.
And regionally a coalition of farmers, foresters and environmental advocacy groups formed with support of their constituencies and strongly influenced protection of agricultural and natural resource lands.

**Alignment with Core Values**

Core Value 1. Urban and rural designations affect everyone in the metropolitan area, but to different degrees. Given limited resources emphasis was placed on building awareness and involvement opportunities to community members within close proximity to the existing UGB (both inside and out.) Second was the rural community consisting of agricultural and forest interests, and third the urban community. Many of the tools used applied to all the audiences.

Core Value 2. Please refer to project results above.

Core Value 3. In addition to direct testimony to the Board during public hearings, compilations of public input were provided to the advisory committees and the Board at four strategic process phases. Compilations included executive summaries, verbatim input and input organized in geographic areas for quick reference during discussions. All input was posted verbatim on the website each month. Frequent updates were provided by staff to the Board during work sessions. For the public, information from the advisory committees and the Board was posted to the website and updates provided to partner organizations for distribution through their channels.

Core Value 4. In addition to engagement noted above, the regional advisory group included representatives of state agencies, environmental, agricultural, development and business groups and city representatives throughout the region. Every meeting had opportunity for public input directly to the advisory group and almost any interest group could identify a representative on the committee to discuss their issue.

Core Value 5. The coordinated public involvement plan approved by the state and by the regional and county advisory committees provided the foundation. The Washington County Communications Plan built upon that with input from the CCI. Multiple avenues of involvement were utilized including person-to-person discussions, written materials and online tools.

Core Value 6. Early phases of the project focused on how the process would move forward, what tools were being considered, what the anticipated timeline was and identified the advisory committees participants. As the analysis and recommendations progressed, updates were posted on the website and notice or summaries were sent to partners, participants and interested parties lists.

Core Value 7. The final outcome represented a significant change from initial recommendations. Not only were many of the community following closely to assess the impact of their input, but the media repeatedly acknowledged how the community influenced the discussions throughout the process as well as the outcome.
One in a series of cow-themed postcards used throughout the process. The discussions often tended to be urban centric. The cows reinforced the need for rural conversations.

Maps were provided at public events to capture comments and local knowledge.

3-D maps were used at public events to help illustrate the importance of regional topography. Laptops and projectors were also used to do virtual “fly-overs” of the region to aid in discussions.

Image used as a sandwich board during presentations. It illustrated a common fear that urban reserves designation meant impending development and initiated good discussions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>River City Blueprint: ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Brisbane City Council and Queensland Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Australia, Brisbane, population 1.52 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Key Question: ‘What is ‘Your Bright Idea’ for the City?’&lt;br&gt;Key Problem: How do we talk to members of the public who live, work and use the inner city, particularly people who would not normally participate in city planning projects, while ensuring their input is broad, long term and strategic when communicating their aspirations for the future of the inner city?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Textural interactive activity, one-on-one discussion, postcards, on-line discussion and website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>An eye catching, travelling interactive display that provided an opportunity for a unique, spontaneous engagement that fit into the daily routine of those who passed it and encouraged input from a wide audience. &lt;br&gt;Participants successfully communicated their aspirations for the long-term future of the inner-city by building their own 3-dimensional ‘Blueprint’ for inner-Brisbane using colourful foam blocks on an aerial photo of the city. The three metre by three metre floor was an aerial photograph of the Blueprint study area (inner 5 kilometres) which helped to set the spatial context of the plan. The colourful 3-dimensional foam blocks assisted participants to communicate complex ideas and provide practical solutions in a simple, non-technical, fun way. &lt;br&gt;The stands were successful in engaging a diverse range of ages and residents, workers and users that reflect the regional significance of the study area and those ages and users normally underrepresented in planning projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>5 kilometre radius from Brisbane’s central business district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Three months (February 2010 – May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>1600 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge
Brisbane is Queensland’s State Capital and at the centre of the fastest growing region in Australia. To cater for future growth and maintain the city’s liveability, there are approximately 80 infrastructure and planning projects in the inner-five kilometres of Brisbane being delivered by the public and private sectors. The River City Blueprint is a ground breaking planning initiative that represents the first time state and local government have co-ordinated long-term, strategic planning for the future of the inner city of Brisbane. The Blueprint will provide a single, consolidated vision for the area through to 2031 and provide a cohesive framework to manage future growth and infrastructure delivery. It will better align Brisbane City Council’s and the Queensland Government’s planning through a focus on five major themes to achieve an inner city that is:

- sustainable
- liveable
- connected
- prosperous and
- inclusive

The issues being addressed in the Blueprint are complex strategic planning issues that require systemic responses and are commonly known as ‘wicked problems’. These issues include land use planning, transport, facilities and open space planning, social and affordable housing, heritage and character, entertainment, sustainability, and cultural and economic development.

The engagement challenge was to encourage wide participation in this complex top-down planning exercise, make it accessible and easy to understand, and support participants to think ‘big’, long-term and beyond their own neighbourhood. Because of the technical nature of city planning, and the number of concurrent plans underway, participating in some engagement activities can be extremely time consuming, which is a disincentive for many people in the community who may be interested in being involved or who are suffering engagement fatigue. In addition, the majority of participants in community engagement activities are often over 40 years of age and have a technical or vested interest in planning.

The challenge was to intercept people when going about their daily business by sparking their curiosity through a visually stimulating and engaging display.

So, how can we grab the attention of those least likely to participate and make the process easy and enjoyable for them?

The Role of Public Participation
The ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stand objectives follow:

Planning Objectives
- Provide face to face opportunities for community to learn and share their ideas
- Use community input to identify information sources, review material and advise gaps
- Gain information about people’s aspirations for:
  - green space types, connections and locations
  - mass transit and active transport modes and connections
  - entertainment and recreation types and preferred locations
  - housing types and residential growth locations
  - the preferred location of new business, research and education facilities
  - anticipated future housing needs in the inner city
  - the location and type of future community and cultural service hubs
**Communication Objectives**
- Raise awareness of the River City Blueprint project and the partnership
- Facilitate active community input into the future of the inner city by encouraging stand visitation and discussion/conversation
- Ensure understanding of the constraints/challenges faced in planning for a liveable, well-functioning inner city
- Provide accessible opportunities for a diverse range of stakeholders to provide feedback that will influence the plan

**Community Objectives**
- To understand what the project is about
- To be able to contribute
- To be kept informed
- To feel that information contributed is carried forward and has an impact

The ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stand provided a space where people could come together, interact and engage in conversations related to the Blueprint themes. In order to capture ideas and experiences of a range of people, a team of facilitators engaged over 1600 people in conversations. Their role was to invite participation, provide supporting information and record conversations. This information was used to inform the development of policy options for presentation at the next phase of engagement, the River City Blueprint Public Forum, and was also shared with other stakeholders online.

**Public Participation Methods**
Three ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stands were rotated among twelve health, culture and education hubs (employment and transport nodes) for approximately three weeks over a three month period. The ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stand used a three metre by three metre colour aerial photograph of the Blueprint area as the floor and a two metre high corner pillar to display information about the Blueprint area, the planning context and the activity. It worked as a display and activity space that could be staffed or unstaffed.

The stand was designed to attract participants, by using an aerial photograph which allowed people to locate their area of interest e.g. their own house or place of work. This provided a starting point for the conversation. The information on the pillar included ‘ideas champions’, real people in the community with real ideas for the future. This gave participants an example of the kind of long term, 'big' ideas that the project was seeking and how the ideas would inform the Blueprint.

Two facilitators invited passers by to put their ideas on the aerial photograph using 3-dimensional foam blocks that represented the key themes within the Blueprint e.g. trees represented green space, ropes represented transport corridors.

The facilitators recorded conversations and participant’s ‘bright ideas’ on a ‘record of conversation’ sheet and took digital photos of the pictures people created on the aerial photograph (floor) using the 3-dimensional foam blocks. Postcards were available for participants to take away, record their ideas and return by post. An online discussion forum
also ran concurrently. In particular locations, a partnership with Queensland University of Technology (QUT) allowed people with mobile phones to SMS their ‘Your Bright Idea’ onto a public screen that passers by could read. Innovative chairs designed by QUT students and made out of coat hangers helped to generate interest and make the stand a welcoming place to visit.

River City Blueprint brochures were available from the stands. These contained supporting information on why the Blueprint was an important project for Brisbane, including objectives, timeframes and planning context.

The locations of the ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stands were advertised via a number of different sources - community service announcements in local newspapers, Council’s website, targeted emails to employees in buildings where the Stands were located, and twitter updates. Industry groups were offered one-on-one sessions and schools within the plan area were encouraged to participate.

Innovation

The ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stand was designed to be tactile, low tech and non-threatening. Both the aerial photograph and the colourful 3-dimensional foam blocks were designed to appeal to participants’ childhood sense of play. The aerial view assisted participants in linking their immediate issue within a wider planning system, understanding the potential impacts of their ideas on other people, and recognition of the need to balance competing needs.

The method helped to identify specific and practical responses to systemic challenges and issues.

Photographing participant’s efforts helped to acknowledge each contribution, demonstrate a commitment to recording it and later linking ideas to policy option development. For example, the most popular bridge suggestion (raised >100 times unprompted at ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stands) was presented to the River City Blueprint Public Forum with the associated photograph.

The stands were designed to have a presence in a public place where people undertake their daily rituals: getting their morning coffee, having lunch, buying their bus ticket, going to the library, to work or university. The stands brought engagement to residents, workers, students and visitors in a fun, friendly and inviting way. This approach ensured a diversity of people engaged with the stand, some of which would not normally take part in a strategic planning activity. Participant demographics comprised 60% under
40 years of age and an even representation of residents, workers, students and visitors and demonstrate that it achieved its aim.

The aerial photograph along with the 3-dimensional foam blocks helped participants visualise how their ideas would work in the existing City. In addition, through capturing an image of an idea on the floor, it could be wiped clean, and used again. Photos were printed and displayed on the pillar, giving participants an opportunity to have a look at other people’s ideas, generating interest and discussion. Images were accompanied by quotes from conversations recorded by facilitators. This helped engage people in a conversation about the benefits and opportunities that growth can bring and gave the project team specific examples of the communities’ expectations.

The 470 photos collected and over 3600 comments were sorted into Blueprint theme areas and collated into a ‘Your Bright Ideas’ Summary in order to inform the project team, the general public and partner organisations. Word clouds were also used at the River City Blueprint Public Forum to provide a simplified visual snapshot of the most popular ideas and issues.

**Project Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Evaluation</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Did we get valuable feedback for the project?</td>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>5 per hour</td>
<td>1710 participants / 9.5 p/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants that did activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>475 participants (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of postcards returned</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>161 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of planners in the project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness: Was the methodology appropriate for the target stakeholders?</td>
<td>Diversity of stakeholders (Age)</td>
<td>70%&gt;40</td>
<td>Under 18’s = 49 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-24’s = 351 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-39’s = 370 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-54’s = 277 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55-64’s = 144 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 64’s = 102 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Users</td>
<td>Community Planning Teams normally engage residents and business owners from within plan area only</td>
<td></td>
<td>605 (40%) live in plan area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>685 (45%) work in plan area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>475 (31%) study in plan area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>497 (33%) visit the plan area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stand activity has been evaluated against the project objectives under the following: effectiveness, appropriateness, and satisfaction.

Data collection was undertaken throughout the activity, this included conversations and photographs, number of participants, demographic profile of participants, participant experience, and value of participant contribution to the Blueprint.

Participants comprised 60% under 40 years of age and an even representation of residents, workers, students and visitors. This represents a big change in the behaviour and level of interest of members of the public who would not normally have participated in a planning engagement process. Obtaining significant input from younger age groups was also important as these groups will be the ones that experience change in the 20-50 year planning horizon of the Blueprint.

In addition, participants took up the offer to continue their engagement by attending the River City Blueprint Public Forum, representing 19.3% of participants at the Forum.

The engagement successfully used appreciative inquiry to focus participants to identify positive solutions to the benefits and challenges of growth, rather than taking negative problems based approach to growth.

Post activity surveys are currently being sought from participants to learn more about how this approach has influenced people’s thinking over time and their continued involvement.

Alignment with Core Values
This project aligns with six of the seven IAP2 core values.

Core Value 1 and Core Value 4
Locations for the ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stands were selected to intercept residents, workers, students, and visitors of the Blueprint area. Brisbane is the State’s capital city, and as a result performs a number of functions and services from local to Capital City. It was important that people who access those functions and services were reflected in the engagement process. As a result the stands were located at key health, culture and education hubs (employment and transport nodes). The participant demographics demonstrate success in reaching a diversity of ages and users who will experience the impact of these changes over the 20-50 year planning horizon.

Core Value 2
The ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stand was run early in the life of the project (prior to any plan drafting) enabling views gained from the Stands to be used to assist in:

- Visioning the inner city for the next 50 years
Understanding what is important to the community  
Assessing alignment of stakeholder views  
Consolidating ideas into themes to influence policy preparation

For example; views generated from the ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stand were used to inform and structure questions and scenarios that were put forward at the River City Blueprint Public Forum. Aspirations for improved public transport, better pedestrian connections and more culturally vibrant precincts are examples of ideas that were explored at the Stands and then presented at the Forum. The Forum provided the opportunity to test stakeholder alignment with these ideas.

These concepts will be further tested in plan drafting currently underway and during consultation on the draft Blueprint later in 2010.

Core Value 3
The project promoted sustainable decisions by:

- Providing contextual information for people including planning context, status of infrastructure planning and development and historical timeline. The aerial photo gave participants a snapshot of the context and complexity of issues currently facing decision makers.
- Creating a place for conversations to occur, and recording those conversations in a systematic way that related each idea to a planning theme. This assisted with communicating the needs and interests of all participants effectively to other stakeholders including decision makers.
- Considering a range of issues via the 3-dimensional foam blocks meant that participants had to engage with balancing aspirations and making trade-offs similar to those that the decision makers need to make.

Core Value 6
The aerial photo gave an immediate snapshot of the study area and its surrounds, helping to set the spatial context of the plan, while the use of 3-dimensional foam blocks assisted participants to communicate complex ideas and provide practical solutions in a simple, non-technical, fun way. Participants were able to understand and contribute meaningfully through the process of play and provide input into a technical and complex process. Top down planning was made accessible by presenting the plan area on the floor where people could step in and get involved.

Core Value 7
Participants from the ‘Your Bright Idea’ Stands received regular updates posted to the Blueprint website providing an important tool in communicating how the communities input has influenced the plan. Participants were invited to the River City Blueprint Public Forum where the ‘Your Bright Idea’ community engagement results were presented.
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Case Study Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Shaping the Future of Nahʔą Dehé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Parks Canada (Nahanni National Park Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Nahanni National Park Reserve, Northwest Territories, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>How to involve a diverse array of people, including new stakeholders, local communities, interested Canadians and an international audience in the development of a management plan – the first to provide strategic direction for the newly expanded Nahanni National Park Reserve, a UNESCO World Heritage Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Collaboration with the Nahʔą Dehé Consensus Team (a mechanism for co-operative management between Dehcho First Nations and Parks Canada), multi-stakeholder workshops, Aboriginal Chief and Council meetings, community open houses, newsletters, videos and an on-line discussion forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Consultations shaped the development of Nahanni’s management plan, providing strategic direction for over 30,000km² of Canada’s protected wilderness. Consultations mixed traditional techniques with on-line engagement (Web 2.0) to reach geographically dispersed audiences and allow all interested Canadians and international visitors to shape the management direction for this iconic park. Positive relationships were built, setting the foundation for continuing dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Management direction of Nahanni has local impacts for surrounding communities and business operators, national impacts for Canadians and international impacts for international visitors and the achievement of UNESCO World Heritage Site goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>The planning scope was developed with the Consensus Team during spring and summer 2009. The consultation program began in fall 2009 and continued until mid-February 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Through local meetings with Aboriginal Chief and Councils, community open houses, stakeholder workshops and the on-line forum, nearly 3000 partners, stakeholders, residents, visitors and interested Canadians participated in the planning program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nahanniplan.ca">www.nahanniplan.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

Nahanni National Park Reserve of Canada (Nahanni) was expanded in June 2009 to approximately 30,000km², making it the sixth largest park in the world. Nahanni, a UNESCO World Heritage Site, is situated in the Northwest Territories in the traditional homeland of the Dehcho First Nations (DFN). A legendary icon of Canadian wilderness, Nahanni provides visitors with world-renowned whitewater canoeing and one of the top ‘big wall’ rock climbing sites in North America. The immediate area around Nahanni is sparsely populated, with approximately 2,000 to 2,500 people in the closest communities – some only accessible by air, boat or winter road. Local Aboriginal peoples, through co-operative management with Parks Canada (PC), work to ensure that traditional use and knowledge is a cornerstone of park management and opportunities for employment, training, and economic development contribute to community sustainable development.

Nahanni’s challenge was to develop a management plan for the original park and expanded area, which respected the traditional use and co-operative management partnership with DFN, balanced the interests of a diversity of partners and stakeholders, and identified how Parks Canada would deliver its commitments to all Canadians of managing national parks for protection, visitor experience and public education. Core to the challenge was strengthening the co-operative partnership with DFN, while also finding ways to bring other stakeholders more meaningfully into the process, overcoming obstacles such as mistrust and physical distances.

Although the park is remote (access is primarily via floatplane), Canadians and international visitors are passionate about Nahanni. Canadians value the protection of Nahanni, as evidenced by the significant number of people who supported the recent park expansion. For some, ensuring opportunities for a remote wilderness experience is paramount, while for others protecting this ecologically important area and minimizing human use is most important. For local residents, businesses, and other organizations, interests in the park and region are often related to economic development opportunities, such as tourism, guided sport hunting, and near-by mineral development. The science community also has interests in the park for its unparalleled ecological and geological research opportunities.

Shaping the Future of Nahʔa Dehé was a management planning program designed to engage small local communities, diverse and geographically dispersed stakeholders, interested Canadians and overseas visitors in a participation process that would set the foundation for trust and cooperation for future management and planning programs. Nahanni approached the participation process as an opportunity to not only strengthen existing relationships, but also to engage many new stakeholders. Reaching out further than in any other previous planning program, Nahanni used a spectrum of techniques to effectively engage local, regional, national and international audiences in setting the management direction of Nahanni.

The Role of Public Participation

Public participation was the foundation of the planning process. The public participation strategy ensured that opportunities were available to Aboriginal peoples, partners, stakeholders, and the public to participate at varying levels of self-selected involvement continually during the planning process. The planning team was conscientiously fully open to suggestions, considering all input received. Comments were often in support of the proposed planning direction. In cases where alternatives were suggested, the planning team carefully considered the input, and reflected the suggestions in the plan as much as possible, and provided reasons when it was not possible (mainly due to legislative and regulatory requirements).
The vision for the park, the desired state 15 years into the future, was the result of significant consultation with Dehcho First Nations (DFN), stakeholders and the public. The key strategies for the management plan were developed initially with DFN. Further consultations with DFN and other partners, stakeholders and the public were instrumental in identifying the issues to be addressed, as well as specific targets and actions. The collaborative development of the content and resulting support for the plan will prove crucial for its successful implementation as many of the action will require co-operation with others. The role of public participation is reflected in the content of the management plan: Nahanni will be protected and presented with, and for, the people of Canada – and visitors from around the world.

Public Participation Methods

Aboriginal partners – The Nahʔa Dehé Consensus Team was created over 10 years ago to enable Dehcho First Nations (DFN) and Parks Canada to work together on cooperative management issues, including management planning. The Consensus Team met with increased frequency throughout the planning process. Members of the Consensus Team, along with the park superintendent and planner, also met with the leadership of local First Nations and Métis communities. During the first series of meetings, questions were raised in regards to park infrastructure, training and employment and traditional use. With this in mind, the second round of consultations involved a presentation from a young Parks Canada staff member who talked about her experience starting as a student employee and her subsequent career development. In addition to DFN, there are also several nearby Aboriginal groups, with potential interests in the park. Each of these groups was invited to join the process, and different methods (self-selected by the groups), were used to introduce the planning program to the appropriate elected officials and community members.

Key stakeholders – The planning team worked with the Consensus Team to conduct a stakeholder analysis and develop a comprehensive contact list of stakeholders, including river outfitters, air charters, sport hunting outfitters, recreational groups, local businesses, scientists, environmental groups, chambers of commerce, mining industry and associations, other government departments, and elected officials. Over 150 organizations were sent updates during the management planning process, accompanied by an invitation to participate. Many organizations communicated directly with the planning team. Due to a high level of interest and their intimate knowledge of the park, a joint workshop was held with key players involved in bringing visitors to the park; coming together for the first time, the Consensus Team, Parks Canada, air charters, and river outfitters met to talk about how to move the park forward.

Visitors and interested public – An on-line consultation process, the Nahanni Forum (www.nahanniplan.ca), was developed to provide an interactive, transparent, and accessible mechanism for Nahanni visitors, Canadians, as well as interested international audiences to participate in the planning process. The Nahanni Forum included videos, photos, background documents, and a series of discussion topics that evolved as the planning process unfolded. The nature of the on-line forum allowed participants to not only communicate directly with Parks Canada but to also dialogue with each other. Because all visitors to Nahanni register, it was possible to invite visitors from the past two years to help shape the plan. Efforts by partner and stakeholder organizations to promote the Nahanni Forum to their members and clients resulted in a significant ‘multiplier-effect’, reaching thousands more Canadians and international visitors.

All public participation methods were supported by effective and targeted communication products, including fact sheets, newsletters, plan summaries, posters, and presentations.
Uniqueness of the Project

*Shaping the Future of Nahâa Dehé* has generated significant interest from within Parks Canada and other federal government departments, who are now looking at Nahanni as an example for how to mix traditional public participation techniques with new tools to achieve a higher level of engagement with a more comprehensive audience. The Nahanni Forum, a bilingual (English and French), user-friendly public participation process on a web 2.0 platform, was innovative for the federal government, who is cautiously moving into the realm of new media. The design of the on-line forum ensured that all federal government legal and policy requirements, such as official languages, privacy and accessibility, were met. *Shaping the Future of Nahâa Dehé* went above and beyond standard approaches for management planning consultations by engaging geographically dispersed audiences. A 360 degree evaluation for the on-line forum was conducted. An analysis of measure of success and results of a participant survey proves the success of an effective public participation approach tool that can be applied to other management planning programs.

Dialogue and feedback received during the public participation process resulted in a plan that reflects a balance between protecting natural and cultural resources, facilitating visitor experiences, and providing opportunities for public education. The public participation process enabled this balance to be achieved, avoiding the common controversy of use vs. protection in national parks. Specific examples of how the public helped shape the plan include:

- Air charter operators, river outfitters, visitors and the science community informed the selection of designated aircraft landing sites;
- Forum participants and river outfitters suggested actions for new visitor opportunities and visitor services infrastructure;
- Visitors supported actions to ensure that camping infrastructure maintains the park’s wilderness character;
- Some Forum participants voiced concern of how to balance visitation with maintaining ecological integrity. As a result, the plan commits to assessing carrying capacity; and,
- Due to concerns over impacts from outside park boundaries (e.g. contaminants from mining), the plan commits to cooperatively developing emergency response measures.

Project Results

Nahanni’s public participation process was effective at engaging, and reflecting input from a diverse group of Aboriginal peoples, partners, stakeholders and general public. The Nahanni Forum, in particular was successful at reaching beyond the park’s close partners, communities and stakeholders. Nearly 5,000 stakeholders and members of the public received updates during the planning program. In addition to the approximately 150 people who participated through community events, workshops, and meetings, 2,650 people visited the Nahanni Forum (over 25,000 page views) and participated either by learning about the process, leaving comments, voting, or downloading documents. This is more people than live in the region surrounding the park and is a significantly higher number than are typically engaged in management planning programs.

The Nahanni Forum was a national pilot for Parks Canada. The experience and the results of the project are informing the development of national guidelines for the use of on-line consultation tools. To best enable the development of national guidelines and sharing of the results of this project, a multi-component evaluation was conducted. A focus group approach was used to evaluate the measures of success, including: target audiences reached; number of
participants; conversation rate; how public influenced the plan; and accountability and transparency. In addition to members of the planning team, other participants in the focus group included Parks Canada’s senior research analyst for new media, senior managers of Nahanni, and the service providers (SustaiNet and Bang the Table).

Although the activity statistics of the Nahanni Forum provide a picture of how the public participated in the process, the planning team wanted to evaluate the process from the participant’s perspective. A survey was completed by 86 forum participants. Highlights include:

- 92% agreed or strongly agreed that they would participate in another on-line consultation process like the Nahanni Forum.
- 91% agreed or strongly agreed that on-line public consultation was a good, additional way to reach more people than through face-to-face processes alone.
- 78% felt that an on-line consultation process was just as, or more, valid than public open house consultation processes.
- 55% agreed or strongly agreed that they felt more comfortable providing feedback anonymously through an on-line process than speaking up in a public meeting.

Further evidence of stakeholder support for Nahanni’s public participation process is evident in a letter from CPAWS (the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society), a national, non-profit conservation organization, written to Parks Canada’s CEO. In the letter, CPAWS writes:

“...The participatory methods of co-management with the Dehcho First Nations, engaging and involving stakeholders, and the emphasis on building informed and supportive public have been well executed. Nahanni has set the bar high...even with limited resources. Although the current Draft Plan is based on years of building relationships and trust, we believe other National Parks could benefit from sharing information about the effort and energy that Nahanni staff put into this Draft Plan.”

Alignment with Core Values

How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?
Different public participation techniques were used to engage the diversity of partners and stakeholders at their desired level of involvement. For example, recognizing that Dehcho First Nations would be most directly affected by the future management of their traditional territory, the management plan was developed jointly with the Consensus Team. Local communities were engaged through meetings and open houses. Key stakeholders, such as river outfitters, air charter companies, were engaged directly and repeatedly though discussions and a workshop. By incorporating an on-line forum, the process was open to broad public participation.

How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?
All of the comments and suggestions received were directly considered by the planning team and iteratively shaped the management plan as it was drafted. The emphasis in the plan on maintaining the wilderness experience of Nahanni was a direct result of the clear priority voiced by Canadians. As this was the first plan to provide management direction for the expansion, public input was instrumental in setting priority actions for this area.

How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?
This was achieved by maximizing opportunities for the park superintendent, planner, and the Consensus Team to dialogue with partners, stakeholders, and the public directly, facilitating open conversation and shared understanding (e.g. air charters and river outfitters shared met
together for the first time). An over-arching objective of the participation process was building long-term relationships. This objective recognized that in order for the management plan to be successfully implemented, the needs and interests of partners and stakeholders would need to be reflected in the plan as their support and involvement is critical to the implementation of many of the identified actions.

**How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?**

A stakeholder analysis, involving a multi-disciplinary team of Nahanni managers and the Consensus Team, ensured a comprehensive identification of organizations and individuals affected by the planning process. Considering that national parks are for all Canadians, a key objective of the planning process was to engage not only the stakeholders with specific interests, but also interested members of the public. The on-line forum was successful at engaging previous visitors (including international visitors) and other interested Canadians. The promotional strategy for the on-line forum included media articles, local radio ads, information bulletins, newsletters, and a YouTube video to raise awareness of the project. Nahanni also worked with stakeholders and partners to further the reach of the public participation process. The scope of those engaged was also broadened through coordination with other Parks Canada initiatives in the region.

**How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?**

The public participation plan was developed with advice from the Consensus Team members, helping to ensure the most effective approaches for engaging local Aboriginal communities. At the first round of open houses, communities were asked about their interests and preferences for continued involvement. This influenced the design and focus of subsequent community public participation events. Letters and conversations with key partners and stakeholders asked how they would like to provide input. In some cases, stakeholders preferred to provide written comments, others preferred conversations with the planner or superintendent, while other participated via stakeholder workshops. Key to encouraging people to select their preferred means of engagement was assurance that all feedback, regardless of mechanism, would be equally considered by the planning team.

**How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?**

A wide range of background information was available in a variety of formats – from videos and photos, to fact sheets on specific subjects, to summary newsletters, to detailed sections of the draft plan. Participants could select the information products which best suited their preferred level of involvement. Some participants who had very detailed suggestions or questions were directed to specialists, such as the park’s conservation biologist. Participant queries resulted in specific fact sheets being researched and developed, in order to ensure access to the same information. The library on the forum was very popular, with 840 downloads made by 330 people. At consultation events a multi-disciplinary team of staff was available.

**How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?**

Transparency of the on-line forum, allowed participants to see dialogue, responses from Parks Canada, as well as a summary for each discussion forum topics addressing how feedback was incorporated into plan. The second newsletter and final mail-out provided participants with an overview of what was heard and how plan elements were shaped accordingly. In addition, detailed submissions for individuals and stakeholders all received follow-up. If suggestions were made, or questions asked, they were addressed in a personal reply from one of the team members.
A young employee talks about her experience with Parks Canada at a community open house.

Screen shots of the on-line forum.

Top left: Smaller communities could only be reached by plane.

Right: Consensus Team members, staff and open house participants in Fort Simpson, NWT.

Bottom left: Discussing caribou herd movement in the expanded park.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Sharing, Listening, Learning and Engaging Communities to Shape Community Health Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Group</strong></td>
<td>Primary Health Care, Capital District Health Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Canada: Halifax, Nova Scotia. Population: 400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Key Question/Problem** | Capital Health is implementing new Community Health Teams (CHT) focused on health and wellness. As every community has different needs and may require different programs, supports, and team members the following questions need to be addressed for each CHT:  
  - What is the scope and design of the CHT?  
  - What do the citizens and providers think about the CHT model?  
  - What are the perceived opportunities, barriers and supports of the CHT?  
  - How will the providers work together – both within the system and in the community?  
  - How will we ensure ongoing communication with citizens and community partners? |
| **Sample Methods** | Open conversations and world cafés with citizens and health providers; targeted focus groups with youth, family physician practices, community groups and organizations; and kitchen conversations with rural/suburban/hard-to-reach citizens |
| **Results** | A detailed engagement framework document and engagement plan supported the CHT planning group to engage multiple stakeholders in meaningful conversations. This framework was based on the IAP2 principles and processes of public participation. Significant input and perspectives were heard from a wide range of stakeholders. Findings were corroborated through a validation session with representative stakeholders. CHT programs and services, principles for working with the community, staff competencies, human resource requirements and future directions were developed in direct response to the engagement findings. |
| **Impact Level** | High - Neighbourhoods of regional municipality (urban and suburban) |
| **Time Frame** | About 12 months per CHT |
| **People Engaged** | 600+ citizens and stakeholders at local community level |
| **Web Link** | [www.communityhealthteams.ca](http://www.communityhealthteams.ca) |
The Problem and Challenge

- Increasing levels of people living with chronic conditions one of the key factors threatening the sustainability of the healthcare system
- How to engage communities in the development of new Community Health Teams so they best fit the needs and character of the community

Many Canadians are living longer and healthier; however, a growing number of young and old Canadians alike are living with one or more chronic conditions. This increasing level of chronic disease in the general population is placing an ever increasing burden on our healthcare system that is ill-equipped to manage this patient population. The sustainability of our healthcare system may depend on its ability to prevent chronic disease and support people living with chronic conditions to better manage their own health in the communities in which they live and work. A new culture of shared accountability for individual and community health needs to be instilled in both the people and health providers.

Capital District Health Authority (Capital Health) has promised to support people to be healthy and well. One of the ways they are doing this is through Capital Health-Primary Health Care (PHC) introducing new Community Health Teams (CHT) into broad neighbourhood communities. The CHT is a community-based health model that focuses on health and wellness and supports individuals and families to build knowledge, confidence and skills to better prevent and manage risk factors that are common across chronic conditions. It will work with community and other partners towards creating healthier community environments.

Two diverse communities were selected as the sites for the first CHTs through a rigorous selection process. There was an understanding that the next phase of CHT implementation would bring CHTs to other diverse communities. There was recognition that every community has different needs and may require different programs, supports, and CHT team members to address these needs. The challenge was how to acquire the mix of information needed to help Capital Health-PHC shape each CHT to meet the needs of that particular community. Some questions that specifically needed to be answered included:

- What is the scope and design of the CHT for each community?
- What do the provider and citizens of each community think about the CHT model?
- What are the perceived opportunities, barriers and support of the CHT for each community?
- How will the providers work together – both within the system and in the community?
- How will we ensure ongoing communication with citizens and community partners?

There were multiple challenges with the potential community engagement. These included limited:

- history of engagement practice within the PHC portfolio
- organizational engagement framework to guide the work
- engagement expertise within the PHC portfolio
- registries of community/stakeholder champions
As the CHT planning team started out on their path of engagement, they had expectations there would be multiple challenges in the road ahead and were ready for the many unknowns. The team of two at this point, Shannon Ryan and Caroline Carr, fully stepped into the engagement process with an unwaivering belief that community engagement would result in a CHT that best fit the need and character of its community and the newfound relationships would eventually result in a new and better way forward for health. This belief bolstered their boldness and confidence and comforted them on the days the weight of the task seemed heavy.

**The Role of Public Participation**

The CHT planning team was fortunate to be part of an organization that had recently embraced engagement as a transformational practice. A new CEO, Chris Power, had undertaken an innovative strategic quest in place of the traditional strategic planning process. This quest engaged many people in bringing to light many of the ways Capital Health was not supporting the population they were accountable to. The result was a new document *Our Promise* ([http://ourpromise.ca/](http://ourpromise.ca/)) which identified Citizen and Stakeholder Engagement and Accountability as one of five strategic directions for Capital Health, together with citizens, to realize a shared vision of healthy people, healthy communities.

It was in this environment of cultural change to embody an organizational commitment of engagement that was intentional and meaningful that PHC began its work. Although some initial efforts to develop guidance for engagement within Capital Health were underway, the CHT planning team was providing a novel approach and acting as a learning platform for the organizational spread of this practice in many senses. Engagement was considered integral to the CHT to move forward with as public participation in the decisions that impact health and wellness lie at the heart of primary health care.

Shannon and Caroline reviewed the engagement research and put their hearts and minds together with others, including community representatives, to develop a comprehensive engagement framework and CHT engagement plan. This work ultimately formed the foundation of an organizational engagement framework. Community leaders involved in early conversations expressed a mix of excitement that community would finally hold a firm voice in local health decisions and cautiousness that this might be one more disappointment in attempts to change the status quo of citizen contribution in decisions that affect them. Without exception, they offered to help in any way they could.

A new staff role, Citizen Engagement and Community Development coordinator, was added to the PHC portfolio and Lynn Lowe joined the team. The CHT team, and the broader PHC team, received professional development training in public participation practices through IAP2 ([http://www.iap2.org/](http://www.iap2.org/)) and Art of Hosting ([http://iap2.affiniscape.com/displaycommon.cfm?an=4; www.artofhosting.org/home/](http://iap2.affiniscape.com/displaycommon.cfm?an=4; www.artofhosting.org/home/)). A consultant with considerable expertise in engagement practice, Ravi Tangri of Chrysalis Strategies Inc ([www.navigatecomplexity.net/](http://www.navigatecomplexity.net/)), was contracted to support the CHT team.
through the public participation phase of the CHT development. The CHT planning team also linked with other portfolios in the organization with experience in engagement (e.g., Community Health Boards) and community organizations (e.g., www.chebuctoconnections.ca).

With the combination of strong commitment and purposeful intention, professional development, new roles with background that fit with public participation, consultant and community support the CHT was able to plan and implement a public participation process that was aligned with community and stakeholders needs and was embraced by the community. One key enabler for community participation was the broad promotion of the open events through school and community posters and flyers, messages through community networks, development of a website and a mail drop postcard that was delivered to every household in the target area. These communications highlighted that conversations would be held in the local community. Participants were strongly valued and received a $25 grocery store certificate in recognition of their time and effort. Childcare, refreshments and transportation were available.

**Public Participation Methods**

- Open café-style conversations with citizens
- Open café-style conversations with healthcare providers and decision makers
- Semi-structured conversations with youth in the high school setting
- Semi-structured conversations with community organizations
- Semi-structured conversations with healthcare providers (family physicians & family practice nurses) from family practice clinics
- Kitchen table conversations with hard-to-reach suburban/rural citizens
- Validation and Direction-Setting session with representative participants

A multi-faceted engagement plan (see above) was developed in concert with community representatives. The plan was designed with the intent to adapt the engagement activities to the preferences of the target audience to maximize community and stakeholder participation. The CHT planning group held the engagement sessions in the local community in settings that best suited the target audience (e.g., school for students; physician offices for healthcare providers; people’s homes in rural setting). The open conversations were held in the community in a well-known and easy to access venue.

An engagement design for each session was developed, which outlined the questions to be asked and the process for engaging participants. For example, for the open conversations, a PowerPoint presentation (which included an embedded video that was developed specifically for the engagement) was shared that outlined the reasons behind and the proposed concept for the CHT. Story telling was used through a theoretical example of “Kim’s Story”. This story was read to the audience and depicted how the CHT might affect the life of an individual in the community. It was received as so authentic that many participants thought the “reader” was the real Kim. Participants were also engaged through café style conversations, which led to the creation of a “Mind Map” and small theme groups. This general design was adapted for the other engagement sessions to best meet the target group situation and preferences.

All the sessions were evaluated for satisfaction with the process and participation in the planning process for CHT development. Other information was captured, such as age,
gender, and whether they considered themselves representative of a distinct group (e.g. Person with Disability; Cultural/Ethnic group). Evaluation results were positive, with an average rating of 3.3 on a four-point scale, for satisfaction with participation in the CHT planning process. Shannon, Caroline and the growing CHT planning group were particularly heartened by one withdrawn individual who originally came only for the refreshments, stayed to participate in the sessions and let the team know afterwards how meaningful the day had been for him.

**Uniqueness of the Project**

Although Capital Health citizens had been engaged in the past to offer their perspectives on health needs and preferences, this was the first time these community citizens had been engaged in such a comprehensive way to directly inform new Capital Health programs and services. Public participation was based on a thorough review of the engagement research and best practice techniques and a structured, yet flexible, engagement plan. This engagement plan, implemented in one part of a large organization, impacted the organization as a whole through contributing to an organizational engagement strategy and framework that will further solidify engagement as institutional practice within Capital Health.

The use of incentives to acknowledge people’s time and efforts as valuable and promote participation was distinctive in this organization and the region as a whole. Recognition that every community is unique, and engagement plans need to be customized to fit the context (e.g., rural/urban) and target groups (e.g., professional/community culture) ensured the engagement was not a cookie-cutter approach that would not resonate with particular communities of interest.

The CHT is being recognized locally and nationally as a leader and innovator in public participation practice. Shannon was selected to present the CHT engagement process at the National Healthcare Leadership Conference held in Winnipeg, June 2010.

**Project Results**

Community engagement for the CHT was undertaken prior to any staff or program decisions being made. Engagement findings directly informed the staff complement and competencies along with setting program and service directions. Human resources positions that were new and novel to the organization were created to accommodate community priorities. New programs and supports are being implemented and continue to be developed. Examples of this influence includes the creation of “Wellness Facilitator”, “Wellness Navigator” and “Lay Health Worker” job roles and having public participation competencies added to traditional health professional roles (e.g., dietitian; physiotherapist).

One key result of the engagement process was the development of principles for how the CHT would work with the communities -one of these principles included the promise that the CHT would engage with the community on an ongoing basis in order to continue to be responsive to their needs. Another objective was to identify and foster relationships with potential partners in improving community health. Many collaborators have been identified and partnership activities are being planned and implemented. These new partners will need to adhere over time to the previously mentioned principles of the CHT developed with/for the community in the design and delivery of their programs and
services. This requirement will contribute to the further spread of public participation practice and changing public expectations.

This public participation project signaled to citizens that there is a new way of doing business at Capital Health. This new way is intended to develop a shared accountability for health. Capital Health is taking on a significant part of the responsibility for the creation of this partnership through engaging the citizens they serve in decisions that affect their lives and facilitating public participation opportunities that people want to and can participate in and hold the integrity to influence decision-making. Lessons learned throughout the process were captured and shared with interested others within and outside Capital Health. The CHT is committed to both nurturing and learning from others in public participation practice.

Full and summary reports of the findings of the complete engagement process, along with the video and other information, were posted on the CHT website at www.communityhealthteams.ca. Summary reports were widely distributed in the relevant communities to report back the findings and how these findings impacted program and other aspects of the CHT.

Alignment with Core Values

**Core Value 1:** Individual and community health affects everyone and is everyone’s responsibility. This belief premises the whole CHT project. Every possible effort was made to involve those living, working or going to school in the community and those stakeholders who can impact health.

**Core Value 2:** Staff hiring and competencies, programs and services, and principles for working with the community were directly influenced by the public’s contributions.

**Core Value 3:** The CHT engagement promoted sustainable decisions by collating the needs and perspectives of multiple stakeholders and facilitating consensus among them through a Validation and Direction Setting session.

**Core Value 4:** A demographic profile of the relevant communities was developed prior to designing the engagement process. This profile, widespread promotion of the comprehensive engagement opportunities, addressing barriers to participation (e.g., transportation), outreach to hard-to-reach groups, and adapting plans as needed to enable participation ensured those most affected by the decision or problem were involved.

**Core Value 5:** The engagement plan was designed in collaboration with community target groups and evaluation results demonstrated satisfaction with participation.

**Core Value 6:** Data on the health of the citizens of the relevant communities, a proposed model for the CHT and a story on how such a model might affect individuals’ lives were shared with engagement participants. This information increased participant’s ability to make informed choices about preferred health programs and services.

**Core Value 7:** Significant focus was placed on ensuring participants knew how their input affected CHT decisions. A full report outlining engagement findings and how these findings were being incorporated into CHT operations was posted on a website. A briefer, visually appealing summary report was produced and widely disseminated in the respective communities. The first regular newsletter that will report on ongoing work of the CHT has been written and distributed. Ongoing face-to-face engagement with the communities continues to help share information, build relationships and establish trust and partnerships.
Kim’s Story

How We Will Work

The East Dartmouth Community Health Team will operate under principles that emerged from the Community Health Team conversations. It will:

- Listen to community members and be flexible in responding to their needs.
- Avoid duplication with existing community supports and services.
- Offer group programming to enhance social and peer support.
- Help people manage their own health.
- Be mindful of the needs and issues of seniors and youth in its activities.
- Respect that people best understand their own life experience and health.
- Recognize that many factors and conditions influence the health of individuals and communities.
- Support community connectedness.
- Network, partner and collaborate with others.
- Connect with community members and stakeholders on an ongoing basis.
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**CASE STUDY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Site C Clean Energy Project (Site C)</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>The provincial government directed BC Hydro to initiate consultations and determine whether Site C – a third dam on the Peace River in northeast B.C. – should continue to be pursued if conservation, upgrading existing equipment, and investing in new sources were insufficient to meet the future electricity needs of the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Three rounds of comprehensive public and stakeholder consultation. Two community consultation offices, discussion guides and feedback forms, stakeholder meetings, open houses, website and online feedback form, submissions, and toll-free information line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>More than two-thirds (69%) of provincial consultation participants agreed with the key question. Overall, 57% of consultation participants agreed with this, while in the Peace Region, consultation participants were evenly split (47%/47%) on their level of agreement. Based on the Stage 2 key findings of a multi-stage process, including extensive public and stakeholder input, BC Hydro recommended proceeding to the next stage. On April 19, 2010, the B.C. government announced Site C would proceed to Stage 3, Environmental and Regulatory Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Province-wide benefits through a clean and renewable energy source. Physical impact in the Peace River region by the creation of a reservoir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>Fall 2007 – Fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>More than 2,500 public and stakeholder participants in three rounds of consultations. Broad and extensive public notification program, including newspaper and radio advertisements, thousands of emails, phone calls and household mailers, and bill inserts. More than 1,700 public inquiries about the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.bchydro.com/sitec">www.bchydro.com/sitec</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PROBLEM AND CHALLENGE

BC Hydro’s load forecast indicates that B.C.’s electricity needs will grow by 20 to 40 per cent over the next two decades as the province’s population grows by more than one million people. As extensive as BC Hydro’s hydroelectric assets are, they will not be enough to provide future generations of British Columbians with electricity self-sufficiency if demand continues to grow as projected.

A variety of options are being pursued by BC Hydro to meet future electricity needs, consistent with provincial energy policy. The provincial government’s energy policy includes a commitment to have zero net greenhouse gas emissions from all new electricity generation, while ruling out nuclear power as an option, and requiring more than half of all energy needs to come from conservation.

As part of the provincial government’s policy commitment to clean energy, the 2007 BC Energy Plan listed the Site C Clean Energy Project (formerly known as the Peace River Site C Hydro Project) as a potential resource option to help meet B.C.’s future electricity needs, and directed BC Hydro to begin discussions with the public and stakeholders. The Site C project is a proposed third dam on the Peace River in northeast B.C. The project would provide enough electricity to power more than 400,000 homes in B.C. per year.

The key question to be asked of the public and stakeholders was whether the Site C project should be pursued if conservation, upgrading existing equipment, and investing in new sources were insufficient to meet the future electricity needs of the province.

There were some key challenges facing a public and stakeholder consultation program on Site C, including:

- B.C. is a geographically large jurisdiction. The province is nearly four times the size of Great Britain, 2.5 times larger than Japan, and larger than any American state except Alaska.
- There are unique regional and provincial interests, with the largest consumers of electricity being located in the heavily populated southwest part of B.C. and the largest generators of electricity located thousands of kilometres away in the less populated northeast region.
- Limited access to the Internet reinforced the need for face-to-face meetings and the opening of Community Consultation Offices in Fort St. John and Hudson’s Hope.

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Consistent with best practices for large infrastructure projects, BC Hydro adopted a multi-stage approach for the planning, evaluation and development of Site C, including comprehensive public and stakeholder consultation. This approach provided for an informed decision-making process by allocating multiple milestones for assessing the project and deciding whether to proceed to the next stage.

Stage 2, Consultation and Technical Review, commenced in the fall of 2007. It included three rounds of public and stakeholder consultation. This stage also included the initiation of environmental and engineering baseline field studies to better understand current conditions in the project area.

Public and stakeholder consultation activities in Stage 2 included three phases, offering many opportunities for public input, which is consistent with best practices for accountability, inclusiveness, transparency, commitment and responsiveness. In all consultation materials and in public meetings, consultation participants were advised that the provincial government was the decision maker regarding whether Site C would proceed to the next stage of project planning. Participants were further advised that their input would be considered, along with technical and financial information, in developing and making a recommendation to the provincial government.
Throughout the course of public consultation meetings, facilitators from the independent consultation firm, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., encouraged participants to raise questions and provide input on any topic. The consultation process provided an opportunity to provide input through discussion, and resulted in an increase in mutual understanding and changes in project and study designs.

The public and stakeholder consultation program included Pre-Consultation, which asked local, regional and provincial stakeholders how they wanted to be consulted and about what topics. It was followed by Round 1 and Round 2 of Project Definition Consultation, examining key benefits, impacts and features of Site C. Public input during Pre-Consultation informed the topics of consultation during both rounds of Project Definition Consultation, including elements of project design, recreation, infrastructure, local impacts, land uses and community benefits. BC Hydro published consideration memos to demonstrate how public input was considered and used.

BC Hydro maintained a public inquiry response program for Site C—more than 1,700 public inquiries on a range of topics were received during Stage 2. Inquiries came in from the toll-free line and community consultation offices, and via email, fax and mail. Each inquiry was responded to and tracked.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS

Kirk & Co., experts in the design and implementation of communications and consultation programs, recommended designing the consultation program to meet or exceed consultation best practices. BC Hydro designed and implemented a consultation program consistent with the Core Values of the IAP2 and were guided by best practices from a provincial and local government perspective, including Public Participation: Principles and Best Practices for British Columbia by the Office of the Auditor General of B.C., Public Process Guide by the City of Vancouver, and Guide to Consultation Best Practices by Kirk & Co.

Consistent with best practices, there were a variety of ways to participate in Stage 2 public consultation, including: visiting two community consultation offices, attending stakeholder meetings and open houses, reviewing the discussion guide, completing feedback forms, calling the Site C toll-free line and mailing, faxing or emailing written submissions.

Public notice of consultation opportunities included 105 advertisements in 16 newspapers, radio advertisements on 11 stations in northern B.C., and thousands of notification emails and phone calls to stakeholders. In addition, 21,000 mailers were sent to households in the Peace River region prior to the first and second rounds of consultation. Public notification also included a bill insert to 1.3 million BC Hydro residential customers prior to the second round of Project Definition Consultation in October 2008.

BC Hydro, with the assistance of Kirk & Co. facilitators, encouraged civil, respectful dialogue between participants and BC Hydro, and among participants. On several occasions, peaceful demonstrators attended meetings and were respectfully welcomed and included in the meeting. For example, demonstrators at a Fort St. John open house were invited to the front of the room and were provided with a microphone to ensure that their views were heard by BC Hydro and meeting participants, and to ensure their concerns were captured on the record in the meeting notes.
UNIQUENESS OF THE PROJECT

The Site C project is unique in that it has been in plans for more than 30 years, having been identified as the preferred location for a new dam on the Peace River in northeast B.C. in 1976. However, this was the first time that the public and stakeholders were consulted so extensively. In terms of impacts and benefits, the reach of this project is also unique. Given the nature of Site C and the presence of local and provincial interests, BC Hydro established early in Stage 2 that consultation would be both local and province-wide, but with a focus on communities in the Peace Region and northeast B.C., where the project would be located.

Based on the results of Pre-Consultation, in which participants were asked about how they wanted to be consulted, the program was modified to reflect regional and provincial differences. As just one example, Pre-Consultation input informed BC Hydro that mail—rather than online communications—was rated highly by Peace region participants as a public consultation method. As a result, household mailers (21,000 in total) were sent to Peace region households prior to the next two rounds of consultation to advise them of opportunities for participation and input.

PROJECT RESULTS

"By anyone’s measure, BC Hydro has been aggressively reaching out to British Columbians during this stage to solicit feedback on the proposed dam (as well as on higher level public policy issues concerning BC’s energy supply) ... Whether Site C Dam’s ability to help meeting BC’s projected electricity deficit outweighs the accompanying environmental and social costs is an issue still up for debate. Further extensive consultation by BC Hydro will not, in and of itself, make this massive industrial project benign. These efforts do, however, ensure that the voices of the impacted communities are at least heard."

- West Coast Environmental Law, Newsletter Volume 35:01 (Spring 2009)

Using best practices in public participation, BC Hydro’s public and stakeholder consultation program effectively addressed key challenges. This included implementing consultation methods consistent with the identified preferences of the public and stakeholders, whether they were in heavily populated urban areas or in less populated rural areas.

The consultation program identified that overall 57% of consultation participants agreed that Site C should continue to be pursued if conservation, upgrading existing equipment, and investing in new sources were insufficient to meet the electricity needs of the province. Provincial and regional differences were also identified—more than two-thirds (69%) of provincial consultation participants agreed with this, while in the Peace Region, consultation participants were evenly split (47% agreed, 47% disagreed).

During the two rounds of Project Definition Consultation, BC Hydro learned that participants expressed a strong interest in avoiding or mitigating local impacts from Site C, particularly possible socio-economic effects associated with an influx of construction workers. Environmental concerns were also raised, including potential effects to air quality, water and agricultural land.

Based on the Stage 2 key findings, including public and stakeholder consultation, BC Hydro recommended proceeding to the next stage of project planning and development. On April 19, 2010, the provincial government directed BC Hydro to proceed to Stage 3, Environmental and Regulatory Review.

Input received during Stage 2 will shape ongoing design of environmental baseline and environmental effects studies for Stage 3. Input will be used to refine some engineering work, such as reviewing highway alignment options and reservoir clearing plans. Stage 2 input will be used to determine consultation topics and issues for Stage 3 public and stakeholder consultation.
As the project proceeds, continuing public and stakeholder consultation and community relations will be fundamental to the project. The public consultation will be undertaken with independent oversight of provincial and federal regulators. Also, the Site C project team will continue to refine and update project designs, update the project cost estimate, advance environmental and socio-economic studies from baseline work to effects assessment, and continue ongoing consultation with Aboriginal groups, the Northwest Territories and the province of Alberta.

ALIGNMENT WITH 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.**
   
   Responding to government direction, and in accordance with best practices, BC Hydro designed a comprehensive consultation process including three rounds of consultation, with assistance from Kirk & Co. and with input from stakeholders. BC Hydro published consideration memos to demonstrate how public input was considered and used. All materials are available to the public online and at the Site C community consultation offices.

2. **Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision.**
   
   BC Hydro committed to considering input gathered through three rounds of consultation and clearly communicated that input would influence the design of subsequent rounds of consultation and that it would assist BC Hydro in refining study topics such as reservoir impact lines, wildlife studies and dam and bridge designs through consideration memos. The Site C project refined project design and environmental baseline and effects studies based on input from public and stakeholder consultation.

3. **Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.**
   
   BC Hydro repeatedly communicated to consultation participants that no decision had been made to build Site C. Kirk & Co. independently prepared a *Consultation Summary Report* for each round of consultation, summarizing public and stakeholder feedback from all consultation methods. This input and a summary of all project work between 2007 and 2009 was presented to the BC Hydro board of directors and to the government of British Columbia, the decision makers regarding Site C.

4. **Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.**
   
   Given the nature of Site C and the presence of local and provincial interests, BC Hydro established early in Stage 2 that consultation would be local and province-wide, but with a focus on communities in the Peace Region and in northeast B.C. Through previous consultation processes, BC Hydro had an extensive list of stakeholders in the Peace Region who expressed an interest in Site C. Additional stakeholder groups suggested by local government, BC Hydro and Kirk & Co were added to this list. Notification of and invitations to Stage 2 consultation events were broad and extensive. To avoid scheduling conflicts and to further encourage participation, meetings and open houses were scheduled at different times of the day, and on different days of the week. BC Hydro recognized the importance of diversity, and provided a variety of opportunities for the public and stakeholders to participate, as some people are more comfortable providing their input in person at an open house, while others prefer completing an online feedback form.
5. **Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.**

Stage 2 public and stakeholder consultation followed best practice by providing an opportunity for participants to provide input into how they wanted to participate in consultation, and about what topics they wanted to be consulted on. More than 600 people participated in Pre-Consultation. Participants provided a wealth of input that shaped the following two rounds of consultation, as well as the direction of the project. Participants provided several suggestions regarding future consultation process and topics, expressed an interest in how and when Site C would be compared to alternate energy sources, articulated concerns regarding local impacts, and communicated an interest in the consultation process and in participating in subsequent rounds of Project Definition Consultation.

Pre-Consultation input shaped the process for future consultations. The following is a list of examples of BC Hydro responses to Pre-Consultation input:

- Opening a community consultation office in Hudson’s Hope in addition to the one in Fort St. John to increase public access to Site C information.
- More opportunities for in-person participation, such as open houses and stakeholder meetings over online and digital mediums in the Peace region.
- Inclusion of consultation topics such as project design, recreation, infrastructure, local impacts, lands uses and community benefits.
- Advancing the development of preliminary socio-economic baseline studies to collect information on topics such as community infrastructure and recreation.

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

BC Hydro has demonstrated its commitment to transparency and to providing participants with the information they need by providing complete, accurate information about Site C. The Site C website and consultation offices offer significant physical and online access to many Site C documents and reports. All public information related to Site C is available online and in hard copy at the community consultation offices.

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

Kirk & Co. produced Consultation Summary Reports for all rounds of public and stakeholder consultation. The analysis and reporting included in Kirk & Co. consultation reports exceed consultation best practice. Synovate Ltd., a nationally recognized market research firm, analyzed feedback forms and written submissions. This added an additional layer of independence in the analysis and reporting of Site C consultation results. Also consistent with consultation best practice, BC Hydro notified consultation participants and the public about the availability of the Consultation Summary Reports. BC Hydro also published consideration memos to demonstrate how public input was considered and used.

**CONCLUSION**

The process by which the public and stakeholders provided their input met or exceeded consultation best practices outlined by IAP2 and other authorities such as the Office of the Auditor General of B.C. Without the thousands of participants and ongoing dialogue about the project, Site C would not have the legitimacy and transparency that a large, high-profile infrastructure project requires. As Site C advances to regulatory review and environmental assessment with the endorsement of the provincial government, public and stakeholder consultation will continue to provide an important foundation for a project that will benefit British Columbians for generations.
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1. Executive summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Tidal Dee and Clwyd flood risk management strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Environment Agency Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Northeast Wales coastline and inland tidal areas around the River Dee and River Clwyd estuaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question / Problem</td>
<td>Flood risk management strategy to help Environment Agency Wales and its partners (including local authorities, the Welsh Assembly Government, and local people), understand how to best manage tidal flooding from the Dee and Clwyd estuaries for the next 100 years. The strategy presents short, medium and long term solutions designed to take into account climate change predictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Workshops, community planning events, supermarket drop-in exhibitions, community interviews, questionnaires, consultation documents, response forms, website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>A comprehensive community engagement programme was central to the development of the strategy and the only one of its size and scope to have been undertaken in Wales to date. The views of local people underpinned the strategy in a way that has never been attempted before by Environment Agency Wales. Local businesses, communities and individuals (as well as statutory bodies and local authorities) are influencing decisions they will live with for the next 100 years. The most affected / vulnerable people were targeted through specific activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Wide area covering main centres of population around Rhyl and Prestatyn (for the Clwyd), and Chester and Flint (for the Dee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Approximately 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Over 1500 stakeholders and local people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Web Link | [www.environment-agency.gov.uk/clwyd](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/clwyd)  
[www.environment-agency.gov.uk/dee](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/dee) |
2. The Problem and Challenge

Environment Agency Wales is producing two flood risk management strategies for the tidal Clwyd and tidal Dee. These will help the Agency and its partners (including local authorities, the Welsh Assembly Government, and the local communities) understand how to best manage tidal flooding from the Rivers Clwyd (shown on the map below) and Dee for the next 100 years.

The strategies cover the north Wales coastline and inland tidal area between Abergele, around the Point of Ayr and up the Dee estuary as far as Chester. The main centres of population are around Rhyl, Kinmel Bay and Prestatyn (for Clwyd) and Chester, Queensferry and Flint (for Dee). In addition to the permanent residents living in the strategy areas, thousands of people visit each year, including holidaymakers at local caravan parks.

The Environment Agency report *Flooding in Wales: a national assessment of flood risk* found that approximately one in six buildings are at risk of flooding, and more than 357,000 people live in properties at risk of flooding. As many as 4,000 people in 1,150 homes and businesses in Kinmel Bay and parts of Rhyl are at risk of flooding should the current embankments fail. If the situation is not addressed the number of people and homes at risk would more than double within a decade.

We had a number of challenges that required consideration in the design of our communications and engagement approach and in the delivery of public participation during the development of the strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different types of flooding</th>
<th>The strategies focused initially on tidal flooding; however there are other sources of flood risk including flooding from rivers (fluvial), and localised flooding in streets as a result of heavy downpours and inadequate urban drainage (surface water flooding). However where exactly water is coming from is of little concern to those suffering from flooding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other consultation on flood issues underway</td>
<td>There was a risk of consultation fatigue or complicating existing messages regarding flooding in the strategy areas as a number of plans, programmes and projects were already in existence when we commenced our work. Most notably this included the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP), Catchment Flood Management Plans (CFMP), flood awareness campaigns (Floodwise programme) and specific local flood risk management schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consultation of this type to date</td>
<td>Consultation in the Agency has historically followed the traditional Decide-Announce-Defend (DAD) model of engagement and decision making where outcomes were simply being presented to stakeholders as a ‘take it or leave it’ scenario. Our approach for these strategies is based on the Engage-Deliberate-Decide (EDD) model however people have got used to the old way and there was an element of distrust (in the Agency but more specifically in local authorities) to overcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The Role of Public Participation

A comprehensive community engagement programme was central to the development of the strategies. In our three stage approach – the largest in size and scope to have been undertaken in Wales to date - the views of local people underpin the strategies in a way that has never been attempted before by Environment Agency Wales. Local businesses, communities and individuals as well as statutory bodies and local authorities influenced decisions they will live with for the next 100 years.
Clear key messages\(^1\) were devised at the outset of the project (along with ‘the five principles’ which will be discussed in the following sections) as part of our Communications and Engagement Plan. The role of local people (predominantly within phase 2 ‘engage’) was to tell us which of the five principles (or combination of principles) they would prioritise in the strategies, where geographically they should be applied and when we should implement them. Everything people told us during our community and stakeholder events was taken on board and helped the project team make decisions about the strategies’ recommendations.

4. Public Participation Methods

Public participation was undertaken using a variety of methods and techniques:

- **Publicity and advertising** – public launch, press releases, adverts, tailored letters, website
- **Ongoing liaison and one-to-one meetings** with key stakeholders (including community members such as landowners and politicians)
- **Exhibitions** – unmanned displays in local libraries, supermarket exhibitions manned by team members, questionnaires and response forms, comments book, summary documents
- **Stakeholder workshops** – targeted at specific interest groups (environmental, community, political)
- **Community planning events** – offered an opportunity for the community to become actively involved in planning solutions and tell us where the principles should be applied
- **Community interviews** - pre arranged appointments and visits to most vulnerable groups and individuals in the strategy areas.

5. Uniqueness of the Project

a. What innovative participation techniques were used?

Developing ‘the five principles’

We needed to communicate complicated technical ideas and a wide range of detailed engineering options to local people in a clear and meaningful way. Simplifying these into easy to understand principles for managing flood risk was key to our approach. ‘The five principles’ were used by the whole project team throughout the development of the strategy, and they meant that all public feedback was genuinely based on a sound understanding of the issues involved.

\(^1\) Our key messages: 1. Climate change is happening – sea level will rise, and there will be larger and more frequent flood events; 2. We are working together with organisations and communities to develop a range of solutions – we will take your views into account; 3. There will be some hard decisions to make.
Community interviews – targeted engagement via pre-arranged appointments with vulnerable groups and individuals and those traditionally deemed hard-to-reach. Examples of interviews undertaken include attending youth group sessions, and bingo nights for elderly and disabled residents in a local community hall.

Community planning events – events that empowered key community representatives (including local councillors, community group leaders, chairs of residents associations, active and interested residents) to plan elements of the strategies as if they were part of the project team. ‘The five principles’ were displayed on flags which allowed people to position (on large maps with overlays showing flood risk outlines) where they thought principles should be applied.

Supermarket exhibitions – in recognition of the fact that traditional exhibitions are often poorly attended due to the inconvenient times or locations they are held, we decided to ‘take the consultation to the people’. A number of exhibitions were held at a range of times (spanning from 8am to 9pm on weekdays and weekends) and at a range of shops to capture a variety of spending profiles. They were designed to suit as wide a range of people as possible, and based on local knowledge of busiest times and the most used shopping venues.

b. How did public participation improve the decision and contribute to the resolution of the problem?

The two ‘softer’ principles (‘be prepared’ and ‘adapt to floods’) were ‘championed’ in the strategies as a direct result of strong local opinion which prioritised them over and above the other three structural, ‘hard engineering’ principles. This important (and relatively unconventional) focus on these two principles could have potentially been neglected in the absence of robust and effective public participation.

c. How did the project spread the practice of public participation into a new area?

As well as steering the Agency away from the DAD model of decision making to an EDD approach, the communications and engagement methodology designed and undertaken for these strategies has been benchmarked as best practice within the organisation and has given added momentum to the Agency’s own ‘building trust with communities’ programme.
6. Project Results

The project was successful in achieving its outcome in producing two strategies for managing flood risk from the tidal Dee and Clwyd in the short (now – 20 years), medium (20 – 50 years) and long (50 – 100 years) term. Public participation outputs clearly contributed to the prioritisation of principles applied within the strategies and justified the solutions put forward. Simple, labelled maps were used to present recommended solutions to local people and link these back to the five principles.

The success of the communications and engagement approach can be demonstrated in a number of ways:

- **Large numbers of people engaged** across a broad geographical area – over 1000 people visited our supermarket exhibitions where more than 900 completed questionnaires in phase 2 (‘engage’) alone.
- **Public appreciation** – the team were thanked and praised by stakeholders and local people for providing a variety of interesting opportunities to be involved at all stages of the process, rather than just being told what was happening at the end.
- **Best practice methodology** – the communications and engagement work on the strategies scored very highly in the Agency’s internal performance measures, and our approach has been recognised as national best practice.
- **Gave people opportunity** - it is not always possible to fully satisfy everyone affected by a major decision but our approach allowed those affected to at least have access to information, understanding of the process and reasoning behind the outcome.

7. Alignment with Core Values

The IAP2 Core Values are reflected within the project in a number of ways:

a. **How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?**

Questionnaires and community planning events (carried out during phase 2) identified Sandy Cove estate in the Clwyd strategy as one of the most affected areas with a large number of elderly and disabled vulnerable users. An exhibition in this location (during phase 3 of our approach) ensured feedback was given to those most affected ‘on their turf’ and that they were given a direct opportunity to give us their views on the strategy recommendations.

Our flexible undertaking of community interviews ensured hard-to-reach groups and individuals were engaged at times and locations convenient to them (e.g. at their centre or regular meeting place, during early morning appointments and clubs held later in the evening after work).

b. **How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?**

As discussed in section 5.b, the biggest contribution the public made to the outcome of the project was the inclusion and prioritisation of the ‘be prepared’ and ‘adapt to floods’ principles in the strategies.
c. How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?

The strategies’ recommendations include long term, more sustainable elements of flood risk management relating to behavioural change and attitudes based on priorities set by local people. The strategies took the social context of the areas and affected communities into account rather than just implementing textbook hard engineering solutions and traditional structural approaches to satisfy immediate short term needs.

d. How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?

Throughout the process stakeholders were regularly asked how they preferred to be involved. For example, during feedback on SEA scoping in phase 1 (‘inform’) we catered to varying preferences in terms of communication method and offered people the chance to either attend an interactive feedback presentation or to receive a written update in the form of a newsletter.

A number of events were planned and undertaken at the direct request or suggestion of stakeholders, including:

- **Modelling meeting** - during initial workshops some stakeholders requested further information on detailed modelling data. This level of technical detail was not appropriate for the majority of attendees so a separate ‘modelling meeting’ was scheduled enabling interested parties to talk on a more detailed level with relevant technical team members.

- **Member’s briefing** - political stakeholder workshops were held during phase 2 (‘engage’) where all councillors were invited to attend, but few participated. It was suggested that holding the presentation at a council venue would yield a larger number of attendees. During phase 3 (‘feedback’) we set up a joint members evening presentation in the Council Chamber itself which was well attended. Members appreciated the offer of a briefing in a location and at a time that was more convenient for them.

e. How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?

Views recorded in questionnaires and at our events were used to form part of the ‘informal’ evaluation criteria against which all viable options were evaluated. This ‘hierarchy of option appraisal’ was created to demonstrate exactly how and at what point people’s views could affect the decision making process in the context of the standard appraisal process the team was required to follow.

This was particularly useful in managing expectations in terms of the extent to which the strategy outcome could be affected, but more importantly identified the practical problems faced in previous flood events (e.g. evacuation and protection of critical infrastructure) and identifying the things that local people feel are important to protect.

All public information (leaflets, boards, posters etc) was produced bilingually and Welsh-speakers were available at most events. Media interviews were conducted in both languages.

f. How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?

Communications at all stages explained ‘How will my views be taken on board?’ and ‘What happens next?’

Materials used in phase 3 (‘feedback’) reported back to local people what the consultation had told us, explained how public views were taken into account, and why (or why not) certain principles were taken forward as part of the strategies’ recommended solution.
IAP2 2010 Core Values Award

Cover Page

1. **The title:** A Trio of Books on “Community Planning” by Wendy Sarkissian and nine co-authors and with-authors: Dianna Hurford, Wiwik Bunjamin-Mau, Nancy Hofer, Chris Wenman, Andrea Cook, Kelvin Walsh, Yollana Shore, Steph Vadja and Cathy Wilkinson with Earthscan, London

   a) *Kitchen Table Sustainability: Practical Recipes for Community Engagement with Sustainability* (2009)

2. **Award category:** Innovation Award

3. **Organization name:** Wendy Sarkissian, nine co-authors and with-authors and Earthscan Publishers, London

4. **Nominee’s name:** Dr Wendy Sarkissian FPIA

5. **Contact Information:**
   Wendy Sarkissian, PO Box 200117, Nimbin NSW 2480 Australia wendy@sarkissian.com.au, Tel: + 61 402 966 284

6. **2 participant references**
   Professor Leonie Sandercock
   Professor, School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, #433-6333 Memorial Road, Vancouver, BC, Canada, V6T 1Z2
   Address: home: 694 Milbank, Vancouver BC, Canada V5Z 3Z3
   Telephone: home: +1 604 874 1817; Telephone: office +1 604 822 0225
   **Summer holidays** home phone no. in Washington State: + 1 360 376 3279
   No mobile telephone number. Email: leonies@interchange.ubc.ca

   Angela Hazebroek, FPIA
   President, Planning Association of Australia, South Australian Chapter
   And Director, Urban and Regional Planning Solutions
   Suite 12, 154 Fullarton Road, Rose Park, South Australia 5067
   Telephone: + 1 8 8333 7999; cell: + 61 407 600 124 Email: angela@urps.com.au

7. **Contact information for 3 publications (newspapers, journals, magazines, etc.) to be notified if your entry is selected**

   1. *Australian Planner*: Gillian Warry: ausplanner@griffith.edu.au
   2. *Journal of the American Planning Association*: Thomas W. Sanchez, Review Editor, JAPA Reviews: JAPA@utah.edu
   3. *Plan Canada*: Senior Editors Deborah Jensen (Deborah.Jensen@nanaimo.ca) or Richard Milgrom (milgrom@cc.umanitoba.ca)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Organizing Group</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Key Question/Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Wendy Sarkissian, nine co-authors and Earthscan publishers</td>
<td>Nimbin and other locations in Australia; Sweden; Canada; publisher in London, UK</td>
<td><em>Kitchen Table Sustainability: Practical Recipes for Community Engagement with Sustainability (KTS)</em> (2009): examines ways for ordinary people to engage with the sustainability discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Creative Community Planning: Transformative Engagement Methods for Working at the Edge (CCP)</em> (2010): explores ways to be more creative and visionary in community engagement processes while still delivering tangible results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Research, writing, publishing and marketing of three books on community engagement in the “Tools for Community Planning” suite from Earthscan, London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Together, these new books fill major gaps in the “practice” literature for engagement practitioners and community organizers, especially when dealing with intractable problems. <em>Kitchen Table sustainability</em> offers techniques that promote education, action, trust, inclusion, nurturing and governance in engagement processes. <em>SpeakOut</em> provides step-by-step guidance for designing and managing the innovative SpeakOut engagement model pioneered in Australia in 1990, now used internationally. <em>Creative Community Planning</em> provides poems, stories and wide-ranging practical guidance for those seeking more creative and visionary engagement processes to appeal to a wide range of community audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>International publisher with wide distribution. Two books currently used as textbooks in planning courses in Canada and Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Book research and writing began in mid-2007. All books available internationally by February 2010.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Wendy Sarkissian, Wiwik Bunjamin–Mau and Dianna Hurford,(co-authors); “with” authors: Yollana Shore, Nancy Hofer, Steph Vajda, Cathy Wilkinson, Kelvin Walsh, Andrea Cook and Chris Wenman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Links</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kitchentablesustainability.com">www.kitchentablesustainability.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.speakoutplanning.com">www.speakoutplanning.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.creativecommunityplanning.com">www.creativecommunityplanning.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Wicked Problems: The Problem and Challenge**

The wicked and intractable problems addressed by these books reflect constantly changing and interconnected environmental, social and economic complexities that influence community resilience and sustainability, as well as community competence in understanding these issues and the approaches and solutions available to them. The books accept that a transdisciplinary approach is necessary that recognises multiple knowledge cultures. Often local people do nothing more than “share their ignorance” through shallow, culture-bound engagement processes that fail to provide opportunities for them to build literacy, knowledge and competence, as well as consciousness. We cannot expect these deliberations to help in working to resolve complex problems that span disciplines, value systems and knowledge bases.

The challenge was to develop a set of practical books for a diverse readership which honestly and accurately reflects and respects the huge body of theoretical and practice literature on community engagement (and the “wicked competencies” of sustainability), while still being helpful to practitioners and community members. A further challenge was to write and illustrate the books in a user-friendly style that values the “soft skills” of communication and facilitation, while accurately respecting the “hard skills” of scientific, technical and theoretical material.

**The Role of Public Participation**

These books are based largely on Wendy Sarkissian’s three decades of innovative and path-breaking practice in community engagement, as well as insights and models of the other authors and contributors (community engagement practitioners, facilitators, social researchers or environmental scientists). They reflect the work of many “reflective practitioners”.

1. **Kitchen Table Sustainability**: Real positive change in the quest for a sustainable world begins at the local level, on the ground. Yet the prospect of participating in building sustainable communities can be daunting. *Kitchen Table Sustainability* offers a unique view on sustainability through the lens of community engagement. Drawing on a rich tapestry of personal stories, professional and academic knowledge, and a heartfelt care for communities and the Earth, this book encourages communities to engage with conversations about sustainability at the ‘kitchen table’ – where anyone can contribute, and everyone has a place. This book provides a strong theoretical underpinning highlighted by practical examples. It is the foundation for the three books.

*KTS* makes the case that communities are the heart and hands of the sustainability movement and explains why engagement practices that help communities articulate, develop and achieve sustainable solutions are at the heart of the transition toward community resilience and global sustainability. This practical guide distils decades of wisdom from community engagement and sustainability practice in a user-friendly and engaging book, full of inspirational examples and case studies. It values the “tender minded” and “tough minded” competencies of sustainability.

The core of the book is a powerful approach to building community competencies in community engagement with the “wicked problems” of sustainability, referred to as **EATING**. Encompassing Education, Action, Trust, Inclusion, Nourishment and Governance, the **EATING** approach helps readers develop a big-picture understanding of engagement with sustainability. It provides knowledge, confidence, vocabulary and tools to help bring sustainability to the forefront of community engagement, planning and development.

The **EATING** approach consists of: **Education**: a new model – *Community Education for Sustainability (CES)* – draws on state-of-the-art environmental education processes to underpin a community-based, participatory approach to strengthening local knowledge about sustainability. CES discusses essential hard and soft skills and how they relate to strengthening individual and community capacity to engage effectively in sustainability discourses.

**Action**: explores relationships among action, activism and sustainability to ensure that community engagement leads to concrete and measurable action and that all activists are welcomed, respected and fully included in engagement processes as valued participants.
Trust: emphasises the importance of trust in all aspects of community engagement and provides approaches that tackle trust in sophisticated ways. The chapter develops opportunities for communities, proponents, developers and governments to form trusting relationships with each other across differences. Inclusion: addresses the critical role of equal opportunity to ensure that everyone sitting at the table is welcome, given equal status, can speak and be heard, with respect for diversity and difference and the realization that everyone’s knowledge as valid and valuable. The chapter includes the notion of widening our conception of ethical community to include the Natural world.

Nourishment: Presents the Personal Sustainability Action Plan as a tool to integrate passion with planning and develop clarity and direction to sustain personal action and avoid burn-out.

Governance: explores innovative approaches to governance that ensure authentic engagement. The chapter includes recommended principles for designing governance structures and examples that provide a starting point for creating sustainable systems of deeply democratic and participatory governance.

2. SpeakOut. Andrea Cook and Wendy co-designed the SpeakOut model in 1990 in Adelaide. Indonesian-born Wiwik Bunjamin-Mau, applied it in the innovative and multicultural Talk Any Kine festival in Honolulu’s Chinatown in 2006. Practitioners (including students and co-authors Nancy Hofer and Dianna Hurford) in Thunder Bay and Vancouver, Canada and Townsville and Brisbane, Australia refined the initial approaches and developed new methods, partly to address some complex “wicked” problems related to housing density. These include engaging, colourful interactive stall exercises, pioneered by Andrea Cook and Steph Vajda in Melbourne in 2004.

This illustrated manual is the product of two decades of successful practice and aims to enable both planning veterans and people with little or no experience in the field to conduct a wide variety of community engagement events with absolute confidence. It introduces the SpeakOut, an innovative, interactive drop-in process with some of the qualities of an Open House and a participatory workshop. It provides hands-on, step-by-step guidance, detailed checklists and practical advice on how to manage community engagement processes, as well as detailed advice on facilitation, recording and training of helpers, as well as five detailed case studies.

Features include:
- Clear step-by-step lists of things to remember when planning a community workshop or SpeakOut, including how to plan, allocate resources, advertise, manage and encourage participation;
- Illustrated case studies from Australia, Canada and Hawai’i where SpeakOuts and workshops have been organized by practitioners, community leaders, activists and academics;
- A unique chapter on SpeakOuts for children;
- How to ‘green’ your workshop or SpeakOut;
- Practical recommendations about the ‘dos’ and ‘don’ts’ when organizing a community SpeakOut or workshop; and
- A chapter on facilitator and recorder training and facilitation methods, including ground rules, group management, communication techniques, brainstorming, recording and detailed specific advice on analysis and reporting of participant contributions.

3. Creative Community Planning takes the process of engagement to “the Edge”. Fully illustrated and co-authored with a poet-planner, it is written in an engaging and “welcoming” style and provides clear access to emerging innovations in artistic, narrative, embodied and technological methods. It explores the frontiers of community engagement and empowerment practice within a fresh sustainability framework. It is widely acknowledged that only multiple perspectives can aid in addressing the diversity of wicked problems faced by communities. Engagement processes can create imaginative forums to build knowledge and nurture understanding, “wicked competencies” and empathy for ourselves and our environments.
Reflecting on the wide continuum of participatory practice, the authors present the work of planning theorists, researchers and practitioners who engage with people living in diverse and ever changing communities and discuss how engagement practices have been enhanced through such practices as visioning and participatory research processes, poetry, theater, film, websites and exercises to access the creative ideas of all ages, including children and young people. Featured processes include using Otto Scharmer’s *Theory U*, active imagery and visualization and other participatory research and engagement processes to enhance creativity. The style and methods in this book offer multiple points for both practice and dialogue, ideal for academics, practitioners, students and instructors in all forms of planning, social research, participatory action research, community cultural development and community engagement.

**Public Participation Methods**

See section immediately above. Here are some extracts from the three books:

1. **Kitchen Table Sustainability: Extract from Chapter 5: Education**
   **Our Learning Model: Community Education for Sustainability (CES)**

   Our learning model, Community Education for Sustainability (CES), emerges from a comprehensive review of learning models, environmental and adult education literature, current research into sustainability issues and our understanding of how community members need to be engaged in sustainability debates, based on our professional experience. Our six-part CES learning model comprises the following ingredients:

   - **Ingredient 1:** Understanding
   - **Ingredient 2:** Community capacity strengthening
   - **Ingredient 3:** Grounded in reality
   - **Ingredient 4:** New relationships with Nature
   - **Ingredient 5:** Justice
   - **Ingredient 6:** Creativity and spirituality

   We describe each of these ingredients in more detail below.

   **Ingredient 1: Understanding:** *Foster broad understanding of all dimensions of sustainability based on science, experience, ethics, values and the intersection of diverse beliefs.*

   This ingredient reflects and extends successful environmental education models, as a major weakness of some models is their reluctance to challenge the established paradigms that drive our lives. The transformational education we advocate requires a complete rethinking of our ‘master metaphorical templates’… We do not aim solely to educate people to operate within the existing paradigm but rather to build the skills of an enlightened citizenry so that people can engage with and question that paradigm in effective ways. This ingredient also highlights the need for processes to support community understanding of the complexity of sustainability challenges by opening up community discussions of ethics, human responsibilities to Nature and the multi-disciplinary and holistic nature of the sustainability crisis. We must assess community knowledge levels so we can target capacity-strengthening activities appropriately. It is a difficult balance.

2. **SpeakOut: from Chapter 5: Designing and Managing a SpeakOut**

   **Lighting and electrical power supply**

   We often have ‘electrical’ difficulties at SpeakOuts or workshops. Working in old buildings, in rural areas, in industrial areas with unreliable power supplies or in marquees and tents requires awareness of our power needs. Often there are simply not enough electrical outlets to support all the technology required for a public workshop. So we need to bring our own extension leads, power boards and double adapters and gaffer (or duct) tape to tape cords to the floor so that people do not trip over them.

   Or it may be that the venue has inflexible ‘romantic’ lighting – designed for weddings and parties. If the lighting cannot be increased to permit people to read materials at their tables (and
recorders to see to record what people say), you may need to provide some additional lighting, as the students did in Vancouver.

Using a projector requires that the room be darkened for best effect. Often rooms described as ‘darkenable’ do not have curtains that cover the full length or width of the windows. If the windows are the only form of ventilation on a hot day, will you still be able to see the slides and not suffocate? It’s good to check for awkward backlighting and glare from windows that can make it difficult to see projected images.

Skylights are a particular problem. We have had to send a person up onto the roof of two gymnasiums we have worked in to tape black garden plastic to the skylight. On one occasion, the outside temperature was 42 degrees Celsius (or 108 degrees Fahrenheit)! And it was a metal roof.

3. Creative Community Planning: from Chapter 5: Heartstorming: Putting the vision back into visioning

How to begin?

How to begin the visioning journey? Following a preframing designed to put people at ease and convince them that this is not a recruitment session for the Church of the Cosmic Banana, I ask people to loosen their belts and uncross their legs. I invite those who are used to doing meditation or yoga to sit in any position that helps them feel centred. There are two ways to proceed. The approach of Enspirited Envisioning is to ‘leap into the future time’ and to find yourself in the future environment. This works well for most people. For those who have a bit more time and perhaps a bit of orientation to this way of working, I guide them along a country road, through an old gate into a secret garden, where they meet a young child who takes them on a journey in a hot-air balloon. Either way works. It’s often a matter of timing. The important thing is to guide with confidence, demystifying the journeying process and giving the impression that this is the most natural thing to be doing!

Paying attention to wording

It must be clear from the foregoing that the wording of the script is critical to success. There is much more to community visioning than sitting around, brainstorming, imagining an ideal future and writing down the key points. Many planning practitioners do nothing more than that and miss the huge benefits of paying attention to wording to prompt participants to look for certain features in the future landscapes they are ‘visiting’. This is not ‘leading the witness’. Quite the contrary. By paying attention to careful wording and the NLP [neurolinguistic programming] principles described above, we can ensure that we prompt only in a generic sense. For example, a future ‘ecological’ vision may have transport or transit components. Rather than guiding participants into a bus station or a train, we can ask them to visualise the transport interchange and they can work out for themselves what the mode of transport might be. Similarly, with schooling, entertainment, community enterprises, shopping, local food production… The key is to cue for a response but keep it generic, while stimulating participants’ unique learning styles.

Innovation

These three books address three problems with current community engagement: (1) little emphasis on capacity building (b) lack of specific and practical “how-to” guidance from engagement processes; and (c) frequent reliance on a limited range of boring and relatively unimaginative engagement methods (such as the open house, search conference or workshop). The careful weaving of voices from theory and practice means that these three books are complementary (and complementary to the three other books in the suite) and build on each other. To meet the ambitious goal of engaging with sustainability issues, KTS provides a model and a framework, SpeakOut provides the exact methods to use and CCP offers a range of “invitations” to work “at the edge” in ways that address more recent formulation of “wicked problems”, i.e., addressing the more creative and radical concept of “wicked delight” via
employing creativity and imagination – an approach currently being developed by Millie Rooney, a PhD student in the School of Environmental Studies at the University of Tasmania.

Project Results
We have recently been advised by Earthscan’s Commissioning Editor that the books are selling very well, better than some of the classic “community” books in their booklist. Critical acclaim has been very strong and reviews generally positive (though they are only slowly coming to light). One reviewer praised the accessibility of the KTS book for its use by activists.

We know that practitioners are using the books (we have each had personal testimonials of people using them) and KTS is already used at two universities as a textbook. Wendy’s workshops and lectures on all three books continue to draw very positive responses and strong evaluations (as with a successful June 2010 workshop on community engagement in Adelaide for the Australian Planning Institute, South Australian Chapter, on “The Edge”).

Alignment with Core Values

1. How did the project ensure that those most affected by the problem were involved?

   • All three books explicitly address approaches to include those marginalized in traditional engagement processes, including the Natural environment (reflected in both a dramatic team development workshop and a community “reconnecting ceremony” in CCP).

2. How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?

   • Authors include valuable lessons from their practice and that of other practitioners to discern what has and has not worked in community engagement processes. What works is defined by how well the community’s voices are heard and influence decisions. KTS describes a successful case study: the Minnesota Block Exercise.

3. How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?

   • While all books espouse the need for inclusionary processes, KTS devotes a full chapter to inclusion, using Patsy Healey’s theoretical framework; many practical examples illustrate how to create welcoming and inclusionary processes, as well as how to encourage participation by hard-to-reach people and groups.

4. How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?

   • See # 1 above. Innovative processes specifically for children and young people highlighted in CCP as “Gilt-Edged Resources” in Appendices.

5. How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?

   • One of the clearest messages of the three books is that a “one-size-fits-all” engagement approach is not appropriate or useful because of the range of communities and the complexities of issues that must be addressed. A range of techniques to match to communities/issues is presented in all three books. A critical message is the importance of time: the need to consult with potential participants before the engagement process to determine which approaches are most suitable.

6. How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?

   • Education for sustainability and civic engagement are fundamental tenets of the EATING approach in KTS. The books collectively make the case that education must be an integral component of all engagement to avoid perpetuating “cycles of ignorance”. Information should be provided to appeal to participants’ intelligence types and learning styles.

7. How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?

   • The community views in the case studies reflect our deep commitment to communication with participants. The wide verbatim reporting of community views reveals our careful listening to the softest voices and our hope that these publications will improve engagement practice by showing how community members actually experience engagement processes.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>We Create Our Future: Pinal County Comprehensive Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Group</td>
<td>Pinal County, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Pinal County, Arizona USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Guided by citizen input, update the County’s plan on how to grow and develop over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Design charrettes; development forums; visioning workshops; road shows; alternatives workshops; preferred future workshops; comprehensive plan workshops; educational forum series; youth charrettes; youth vision writing; technical advisory groups; tasks forces; comprehensive plan advisory group; leadership interviews; interactive website; meetings-in-a-box; public hearings; scenario visualization; Facebook (social media) page; feedback instruments and surveys; stakeholder briefings; Tribal meetings; community presentations; university/student focus groups; peer-community analysis; eNewsletters; press releases; technical briefings; agency review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Vision-based, community-driven plan to manage growth, preserve the quality of life, and promote sustainability while serving as the model of smart growth planning for the Southwest United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Principal impact (political jurisdiction): County of 5,386 square miles (1,394,967 hec); nearly 350,000 population (projected buildout population 4.1 to 5.2 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary impact: Sun Corridor Megapolitan, State of Arizona, Southwestern United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>June 2007 to November 2009 (30 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>2,000+ participants in participation and engagement activities; 100,000+ estimated informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/">http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PROBLEM AND CHALLENGE

Arizona’s Sun Corridor is one of a handful of locations demographers anticipate the majority of future growth in the US to occur. Home to approximately 5 million people today, the Sun Corridor spans from Prescott through metropolitan Phoenix and Tucson, and south to the Mexico border where projections indicate the population could double over the course of the next few decades. In the heart of this Corridor is Pinal County: a rural community, proud of its agrarian history, and larger than the state of Connecticut. Facing the possibility that it may be home to the next several million Sun Corridor residents, Pinal County initiated a broad-based stakeholder engagement strategy to define a community-derived vision for the future that could accommodate the anticipated growth while preserving what residents valued today. The result is the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan, a landmark project that will serve to steer the County on a positive course of action to manage growth, preserve the quality of life, and promote sustainability while serving as the model of smart growth planning for the Southwest.

Link to unanimously adopted plan (358 pages):

Creating a sustainable, smart growth plan for Pinal County was not easy. When the project began, Pinal was on a growth spurt having already entitled over 650,000 dwelling units and approving residential developments at an average of 3.5 dwelling units per acre in unincorporated Pinal—if development continued as it had, Pinal could have become home to nearly 4 million in unincorporated lands alone! People flocked to Pinal County between 2000 and 2007 because they could afford a larger home at a lower price, with the trade-off that they may have to travel substantial distances for employment, services and entertainment. Translated, this meant only 160 jobs per every 1,000 Pinal County residents, versus the much healthier economic conditions in neighboring Maricopa and Pima (585 and 514 jobs per 1,000 residents respectfully). With so few jobs in Pinal, traffic and commute times increased for residents who started thinking long and hard about the consequences of their “time tax.” Thus, from the onset, one clear message was communicated: In Pinal, it could not be business as usual.

The Plan strives to position the region as the “County of choice”. Pinal County will continue to improve its livability by attracting quality jobs, a full range of housing in quality neighborhoods, educational and job training opportunities, and services for a multi-generational population. The Arizona State University’s Morrison Institute Report, The Future at Pinal, challenged Pinal County to choose becoming a “McMega Drive Through” or a “Distinguishable Destination;” the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan strives to implement the latter.

To do so, the Plan links land use and transportation, directing growth towards existing infrastructure in order to preserve a remarkable 1/3 of the County (or 1.4 million acres) as open space and parks. The essential ingredient to this aggressive open space program was the focus on mixed use activity centers throughout Pinal County. Residents endorsed the strategy of activity centers as a way to reduce sprawl, conserve open space and protect irreplaceable natural beauty and resources. This sort of nodal development pattern, the planning team articulated, would translate to compact community and building design and thus, less land required for construction. This approach also reduces energy needed for transportation, transporting water and providing other services, while reducing the carbon footprint and environmental impact. The Pinal County Comprehensive Plan is Arizona’s premier example of a smart growth plan, addressing all ten principals of smart growth as defined by the Smart Growth Network and serving as the feature case study recently at the Sustainability Award Submission.
Arizona Workshop Series. The Plan was also influential in Arizona Department of Transporations projects, Build a Quality Arizona (bqAZ) and Statewide Rail Framework, as well as the Maricopa Association of Governments I-8/I-10 Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study.

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
The Plan’s success has as much to do with the technical expertise as it does the feedback and ideas generated through an extensive public and stakeholder engagement process; make no mistake, the project brand, “We Create Our Future”, was the foundation of the project. Nearly 2,000 people participated in the 46 official events held throughout the process and over 100 people participated on work groups or task forces that contributed to various aspects throughout the project. Additionally, hundreds of hours of presentations were made and meetings attended with stakeholders, landowners, cities and towns, Native American communities, development interests, and other governmental entities and organizations.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS
Inform Methods
- Interactive project website: http://www.psaplanning.com/ Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/
- Facebook: social media project page
- Forums: The project team conducted an educational Forum Series on four critical topics of the Plan: economic development, water, multimodal circulation, and sustainability.

Consult Methods
- One-on-One Meetings/Interviews: Throughout the process, the project team met informally with individuals and leaders to understand issues, perspectives, and ideas; one of the most important parts of consensus-building is effective listening.
- Milestone County Briefings: Gave Board of Supervisors and appropriate Commissions updates and formal opportunities to provide input and comment on interim products.
- Municipality and Indian Community Leadership Consultations: Held numerous meetings with jurisdictions within and adjacent to Pinal County.

Involve Methods
- Meetings-In-A-Box: Since Pinal County is so large and our goal was to ensure extraordinary public involvement, “Meetings-In-A-Box” concept was created that provided all the tools that any group (such as a homeowners’ association) would use to conduct a meeting or discussion about specific planning topic; participant groups subsequently submitted their findings to the project team via a postage-paid return envelope.
- Road Shows: Eight two-hour workshops (including a presentation followed by facilitated dialogue) were held to introduce the project and initiate the engagement program.
- Visioning Workshops: These events were held to discuss visioning and future land use/development opportunities. Each workshop was a three-hour interactive event in one of six different communities across Pinal County.
- Design Charrettes: Six Design Charrettes were held, allowing residents to design land use and other important features for the future in Pinal County using gaming pieces and a map of Pinal as a “game board”.
- Pinal County Visualization Model: A unique partnership with the Arizona State University's Decision Theater was formed to explore public planning alternatives. The model allowed participants to visualize "what if" scenarios.
- Alternative Workshops: Six Planning Workshops were held to discuss and evaluate the alternatives and to fine-tune the preferred alternative. Each workshop was an interactive event where participants provided feedback in order to craft a preferred alternative.
• **Pinal Preferred Future Workshops:** Following the Alternatives Workshops, six more workshops were held to discuss Pinal’s preferred land use and transportation network as it pertains to the development of the Comprehensive Plan. Participants feedback was used to fine-tune the preferred land use and transportation alternative.

• **Public Hearings:** A dozen formal public hearings were conducted over the course of a year-long citizen and stakeholder review process before the Plan’s unanimous adoption.

**Collaborate Methods**

• **Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC):** The CPAC was composed of representatives from each of the county planning areas and special interests (e.g. business, agriculture, developers) and serves as the project steering committee.

• **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):** The TAC was composed of agency representatives (e.g., Arizona State Lands Department, Arizona Department of Transportation, Bureau of Land Management), and utilities that met at key project milestones.

• **Regional Planning Team (RPT):** The RPT was composed of the municipal, tribal and regional planning directors (or their representatives) for the purpose of coordinating area development and planning.

• **Topic Specific Task Forces:** An Economic Development Task Force, Transportation Task Force and Energy Task Force consisted of individuals representing groups and agencies focused on these topics to provide targeted feedback and analysis.

**UNIQUENESS OF THE PROJECT**

The team used a comprehensive scenario development and analysis process to craft the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan. Twenty-seven conceptual land use and circulation plans were developed by the public and stakeholders during Design Charrettes throughout Pinal County. These plans coupled with the youth input resulted in seven Framework Plans. These plans were analyzed and discussed with the Comprehensive Plan committees and evolved into the three alternatives that were discussed and debated publicly. Also unique to the process was scenario visualization made possible through a partnership with Arizona State University’s Decision Theater. The consultant team together with staff, the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Group, Governor’s Office, Arizona Department of Commerce representatives, and representatives from local economic development organizations participated in a half-day event in “the drum” (a seven-screen “decision lab” used to simulate the consequences of various land use, economic development and transportation decisions) to visualize, discuss and fine-tune three alternative approaches.

**PROJECT RESULTS**

The Pinal County Comprehensive Plan provides a foundation for land use and transportation planning in Arizona’s Sun Corridor Megapolitan. Strategies outlined in the Plan are already being implemented, including creating a taskforce to address showing the physical availability of water when rezoning land. Additionally, the Plan helped provide the impetus for a landmark partnership by the state’s three largest councils of governments (Central Arizona, Maricopa and Pima) to come together and develop a comprehensive growth strategy for the Sun Corridor.

**ALIGNMENT WITH CORE VALUES**

*How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?*

From the outset of the planning process, the discussion focused on what was most important to Pinal County residents, analysis of past County decisions, exploring potential opportunities, weighing priorities, and making choices about Pinal County’s future. A fundamental goal of the
engagement process was education. Extensive efforts were made to provide participants the necessary information to provide educated input at every step in the Plan development process. Summary reports of all events were developed and made available on the comprehensive, interactive project website (http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/index.html, see “Library”). Numerous communication tools were utilized throughout the process to keep interested citizens and stakeholders informed, including project press releases (http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/ProjectNews.html) and eNewsletters (http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/eNewsletter.html).

**How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?**

The Pinal County Comprehensive Plan is the product of the feedback, ideas, hopes and desires of Pinal County residents. The role of the planning team was to consume the feedback received and translated it into a technically sound, long-range development plan. Early drafts of the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan included *participant quotes offered during the process on every page of the document* (nearly 300 pages in total) to illustrate that the Plan was made by and for the community.

**How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?**

The ultimate goal of the Plan was to present “one plan” that reflects a County-wide consensus and a coordinated effort between incorporated cities and towns, federal, state, regional agencies, public/private service providers and Native American communities. The Plan outlines how and where the entire County should grow and develop over time. It recognizes the importance of the current and future role that the Arizona State Trust and Native American lands will play in Pinal County and encourages close coordination and joint planning efforts to ensure achievement of mutual visions. The Plan strives to create robust and healthy communities, both physically and fiscally within Pinal County by encouraging orderly development. Through accommodating new growth in areas that can nurture additional development, the Plan encourages resource conservation and healthy communities based on well-protected environmental resources and a strong, diversified economy.

The principles of smart growth and sustainability provide the overall framework for the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan uses the concept of “buildout” as the foundation. Buildout is defined as the ultimate development of land in Pinal County with appropriate land uses based on a series of assumptions, including land ownership patterns, topographic and environmental constraints and opportunities, development potential, infrastructure support, and private property rights. Buildout does not depend on a benchmark year, but the Plan’s Growth Areas element does focus on a ten-year planning horizon in order to identify where and how Pinal County will direct and support development over this shorter-term timeframe.

**How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?**

A unique element of outreach was the specific inclusion of youth. Because the young people of the County will be the ones most impacted by inheriting the results of planning decisions made today, involving youth in the plan development process was critical. Eight youth Design Charrettes were held in classrooms across Pinal County giving voice to more than 200 students. The results of the land use and transportation plans, as well as the students’ hopes and dreams for Pinal County, were used while developing draft alternatives. Additionally, students at Arizona State University and University of Arizona provided input to the comprehensive planning process. Some of the most innovative and unique ideas included in the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan were those offered by youth.
This specific youth outreach program has already received special recognition as a specific public participation program by the Arizona Chapter of the American Planning Association in 2008 and was the principal case study in the “Youth in Planning” session (led by the nominating firm) at the 2009 IAP2 Annual Conference.

**How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?**
The team believed strongly in providing a variety of engagement opportunities that spanned the IAP2 public participation spectrum: from in-person participation at a design workshop or participating *virtually* by submitting feedback via the project website. Additionally, the project team provided accommodations for special populations, including translation services for those Spanish-speaking residents and providing engagement opportunities specifically designed for the Native American tribal communities.

**How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?**
The team ensured technical aspects of land use and urban planning, multimodal circulation and transportation, economic development, natural and cultural resources analyses were effectively communicated and understood by the public and officials so that good decisions could be made. The ultimate charge of the consulting team and staff was to ensure an open, comprehensive, technically-sound, and transparent planning process.

**How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?**
The “Comment Matrix” concept that was used to track the over 2,000 individual comments received during the two 60-day review periods and public hearings is a remarkably powerful tool in supporting transparency. This comment matrix was used by staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Board of Supervisors and ultimately, the public, to understand the type of comments being made and to show the evolution of the plan throughout the year-long review and adoption process.

The November 2008 Comment Matrix (149 pages) is a great example, [http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/PDF/110408_FINAL_TextCommentMatrix-Actions.pdf](http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/PDF/110408_FINAL_TextCommentMatrix-Actions.pdf)

However, all matrices can be found on the project website’s Library ([http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/Library.html](http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/Library.html)) under “Project Documents”.

After all stages of public engagement, reports were produced summarizing feedback as well as collating all individual comments received—in their original format (including spelling and grammatical errors!)—so that at any point during the process, those who participated could literally see that their feedback was collected and considered, and those who did not participate in the event could follow along. This ‘archive’ of public feedback serves as a wonderful vault of ideas and another way to demonstrate transparency of the decision-making process.
See hundreds more photos at our online photo gallery:
http://www.psaplanning.com/Clients/Pinal_County_Plan/Gallery.html