

The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia



**Report by Carla Rogers
2002 Churchill Fellow**



To investigate ‘successful approaches by Government land management agencies to involve the community in protected area planning and management’.

I understand that the Churchill Trust may publish this Report, either in hard copy or on the Internet or both, and consent to such publication.

I indemnify the Churchill Trust against any loss, costs or damages it may suffer arising out of any claims or proceeding made against the Trust in respect of or arising out of the publication of any Report submitted to the Trust and which the Trust places on a website for access over the internet.

I also warrant that my Final Report is original and does not infringe the copyright of any person, or contain anything which is, or the incorporation of which into the Final Report is, actionable for defamation, a breach of any privacy law or obligation, breach of confidence, contempt of court, passing-off or contravention of any other private right or of any law.

Signed:

Carla Rogers

Dated:

19 October 02



Acknowledgements

Thankyou to so many, particularly:

To the Winston Churchill Fellowship Trust for rewarding and furthering passions (not related to sport) and for what was, 'the opportunity of a lifetime'.

To my partner, Pat Newman, for joining me on and infinitely enriching this journey in so many ways, least of which as my 'interpreter', guide and sounding board.

To all the wonderful people that I met along the way and whom I mention in this report, for their time, wisdom and hospitality. Thank you to Michael Rees, Jillian Roulet, Marcia Morash and Heather Rice for facilitating visits and again to Michael, Heather, Cindy Boyko, Marsha Abra, Cindy and Sheila, Erin and Carol, Nick Hardigg and Anne Castellina for extending hospitality into their homes.

To my dear friends Russel Gluck and the (late) Dr. Cecily Boas for adding their energy and wisdom to the proposed journey and Alison McIntosh, who, as always, drops all for my last minute requests for editing and guidance.

To my family, particularly Mum, who responded to 'pleas for help' for things left behind or lost.

And finally, to my sponsors, Mick Tuck, David Broyd, Helen Hannah and Robert Quirk and my mentor Nicholas Carlisle for helpful words and guidance, and to the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, especially Tim Shepherd and Marcus Sandford, for their support of this opportunity.



Executive Summary

Carla Rogers – Churchill Fellow 2002

For more information on this report contact Carla Rogers at www.evoves.com.au

THE JOURNEY

Why and how the community is involved in assisting Government planning processes has been of considerable personal, professional and intellectual interest to me. With the aid of a Churchill Fellowship grant, I was able to pursue this interest in the United States and Canada, investigating 'successful approaches by Government land management agencies to involve the community in protected area planning and management'. I chose to focus on protected area planning and management due to the particular challenges that it poses and the opportunities it presented, particularly identifying and connecting with communities of interest (international, national, local and 'future generations').

HIGHLIGHTS

- Meetings with over 100 people from National Park Service (USA) and Parks Canada.
- Annual Conferences of the International Association of Public Participation (Salt Lake City, Utah) and International Association of Facilitators (Fort Worth, Texas).
- 20 protected areas visited across 9 states and including 7 World Heritage Areas.
- Presentations made/ papers delivered to National Park Service, USA and International Association of Public Participation, Salt Lake City and fortnightly radio interviews with ABC Far South Coast (Bega).

KEY FINDINGS

The challenges that I explored, successful approaches outlined and recommendations made in this report relate to the following six key themes:

- 1 Consulting within legal frameworks: how do you engage the community in a community involvement program where the decision-making authority is legally mandated and rests with the agency (that is "we want your views but we make the decision")?
- 2 Accessibility and transparency: how can you make both planning and community involvement programs open, transparent and accessible to a wide range of people?
- 3 Capacity building (of communities and employees): how do you build a 'culture of participation' ensuring that both staff and participants have the necessary power and skills to create this culture?
- 4 Accountability: how do you achieve accountability to the community for the progress and performance in the implementation of management plans?
- 5 Indigenous peoples: how do you effectively involve indigenous people in the preparation of management plans and ensure that this involvement is reflected in the plan itself?
- 6 Relationships and trust: what are some initiatives and programs that can help develop relationships outside of direct community involvement programs for management plans, thus building trust between the agency and the community?

SHARING MY FINDINGS

I believe that many of the successful approaches for community involvement explored, are relevant to Australian land management agencies and could assist with the evolution of our practice within Australia. I am excited about the opportunity to share ideas, with land management agencies, professional associations and the community. Current arrangements to share findings are detailed in attachment 2.



Table of Contents

1. THE JOURNEY: MAY 3 2002 – JULY 21 2002	1
2. INTRODUCTION	2
3. HOW TO READ THIS PAPER.....	3
4. THE CHALLENGES	4
4.1 CONSULTING WITHIN LEGAL FRAMEWORKS	4
4.1.1 Bureau of Land Management (BLM), USA – ‘Inimim Forest Plan’:	4
4.1.2 Parks Canada – Planning For Banff National Park.....	5
4.1.3 National Park Service (NPS), USA- ‘Scoping’ within Management Plans	6
4.1.4 Parks Canada – Three Valley Confluence Restoration Framework	6
4.2 ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPARENCY	7
4.2.1 NPS USA – A clearly defined process for preparing GMPs	7
4.2.2 Parks Canada - Accessible Information and Plans.....	8
4.2.3 NPS, USA - Enabling Participation, Alaska (Talkeetna and Denali).....	9
4.2.4 On-Line Dialogues – EPA, USA and Parks Canada.....	9
4.3 CAPACITY BUILDING (OF COMMUNITIES AND EMPLOYEES)	11
4.3.1 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) – Empowering Staff	11
4.3.2 NPS USA - Rivers and Trails Program – Toolbox for Communities	12
4.3.3 Parks Canada Guide – A Participatory Culture	13
4.4 ACCOUNTABILITY	13
4.4.1 Parks Canada Guide – Evaluation of implementation of management plans.....	13
4.4.2 NPS, USA- Visitor Experience and Resource Protection Framework (VERP) ...	14
4.4.3 Parks Canada, EPA, NPS, BLM USA - Evaluation.....	15
4.5 INDIGENOUS PEOPLES.....	16
4.5.1 NPS USA - Ka-loka Hon-ko-hau GMP/EIS.....	16
4.5.2 Parks Canada: Gwaii Haanas National Park – Co-operative Management	17
4.5.3 Gwaii Haanas National Park – Watchmen Program.....	18
4.5.4 Jon Isaacs – Incorporation of Traditional Knowledge into EIS	18
4.6 RELATIONSHIP BUILDING AND TRUST	19
4.6.1 NPS USA - Voluntarism.....	19
4.6.2 NPS – USA: Artists-in-Residence Program.....	19
4.6.3 NPS USA - Learning Centres	20
4.6.4 NPS USA - Gateway and Park Communities	20
4.6.5 Professional Associations – IAP2 and IAF	21
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	22
6. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22
References.....	24
Attachments	24



1. THE JOURNEY: MAY 3 2002 – JULY 21 2002

During the three-month trip, I met with over 100 people through both Professional Associations and with Agencies such as the National Park Service, USA and Parks Canada at the following locations. For more information on the journey and people met, see Attachment 1.

Utah, United States. May 3 – May 14 2002

- Annual Conference of the International Association of Public Participation, Salt Lake City
- Dinosaur National Monument
- Arches National Park
- Zion National Park

Arizona, United States. May 14 – May 19 2002.

- Grand Canyon National Park, North Rim
- Hubbel Trading Post, National Historic Site
- Canyon de Chelly National Monument

Texas and Colorado 20 May – 2 June 2002

- Mesa Verde National Park
- Annual Conference of the International Association of Facilitators, Fort Worth, Texas (23-25th May)
- NPS Denver Service Centre
- Cache La Poudre Heritage Area, Fort Collins
- Rocky Mountain National Park

British Columbia, Canada 3 June 2002 – 16 June 2002

- Vancouver, Parks Canada
- Gwaii Haanas National Park

Alberta, Canada 16 June 2002 – 23 June 2002

- Banff National Park
- Jasper National Park
- Yoho National Park

Alaska, United States, 23 June 2002 – 3 July 2002

- NPS Offices, Anchorage, Alaska
- Denali National Park, Alaska
- Kenai Fjords National Park, Alaska

Washington, United States, 3 July 2002 – 14 July 2002

- NPS Offices, Seattle
- Mt Rainer National Park
- Olympic National Park

Hawaii, United States, 14 July 2002 – 20 July 2002

- Honaunau National Historic Park
- Hawaii Volcanoes National Park



2. INTRODUCTION

“To start with I had to know something about the people, the country, and the trees. And of the three, the first was most important”.

Gifford Pinchot, USA, 1947

“Out of intense complexities intense simplicities emerge”.

Sir Winston Churchill

Why and how the community is involved in assisting Government planning processes has been of considerable personal, professional and intellectual interest to me. This interest has extended across the continuum of public participation methods, from consultation with communities (for example on planning approvals) to partnership and collaborative approaches for preparing legal planning documents. I support the suggestion of Carson & Gelber (2001) that earlier engagement of the community is likely to give rise to a more collaborative approach to plan making and a greater sense of ownership, support and legitimacy of the emergent plan. Having accepted the ‘Why’, my main interest is in the ‘How’ – what are effective approaches in achieving such? This question, combined with previous experience in the design and exploration of different consultative approaches within both Local and State Government in NSW, motivated my application for a Churchill Fellowship.

The aim of the Winston Churchill Fellowship Trust, Australia is to “give opportunity, by the provision of financial support, to enable Australians from all walks of life who, having exhausted opportunities within Australia, desire to further their search for excellence overseas” (Winston Churchill Memorial Trust, 2000). My topic was to investigate ‘successful approaches by Government land management agencies to involve the community in protected area planning and management’. I chose to focus on protected area planning and management due to the particular challenges that it poses and the opportunities it presented, particularly identifying and connecting with communities of interest (international, national, local and ‘future generations’). The challenges include:

1. **Consulting within legal frameworks:** how do you engage the community in a community involvement program where the decision-making authority is legally mandated and rests with the agency (that is “we want your views but we make the decision”)?
2. **Accessibility and transparency:** how can you make both planning and community involvement programs open, transparent and accessible to a wide range of people?

3. **Capacity building (of communities and employees):** how do you build a 'culture of participation' ensuring that both staff and participants have the necessary power and skills to create this culture?
4. **Accountability:** how do you achieve accountability to the community for the progress and performance in the implementation of management plans?
5. **Indigenous peoples:** how do you effectively involve indigenous people in the preparation of management plans and ensure that this involvement is reflected in the plan itself?
6. **Relationships and trust:** what are some initiatives and programs that can help develop relationships outside of direct community involvement programs for management plans, thus building trust between the agency and the community?

I chose to visit the United States and Canada due to their relative breadth of experience and focus on National Park management. Key agencies visited include the USA National Parks Service (NPS) and Parks Canada, across nine states (including Alaska and Hawaii) and twenty-one protected area units. Annual conferences of the International Association of Public Participation and International Association of Facilitators were also attended.

3. HOW TO READ THIS PAPER

Six key themes or challenges are identified. Under each of these challenges, examples or 'neat ideas' for potential approaches that may assist in meeting the identified challenges are described. From these examples, conclusions related to the six themes are drawn and recommendations made. The term 'Agency' within the body of the report is used interchangeably between all Government land management Agencies, with the proposition that identified ideas are potentially applicable to Federal, State and Local Government. Within the recommendations however, 'the Agency' means the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service.



4. THE CHALLENGES

4.1 CONSULTING WITHIN LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

The Challenge

How do you engage the community in a community involvement program where the decision-making authority is legally mandated and rests with the agency (i.e. “we want your views but we make the decision”)?

4.1.1 Bureau of Land Management (BLM), USA – ‘Inimim Forest Plan’:

For further information: visit <http://www.ca.blm.gov/folsom/inimim.html>, BLM, 1997, *The Inimim Forest: Federal Land-Use Planning*

The Idea: To have community groups responsible for preparing a management plan, which is then reviewed and endorsed by the responsible agency.

In Northern California, the rural-residential community of Nevada County came together to write its own forest management plan for the public lands adjacent to their homes. To begin the process, two community organizations entered into a Cooperative Management Agreement (CMA) with the BLM. To achieve the objectives listed in the CMA, both a resources inventory and development of a management plan became the responsibility of the community, working through the two community organizations. The role of the BLM was to act as a partner and a coach in the effort.

The community organizations were responsible for preparing a draft management plan for the 'Inimim Forest' within the constraints set by existing federal law, policy, and regulations. The BLM then formally presented the draft plan through the NEPA process for possible official acceptance: A BLM (1997) publication noted that the “community responded with enthusiasm. After a lot of fieldwork, much study, many long discussions, and numerous meetings with neighbours, all of it on their own time, they completed their task. True to its word, the BLM did an Environmental Analysis of the plan, held a public review and comment period, and then officially adopted the plan, with some modifications, in June, 1995”.

4.1.2 Parks Canada – Planning For Banff National Park

For further information: Hodgins *et al*, 2002, “From Confrontation to Conservation: The Banff National Park Experience”.

http://www.wilderness.net/pubs/science1999/Volume2/Hodgins_2-36.pdf

The Idea: To involve the community in preparing a management plan for a World Heritage Area through a representative community group which reviews information and provides recommendations to shape the development of the plan. The group operates on a consensus basis.

Under the National Parks Act 1998, each of Canada’s 39 national parks is required to prepare a management plan, and, in consultation with Canadians, to update the plan every five years. The Minister of Canadian Heritage endorses Management Plans. This ‘neat idea’ relates to how the community was involved in the preparation of the management plan for Banff National Park, Canada’s first national park and also a World Heritage Area.

The Banff Bow Valley study on which the Banff National Park Management Plan is based, is promoted as a ‘landmark document’ by virtue of its innovative approach to public engagement in plan development (Hodgins *et al* 2002). Key challenges in the design of the consultation program were “public scepticism and a critical lack of trust in the decision making process that had led to polarisation of opinion.” (2002:283).

A five-member, independent task force carried out the study, which took two years to complete and cost \$2.8 million Canadian (Hodgins *et al* 2002). A range of community involvement techniques was utilised in the preparation of the study, but the most innovative of these was the ‘round-table approach’. The round table consisted of 14 sectors of community interest each with a defined constituency, chair and working committee. With the assistance of an independent mediator, the round table developed consensus procedures, canvassed the issues it felt were important, prioritised them and then set its work plan. Within the round table, the task force undertook a range of roles including client (the task force agreed to ensure that any recommendation that had the full consensus of the table would be incorporated into the final report), participant, leader and expert adviser. The round table met during a fourteen-month period, with the results of its deliberation informing the Banff Bow Valley Study Report and Banff National Park management plan. Hodgins *et al* (2002:89) offer the following as characteristics of an effective community consultation process:

- Getting the right people early in the process.
- Building constituent support.
- Matching the process with the desired outcomes and investing accordingly.
- Prescribing results rather than solutions.
- Harnessing the imagination of others to achieve goals.
- Getting involved in the processes of others.
- Benefiting from a fresh or sober second review of recommendations.
- Ensuring clear accountability for results.

4.1.3 National Park Service (NPS), USA- 'Scoping' within Management Plans

For further information: visit <http://planning.den.nps.gov/tools.cfm>, DO2: Planners Sourcebook

The Idea: To legally mandate community involvement at the outset of the preparation of a management plan to identify community issues and concerns.

Management Planning for protected areas is a complex process within the legal framework of USA National Environment Protection Act (NEPA). An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) accompanies each general management plan (GMP). Under NEPA, there are six steps that require community involvement when preparing a management plan:

- Public notification of intent to prepare plan (placed in Federal Register);
- Scoping: Early and open process to determine important community issues, outline agency objectives and constraints and to identify reasonable alternatives;
- Public exhibition of draft EIS/GMP, which identifies alternatives, including a preferred alternative, describes affected environment, evaluates environmental consequences and identifies mitigation measures;
- Preparation of Final EIS/GMP that responds to public comments and revises draft EIS/ GMP;
- Final EIS/GMP made publicly available; and
- Record of decision also made publicly available.

Discussions with a range of NPS staff indicated that staff felt that resources, particularly human resources, are generally fully committed in achieving the above with limited ability to introduce additional community involvement initiatives. Also, many staff felt that the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which sets rules for establishing advisory committees, is responsible for constraining additional community involvement beyond the legally mandated process. Irrespective of this, the six-step process does legally mandate community involvement at the outset (during the scoping phase). Although a common practice within Australian agencies, it is not legally mandated within this country's protected area legislation.

The objective of scoping is to identify the full range of people's interests and concerns early in the planning process through 'scoping' sessions with the park staff, governmental agencies with a special interest through law or expertise, Indian tribes, and the general public. Suggested techniques for scoping include meetings, newsletters with response forms, visitor surveys, focus groups, telephone contacts, or interviews, workbooksⁱ and open housesⁱⁱ.

4.1.4 Parks Canada – Three Valley Confluence Restoration Framework

For further information: Parks Canada Parks Canada 2001, *The Three Valley Confluence Restoration Framework (draft)*. Jasper National Park, unpublished report. <http://www.worldweb.com/ParksCanada-Jasper/>

The Idea: To engage the community in the planning and on-going management for restoration activities within a Park.

The draft Three Valley Confluence Restoration Framework (Parks Canada, 2001), Jasper National Park, is a good example of how a community was engaged in the planning for and on-going management of restoration activities within a Park. The area around the community of Jasper, known as the Three Valley Confluence, is among the most ecologically important parts of Jasper National Park of Canada (Parks Canada, 2001). Two advisory groups were convened to assist with the development of management recommendations: a team of park resource specialists and an advisory group of local stakeholders with expertise on the needs and interests of recreationists and businesses. In consultation with the stakeholder advisory group and park specialists, consultants for Parks Canada developed a report recommending priorities for ecological restoration of the area and used computer models and other analytic tools to evaluate the likely benefits of the recommended recovery initiatives. The resultant framework embraces the principles of adaptive management with actions only occurring after experts and stakeholders have assessed results against predicted improvements in ecological integrity.

4.2 ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

The Challenge

Making both planning and community involvement programs open, transparent and accessible to a wide range of people.

4.2.1 NPS USA – A clearly defined process for preparing GMPs

For further information: visit <http://planning.den.nps.gov/tools.cfm>, DO2: Planners Sourcebook

The Idea: To provide clear guidelines to staff on how to make decisions when preparing a management plan, with information on what, how and why decisions are made being publicly available.

Accessibility and transparency in the context of community involvement includes the decision making process. As a member of the community can I obtain information on HOW decisions are made by an Agency, WHO makes them, WHAT the decision is and WHY it was made.

Although procedures for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan are complex and resource intensive under the NEPA, they provide a clear framework for decision making, the results and rationale of which are made available to the public. The Planners Sourcebook for example, provides guidelines to NPS Staff on the preparation of general management plans. It requires clear documentation of:

- HOW decisions are made;
- WHO is responsible for making them;
- The need to explain WHY particular options were selected; and
- WHEN and HOW the community can be involved in this process.

A range of community involvement (for example 'open houses', comment letters, email feedback) and outreach strategies are utilised for each stage that incorporates a community involvement component. For example, each National Park has a website that includes information on planning projects.

Additional guidance on HOW to make decisions for NPS staff is provided through a system of 'Choosing By Advantages' (CBA). CBA is a decision making process that is based on the relative importance of advantages of various options, as opposed to weighting the relative importance of different attributes. CBA is a systematic process used to select the preferred alternative, for example, in a General Management Plan (see <http://decisioninnovations.com/rcd/> for more information).

4.2.2 Parks Canada - Accessible Information and Plans

For further information:

Hodgins, *et al*, 2002 'From Confrontation to Conservation: The Banff National Park Experience'.

http://www.wilderness.net/pubs/science1999/Volume2/Hodgins_2-36.pdf,

Banff National Park Management Plan 1997, Parks Canada

http://www.worldweb.com/parkscanada-banff/mp_bnp_e.html

Parks Canada. 1999. *Yoho National Park: Field Community Plan*.

<http://www.worldweb.com/parkscanada-yoho/fieldpln2e.html>

The Idea: To ensure the community is provided with adequate information and explanation which promotes effective contribution to decision-making and that the format and content of the plan is interesting, easy to read, attempting to engage and connect with the community.

Considerable effort was made in the preparation of the Banff National Park Management Plan not only to convey scientific information, but to promote public understanding and acceptance of this information. The study recognised that "it needed to silence the information debate, levelling the playing field of information" (2002:284). A number of initiatives were used to achieve this including:

- Preparation of a compendium of all known information on the park which was then critiqued and modified by the community (through the round tables);
- Modelling of future growth scenarios and assessment of potential impacts in consultation with both the round table and the general public; and
- Scientific Review Committee: Independent committee who provided peer review of scientific work.

Also, a component of accessibility is how the information is presented to the public. Is it easy to read, interesting, clear in rationale, logical in format. For a management plan, does it evoke feelings about the area and enable the public to identify with the information? Is it also a useful management tool providing guidance on management vision, objectives, strategies and indicators?

The format and content of Management Plans prepared by Parks Canada are considered good examples of documents that, while meeting legislative requirements,

are both interesting and easy to read providing a balance between both descriptive and prescriptive writing. The layout is 'friendly' inviting the participant to engage with the document with titles like, for example. 'A Place for Nature', 'A Place for People', 'A Place for Open Management'. The writing style is in parts descriptive, invoking images and inspiration for what is many a special place: "Let us act thankfully, and carefully, to preserve and enjoy this cherished creation of planet Earth – forever. It is my fervent hope and desire that this document will help us to meet this challenge". (Sheila Coppins, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, BNP Management Plan).

The Field Community Plan – Yoho National Park, 1999, is also considered an 'accessible' document particularly due to its use of illustration to visually depict design intent and strategies. Attachment 3, for example, illustrates the design intent and strategies for a main street in Field. These diagrams were produced through computer simulation and were made available at a number of community meetings so that concepts could be visually depicted as they were discussed.

4.2.3 NPS, USA - Enabling Participation, Alaska (Talkeetna and Denali)

For further information contact: NPS, Talkeetna Ranger Station, Talkeetna, Alaska
Regarding Talkeetna Community Tourism Plan - NPS

The Idea: To provide participants with support (for example transport, childcare) to enable participation in meetings and also encouraging participation through other mediums of those who cannot attend meetings.

Talkeetna, Alaska is a key gateway town to Denali National Park. Through the facilitation of and funding by the NPS, a community committee is currently designing and guiding the preparation of a Community/ Tourism Plan to "address community and visitor related issues in Talkeetna". I met with the NPS project leader, Miriam Valentine at Talkeetna. From discussions with Miriam and other town participants, the project (which was approximately midway) was a major success with high attendance at community forums (over 72 per cent of the town's population of 500 attended meetings). Part of the success of the project was attributed to the efforts of the Community Committee members, especially in providing catering, venue and support for participants (for example babysitting) enabling a diverse range of participants. (pers Comm. Miriam Valentine). Participants were provided with excellent information through easy to read workbooks that included outcomes of deliberations to date.

Similarly, a 'workbook' was utilised to capture information/input from community members who could not attend meetings for planning for other gateway towns to Denali National Park. *For further information* see *Designing for Community: A Workbook for the Denali Borough Community. How to build communities that are great places to live, work and visit*, 1999, Chris Beck and Associates.

<http://www.guidingalaskatourism.org/community.pdf>

This workbook is easy to read, supported by excellent visuals and poses questions to elicit input from the community.

4.2.4 On-Line Dialogues – EPA, USA and Parks Canada

For further information see: Beierle, T. 2002. *RFF Report: Democracy On-Line: An Evaluation of the National Dialogue on Public Involvement in EPA Decisions*. Resources For the Future, Washington, D.C.

http://www.rff.org/reports/PDF_files/democracryonline.pdf

Gajda, A., 2001. 'Wilderness @ Internet Public Consultation in Cyberspace – A Test at the Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve and Haida Heritage Site in Canada', *International Journal of Wilderness*, Vol. 4, no. 2:28- 31.

The Idea: To introduce use of the Internet as a tool for encouraging wider involvement and discussion, to supplement other community involvement strategies.

With the objective of diversifying and extending comment on its draft Public Involvement Policy, the USA EPA conducted a national Internet based discussion or 'dialogue'. This initiative brought together 1,166 people in July 2001 for a two-week on-line discussion of public participation at the EPA (Beierle, 2002). Key findings of an evaluation report on the dialogue (see Beierle, 2002) were that:

- A large number of people participated, creating complex communication dynamics;
- Participants were highly satisfied with the process;
- The process increased the number of voices heard, but the voices were not necessarily new;
- Communication in the dialogue was good, but many found it difficult to participate;
- Participants learned much, networked a little, and felt they would have some influence on EPA policy and practice;
- EPA accomplished its goal of garnering broader input about what it does right and wrong. It also opened up new lines of communication with the public, encouraged a few more formal comments on the Public Involvement Policy, and generated some public goodwill.

The report concluded that the on-line dialogue, combined with other techniques, was a viable approach and that problems that arose during the dialogue can largely be addressed through future changes in design, software and norms of participation. Others may be addressed through societal trends in computer ownership, use and familiarity (2002:11).

Gwaii Haanas National Park and Haida Heritage Site are located in the Queen Charlotte Islands, off the coast of British Columbia in Canada. The remoteness of the Gwaii Haanas setting presented unique challenges to ongoing communication with visitors, local stakeholders, and other interested people (2001:29) In response, a two pronged consultation program was developed for the preparation of a Backcountry Management Plan. On a local level, brown bag lunch discussions were held weekly over a two-month period. These sessions were held over lunch at the Parks Canada office, where members of the general public, commercial operators, and staff discussed one or two backcountry issues. To engage the broader public, an Internet discussion site was utilised. A number of technical difficulties were experienced with the website, which affected participation. Gajda (2001) concluded that overall, whilst the website was effective in soliciting valuable input from a few dedicated participants, it was not utilised as a discussion forum. A number of improvements to the website use for future application are suggested.

4.3 CAPACITY BUILDING (OF COMMUNITIES AND EMPLOYEES)

The Challenge

Ensuring a 'culture of participation' and that both staff and participants have the necessary power and skills to create this culture.

4.3.1 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) – Empowering Staff

For further information see *A Desktop Reference Guide to Collaborative, Community-Based Planning* available from <http://www.sonoran.org/>

The Idea: To prepare a comprehensive guide for and by staff, on how to undertake collaborative, community-based planning.

The BLM, in cooperation with the Sonoran Institute, has produced an excellent guide for staff on Collaborative Community Based Planning. The guide, prepared largely by and for field personnel and based on common experience, outlines seven guiding principles of successful collaboration and supports each principle with examples from the field. For each principle, common obstacles are discussed and suggestions for ways of dealing with these are included. The seven principles are:

1. Build lasting relationships;
2. Agree upon the legal sideboards early on;
3. Encourage diverse participation and communication;
4. Work at an appropriate scale;
5. Empower the group;
6. Share the resources and the rewards; and
7. Build internal support.

The guide also includes four principles to build capacity within the organization, which is summarised as: -

1. Personnel and Training:

- Hire diverse personnel
- Reward experimentation and risk taking
- Train specifically for collaborative approaches (a series of courses on collaboration are offered through the BLM – National Training Centre. See <http://www.ntc.blm.gov/partner>).

2. Planning Guidance

Addresses the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), how they relate to community-based collaboration and suggests ways for enabling collaboration whilst still meeting the requirements of each Act. (Note: the FACA was suggested consistently by staff in the NPS as a key constraint to adopting more collaborative approaches to General Management Planning. In this instance the BLM has gone beyond the constraints of legislation to consider ways that it can be addressed whilst still adopting a collaborative approach).

3. Budgets and Time Allocations

Suggests the need to incorporate allocations for collaborative community-based planning in both budget and time allocations.

4. Tools and Assistance

- . 'How to' workbooks
- . Training programs
- . Model agreements
- . Involvement in the development of curricula for high school students (skills for community based planning)
- . E-mail network
- . Web support site (devoted to collaborative based planning and community stewardship)

4.3.2 NPS USA - Rivers and Trails Program – Toolbox for Communities

For further information on the program see: <http://www.ncrc.nps.gov/programs/rtca/> for the community toolbox: <http://www.nps.gov/phso/rtcatoolbox/>

The Idea: To provide a community toolbox on the Internet aimed at assisting in building the capacity of local communities to engage in and develop their own planning projects.

The Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program of the NPS works with community groups and local and State governments to conserve rivers, preserve open space, develop trails and to achieve community-set goals. The Program focuses on assisting communities through the services of staff skilled in planning and facilitation.

The program is included as a 'neat idea' for the excellent resource provided to build the capacity of community participants. This is achieved through a comprehensive community toolbox for public participation on the National Website for the Rivers and Trails Program. An extract from this toolkit is provided at attachment 4.

The Tool box provides clear guidance on the how, when and why of:

- . Decision Making (Action Agenda, Consensus Building, Defining Issues, Goal Setting, Setting Priorities, Vision Creating)
- . Events (Art Projects, Awards, Conferences and Symposiums, Festivals, Field Trips)
- . Gatherings (Charrettes, Meetings, Open Space, Workshops)
- . Visual Communication (Displays, Presentations, Videos)
- . Written Communication (Brochures/Flyers, Newsletters, Newspaper Questionnaires, Press Releases)
- . Facilitation (Active Listening, Brainstorming, Break-Out Groups, Dialogue, Flip Charts, Ice Breakers)
- . Organization (Partnerships, Project Steps, Task Forces, Volunteers, Work Plans)
- . Outreach (Networking Database, Postcard Mailings, Press Conferences, Speakers Bureau, Telephone and Email, Websites)
- . Collecting Information (Focus Groups, Group/ Public Meeting, Inventory, Photo Inventory, Public Surveys, Stakeholder Analysis)

A resource similar to the above that provides general guidance (and potentially training) to enable participation of community members in park planning and management would be of value.

4.3.3 Parks Canada Guide – A Participatory Culture

For further information see *Parks Canada Guide to Management Planning*, Parks Canada, 2001 http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca/library/index_e.htm - manuals

The Idea: To include clear guidance for staff on the importance of community involvement and how to go about it as an integral component for the preparation of management plans.

The Parks Canada Guide for the preparation of management plans includes a section on the rationale for community involvement, contributing not only to a better understanding of why it is important, but also assisting staff in deciding how to go about it.

“Public involvement is a cornerstone of policy, planning and management practices to help ensure sound decision-making, build public understanding, and provide opportunities for Canadians to contribute their knowledge, expertise and suggestions (Guiding Principles and Operational Policies:18).”

With this guiding principle as a foundation, the guide identifies a primary goal for consultation, seven objectives and 14 key elements including tips on how to run community involvement processes for management plans. The comprehensive community involvement programs for Management Plans for the Canadian Rocky Mountain Region Parks (Banff National Park, Jasper National Park, Kootenay National Park) are indication that within the organization, a culture of participation is fostered and supported.

4.4 ACCOUNTABILITY

The Challenge

Has the Agency adopted procedures to ensure accountability to the community for progress and performance in the implementation of management plans?

(Community involvement should not stop with the adoption of management plan. It is important to maintain feedback to and involvement of the public).

4.4.1 Parks Canada Guide – Evaluation of implementation of management plans

For further information see: *Parks Canada Guide to Management Planning*, Parks Canada, 2001 http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca/library/index_e.htm - manuals

The Idea: To evaluate and review the performance of plans, with this information being publicly available.

The Parks Canada Guide suggests three key areas of measuring and reporting on performance in the implementation of management plans:

- Inclusion of Performance Indicators in the plan: the presentation of specific objectives, actions and indicators of success for protecting natural resources and maintaining or restoring ecological integrity within the plan. (The guide suggests that 'in pursuing **The Ideal** of adaptive management' that the plan indicates what management steps would be taken or suspended if an indicator failed to meet or exceeded a target value);
- Annual Reporting on Plan Implementation (through the Park Business Plan); and
- The requirement to review plan (with public consultation) every five years.

The Annual report on plan implementation for the Banff National Park Management Plan for example, is conducted as a two-day public forum.

Both Parks Canada and the NPS utilise annual Business Plans as key reporting tools for plan implementation. The Zion National Park Business Plan (NPS, 2001), analyses the current financial resources of the Park and identifies shortfalls that exist. For each program area, the plan estimates the percentage-funding shortfall, for example Resource Management Programs operate at a 30.7 per cent shortfall. The key value of this information is that it publicly identifies where and why a management plan may not be in the process of being implemented.

4.4.2 NPS, USA- Visitor Experience and Resource Protection Framework (VERP)

For further information: VERP Handbook, NPS, 1997
<http://planning.den.nps.gov/document/handbook.pdf>

The Idea: To include an iterative, adaptive management planning process in conjunction with communities.

The Visitor Experience and Resource Protection Framework (VERP) was developed by the NPS to provide a logic and rationale for making decisions on carrying capacity issues. A plan developed under this framework is usually prepared in accordance with and sits under a management plan. This framework includes the:

- description of the desired future conditions for park resources and visitor experiences (through management zoning),
- identification of indicators of quality experiences and resource conditions,
- establishment of standards that define minimum acceptable conditions,
- formulation of monitoring techniques to determine if and when management action must be taken to keep conditions within standards, and
- development of management actions to ensure that all indicators are maintained within specified standards.

VERP is included as a 'neat idea' as it is an example of an iterative, adaptive management process with community involvement as a key principle and practice in each of the above steps. By defining a desired condition and how to measure its

achievement, and then responding to this measurement with public consultation, the VERP process increases the overall public accountability of park management.

4.4.3 Parks Canada, EPA, NPS, BLM USA - Evaluation

For further information see:

Parks Canada Guide to Management Planning, Parks Canada, 2001
http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca/library/index_e.htm - manuals

EPA, 2002, *Stakeholder Involvement & Public Participation at the U.S. EPA: Lessons Learned, Barriers and Innovative Approaches*: <http://www.epa.gov/stakeholders>,

Force, J.E. and Forester, D.J. 2002. 'Public Involvement in National Park Service Land Management Issues' in *Social Science Research Review* Vol 3, No. 1,
<http://www.nps.gov/policy/DOrders/PISummary.pdf>

The Idea: To prepare guidelines for the evaluation of Community Involvement Programs based on an evaluation of the collective experience of an Agency and to stimulate academic interest, research and debate.

Parks Canada, the EPA and the BLM either provide guidelines for the evaluation of Community Involvement Programs and/or have undertaken evaluations of the success of programs.

The Parks Canada Guide (2002: 72) emphasises the importance of evaluating consultation programs through the establishment of benchmarks or targets at the beginning of a community involvement program. It suggests "benchmarks for public involvement should be established during program scoping to measure effectiveness of consultation, both during a program and after. They will help illuminate which methods of consultation will be appropriate, how well the program is proceeding, if changes are needed, and what needs to be done in future consultation. They will also help ensure that any decisions made through public involvement will uphold the primary goal and objectives of public consultation as detailed".

Three areas of evaluation indicators or benchmarks are suggested:

1. Satisfaction of participants are key indicators of effective relationship building. They are measured in collaboration with participants, both during and after a program (for example, did the participants understand the process?)
2. Short-term results are key indicators of success in working toward main goals. (For example, all landowners surrounding a park or historic site have received a newsletter about a planning program); and
3. Longer-term results are benchmarks of success that relate to fundamental goals of protected area management, but may take years to achieve. (For example, trust and a productive relationship has been built with key stakeholders).

The EPA report (EPA, 2002) also emphasises the importance of evaluating community involvement programs and suggests greater focus on developing standard evaluation criteria (for example What were stakeholder/public perceptions regarding their ability to participate in the process? To what degree were those expectations met?) and

performance measures (for example How many stakeholders/citizens participated in the effort?).

The NPS engaged a consultant to undertake an evaluation of its community involvement programs (see Force *et al*, 2002). This paper presents a conceptual framework borrowed from small-group decision-making literature to assist public land managers in determining the role and place of community involvement in the management process. The paper makes several recommendations including:

- clarify the goals of public involvement;
- focus on the public involvement process as well as the outcome; and
- use a variety of techniques to reach a diversity of stakeholders.

Collaborative-community based planning approaches have attracted considerable academic interest and debate within the USA, particularly those approaches adopted by the BLM. Examples of papers critiquing collaborative approaches include:

- Kagan, Robert A. 1997. 'Political and Legal Obstacles to Collaborative Ecosystem Planning'. *Ecology Law Quarterly*. Vol 24(4):871-875.
- Coggins, George C. 1998. 'Regulating Federal Natural Resources.' *Ecology Law Quarterly*. 24(4): 602-610.
- Michael McCloskey. 2001. 'Is This the Course You want to be on?' *Society and Natural Resources*. Vol 14: 627-634.
- Michael McCloskey. 1996. 'The Sceptic: Collaboration has its Limits'. *High Country News*. (<http://www.hcn.org/>).

Following the fellowship, I have been in contact with Tammi Laninga who, through the University of Colorado, is undertaking doctoral research into collaborative planning approaches of the BLM.

4.5 INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

The Challenge

How do you effectively involve indigenous people in the preparation of management plans and ensure that this involvement is reflected in the plan itself?

Note: Within this theme, I encountered many practitioners in the United States and Canada looking to Australia for ideas/ new approaches. Where possible, I shared information and suitable contacts with practitioners in the United States and Canada about innovative approaches within Australia.

4.5.1 NPS USA - Ka-loka Hon-ko-hau GMP/EIS

For further information contact Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park, 73-4786 Kanalani Street, #14, Kailua Kona, HI, 96740, Phone: 808-329-6881 regarding National Park Service. 1974. *The Spirit of Ka-Loko Hono-ko-hau: A proposal for the establishment of a National Cultural Park & National Park Service*.

NPS. 1994. *General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement. Ka-Loko Hono-ko-hau National Park*.

The Idea: To acknowledge the importance of oral traditions in indigenous cultures and the inherent difficulties in capturing this importance in the written word (including management plans).

Two key difficulties in preparing management plans for areas that have special values to indigenous people, is that firstly, many traditions are predominantly oral and secondly, incorporating a 'holistic landscape' approach into what are traditionally compartmentalised documents (management plans).

Ka-loka, Hon-ko-hau (Proposal for the Establishment of a National Cultural Park) indicates the cultural difficulties associated with oral versus written traditions:

"It is difficult to explain the real significance of the Ka-loko, Hono-ko-Hau through the medium of the written word. The written word is merely symbol on a piece of paper which has today become mans major form of communication. There is no question that it is unsurpassed as a means of transmitting information, but just sitting on a page, inanimate and unfeeling, how could it possibly begin to convey the feelings of a people who are trying to re-establish their identity and thus maintain their existence as a people? How could it effectively portray the determined efforts of these people to hang onto every bit of their culture and heritage that has not been bought, sold, misused and lost? The answer is a simple one. It cannot.the proposal does not maintain the integrity of the Hawaiian language or oral tradition, and for this we ask the forgiveness of our kupuna who passed on their legacy. But, like a poem or short story, it will try to convey a message that is alive". (1974: 1).

The subsequent General Management Plan and EIS, begins with poems written by local school children and whilst meeting conventional format and content standards, captures some of the evocative words and sentiment of the original proposal. It does not however, address the issues of integration or adopting a holistic approach to landscape.

4.5.2 Parks Canada: Gwaii Haanas National Park – Co-operative Management

For further information: contact Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve/ Haida Heritage Site, <http://www.harbour.com/parkscan/gwaii>

The Idea: A joint management agreement between the Council of the Haida Nation and the Government of Canada where the two parties in parallel statements express divergent viewpoints regarding sovereignty, title and ownership with converging views about the care, protection and enjoyment of the Archipelago.

Gwaii Haanas National Park is a unique example of cooperative management for a National Park in both the United States and Canada. The Council of the Haida Nation and the Government of Canada are both parties to a joint management agreement for the Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve and Haida Heritage Site, which comprises 138 islands and is located off the British Columbia Coast, north of Vancouver. The two parties in parallel statements express divergent viewpoints regarding sovereignty, title

and ownership with converging views about the care, protection and enjoyment of the Archipelago.

Management of Gwaii Haanas is shared through the Archipelago Management Board (AMB). The mandate of the AMB is defined by the commitments in the Gwaii Haanas Agreement and the existing laws and policies of the parties. The Board consists of an equal number of representatives from the two parties. Decisions of the Board are made by consensus. Under these management arrangements, the community representative sits at a decision making level (pers. comm. Cindy Boyko). The preparation of the Gwaii Haanas National Reserve Management Plan and Backcountry Management Plan was guided by the AMB, with the extensive involvement of members of the Haida Nation. The Council of the Haida Nation, who had was party to the AMB guided and facilitated this involvement.

The agreement also includes intent to assist Haida individuals to “take advantage of the full range of economic and employment opportunities associated with the planning, operation and management of the Archipelago At present, 27 of the 39 Haida staff have been hired locally (pers. comm. Cindy Boyko).

4.5.3 Gwaii Haanas National Park – Watchmen Program

For further information see: <http://parkscan.harbour.com/gwaii/watch.htm>

The Idea: To encourage Haida people to act as guardians for cultural sites and at the same time to present visitors with a first hand introduction to Haida culture.

In 1981, prior to Gwaii Haanas being designated a Haida Heritage Site or a National Park Reserve, the Skidegate Band Council and the Haida Nation responded to concerns about the potential for vandalism and other damage to old Haida village sites by initiating the ‘Haida Watchmen Program’. This program began with several parties of one or two volunteers who used their own boats to travel to these sites where they would camp for the summer season. The program continues today, with Haida employees acting as guardians for sites. At the same time the present visitors with a first hand introduction to Haida culture by exposing them to Haida life and sharing their knowledge of the environs as well as stories, songs and dances associated with the sites. My time at the Haida watchmen sites was a particular highlight of this trip.

4.5.4 Jon Isaacs – Incorporation of Traditional Knowledge into EIS

For further information contact: URS Corporation, 2700 Gambell Street, Suite 200, Anchorage, AK 99503, USA.

The Idea: To incorporate traditional knowledge as a key component of an Environmental Impact Statement, as both baseline information and for the examination of impacts.

Jon Isaacs, is a planner working with URS, Anchorage Alaska. With URS, Jon has established protocol for interaction with Native Communities and has completed a number of Environmental Impact Statements where incorporation of Traditional Knowledge is a key component. One project involved the gathering of traditional and contemporary knowledge of the Inupiat Eskimo as it related to proposed oil and gas

production activities. The cultural importance of the subsistence lifestyle, Inupiat ties to and intimate knowledge of their environment, the importance of certain roles within the Inupiat subsistence culture and the proven reliability of Inupiat Traditional Knowledge is discussed. The document not only gathers this information but examines the potential effects of oil and gas development/production activities on Traditional Knowledge.

4.6 RELATIONSHIP BUILDING AND TRUST

The Challenge

What are some initiatives and programs that can help develop relationships, building trust between the agency and the community, outside of direct community involvement programs for management plans?

4.6.1 NPS USA - Voluntarism

For further information see <http://www.nps.gov/volunteer/>

The Idea: To develop an extensive and accessible volunteer program that aims to match opportunities to preferred criteria and skills as specified by the volunteer.

Voluntarism can fulfil a number of mutually beneficial roles, one of which is the development of a positive relationship between the agency and the individual. The NPS estimates that each year more than 120,000 volunteers donate over 4 million hours of service in the U.S. national parks (NPS, 2002, <http://www.nps.gov/volunteer/>). During my visit to twenty-one National Parks within the US, I observed volunteers undertaking the following roles:

- Information officer (at Visitor Information Centres)
- Interpreter (providing a range of interpretative talks, guided walks)
- Writing/designing visitor brochures
- Campground hosts
- Demonstrators
- Research assistants

Interviews of a number of volunteer campground hosts and interpreters indicated a general enthusiasm for the volunteer program and appreciation of the opportunity to undertake volunteer work. The program, through application on the NPS website, is made accessible to the community and aims to match opportunities to preferred criteria and skills as specified by the volunteer (see <http://www.nps.gov/volunteer/volunteerapp1.htm>).

4.6.2 NPS – USA: Artists-in-Residence Program

For further information see <http://www.nps.gov/volunteer/air.htm>

The Idea: To create opportunities for artists to both work in parks and with communities off-park as a catalyst for increased environmental awareness and action at the community level.

The NPS offers opportunities for two-dimensional visual artists, photographers, sculptors, performers, writers, composers, and craft artists to live and work in the parks. There are currently 27 parks participating in the Artist-In-Residence program. I visited the program at Rocky Mountain National Park, which “offers professional writers, composers, visual, and performing artists the opportunity to pursue their particular art form while being inspired by the surrounding mountains”. Each year, five to eight artists are selected to spend two weeks in residency within Rocky Mountains National Park. Artists are asked to donate one piece of artwork representative of their stay in the Park and provide two public programs, in return for their stay at a historic cabin (see <http://www.nps.gov/romo/visit/park/artist.html>).

The NPS also offers a residency program (Art and Community Landscapes (ACL)) that supports site-based art (off-park) as a catalyst for increased environmental awareness and action at the community level. With several partners, the NPS is helping to establish a national team of ACL artists that will serve yearlong residencies attached to a NPS field office. Projects created by ACL artists may include temporary art installations, exhibitions, interpretive media, festivals, or other works informed by the sites and communities in the project's region. I visited the artists in residence for two years at the NPS office at Seattle, Washington. An example of a project being undertaken by these artists in conjunction with local residents is the creation of a green corridor.

(http://www.ncrc.nps.gov/programs/rtca/WhatWeDo/recent_innovations/arts&cons/artandcomm.html)

4.6.3 NPS USA - Learning Centres

<http://www.nature.nps.gov/challenge/NRC.htm>

The Idea: To facilitating research efforts and provide educational opportunities for communities to learn about National Parks.

The NPS is creating a network of 32 learning centres placed strategically around the nation. Learning centres have been developed to facilitate research efforts and provide educational opportunities to the American people to gain new knowledge about National Parks. Learning Centres are intended to be field stations for collaborative research activities providing researchers with laboratory, office and dormitory facilities.

4.6.4 NPS USA - Gateway and Park Communities

For further information see http://www.nps.gov/transportation/alt/te_gud_3.htm

The Idea: To develop co-operative arrangements that build the capacity of public land managers and gateway communities to collaboratively identify and address gateway and adjacent land issues through place-based partnership initiatives.

Gateway communities are communities, cities or towns that border or are close to protected lands and recreation areas. The NPS have established co-operative arrangements with other land agencies including the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, The Conservation Fund and BLM to assist in the development of Gateway Towns. The

'Gateway Community Leadership Program' is an example of a cooperative venture. This program aims to "build the capacity of public land managers and gateway communities to collaboratively identify and address gateway and adjacent land issues through place-based partnership initiatives. The Program develops education resources and offers training courses, workshops and technical assistance to existing and emerging partnerships".

Another collaborative planning program is the 'Transportation Enhancements' program. Under this program the town of Springdale, adjacent to Zion National Park, won funds to design a transit plan that integrated not only transport but also the aesthetics of the park and town. The result of this (and a range of partnerships between the town, the NPS, other government agencies and private corporations) is a 'seamless' town and park with a public transport system (shuttle buses). The town of Springdale and the NPS recognised their symbiotic relationship, and began a collaborative effort. An indication of the degree of integration between town and park is the regular attendance of an elected Councillor for Springdale at Zion National Park Senior Staff meetings (pers. comm. Martin Ott).

At Mt Rainer National Park, outside of Seattle Washington, I also met with Brian Bowden who is employed as a community planner specifically to liaise with local communities and implement those aspects of the Mt Rainer National Park Management Plan that pertain to the surrounding gateway communities.

4.6.5 Professional Associations – IAP2 and IAF

For further information see: www.iap2.org and <http://www.iaf-world.org/>

I attended conferences of the International Association of Facilitators and International Association of Public Participation. Excellent contact and resources were obtained through these organizations, which both have a wealth of material on designing consultation programs and facilitation skills. References for a number of 'neat ideas' suggested in this paper were obtained at these conferences.



5. CONCLUSIONS

My key objective in undertaking this fellowship was to explore ways of improving my own approaches to community involvement and more importantly to share, discuss and trial these ideas with other practitioners (including the community). In many cases, particularly the involvement of indigenous communities, I encountered practitioners in the United States and Canada looking to Australia for ideas/ new approaches. Where possible, I shared information and suitable contacts with practitioners in the United States and Canada about innovative approaches within Australia. I firmly believe in the value of cross-fertilisation of ideas and information, and the potential continuous improvement, evaluation and evolution of my own practice. Some of the 'neat ideas' identified will assist this.

In this context, I recommend the following approaches and ideas presented under the identified six key themes for further investigation and potential application to assist community involvement strategies for protected area planning and management within Australia. I emphasise that the applicability of recommendations to different community involvement projects will vary, according to the scale and scope of the project and to the identified issues. Strategies to disseminate and implement these recommendations are identified in attachment 2.



6. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the following approaches and ideas be further investigated and where appropriate applied to assist community involvement strategies for protected area planning and management within NSW, Australia. All recommendations are based on current practice/case studies either within the United States or Canada. The 'Agency' refers to the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service. Recommendations are identified as to where the responsibility for action would predominantly rest within the Agency (either at a State level or Regional level or shared by both).

How we go about involving communities in the preparation of management plans.

1. Legally require that the Agency involve the community at the outset of the preparation of a management plan, to assist in the early identification of community issues, concerns and suggestions. (State)
- 4 Utilise a range of strategies to involve communities in the preparation of management plans, for example informal discussion groups for local communities and Internet discussion groups to extend to the wider, national community. (Regional)

- 5 Ensure that the community is provided with adequate information and explanation of this information to effectively participate in decision-making when preparing a management plan. . (Regional)
- 6 Provide community participants with support (for example transport, childcare) to enable participation in meetings and also implement strategies to encourage the participation of those whom cannot attend meetings (for example questionnaires, surveys). (Regional)
- 7 Establish a pilot/case study (where circumstances suitable) where the community is responsible for the preparation of a management plan within identified legal frameworks. The draft plan would then be exhibited, finalised and determined by the responsible agency. (State/Regional)

The Management Plan

- 8 Make the format and content of management plans interesting and easy to read, to assist with engaging the community. Use pictures and descriptive language to invoke the beauty and inspiration of an area. Visually depict proposed policy and guidelines where possible. (State/Regional)

Guidelines for Staff and the Community

8. Provide clear guidelines for staff on how to make decisions when preparing a management plan. (State)
9. Provide clear guidelines on the importance of community involvement when preparing a management plan and guidance on how to go about it. (State)
10. Develop a community toolbox (made available on the Internet) that assists local communities to engage in community involvement programs for management plans and generally. (State)

Undertaking Evaluations and Increasing Accountability

11. Make the information on what, how and why decisions are made during the preparation of a general management plan, available to the community. (State)
12. The Agency undertakes a public review of its general community involvement policy and programs. This review could utilise Internet discussion groups to stimulate broader discussion. (State)
13. Establish criteria for the evaluation of the success of community involvement programs at the outset of each program (for complex plans only), and undertake this evaluation with involvement of the community. (State/Regional)
14. Evaluate and review the performance of general management plans at set intervals (for example annually), with this information being publicly available. (Regional)
15. Encourage academic research into the success of community involvement programs, from the perspectives of the Agency and participants. (State/Regional)

Involvement of Indigenous Peoples

Note: Within this theme, I encountered many practitioners in the United States and Canada looking to Australia for ideas/ new approaches. Where possible, I shared information and suitable contacts with practitioners in the United States and Canada about innovative approaches within Australia.

16. Explore the suitability of employment programs that enable Aboriginal people to undertake the role of on-site custodian and interpreter of significant cultural heritage

sites, which are not currently interpreted/managed by an Aboriginal community. (State/Regional)

Building Relationships and Trust outside of community involvement programs for management plans

17. Develop an extensive and accessible volunteer program that aims to match the volunteer opportunity with the volunteer's skills and location criteria. (State)
18. Provide opportunities for artists to both work in National Parks and with communities off-park as a catalyst for increased environmental awareness and action at the community level. (State/Regional)
19. Develop and implement partnership programs between public land managers and gateway communities to collaboratively identify and address gateway and adjacent land issues. (State/Regional)

References

Carson, L & Gelber, K 2001, Ideas for Community Consultation: A discussion on principles and procedures for making consultation work, NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, Sydney.

Winston Churchill Memorial Trust 2001, The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust Annual Report: 2000, <http://www.churchilltrust.org.au/>

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Details of the Journey

Attachment 2 – Proposals to Share Findings

Attachment 3 - Extract from Parks Canada. 1999. Yoho National Park: Field Community Plan.

Attachment 4 – Extract from community toolbox for public participation on the National Website for the Rivers and Trails Program.

Attachment 5 – Emails from Carla Rogers

ⁱ **Workbooks:** Detail background information on the Park and ask respondents to respond to multiple-choice questions concerning different aspects of park management. 'Trade-offs' associated with each of the choices detailed.

ⁱⁱ **Open Houses:** A range of opportunities for participation provided including facilitated discussions at stations representing different aspects of the plan, response forms, tape; computer terminals and a 'graffiti wall' where participants can write their comments.