

WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS 2002-5

sustainable
forest
management
network

réseau
sur la
gestion durable
des forêts



Improving Practice in Public Participation in Sustainable Forest Management: Proven Approaches, Knowledge Needs and Research Projects

October 19-20, 2001
Halifax, NS

For copies of this or other SFM publications contact:

Sustainable Forest Management Network
G208 Biological Sciences Building
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2E9
Ph: (780) 492 6659
Fax: (780) 492 8160
<http://www.ualberta.ca/sfm>

ISBN 1-55261-156-6

***Improving Practice in Public Participation in Sustainable Forest Management:
Proven Approaches, Knowledge Needs and Research Projects***

Proceedings
of a Workshop of the
Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Network

Halifax, Nova Scotia
19 – 20 October 2001

Compiled and Edited by
Peter Duinker
and
Bella Niles

May 2002

Table of Contents

PREFACE	2
WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES	3
WORKSHOP FORMAT	3
<u>FRIDAY, 19 OCTOBER 2001</u>	
Opening Remarks	4
Overview of SFM Network's Public Participation Philosophy and Workshop Mission	4
Proven Approaches I: Findings and Experiences of Forest Researchers	
The Effect of Forest Management Knowledge Transfer on the Public	4
Effective and Meaningful Consultation with First Nations	5
Public Involvement in Environmental Assessment:	
The Case of Non-Participants	7
Public Involvement in Policy and Practice in Manitoba:	
A View from the Trenches	8
Mutual Learning/Transfer of Knowledge Principles:	
The Case of the Fundy Model Forest	10
Public Participation in Sustainable Forest Management:	
Experiences in Eastern Nova Scotia	11
Proven Approaches II: Findings and Experiences of SFMN Partners/Practitioners	
Public Participation in Forest Management in the Gwich'in Settlement Area	15
An Industrial Landowner's Perspective on the Role of Public Participation	18
Public Participation in Sustainable Forest Management in Newfoundland	20
A Provincial Government's Approach to Public Involvement	22
<u>SATURDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2001</u>	
Knowledge Needs, Research Developments: The SFM Network Public Participation	
Research Projects. Panel Discussion	25
Public Participation in Integrated Resource Management: Three Alberta Cases	27
A Study of British Columbia Forest Values and Inter-Group Relations	28
Sustainable Forest Management Issues in Nova Scotia	29
Key Messages and Insights from the Workshop: A Practitioner's View of Promising Progress and Needed Improvements in Professional Practice	30
WORKSHOP PRESENTERS AND PARTICIPANTS	34

PREFACE

The Sustainable Forest Management Network (SFM Network), founded in 1995 at the University of Alberta as one of Canada's Networks of Centres of Excellence, undertakes research on a wide range of topics that are central to the achievement of sustainable forest management in Canada. SFM Network Partners - including various forest-products companies, provincial governments, First Nations, environmental groups, and others - identified public participation as one of those topics. In response, a few years ago the Network encouraged formation of a public participation research group. We formed this group early in 2001 with the inauguration of a small suite of research projects across Canada. The projects are dedicated to shedding light on key uncertainties still hampering strong progress in implementing good public participation in forest management and policy decision-making. The meeting described in these proceedings represents the first formal gathering of the researchers and partners associated with our public participation research efforts. The plan is to have at least one such meeting per year for as long as the research group is active.

In organizing this workshop on behalf of the SFM Network, I did not ask presenters to prepare written submissions to accompany their presentations. Rather, they were invited to leave with us any presentation materials such as copies of digital images. However, in preparing the proceedings, we have been wonderfully assisted by a group of dedicated Dalhousie University students, all of whom were registered in my graduate course on "Public Involvement in Resource and Environmental Management" (and whose names are listed at the end of the document). The students took copious notes during presentations and discussions, and the whole meeting was recorded on audiotape. From their write-ups, co-editor Bella Niles and I have created the document you have before you. May I express my most sincere thanks to the students (all of whom actually received strong credits in the course for their involvement in the workshop!) for their assistance and good nature during our time together.

I acknowledge the very generous sponsorship of the workshop by the SFM Network through a workshop grant to assist the Public Participation Research Group in networking and knowledge exchange. Inquiries about the projects undertaken by members of the group, and about the SFM Network in general, are welcome.

Peter Duinker

Director and Professor, School for Resource and Environmental Studies, Dalhousie University

Group Leader, Public Participation Research Group, SFM Network

peter.duinker@dal.ca

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

1. Researchers will share lessons from their experiences in teaching, researching and undertaking professional practice related to public participation in forest management and other natural resources and environmental decision-making processes. Question to be addressed: What do researchers know now that ought to be implemented in current practice?
2. SFM Network partners and other practitioners will share their own insights into what works and what doesn't in public participation practice. Question to be addressed: What do practitioners know now that ought to be implemented in current practice?
3. Practitioners and researchers will discuss:
 - (a) Public participation requirement of governments and certification schemes, and how these influence practice;
 - (b) How to measure effectiveness and efficiency of public participation programs to satisfy requirements of criteria-and-indicator frameworks; and
 - (c) Ways to enrich the SFM Network's developing research area in public participation.

Additional Topics for Discussion

- What is the intent of public participation (e.g. education, empowerment, identifying public values, seeking acceptance for actions) and how are the various objectives accounted for in the public participation strategies used?
- How does public participation activity get translated into management plans (or values that generate choices regarding timing and location of management actions)?
- What is the appropriate scale of public participation in local forest management? How do we account for the values of non-local members of the public?

WORKSHOP FORMAT

The workshop brought together forest researchers (including graduate students) and forest practitioners and partners from business, government and First Nations. The mandate was to share ideas about improving public participation in sustainable forest management based on proven approaches, past and present research, and experiences 'in the trenches.'

Friday, 19 October 2001

The morning was devoted to presentations - with discussion - from five university-based forest researchers on Proven Approaches: Findings and Experiences. These approaches ranged from knowledge transfer and environmental assessment to the Model Forest concept. The luncheon speaker addressed the industrial practitioner's point of view of Public Participation in Sustainable Forest Management. The afternoon presentations offered practical perspectives from First Nations, an industrial landowner, and a provincial government partnership.

Saturday, 20 October 2001

The morning started out with a panel discussion on Public Participation Research Projects, followed by two presentations on current research projects in Alberta and British Columbia. During lunch, the group heard about Sustainable Forest Management Issues in Nova Scotia, a talk given by a representative from the Department of Natural Resources. In the afternoon, a private consultant summarized the key messages from the workshop, and the workshop ended with an overall discussion about research program development for the SFM Network.

Friday, 19 October 2001

Opening Remarks

Peter Duinker, SFM Network researcher, Dalhousie University Professor, and Convenor of the workshop gave the opening remarks. In his address, he welcomed the workshop participants comprised of researchers, practitioners and graduate students.

Overview of SFM Network's Public Participation Philosophy and Workshop Mission

Terry Veeman, Interim Program Leader, SFM Network

The Network views public participation as a key element of sustainable forest management. The Network puts a lot of effort on research with emphasis on excellence. It recognises that public demands are important in decision-making and therefore engages in research in public participation issues. The Network's aim is to draw national effort to strengthen participatory activities in the forest sector.

Mission of the workshop is to exchange knowledge and disseminate information about (1) current knowledge and exemplary practices, (2) vexing uncertainties that need to be addressed in research, and (3) identifying the right approaches and the way forward.

Proven Approaches I: Findings and Experiences of Forest Researchers

The Effect of Forest Management Knowledge Transfer on the Public

Luc Bouthillier, Laval University

Dr. Bouthillier presented a case study that analysed the effects of round table discussions on the extent of change in public involvement and decision processes in forest management practices. The participants of the study were twenty informants who were interviewed and then involved in round table discussions. The discussions concerned forest management situations. The respondents were individuals from the government [fishing/hunting], municipalities, commercial companies and others. It was noted that the participants showed a continuous level of participation during the round table discussion process. Following a period of 18 months, a questionnaire was administered as a follow-up.

The case study yielded successful results since the assessment, conducted at the end of the 18-month period, showed an improvement and change in participants' forest management values. Empowerment was one of the main improvements experienced by the participants. However, the researchers are convinced that there is room for further development. As is the case with any research, the results obtained pose new questions that require further research to be answered. For instance, an in-depth exploration of why respondents filled the questionnaires the way they did and if their perceptions are equivalent to the facts would be a promising area of research.

DISCUSSION

- The sample chosen in the study may not be representative of the entire population, so the results of the study may differ if the questionnaire were administered to a different or larger group of people.
- The follow-up sent 18 months after the first questionnaire does not provide ample time to examine the results of the study as 18 months was considered to be a short period. Furthermore, to what extent does a questionnaire assess the change in people's attitudes and perceptions and learning experience?
- When considering the results of the study, a person should bear in mind that the voice and opinion of Aboriginal people has not been shared because they refused to participate.
- It was agreed that round table discussions are a necessary tool, yet they are insufficient. There should be continuous research to find new ways that would engage larger groups of people in public participation.
- Natural crises may be regarded as ideal opportunities to reach the public and stimulate their interest in participating in environment-related issues.
- Public participation may be viewed as an exercise of trying to change the situation or change the minds of people.

Effective and Meaningful Consultation with First Nations

Gary Bull, University of British Columbia

First and foremost, what has to be recognised is that First Nations have to solve their own problems and that we can't solve their problems for them. The good news is that more First Nations individuals than ever before are enrolled in university, and there has been an increase in efforts to get First Nations people involved in the forest industry in British Columbia. Current processes in BC tend to limit the effectiveness of First Nation's involvement in forest management issues. Consultation processes for First Nations in the province exist mainly within a government setting through Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP), treaty negotiations and the MOF referral process. However, most First Nations refuse to sit on LRMP committees while at the same time, treaty negotiations and the MOF referral process inhibit any consultation because First Nations tend to remain quiet and uninvolved.

First Nations object to these processes because they feel they do not embrace fiduciary obligations and negate claims to Aboriginal rights and title. First Nations also refuse to participate

because they were not involved in the development of consultation guidelines that they are now required to abide by. Other consultation processes in BC include certification (e.g. NAFA-FSC), industry initiatives, memorandums of understanding (MOUs between community, ENGOs and First Nations), and national-level principles. Although these processes call for public involvement, there is no clear idea regarding effective and meaningful consultation with First Nations.

To develop effective and meaningful consultation, there need to be clearer descriptions of consultation and other participation processes. Evaluation criteria, which reflect the notions of effective and meaningful consultation, need to be developed. This is currently being done through pilot studies with specific First Nation groups. First Nations should have a say in what criteria are required and acceptable so that satisfaction with the process is as high as possible. Existing processes should then be analysed using the developed criteria to determine any gaps or improvements that need to be addressed. Finally, changes should be made to the current processes and a SFM guide developed regarding effective and meaningful participation of First Nations for future consultation advancement.

The current concept presently floating around British Columbia is: Community Acceptance = Government Approval + Social License. In other words, there needs to be some social acceptability regarding rights of certain groups to use the forest. To develop this idea, there needs to be an effective consultation process. At present, every First Nation band in BC is at some level of negotiation with industry and government. Within the UBC's Faculty of Forestry, the priority issues for a provincial First Nation's Strategy are to (1) improve First Nation access to, and relationship with, the forest industry; (2) improve capacity-building within First Nations; (3) promote resolution of treaties and management of treaty lands; (4) improve forest-sector understanding of First Nations and vice versa; and (5) improve First Nations involvement in land-use and resource-development planning.

DISCUSSION

Structural issues arise when trying to deal effectively with forest issues. There are multiple and cumulative impacts from interactions between and among the forest sector, outfitters, oil/gas developers, governments and First Nations regarding use. No one window exists at which all these impacts can be discussed.

- Are there a sufficient number of joint ventures taking place? No – the 170 joint-venture relationships that currently exist are not enough, and many of the ones that do exist are still in the initial stages. This is only one of many changes and processes that are happening, and there will probably be a five-fold increase in the next few years of such ventures. While there is a large demand for the sharing of resources, there are estimates that First Nations will control 12-15% of BC's wood supply in the near future. First Nations will need to work with industry as they do not currently have the capacity to run it all themselves.
- What would the costs and benefits be of returning some of the land to First Nations and coming together in joint-venture projects? New capital would become available for First Nations; however, a lot of consultation needs to be done first.

Public Involvement in Environmental Assessment: The Case of Non-Participants

John Sinclair, Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba

There has been little information in the literature about the reasons why the public does not participate in resource management initiatives. A case study of a new \$120 million hog processing facility in Canada was used to examine this issue. The data for this study are collected in three phases using multiple techniques, including document reviews, semi-structured qualitative interviews and a mail questionnaire. In Phase 1, nineteen senior environmental assessment (EA) officials throughout Canada were interviewed. The participants were asked specifically why some people refrain from participating in the EA process. Data for Phases 2 and 3 were drawn from the hog processing facility in Brandon, Manitoba, through interviews and mail questionnaires sent to government and non-government individuals and randomly chosen residents of the surrounding community.

Barriers to participation can be divided into two categories: structural and individual. Structural barriers include constraints related to societal structures. Results from the study indicated that many persons felt that they were unable to participate in EA processes due to the complexities and time pressures of modern living (involuntary complexity). Others felt that there were deficiencies in the EA process such as inadequate notice and lack of opportunities to participate. Some respondents also felt that their input would not make that much of a difference in the decision-making process. A third reason identified was alienating dominant discourses, where technical and scientific information were generally unavailable to the public.

In response to the second category identified - individual barriers - many of the participants felt that their concerns were already adequately addressed and they were comfortable with the way that the project was proceeding. Another reason identified for non-participation was that persons often felt that the views of those who did participate represented their own views and therefore "left it to others" to express their views. Another issue was lack of understanding. Many persons indicated that they were often unable to understand many of the technical themes and issues in environmental assessments.

The results of the study were consistent with the literature, where foregone conclusion was seen as an impediment to participation. Early involvement of the public in EA processes was seen as a means of addressing that concern. The study found that lack of interest is not a significant reason why people are often reluctant to participate in EA processes, indicating that EA practitioners need to continue the quest for new and innovative ways to engage inactive members of the public.

DISCUSSION

- Workshop participants were not in agreement with the factors used to measure success in the public participation process. Often success is measured by the number of persons who participate in the process by reviewing documents and sending in their comments, or the number of persons who participate in a meeting. One participant pointed out that people usually participate in these processes when they are interested in them and therefore, by choosing not to be actively involved in a process, the public is inadvertently voicing an opinion through non-participation.
- The factor used to measure success should be information dissemination. EA practitioners and others involved in the public participation process should ensure that the public is made aware of the participation process and opportunities.

- One participant raised the issue of the participation techniques: do the methods used restrict or inhibit participation? Furthermore, sometimes the public participation process is too long and tedious. Another concern was that some people only participate in public forums for entertainment. Many persons in communities show up to public forums because they know that they will be entertained – should this be used to measure success?

Public Involvement in Policy and Practice in Manitoba: A View from Trenches

Peter Miller, Centre for Forest Interdisciplinary Research, University of Winnipeg

The presentation provided an historical trend in public participation in the Manitoba forest sector from 1989 through 1997. It highlighted major public participation developments in sustainable forest management.

1989 Events

Several campaigns were launched in protest against logging and the sale of forest goods to private developers. This resulted in arrests of protesters including the Ontario New Democratic Party [NDP] leader Bob Rae. In Manitoba, Manfor was sold to Repap and there were plans to expand bleached kraft pulp production. It was during this time of increased public awareness of forest issues that the TREE coalition was established. TREE involved all interested parties including environmental groups, concerned citizens, youth and learning institutions, among others.

TREE proposed goals were:

- Creation of a sustainable forest policy that is ecologically friendly and sensitive to a diverse range of forest values.
- Preservation of wilderness areas large enough to protect the ecosystem and natural features.
- Environmental assessment that has significant input from an informed public.

The proposed forest agenda of TREE had successes as well as shortcomings. Successes included:

- Delayed mill start-up and improved process in the area of promoting profitable business and quality products by the company.
- A healthier environment that has less pollution.
- A willingness to engage the public in the process.

Limitations faced by the group included:

- Lack of publicly vetted forest policy.
- Lack of a comprehensive land-use policy.

The shortcomings led to a change in the strategy in 1992 in addressing issues of public involvement in sustainable forest management.

1992 Events

Once more there was an outcry from the public protesting forest management policy. As a result, there was a need to invest resources in forest issues and to establish an improved forest management strategy. At the national level, the Model Forest Program was launched. The Canada Forest Accord and National Forest Strategy were established which stated that all Canadians were entitled to participate in determining use and management of their forests. In Manitoba, the first environmental assessment was carried out for the Abitibi Pine Falls Forest (later known as Pine Fall Paper Company or PFPC).

The approach taken in 1992 had some successes in terms of agreements and levels of principles and values through negotiations, but faced shortcomings in the areas of reaching a conclusion on licensing, the opting out of First Nations, and ineffectiveness of advisory committees.

Creation of The Manitoba Model Forest

This was done in a controversial negotiation process between the company, PFPC, and ENGOs. The negotiations resulted in establishment of the Sustainable Forest Management Advisory Committee for PFPC. The vision for the Manitoba Model Forest is a partnership in operations aimed at achieving ecologically sustainable forest management. The partnership is based on inclusiveness and open problem-solving principles and values.

1997 Events

At the national level, British Columbia laid down a foundation for participatory land-use planning. In Manitoba, the Model Forest and National Forest Strategy renewal initiative changed the focus to an emphasis on public involvement processes rather than forest resource management. By involving the public in the management process, a more integrated approach toward sustainable forest management will be achieved.

DISCUSSION

- Land use planning: The process needs to be driven by the team in the participatory process but the authorities maintain the right to make informed policies and management plans. Delegation in some aspects of sustainable forest management should only occur when the stakeholders have the capacity and confidence.
- First Nations issues: The First Nations are seen as a unique part of the process and not just as stakeholders. A different approach may be required for First Nations' involvement in public participation in sustainable forest management.
- Increased participation through the effective engagement of the public by companies. It was suggested that there is a need to address the problem of public burnout that often deters individuals from participating in management processes.
- The biggest improvement that can be cited in the Manitoba Model Forest:
 - ⇒ People with authority use it and this makes a big difference in the participatory process.
 - ⇒ It can facilitate a vision of participation making a difference in resource and environmental health.
 - ⇒ Evaluation is carried out at different levels.
 - ⇒ It can help focus more effort on research into social dynamics of what works and what does not work.

Mutual Learning/Transfer of Knowledge Principles: The Case of the Fundy Model Forest

Omer Chouinard, University of Moncton

A case study of the Fundy Model Forest [FMF] was used to describe mutual learning and transfer of knowledge principles. Research was undertaken using 31 participants who were interviewed using open-ended questions. Thematic analysis was used in quantifying the data.

It is essential that partners in the FMF understand and are willing to work with other viewpoints. Partners need to identify the common goals of all stakeholders. To work better with the public, managers need to have dispute/conflict-resolution skills, as well as being versed in some knowledge of diplomacy. Being a good listener is important as tensions between users and uses are common.

Forest management consists of much more than managing trees – people should now be adopting a broader view of forest management. Managers must be able to appreciate the aesthetic and spiritual forest values of many stakeholders. To many, a forest is seen as having mainly economic value; others value it more for recreation. Knowledge and understanding of Aboriginal rights and issues is another factor that managers also need to be aware of. All this is important if managers are to communicate with the public which has different interests in the same resource.

Factors found to affect the learning process were (1) personal commitment, (2) access to information, (3) participation in research, and (4) the level of staff support. Tension towards the provincial government was another factor. Too many structured levels and slow process were identified as impediments to the learning process. One of the questions the study attempted to answer was whether the behaviour of persons who participated in the study changed after the sensitization process about forest management principles and processes. The research identified two changes: organizational and personal. Organizational change relates to FMF management practices such as certification, stakeholder involvement, and increased networking. Personal change relates to personal growth, the ability to appreciate new perspectives, and development of self-confidence.

The study concluded that interaction between and among groups promotes the mutual learning process, which is identified as a form of social cohesion as stakeholders are able to share common goals.

DISCUSSION

- One participant asked the speaker whether the study was able to show that some groups failed to learn anything during the study period. Dr. Chouinard commented that, in general, most groups felt that they were able to learn a lot during the study period.
- It was suggested that model forests should be seen as large learning organisations through which different participating groups are encouraged to learn about forest management. These groups would then take that new knowledge back to their institutions where this knowledge would then become institutionalized.

Luncheon Speaker

Public Participation in Sustainable Forest Management: Experiences in Eastern Nova Scotia

Russ Waycott, Stora Enso Port Hawkesbury Ltd.

Stora Enso complies with the principles of sustainable development. Although the company is a novice in the field of public participation with about two years' experiences, Stora Enso has learned from the experience and knowledge of others to allow faster progress. For example, the company is active in the Nova Forest Alliance and has gained knowledge from the Newfoundland process.

Stora Enso operates in the diverse forests of Eastern Nova Scotia. The wood supply originates from both private woodlot owners and Crown supply: geographically, 30% of the wood supply comes from Cape Breton, 50% from the Guysborough area, and 20% from central Nova Scotia. The Crown license from the province is a 50-year renewable license, covering most Crown land in NS. Granted to the company in 1960, Crown land supplies about 30% of wood now, but it could supply closer to 50% as the annual allowable cut increases. The license grants management rights to harvest wood, build roads, and practice silviculture. The total area of licensed lands is 607 000 ha, but the productive, operable lands constitute 432 500 ha.

Sustainable Forest Framework

Stora Enso operates under a 'Sustainable Forest Framework' consisting of an environmental management system. In 1998, it was the first forest company in Canada to get ISO 14001 certification. This was a good start towards on-the-ground sustainable forest management. Stora Enso is moving towards a sustainable forest management system, and is committed to three other certification schemes: FSC (Forest Stewardship Council), SFI (Sustainable Forestry Initiative), and CSA (Canadian Standards Association). Right now, Stora Enso is working on SFI and the CSA certification. The goal is to be successfully certified by the end of 2002. The ISO 14001 certification and the three forest certification schemes are important to be able to claim sustainability and they confer credibility, enhanced acceptance and respectability. The different certification schemes all confer different aspects of credibility:

- ⇒ CSA requires public input processes, and brings discipline to Crown license management through the use of criteria and indicators;
- ⇒ SFI provides overall conduct standards and stewardship requirements for private wood suppliers, which is important since a high proportion of wood originates on private land;
- ⇒ FSC brings in the ENGO perspective and acceptance; and,
- ⇒ The ISO 14001 environmental management system provides the overall structure to the organization.

Long-Term Planning

Legally, the forest license requires a forest management plan to be submitted to the province every forty years. Written in 1960, the management plan requires an improvement in yield, and states that the forest company contribute to sustainable development while considering the principles of multiple land use. Integrated Resource Management (IRM) planning is the basis of the provincial requirements of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). This led to the creation of an Ecological Long-Term Plan, composed of a strategic plan, a landscape plan, and an operational plan. The IRM objective is to identify and balance the multiple social, environmental, and economic interests of forest users. Ecological Landscape Classification provides the system framework for long-term planning.

Public Consultation

Phase 1 of the public participation process was conducted jointly by DNR and Stora Enso. This started in May 1998 with a school survey of students in grade six classes. Next, an overview document was provided to over 1000 identified stakeholder groups and individuals. An environmental learning consultant developed the public consultation process and provided a plan for input sessions with the communities. This consisted of twenty-eight community sessions in the autumn of 1998. The DNR objectives were to identify current land uses, local issues and broad themes. The company had three specific objectives: (1) identify locally important indicators; (2) assess the strengths / deficiencies of current forest operations; and (3) identify public objectives and priorities for forest management.

Public sessions were held in community halls. Stora Enso invited stakeholders, and also advertised the meetings. The number of attendees ranged from six to over forty. The meetings were designed to be non-confrontational. During the meetings, the long-term planning process was explained, as was how public input would be used. Since the long-term plan is revised every five years, public input is needed on an on-going basis. In the public session, Ecological Land Classification was discussed as it is used in Nova Scotia, and Stora Enso explained that its silviculture program is trying to match ideals and to conserve nature.

In the first round of consultation, Stora Enso introduced the long-term planning approach to a broad public. It received some good public input – 550 surveys about Port Hawkesbury forest activities, 1200 submissions on special issues, and 1300 comments on broad topics. This combination of broad and specific issues provided information that was used to develop the initial set of indicators of sustainable forest management. One and a half years later, the results were taken back to the community in a second round of public consultations.

In Phase 2, DNR and Stora Enso had somewhat different but compatible objectives. DNR needed to present the land use plan developed through the IRM process, whereas Stora Enso's needs were to get public input and verification of the long-term planning process to confirm that it had interpreted the public's issues correctly. Phase 2 consisted of sixteen open-house sessions that included representatives from DNR. DNR presented its land-use plans, consisting of Category 1 (general resource use), Category 2 (adaptive resource use area), and Category 3 (limited land use). The company then took that information to develop a draft 20-year plan. Stora Enso also prepared a company video about forest practices to increase public understanding of field techniques.

In general, the result of this process showed that the public was not interested in the specifics of harvest practices and how the long-term plan was developed. The public was very interested and concerned, however, with the government's land-use classifications. Overall, people appreciated that the land-use planning was scientifically based.

In order to interpret the public's input from the consultation processes, topics discussed were synthesized into 20 broad themes. These were then given one of three ratings: green ⇒ public provide clear indication to proceed as planned; yellow ⇒ review procedures; and red ⇒ public had real concerns. A Forest Advisory Committee was formed following the public consultations. People were invited to submit their names at the meetings, and other interested groups and individual's names were provided to a consultant, who then interviewed and selected people throughout Nova Scotia. The resultant committee of fifteen is composed of people representing business, tourism, forest contractors, woodlot owners, First Nations, and environmental organizations. The group started last fall (2001) and meets consistently every month. Alternates often attend too. At the beginning, in order not to waste time developing procedures, Stora Enso suggested a framework of how to run the meetings and the committees based on other

examples that worked. This meant that only one or two meetings were spent on procedures and objectives, translating into a gain of 6-12 months.

The committee is involved in technical aspects of developing long-range forest management plans. Participants received a short course in forest management and harvest techniques, starting with a forest description, discussion of required actions and results, and an introduction growth-and-yield curves. People were very interested and happy to learn this. Constraints were also discussed, including the spruce budworm. Objectives were then set to maximize the desired value and consider the necessary trade-offs. The Committee examined all of this in relation to indicators. Specific items considered were the proportion of the landscape that would be cut, and where features like deer wintering habitat and viewsheds were located.

The result of this process was a complex land-use summary. A map of the Cape Breton Highlands was produced to show corridors, connectivity zones and special preserved zones. The map also illustrated the amount of landscape actually available for timber harvest. As guided by the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, criteria and indicators were developed with the help of the Nova Forest Alliance. This resulted in 52 indicators sorted into themes. Stora Enso undertook computer-based modelling to determine levels for the indicators under alternative management scenarios. Potential results were generated illustrating how much land would be allocated for protection or clearcutting based on different scenarios. This showed the effects of various choices. The committee is currently voting on the proposed management techniques, and final selection will involve discussion of trade-offs based on long-term goals. On a final note, the Committee expressed a desire to look at the 75% of the wood supply that comes from private woodlots. Consequently, a new objective was added to its mandate to encourage the company to assist private landowners to manage more sustainably.

Conclusion

Is it worth it to involve the public? Yes. Even though Stora Enso already undertook forest planning before this consultation process was initiated, it was missing an understanding of what the public felt was important and should be managed for on the land. It is essential to have the public's views to manage sustainability.

Stora learned two lessons about public involvement. The first is that the process takes twice as long as expected. The process has been very slow compared to the company's objectives to move forward. But when given all the facts, citizens make good decisions and impressed the company with their desire to learn. As foresters, Stora Enso people tend to think technically while the public reacts to impressions and values. We have to bring these two thought-processes together because the intentions are not really that different. By presenting plans to the public, the company is forced to question its own decisions.

Engaging the public and having a public advisory committee certainly does not stop criticism in the media, nor does it stop public debate about land use. It does, on the other hand, help to make better decisions. The public participation process fosters alliances and friendships, and helps to get a little more leeway from the public. Everyone involved in the process is working towards continuous improvement.

DISCUSSION

The Advisory Group:

- Member turnover has not been a problem thus far. Each participant has an alternate who often comes to meetings. If a few key people can't continue in the process, the Advisory Group could lose ground, but so far this hasn't happened. Committee members are paid for food and mileage. Meetings last about four hours. The public representatives are often reluctant to become public spokespersons. We cannot expect them to do that, and it may destroy their credibility. But Stora Enso is hoping that the committee members will come to future public sessions to explain the process that they're going through.
- The Advisory Group disseminates information and keeps the public happy and informed. It is planning to go back to the general public and hold public meetings. Stora Enso hopes that the participants on the committee have been communicating back to their groups and communities so that the next public meetings will go well. The viewpoint of city-dwellers is represented, though not directly.
- With respect to voting on the preferred long-term management plan, each committee member was given eight votes to distribute over the criteria. This will be followed up with discussions on the distribution of votes before deciding on the final plan. The success of the process undertaken by the committee is not formally evaluated. The Advisory Group feels success on the gut level, and has continued and involved participation. One will have to wait and see the reaction when it goes to the public.

Credibility of Long-term Planning

- A concern was brought up that the British Columbia experience showed that only about 15% of what was identified in long-term plans is being done. Stora Enso responded that it has done what it said it would to maintain public credibility. The ISO 14001 process requires this. The Committee is actually dealing directly with managers so that what is recommended can be accomplished in forest operations.
- In adaptive management, while it may be impossible to show a map of what will be done for a 200-year period, Stora Enso can state exactly where certain practices will be done (i.e. for deer wintering) for a period of maybe twenty years.

Wood Supply

- A question was asked about what would happen if the committee recommended that the wood supply be cut in half. The bottom line is that the manager can decide what is reasonable and what isn't. Management would simply not agree to suggestions that could put the company out of business, but this isn't a relevant issue – people recognize the importance of having the company there for jobs. Furthermore, there is a level of trust between the public and the company. There is also a balance between private and public land use, and a cost to doing what the public wants. Stora Enso would rather incur some costs and ensure public satisfaction than have to go out of business or incur some long-term, unforeseen impacts.

Proven Approaches II: Findings and Experiences of SFMN Partners/Practitioners

Public Participation in Forest Management in the Gwich'in Settlement Area

Peter Clarkson, Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board, Inuvik, Northwest Territories

In the Gwich'in settlement area, the ways of interacting with the public and managing resources are much different than in southern Canada. There are two things that drive the resource management process in this area: (1) in Northern Canada there is generally more freedom; and (2) because the Gwich'in have land claims, there is ownership. This means that they can decide how to manage their resources and they have a right to participate.

The experience of Mary Kay, a Gwich'in member, illustrates the relationship of the people of the area with natural resources:

Mary Kay is in her 80s and has lived her entire life on the Rat River. The river is part of her family history; during the gold rush her family was in the area. Mary Kay whittles sticks from the forest for her son to use to drive fish. The wood is important for her livelihood. Mary Kay's use of the forest is as significant to her as the forest is to the Irvings.

It is important to understand her point of view, and to ask, for example, what it means to Mary when an outsider from a southern university comes to her community to talk about land use and forest management. We should think about Mary's use of the land, and that her husband, parents and son have or still depend on the forests for their livelihood, and try to understand what this means to her and the community. Before talking to the community about forest management, we should think about the views and the reality of the residents.

Workshops and meetings up North always begin with an opening prayer given by an elder. This has little to do with religion – its purpose is to encourage everyone to have an open heart, to recognise the endurance of the land, and to set a level playing field so everyone knows they are there to share their knowledge. Following the prayer is a round of introductions allowing everyone to describe themselves and express their objectives for the meeting. Their words are written down so that everyone sees that their objectives are recognised.

The Gwich'in land claim agreement confers three types of rights: land, money, and management. The Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board was established in 1995 to work with communities to determine how to manage renewable resource including the land. Half of the Board members are chosen by Aboriginal groups.

The Gwich'in settlement area is located at the northern end of the boreal forest, part of the Northwest Territories on the MacKenzie River delta. This area provides interesting ecological management issues that can be divided into five categories:

1. Forest resources and uses
2. Co-management
3. Public participation and forest management
4. Community capacity building
5. Communication and education programs

1. Forest resources and uses

In the Gwich'in area there are no active forest industries, not even a local sawmill. Nevertheless, most communities have a portable sawmill which may or may not be used. There are no lumber products. Most of the wood is used for firewood which is harvested from driftwood and collected from the river and brought onto land. Growth regeneration studies have shown that trees in the area grow for 600-800 years. For that reason, these trees can't be harvested for a timber industry. There is some use of forest trees for pilings and cabins but in a much different way than traditional use in the rest of Canada.

2. Co-management

Forest management is achieved through co-management starting with the Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. It is composed of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal representatives; 5 of the 7 voting members are Gwich'in. On the Board are two government representatives, one from the Canadian Wildlife Service and one from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. A woman Gwich'in elder represents the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), and this reflects the good relationship and existing trust. At the Board level, two-thirds of the people sitting at the table are Gwich'in, hence they have a huge voice in public participation. Thus far, the Board has only had one controversial issue.

The Board has support staff so that it can build capacity in the community and train Gwich'in people. The support staff varies in number and helps the Board get things done. The staff works with the people in the community to facilitate the management of their resources. The staff also represents public participation because its members are personally connected to the community through direct interaction.

The Gwich'in also participate through the funding initiatives of the Renewable Resources Board. Community approval is requested by the Board before it funds any research. The Board provides most of the research and management in the Gwich'in settlement. Two million dollars was initially given to the Board to invest and distribute to various projects.

3. Public participation and forest management

Each community has a Renewable Resource Council (RRC) elected by the community. The RRCs have the authority on resource issues for their areas; their role is to make decisions on the allocation of funds amongst other things. The RRCs interact with different committees and create a relationship with the community. Both the members of the RRCs and the community committees are paid so that all participants are seen as equals.

At the RRC meetings, a researcher attends and people are asked how they feel about proposed research for their areas. In addition, they are asked to suggest research they would like to see done. The direction for research projects comes from the community using the meetings to facilitate dialogue. Some meetings take place one-on-one, and often outdoors. When a project is going to take place, the RRC selects which community members will work on the crews to assist with research. The community assistants participate in the projects, so they feel some ownership, and can provide input on management. These assistants talk about the projects with their family and friends in the community, further sharing the information.

A Forest Working Group (FWG), made up of leaders and staff of various departments such as the MNR, meets to discuss current projects and decide on what research proposals should be submitted to fill gaps in knowledge. Forest management planning is recognised as a long, on-going process. As part of the management planning process, the FWG uses traditional community knowledge. Elders are asked to share their knowledge about traditional uses of the forest to find out when, where, and how things were done, and whether people use the forests more or less than in the past. It is important to identify the concerns of the elders about the forests.

4. Community capacity-building

The Renewable Resources Board does a lot of capacity-building amongst community members to enable them to take care of their land. This requires a lot of knowledge-sharing. Since the land claim, everyone is trying to move to a more community-based system of management. This process is not easy though. It takes a long time to alter the responsibility from the federal government to the community and to encourage the community to take ownership and responsibility for land use and management. To help this process, it is important to change the goals of resource management to accommodate the community's views and desires.

5. Communication and education programmes

Gwich'in people are beginning to see themselves as managing their own resources. For example, every year, the Board produces a harvest study calendar. The people involved are pictured in the calendar and it shows the community participating. This reminds the community about what is going on and shows that everyone can share in the responsibility of managing the resources. There are also a lot of school programmes, special school days and career days. The idea is to communicate what's going on and to let people know how to participate.

SUMMARY

In the Gwich'in settlement area there is a lot of community participation. Public participation is a mindset and a way to do business – it is not just one piece of the process. This is especially true in this case where public participation is part of the land claim legislation. The only way to have sustainable forest management is when the community is part of the process and people feel some kind of ownership. Relationship-building is key.

Time is of the essence, but this doesn't mean that things need to be done quickly. Communities need time for capacity-building and feel comfortable with what is being asked of them. RRC and FWG staff need to have patience and allow communities the time they need. Members of the Renewable Resource Board and the Forest Working Group are prepared before going to the communities, by speaking plain language and communicating well. Acronyms and slang may not be understood or appreciated, especially by elders. Staff is also trained to 'facilitate, not dictate'. This takes time to learn, particularly for recent graduates who have been trained as researchers or managers. They must learn how to facilitate to encourage people to utilise their own knowledge.

At the end of any meeting we go back to a circle, look at the objectives and ask people if their objectives were met. A closing prayer reminds people of the purpose of the meeting and reaffirms the level playing field amongst all attending.

DISCUSSION

Co-management

- Co-management is co-operative management. To work, it requires two things: co-operation and participation. The biggest challenge of co-management is building capacity at the community level. Because there is a low population density and only governments and Aboriginal groups in the Gwich'in settlement area, co-management may be easier than in other areas. Even so, the foundations of this experience can be used anywhere.

- The difference between community-based management and co-management is that community-based management is when people in a community manage their resources. Co-management, on the other hand, is when government agencies with support staff have legislated mandates to sit around a table with the communities. There is no management from individual departments.

Accountability to the general population

- There are linkages between the Renewable Resources Board, the Community Council and the general population. There are strong community ties between the Board, Councils, and the community because members are part of the community as well. As a result, there is quite a bit of direct communication.

Interest of the community, particularly youth in resource studies

- It is likely that the research and projects are influencing people to consider resource management for employment. Some Gwich'in trainees have obtained jobs as wildlife officers, and another is now at university pursuing related studies. Before we can assess this, we have to look at the longer time scale. There has been a quick evolution and the process is changing things quickly. If we look at future generations, maybe kids will want to pursue resource studies because of the experiences of the present generation. The effects will grow as time goes on.

An Industrial Landowner's Perspective on the Role of Public Participation

Gaetan Pelletier, J.D. Irving Ltd.

J.D. Irving is a large lumber business that produces quality solid wood products and other value added products (tissue paper, mouldings, baskets, etc). The company's forest management practices are strongly focused on the long-term. *'You do something as if you were doing it for a thousand years'*. This perspective is engrained in the company's decision-making strategies. Irving is a family business which manages forests on both public and private land.

Management plans are implemented through best management practices. Irving's forest management plan is an eighty-year plan. The company has a very rigid in-house process (IQ200) to measure and improve quality. Feedback from external audits (used for quality measurement) and the public is solicited and incorporated in the management plan. High emphasis is placed on public involvement. The public is a neighbour as J.D Irving's operations are surrounded by families and communities. The company operates a world-class GIS system. Computer models are used to forecast the long-term supply of timber.

Highlights of the Irving management plan are:

- ⇒ Maintain portion of land base that is old forest
- ⇒ Maintain forest diversity and forest habitat
- ⇒ Use multiple harvest instruments
- ⇒ Harvest at sustainable levels

One of the main objectives of the company is to maintain and facilitate public involvement. Dealing with the public is a big part of forestry. Irving realizes that it requires well-informed staff to interact with public groups. This goes beyond public relations. The company insists that its management staff attend all public meetings as the company wants to be sure that the decision-makers hear the concerns of the public. This demonstrates that the company places great importance on public input and participation.

Another of the company's priority objectives is listening to what the public has to say about management issues. Management constantly strives to be a good neighbour in the community and aims to educate the public about forest practices. Company representatives familiarize public groups with forest management practices by taking them for tours in the woods. The tours and presentations reach over 30,000 people each year. Management seeks to identify gaps [real and perceived] and try to understand and identify public values. There are public advisory groups in all areas where Irving operates, through which the company strives to establish credibility amongst these communities.

Management uses external audits to assess performance. This is considered the best way to obtain third-party opinion. J.D. Irving participates in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) forest certification program. All lands are under ISO 14001. FSC certification is considered very important for the identification of information gaps. This is an on-going process. Although much effort is placed on this process, it is viewed as a positive experience.

The Forest Research Advisory Committee (FRAC) runs parallel with the public involvement program. The committee has been active since 1998. The company stresses that *'the best science is right for the environment and makes good business sense'*. The FRAC consists of seven scientists and ecologists who meet several times a year. The purpose of FRAC is to acquire the information needed to make managerial decisions and identify research gaps. This helps managers make decisions based on science.

Irving engages in educational partnerships. The company has developed scientific programs for school-aged children at the Irving Nature Park and La Dune in Bouctouche, NB. The company takes great care to present its material in an unbiased manner. It has developed a web site and also conducts educational tours for students and teachers.

The company encourages public participation and public input. There are a lot of public values to consider in SFM. The most challenging aspect of public participation is finding people who will stay with the process. The most interested people gain understanding for how complicated it is to manage forest operations. The company tries to gain participant trust for the planning process and support for the company's intentions. The company representatives ensure dialogue is maintained. Keeping the momentum presents a challenge in public involvement. Stakeholders tend to lose focus and interest. SFM is a long-term endeavour – sometimes it is difficult for people to think in this dimension. The scientific nature of the problems requires much explanation. Often it is best to bring in the experts to explain the technical issues. When the link is made between committees, the process runs smoother.

Although public participation comes with some challenges, this process has succeeded in several areas. Among these accomplishments are the Black Brook Group in northern New Brunswick, which helped design special management zones for the 2002 Forest Management Plan. This group has about ten to twelve people with a high level of participation. They address issues like biodiversity, wildlife habitat and conservation. The group produces a plan similar to Irving's initial ideas. Another place where the public participation process has worked well was in Glazier Lake. The Glazier Lake Committee was solicited to help plan an aerial herbicide program with initiative to do a deer research project. It was given maps to work with and was asked for feedback. It recommended minimal changes to the management plan. Its concerns were with special areas such as wildlife corridors, which were, in turn, considered by the company. A third example comes from using the process to build trails in northern New Brunswick to accommodate all-terrain vehicles on private land.

The J.D. Irving experience as an industrial landowner using the public participation process resulted in several potential improvements:

- ⇒ Use of facilitators to maintain momentum.
- ⇒ Rotation of advisory committee members. To make sure that the process continues when people no longer want to participate, management suggests the idea of bringing a buddy to work and phasing out the other person who no longer wants to participate. This will ensure that the committee continues to move forward.
- ⇒ Give challenges to committees; allow them to work on real cases.
- ⇒ Acknowledge the advisory committee so that the community recognizes the members and can speak to them about Irving (e.g. put photos and reports in the local newsletter).
- ⇒ Advisory committee should participate in preparing meeting agendas.
- ⇒ Key staff must participate in public meetings.
- ⇒ Recognize regional differences; public concerns vary in different regions.

There were three main challenges identified in Irving's experience with public participation: (1) it is a lot of work – especially for management staff as they are required to work long days and weekends; (2) it is not about scientific information, it is about public values; and (3) it is not a science – it is a lot of work!

DISCUSSION

- Irving has public advisory groups on all lands that it owns. Input from the public on public-land management is strong. On private land, the input is a bit less demanding and more suggestive. Issues on private land tend to be more focused on access.
- There appears to be a difference in public attitudes towards activities on private land across borders. In the United States (e.g. Maine), people seem to think that if you own the land you are able to do what you like with it. However in Canada, there is a subtle underlying premise that people still have some rights to the land even though it is privately owned.
- It is a balancing act to bring the public's desires to the owner of the land to find an acceptable solution. The issue of land ownership is a complex issue. It is uncertain whether small private land ownership will decline. Land tenure appears to be a big issue.

Public Participation in Sustainable Forest Management in Newfoundland

Don Brain, Abitibi Consolidated, Grand Falls, NF

Newfoundland has a commercial woodland limit of 1.8 million ha., and an AAC of 608 000 m³. Productive land is about 45% of the total and the species composition consists of 70% black spruce and 30% balsam fir. Abitibi has two mills in the province, one in Stephenville and the other in Grand Falls-Windsor, producing nothing but newsprint (~390 000 tonnes) and employing about 1000 people. The management plan for Abitibi operating areas consists of 5-year operating plans, with the Crown responsible if there is multiple ownership. Districts 10, 11 and 12 decided to develop Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) plans.

The goal of the SFM plans is to incorporate public values in forest management decision-making, and establish a long-term SFM plan for the forest that meets certification requirements. Abitibi Consolidated Inc. was the first company in Newfoundland to be certified. After obtaining ISO 14001 certification, it looked to achieve CSA certification, as well as other standards. It was a company objective to be certified.

In May 1997, Abitibi Consolidated began its public participation process using the CSA benchmark for public participation. Jacques Whitford was hired by the company to facilitate the process. Potential stakeholders were identified and information packages were made available to interested parties. After identification, stakeholders were telephoned for confirmation purposes. Three public meetings were held between June and October 1997 in order to develop a long-range 20-year plan. Thirty-one parties were interested in the process and a planning team was formed. In the last three years, at least 100 meetings have taken place to discuss various issues with stakeholders. The process takes a lot of effort and time, and the long-range plan was formally developed in 2001.

A couple of key ingredients are required to make sure the process is successful. Firstly, a balanced table is very important so that every stakeholder is represented, including the union. People have different views that need to be addressed, but it's important to respect them. Also, ground rules also need to be established, and in this case the draft review of the ground rules took months, or maybe even a year, to develop and given to the planning team. Each district has its own planning team; however, the Ground Rules Handbook developed by Abitibi is now used as the standard across Newfoundland. Each committee may make changes according to its own District's situation. A consensus approach is used when determining what the ground rules will be in each district.

Other important ingredients to success include having alternates available for various aspects of the process, and establishing a timeframe for plan development with clear, explainable goals. They cannot be above the laws and they have to work within the overall framework. The objective of the public process was to develop a management plan. This was not a land-use exercise. Facilitator requirements are important to recognize though not always required. In this case, the process started with outside consultants who were then relieved once the planning team was comfortable with its own rotating chair. For education purposes, field visits are extremely important as participants could see the work that is being done such as road construction, harvesting and other forestry practices. The establishment of a monitoring committee is the most important ingredient of all at this stage. It helps keep the focus of the group, understand what has been agreed upon, and see whether the group has been successful.

Moving from theory into practice, the values identified from within the stakeholder groups are then translated into objectives and targets within the ISO 14001 Management System. The SFM plan contains a criteria-and-indicators section that sets out who is going to do what and when based on what the committee has identified as objectives. An action plan is outlined and translated into actual planning documents. First- (internal), second- (corporate) and third- (government, ISO) party audits are conducted for certification and documentation purposes, and for providing an objective external review of checks and balances. The planning team will also conduct field checks through the monitoring process.

Several challenges arise during the process that must be considered and addressed. It is important to determine whether the views at the table are representative of all interested parties. In this part of Canada, it is very difficult to get wildlife and tourism representatives, but in the media and general public, they get most of the attention. 'Outside' values need to be recognized. Deciding on the tools to evaluate the success of the process is important while incorporating the public into the evaluation. The challenge of meeting changing certification schemes also needs to be recognized.

'Forest management is not rocket science... it's more complicated than that'.

DISCUSSION

- Why is it hard to get tourism and wildlife represented? The government goes through a lot of changes, there are different mandates that conflict with one another, and it's hard to get the politicians at the table. However it's important to try and meet them at the table, not at the later environmental assessment process.
- Why harvest trees in Newfoundland when they seem to grow so slowly? In reality, they don't grow that slowly, depending on how you define it. The trees can grow in 80 years, and there is 80 to 90% natural regeneration. Small trees grow back quickly, and there is often a hard time finding places to plant trees. However, Labrador is different so management needs will be different in these regions.
- How do you define different levels of consensus? This is found in the brochure, and can range from "oppose" to "endorse." Try to stay as high as possible in consensus, though this is not always possible. If consensus is not found, take a smaller committee out to look at the issue in more depth and then come back with its suggestions.
- CSA standards required the public to help design the process. How does this work with the Ground Rules Handbook that is now used as the provincial standard? Give the people the option to design a new process, or take the existing process and work on improvements.
- If the process had started without a facilitator, would it have gone as smoothly as it did? A facilitator was not really needed, but it gave the process more credibility and showed that this was not an Abitibi-controlled process.
- Isn't it hard for the facilitator to have a double role of representing the company and being the leader of the process? This depends on the people at the table, and should be left to the group to decide.

A Provincial Government's Approach to Public Involvement

Sean Dolter, Western Newfoundland Model Forest, Corner Brook

The role of public involvement in forest management is important. Although interest in SFM issues ranks high in public opinion polls, participation is low. A public survey reported that 78.4% of people are interested in forest management issues; however, only 1% attend meetings. It is difficult to get people involved in SFM planning. It is important to identify what is wanted in a public involvement process and it is also important to define terms like "citizen", "public" and "community". It would be ideal if one stakeholder's perspective could represent many, but this is often not the case. It appears that the views held by one person do not always represent ideas held by others. Thus, the test is really on the methods of outreach.

How do you get the public involved? In most cases to get the public involved, you have to go to the citizens. The forester has to think about the desired level of participation from public groups. The public participation level can be classified on different levels of a ladder. The top step represents the highest level of participation and the levels decrease as one descends the ladder. In the top level or step,

citizens have full power. The second level deals with negotiations and tradeoffs, and the third offers an advisory capacity with no decision-making power. The fourth level allows participants to listen and voice their opinion while the lowest step on the ladder is one-way communications for education purposes. Stakeholder involvement in strategy development continues to be debated in the province. For the strategy in District 16, the tourism industry wrote the section of the strategy that deals with tourism. It appeared that in this instance, people read too much into the plan and made demands on land-use planning.

There are several methods to secure public involvement starting from newspaper ads, letters, telephone, and email that help educate the public about forest management practices. Most importantly, the public needs to know about, and have access to, opportunities for public participation. This means that platforms for open discussions such as round tables, mini-seminars, meetings, workshops need to be planned within centralized locations. Communication formats need to be available so that the public can comment immediately and send written comments or debate the issues at a later meeting.

The experience of public involvement in Newfoundland and Labrador provides us with a number of successful strategies for approaching public participation:

- ⇒ Stakeholder inclusion. It is possible to do a great job when there is a full-range of stakeholders involved in the process.
- ⇒ Working agreements. Rather than insisting on complete consensus, people participating in the process do not always have to come to total agreement.
- ⇒ Establish ground rules. This usually happens during the first few meetings.
- ⇒ Facilitator-oriented. When a facilitator is involved, it adds a neutral person to the process. In some cases, there are very vocal environmental interests (e.g. in District 15, 16). There is need for a trained facilitator to handle disagreements from public groups.
- ⇒ Welcome the electronic age. Plans and strategies are provided on CD Rom and the Internet.
- ⇒ Information exchange in negotiations between stakeholders in conflict is very important.
- ⇒ Conflict resolution techniques are essential. There are trade-offs dealing with buffer zone variability and time of operation. Behind the scenes, industry is interactive in conflict resolution with stakeholders.
- ⇒ Establishment of working group. This allows the fragmentation of arguments that are not equally important to everyone.

Alongside these proven strategies are perceived weaknesses which fall into three categories: administrative, inclusion and education.

1. Administrative: Too much, too quick for the district forester. It is difficult to interpret and adapt information, such as criteria and indicators and access conflicts in a limited amount of time. There is a lack of support for personnel to deliver what is being built into the plans, and district staff is not yet trained with the GIS technology – the learning curve is steep. Non-timber, socio-economic aspects in GIS are difficult to incorporate. The gaps in the database make it difficult when staff is being asked to make decisions on non-timber and socio-economic issues where there is not a common language or framework, particularly between industry and the public.
2. Inclusion: There is a definite need for more non-timber representation. Intimidation by number may be happening – people do not feel comfortable speaking when there are too many industry representatives. The process needs to separate value discussion, i.e. at times there are too many meetings devoted to dealing with one issue. The people concerned about the issue should be divided into working groups so that the process can continue. Time constraints and inaccessible meeting

places also affect rates of inclusion. In some areas, the process is personality driven, resulting in a feeling of stakeholder bias.

3. Education: It is important to make the intent, scope and guidelines perfectly clear from the very beginning. Goals of the public participation process need to be made clear to participants. It is also important to present policy and regulations in a clear manner so there is no confusion between industry versus legislative processes. Educating the participants about the ecosystem-based plan for management is valuable to the public process. The plan should not be advertised as an ecosystem plan when it is, in fact, a forest management plan that considers ecosystem values. This causes confusion.

Indicators play a big role in education. At one end are the citizens who have little interest in looking at indicators. They don't understand them and do not know how to monitor them. It is confusing, exclusionary and possibly intimidating when industry representatives use indicators to support management actions. Alternatively there are the people who want economic indicators to understand the socio-economic demands on the resource.

The public participation process needs a foundation of trust. In Newfoundland and Labrador, the media is a powerful force in forest management. The media deliver mixed messages; industry must learn to rebut and be able to handle the media. In addition, because there is no land-use management process in Newfoundland, the forestry process is taking the brunt of public desire to influence land management issues.

Preparing for the Future

The public needs to be approached using common language. Concepts of management and indicators must be accessible to all participants. People appreciate maps to discuss spatial conflicts. The public is demanding spatially-driven discussion, thus information has to be presented in a different manner. Key elements are techniques like geo-referencing non-timber issues, 3D visualization and modelling, and 3D virtual reality. Spatial and aspatial modelling supports adaptive management by forecasting and testing assumptions to check validity.

There is always a demand for visiting past, present and future harvest and operating sites. More field trips need to be incorporated into the educational component of the public process. Likewise, consultation and input can increase with going out and visiting people, especially those who do not get involved (e.g. tourism operators). There needs to be a broader survey of the public, and the use of electronics can facilitate this. There are different ways to meet people without having to be somewhere in person (e.g. web communication, training operations, emailing). This will allow the process to continue between meetings.

Public sector involvement is another way to prepare for the future. Duties need to be spelled out in the strategic plan. The framework should be consistently described early in the process. Other tools include off-the-shelf strategies that can be used as guidelines, for example, conflict resolution techniques, buffer zones, non-timber mapping, socio-economic valuations, and landscape design manuals.

DISCUSSION

- The public involvement process is often driven by strong personalities. Sometimes these people are trained environmentalists that take advantage of the opportunity to express their views. This can

cause adversarial relationships and make it difficult to build trust. It also makes it difficult for others to participate.

- There is only one First Nations organization in Newfoundland and Labrador that chooses to participate in the public involvement process; others do not. There are some land claims in Labrador that are currently in the initial stages of agreement, and the Innu of Labrador seem to be interested in looking at the public involvement process. Model forests are useful to help transmit knowledge in other areas.

Saturday 20 October 2001

Knowledge Needs, Research Developments: The SFM Network Public Participation Research Projects. Panel Discussion

John Sinclair, University of Manitoba

Shashi Kant, University of Toronto

Rich Stedman, University of Pennsylvania

Tom Beckley, University of New Brunswick

Peter Duinker, Dalhousie University

Presentations were made on the subjects of research on public participation in forest management. The panellists presented brief statements on their field of study and engaged the participants in discussion on related presentations.

In presenting his research on sustainable forest management that looks at the license system for in Manitoba, Dr. Sinclair asked participants to ponder the following questions:

- ⇒ What conditions favour effective, efficient and fair public involvement?
- ⇒ Does transformative learning take place through public involvement?
- ⇒ What are the linkages between individual learning and social learning?
- ⇒ What confidence factors are operational through public involvement?

Given the researcher's interest in the education/learning involvement matrices, reference was made to the "theory of learning" and its application to adults. Focusing on the process of learning, this theory recognizes that the ideal conditions for learning mean (1) having access to accurate information, (2) being free from cohesion, (3) having available alternative perspectives, (4) having the ability to reflect, and (5) assessing weaknesses.

Of concern to Dr. Sinclair's research are the expectations of people in the process of public participation. It is estimated that only 1.1% of the 785 of people who talked about public participation actually participate. The result is a condition of exhaustion experienced by a small group that leads researchers to believe that financial rewards may help reduce/dampen the burnout problem. Establishing advisory groups is believed to be an effective alternative.

Research by Dr. Stedman focused on understanding the processes of public advisory groups in Alberta. Through this work, it is recognised that public involvement activity in Alberta is widespread and growing rapidly. It is thought to be an important and desirable process. While this is perceived to be good, some researchers believe that such importance and desirability for public involvement has impeded the

conduct of good research on the effectiveness of examining processes of public involvement. Consequently, researchers are unwilling to criticize and critically examine public involvement as it occurs. It would therefore be useful to invoke the criteria on ways in which the effectiveness of public participation can be measured.

There is a tendency for advisory groups simply to mirror the public in their existence. In effect, too much attention is paid to single-criterion representatives who do not represent the public. Whether or not this occurrence is of significance, it is critical to assess the extent to which these representatives focus on representativeness, and to what extent they neglect issues of process that happen both within and without the participatory groups.

In formulating the ideas of the “Public Sphere”, the German sociologist Jurgen Habermas identified the following as requirements for good public participation process within groups and advisory boards:

1. Set aside social differences in groups and ensure equality.
2. Rational arguments and the process are of paramount importance. It requires that individual differences and perspectives be set aside on entering the group.
3. Include new ideas that were formally considered off the table of discussion.
4. Widespread inclusiveness is required. Group members must seek feedback from the community and even go beyond this two-way communication.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the attributes of the Public Sphere, the case studies in Alberta will address the questions if, why and how these attributes are met and whether they can be used as criteria for effectiveness in public participation processes [see Fluet’s presentation summary on page 27].

The need to document and assess what was going on in public involvement forums was highlighted by Dr. Beckley. It is necessary to have clear indications of people’s expectations going into the public participation process. An understanding of their relative position along Arnstein’s Ladder is important to understand the expectation levels of participants in the activity. Also, practitioners need to start having more fun in participation events. They need to be more innovative and start developing unique experiments to assess public participation.

Dr. Duinker spoke on how public participation links to model forests and certification. He asked how should a forest management company assess its position with respect to public participation requirements and certification when it is involvement in the model forest exercise? To what extent can the model forest exercise be seen as contributing to the company’s requirement under certification as implementing public participation?

The relationship to knowledge and knowledge needs are seen as occurring in a spherical world in which the known lies within and the unknown reaches outside the sphere. Within the domain of knowledge, questions about public participation which fall inside the sphere are those to which answers are available. Questions outside the sphere require research and constitute our knowledge needs. Public participation processes are seen to lie along a similar spectrum. In making a good public participation process, one needs to move people up the spectrum of knowledge, putting into practice what is known and not expend research effort on the known. This can be demonstrated by using the experiences of model forests in a knowledge exchange and technology exploitation scheme in moving available knowledge into practice.

In focusing on the challenges ahead, Dr. Duinker pointed out that we know how to communicate to inform the masses, and we know how to run stakeholder advisory groups. The challenges to which

research may be required are in expanding the learning experiences beyond the heavily involved and co-ordinated stakeholder groups. Research needs to look at timely process in public participation processes, and mechanisms to elicit new evaluation arrangements. He concluded by suggesting to researchers to explore ways of expanding the learning experience beyond those who are knowledgeable on the subject.

Dr. Shashi Kant described two projects funded by the SFM Network. The first one is on Sustainable Forest Management Through Co-management In Northwestern Ontario. There are two students working on this project. One student surveyed the forest values and perceptions of four groups (Aboriginal peoples, OMNR, forest industry and ENGO's) in Northwestern Ontario. The other student is working on macro- and micro-level institutions for co-management. The second project is on People's Participation in SFM through Local Citizens Committees in Northwestern Ontario. One student is working on this project. Dr. Kant raised four issues and argued that, as researchers, we have to ask ourselves:

- ⇒ Why are we talking about public participation? What is the main objective behind public participation? Is the main purpose social licensing to the forest industry, or is it aimed to meet the legal requirements of the provincial law? Is it the right of people that we should seek their participation? Is the main purpose sustainable forest management, and is people's participation a necessary input for that?
- ⇒ What is public participation? Is it a product or a process? What type of product or process is it?
- ⇒ What are the desired outputs from people's participation?
- ⇒ What, as a group of researchers, can we contribute to people's participation?

Public Participation in Integrated Resource Management: Three Alberta Cases

Colette Fluet, University of Alberta

Ms. Fluet is working on an SFM project on Integrated Resource Management [IRM] in Alberta, specifically between the forestry and the oil-and-gas industries. In her thesis, she will focus on three current initiatives in public participation to increase understanding on how each of the cases is approaching public involvement. The three cases are:

1. Alpac's Integrated Landscape Management [ILM] Project.
2. The Northern East Slopes Strategy.
3. The Little Red River/Tall Cree First Nation initiative.

Public involvement is one of the key components for successful IRM, which is defined as the cooperation and coordination of various actors to achieve landscape-level management. In IRM, it is important to have general support of the public as well as support of stakeholders.

1. Alpac's Integrated Management Projects

Alpac is pursuing co-ordination between companies to make a smaller footprint and generate cost savings. Ms. Fluet is looking at the effectiveness of taking a smaller scope and thus purposefully not including all stakeholders.

2. The Northern East Slopes Strategy

The project document says that IRM is based on cooperation, communication, consideration of all values, and consultation before action. The document does not interpret what these concepts really mean, thus leaving a sense of vagueness about the ideals. The project involves multiple stakeholders,

and several general public meetings and additional meetings with industry, environmental groups, aboriginal communities, and federal, provincial and local government employees have been held.

3. The Little Red River/Tall Cree First Nation Initiative

The agreement includes a co-management and sub-regional IRM plan. The co-management board is proposing a landscape assessment scenario-modelling project, where traditional use knowledge will be digitized and overlaid on maps of oil-and-gas and forestry activity.

There isn't necessarily consensus among practitioners and researchers on a lot of things involving public participation. There are certainly things we need to know in order to explain what we are doing and why:

- ⇒ Why are we including the public and what is the goal of doing so? Are we assessing public values to guide policy and management decisions, or are we including the public in each management decision to fulfil policy requirement?
- ⇒ Who is the public? General public, stakeholders, directly affected people, indirectly affected people, concerned individuals and groups, sector representatives, and community members.
- ⇒ How do we involve the public? There are various ways to involve the public; among the issues we have to consider are data, time, clerical support and funds.

Public participation does not happen in a vacuum and therefore we need to be sensitive to each situation. If there is deep mistrust, trust will have to be rebuilt before progress can be made. Everyone's need is hardly going to be met on the same piece of land simultaneously, so public participation must include finding a balance. There is also power involved to say who gets to be involved and who has real influence over the final outcome.

A Study of British Columbia Forest Values and Inter-Group Relations

Loraine Lavallee, University of Northern British Columbia

Media portrayals and some social science research suggest that people belong exclusively to one of two opposing ideological camps with regard to forest values – environmental or economic. This implicit view of values related to forests does not address the problems associated with (1) a lack of understanding of social values, (2) disputes resulting from a lack of understanding of social values, and (3) the absence of any inventory of social values. The disregard for shared values and perspectives on forests is the basis for a study to capture and reflect the complexity of British Columbian's values associated with forests. Project researchers looked at values common to stakeholder groups, identifying and clarifying contentious values.

The study was conducted in two stages: face-to-face interviews (N=302), and mailed questionnaires (N=173). Selection of participants was based on a combination of maximum variety sampling and quota sampling. The six main criteria for quota sampling were:

- ⇒ work relation to forest
- ⇒ forest region
- ⇒ urban/rural
- ⇒ level of economic forest reliance
- ⇒ gender
- ⇒ culture background (e.g. First Nations)

The questionnaire was developed from the results of the interviews and targeted these value domains:

- | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. provincial | 5. equity/moral | 9. recreation |
| 2. community work | 6. quality of life/well-being | 10. cultural |
| 3. outdoor experiences | 7. ecological | 11. knowledge/education |
| 4. aesthetic | 8. environmental | 12. company/industry |

Definitions in use:

Values: desirable end-states of existence

Forest values: enduring conception of the good related to forests and forest ecosystems.

In this study, the research indicated that it would be inaccurate to characterize BC stakeholder groups as solely endorsing either environmental or economic values. A wide range of environmental, social and economic objectives were highly important. It therefore infers that conflict over forest management may be less about these two fundamental, 'opposing' values and more about the means for achieving these desired end-states. One distinction between the shared and contentious values is that many shared values are end-state values, whereas contentious values are means values.

Clearly, there is evidence of two worldviews – environmental and economic. People tend to strongly endorse one over the other, but some folks may strongly endorse both. Some do not endorse either. It is also evident that there are many social, personal, economic and environmental values that are shared by all groups. Mapping the relationship among means and end-state values may identify shared fundamental values embedded in contentious values and increase inter-group understanding about the importance of contentious values.

Luncheon Speaker

Sustainable Forest Management Issues in Nova Scotia

Ed MacAulay, Department of Natural Resources, Nova Scotia

When developing an action plan for sustaining Nova Scotia's forests, a number of realities must be understood. Nova Scotia is a relatively small province with a high population density spread fairly uniformly over most of its area. Half of Nova Scotia's forests are owned by some 35 thousand small private owners and a quarter is owned by logging companies, leaving only a quarter of NS forests under the direct control of the government. The high rural population combined with the small proportion of Crown land has led to continued tensions, where both the public and industry perceive government policies and legislation directed towards sustaining Nova Scotia's forests as infringing on their rights.

In recognizing this tension, the government has taken an integrated approach and developed a Nova Scotia Forest Strategy in conjunction with the public, private owners and industry. Initially for organizational purposes, the IRM process in Nova Scotia divided the Crown land into three categories: (1) General uses i.e. areas without much conflict, (2) Resource value conflict i.e. prioritized areas, and (3) Unique areas i.e. protected areas and parks. The information used to determine these areas came from historical data, aerial surveys, GIS analysis, forestry research, and trial forest plots. A planning committee was struck to develop certain initiatives for the Forest Strategy. The committee held two public forums where it received input on land values and land-use commitments. Some of the initiatives that have been put into practice include fifty-year forecasts of sustainable timber harvest levels, implementation of 20-m buffer zones around all streams greater than 15-cm width, and development of fair, effective forestry practices.

Three key elements are used in implementing the new ecosystem-based forest strategy. The first is a registered buyer's list of anyone who buys more than 1000 m³ of wood yearly, developed primarily to obtain information on the status of the timber harvest. Secondly, an educational group was created to disseminate good forestry practices to the public and all stakeholders. A Forest Technical Advisory Committee was then established to help guide industry and evaluate monitoring and enforcement.

A number of challenges must continue to be overcome to ensure the effective and efficient use of resources and the production of a sustainable wood supply. Making sure there is compliance with the strategy by all the stakeholders is one. This is currently exemplary, likely due to the fact that the stakeholders were all involved in the design and therefore have ownership in the strategy. The biggest challenge is for all parties to continue moving away from managing the forest as an individual entity and towards an integrated, land-based management style that incorporates all resource uses.

DISCUSSION

- There was some confusion as to why the Nova Scotia government does not use annual allowable cut (AAC) figures. It is because Crown land only accounts for a quarter of the province's forests.
- Why are registered buyers subject to a \$3 fee on every cubic metre of wood purchased. The answer is that the fee is used to ensure the maintenance and development of the sustainability strategy initiatives. The fee is accommodated by either a loss of profit by the producer or an addition to product cost.

Key Messages and Insights from the Workshop: A Practitioner's View of Promising Progress and Needed Improvements in Professional Practice

Anne Comozzi, Corvid Enterprises Inc., Nova Scotia

1. Defining Public Participation

- ⇒ Participation was defined as an exercise to try and change people's minds.
- ⇒ It takes twice as long as you think it will.
- ⇒ Explaining what is done is helpful to companies.
- ⇒ All are working together for continuous improvement.
- ⇒ When people have facts, they make good decisions.
- ⇒ The public reacts to impressions and values, not to technical information.
- ⇒ Rather than informed judgement, we need informed participation.
- ⇒ Defining "who" is the public is important.
- ⇒ There are three kinds of public involvement: (1) sharing information, (2) promoting and holding a dialogue, and (3) sharing in decision-making.
- ⇒ Education is a critical part of the process.
- ⇒ This does not just apply to First Nations.
- ⇒ Maybe the question is: are the forest accord and strategy too broad?
- ⇒ A good job is being done with a limited process.
- ⇒ Right now everything in public participation is tied to certification.
- ⇒ The intent and purpose of the participation process is very important.

2. When do People Participate? When:

- ⇒ location is somewhere they feel comfortable.
- ⇒ time and place are convenient.
- ⇒ language and terminology are understandable.
- ⇒ they feel the end result is not already determined.
- ⇒ they have a “need” to be involved - when something is at stake.
- ⇒ there is opportunity to have input into designing and defining the process.
- ⇒ they feel invited and welcomed, and feel their views are respected.
- ⇒ they feel they have an equal opportunity to express their views.
- ⇒ differences in culture, language, gender and religion are respected.
- ⇒ it is informal and fun - when they can move, laugh, and share.
- ⇒ they have an opportunity to get “into the woods”.

3. Getting People Engaged

There was a lot of discussion at the workshop about how to get people engaged in the public participation process:

- ⇒ Boring definitions and descriptions of the process are problematic.
- ⇒ Many public meetings are not consultations.
- ⇒ People asked why don't people participate? We heard that this is because people think the results are already forgone conclusions and that they didn't feel invited to share the process.
- ⇒ We heard about kitchen-table roundtables.
- ⇒ We heard that there must be a level playing field with regards to data, time and clerical support.
- ⇒ We heard about the importance of informal participation.

What was not stated at the Workshop:

- ⇒ Enough about the use of understandable language. Language is critical and important.
- ⇒ How an issue is framed is critical to the success.
- ⇒ While some advertising is done for public roundtables, advertising is often not wide enough.
- ⇒ Participation should take place in diverse settings such as bingo halls and the workplace.
- ⇒ People from the community are needed to help bring other people to the process.
- ⇒ A key underlying factor must be RESPECT.
- ⇒ Most importantly, participation must have an impact → it must make a difference.

4. Steps in Designing the Process

- ⇒ 1. Define needs 2. Set goals 3. Design programs 4. Implement 5. Evaluate
- ⇒ When sharing information, ensure that the information is credible. Language and terminology should be simple and understandable.
- ⇒ Check to make sure that all participants agree on definitions.
- ⇒ Make sure that information gets out early enough.
- ⇒ Accommodate special needs including language and disabilities.
- ⇒ Accommodate varying levels of literacy.

5. Education and Learning

- ⇒ Did learning get translated into action? Did learning take place?
- ⇒ Someone said “We know how to inform the masses.” This was surprising. Do we really know how to do this?

- ⇒ Public participation involves education, and that is very important.
- ⇒ People spoke about the need for evaluation models for learning.
- ⇒ There was some discussion that new graduates from university are not ready for public participation processes.

What was not heard:

- ⇒ An elaboration of the link between a better-informed public and participation.
- ⇒ More education for resource managers to deal with people.
- ⇒ Education within universities to train resource managers to deal with people.
- ⇒ Programs which address knowledge, skills and attitudes.
- ⇒ One citizen-participation ladder was the bottom rung as “Education which is one way”. This is not true education. Maybe we need to revise the ladder.
- ⇒ There should be innovative ways to educate including pre- and post-tests.
- ⇒ There is still a lot of confusion between education and communication.
- ⇒ People need to ask the question: how can learning be facilitated? Keep in mind that all adults learn differently.

6. The Process

- ⇒ This area received the most comments in all of the presentations. We heard a lot about it.
- ⇒ Managing expectations and having clear mandates.
- ⇒ Consensus is not always best.
- ⇒ The roundtable is not enough.
- ⇒ Timeframes are important.
- ⇒ Volunteers are suffering from consultation fatigue.
- ⇒ The players are changing which interrupts the process.
- ⇒ Using facilitators is good, although there was some disagreement about whether facilitators could be company people.
- ⇒ We heard about how to deal with those who control the agenda.
- ⇒ Many issues of process were discussed.

Comments:

- ⇒ There’s not just volunteer burnout. There is also leadership and government burnout including cynicism about changing priorities within government.
- ⇒ There is increasing sophistication about processes and expectations of what will happen from the public.
- ⇒ There is a need to set objectives each time you meet and clear objectives at the beginning of the process.
- ⇒ There is a need to use a variety of process techniques.
- ⇒ There is frustration with repetition and dragging out of steps because people are not there.
- ⇒ There need to be different voices at the table.
- ⇒ There needs to be documentation of processes.
- ⇒ Efficiency and effectiveness can be accomplished through the use of innovative process techniques.
- ⇒ Those who are well trained in the area and extremely knowledgeable about the subject are not always the best facilitators.
- ⇒ Perhaps in consensus one thing that can be accomplished is to agree not to agree.
- ⇒ Organizers do not leave enough time for preparation and design.
- ⇒ There are often unrealistic expectations from organizers about what can be accomplished in a specific timeframe.

7. Research

There was a lot of discussion about different quantitative and qualitative techniques.

⇒ Most qualitative research involved interviews and focus groups.

What was not heard:

⇒ We need to expand inventories of social values and knowledge.

⇒ Qualitative research should inform quantitative design, particularly of surveys.

⇒ There was no discussion of visual representation techniques such as matrices.

⇒ We need research on education and documentation of changes in knowledge, skills and attitudes.

⇒ We need research on gaps in knowledge, attitudes and skills.

⇒ We need to make clear definitions for public participation and have hierarchical approaches.

⇒ There should be criteria and indicators for public participation.

⇒ There should be clear definitions and cases related to consultation and roundtables.

⇒ We need to be asking the question: is it a consultation if no one comes to the meeting?

SUMMARY

⇒ The future will not just be multi-stakeholder → it will be multi-issue.

⇒ Prioritization is important.

⇒ Practical information on how to do public participation must be documented.

⇒ Just as there is a scientific need in forestry for reporting and monitoring and criteria and indicators, we need this in public participation.

⇒ One of the problems may be that Model Forests are competitive. This doesn't allow for co-operation.

⇒ There should be more sharing of information.

⇒ The processes should be creative, results-oriented and thoughtful.

⇒ There should be an integration of strategic planning models into the process.

⇒ A new trend in community-based resource management is asset-based community development.

⇒ We need to involve youth, retirees and grandparents.

⇒ We need to address and respond to the First Nation's issues.

⇒ We need to take the discussion and processes to a new level.

⇒ Water will be the most important issue in the next ten years and public participation will be centred on this issue.

⇒ Final note: respect and value the COMMUNITY.

Most Resource Management Conflicts are Disputes Over Values, not Facts.

**“Improving Practice in Public Participation in Sustainable Forest Management:
Proven Approaches, Knowledge Needs, and Research Projects”**

**A Workshop of the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Network
19-20 October 2001, Halifax, Nova Scotia**

Attendees

Speakers:	
<p>Tom Beckley, Ph.D. Associate Professor Faculty of Forestry and Environmental Management University of New Brunswick Fredericton NB beckley@unb.ca, www.unb.ca/forestry</p>	<p>Luc Bouthillier Professor Université de Laval Ste. Foy QC luc.bouthillier@sbf.ulaval.ca</p>
<p>Don L. Brain, R.P.F. Superintendent of Forestry and Continuous Improvement , Newfoundland Woodlands Abitibi Consolidated Inc., Grand Falls Division Grand Falls-Windsor NF don_brain@abicon.com</p>	<p>Gary Bull, Ph.D. Assistant Professor University of British Columbia Vancouver BC garybull@interchange.ubc.ca</p>
<p>Anne Camozzi Corvid Enterprises Inc. P.O. Box 1514 Antigonish NS B2G 2L8 corvid@ns.sympatico.ca</p>	<p>Omer Chouinard, Ph.D. Professeur titulaire, Directeur, Programme de Maîtrise en études de l'environnement Université de Moncton, Moncton NB chouino@umoncton.ca</p>
<p>Peter Clarkson Executive Director Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board Inuvik NT peter.clarkson@grrb.nt.ca</p>	<p>Sean Dolter Planning Specialist Western Newfoundland Model Forest Inc. P.O. Box Box 68 Forest Centre, University Drive Corner Brook NF A2H 6C3 sdolter@wnmf.com</p>
<p>Peter Duinker, Ph.D. School for Resource and Environmental Studies Dalhousie University Halifax NS peter.duinker@dal.ca</p>	<p>Colette Fluet Graduate Student University of Alberta Edmonton AB cfluet@ualberta.ca</p>
<p>Shashi Kant, Ph.D. Associate Professor Faculty of Forestry University of Toronto Toronto ON shashi.kant@utoronto.ca</p>	<p>Loraine Lavallee, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Psychology Program University of Northern B.C. Prince George BC lavallee@unbc.ca</p>
<p>Ed MacAulay Executive Director, Renewable Resources NS Department of Natural Resources Halifax NS emmacaul@gov.ns.ca</p>	<p>Peter Miller, Ph.D. Professor Centre for Forest Interdisciplinary Research Department of Philosophy Univeristy of Winnipeg Winnipeg MB p.miller@uwinnipeg.ca</p>

<p>Gaetan Pelletier Manager Forester - Directeur Forestier J.D. Irving Ltd. Woodlands Division St. Leonard NB pelletier.gaetan@jdirving.com</p>	<p>John Sinclair, Ph.D. Professor Natural Resources Institute University of Manitoba Winnipeg MB jsincla@ms.umanitoba.ca</p>
<p>Richard Stedman, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Penn State University Pennsylvania rstedman@psu.edu</p>	<p>Terry Veeman, Ph.D. Interim Program Leader Sustainable Forest Management Network University of Alberta Edmonton AB terry.veeman@ualberta.ca</p>
<p>Russ Waycott Vice President, Woodlands Stora Enso North America Port Hawkesbury NS russ.waycott@storaenso.com</p>	
<p>Participants:</p>	
<p>Farah Al Ayoubi MBA Candidate Dalhousie University fayoubi@is2.dal.ca</p>	<p>Kenneth B. Beesley, Ph.D. Professor Department of Business & Social Sciences Director, Rural Research Centre Nova Scotia Agricultural College Truro NS kbeesley@nsac.ns.ca</p>
<p>Erin Breen Master of Marine Management Candidate Dalhousie University eabreen@hotmail.com</p>	<p>Simon Bridge Criteria & Indicators Policy Advisor Policy, Planning and International Affairs Branch Canadian Forest Service Natural Resources Canada Ottawa ON sbridge@NRCan.gc.ca</p>
<p>Caroline Cameron Master of Environmental Studies Candidate Dalhousie University caroline_camer@hotmail.com</p>	<p>Alison Coyne Executive Research Associate SFM Network University of Alberta Edmonton AB acoyme@ualberta.ca</p>
<p>Margaret Donnelly LP Canada Swan Hills MB margaret.donnelly@lpcorp.com</p>	<p>Jennifer Dunlap Policy Analyst Policy, Planning and Federal/Provincial Relations Natural Resources and Energy Fredericton NB jennifer.Dunlap@gnb.ca</p>
<p>Gudjon Eggertsson Icelandic Visiting Student Dalhousie University gie@hi.is</p>	<p>Peter Etheridge General Manager Fundy Model Forest 181 Arton Rd. Sussex NB etheridge.peter@jdirving.com</p>

<p>Isabelle Frenette Communications Coordinator Fundy Model Forest Sussex East NB isabelle@fundymodelforest.net</p>	<p>Greg Fraser NS Department of Natural Resources Antigonish NS frasergh@gov.ns.ca</p>
<p>Nancy Gelinas Université de Moncton Edmunston NB Ngelinas@cuslm.ca</p>	<p>Hugh Gillis Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources Halifax NS gillishg@gov.ns.ca</p>
<p>Thomas Hall Master of Marine Management Candidate Dalhousie University, Halifax dabyes@hotmail.com</p>	<p>David Harris Department of Natural Resources 300 Mountain Rd. Sydney NS B1P 6T2 harrisdl@gov.ns.ca</p>
<p>Arnheidur Hjorleifsdottir Master of Environmental Studies Candidate Dalhousie University, Halifax arnheidur@isl.is</p>	<p>Dianne Korber Research Coordinator SFM Network University of Alberta Edmonton AB dkorber@ualberta.ca</p>
<p>Salome Machua Master of Marine Management Candidate Dalhousie University, Halifax machuasalome@hotmail.com</p>	<p>Bruce Maclock General Manager, SFM Network University of Alberta Edmonton AB bmaclock@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca</p>
<p>Tom MacMillan Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources Tusket NS macmilft@gov.ns.ca</p>	<p>Andrew Magloire Master of Marine Management Candidate Dalhousie University, Halifax cfra@cwdom.dm</p>
<p>Catherine Martineau-Delisle Graduate Student Université de Laval, Québec cmartineaud@hotmail.com</p>	<p>Brett McGurk Master of Natural Resources Management Candidate Natural Resources Institute University of Manitoba, Alberta mmcgurk@mb.sympatico.ca</p>
<p>Solange Nadeau Canadian Forest Service Fredericton NB sonadeau@nrcan.gc.ca</p>	<p>Paul Noble University of New Brunswick Fredericton NB n4ng@unb.ca</p>
<p>Holly Palen Master of Environmental Studies Candidate Dalhousie University, Halifax hollypalen@hotmail.com</p>	<p>Mark Robson Ph D. Candidate Earth Sciences Centre Faculty of Forestry University of Toronto Toronto ON mark.robson@utoronto.ca</p>
<p>Lauranne Sanderson Nova Scotia Agriculture College Truro NS lsanderson@nsac.ns.ca</p>	<p>Doug Sklar Alberta Sustainable Resource Development Edmonton AB doug.sklar@gov.ab.ca</p>

<p>Randy Tattrie Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources Truro NS rtattrie@gov.ns.ca</p>	<p>Sara Teitelbaum Researcher Montreal QC steitelbaum@hotmail.com</p>
<p>Rory Thompson, RPF Senior Manager Land use Planning Branch Land Administration Division Alberta Land and Forest Service Edmonton AB rory.Thompson@gov.ab.ca</p>	<p>Laverne Walker Master of Marine Management Candidate Dalhousie University, Halifax luvwalk@hotmail.com</p>
<p>Carl Weatherhead Forester Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources Halifax NS cbweathe@gov.ns.ca</p>	<p>Jim Webb Manager, Corporate & Intergovernmental Relations John D'Or Prairie AB jwebb@incentre.net</p>
<p>Joanne Weiss Master of Environmental Studies Candidate Dalhousie University, Halifax jweiss@is2.dal.ca</p>	<p>Gary Westoll NS Department of Natural Resources Truro NS gwestoll@gov.ns.ca</p>
<p>Arden Whidden NS Department of Natural Resources Halifax NS whiddeal@gov.ns.ca</p>	