

(p.1)

To: RPWG

From: Sandy 9/21/90

Subject: Public Involvement (Some analysis : some thinking)

There is not one correct answer or path. I have tried to revisit our public involvement goals and compare them to four "models" we might consider. Let me explain what they are for the sake of this exercise.

### "Public Meetings"

Conduct meetings so public can review whatever RPWG provides. Basically 1-night stands.

### "Network"

No meetings conducted with public. We develop a telephone network (some travel) and poll our contacts on issues when needed.

### "Community Groups"

Establish 1 super community group that has representation from the 15-20 communities. Conduct a series of meeting/workshops.

### "Focus Groups"

Define all interests i.e. fishing, mining, recreation tourism etc.... Establish groups for each w/ an eye toward geographic coverage of entire spill area. Conduct a series of meetings/workshops.

With this in mind you can look at the next page (chart) and see how I think objectives are met. There is lots of room for refinement and/or what if questions. Backing up - do we agree on objectives?

Lastly I have taken more liberties and assumed we do something and compare that to our milestones from 9/29/90. This gives me a sense of time available and - at least for me - illustrates how much effort is required.

Lets discuss it!



Objectives ↓ Choice of Membership	Public Meetings Easy, no expense, random.	Network Time to develop but relatively minor	Community Groups If formal, long time to work out.	Focus Groups Similar to "network."
Adequacy of representation	Variable.	good if RPWG does enough homework	Best w/ community concerns but could have weakness on issues	good on issues, of course. good for communities
Opportunity for joint ownership of ideas/plans	weak	potentially strong but lack of meetings could hinder greatly	good	best
Use of local knowledge	fair	good	good	best
Media opportunity	fair - good	fair (weak?) (no events)	good	good
Opportunity for joint fact finding	none	little, lack of meetings is likely to prevent it	Some opportunity but "secret science" hinders	Some opportunity but "secret science" hinders. Knowledge in specific areas may help overcome however
National interests represented	weak,	OK results possible - likely some contact	Difficult to accomplish	Most likely especially if it is goal/objective of organization
Obvious problems w/ method	Public "involvement" is weak. Gov't's provide all public reviews	Public "involvement" is received + used. Lack of "events" is weakness as is "secret" appearance of process	Time consuming + costly. Process of NADA makes sharing facts difficult which makes products suspect. Focus groups may not be adequately represented	Time consuming + costly. Process of NADA makes sharing facts difficult which makes products suspect.

# Public Involvement AND The Big Picture (9/29 RPWG meeting)

1990

SEPT

OCT

NOV

DEC

Conduct Organizational Meeting

Establish roles + responsibilities, define <sup>(desired results)</sup> goals + objectives, meeting schedule, admin process etc...

1991

JAN

1st Meeting

Share information (to extend possible) refine <sup>or review</sup> goals + objectives, develop mutual understanding of

FEB

NRDA Chapter for GSOYB

needs + wants. Briefing on GSOYB

MAR

2nd Meeting

Work focused on Sept (2nd progress report) and December methodology Plan

APRIL

MAY

JUNE

3rd Meeting

same

JULY

AUG

2nd Progress Report Completed

SEPT

4th MEETING

OCT

NOV

Draft Methodology Plan

DEC

5th Meeting

1992 - draft claim document (non-public)  
midyear - Report of assessment (non-public)

# STATE OF ALASKA

## DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

### DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

STEVE COWPER, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX 3-2000  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802-2000  
PHONE: (907) 465-4120

FAX (907) 586-9612

#### FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO:

Bryan Ross

DATE:

5/2/90

FROM:

Judi Maxwell

2  
(No. of pages not  
including this page)

MESSAGE:



(1)

April 27, 1990

Subject: Public Involvement in Restoration Planning

To: Restoration Work Group

From: Judi Maxwell

A conversation that Frankie and I had with Roger Clark during the symposium started us thinking about ways to involve the public in the restoration planning process. Indeed, the public is likely to insist on getting involved given the potential for restoration to effect not only biological, but also, economic and social change. With the diversity of interests involved we could be sitting on a "powder keg" -- if the Tongass is any indication. However, the potential exists to get the public involved in a way that will not only result in a Restoration Plan that is technically sound but supported by the many diverse parties that will be affected.

Several symposium speakers reflected on the potential for direct participation in restoration activities to have a healing impact on humans. This is probably true if restoration planning process does not dissolve into a political morass with each group seeking to convince the agencies of the validity and legitimacy of their concerns, as opposed to those of their adversaries. Wondolleck (Public Lands Conflict and Resolution: Managing National Forest Disputes, 1988) observes that the planning document process only provides a way to receive input, and later, criticism. By not providing an opportunity for the different groups to jointly determine where and how natural resources can be restored and with what consequences, there is no means for resolving the disputes that inevitably arise. Nor do the interest groups have to grapple with the very real budget, labor and resource constraints confronting the agencies or with the real concerns and interests of other user groups.

It seems then that one of the key factors in getting the public involved in a way that is beneficial to all, is to provide the forum so that each group can air its concerns, participate in joint fact-finding, and hopefully find some common ground. When I asked Roger Clark if he would be willing to meet with the Working Group to discuss this he said that he is so committed to helping us get the planning process off on the right foot -- that he is willing to pay both his way and that of Bob Lee, College of Forestry, U of W, to come to Anchorage for a brainstorming session. Bob advised the USPS on how to involve the public in the development of the Tongass National Forest Management Plan; his advice was ignored.

Roger suggested a 1.5 day format - the first half day devoted to informal sharing of experiences and concerns by both invitees and Work Group members. The next day would focus more on the specific issues/mechanisms for achieving the type of public involvement that would support our technical efforts. This would include a



session(s) of how to work with the media from the perspectives of both users and the media, themselves. Roger and Bob would prefer to schedule a meeting for the end of May. Roger also suggested a few other people that we might wish to invite, as has ADF&G's Public Communication Services. Roger has been out of town, but I will try to reach him before our meeting to get more specific ideas on how the meeting ought to proceed and what it ought to achieve. I would hope we come away from the meeting with a doable plan for getting the public involved. What are your ideas?

# DRAFT

RPWG  
u (2)

## MEMORANDUM

## STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Fish and Game

To: Restoration  
Working Group

Date: May 9, 1990

File No:

Telephone No: 465-4120

From: Judi Maxwell  
Economics Program Manager

Subject:

### Budget for Public Participation in the Restoration Planning Process

#### Objectives:

The conflicts that will inevitably arise in the restoration planning process are not inherently bad. In fact, conflict can have the multiple beneficial effects of defining issues, encouraging creative solutions to problems, and in facilitating the agencies' own management objectives. The overall objective of encouraging and formalizing public participation in the restoration planning process is to harness these benefits while minimizing the potential for the Final Plan to be undermined by appeals and lawsuits of dissatisfied interest groups.

#### Expenses for Public Participants (July 1, 1990 to February 28, 1991):

Per diem	22,440
Travel	16,750
Support services	<u>5,000</u>
Total	\$44,190

#### Assumptions used in budget calculations:

##### A. Participants' Expenses:

1. Number of participants - A group size of 12 is arbitrary but was chosen to address the need to keep the size of the group manageable while assuring that all stakeholders are represented. The following estimates further assume that all meetings are held in Anchorage and that 2 of the 12 participants live there and do not require travel support.
2. Number and duration of meetings - Initially meetings will be held on a monthly basis and will increase in duration and/or frequency as the deadline for the Restoration Methodology Plan approaches:



# DRAFT

July and August	total of 3 meetings, 1 day each
September and October	total of 2 meetings, 2 days each
November	2 meetings, 2 days
December	1 meeting, 4 days

3. Per diem - expenses will be paid at an average rate of \$125 per day for the 10 nonresidents and at \$35 per day for the two residents.
4. Travel includes air, train, taxi fares and reimbursement of private car expenses. The calculation shown here assume an average roundtrip airfare of \$175 and \$50 for ground transport for nonresidents.

## B. Support services

Expenses incurred by the public participants to support joint fact-finding and analyses including telephone bills, costs to acquire documents and other published data, clerical services, computer services, postage, etc.

cc: Gregg Erickson, Michael Dean

## RPWG PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WORKSHOP

August 16, 1990 - FED BLDG, ANCHORAGE

NAME	AFFILIATION	ADDRESS	PHONE
Brian Ross	US EPA	RESTORATION PLANNING OFFICE 437 E. ST, SUITE 301 ANCHORAGE, AK 99501	(907) 271-2461
Mark Brodersen	AK DEC	PO Box 0 Juneau, AK 99801	907 465-2610
George Stankey	Oregon State U.	Department of Forest Resources Corvallis, OR 97330	(503) 737 1496
Julia Wondoldeck	School of Natural Resources University of Michigan	430 E. University Ann Arbor, MI. 48109-1115	(313) 764-1570
Peg Kehrer	OSIAR Div. (Oil spill) ADFG + Game - Juneau	Box 2-3000 Juneau	465-4120
Nancy Menning	US EPA	RESTORATION PLANNING OFFICE 437 E ST, SUITE 301 Anchorage AK 99501	(907) 271-2461
John Strand	NOAA/NMFS	P.O. Box 211029 Anchorage Bay, Alaska 99821	(907) 789-6605
Janet Pawlukiewicz	EPA	OMEP/OW/WH556-F 401 M St, SW. Washington, DC 20460	(202) 245-4371
Sandy Rabinowitch	DOT - NPS	2525 Gambell St Anchorage 99503	257-2653
Judi Maxwell	ADFG/OSIAR	P.O. Box 3-2000 JUNEAU, AK 99801	(907) 465-4120
Stan Sanner	ADFG/OSIAR USFS/JUNEAU	437 "E" St., Suite 301 Anchorage, AK 99501	271-2462