PLAN MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION
Public Participation
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT or PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
Is a two way communication process that provides a platform for people to voice their opinions and inform decisions that impact their lives. Inclusive community involvement will reflect the community’s values and increase support for the plan.

SCIENCE OF PLANNING: A factual understanding of the community
ART OF PLANNING: An understanding of the aspirations of the community

3 key outcomes of Public Involvement:
1) Information – Make information available. Citizens should be able to keep up with the process without going to every meeting.
2) Influence – Citizens should be able to contribute and shape the plan
3) Support – Results in a consensus and buy-in. Stronger support when presented to public officials and decision makers.
4) Empowerment – Public is more empowered to use the plan

Steps:
1) Purpose of engagement (Be specific in your answers to help define the outcome or let it evolve organically)
   a. Are you looking to inform the public? Engage the public? Empower a specific group?
   b. Why is public participation necessary for this project?
   c. What outcomes need to be achieved?
2) Stakeholders
   a. Project Partners – (client or employer)
   b. Usual Suspects – (interested parties that are always engaged in various processes, coworkers, agencies, departments)
   c. Community Stakeholders – (parties who may be most impacted by the outcomes of the plan, may have to go find these people in the community)
      i. Residents
      ii. Businesses
      iii. Non-profits
   d. Measure the demographics of the area that will be affected and be inclusive
      i. Age, race/ethnicity
      ii. Rent or own homes
      iii. Languages spoken
      iv. Income levels
      v. Education levels
3) Resources and Scale of Engagement
   a. What are your resources?
      i. Budget
      ii. Staff
      iii. Relationships with community & local partners
      iv. Timing (within the seasons of the year – i.e. school, irrigation, winter, summer, etc)
      v. Timeline
      vi. Stakeholders interest levels
   b. What level/scale of involvement?
      i. Broad – Most opinions are considered in the outcome
      ii. Moderate – only some opinions are considered
      iii. Limited – Minimal public input is needed
4) Public Input Methods
   a. Types of meetings
      i. Public Hearings – Formal hearing process, each individual gets a few minutes to voice opinion.
ii. **Public Meetings** – Informal discussion where the audience probably won’t have a chance to speak, but can hear the elected officials discussion.

iii. **Citizen Advisory Committee** – 10-25 people – expert group to provide input and establish goals

iv. **Citizen Referendum** – Citizens vote for a public measure by official ballot
   1. Key pad polling etc.

v. **Workshops** – Multiple rounds
   1. Identify and prioritize issues
   2. Shape goals and objectives
   3. Draft Recommendations
   4. Draft Implementation Strategies

vi. **Focus Groups** – uses a trained moderator to guide the discussion and get specific opinions from that demographic or special interest group.

vii. **Delphi Technique** – Acquire information from various experts, present questions in a series of rounds, clarify previous information in each round and achieve consensus.

viii. **Charrette** – Usually has a single goal, can take several days, Hands on workshop, revise designs or plans as a group, hold a final public meeting to review the final plan.

ix. **Fishbowl Planning** – a few people are isolated to discuss a topic while the larger group listens to the discussion but does not participate

x. **Web-based interaction**
   1. Surveys
   2. Web maps – Commenting on specific locations
   3. Make documents available for education and/or review

b. Public Outreach (Best Practices – go to the people) – Be sure to engage the underrepresented – minorities, aged, handicapped, etc – reach out to community leaders
   
   i. Festivals
   ii. Farmer’s Markets
   iii. Faith based, fraternal, community organizations
      1. Rotary, Kiwanis, etc.
   iv. Small businesses
   v. Community Health Centers (Rec Center, Library)
   vi. Academic institutions
   vii. Stakeholder Interviews
   viii. Open houses

5) **Final plan/Implementation**
   a. **Draft Plan Review**
      i. Let the stakeholders be involved in the editing process
   b. **Final Plan**
      i. Let the stakeholders help present the final plan/project to the elected official for adoption
      ii. Shows support and public buy-in
      iii. Gives them a sense of ownership and helps them to enforce the goals long term.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION TOOLS – ICICE** (See hand out from Diane, attached)

Inform
Consult
Involve
Collaborate
Empower
**OPEN MEETING LAWS**
Refer to Idaho Code §§ 74-201 through 74-208
Know the Sunshine Law – Conflict can be a matter of perception as a good enough reason to step aside in the decision making process.

**People involved in Advocacy Planning**
Paul Davidoff – “Father of Advocacy Planning”
1965 – Advocacy & Pluralism in Planning, article in JAIP.
Saul Alinsky – Community organizer 1945-1972
Sherry Arnstein – Ladder of Participation 1969 *(know the ladder)*

**Terms**
**Environmental Justice** – The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of laws, regulations and policies. To aid in the protection from environmental and health hazards and provide equal access to the decision making process to have a healthy environment in which to live, learn and work.

**Consensus Building** – Provides participants with the opportunity to collaborate and arrive at a mutual agreed upon outcome/result. Processes can include negotiation, facilitation, and/or mediation.

**Coalition Building** – Coalition is the alliance or partnering of groups in order to achieve a common purpose. Coalition building is the process by which these groups come together to form a single group with a single purpose.

**Facilitation** – A group meeting led by one individual to make sure the meeting runs smoothly, stays on track and all the goals of the meeting are met in the end.

**Mediation** – A dynamic, structured interactive process where a neutral third party assists in resolving conflict between parties, using specialized communication and negotiation techniques.

**Negotiation** – Complex series of actions that seeks to provide a mutually agreeable outcome. Five Collaborative stages may include: Preparation, Exchange of Ideas and Information, Bargaining (arguing a point of view), Conclusion, Execution.
Inform – providing data and information
- Data gathering, interpretation, presentation
- Displays, brochures, fact sheets
- Open Houses
- Field trips or walking tours
- Websites, webinars, social media
- E-government
- News releases, newsletters, newspaper inserts
- Public hearings

Consult – obtaining public feedback
- Public meetings and comments
- Focus Groups
- Surveys
- Delphi method

Involve – working with the public
- Workshops
- Deliberative polling, keypad polling
- Expert panels, task forces
- Fishbowl
- Brainstorming
- Samoan Circle
- Visual preference
- Computer simulations, crowd sourcing

Collaborate – partner with the public
- Participatory decision-making
- Visioning – Oregon model
- Charrettes
- Citizen Advisory Committee
- Homeowners Association
- American Assembly
- Consensus building
- Nominal Group
- Strategic Plan

Empower – decision-making by the public
- Citizen juries
- Ballot, referendum
- Delegated decision (P &Z
- Town meeting
Why the US Revolution? Stark contrast to monarchy giving birth to direct democracy.

Constitutional amendments underscore rights not afforded in Monarchical England, other European

Chicago Plan- Wacker led a public campaign for the plan, citing civic involvement as responsibility; huge number of bond referenda passed (1912-31) demonstrating public support.

What were the 60’s known for?
Simultaneous events and movements empowering public participation.

Model Cities (MC) 1966-74 - Inner city upheaval largely the impetus for Johnson’s Great Society and War on Poverty - cornerstone MC (150 projects giving Fed funds for local bricks and mortar planning projects.

Jacobs: 1961

What was the premise of Silent Spring? (DDT to silence all the birds)

NEPA- 1969

AIM= American Indian Movement

A-95: designed to implement Model Cities (‘66) & Intergovmmt’l Cooperation Act (‘68); used in Glens Falls, NY to block a park swimming pool partially funded by prominent citizen (and Fed $); A95 req. state clearinghouse review, so citizens had point of entry/comment they otherwise would not have
On a continuum from informing to empowering, where are we today?

Yes the collaborative/empower model is preferred.
The Ladder is another way to think of participation on a continuum.

Has planning always been about advocacy? No, but emerged in that direction.
Pneumonic device may help you- L A D E R

From non-participation (bottom) to Citizen Power (top). Where does planning lean today?
Cleveland was another birthplace of more activist planning, giving rise to “Equity” planning.

Q. “Urban renewal” came in what forms during this period?
A. Housing projects (large) and highways which cut swaths.

AIP means? (precursor to AICP)
Known for controversial tactics.

Q. Was he leftist or rightist??
A. He may have been leftist, but that’s unimportant compared to his cause to get things done - he is known for tactics.
Theory - Advocacy

- Paul Davidoff (‘60s)
- Forge solutions to **openly serve** a given client group’s interests.
- Develop plans for a particular project & **advocate for** client’s interests or those affected by the plan(s).
- Involvement in political process as advocates for the interests of government and other groups – **mostly low income & minority groups**.
- **Founded the Suburban Action Institute** (1969), challenging exclusionary zoning and winning *Mt. Laurel* decision; communities must supply “regional fair share” of low-income housing

Arnstein and Alinsky also seen as Advocate Planners - Davidoff more commonly seen as founder of the theory.

Advocacy planning has roots in the legal profession.

Advocacy rejects view of planner as objective analyst.
Mt. Laurel – Housing

Origins from ‘60s wherein African American group planned a low-income housing development blocked by locals

1975 – Mt. Laurel I
- NJ Supreme Court struck down exclusionary zoning ordinance that prevented construction of affordable housing for poor and moderate-income families
- Local government required to rewrite zoning laws to accommodate a fair share of housing stock as affordable

1983 – Mt. Laurel II
- NJ Supreme Court established fair-share housing requirements criteria for growth areas.
- Also known as “affirmative measures,” included the removal of restrictive barriers, density bonuses, mandatory set-asides, and mobile home zoning.
- See also Colleen O’dea in NJSpotlight. www.planetizen.com/node/65470

Overlap with planning law history.
Community Plans nor zoning can exclude classes of people (i.e. large lot zoning which makes it unaffordable for wider range of incomes)
Linear, but with feedback loops

Reliance on quantitative analysis, i.e. the answer must be in the numbers. Is that always the case when it comes to community complexities?

Ex. Cost benefit analysis for environmental impact decisions became frowned upon.
Here's the other end of the spectrum.

Might we today say “get real”?
In other words, don’t make your decisions in the ivory tower, in your office.
**Theory – Radical**

- **Spontaneous public activism** promoting self-reliance and mutual aid
- Important features: personal growth, cooperative spirit, and **freedom from manipulation by others**
- Draws on inspiration-economics and ecological ethics, social architecture, humanistic philosophy, and historical precedent (works of Shumacher, Goodman, Illich, Katz, Bender, & Hampden-Turner)
- “Going back to one’s roots.”
- **Minimal intervention** from the state
- **Example**: let neighborhood committees take over planning functions usually vested in central bureaucracies.

** Whereas Advocacy is associated w/ Arnstein, Alinsky, and Davidoff-**

** SITAR = Synoptic (Rational), Incremental, Transactive, Advocacy, Radical **

**Could this be Tea Party / no government intervention philosophy?**
Era of US literature and utopian movement

Utopia is idea state. Almost by definition cannot exist.
Now that you’ve reviewed theory, we’ll talk about public participation:

• Motivation, i.e. why do it?
• Strategies on how to approach it
• Strategies – basic elements to think through
• Strategies on dealing with the public in small & large groups

Later, we’ll delve into the tools & techniques
Some pitfalls of past methods

Strategies – Traditional

- Traditional
- Plans prepared, then tell merits in a public meeting
- Left many unanswered questions
- Not constructive for consensus

- Preferred
  - What level of detailed information?
  - Preconceived or blank sheet?
  - How focused should the meetings be?
  - What are the expected outcomes?
Should you be doing the minimum?

Think of the legal ads for planning issues/land use or zoning changes. Can the common person understand the ad? Probably not, however it satisfies the letter of the law.

Best practices urge us to truly involve the public, even if that may slow down or confuse a decision. (APA Florida Best Practices) - Primary Author

As opposed to letting elected representatives make decision for us.

As many lament, democracy can be “messy.”
There’s a philosophy that fast and decisive action, or “railroading” is the way to go.

This has proved less than useful in the long run; it can lead to court challenges and even MORE delay.
Varying definitions of consensus.

Re realistic- sometimes not achievable.

Not keen on the term “stakeholders” however commonly used.
Pneumonic device to help you recall the 5 types.

Realize they’re not so neatly separated- some overlap of the types of participation.
Quick review of Ariail's 5 types, examples of each.

Then for a few selected ones we delve deeper. )
2 – Consult

- Public meetings & comments
- Focus groups
- Surveys (mail, telephone, web, interview)
- Delphi Method
3 – Involve

- Workshops
- Deliberative polling, keypad polling
- Expert panels, task forces
- Fishbowl
- Brainstorming
- Samoan Circle
- Visual preference
- Computer simulations, crowdsourcing
4 – Collaborate

- Participatory Decision Making
- Community Visioning & "Oregon Model"
- Charrettes (APA 9 Strategies)
- Citizen Advisory Committees
- Neighborhood/Homeowners Associations
- Consensus Building
- American Assembly
- Nominal Group
- Strategic Planning
5 – Empower

- Citizen Juries
- Ballots, Referenda
- Delegated Decisions (P&Z Boards)
- Town Meetings
(1) Data-Gathering/Analyzing

- **Population**: All members of a group about which data are to be collected; a parameter is a characteristic of an entire population
- **Random sampling**: Giving each subject/person in a population an equal chance of being selected
- **Convenience sampling**: Data from convenient-to-reach subjects/persons; biased since it eliminates difficult-to-reach subjects/persons
- **Volunteer sampling**: Data from only those subjects who volunteer to participate; biased since it eliminates unwilling subjects/person
- **Snowball sampling**: Data from subjects/persons emerging as relevant as the study progresses (appropriate for some exploratory studies). First, interview/survey a few subjects/persons believed knowledgeable of topic, then find others on clues from the original respondents.

What is a population?

Here are 4 ways to sample your study population
(1+) **Electronic/Social Media**

**Electronic**
- Web page (sophisticated design; interactive too)
- Constant Contact / E-blasts
- Virtual Town Hall
- Blog
- Crowdsourcing
- Etc.

**Social**
- Microsite, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube
- Tumblr, MindMixer, LinkedIn, Google+
- Etc.

(Source: Randy Goers, InVision Tampa Project Mgr. and Beth Leytham, the Leytham Group, 2013 APA State Conference.)

Not only for 1st type (hence 1 + )

Many methods emerging today which cut across all types- from sharing data, to dialoguing with the public.

Etc. means as soon as this is written, it will be obsolete as new methods emerging as fast as internet morphs or new social media applications are discovered.
(1+) **Electronic/Social Media**

- **Web 2.0**
- **Any cumulative changes** in web use and production
- **Examples** - social networking sites, blogs, wikis, folksonomies, video sharing sites, hosted services, web applications, and mash-ups
- **Pros/Cons**
  - Metrics from users, reach more quickly, cost efficient / Digital Divide, can add 25% to cost
  - Forces planners to be succinct 😊

(Source: Randy Goers, InVision Tampa Project Mgr. and Beth Leytham, the Leytham Group, 2013 APA State Conference.)

“Web 2.0” refers to virtually any web innovation.

Can include computer simulations, keypad polling, crowdsourcing,
(2) Public Meetings/Hearings

3 Elements for Success: *
- Notification & Informational Materials
  - Multi lingual
  - Notice & Agenda
  - Non-technical information
- Room Arrangement (see next slide)
  - Diverge from “same old” practices?
- Interaction & Involvement
  - Welcoming
  - Listening, facilitation techniques, dissenting views

Customary Public Comments (note 2013-227, Laws of Florida, requiring opportunity)

(* Source: APA, Planning & Urban Design Standards.)

Traditional means should pay special attention to APAs 3 Elements.

Just because we’ve always done it that way does not make it effective means of REALLY receiving GOOD public participation.

If new ideas and dissenting view entertained in earnest, and early in the process, can lead to better decision making and ultimate consensus.
How will you lay out the room?

What do some of these layouts make you feel if you are audience (example Dias on raised platform)

Some set ups automatically put the participating public on the defensive.

As a practicing facilitator, I favor more round/ everybody’s equal type of set up. The Native Americans are instructive on this.

Here are a few names of layouts. Refresh your memory of each and think of how/where you might use each (or never use some).
Type 2, consulting.

I’ve heard there can be plenty of questions about surveying- refresh your memory ranging from names, to methods, statistics, etc.

Another example of web-based technology figures in. New emerging ways to glean public’s preferences.

Numerous companies with various products; APA doesn’t endorse one over another, however Survey Monkey is a popular one which I have seen used by public agencies.
(2) Survey/ Polling Research

- Choose sample with statistical validity through a structured mathematical means and response rate; size relative to population under study
- Write survey instrument - Dependent on approach, time, budget & outcomes expected
- Do it right, or face embarrassment; don’t “cook” the survey or “push” questions

See also Planner’s Toolbox “Planning for a Planning Survey,” George Homsy, Cornell University

By the way, to get valid results size of sample doesn’t go up straight line with size of population. It’s a phenomenon abstract to many.

So sampling 4000 people to learn about resident preferences for a city of 30,000 might be enough. And the same size sample might be enough for the parent county of 150,000

Regarding questionnaires (survey instrument), a smart technique is to test it with some unknowing subjects to discover flaws or unnoticed biases, etc.

What does “cooking” or “pushing” mean?
Here's an example, wherein the question induces a typical answer.

Not good for good social science research!
Refresh your memory of the various basic types of sampling.

What best suits your situation or planning problem?
There are split opinions about whether these are inexpensive.

There’s a hybrid too, wherein a post card directs the recipient to a website/online survey or poll.
(2) Surveys – In-Person

- AKA “person on the street” or “face-to-face”
- Examples:
  - Exit polling in elections
  - Shopping preferences
  - Community preferences
(2) Surveys – In-Person (continued)

Advantages/Disadvantages

- If short, can be quick & inexpensive
- If long, can be time-consuming & expensive
- Validity of sample is dicey; can produce unreliable results
- Good training of interviewers can increase accuracy
- Bad interviewer can induce bias
- Good for long questionnaires
- Good for accessing hard-to-reach populations (i.e., homeless)
(2) Surveys- Telephone

Advantages/Disadvantages

- Fast
  - Cheaper than in-person, but training can be expensive
- Usually valid outcomes & samples (not self-selected)
- Avoids biases, however requires excellent training & good, concise survey instrument
- Respondents are familiar since often used
- Ignores those without phones (house vs. cell phones)
- Interviewers must be monitored
- Unwilling subjects
I’m not familiar with this in common use, however note its good intent.

Could be very good to synthesize ideas among respected experts.
(2) Delphi (continued)

Advantages/Disadvantages
- Inexpensive, no assembly needed, time and space not an issue (electronic?)
- Good tool for Scenario Planning
- Can be lengthy
- Little or no face-to-face participation by stakeholders could erode “buy-in” or trust

(Sources: http://psychicinvestigator.com/demo/DELPHI.htm
James M. Nehiley, Ph.D (2001) How to Conduct a Delphi Study http://extmarket.ifas.ufl.edu/FOCUS.html )
Useful to get honest input from like minded groups who otherwise might not open up in large group setting (with traditional foes in the room)

Could be criticized for selecting small groups with special interests, as opposed to traditional open-to-all public meeting.
The trained facilitator probes with the group in an objective manner.

Not unlike what a therapist may do with a patient.

There’s a technique known as Three Whys (attributed to the National Charrette Institute) wherein why is asked three times in a row to delve deeper into a problem or issue in search of its root cause.
Explain what it is.

Example of landscaped/greenway versus controlled access highway. How would each score?
Engaging

However has drawbacks.

My experience is the answers are pretty obvious, unless pictures are carefully selected with only subtle differences. But may not get distinctive results.
Some type threes

Pretty traditional, and you’re probably familiar with this.

Could there be bias with a TF? Yes.

Could there be high quality technical analysis achieved through a TF? Yes
How does it work?

How does it not work?
(3) Fishbowl Planning

- Highly visible to all interested parties involved from beginning. Typical components: workshops, public meetings, citizen committees, and study brochure.
- Seat small group (5-8) in circle; conversation in full view of larger group of listeners, encircled like a donut - chairs open to observers. Mostly self-organizing; usually has facilitator.
- Citizens serve as a check on planners’ or officials’ biases, & contribute ideas & alternatives.
- Creative public inclusion in a small group discussion. Wide array for use: workshops, conferences, organizational meetings & assemblies.
- Good to vet “hot topics” like public works & planning proposals or sharing ideas/information from varying perspectives.

Another means of 3- Involving

Donut diagram to show desired layout.
Contrasted with fishbowl, where the viewers don’t get into the mix (inner circle)

I’ve used this in setting where unexpected persons show up.
(4) Citizen Advisory Committee

- More traditional method
- Government body establishes
- Represents ideas of other local groups and residents (presumption)
- Advises planning agency or policy-making body
- Probably a standing committee meeting on regular basis to advise decision maker(s)

Type 4 is collaboration w/ public, more than (3) involvement. Type 5 is collaboration with empowerment, meaning the decisions from citizen committees/meetings carry even more weight/authority.

Example  City has Citizen Redevelopment Board advising Community Redevelopment Agency. They are not empowered with tangible authority, but can sway the decision makers if advice is followed.
Another example of advising and swaying the real decision-makers (collaboration), but stops short of full empowerment.

Last item is a example discovered during my best practices research.
Review the meanings and definitions.

Typically used for Visioning, Strategic Planning.
A collaborative tool similar to SWOT but different emphasis.

Also typically used for Visioning, Strategic Planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Technological</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental law</td>
<td>• Interest and exchange</td>
<td>• Gender roles</td>
<td>• Rate of developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment and trade</td>
<td>rates and Inflation</td>
<td>• Class divisions</td>
<td>• New advances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Demographic trends</td>
<td>• Continuing innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taxation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do you want to become, or be known for?

Picture on the mind’s eye- should be aspirational.
Consistent with Planning as a profession integrating EVALUATION into the process (70s and 80s)

More methodical than just visioning, and borders on strategic planning with steps 4 and 5.
Corresponding diagram, with addition of Evaluation (last step).

You may see a diagram like this.
Understand the comparisons between the processes.

Strategic Planning in another module.
Origin of the word is: _______________?

Alternate term little known to me.

Process gets borrowed for shorter sessions, Charrette look-alikes, however genuine is 3-5 days (per National Charrette Institute, with which I am certified)

Can encompass policy, however genuine value from visual and geospatial expression

Consensus builder, (but may not achieve)

Costly can mean ~ $200,000
(SOURCE: APA, Planning & Urban Design Standards, p. 57.)

1. All interested parties from the beginning
2. Multi-disciplinary
3. 2-7 days; compress the decision making process
4. Ideas created in public view; presented within hours
5. Details and big picture concurrently.
6. Every decision should be fully informed from relevant experts
7. Drawings to present win-win outcomes.
8. The more difficult the problem, the longer the Charrette
9. Studio accessible to stakeholders
Fancy term for method to synthesize group ideas, build consensus in a creative and problem solving manner.

Avoids the perils of group think, since participants compose their ideas privately before displaying before group.

Skilled facilitator synthesizes, groups like ideas, ideally shaping better ones.
Facilitator enlisted to find “clear” consensus
Statistical validity in rank - questionable, since low “n”
(4) NGT Variations

- “Magic Wall”
- Sticky notes

Photo shows demonstration of technique by the Author.
(4) American Assembly
Attributed to Columbia University, President Eisenhower
Process
- Steering committee of stakeholder leaders
- Steering committee selects participants and gets funding, selects topics, prepares background analysis
- Meet 2 ½ - 3 days
  - Opening plenary
  - Breakouts
  - “Browbeating” to consensus by breakout group & topic
  - Staff participation & editorializing
  - Closing plenary; voting for consensus or change
Advantages/Disadvantages
- Can handle large, diverse group
- Consensus reached by group
- Dominance of leadership and personality
- Potential staff steering of outcomes, cost

Skilled facilitator with large group

Used to forge complex platforms with many policy positions.

Author has participated in several.

Participants given a sort of objection/veto authority- “not over my dead body” vote

“Browbeating” means objectors are induced to negotiate with the majority group position.
(5) Citizen Juries

- Randomly chosen group of citizens represent the community similar to the jury system.
- Community members group is briefed on the issues, then asked to give input on how development should occur.
- Says Florida designer/planner Andres Duany:
  - Without the briefing process, it is taken over by "a bunch of little mobs, invited in by idiot public planners." (Perth, Australia, example)
  - However, a "citizen jury" is a poorly-trained planning commission, it misunderstands its role, and it believes it is appointed to rule on what it "likes" rather than to implement regulations or use discretionary review to meet stated, adopted community goals.
  - Commissioners may revert to emotions or accepted wisdom (ex: we need more parking! or that's too dense! or we don't want dense housing near a school, it will be dangerous! or that modified grid system will have too much traffic!)

(Source: Planitezen.com, 2010 article)

Not aware of where this is used in US

The selection at random is as valid as jury selection pools, however see the frustration over potential mis-informed decision making.
(5) Referenda

- Citizens vote approval or disapproval of a public measure by official ballot.
- Formalized polling
- Timing is limited by election schedule, otherwise cost soars
- Binding (more common) or non-binding (rare)
Other Methods (Various types)

- Various methods for collaboration/empowerment
- World Cafes – series of simultaneous conversations around specific questions. Participants change tables, focus on identifying common ground for each question.
- Open Space meetings – self-directed format. Participants create own agenda, work groups related to a central theme.
- Symposia, Open Houses, Games & Simulations
Other Methods (Various types)

Resident feedback registers – randomly selected database of residents who are willing to provide feedback. May be used as a source for recruiting people for other processes.

Appreciative inquiry processes – specific process that focuses on what is working for an organization to plan for the future

Responsiveness summaries – report, a formal way of responding to every public comment in writing
## Other Methods (Various types)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Kiosks</th>
<th>Telephone Hotlines</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Rooms</td>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td>Stakeholder/ Elected Official Briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>Comment forms</td>
<td>Speakers Bureaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>Newsletters/ Progress Reports/ Direct Mail</td>
<td>Mix and Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail lists</td>
<td>Fairs/ display tables</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Serves</td>
<td>Study circles</td>
<td>Others: ____________ (some proprietary)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Survey (ICMA)</td>
<td>Tours &amp; field trips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructor’s Notes: In order to offer exam candidates the widest range of preparation tools and to accommodate various learning styles, this guide includes scripts or notes that instructors used while recording the instructional videos. Candidates should be aware that these unedited Instructor’s Notes are intended to complement videos, not replace them. To get the maximum instructional value from this guide, candidates should also watch the videos and read any accompanying resources.

Lesson 3 – PP Motivation & Strategies

Strategies – Elements

1. Ask key questions
2. Set goals, list anticipated outcomes
3. Develop an involvement plan
4. Implement the plan
5. Evaluate plan implementation success
6. Document & revise the plan

The basic framework for designing a public involvement strategy.
A model to think of modern public participation, which goes much further than “traditional outreach”
Professional facilitators (this author is one) are experienced at listening, mirroring, diffusing differences, finding threads of commonality, etc.

Yes, and . . . Example

While there are many types of meetings, tools, agendas, exercises (which we’ll cover below), there are also many facilitation/communication skills employed to produce effective public engagement.

Good, objective facilitator is:
1/3 traffic cop (enforcing agreed upon ground rules)
1/3 orchestra conductor (keeps parts working together)
1/3 group guide (leads the group on a journey)

In a moment well review numerous meeting tools and techniques where these facilitation skills apply.
Reminder of the meaning of these common terms; differentiation.

**Strategies— Resolving Conflicts**

**TERMINOLOGY**

**NEGOTIATE:** To confer with another so as to arrive at the settlement of some matter; To arrange for or bring about through **conference, discussion and compromise**.

**MEDIATE:** Neutral & impartial 3rd party encourages and facilitates resolution of a dispute without prescribing what it should be; **informal and non-adversarial**, intended to help disputing parties reach a mutually acceptable agreement.

**ARBITRATE:** The hearing and determination of a dispute by an impartial referee agreed to by both parties (often used to settle disputes between labor and management).
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- Intergovernmental relationships
- Stakeholder relationships
- Communications and techniques

Narrative:

Hello, I’m Susan Elks with the Pennsylvania Chapter of APA and I will be presenting portions of the Plan Making and Implementation module. This is Lesson 3, on Communications and Stakeholder Relationships.

Communications and stakeholder relationships are a major component of the plan making process. Public participation overall is crucial, and that is addressed in the Public Participation and Social Justice module. This lesson focuses on communication within the plan making and implementation process, and specifically on stakeholders and intergovernmental relationships.

- Intergovernmental relationships
  - Multistate
  - Regional
  - State/Local relationship
  - Sub-state regions

Narrative:

Depending on what exactly your work in planning is, you could be planning at various levels of government, and most likely you are working across different levels of government and related agencies. Planning is very broad, and it’s important to consider the different governmental relationships that can come into play.

Multistate regions frequently need to work together on projects, particularly related to environmental issues. Planning for water use, as is done through river basin commissions, is a good example of a project that is frequently multistate. Transportation planning, particularly the work of metropolitan planning organizations, or MPOs, is frequently regional, or even multi-state, in scope.

Even on smaller scale projects, there is a need for coordination through the government ladder – local, state, and federal government and agencies. For example, a transportation project as limited as a bridge replacement requires a state department of transportation and local municipalities to coordinate together, and coordinate with agencies that have jurisdiction over resources – the state historic preservation office and department of environmental protection as two examples.
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- **Intergovernmental relationships**
  - Multistate
  - Regional
  - State/Local relationship
  - Sub-state regions

Narrative continued:

Coordination across agencies is also critical – community development, planning, and economic development may be provided within the same department at the local government level, or it may be provided by three different departments. Each brings its own perspective, authority, and expertise.

The Outer Banks of North Carolina are an example of a sub-state region – while there may not be a single overarching entity planning across the entire region, clearly this part of North Carolina shares issues unique to their geographic location and all of its implications, and coordinating on areas of common concern and opportunity can be productive. Please refer to the module on spatial planning for more information in this area.

One example of intergovernmental relationships is the creation of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, which brought together the 7 counties around Chicago to address the fragmented state of planning in the area and to work on a regional comprehensive plan. Please pause the lesson and view the video on the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning prior to advancing in this lesson.

- **Stakeholder Relationships**
  - Identification
  - Outreach
  - Communications

Narrative:

Stakeholders are a critical part of any plan making and implementation process. Understanding who the stakeholders are in a specific project is an individual process. There are the typical standards to check for, such as a recreational organization or land trust for a greenway project, but it’s necessary to talk with local officials and other community contacts to identify other entities that may be a valuable resource for a project.

How to coordinate with the stakeholders is another decision to make. Individual interviews, serving on a steering committee, an online survey – what is the best combination of techniques? With this, it is also necessary to keep in mind underserved populations in your project area - how to identify them and how to bring them into the planning process. Do you need outreach in a different language? Do you need methods that are more one on one? Perhaps more low tech or more high tech? For each project this should be a unique assessment and plan.
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- **Stakeholder Relationships**
  - Identification
  - Outreach
  - Communications

Narrative continued:

Also remember that involving stakeholders early in the planning process is critical to developing a plan that has community support and therefore will be carried out and implemented. Coordination during implementation – when the local community may have to deal with short-term impacts such as construction – is also necessary, and should be considered independently of coordination carried out during the plan-making process.

Consider a downtown improvement plan focused on the streetscape. Coordination with stakeholders during plan development is necessary to create a functional and appealing design, but coordination with stakeholders prior to and during construction is also necessary to minimize the impacts of work such as sidewalk replacement, installation of pedestrian amenities, and any impacts on parking.

- **Communications and techniques**
  - Charrettes
  - Community meetings
  - Facilitated meetings
  - Surveys
  - Press Release
  - And the list goes on…

Narrative:

The Public Participation and Social Justice module has detail on the communication techniques listed here as well as other techniques. In the context of plan making and implementation, it is most important to choose the techniques that fit the project. For example, if working on a bike and pedestrian connection plan, a walking and biking tour of the area may be the best way to get the local cycling community involved in the project and get detailed input.

For most projects, what will be best is a combination of techniques, and use of specific techniques at specific times in the planning process – such as a charrette earlier in the process rather than later. Also consider what techniques may be mandated and what techniques will be most useful. While charrettes and online information may be critical to the process, a public notice in a newspaper and a public hearing may be what is required by law. Effective communications should include required techniques and those that will be best at engaging stakeholders and the public.
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Narrative:

This completes the communication and stakeholder relationships lesson, but please view the video on the 2040 COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL PLAN: A VISION FOR NORTHWEST INDIANA for an example of a plan and process that addressed many of the communication and stakeholder relationship items covered in this lesson. The Northwestern Indiana Comprehensive Regional Plan illustrates the need for, and benefits of, regional planning, as well as communication techniques that can be used to draw in stakeholders and the public.
Instructor’s Notes: In order to offer exam candidates the widest range of preparation tools and to accommodate various learning styles, this guide includes scripts or notes that instructors used while recording the instructional videos. Candidates should be aware that these unedited Instructor’s Notes are intended to complement videos, not replace them. To get the maximum instructional value from this guide, candidates should also watch the videos and read any accompanying resources.

Lesson 5 - Social Justice (S5) Definition & Role

**Social Justice**

- Definition & Planner’s Role
- Origins & Milestones
Lesson 5– Social Justice (SJ) Definition & Role

**Definition & Role**

- “... broadly understood as the fair and compassionate distribution of the fruits of economic growth.... Neglect of the pursuit of social justice in all its dimensions translates into de facto acceptance of a future marred by violence, repression and chaos.” [United Nations, 2006]
- “... Seek social justice by working to expand choice & opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of the disadvantaged and to promote racial and economic integration; ... urge alteration of policies, institutions, and decisions that oppose such needs.” [from AICP Code]

*Source: Wikimedia Commons*
Communities are a complex quiltwork, agree?

From this author (with political science degree and part of career in same), the intent here is NOT to engage your own political philosophy. Rather to understand the historical origins as they overlap with planning circles.

Recall that planning tools and planning decisions have been used to EXCLUDE various underserved communities; review planning law against exclusionary zoning.