



American Planning Association  
**Georgia Chapter**

*Making Great Communities Happen*

***Welcome to***

**AICP EXAM REVIEW**

February 12, 2011  
Georgia Tech Student Center

# AICP Exam Review

## Topics Covered Today -

- **Public Participation / Social Justice**  
FAICP
- **Ethics and Professional Conduct**  
City of Duluth
- **Spatial Areas of Practice**  
Jacobs

## Faculty

Bruce Stiftel, Ph.D.,

Glenn Coyne, AICP -

Gary Cornell, FAICP -



American Planning Association  
**Georgia Chapter**

*Making Great Communities Happen*

# Public Participation

## AICP EXAM REVIEW

February 12, 2010  
Georgia Tech Student Center

# Two Views of Why Planners Do Citizen Participation

- Legitimacy
  - Improve representativeness of democracy
  - Enhance social development of the polity
  - Foster civic engagement
  - Boost faith in government
- Efficiency
  - Make better government decisions
  - Get programs adopted
  - Get programs implemented



# Evolution of participation

- 60's participation
  - Decide, Announce, Defend
  - Participation as PR
  - Isolate Participation from Technical Work
  - The Public Hearing
- Advocacy
- Empowerment
- Collaboration

# Evolution of participation

- 60's participation
- Advocacy
  - Planner represents special interests
  - Argues in "coin of public interest"
  - Conflicted and unstable roles
  - Wide evolution/effect
- Empowerment
- Collaboration



# Evolution of participation

- 60's participation
- Advocacy
- Empowerment
  - Build planning skills in the community
  - "Teach to fish"
- Collaboration




# Evolution of participation

- 60's participation
- Advocacy
- Empowerment
- Collaboration
  - Stakeholder identification
  - Planner as mediator
  - Win Win



# Participatory Innovations

- Plan for Participation
- Tie participatory design to actual decisions
- Distinguish Input, Output and Exchange methods of participation
- Use methods that fit the task
- Negotiated rulemaking
- Joint fact finding
- Mediated participation
- Use information technology



# Use Methods that Fit the Task

- Input, Output and Exchange
- A “Cafeteria” of public participation techniques:
  - NGT
  - Delphi
  - Samoan circle
  - Charrette
  - Visioning
  - Idea marketplace
  - ....
- Ideas from social psychology, organizational development, decision theory

# Plan for Participation


## Do Your Homework, Part I

1. What are the issues?; What is the planning process?
2. What situational variables are at play?
  - History
  - Role of technical data or analysis
  - Communication patterns among parties
  - Power relationships
  - Resources for planning
  - External constraints
3. Party Identification
  - Preliminary interviews
  - Further round interviews until few new suggestions
  - ID exercise through brainstorming in prelim meeting
  - Survey/Delphi of parties until closure




# Tie participatory design to actual decisions

- Ask: what are the key decisions in the planning process?
- Ask: what information is needed from, or should be provided to participants at the time of each decision?
- Design participatory timing and methods to provide what input or education is needed at each key decision point.



# Distinguish Input, Output and Exchange methods of participation

- Capacity building for participation requires education (Output)
  - Newsletters/videos/web sites
  - “Dog and pony shows” for civic and school groups
  - Public educational fora
- Informed decision making requires collection of views (Input)
  - Surveys
  - Workshops
  - Hearings
- Consensus building requires dialogue (Exchange)
  - Advisory committees/task forces/blue ribbon panels
  - Citizen juries
  - Negotiated rulemaking



# Use Methods that Fit the Task

- A “Cafeteria” of public participation techniques:
  - NGT
  - Delphi
  - Samoan circle
  - Charrette
  - Visioning
  - Idea marketplace
  - ....
- Ideas from social psychology, organizational development, decision theory

# Negotiated rulemaking

- Voluntary process for drafting regulations that brings together those parties who would be affected by a rule
- Origins with Philip Harter (1982)
- Enacted as US federal law in 1990 (Negotiated Rulemaking Act); forms committee to negotiate text with mediator assistance BEFORE proposed rule is published in the Federal Register
- Extensive use by EPA during Clinton administration



# Joint Fact Finding

- Needed to overcome conflicting or inadequate science base
- Involves scientists from wide range of perspectives
- Process (consultancy, or task force) designed to produce new data that will lead to consensus scientific recommendations
  - “Cognitive mapping”
  - Joint identification of research gaps
  - Data collection and joint interpretation
- Fla. medical malpractice controversy
- Colorado Foothills water supply plan



# Mediated Participation

- Premised on notion that traditional negotiation behaviors are often counter-productive in multi-issue, multi-party disputes
- “N+1<sup>th</sup>” party neutral seeks to build decision environment of trust, shared information, and creative problem solving
- 26 state offices of environmental dispute resolution
- ACR Environment/Public Policy Section
- GA Conflict Consortium

# Use Information Technology

- e-Government
- Web provision of information (Output)
- Wiki format for text development (Exchange)
- Web-based input of comments, discussion, and/or responses (Input and/or Exchange) (NPS Park Planning)
- Fla DOT ETDM: Efficient Transportation Decision Making

# Public participation

QUESTIONS?