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Abstract

Since the late 1960's, public participation in environmental decision making has become increasingly common. Such participation, however, has often been performed in an uncoordinated fashion, with little reflection upon the forms of participation which are most effective in terms of meeting societal goals. In a democracy such as Canada, effective participation is the form of participation deemed most desirable by the general population. Therefore, the aim of this study is to obtain a 'democratic' definition of effective participation in environmental decision making. I have selected the Vancouver International Airport Environmental Assessment and Review Process as a case study. Interviews with forty-three participants were carried out in order to determine their definition of effective public participation.

Public participation has been conceptualized as being composed of a primary dimension, the degree of power sharing between elected officials and the public; and five secondary criteria which are necessary to reach effective participation in practice. These five criteria are: who is permitted to participate in environmental decision making; the degree of access to resources; the nature of the participatory mechanism; the scope of the participatory process; and finally the stage in the decision making process that participation is solicited.

In terms of the primary dimension of participation, it was found that the consultative model of decision making was the most popular definition of effective participation. The Environmental Assessment and Review Process itself was a consultative process, therefore, the majority of the interviewees considered the 'status quo' level of power sharing to be most conducive to effective participation. Opinions of effective participation in terms of power sharing were dependent upon individuals' participatory experiences, motivation for participation, and sociological makeup. In terms of the five secondary effectiveness criteria, a third of the participants found that the Environmental
Assessment and Review Process was already conducive to effective participation. Alternative visions of effective participation in practice were expressed, and they were commonly associated with an individual's motivation for participation.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the late 1960's there has been an increase in demands made by the general public to participate in environmental decision making. Governments have largely met these demands by increasing participatory opportunities in decision making processes. This has, however, been performed largely in an uncoordinated fashion, without any real consideration of how such participatory activity meets overall societal goals and aspirations. If participation is a means to an end rather than an end in itself, it can be argued that participatory activity can only be considered effective if it enables the goals of society to be reached. However, just as there is no general agreement as to what constitutes societal goals, there can be no universal definition of effective participation. Given that this study is set within a democracy, it can be argued that societal goals are formulated from the aggregate of individuals' personal, as well as societal goals and aspirations. Therefore in a democracy, effective public participation is that level of participation that the general population deems sufficient to meet societal objectives.

Many writers have produced their own definitions of effective participation (for example, Manheim, 1981, 330; Arnstein, 1969). However, none has claimed to have consulted any members of the general public when formulating their definition. It seems rather paradoxical that these writers, who have shown themselves to be concerned with participation, neglected to solicit any when forming their definitions. This thesis will extend the definitions of effective participation given in the literature by considering directly the views of members of the public in formulating a definition for, and analysis of, effective participation.
1.1 Aim of Thesis

The broad aim of this thesis is to develop a definition of effective participation by asking members of the public their views directly. I will then attempt to understand why respondents conceptualized effective participation as they do.

Public participation is multifaceted and therefore complex. In order to define effective participation, it is first necessary to develop a theoretical conceptualization of public participation. This involves identifying specific parameters which can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of participation. The pertinent literature reviewed has identified several parameters in this context. I argue that one of these parameters is of paramount importance and will refer to it as the primary dimension of participation. This dimension is the degree to which decision making power is shared between elected decision makers and members of the general public. This can be visualized as a spectrum on which the elected official has all the decision making power at one extreme, and the general public has all the power at the other extreme. Most commonly, however, there is some degree of power sharing between elected officials and members of the general public. The extent of power sharing can only be regarded as the sole criterion for effectiveness of participation if the pluralist assumption is adopted. Pluralism assumes that all members of the general public have an equal ability to participate in decision making processes. Factors such as unequal access to resources suggest that such an assumption is unjustified. Therefore, five further parameters have been drawn from the literature in order to further define effective participation in practice. The first concerns which individuals and/or organizations are permitted to participate. Some participatory processes bar groups of individuals from participating; for example, participants in a B.C. participatory process may not consider opinions of those from outside the province as being relevant. The second criterion concerns access to resources, such as time, money, information, and expertise, which are spread
unevenly across the general population. Thirdly, the nature of the process mechanism needs to be considered when defining effective participation. For example, public hearings can be intimidating for speakers, thereby precluding some participants from taking part in discussions. Fourthly, effective participation depends upon the scope of the process which refers to the nature and breadth of issues in which the public is permitted to participate. The final criterion concerns the stage in a decision making process in which participation is solicited. The potential impact and overall nature of input is likely to vary according to the stage of the decision making process in which participation is solicited.

In order to produce a definition of effective participation, it is first necessary to identify the level of power sharing which is deemed most effective in terms of meeting societal goals. Once this has been identified, the other five participatory parameters must be considered, as they are necessary for achieving effective participation in practice. The power sharing conception of effective participation is considered to be primary because it is the factor that has the most influence in shaping a decision. For example, a participatory process may be considered perfect in all matters, except that the decision maker's only purpose is to inform. Hence, no matter who attends, and how well funded participants are, participants will still only have minimal impact upon the decision.

In order to obtain a democratic definition of effective public participation, I have undertaken a case study methodology using the 1989-1991 Vancouver International Airport Environmental Assessment and Review Process (EARP). The relevant public for this study included those who participated in the EARP. Forty-three participants in the process and all four panel members were interviewed.

The above discussion of effective participation constitutes the broad aim of this thesis. Within it there are three specific objectives. First, is to focus on the most fundamental
dimension of participation, namely the degree to which decision making power is shared between elected decision makers and members of the public, and to locate the point upon the power sharing spectrum which is considered most effective by participants in the Vancouver Airport EARP.

Second, the thesis addresses why individuals perceive effective participation in terms of power sharing as they do. The reason for the second objective is summed up by Pepper (1984, 2),

... we should listen to what others say, and reflect not necessarily upon the 'truth' of their arguments, but on why they make them or believe them, i.e. from what material or ideological vested interest position they speak, and what broader assumptions and philosophy serve their interest. (original emphasis)

This discussion will be conducted on two levels. Firstly, the thesis explores whether and how various personal and participatory experiential factors influence an individual's preferred definition of effective participation; and secondly, the thesis examines the suggestion that conceptions of effective participation in environmental decision making are shaped to some extent by one's 'environmental attitude'.

Thirdly, I will explore participants' views of effective participation in practice through their perceptions of the dynamics, strengths and weaknesses of the EARP participatory process. To do so, the public hearings within the EAR process can be conceptualized as a theatrical stage, onto which players congregate, adopt the role they have chosen for themselves and say their piece. They are there to be heard, and to convince. Their goal is to persuade the audience who, as in all theatres, will ultimately be the judges of their performance. Their job is not an easy one. As with all actors on a set, they have to interact with, and react to, other performers who are assuming very different roles. In addition, they are constrained by the context in which they are set, namely the subject.

1 An attitude has been defined by Schiff (1971, 8-9) as an '...organized set of feelings and beliefs which influence an individual's behavior'. Thus an 'environmental attitude' would refer to a set of feelings or beliefs associated with environmental issues.
of the play, their own terms of reference, and the nature of their audience. In this theatre, the players are the participants, and the audience the EARP panel. The subject of the performance is the Vancouver International Airport EARP.

The Vancouver International Airport EARP can be situated at a discrete point upon the power sharing spectrum. By evaluating participants' comments concerning EARP in the light of the five participatory parameters, it is possible to develop an understanding of how participants conceptualize effective public participation in practice.

1.2 Thesis Approach

Chapter 2 reviews the literature in order to demonstrate the context from which the three research questions have been developed. In addition, a conceptual framework is suggested for evaluating effective participation both in terms of power sharing and the five subsidiary parameters.

As already stated, the study population has been defined as the participants in the Vancouver International Airport EARP. Chapter 3 explores why this particular case study and such a narrow sector of the public have been chosen for analysis. The chapter then proceeds to describe the proposal to build a parallel runway, introduces the EARP process, and discusses the methodology adopted in this study.

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 present and analyze the results obtained from interviews with 43 participants and four EARP panel members. In particular, Chapter 4 develops a conceptual framework of the participants within the Vancouver Airport EARP. This will help illuminate participants' views of the process, allowing an evaluation of effectiveness according to the five parameters. This provides the basis for assessment of the participants' conceptions of effective participation in practice.
Chapters 5 and 6 present the selected definitions of effective public participation (in terms of the power sharing dimension), provided by those interviewed and attempt to explain the reasons behind the selection of these definitions. Chapter 5 presents the definitions of effective participation given, and investigates the reasons why conceptions of effective participation were as given for the sample as a whole. Chapter 6 then attempts to explain the reasons behind these preferred definitions of effective participation by looking at the varying responses within the interview sample. This involves disaggregating the responses according to participants' reasons for participation, participatory experience, and gender. In addition, Chapter 6 investigates the alleged relationship between people's definitions of effective participation and their 'environmental attitude'. Finally, Chapter 7 will conclude by summarizing the contribution of this study to the literature, and by discussing some of my own reflections concerning EARP and effective participation.

1.3 Scope

The intention of this study is to achieve a definition of effective public participation for the interviewed participants in the Vancouver International Airport EARP. The interviewed sample is not statistically representative of the general public. Therefore, although I speculate how the views of those interviewed may differ from the opinions of the general public, I cannot, and do not attempt to make any concise statements concerning the general public's conceptions of effective participation.

2 It must be noted that my third thesis objective is discussed in the text before my first and second objectives. The reason for this is that whilst discussing the Vancouver Airport EARP in order to achieve my third objective, an important conceptualization of the participants in the process is developed. This conceptualization is then used in discussions of my first two objectives. To present each objective sequentially would have resulted in fragmented discussions in later chapters and unnecessary confusion.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

It has been held that this act of establishment [representative democracy] was a contract between the people and the rulers it sets over itself - a contract in which conditions were laid down between the two parties binding the one to command and the other to obey. It will be admitted, I am sure, that this is an odd kind of contract to enter into....

... it would come to the same thing if the name 'contract' were given to the act of one man who said to another: 'I give you all my goods, on condition that you give me back as much of them as you please'.

Rousseau (1961, 81)

The broader literature on public participation provides a basis for the development of a theoretical framework in which to consider effective public participation in environmental decision making in Canada. In particular, it is necessary to consider the ambiguous relationship between participation and democracy.

2.1 Public Participation and Democracy

Because of a focus on public participation in Canada, all ensuing discussions in this thesis will assume the existence of a democratic framework. Democracy literally means 'government by the people' (Oxford English Dictionary), and hence participation, which means 'a taking part (with others) in some action or matter' (Oxford English Dictionary), is an essential element of democracy. Because this analysis is set within a democratic framework, only these forms of participation which are considered to be legitimate will be considered. Forms of participation, such as rioting, are not addressed. However, there are different interpretations of democracy, and it is important to review these, as an individual's conception of legitimate public participation is necessarily constrained by his/her vision of democracy.
There are two long-opposed theories of democracy, each of which is grounded in a belief in the nature of freedom (Parenteau 1988, 1). The first theory, that of direct democracy, stems from a belief in 'positive freedom'. This upholds the right and duty of individuals to be able to determine their own lives. Direct democracy involves "the direct rule of the people themselves as a body without superior authority set over them" (Hirst 1990, 23).

This form of democracy can be traced back to the origins of democratic thought and practice in Athenian Democracy (Mayo 1960, 35), and was supported by such philosophers as John Stuart Mill and Rousseau (Pateman 1970, 21). From about the eighteenth century to the 1960's, however, it has been considered unnecessary in modern Western politics because of an increasing division of labour and individual specialization. However, since the 1960's the concepts of direct democracy have been revived (Qualter 1986, 267) and to some extent implemented within the political arena.

In contrast, 'negative freedom' involves a belief in the right of individuals to be protected from intrusion and coercion by other people (Gibson 1975, 27). This provides a rationale for the existence of the second theory of democracy, namely representative democracy. Although forms of representative democracy have been practiced for hundreds of years (Arb plaster 1987, 82), it was first formulated as a distinct theory by Joseph Schumpeter in 1943 in his book, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy (Pateman 1970, 3). He conceived of democracy as a political method and stated that

---

1 Direct Democracy has also been termed Participatory Democracy (Qualter 1986, 267; Pateman 1970, 42) and face-to-face democracy (Mayo 1960, 42).
2 Also termed Elected Democracy (Parenteau 1988, 1).
3 It must be noted that forms of representative government did not surface within Upper and Lower Canada until 1850 (Fairley, undated, 9).
the democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political
decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a
competitive struggle for the people's vote. (Schumpeter, third edition, 1950,
269)

Considerable debate exists between the proponents of each form of democracy.
Controversy stems from different assumptions as to the essence of human nature. Two
theories are commonly advanced (for example by Gibson, 1975, 11 and Warren, 1992,
8). The first theory conceives humans as being 'consumers', and is assumed by
proponents of representative democracy. This vision of human nature has its origins in
nineteenth century liberal thought (Warren 1992, 8). As Gibson (1975, 22) explains:

The elite theorists' (supporters of representative democracy) opposition to
widespread and significant public participation rests on their fundamental
assumption that individuals are essentially selfish and insatiably desirous
consumers of satisfactions whose interactions are necessarily typified by
opposing interests and conflict.... Consequently, the consumer assumption leads
elite theorists to conclude that the exercise of power by elite rulers is required if
the necessarily conflicting demands of individuals are to be prevented from
disrupting the continued and expanding provision of consumables.

Individuals are required to vote periodically to ensure that elected decision makers are
held accountable for their actions, and partnership or citizen control are seen as
unnecessary or even undesirable.

The second conception of human nature regards humans as being 'exerters'. They are
both social beings and self-determining. Because these needs are not satisfied under a
system of representation, some commentators (for example, Gibson 1975) regard
representative democracy as being unethical. Supporters of direct democracy declare
that it alone allows individuals "to be informed, interested and involved citizens who
have a sense of control over their own lives" (Olsen 1982, 22). They argue that
participation in decision making is not merely a means to an end. Instead, participation
is regarded as an end in itself for two reasons. Firstly, John Stuart Mill (1946 ,150) has
emphasized its value as an educator, and Warren (1992, 8) and Gibson (1975, 23)
discuss its value in leading to a positive self-transformation of the participating individual.

Other debates between the proponents of direct and representative democracy concern the practicality of direct democracy. Stankiewicz (1980, 164) has commented that the general public is on the whole not competent enough for decision making. However, Pateman (1970, 42-43) has argued that the more that individuals are enabled to participate, the 'better' they will become at it. Stankiewicz (1980, 164) argued however, that society is too fragile and complex to permit such a trial and error approach to decision making.

A related criticism concerning the practicality of direct democracy has been raised by Qualter (1986, 268). He claims that the general public would not be interested in participating, and that there is often a feeling of general apathy with respect to participation. This has been noted especially amongst the less educated (Milbrath and Goel 1977, 47-8). However, Gibson (1975, 25) believed that such apathy is not surprising given that the vast majority of the public have never been given a chance to participate. He claimed that elite theorists assume people are naturally apathetic, when in fact they have been socially conditioned to be so. Hirst (1990, 23) and Wengert (1976, 33) have challenged the practicality of direct democracy from a different perspective. They concede that it may have been possible once, but that society is too large and complex today for it to work.

Such debates illuminate the forms of participatory action considered adequate and legitimate under each form of democracy. If society subscribes to a pure representative democracy, then in theory, the only necessary and legitimate participatory activity would be voting for elected representatives. Elected representatives would then be able to make all public decisions, being held accountable periodically at the ballot box. In
contrast, if a pure direct democracy were considered the ideal, then voting for one person to represent a constituency on all matters would be undemocratic. Instead, individuals would participate directly in decision making, perhaps using mechanisms such as binding referenda, voting on individual issues at town meetings, or stakeholder groups negotiating an acceptable resolution. This discussion suggests that there are only two discrete forms of participation which are consistent with democratic theory (see figure 2.1). Of course, in practice there is a spectrum of participation which ranges between these bipolar extremes. Such a discussion of democratic theory leaves open the question of how such considerations of democracy and participation relate to actual participatory experiences. In order to elucidate the nature of the spectrum of forms of participation, the recent history of participation in environmental decision making is explored below.

**Figure 2.1**

**Participatory Implications of Theories of Democracy**

Direct Democracy   Representative Democracy

*  <--------------------->  *

2.2 Participation in Environmental Decision Making in Canada: Pressures for Direct Democracy

Canada is primarily a representative democracy. However, recently emerging voices have been increasingly calling for direct means of participating in environmental decision making. This evolution of citizen participation since the emergence of representative democracy has been summarized by Tester (1992, 37-8):
Three distinct but overlapping phases of citizen participation can be identified within the history of liberal democracies. The first phase centered on gradual extension of the right to vote.... A second phase... was characterized by a strong commitment to representative democracy and the development of a limited form of the welfare state.... It was also dominated by social values which included respect for authority and expertise.... The third phase began in the mid to late 1960's, a period often characterized as a time of rising social concern and activism... citizen participation was something actively demanded by the public....

This third phase of citizen participation coincided with a dramatic rise in environmental awareness in North America (one manifestation of the 'rising social concern'), which has been dated from 1968 (Paehlke 1992, 18). Hence, it is not surprising that,

... citizen participation was an important part of the early stages of the environmental era..... More than that, environmentalists have consistently pressed at every opportunity for more and more effective means of involving the educated and general public in decision-making processes. (Paehlke 1990, 41)

Several reasons have been given as to why there has been a general increase in demands to participate in environmental decision making from the late 1960's until the present day. These may all be viewed as symptomatic of people becoming dissatisfied with being 'consumers' and of their desire to be 'exerters'. Firstly, Sadler (1978, 3) and Webb (1990, 218) point to a disillusionment with our elected officials. Sewell and O'Riordan (1976, 2) write that this disillusionment has occurred as government has frequently misidentified the desires of the public; however, Nord and Weller (1983, 252) have attributed it to increased alienation experienced by the general public.4 Inglehart (1977, 4) on the other hand, has two alternative explanations for increasing demands to participate. Firstly, he suggests the existence of a decline in the perceived legitimacy of such constructions as hierarchical authority, patriotism, and religion, which leads to a decline in confidence in institutions. Secondly, there is a shift in the

4 According to Marxist analysis, alienation will lead to a struggle for power by the alienated groups, leading to a loss of faith in elected decision makers and greater demands to participate. Wengert (1976, 28) and Kierans (1985, 32) attributed this feeling of alienation to increasing government centralization, with resulting removal of local decision making power. In contrast, Nord and Weller (1983, 252) have attributed it to the conflicting interests of groups in society, to which government has been unable to respond adequately.
balance of political skills between elites and the masses. As the general public become increasingly better educated and politically aware, they demand to have a greater input into decision making. Finally, Tester (1992, 34) regards the increasing demands to participate as being a case of positive feedback where,

the positive steps toward openness and participation won by environmental activists and others have encouraged a general expansion of public expectations about being consulted on a wide range of policy matters.

The most well known example of this in Canada is the celebrated Berger Inquiry of 1975 which was set up to review a proposed natural gas pipeline in the Arctic.

Since the 1970's, governments have largely responded to these participatory demands and heightened environmental concern by creating formalized environmental decision making processes which allow for public consultation. In Canada, several processes were established in the 1970's in the field of environmental impact assessment, including the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process Cabinet Directive (1973) and the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (1975). The processes incorporated in this Directive and Act involve participation in the form of public hearings.

The Berger Inquiry established several participatory procedural precedents including the provision of participant funding, and use of alternative participatory formats to the public hearing, for example, preliminary and community hearings (Smith 1987a, 217). This inquiry became a role model for later participatory exercises, as Smith (1987a, 223) explains:

If the Berger Inquiry characterized the state-of-the-art regarding participatory practice in Canada, it has been the repercussions of the Berger experience that have defined recent practice. The Berger Inquiry created an awareness and an expectation of how public participation should be practiced in Canada....

In spite of these precedents, later participatory activity did not fulfill the expectations that the Berger Inquiry had cultivated. The expense of the Inquiry in terms of time and
money resulted in government reluctance to initiate repeat performances (Reed 1984, 29). Such government attitudes were compounded by the economic recession during the late 1970's and early 1980's which resulted in budgetary cutbacks, narrowing the terms of reference for public participation programmes. This has led to considerable disillusionment in post-Berger participatory practice in Canada (Smith 1987a, 224).

This disillusionment with participation, combined with a renewed wave of environmental concern in the late 1980's (Paehlke 1992, 18), and the recommendations for enhanced public participation in the Brundtland Report (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987) prompted federal and provincial governments to review their participatory infrastructures. This resulted in the formation of participatory formats which were very different from the traditional public hearing that was so popular in the 1970's. The new processes were frequently based upon consensus decision making, involving members of the public representing different interests, but like the earlier governmental initiatives, they tended to be advisory in nature. Examples of such processes from the late 1980's until the present day in Canada are listed in table 2.1.
Table 2.1

Examples of Government Sponsored Participatory Initiatives

In the Late 1980's and Early 1990's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Formed</th>
<th>Mandate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraser River Estuary Management Plan (FREMP)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>to provide the means for accommodating a growing population and economy, while maintaining the quality and productivity of the Fraser Estuary's natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Action Plans (RAPs)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>to clean up the Great Lakes Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Round Table</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>to provide leadership in the new way we must think about the relationship between the environment and the economy and the new way we must act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Provincial Round Table</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>to consult with the people in the province about land conflicts and a sustainable development strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Commission on Resources and the Environment (CORE)</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>to consult with the public about developing and implementing a land use and related resource and environmental management strategy for the province</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of these initiatives involved governmental reactions to public demands to participate. However, beyond this, there have also been several recent local initiatives by citizens constructing their own decision making processes independently of government, suggesting the existence of further demand to participate in environmental decision making over and above what is offered by governments. These initiatives often recommend participatory management, frequently along the lines of co-management.\(^5\)

Examples from British Columbia include the Hazelton Framework for Watershed Management\(^6\) (Hazelton, 1991) and the Tin Wis Coalition\(^7\) (Pinkerton, 1993; Tester, 1992) which have both proposed co-management approaches to forest practices. Another example has been the extension and adaptation of the government initiated round tables by communities who have formed their own local versions, such as the Howe Sound Round Table.\(^8\)

Thus, it can be seen that government-minded environmental assessments have tended to involve consultation with members of the general public. More recent government initiatives, although still consultative in nature, tend to have a broader mandate and the commitment to consensus and the diverse nature of individuals involved at least ensures that all viewpoints are considered. The Remedial Action Plans\(^9\) (table 2.1), instituted by the government of Ontario, are a step even closer towards direct democracy as the government has entered into joint decision making with the public. In addition, since

\(^5\) Co-management usually develops around common property resources and usually involves genuine power sharing between community-based managers and government agencies (Pinkerton 1993, 37).

\(^6\) In 1991, the Village of Hazelton recommended a set of principles and rules of practice for sustainable forestry in B.C. The aim was to reduce the number of confrontations between communities, the forest industry and government.

\(^7\) The Tin Wis is a coalition of different interest groups who proposed a model Forest Practices Act for B.C. in 1991.

\(^8\) The Howe Sound Round Table was launched on 14th July, 1993. Members of the Round Table come from major stakeholder groups in the area and they work on a consensus basis. The broad aim of the Round Table is advisory, to attempt to balance environmental, social and economic interests in the Howe Sound region.

\(^9\) These were set up by the Province of Ontario to clean up the Great Lakes Basin. The project depends on the full and effective involvement of all stakeholders, both in the development and implementation of Remedial Action Plans (Hartig and Hartig 1990, 26).
the 1970's there has been an evolutionary change in public demands from consultation towards a demand for direct democracy, as members of the public are beginning to define problems and attempt to resolve them using participatory processes which are either joint with, or independent of government.

Therefore, both the public demands to participate in environmental decision making and governmental responses to them seem to be moving the decision making fulcrum away from the representative participation of the 1960's towards participation congruent with direct democracy. This trend in environmental decision making has also been noted by Tester (1992, 38), who states:

> The record of gains for citizen participation in the 1970's and 1980's has been largely in accord with Arnstein's depiction. Under citizen pressure, governments have moved slowly to allow increasing direct citizen involvement in a variety of areas, including environmental policy and regulation.

2.3 Establishing a Participatory Spectrum

Consideration of practical experiences of environmental decision making in Canada suggests modifications to the bipolar theory of democratic participation summarized in figure 2.1. The representative democracy conception of participation has effectively been expanded, due to public pressure, in the direction of direct democracy. As a consequence, several additional points can be identified on the participatory spectrum (figure 2.2) which ranges from the one extreme of citizen control to representative decision making at the other.

Within the rubric of representative democracy, three forms of decision making have emerged. Representative decision making (A on figure 2.2) is the classic form of participation under representative democracy, and refers to a situation where an elected

---

10 Arnstein (1969) produced a ladder of citizen participation which is mentioned in section 2.4. She basically envisions society moving up the ladder, where the bottom rung corresponds with pure representative democracy, and the top, direct democracy.
individual makes decisions without consulting the general public. A slightly more participatory form of decision making is informative decision making (B), which involves minimal public contact. The public contact that does occur tends to be a one-way flow of information and views. For example, the decision makers 'educate' the public to come round to their own viewpoint. There is little interest in obtaining the public's views. Consultation (C), the second modification of representative democracy, has been defined differently by various authors in the literature. For example, Parenteau (1988, 6-7) defines it as,

...a process in which an authority voluntarily enters into interaction with the public and invites comments on a pending decision. It commits itself to taking these contributions into account in the decision making process, so as to balance the interests of the parties involved.

In contrast, Dorcey and Riek (1987, 8) consider it to occur,

when an individual or organization consults with other individuals and organizations before making the trade-offs and imposing the decision.

In Parenteau's definition, if the authority decides to consult with the public, then they are obliged to take the public's views into consideration, whereas in Dorcey and Riek's definition, there is no such requirement. The definition that has been used on the spectrum above is the one provided by Dorcey and Riek because it is similar to the definition of 'consultation' used in the Environmental Assessment and Review Process. Thus, the definition given by Parenteau would fall to the left of consultation on the spectrum above. Hence, the only forced accountability of the decision maker under the consultative model is at the polls.
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Direct democracy encompasses two major elements on the spectrum. The first of these is partnership (D) which in its true sense involves the sharing of decision making power between elected officials and non-governmental players (Phillips 1991, 185). Phillips warns that this term is often interpreted differently by governmental departments and is sometimes "used as nothing more than tinsel to adorn an existing arrangement" (p185). This study uses the word partnership in its 'true sense'\(^{11}\). The second form of direct democracy is 'citizen control' (E) which occurs when members of the public reach decisions amongst themselves. In theory, citizen control would only occur within a direct democratic framework, where there would be no traditional elected officials. In practice, it also occurs within representative democracy, where there are 'enclaves' of direct democracy within a broader representative framework. Where this occurs,

\(^{11}\) I classify partnership as a form of direct democracy because it allows all citizens to become directly involved in decision making, even if it allows the elected decision maker to enter into the decision making process.
elected officials do not take part in the decision making process, and are just required to help implement the decision that is reached. In Canada, there are very few examples of where citizen control decision making is practiced. However, some First Nations currently have control over aspects of education (for example the Nisga’a from British Columbia) and may gain control in other areas in the future.

Informative and consultative decision making processes are simply a modification of existing representative participation and are part of representative democracy. They are the result of reformist reactions to the problems associated with a pure representative democracy. In contrast, citizen control and partnership are regarded as being part of direct democracy, and have developed as a more radical reaction to representative participation.

2.4 Defining Effective Public Participation

Public participation is defined as any activity which falls upon the power sharing spectrum ranging from voting for an elected representative, to citizen control over decision making. However, the central question to be addressed is what is effective public participation.

Rosener (1978, 459) comments that considerations of effective participation can occur at two levels. These depend on whether participation is regarded as a means to an end or an end in itself (as proponents of direct democracy assert, as discussed in section 2.1). Consideration of participation as an end in itself is important, but beyond the scope of this study which focuses on participation as a means to an end, the end being the attainment of various societal goals. Therefore, participatory activity can only be considered to be effective if it helps to achieve these goals.
A search of the environmental decision making literature was undertaken in order to
gauge recent conceptions of effective participation. Thirteen definitions of effective
participation were identified and they are located on the spectrum according to who has
the ultimate decision making power, the elected representatives or the public (figure
2.3). Where the elected decision maker has ultimate decision making power, the
definitions are located according to how much participatory input they solicit before
reaching their decision. It must, however, be emphasized that choosing where to locate
different definitions on such a spectrum is subjective.

1) The Canadian Nuclear Association (1980, 66) viewed participation as fulfilling the
following role;

…the primary purpose of the process [public participation] should be to

demonstrate to the public that right decisions are being made for, on balance,
the right reasons.

This involves a one-way flow of information from the decision makers to the concerned
public. It allows no input from the public and hence is a classic definition of
informative decision making.

2) The study group on Environmental Assessment Hearing Procedures (1988, 18)
defined effective participants as 'those who the panel listens to most of the time'. This
implies that the decision maker only has to listen to citizens for involvement to be
effective; there is no notion of their views having to be heeded. Thus, such a definition
is congruent with consultative decision making.

3) Manheim (1981, 330) had the following views concerning participation:

There must be full opportunity for timely and constructive involvement of
affected interests in the process, such that every interest -individual or group-
that may potentially be affected by the changes being considered has full and
timely access to all relevant information and has full opportunity to influence
the process constructively.
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Key:

1 = Canadian Nuclear Association (1980)
2 = Study Group on Environmental Assessment Hearing Procedures (1988)
3 = Manheim (1981)
4 = Lucas and McCallum (1975)
5 = Jain et al. (1981)
6 = Sewell and O'Riordan (1976)
7 = UN Conference on Habitat (1976)
8 = Connor (1972)
9 = Gibson (1975)
10 = Manty et al. (1974)
11 = Goldenberg and Frideres (1986)
12 = Arnstein (1969)
13 = Tester (1989; 1992)
The statement suggests that the participants will gain direct access to the decision maker. However, the statement 'opportunity to influence the process constructively' implies that decision makers are not obliged to take their views into account. It is up to the participants to seize the opportunity to attempt to influence them, leaving the onus on the participant, not the decision maker.

4) Lucas and McCallum (1975, 313) believed that the public should be involved in environmental impact assessments,

first, as a contributor to decision-making and second, as a scrutineer to ensure that the proper procedures are followed.

Not only should the public have a voice, but the word 'contributor' suggests that their voice should be taken into account at least to some extent when decisions are made.

5) Jain et al. (1981, 128) state that several conditions must be met for effective participation. First, as much information as possible should be made available to the public. Second, community members must have access to the decision process. Third, the input provided by citizenry should result in a course of action consistent with the desires and needs of their fellow community members. Thus, not only are participants allowed to voice their opinions, the final decision should also reflect their interests.

6) Sewell and O'Riordan (1976, 16) wrote that

the ultimate aim of participation is community participatory design where citizens, resource professionals and politicians work together to resolve legitimate disagreements and fairly allocate environmental resources.

They then add:

Maybe on grounds of practicality and political realism it is neither possible nor desirable to raise the level of public involvement much beyond what is found in some of the more advanced participatory programs today.... Effective participatory experiments are expensive and time consuming, requiring highly trained skills of communication and group problem solving that are not readily found among resource managers of today, nor yet widely taught in the professional syllabuses. Hence, in the absence of a tremendous amount of forethought, good faith and patience, most participatory programs will probably fail. Indeed they may even prove to be counterproductive in the sense that
sincerely motivated citizens may become deeply frustrated, resentful and cynical about the whole political process and the holders of power. (19-20)

The authors seem to believe that partnership is optimal, yet they are more cautious in practice. Because of this, they have been placed between consultation and partnership on the spectrum.

7) The U.N. Conference on Habitat (1978, 88) assumed that:

Public Participation is the dynamic incorporation of the people in the economic, social, and political life of a country which would ensure that the beneficiary is an effective participant in collective decisions with regard to the common good.

The words 'dynamic incorporation' and 'collective decisions' suggest that individuals are very much more involved in the decision making process than proposed by authors number 1 to 6. Nevertheless, there is no specific allusion to power sharing between citizens and traditional decision makers.

8) Connor (1972, 15) wrote that constructive citizen participation is a process which provides an opportunity for citizens, planners, managers and elected representatives to share their experience, knowledge and goals and to combine their energy to create a plan which is acceptable by most affected people.

9) Gibson (1975, 7) discussed the necessity of a broad redistribution of decision-making power if significant and effective public participation is to be permitted and encouraged. His paper justifies the necessity of direct over representative democracy. He wanted elected decision makers to redistribute much of their power, but there is no mention of them losing all their powers. Hence, traditional decision makers are likely to still be involved in the process, even if marginally so.

10) To Manty et al. (1974):

Effective community participation is a community acting with full information, equal access to decision-making institutions, and implementing its jointly articulated objectives.
11) Goldenberg and Frideres (1986, 273) defined real participation as the "involvement of members of the public in a decision-making capacity".

Although the writers of definitions 10 and 11 advocate direct democracy, they do not exclude representative decision makers from participating in their official role, and are therefore not definitions of pure citizen control. In contrast, definitions 12 and 13 correspond to citizen control. Neither allow elected decision makers to be involved in decision making in their professional capacity\(^\text{12}\) (although they may be involved in decision implementation).

12) For Arnstein, effective public participation occurs when rung 8 on her participatory ladder is reached. This is where "have-not citizens obtain the majority of the decision making seats or full managerial power" (1969, 217). She warns against participation without complete power redistribution using the following example (216):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Je participe,} \\
\text{tu participes,} \\
\text{il participé,} \\
\text{nous participons,} \\
\text{vous participez,} \\
\text{ils profitent.}
\end{align*}
\]

13) For Tester (1989), an ideal approach to public participation in environmental and social impact assessment would be when

local communities conduct their own research, and develop their own consciousness and positions through sharing knowledge and experience.

This description does not intuitively fit onto the spectrum as there is no comment on the allocation of decision making power. However, Tester (1992, 38) did discuss the desirability of community management over environmental resources.

\(^{12}\) It must be noted that writers have different ideas of how to reach direct democracy. For example, Arnstein implies that she envisions society climbing up her ladder of citizen participation in a reformist manner, until it finally reaches 'citizen control'. In contrast, Tester envisions a paradigm shift in order for citizen control to be reached, presumably as society 'flips' from a representative to a direct framework. He envisions a much more radical (if not revolutionary) approach to change, where one would move straight from the current system to citizen control.
It can be seen clearly how definitions of effective public participation vary from author to author. It has been previously mentioned that demands to participate have become stronger since the late 1960's, and hence it might be expected that the definitions on the spectrum would reflect this. However, this does not seem to be the case, and definitions are not found on the spectrum in any chronological order. It seems likely that the reason for this is that academic opinion does not necessarily mirror public opinion at all. This is not surprising considering that none of the writers of the definitions appeared to have consulted with any members of the general public while formulating their ideas of effective participation. Instead of tightly following, or even leading public opinions and trends, the definitions in the literature are probably more influenced by an individual's personal outlook. Some writers tend to be more utopian and radical, whereas others are more conservative.

I would argue that no single definition is more correct than any other, because there is no 'right' definition of effective participation. Each individual's definition of effective participation is dependent upon his/her particular conception of both his/her own and society's goals. There is a wide range of opinion as to what comprises society's goals. In a democracy, the level of participation should be in accordance with the wishes of the general public and this should constitute the working definition of effective participation. This definition of effective participation is likely to be transient as opinions are reconstituted over time.

I have not encountered any authors who have professed to having asked the public its views concerning effective participation, which surely is a first step towards achieving effective public participation in practice. This is a significant gap in the literature, and forms the focus of this thesis. Therefore, I will address my first thesis objective, to obtain a 'democratic' definition of effective participation, using the participants in the Vancouver Airport EARP as a sample population. Results are presented in Chapter 5.
2.5 Other Parameters for Defining Effective Participation

In Chapter 1, effective participation has been defined in this thesis as the point on the power sharing spectrum which was most 'desirable' (i.e. in accordance with the wishes of the general public). However, the conception of effective public participation as simply a point on a power sharing spectrum requires the assumptions of the pluralistic model of democracy. A pluralist philosophy involves:

the belief that democratic values can be preserved in a system of multiple, competing elites who determine public policy through a process of bargaining and compromise, in which voters exercise meaningful choices in elections and new elites can gain access to power. (Dye and Zeigler 1978, 10)

The pluralist model assumes that interests are equal in their opportunity to influence the final decision (Lang and Armour 1980, 304). In practice, however, this is not the case as unequal access to both resources and decision makers render some groups of individuals better able to influence a decision than others. In addition, just as the pluralist model ignores the fact that some sectors of society have less access to decision makers than others, the model pays no attention to which environmental decisions are open for participatory input, and which are not. Thus, the pluralist model must be rejected as being an unrealistic representation of society because it conceptualizes effective public participation solely in terms of the degree of power sharing between elected officials and the public and ignores these other considerations.

These two criticisms of the pluralist model must be addressed if a workable conception of effective public participation is to be reached. The relevant literature has been reviewed to identify parameters which have been used to define effective participation (table 2.2). These 'effectiveness' parameters identify practical mitigation measures which attempt to negate the criticisms of the pluralist model (summarized in table 2.3). These parameters therefore constitute further components to the definition of effective participation.
The extent to which decision making power is shared between elites and the public (#1 in table 2.2) is recognized by at least five writers as important. The other parameters can be categorized according to the two identified criticisms of the pluralist philosophy, namely unequal interest representation, and lack of attention to which decisions are open for participatory input, and which are not. There are two parameters identified in the literature which will not used in this study. First is citizen organization, which refers to the degree to which participating citizens are organized. Citizen organization is independent of any participatory process, and because this study is interested in evaluating a process with respect to effective participation, this factor is not a relevant consideration. Second, is the awareness criterion which refers to the amount of awareness and education created by participation (Smith 1993, 70). This effectiveness criterion will not be used in this study because it regards participation as an end in itself. As was discussed in section 2.4, such considerations are beyond the scope of this study.

Interest representation refers to whether all interests are represented in the process or not. The literature suggests that interest representation can be gauged in three different ways. First, 'who' participates refers to whether everyone has equal legitimacy participating. Participatory processes can be closed to some people; for example, a process may only allow participants within a certain geographic region to participate. Second, access to resources is recognized as essential for effective public participation. Resources include time, money, information, expertise, and organizational and administrative support. Inaccessibility to resources can preclude various interests and individuals from being heard. Finally, the process mechanism adopted can restrict some individuals and interests from participating by being inherently biased against some population groups. For example, some participatory processes may be culturally
### Table 2.2

**Parameters for Evaluating Effective Participation**

**From the Literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Power Sharing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1) Primary Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Who Participates</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2), 3) and 4) are Related to Interest Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Access to Resources</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Scope</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5) and 6) Refer to the Openness of the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Stage</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>7) and 8) are: Not Included in any analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Citizen Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions of Effectiveness Parameters:**

1) Power Sharing: The degree that decision making power is shared between elected representatives and the general public.
2) Who Participates: Concerns whether a participatory process bars certain individuals from participating.
3) Access to Resources: Degree of access to resources, such as time, money and information.
4) Mechanism: Concerns whether a participatory mechanism is inherently biased against some participants.
5) Scope: The nature and breadth of issues in which the public are allowed to participate.
6) Stage: The stage in the process in which participation is permitted.
7) Citizen Organization: The degree to which participating citizens are organized.
8) Awareness: Degree of awareness and education created by participation.
inappropriate; indigenous peoples may find community meetings to be more conducive to effective participation than a judicial public hearing. With respect to the second criticism levelled at the pluralist model, namely that it does not address which issues are open for participatory debate, two indicator parameters were identified in the literature. The *scope* of the process refers to the nature and breadth of issues that the public are permitted to participate in. *Stage* refers to the stage of the process when participation is permitted. Stage is related to scope in that if people participate earlier in a decision making process, the scope is often broader than if they participate at the end, when many issues have already been determined.

These five parameters are used for evaluating the effectiveness of public participation in practice. Each one can be conceptualized on a continuum. Every participatory process can be located at a point on each of these continua (as well as on the power sharing spectrum). Effective public participation can also be visualized as a point on each continuum. Thus, a democratic definition of effective participation is the combination of discrete points on each continuum which is deemed most effective by the general population.

Figure 2.4 illustrates the five continua that have been developed for the parameters which will be used to determine effective participation. The continuum pertaining to who is permitted to participate ranges from open (where anyone can participate) to restricted participation (some stakeholders are banned from participating). Access to resources can be visualized as a spectrum ranging from very uneven resource distribution between interests (the status quo) to one where each participant has equal access to resources. The participatory mechanism is represented as a spectrum which ranges from being accessible to all stakeholders to inaccessible to some interest groups. A participatory mechanism would be considered to be accessible, for example, if it was
Table 2.3  
Parameters for Evaluating the  
Effectiveness of Participation  
According to the Pluralist Critique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions of the Pluralist Model</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Representation</td>
<td>Who is allowed to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all interests have equal</td>
<td>Resource Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to be represented</td>
<td>Participatory Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the participatory process)</td>
<td>Scope of discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage of participation in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions in which participation</td>
<td>process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is solicited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Is not concerned with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which decisions are open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for participatory input and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which are not)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

culturally appropriate for all participants. The scope of a participatory process can vary from a very narrow scope, which only seeks 'yes' or 'no' responses to an issue, to an undefined scope, where participants can discuss whatever they like. Stage of participatory activity varies on an axis from idea conception to the end of a process when the final decision is made.

The pluralist model does not acknowledge the importance of any of these parameters; they are simply ignored. In a society adhering to the pluralist model, the parameters who is permitted to participate, the participatory mechanism, scope, and stage are considered independent factors which will not preclude or advance the achievement of effective participation. In contrast, the pluralist philosophy requires the resource access parameter to be uneven, at the far right of the continuum, as it assumes equal ability to influence decision makers without a reallocation of resources. In this study, I have
rejected the pluralist model because it is an untrue and unfair representation of society, and hence, for effective participation to occur, the resource access parameter has to be modified at least to some extent from the far right of the continuum.

These five spectra provide the framework for achieving the final thesis objective. Once a location on the power sharing spectrum (figure 2.2) has been selected, then the five parameters can be employed to evaluate the effectiveness of participation in practice. The five parameters have been tied to a discrete point upon the power sharing spectrum rather than being considered in an abstract fashion because the level of each which is deemed effective will vary with the degree of power sharing. For example, equal access to resources during informative decision making may be considered less important than during citizen control decision making.

---

**Figure 2.4**

**Continua for Parameters for Evaluating Effectiveness of Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is Permitted to Participate</th>
<th>Access to Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Closed or Restricted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Mechanism</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Inaccessible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Idea Conception)</td>
<td>(Project Implementation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Factors Potentially influencing Conceptions of Effective Public Participation

The second thesis objective is an attempt to explain why individuals perceive effective participation (in terms of power sharing) as they do. The literature discusses the potential influence of previous participatory experience and an individual's environmental attitude in shaping conceptions of effective participation. Thus, the thesis will attempt to discern the extent to which these shape participants' views of effective participation. The theoretical basis for each is discussed in turn.

2.6.1 Participatory Experience

The impacts of participatory experience upon views of effective participation have been developed in the literature along two lines. Combining the conclusions of Leighley (1991, 209), Ginsburg (1982, 182) and Madsen (1987, 571), it is suggested that if a participant perceives him/herself to have been successful within a participatory process, (s)he is more likely to support (or be neutral towards) a form of participation which is congruent with the status quo. In addition, (s)he is more likely to support participation in the future. In contrast, if a participant is unsuccessful, (s)he is more likely to perceive government as unresponsive and will seek more radical alternatives.

Secondly, the degree to which an individual participated within a given process may affect her/his definition of effective public participation. Finkel (1985, 908, 909) implied that a low level of involvement within a participatory process may cause an increase in the feeling of process legitimacy. More time-consuming involvement within a participatory process may lead to neutral or negative feelings of this process. Hence, those very involved would have a more radical definition of effective participation and those less involved may be content with the status quo.
2.6.2 Environmental Attitude

O'Riordan (1981, 376) has implied that there is a relationship between environmental ideology and conceptions of effective participation within environmental decision making. He has made this connection while developing a conceptualization of environmental ideologies (O'Riordan 1977, 1981, 1985a, 1990) in the form of a spectrum of environmentalism which ranges from technocentrism to ecocentrism. According to O'Riordan (1977, 6):

Technocentrism is associated with professional and managerial elitism, scientific rationality, and optimism. It is utilitarian to the core....

In contrast, ecocentrists,

not only believe in the finiteness of the earth... [they] also accept that no habitable future is possible without a fundamental change of attitudes away from a sense of technological hubris towards a much more humble and humane approach of harmony with ecological processes and a sense of true association with the earth. (O'Riordan 1981, 377)

On this continuum he identified four points: deep environmentalism, self-reliance, accommodation, and cornucopianism\(^\text{13}\) (table 2.4). These points are associated with particular attitudes towards participation (figure 2.5). Cornucopianism is characterized as involving a strong faith in experts. It does not recognize the necessity of involving members of the public in decisions concerning the environment, as the 'expert' is much better qualified to make them. Hence, a cornucopian approach to environmentalism within a democracy would sanction representative, or possibly informative decision making, as the experts 'educate' the public. Accommodation has been characterized as the liberal branch of technocentrism (O'Riordan 1977, 11), and is open to more

\(^{13}\text{It must be noted that these are discrete points, and others could have been identified on the spectrum. For example, Colby (1990, 8) and the Government of Canada, (1991, 1-7) who are effectively using a similar conceptual framework, select different points along the continuum. In addition, Reed (1988, 16) adds sustainable developers to O'Riordan's spectrum. These additional locales along the continuum could all be amalgamated, which would be useful for characterizing environmental attitudes. However it would not be helpful for this study as O'Riordan's four points are far enough apart that they can be associated with distinct participatory expectations. If any additional environmental ideologies were added, it would blur the distinction in participatory attitude between one locus and its adjacent point.}\)
interactive decision making techniques such as environmental and social impact assessment. Such forms of decision making necessarily involve the public. Hence, this ideology would certainly sanction consultation, and possibly even partnership in some cases in an effort to reach a socially acceptable decision. EARP, with its consultative emphasis in environmental impact assessment, appears to be a classic example of the accommodation approach in practice. The philosophy of self-reliance involves the concept of participatory democracy. A proponent of the self-reliance ideology would support direct democracy, either in the form of partnership or citizen control.

The deep environmentalist position is profoundly ecocentric, embracing the characteristics discussed in table 2.4. This ideology consists of several strands of thought. Each strand identifies with the characteristics that O'Riordan outlines, but they also incorporate unique aspects. Examples of philosophies which are consistent with that of deep environmentalism are deep ecology (Naess, 1973), social ecology (Bookchin, 1982), and ecofeminism (for example, Merchant, 1992). O'Riordan does not, even in his 1990 paper, distinguish between these splintered approaches to deep environmentalism. It seems likely that they would all be located in a similar position upon his ecocentric-technocentric spectrum, and hence there is no need to distinguish among them. However, one point of divergence among these various strands of deep environmentalism concerns participation. For example, some deep environmental principles and their advocates have been charged with being eco-fascist, and therefore

14 Although these are all profoundly ecocentrist, each has a different emphasis. For example, social ecology criticizes social hierarchy and believes that the domination of nature by humans stems from the domination of humans by humans (Eckersley 1992, 148). Ecofeminists on the other hand believe that the domination of nature and the domination of women by men both stem from patriarchy (Plant 1991, 102). In contrast, deep ecology is frequently noted by an absence of a structural explanation for the dominance of nature. Instead it tends to regard all human beings as being responsible for this domination, without emphasizing any intra-societal divisions. For example Naess' and Sessions' principles of deep ecology (1984) class all humans together, no distinctions are noted (Devall and Sessions 1985, 70).

15 For example, by Pepper (1984, 204-213), Bookchin (in Bookchin and Foreman 1991, 60), and Regan (1983, 362).
Table 2.4  
O’Riordan’s Conception of Environmental Ideologies and their Associated Characteristics

Environmentalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecocentrism</th>
<th>Technocentrism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep Environmentalists</strong></td>
<td><strong>Self-Reliance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of faith in modern large-scale technology and its associated demands on elitist expertise, central state authority, and inherently antidemocratic institutions</td>
<td>1. Lack of faith in modern large-scale technology and its associated demands on elitist expertise, central state authority, and inherently antidemocratic institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implication that materialism for its own sake is wrong, and that economic growth can be geared to providing for the basic needs for those below subsistence level</td>
<td>2. Implication that materialism for its own sake is wrong, and that economic growth can be geared to providing for the basic needs for those below subsistence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intrinsic importance of nature for the humanity of man (sic)</td>
<td>3. Emphasis on smallness of scale and hence community identity in settlement, work, and leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ecological (and other natural) laws dictate human morality</td>
<td>4. Integration of concepts of work and leisure through a process of personal and communal improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Biorights- the right of endangered species or unique landscapes to remain unmolested</td>
<td>5. Importance of participation in community affairs, and of guarantees of the rights of minority interests. Participants seen both as a continuing education and political function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodaters</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cornucopians</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Belief that economic growth and resource exploitation can continue assuming (a) suitable economic adjustments to taxes, fees, etc.</td>
<td>1. Belief that man (sic) can always find a way out of any difficulties, either politically, scientifically, or technologically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of new project-appraisal techniques and decision review arrangements to allow for wider discussion or genuine search for consensus among representative groups of interested parties</td>
<td>2. Acceptance that pro-growth goals define the rationality of a project appraisal and of policy formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provision of effective environmental management agencies at national and local levels</td>
<td>3. Optimistic about the ability of man (sic) to improve the lot of the world’s people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** O’Riordan (1981, 376)
Figure 2.5

The Relationship Between Environmental Ideology

And Definition of Effective Participation

(As Defined by O’Riordan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT DEMOCRACY</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornucopianism</td>
<td>Cornucopianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Self-Reliance&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Self-Reliance&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;DE&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;DE&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DE = Non-Authoritarian Strand of Deep Ecology\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{16}\) Deep ecology can also be authoritarian in approach (see text). However, authoritarianism is not included within the participatory spectrum because it is not a democratic form of decision making.
eco-socialist, implying a fundamental commitment to participatory decision making. There is therefore no coherent relationship between deep environmentalism and conceptions of effective participation.

Ideally, it would be preferable to depart from O'Riordan's classification at this point, and attempted to characterize each of the deep environmentalist perspectives in terms of their particular conceptions of effective participation. However, because of the nature in which participant interviews concerning environmental attitudes were structured, this was not possible.18

Thus, as O'Riordan implies by his silence, it is not realistic to attempt a characterization of deep environmentalists in terms of their definition of effective participation. Deep environmentalists themselves do not attempt to do this, and their views of participation cannot be inferred because of the ambiguous political nature of the ideology. The radical nature of the ideology and its apparent association with extreme political positions suggests that views of participation will also be radical, either 'citizen control' or 'authoritarian.'

The relation between ideology and participation identified by O'Riordan (for cornucopianism, accommodation and self-reliance) seems to suggest a relationship between an individual's 'environmental attitude' and her/his conception of effective participation. This would require an individual identifying with a particular

---

17 For example, by Pepper (1984, 188-204).
18 The interview questions designed to elicit environmental attitudes consisted of three questions, each one involving an environmental scenario. For each there was a range of possible policy reactions, each one corresponding to an environmental attitude. Each participant was asked to select their preferred option (for a justification of this interview technique see 3.4.1). It is fairly straightforward to create policy options which correspond with the four ideologies O'Riordan outlines. However, when I attempted to design options which were consistent with the various strands of deep environmentalism, it was difficult to characterize each accurately whilst maintaining distinct policy options. This is because these strands would often be in agreement respecting policy options. In addition, where there are differences in their attitudes, it is very difficult to attempt to characterize them as they are often blurred and open to debate.
environmental ideology, which would then shape his/her 'attitude'. O'Riordan (1981, 1432; 1985b, 413) and Pepper (1984, 27) warn, however, that no one would identify with a single strand of ideology, and hence there is no such thing as an 'environmental attitude'. Yet, both use O'Riordan's spectrum throughout their work and they comment upon points of the spectrum as if they were attitudes held by people as well as abstract ideologies. For example, O'Riordan refers to 'the ecocentrists...' (1981, 377) and Pepper (1984, 11) writes that the spectrum is for 'classifying environmentalists and their ideologies'. Despite their warnings, both writers imply that individuals can identify with these ideologies and hence have an 'environmental attitude'.

It is not suggested that everyone would have an 'environmental attitude'. However it does seem likely that some people would, especially as increasing environmental awareness has led people to consider both environmental issues and approaches towards them more explicitly. In order to test this hypothesis, a preliminary study was carried out on a fourth year U.B.C. Geography undergraduate class. It was found that half of the students demonstrated a consistent environmental attitude (see section 3.4.1 for a definition of this). It is therefore reasonable to attempt to test whether there is a relationship between environmental attitude and an individual's definition of effective participation.

2.7 Summary

The literature reviewed has provided both a justification for the three research questions, and the tools needed in order to respond to them. The literature has suggested that public participation in environmental decision making may be conceptualized on a spectrum from representation to citizen control. This spectrum can then be used to define effective participation in terms of power sharing. In order to overcome the disadvantages of the pluralist assumption which is built into this power
sharing conceptualization of effective participation, five parameters were also selected for defining effective participation in practice. The literature suggested that participants will have different interpretations of effectiveness of participation based upon their participatory experience and environmental attitude. These ideas are examined in the case study which follows. However, first, Chapter 3 presents details of the case study and research methodology.
Chapter 3

CASE STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

'Effective' public participation within environmental decision making is a somewhat abstract concept. Therefore, rather than gather a random sample of opinions from the general public, many of whom may not have considered the issue, I was interested in hearing the views of those who are likely to have an informed opinion. It seems plausible that those who have participated in an environmental decision making process are likely to have considered opinions concerning participation. The Vancouver International Airport Parallel Runway Environmental Assessment and Review Process (EARP) was selected as the focus of this study and a sample of the participants were interviewed.

This particular case study was chosen for practical reasons. The airport is located close to the University of British Columbia, where this study is being investigated. Most of the participants live within a close enough distance for face-to-face interviewing. In addition, the hearings were relatively recent (January and February 1991) so that impressions were still fresh in people's minds, yet the process was not so recent that participants had not had time to sit back and consider events.

It is realized that substituting 'participants within the Vancouver Airport EARP' for 'public' will bias the type of responses made (the possible nature of this bias is discussed in detail in Chapter 5). However, the object of interviewing is to obtain interviewees' perceptions of effective participation to provide a data set from which qualitative, logical generalizations about participants' views of participation can be obtained. This will help develop an in-depth understanding of opinions concerning
effective participation. Therefore, the desirability of obtaining a considered opinion outweighed the importance of obtaining a statistically valid population.

3.1 The Environmental Assessment and Review Process

In December 1973, the Canadian government passed a Cabinet Directive in order to implement a process to evaluate the environmental consequences of federal programs and policies (FEARO, 1978a). This resulted in the formation of the Environmental Assessment and Review Process (EARP) on the 1st of April 1974, to be administered by the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office (FEARO).

Since 1974 there have been three alterations to the process. Firstly, in 1977, minor changes were made to fine-tune the process (FEARO, 1978b). Secondly, on the 22nd of June 1984, under the 1979 Government Organization Act, a Guidelines Order for the EARP was passed to replace the Cabinet Directive (Canada Gazette, 1984). These made more explicit recommendations as to how the process should be implemented.

Many criticisms had been levied at the process (for example Rees 1981, 8-17). Although Bowden and Curtis (1988, 105) and Fenge and Smith (1986, 603) suggest that the 1984 Guidelines ironed out some of the problems with the process, it continued to receive much criticism after 1984; for example, criticisms have been directed at EARP for not having a legislative basis (Smith 1987b, 13-14) and for its policy of self-assessment (Rawson Academy 1987,4). In response, a third change to the process was announced on the 23rd of September 1987. The federal Minister for the Environment released a green paper calling for reform of EARP:

The government will consider all feasible improvements in the scope, application and administration of the existing process. (McMillan 1987, 1)
In April 1989, the call for reform of EARP was strengthened by a court ruling on the Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project\(^1\) (Canadian Wildlife Federation v the Minister of the Environment) which set a precedent by ruling that the application of the EARP Guidelines was not discretionary, and according to the Federal Court, the Guidelines had the force of Administrative Law, 'something which was never intended' (Charest 1991, 2).

On June 18th 1990, the Environment Minister announced a package of reforms for EARP which included the proposed Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, Bill C-78 (DeCotret, 1990). This was later altered and renamed Bill C-13. This was passed by Parliament and subsequently given Royal Assent in June 1992 and is currently awaiting proclamation (Robinson 1993, 10). The provisions under Bill C-13 will not be applied to the process until it is proclaimed. The process under the 1984 Guidelines is of interest here, since it was under these that the Vancouver Airport EARP was held.

The EARP Guidelines have to be followed whenever a federal government department intends to undertake a proposal of its own, or when a project is to be undertaken on federal lands, or involves federal funding (FEARO 1987, 8). The full process involves two stages, although not all projects will reach the second stage. The first stage is that of initial assessment, conducted by the project proponent. The second is a public review, administered by FEARO.

In the initial assessment phase, the proponent evaluates the proposal in order to determine if it is likely to cause significant adverse environmental impacts. If the proponents believes that no adverse impacts will be incurred, they can withdraw from

---
\(^1\) In 1988, the federal Minister of the Environment had issued a licence to build the project without subjecting it to an EARP. The Canadian Wildlife Federation claimed that an EARP should have occurred and filed a law suit to set aside the licence. The Federal Court ruled in favour of the Canadian Wildlife Federation, withdrew the licence and ordered that the project be subjected to an EARP (FEARO 1991a, 4).
EARP and construct the proposed project. However, if significant adverse effects are identified, or if there is significant public concern, then the proponent refers the proposal to the Minister of the Environment for public review (Canada Gazette 1984, sections 12 and 13). In practice, very few projects ever reach the public review phase. Between July 1st and October 30th 1991, 318 decisions were made to withdraw proposals from EARP after initial assessment, 9 decisions were made to carry out further study on the proposal (Initial Environmental Assessment) and only one decision was made to refer a project to FEARO for panel review (FEARO, 1991b).

If the project is referred to the Minister of the Environment for public review, the Minister will appoint an environmental assessment panel and establish its terms of reference which describe both the nature and the scope of the review (FEARO 1987, 10). The panel's first task is to establish and publish its own operating procedures based on FEARO's publication 'Procedures and Rules for Public Meetings' (FEARO, 1985). The panel then creates scoping guidelines for the proponent which outline what they are expected to include within the environmental impact statement. The panel may consult the public at this scoping stage. The proponent then writes the environmental impact statement, which is reviewed by the panel. Once the panel considers the environmental impact statement complete, it schedules a series of non-judicial public hearings to consult the public. Once this has been completed, the panel writes a report to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister who proposed the project, recommending whether the project should proceed as intended, or under certain conditions, or not at all. The recommendations of the panel are advisory. The Minister for the initiating department then decides the extent to which the panel's recommendations will be followed (Couch 1988, 14).
3.2 Vancouver Airport EARP

Vancouver International Airport is located on Sea Island, in the Fraser River Delta. It is within the Municipality of Richmond, located 13 kilometers south of downtown Vancouver (figure 3.1). Vancouver Airport was opened on Sea Island on July 22nd, 1931 (Transport Canada 1991, 10) and became an International Airport in 1934. It was built and initially operated by the City of Vancouver, but in 1962 the City of Vancouver sold the airport to the Department of Transport. When the EARP was conducted, the airport was still a federal responsibility (although on July 1st, 1992 it was transferred to the Local Airport Authority).

Currently the airport has three runways: the main runway, the crosswind runway and taxiway Alpha, operated as a short runway (FEARO 1991c, 15). The main runway carries most of the airport traffic, the crosswind runway being reserved for small aircraft and for when the main runway is closed. The taxiway is only 1067 meters long and can serve only very small aircraft. There have been increasing traffic demands at Vancouver International Airport since the 1940's and Transport Canada has proposed several projects in response to this since that time (FEARO 1991c, 11). One such project is to build an additional runway which would be orientated parallel to the main runway. This proposal was first put forward in 1946, and was resubmitted by the Vancouver Planning Board in 1959 (FEARO 1991c, 11). The area was zoned for a parallel runway the same year. Nothing was then done until 1972 when Transport Canada expropriated much of the property on Sea Island in preparation for this runway. The expropriations resulted in a public outcry, and led to concerns about the runway being voiced. In response, an Airport Planning Committee was formed in 1973 to review different runway proposals. This report was completed in 1975, and in 1976 Transport Canada advanced another proposal to build the parallel runway. This plan has remained basically unchanged to the present day.
Figure 3.1

Map of Vancouver International Airport and Proposed Runway

Source: FEARO (1991c)
The history of the EARP associated with the runway proposal spans a period of nearly twenty years. In 1976, Transport Canada referred its runway proposal to the Minister of the Environment for public review under EARP. A panel was formed, and after consultation with the public, guidelines for compilation of the environmental impact statement were issued in 1978. Transport Canada submitted the environmental impact statement, but then the process was temporarily withdrawn pending the results of a master planning exercise (Transport Canada 1990, 3). In 1983, the runway project was again referred to the EARP panel. This time, public hearings were held and new environmental impact statement guidelines were issued. However, due to the reduction in air traffic because of the economic recession in the early 1980's, Transport Canada again withdrew the proposal (FEARO 1991c, 11).

In November 1989, the Minister of Transport referred the proposal to the EARP a third time. A preliminary environmental impact assessment was produced and used as the basis for scoping workshops, held in April 1990, which were designed to develop the guidelines for the final environmental impact assessment. In addition to its requirements under EARP, Transport Canada held a series of open houses informing people of the proposal. The final environmental impact statement was completed in August 1990, and public hearings to review it were held in January and February 1991.

In August 1991, the panel presented its recommendations to the Minister of Transport (FEARO, 1991c). They advised that the runway proposal should go ahead; however, they attached 22 conditions to the proposal's construction. The Minister of Transport responded to their recommendations on 24th June 1992 (Corbeil, 1992), and confirmed that the runway would proceed.² The runway is currently under construction, scheduled to be completed in late 1996.

² The Minister of Transport adopted twelve of the recommendations, modified eight, and two were rejected (these were the recommendations for noise compensation, and that there should be no airport-related commercial and urban development in the Airport North Area).
3.3 Sampling Methodology

In order to achieve the objectives of this study, 43 participants out of a total of approximately 220 participants in the Vancouver International Airport EARP were interviewed. In addition, all four of the panel members were interviewed.

As has been mentioned, it is not the aim of this study to make inferences about the general public's ideal definition of effective participation, therefore there has been no attempt to make the sampling frame representative of the general public. In addition, there has been no attempt to make the sample statistically representative of the sampling frame. This is because I wanted to ensure that I interviewed as many key participants within the process as possible. Key participants are those who had devoted much time to the EARP and were identified to me by the chair of the EARP panel. It was considered ideal to interview these participants because, having given a lot of time to the process, they may have given their ideal of effective participation considerable thought. In addition to attempting to interview key players, an attempt was made to interview individuals from each type of stakeholder group (these are discussed in section 4.1.2) because different stakeholder groups may have varying attitudes towards participation. It was therefore deemed not appropriate to select participants for interview randomly.

3.3.1 The Sampling Frame

The sampling frame for this study can be defined as the stakeholders in the Vancouver International Airport Parallel Runway proposal. A stakeholder's interest may be demonstrated in two ways: either by participating within the EARP, or by declaring

---

3 A stakeholder is defined as those individuals or organizations who declare themselves to have an interest in the proposed runway. See 3.3.1 for a more detailed discussion of this definition.
their interest but refusing to participate because they object to the process. Where there was an individual (or several individuals) speaking on behalf of an organization, and the individual(s) had no direct interest in the process, it is the organization which was defined as the stakeholder. On the other hand, when individuals spoke on behalf of an organization, but also declared a direct personal interest in the runway, it was the individual who was considered the stakeholder.

According to this definition of stakeholder, two groups of players in the process were not counted as being stakeholders, and were therefore excluded from the sampling frame. These were hired consultants who participated for direct monetary compensation; and members of the panel, who were selected for their impartiality concerning the runway, and were therefore not stakeholders. Having removed these two groups, approximately 150 stakeholders were identified in the process.

In practice, however, the sampling frame had to be narrowed due to logistical constraints. Names of those people who either wrote letters, attended the scoping workshops or gave presentations at the public hearings were obtained from the transcripts of the public hearings and from copies of the letters received by the panel. This information did not reveal the names of those who only attended the public hearings without speaking. A couple of names of such individuals were obtained from other interviewees and they were subsequently interviewed in order to attempt to obtain a broad range of responses. It was thought that their particular experience of the process may have introduced a new perspective. Everyone else who was interviewed either wrote a letter to the panel concerning the runway, attended the scoping workshops or gave presentations at the public hearings. Some people had moved since

---

4 In practice, however, none of the panel members, nor the panel secretary, recalled anyone who had said that they would not be participating in the process because they objected to the process itself. In addition, there may have been other stakeholders who neither participated in the process nor stated their interest to the panel members or the secretary. These individuals, however, cannot be traced, and are therefore not included within the sampling frame.
1991 and could not be traced, and others did not write their address on the letter they wrote. These people had to be removed from the sampling frame.

Although the sampling frame includes those who attended the scoping workshops, discussions concerning EARP in Chapter 4 concentrate on the public hearing aspect of the process. Only six of the people interviewed attended the scoping workshops and they generally had fewer comments about them than the hearings.

3.3.2 Sample Selection

3.3.2.1 Stratification Criteria

The literature review in section 2.6.1 outlined two factors that may influence an individual's opinion of effective participation: first, whether participatory efforts were perceived to be a success or failure by the participant, and second, the degree to which participants became involved within the process. These were developed into stratification criteria.

The final decision to build the runway meant that amongst the participants in the Vancouver Airport EARP there were both 'winners' and 'losers' to different degrees. Those who wanted the runway to be built were effectively the winners in this case, and those who did not were the losers. It seemed likely that the winners considered their goals to have been achieved in the process, and the anti-runway activists viewed their activities as unsuccessful. Because it is not possible to measure perceptions of success from the lists of participants, considerations of whether individuals were in favour, neutral, or against the runway were used as proxies for stratification purposes. This information was relatively easy to obtain from the written submissions and transcripts of the hearings. Thus from the discussion in 2.6.1, it may be expected that those who wanted the runway to be built (having effectively 'won' within this particular process)
would have a high opinion of the consultation process, and would emphasize its desirability as an effective decision making model. Those who lost would have the opposite view.

The sample was stratified on one dimension according to whether the participants' degree of involvement within the process was low or high. This stratification criterion was based upon the amount of time invested by participants and the degree to which participants became directly involved within the process. It was considered that simply attending the public hearings (without giving a presentation) or writing one letter to the panel was a 'low' level of participatory involvement. On the other hand, writing two or more letters, attending a scoping workshop or giving a presentation were considered to be a 'high' level. As table 3.1 illustrates, the sample population was stratified using the degree to which the individual participated and the position that the participant held in relation to the runway.

3.3.2.2 Stakeholder Selection

A stratified disproportionate sampling method was adopted in order to ensure sufficient numbers of cases from each category for analysis (Babbie 1973, 102). In order to gain a balanced opinion for each perspective, it would have been ideal to carry out half the interviews with individuals whose degree of participatory involvement was low, and half with those whose level of involvement was high. However, this was not possible as it would imply sampling an unrealistically large proportion of the former population (see table 3.2a). It was decided to simply interview as many people as possible who wrote letters or attended hearings. In the end, 16 people in the 'low' category and 27 in the 'high' category were interviewed.
Table 3.1

**Stratified Sampling Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Participation</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure Note:**
'Low' refers to those who wrote one letter to the panel concerning the runway, or only attended the public hearings. 'High' refers to those who participated by giving a presentation, attending the scoping workshop or by writing two or more letters.

Ideally, it would also have been preferable to divide the interviews of those 'in favour of,' 'neutral,' or 'against' the runway into thirds, again in order to gain a balanced perspective. However, as can be seen in table 3.2a, there were relatively few submissions who were neutral in relation to the runway. It was deemed desirable therefore, to attempt to have at least 10 interviews in this category. In total, interviews included 14 interviews of those who were 'in favour of' the runway, 19 'against' and 10 who were 'neutral'. The proportion of individuals who fell into each category of the sampling matrix is presented in table 3.2. It must be noted that a much higher proportion of those against the runway were interviewed than those in favour of it. The reason for this was that there were more key participants against the runway than in favour of it.
# Table 3.2

Matrices of the Total Population and the Sample Interviewed

**a: Matrix of the Total Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in relation to runway</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b: Matrix of the Sample Interviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in relation to runway</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c: Matrix of the Percentage of the Total Population Interviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in relation to runway</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Interview Questions

The method of initial contact with interviewees, interview format, and interview questions were passed by the University of British Columbia Ethics Review Committee in March 1993. The questions were pre-tested on a fourth year undergraduate class at the university in order to elicit feedback and comments before interviewing participants. Most interviews were carried out face-to-face, except for a few by telephone with participants living beyond the Greater Vancouver Regional District. The interviews were carried out in a semi-structured fashion, and the length ranged from 15 minutes to 2 hours, the majority taking approximately 45 minutes. A very high positive response rate was noted, with about 92% of the participants approached agreeing to be interviewed.5

Individuals who agreed to be interviewed were asked to respond on their own behalf if they were the stakeholder themselves. When participants were speaking on behalf of an organization, they were asked to attempt to respond from the organization's perspective.

There were four objectives to be fulfilled while interviewing, and it was these which determined the structure of the interview questions (appendix 1). The first goal was to determine relevant information about the stakeholder's background (questions A to E and H to L) in order to establish links between an individual's specific participatory experience, reasons for participation, and definition of effective participation. The second goal was to elicit opinions of EARP and how participants believed that it could be improved (questions F and G) in order to gauge individuals' opinions of EARP as an

---

5 Three people refused to be interviewed because they said they were too busy, and one individual refused because she had since left the organization which she had spoken on behalf of, and thus felt unqualified to represent their views now. Two of these individuals represented business interests, one was a Mayor and one was a member of a local interest group.
effective process. Comments given will be evaluated according to the five parameters developed in section 2.5.6

The third goal was to obtain participants' ideal definitions of effective public participation in terms of power sharing in order to locate their conceptions upon the power sharing spectrum (figure 2.2). In order to do this, question M asked each individual to identify the level of participatory activity that he/she considered ideal, or most conducive to effective participation. Each interviewee was handed a copy of the question to read and consider. The five options in the question correspond to the points on the spectrum of power sharing (figure 2.2), namely representation, information, consultation, partnership and citizen control decision making. The five options were presented to each participant in order, from one extreme on the spectrum to the other, in order to demonstrate the concept of the spectrum. They were then asked to select their preferred option, or the two options they believed they fell between, and their least preferred option. This latter question was asked not only to elicit their opinion but also to validate the question by ensuring that each individual really understood what was being asked. For example, if someone declared that (s)he liked citizen control best and partnership least, this would suggest that (s)he had not understood the conceptual basis of the question. In practice, however, responses were consistent, suggesting that everyone understood the question. Questions G and J were posed to corroborate the findings of question M for replicability. Questions E, F, G, H, J, K and L were also set to aid analysis of individuals' views of effective participation. Finally, the questions were designed to discover participants' 'environmental attitude', and the importance they attached to environmental issues to ascertain whether there is a link between

---

6 Participants were not asked their opinions of EARP according to the five parameters directly because such narrow questioning may preclude participants articulating other parameters which had not been noted in the perused literature. In addition, naming potential concerns of EARP to participants was considered to be a leading question.
environmental attitude and definitions of effective public participation (as discussed in 2.6.2).

3.4.1 Eliciting Environmental Attitudes

Questions N to S focus on 'environmental attitudes'. It is not possible to obtain an 'attitude' directly, however (Mitchell 1989, 102), so three 'environmental scenarios', questions Q, R, and S (see appendix 1), were designed to attempt to elicit it by asking individuals their approach towards resolving various environmental issues. As Mitchell pointed out, such questions elicit an individual's verbal behavior, and this has often been proven to be very different from his/her overt behavior. This problem is irresolvable and simply has to be borne in mind throughout.

Each of the three scenarios was followed by four possible policy responses, and each option is designed to coincide with one of O'Riordan's environmental ideologies. Each person was asked to rank the four policy options in order of preference. Policy options were framed in a manner that suggested some of their associated implications in order to ensure that the individual was aware that each option necessarily involves trade-offs. Each scenario raised the type of issues which respondents, as residents of British Columbia, would be familiar with. Considered rather than spontaneous views were sought, and it was thought that individuals would be more likely to have a considered opinion of familiar issues. However, presenting familiar scenarios could increase the chances of the respondent being influenced by both media and current policy reactions to that issue. In an attempt to minimize this problem, topics were selected that were not at the forefront of public debate at the time of interviewing.

---

7 It would have been preferable to ask more than three questions, but it was considered that three was the maximum number that could be asked before respondent interest waned.
8 Cornucopian, accommodator, self-reliant or deep environmentalist (discussed in 2.6.2).
In order to design policy responses to reflect each of the four ideologies, it was necessary to cover the range of possible responses within each ideology. This was fairly straightforward for the first three ideologies (namely, cornucopianism, accommodation and self-reliance), as responses are relatively consistent from issue to issue. However, deep environmentalism was more difficult because it potentially embraces a plethora of approaches. For questions Q and R (concerning air pollution and electricity respectively) the deep environmental response seems less radical than for question S (concerning smelters), because the 'status quo' in British Columbia is much closer to these options in Q and R than it is for question S. The deep environmental policy option for question S was designed to reflect the fact that the ideology can also advocate more radical solutions.

To exhibit a consistent 'environmental attitude' a respondent either had to rank the four ideologies in the same order for all three questions, or rank the ideologies identically for two questions, with no more than two adjacent rankings being switched for the third question. For example, if someone ranked cornucopianism last and accommodation third for two questions, and then switched this order for the third question, but kept their first and second preference constant throughout, then they would be considered to have a consistent environmental attitude.

In total, 32 out of the 43 participants were asked questions concerning their environmental attitudes. Eleven people who had participated on behalf of an organization were either too busy to respond or were interviewed by telephone, and it was considered too problematic to ask such questions over the telephone. Although it would have been useful to elicit the views of those representing organizations concerning the environmental questions, it was not essential to this study. When selecting a preferred definition of effective participation, such individuals had answered on behalf of their organization, yet when giving responses concerning the
environmental scenarios, they gave their personal views. Thus their environmental attitudes could not be linked with perceptions of effective participation. Questions N, O, and P were designed to determine the importance attached to environmental issues by each respondent and to characterize an individual's environmental attitude further.

3.5 Summary

This chapter has outlined the mechanisms of the EAR process as it was applied to the proposal to build a parallel runway at Vancouver International Airport. The sampling frame has been defined as the stakeholders in the Vancouver International Airport EARP, and participants were selected for interview using a disproportionate stratified sampling method. Four objectives to be fulfilled when interviewing were outlined and these provided the rationale for the interview questions.

The next chapter, Chapter 4, builds upon the Vancouver International Airport EARP case study which was introduced in this chapter. A framework for conceptualizing the participants in the process is developed. In addition, participants' opinions of EARP are discussed, allowing an evaluation of EARP as an effective participatory process in practice.
Chapter 4

DRAMATIS PERSONAE:
PARTICIPANTS AND PERCEPTIONS OF EARp

The further I went through the process, the angrier I got about being co-opted, about being just a token public opposition who was really not ever given a chance. And on the other hand, I had this absurdist sense in living through a sort of Alice in Wonderland world where there was simply no connection between what they were doing and saying and any reality that I could recognize.

Comments by a Vancouver Airport EARp Participant

This chapter develops the 'theatrical stage' metaphor which was introduced in Chapter 1. The 'scene is set' by characterizing the dynamics of the hearing process; the dramatis personae, the roles that were assumed, and the reactions of the players to the audience. Comments made by the players concerning their experiences in the process will then be used to reflect upon the process itself, presenting its perceived strengths and weaknesses. Finally, the five parameters developed in Chapter 2 will be used to evaluate participants' perceptions of effectiveness of participation in the context of the Vancouver Airport EARp. This characterization of the dynamics of the hearing process is very important in the analysis of why participants hold their views of effective participation and will be discussed in Chapter 5.

4.1 Setting the Scene

The Vancouver Airport EARp has been characterized by panel members and FEARO employees as being a fairly low profile process for an EARp. One panel member commented how little grass roots activism there had been when compared with other EARPs, that there had not been much popular concern, just a few dedicated individuals. The public hearings went fairly smoothly and, on the whole, there was
relatively little visible bad feeling between proponents and opponents.\(^1\) Only once did
the chairman of the panel have to ask participants not to be so aggressive when
questioning speakers.

4.1.1 Dramatis Personae

Within the Vancouver Airport EARP there were several identifiable groups of
participants\(^2\) (table 4.1). Transport Canada, the project proponent, reflecting upon the
long history of the runway proposal, took the attitude that this was its last chance to get
the runway built. As the Vancouver International Airport General Manager stated:

It is extremely important that supporters get involved in the parallel runway and
let the panel know their views. If we miss this time, it's gone.

(Sounding Board, May 1990\(^3\))

In support of Transport Canada were the business community, labour unions, aviation
interests, and various levels of government. Business community support was chiefly
organized by the Vancouver Board of Trade. A member of the Board of Trade
described its campaign, thus,

... we also had a public information campaign on the importance of Vancouver
Airport relative to the economy and so on. We distributed some 80 000
pamphlets....

---

\(^1\) Toronto Pearson Airport has since been through an EARP concerning the building of a new runway
(FEARO, 1992). One of the Vancouver Airport panel members who was also a panel member on the
Pearson EARP, commented that the Pearson EARP was a more high profile, hotly debated issue than the
Vancouver EARP. The Pearson EARP attracted many more participants (this may be partly because the
Vancouver runway project has been discussed on and off for twenty years, and there is evidence that
some individuals had given up participating by 1991; see 4.2.1) and was much more acrimonious, with
mistrust and bad feeling towards Transport Canada.

\(^2\) These were identified from the transcripts of the public hearings and letters submitted to the panel.

\(^3\) A publication of the Vancouver Board of Trade.
Table 4.1

Summary of Participant Groups Involved

in the Vancouver Airport EARP

Position in relation to the runway proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour of</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport Canada</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Interests</td>
<td>Some Environmentalists</td>
<td>Some Environmentalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Unions</td>
<td>Some Local Organizations</td>
<td>Some Local Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Interests</td>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>Some Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government:</td>
<td>Government:</td>
<td>Forum Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>B.C. Env.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD</td>
<td>Env. Canada; DFO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Govt.</td>
<td>FREMP</td>
<td>Musqueam First Nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Notes:

B.C. Env.: Provincial Ministry of the Environment
B.C. Govt.: B.C. Government Cabinet Committee
DFO: Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Env. Canada: Environment Canada
FREMP: Fraser River Estuary Management Program.
GVRD: Greater Vancouver Regional District

In addition to the Vancouver Board of Trade, there were other business umbrella groups campaigning for the runway. These included nine Chambers of Commerce and seven tourism, hotel and restaurant associations. There were also other participants representing both large and small businesses who were in favour of the runway. These businesses included local companies, as well as national and international organizations. Much of the business community supported the building of the runway because airport congestion has resulted in flight delays which impinge upon both cargo and passenger transportation. The large tourist and hotel lobby was especially concerned with flight

---

4 A breakdown of the number of interviews carried out within each participant group is provided in section 4.1.4.
5 FREMP is an inter-governmental, inter-agency program set up to manage the Fraser River Estuary (FREMP 1988, 1).
delays. Other business interests were more concerned that the runway be built in order to increase the general importance of Vancouver as a world trade centre.

Three labour unions (Canadian Autoworkers, Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport, and General Workers, and the B.C. Federation of Labour) also participated within the EARP in support of the new runway provided there was adequate environmental mitigation. Their position was that an additional runway would lead to economic expansion and more job creation in the Vancouver region, if not the whole of Canada.

There was support for the runway at the municipal, regional, and provincial levels of government. There were 20 letters and presentations on behalf of municipalities, regional districts, and townships around the province, all in support of the runway, stressing their dependence upon Vancouver Airport. The Mayor of Kelowna described the situation for his town, which was typical of many in B.C.:

The hub of B.C. air network is Vancouver International Airport. Kelowna is one of the spoke communities that depend on Vancouver Airport as their gateway to the Lower Mainland and the rest of the world. (FEARO 1991d, 540-1)

Regional and provincial governments also supported the runway, providing that adequate environmental mitigation measures were met. The Greater Vancouver Regional District supported the proposal because it felt the proposal was consistent with many of its policies enunciated in the planning document Creating Our Future: Steps to a more Livable Region. The B.C. government formed a Cabinet Committee on the Vancouver International Airport to review Transport Canada’s reports and any letters submitted to them. The committee concluded that the building of a runway was a necessity to address traffic congestion and flight delay problems.

The aviation interests consisted of several airlines and various aircraft associations (related to business, the Canadian airforce, aircraft owners, and pilots). In addition,
participants included three aircraft worker associations (for Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Pilots, and Air Traffic Controllers) and the Airline Union. Each had a similar, direct interest in runway construction.

There were several other identifiable stakeholder groups who were either against the runway or were neutral. Those who were neutral participated to ensure that various mitigation or compensation measures be carried out if construction were to occur. The most vocal group questioning the runway proposal was the Community Forum on Airport Development. It was formed in 1973 in reaction to the runway proposal, and continuing in existence up until the present day. This organization was registered as a non-profit society under the Society's Act in 1976. One member described the Forum's policy on the runway:

We had real problems with the proponent's rationale for the need of the runway, the concerns about the increased noise impact to the community.... the impacts on the environment overall were very concerning.

The Forum, as a collective, was not against the runway, although many of its members were. Instead its purpose was "...to question whether this is the right move for the community" (Vancouver Sun, 2.10.90).

There were seven representatives participating on behalf of other local groups, including two strata corporations, a homeowner's association, a ratepayer's association, a community association, and two planning committees. Some of these groups were against the runway, whereas others were neutral. Of the latter, some were concerned with the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures and others proposed additional measures; for example, there was a proposal by one of the local organizations to build a berm on the south side of the island to reduce the noise impacts.

Several environmental groups also participated within the process, and were concerned not only with the environmental impacts of the runway, but also with the implicit
growth philosophy adopted by proponents of the runway. Some environmental groups were against the runway *per se*, whereas others were simply concerned that mitigation measures were inadequate. These participants represented both international, national and local environmental organizations. None were, however, established specifically to participate in the runway review process.

The Musqueam Indian Band had several concerns about the runway proposal, as the people use Sea Island as a point from which to fish, as well as to hunt waterfowl and game birds. They also use it for spiritual activities and cultural ceremonies, and there are important aboriginal archaeological sites on the island. The Band has an outstanding land claim for the whole of the Island. Runway construction could jeopardize their chances of a successful land claim\(^6\) and would have an impact upon their traditional activities on the island.

There were also several individuals who spoke on their own behalf. These people tended to be either against the runway or were concerned with the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures.

Finally, FREMP and some representatives from government departments at the provincial and federal level were neutral with respect to the proposal, for example Environment Canada and the B.C. Ministry of the Environment. This is in contrast to the municipal, regional and provincial sectors of government who were in support of the runway. These neutral agencies were involved in the process in order to give advice and information concerning the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures.

In addition to these participant groups, there was also an audience, the environmental assessment panel, whose role it was to listen to all, and decide which actors' viewpoints

---

\(^6\) One criterion for a land claim settlement in B.C. are current levels of 'use and occupation' of the claimed land. The proposed runway would reduce the available land that the Musqueam could utilize, and thus negatively impact upon a land claim (Musqueam Indian Band 1991, 14).
were the most credible. The panel consisted of four members, each appointed by the Minister of the Environment because of his expertise and perceived impartiality. Mr. Ray Robinson, was a FEARO employee (now retired) and panel chairman, Mr. James Wilson is a retired planner, Dr. Chad Day is a past Director of the Natural Resource Management Program at Simon Fraser University, and Mr. Melvin Hagglund is an aviation expert, and past employee of Transport Canada.

4.1.2 Roles Assumed by the Players

It is instructive to compare the roles played by participant groups with those identified as typical both in the environmental literature and in other airport inquiries. This comparison is facilitated by drawing on elements from Parenteau (1988) and O'Riordan (1978). The geographic perspective contributed by Parenteau is combined with the view of participant motivations to participate supplied by O'Riordan in order to establish a framework for conceptualizing these participant roles in the Vancouver Airport EARP. This conceptualization will then be used to help understand why the participants held such views of the process, and why they held their stated definitions of effective participation.

Parenteau (1988, 25-27) considered there to be three typical groups of participants in environmental public hearings in Canada: first, the proponent (in this case, Transport Canada), second, 'the government apparatus,' and third, the public participants themselves. It is this third group which is the primary focus of this study. Parenteau subdivided this third group on the basis of geographic location. 'Local' residents were located near to the proposed project and were likely to be impacted by it. This group was characteristically composed of both individuals speaking on their own behalf and special interest groups, often formed for the purpose of fighting the proposal. 'Outside'

---

7 This includes both the proponent and the review board (Parenteau 1988, 25).
participants were not located near the proposed project and are not directly impacted by the proposal. This group usually represent established organizations and have often had considerable experience participating in public hearings.

'Local' participants are defined here as those who were located near enough to the airport to experience the direct impacts of the proposed runway, the principal one being noise. 'Outsiders' are those who were located beyond the area experiencing direct impacts from the runway. Physical boundaries have not been used to distinguish between 'local' and 'outside'; instead the criterion is whether participants reported that they would experience direct impacts if the runway were built. The Musqueam Indian Band, participating members of the public, speakers for local associations and the Community Forum were considered 'local' participants. Local groups and individuals came mostly from wealthy areas of Vancouver, such as Southlands, Kerrisdale, Dunbar and Marpole (figure 4.1). Interestingly, there were very few protests from Richmond against the direct impacts of the runway. Finally, environmental groups, business interests, labour unions, government and aviation interests are defined as 'outside' participants.

Parenteau's conception of the participants in an environmental public hearing can be applied to the participants within the Vancouver EARP. But his geographical division alone is not sufficient to characterize the role that participants played within the process, where some of the 'local' people had as much in common with the 'outsiders' as they did with other 'local' people.
Figure 4.1
Map Locating Residences of Local Participants

Source: FEARO (1991c)
In writing about the Third London Airport Public Inquiry, O'Riordan (1978, 143–4) described the anti-airport protests as falling into two categories: amenity protest groups and ideological environmental pressure groups. Unlike Parenteau's geographic characterization of participants, O'Riordan's formulation was based on the role that individuals adopted when participating. Thus, amenity protest groups fought the airport because they wanted to preserve their current rural amenities, and the airport would threaten these. Ideological pressure groups "sprang up to oppose the philosophy towards growth and nature dominance" (O'Riordan, 143).8

It would seem that similar roles can be identified in the Vancouver EARP, but O'Riordan's characterization alone is too simple and results in the unnecessary polarization of participants. For example, members of the Community Forum said they were protesting both for ideological reasons and because they were going to be directly impacted by the runway, due to physical proximity.

If the conceptualizations of O'Riordan and Parenteau are combined, however, a useful characterization of the participants emerges. This combination would create three participant groups: (1) participants who are locally situated who are amenity protest activists, I will term 'NIMBY' (Not In My Back Yard), (2) those who are locally situated, being both ideological and amenity protest activists, will be called 'community' groups, and (3) those who are ideologically motivated, and who are predominantly 'outsiders' who will be termed 'ideological' actors.9

---

8 Kemp, O'Riordan, and Purdue (1984, 480) characterize these ideological pressure groups as being recently emerged third party participants (whereas the project proponents and locally impacted residents were first and second parties), who claim to represent the broad public interest.

9 It must be noted, however, that there were three locally situated individuals who emphasized that they were not participating because of the noise impacts upon themselves but for ideological reasons. These three people were thus also classed as ideological actors.
O'Riordan, unlike Parenteau, did not include those who were in support of the airport in his classification. Therefore, in order to place these stakeholders in the classification, I will extend O'Riordan's amenity protest group to a broader category called 'self-interest'. Self-interest refers to any action taken to benefit an individual directly. Those in support of the runway are outsiders by nature, and all had at least an indirect, if not a direct interest in the runway construction. Hence, like most local objectors, they were also participating from a self-interested position.

In addition to speaking from a self-interested position, many stakeholders who were in favour of the runway may have also been speaking from an ideological position, being fundamentally pro-growth. Therefore, in order to include those who were ideologically pro-growth, O'Riordan's definition of 'ideological' is broadened to include any motivation which is beyond that of immediate self-interest. It is not possible to determine whether participants who were in favour of the runway were acting out of self-interest alone or for both ideological and self-interested reasons. This is because the two are so closely associated.

Participants who were outsiders but in favour of the runway for self-interested and/or ideological reasons will be called 'professional' people\textsuperscript{10} (see figure 4.2). I have coined the term professional because nearly every person within this category was participating on behalf of a company, organization, municipality or government department and was acting within a professional capacity.

\textsuperscript{10} The only exceptions are the few participants from provincial and federal government who were professional, but neutral with respect to the runway. They will also be included within this classification because they were still professional actors.
Combining and adapting the characterization of O'Riordan and Parenteau suggests that there are four general types of roles being enacted: three neutral/against the runway and the fourth in favour of the runway (see table 4.2). Table 4.3 classifies the 43 interviews according to stakeholder category.
Table 4.2

Locating Participant Roles and Participant Groups

in a Matrix Referring to their

Participatory Motivation and Geographic Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Motivation</th>
<th>Geographic Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest NIMBY [Individuals]</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL⁷¹ [Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest And Ideological [Community Forum Local Organizations Musqueam Band Individuals]</td>
<td>Airline Interests Business Labour Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological IDEOLOGICAL [Individuals]</td>
<td>[Environmentalists]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3 The Players' Perceptions of the Audience

Nearly half of those who commented about the panel used such terms as 'fair', 'impartial', 'concerned', and 'impressive'. There was no distinct participant group who made such comments. However, there were some professional and community individuals who did raise criticisms relating to the perceived bias of the panel. Five community members thought the panel was biased towards Transport Canada. Some considered this to be a blatant bias; for example, one member of the Forum commented that the panel had simply ignored the proposal put forward by some participants to build a short runway, despite it being within the panel's terms of reference:

⁷¹ As already mentioned, it is not possible to determine whether these professional groups were acting out of self-interest alone or for both ideological and self-interested reasons.
I was very curious to see how the panel would deal with that in the final report, and the answer was that they did not deal with that. They did not even take cognizance of that argument.... They simply ignored that level of argument which I'm afraid could only be deliberate.

Other community members perceived the panel's bias to be more implicit, that they had 'listened with only one ear' and had already made up their minds to build the runway.

Table 4.3
Distribution of Participant Interviews According to Role and Stakeholder Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Motivation</th>
<th>Geographic Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Interest and Ideological</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musqueam Band</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideological</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEOLOGICAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers Refer to the Number of Interviews Held in Each Stakeholder Group

12 No interviews were carried out with participants who spoke on behalf of labour unions because these individuals could not be contacted.
In contrast, a professional participant said he thought the panel was biased against Transport Canada! In addition, two community members questioned the impartiality of one of the panel members who had previously worked for Transport Canada, although now retired. This panel member, when interviewed, seemed rather sensitive on the subject as he brought it up and was eager to point out his neutrality concerning the runway. He claimed that because he was retired and was not receiving any money from Transport Canada, he was impartial. Another individual who was in favour of the proposal had a totally different view of the panel members and suggested that only this panel member had enough experience, and that the others had insufficient expertise to do the job!

4.2 Opinions of the Process and Suggested Improvements

Each individual was asked his/her opinion of the EAR process and how (s)he felt that the process could be improved. A full list of comments made about the process is provided in appendix 2.

4.2.1 Opinions of EARP

About one third of the people interviewed thought the process was good, and had further comments about it. It must be noted that the vast majority of those who liked the process were professionals who had been in favour of the runway. Since this group had very little to say except that the process was 'OK', 'fine', or 'excellent', the rest of this section will be devoted to those who had criticisms.

The criticisms can be separated into two categories according to the seriousness of the allegation. There were 'fundamental' criticisms (questioning the nature of the process), and practical ones (concerned with correcting some aspects of the process). These categories are certainly not mutually exclusive and some practical criticisms could be
interpreted as being fundamental and vice versa. For example, a few individuals said that resource inequity was a problem, and although it was perceived as a serious barrier to participation, they regarded it as a practical constraint which could easily be rectified. Hence, this criticism is discussed as if it were a practical constraint. Yet, a Marxist interpretation of this 'practical issue' would be that the resource inequity was a deliberate attempt to prevent a powerful opposition. Hence, it becomes a fundamental problem. Bearing in mind that each criticism is not necessarily constrained to one category, I will discuss the criticisms in the way that they were presented to me by the participants.

A 'fundamental' criticism which was levied against the process by several community, ideological, and NIMBY individuals was that the decision had already been made to build the runway before the hearings had occurred. They felt that they had no chance to influence the process and some felt used. One angry Community Forum member commented:

I realized after awhile and this impression just strengthened until the end that we were being co-opted. They wanted to give an illusion of a public process, of getting the public involved, but in fact it was always carefully managed, they were never listening. We were just tokenism, it was just a way of saying look, we did include the public and yet this is what the panel came up with.

Two others had very different 'fundamental' criticisms of the process. Their comments suggest that they felt that the process ought to be more tokenist in form. One neutral NIMBY who sympathized with Transport Canada, commented:

The idea of giving protest groups money to protest what you're doing, I don't know, somehow doesn't seem right, it doesn't seem fair.... To what extent would you want to go to make it more difficult? These guys [Transport Canada] went through a lot of effort to get this thing.

---

13 It must be noted that there were some participants who complained of this but did not seem to find it a fundamental problem. For example, one NIMBY participant commented "It [the process] was OK, but the decision had already been made before we started." Thus she suggested that the process could still be evaluated independently of this constraint and did not feel that it rendered the process meaningless.
He seemed to feel that the runway should go ahead despite the results from the hearings, providing Transport Canada had put some effort into the process. The other person, a professional businessman, suggested that the panel should not attempt to compromise to please the maximum number of stakeholder groups. He commented on the panel's report:

So they built a whole lot of recommendations into it trying to appease all the groups which appeared before them, balancing all the points of view. You ended up with some curious recommendations.... Some pretty odd things, [for example] land compensation, two for one, or three for one ratios which came out of nowhere.

It seems that both believed the process should not attempt any fundamental change or depart from the 'business as usual' stance.

Several NIMBY, community and ideological participants commented that the panel's recommendations were not legally binding and that this was a serious disadvantage of EARP. One of these people was a panel member who was very angry and distressed that Transport Canada should be allowed to reject the panel's recommendations; for example, the panel’s recommendation to instigate a noise compensation program for those affected by the runway was completely dismissed. He said he was concerned for the people and the birds. He commented that the 'bureaucrats completely manipulated the process', and blamed this on the model of the British Parliamentary System and ministerial discretion. However, two other panel members were not so concerned by the non-binding nature of the recommendations. One commented that it did not upset him because the ministers would override the recommendations later if they wanted to. The other thought it was fine that Transport Canada could change the recommendations because, after all, it was clear from the beginning that they could. In addition, there were some participants who thought ministerial discretion was a good thing. These people were professionals, in favour of the runway, and upset with some of the panel's
recommendations; for example noise compensation for local residents. Hence they were pleased that some of the panel's recommendations were overruled.

Four practical constraints to the process were raised. One complaint concerned resource inequity between the proponents and the opponents in the form of money and time. A member of the Community Forum reported that she asked Transport Canada what their budget was for the whole process. They replied 'as much as it takes'. The Community Forum, in contrast, received $91,000 in intervener funding. Another participant commented that the giant machine represented by Transport Canada was 'Goliath' and those against them were 'David', almost to the point of being overwhelming. There were also complaints about the length of time that the discussion of the runway had been going on (nearly twenty years, on and off). This had resulted in local residents, who were against the runway, assuming that it would eventually happen, that the decision had already been made, and therefore they had stopped fighting. Two participants reported that their friends and neighbours had tired of fighting the proposal, and their attitude was 'well build the damn thing if you're going to'. Transport Canada had won a war of attrition. Others commented that the act of having to make a presentation was very intimidating, and discouraged people from presenting. Finally, one professional businessman commented that he thought that the process was too time-consuming and too expensive to the taxpayer.

4.2.2 Suggested Improvements to EARP

Participants were asked how they thought the EAR process could be improved. A third of the participants felt that no improvements to EARP were necessary. Of those who did suggest improvements, recommendations varied enormously. Some suggested that our whole attitude system and priorities needed changing in order to improve decision

14 In total, $170,500 was provided for intervener funding (FEARO, 1990a).
making. Alternatively, others suggested that a different process would be ideal. However, most made comments about practical alterations to the current process. Each suggestion is considered in turn (and a complete list of comments is presented in appendix 3).

Four participants believed that we need to reorient societal priorities if we are to improve environmental decision making. One ideological and one community participant commented that we need to stop making economic goals our top priority and should focus more upon environmental and social considerations. A NIMBY participant commented on improving EARP:

Well, you would have to start by shredding the whole government and getting rid of half the bureaucracy in an effort to respond to people.

Another community individual commented that she did not see how the process could be improved because they had made up their mind to build the runway anyway. Hence, she suggested that a more fundamental problem than the process is our attitude towards public participation and decision making.

Four people commented that they would like to change the format of the EARP and put another process in its place. However, their conceptions of its content were very different. One professional individual thought there should first be a set of hearings with an expert panel to discuss the technical feasibility of the project. If the project receives approval, there should be environmental hearings to deal with mitigation aspects. He made no comment concerning the broader need for the project and assumed that if the project is feasible, it should go ahead.

In contrast, a panel member suggested that there should be two panels in the process, one to look at the need, and the other to look at the environmental impacts if need is established. An ideological person who was against the runway thought that the process should also involve two stages: the first, a one-to-one contact with the panel, so that
individuals could voice their concerns freely, and then a public hearing stage. He stressed that once they had written their report, the panel should return to the stakeholders to discuss their recommendations. Finally, a professional commented:

I think a much better process... is one that doesn't become nearly as public. It still provides an opportunity for all the views to be heard, but in a much more professional and thoughtful way.

He thought it better for everyone to write letters, which would be available for anyone to look at and respond to, but that there should be no hearings. He was concerned that participants in the EARP 'spoke to the cameras' and that those with a more radical position got greater media coverage and hence influenced the panel twice.

Suggestions of how to alter EARP itself were made by many participants. Comments such as making the recommendations binding and providing better funding for interveners were as expected, as these were raised as criticisms of the process. Other suggestions such as opening up the process to the public earlier and letting the Minister of the Environment decide whether to accept the panel's recommendations (not the Minister of Transport with his/her vested interests) were also made. Another man objected to the tone of the public hearings, saying:

Transport Canada was the proponent, so right away the thing was cast off in an adversarial mode, that you have the proponent and opponents.... I feel that if the process had started by looking for more creative solutions... then we might have seen them. But this way we just went the conventional route with all this artillery and bulldozers rolling over anyone who had any alternatives.... What I think would be great is if they had a relatively short process of honestly looking at alternative schemes.

4.2.3 Summary of the Findings Concerning Participant Opinions of the Process and Improvements to It

The range of opinions about EARP and potential improvements to it can be seen to be large. Criticisms and suggestions varied widely from a fundamental reorientation of our society to altering specific aspects of the present process. The process was liked most
frequently by professional participants, which is not surprising given that it resulted in a favourable decision from their perspective. The professional participants who criticized the process did so because they found it to be too favourable towards the opponents of the runway. They had only a few suggestions for improvement, and these tended to be fairly conservative. On the other hand, NIMBY, community, and ideological participants tended to be more critical of the process, which is again not surprising as the outcome of the process did not satisfy many of these individuals. Criticisms centred upon the fact that the process was perceived to be unfair and biased against them. In addition, many people were very upset that the panel's recommendations were not binding. Suggestions for improvement focussed upon making the process more accessible and the recommendations binding.

4.3 Participants' Perceptions of EARP and Effective Public Participation

Five parameters for evaluating effective participation, in addition to the power sharing dimension, were developed in section 2.5. Each criterion has a continuum of possible responses, and the Vancouver Airport EARP will be located on each of these continua using the 1984 EARP Guidelines Order and the mandate to the Vancouver Airport EARP panel (issued by the Ministers of Environment and Transport) for the airport inquiry. Participants' comments concerning EARP will permit the location of their conceptions of effective participation on each of the continua.

4.3.1 Locating EARP on Each Continuum

In figure 4.3, the approximate position of EARP on each continuum was determined by the following factors. First, the Vancouver EARP was an open process in which anybody was permitted to participate. Second, in terms of access to resources, participant funding was available for interveners. This money was given to assist participants in the review of Transport Canada's Environmental Impact Statement and
in presenting their views to the panel at the public hearings. In addition, the public had access to all relevant information that they requested (Canada Gazette 1984, 7). Although such regulations potentially help to remedy the resource inequality between interest groups, a significant imbalance still remained. EARP is therefore located on the continuum halfway between even and uneven resource access.

Thirdly, public hearings, as a participatory mechanism, do not explicitly bar any individuals from participating, as for example litigation may (because some individuals may not attain standing). However, even though the EARP public hearings are non-judicial in nature, the process can unwittingly exclude individuals, because giving a presentation can be intimidating. The Vancouver Airport Environmental Assessment Panel (FEARO 1990b, 1) recognized this fact and commented that the scoping workshops and written submissions provided other avenues of participation if an individual did not want to give a presentation. However, the scoping workshops were held earlier in the process than the hearings, and were designed to address the scope of the impact statement, not if, and how the runway should be built. Therefore, the scoping workshops were not a real alternative to participating in the hearings. In addition, it is likely that an individual would be disadvantaged writing a letter (instead of both writing and presenting), as he/she may have less of an impact upon the panel. Thus, although the EARP public hearings tend towards being an unrestricted participatory process, they are not completely so.

Fourth, the scope of the process was determined by the panel's mandate. This mandate included looking at project alternatives, related future development plans for the Airport, economic costs and benefits of the project, environmental and socioeconomic effects of the runway, and potential mitigation and compensation in order to reduce any negative environmental impacts from runway extension (FEARO 1991c, 119). This breadth of mandate was carried into the public hearings, and participants were free to
discuss these issues. Thus, the scope of debate was fairly broad in terms of the airport and the regional aviation context. In addition to environmental impacts, social and economic considerations were also discussed. However, the scope of the discussions did not branch into broader debate concerning how such a runway would shape the overall development of the Greater Vancouver Regional District. The scope of participation is broad, but is not totally unrestricted.

Finally, the stage of EARP in which participation occurs is very late. By the time the public is allowed input, the preferred project has already been selected and detailed. Thus, although the scope of the project allows for broad debate concerning project alternatives, by the stage at which participation occurs, Transport Canada is financially committed to its project and is unlikely to be open to debate concerning project alternatives. In addition, the panel's mandate is to present recommendations concerning the benefits and disbenefits of the proposed project (FEARO 1991c, 119). There is no mention of the panel actually recommending project alternatives. Thus, although the scope of discussions seemed to be broad, the likelihood of public input at this broad level being heeded is slim, due to the late stage of the process that participation is solicited and the nature of the mandate concerning the panel's recommendations.
### Figure 4.3

**Locating the Vancouver International Airport EARP on the Participatory Continua**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Who is Permitted to Participate</th>
<th>2) Access to Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Uneven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EARP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) Participatory Mechanism</th>
<th>4) Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Narrowly Defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessible</td>
<td>Defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EARP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (Idea Conception)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End (Project Implementation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EARP**

**Figure Note:**

EARP refers to the approximate location of the Vancouver International EARP on each spectrum.

---

### 4.3.2 Conceptions of Effective Participation According to the Five Parameters

When participants made no comment upon a subject, it was assumed that they were relatively content with the status quo (i.e. the location of EARP in figure 4.3). In terms of who should be allowed to participate, most participants did not criticize EARP for any lack of openness. However, there were three professional individuals who objected to the EARP policy of openness. Two believed that local residents and the Community Forum should not be able to participate as they chose to live near the airport in the first
place. The third believed that more weight should be given to those who spoke on behalf of a large number of people. He was concerned with the representativeness of participants. All three individuals were basically concerned that the public interest could be subverted by self-interested, minority pressure groups. With respect to resource access, there were again relatively few complaints. Two NIMBYs and one ideological person commented that it was unfair and that the proponents had more resources than opponents. They thus perceive effective participation to involve a more even distribution of resources than under EARP. Yet, none of these three regarded such resource inequity as a fundamental flaw in the process. Unlike the Marxist view, which would demand equal access to resources, they simply requested more equal access to such resources. However, there was one NIMBY individual who preferred resource distribution to be less even than under EARP.

Three participants commented that making a presentation at the public hearings was intimidating, suggesting that they prefer participatory mechanisms to be less restricted than EARP. In addition, an ideological actor said he preferred a process with one-to-one contact with the panel as this would be less inhibiting for participants. All four individuals clearly preferred a more unrestricted participatory process to public hearings.

There were three comments made by participants concerning the scope of participation within the process. Two were community participants, one of whom commented that more attention should be given to discussing the need for the runway. The second felt that it would have been better if there had been more brainstorming for creative solutions. Both these individuals believed that the scope of discussions should be broadened further. The third person was the professional who envisioned a two-stage process replacing EARP. His vision of a process would have had a much narrower
scope than the current EARP. There would be no consideration of project alternatives, or whether net socio-environmental-economic costs exceed the benefits.

In terms of the stage of the process at which participation was solicited, opinion was unanimous that initial participation should not occur any later within the process. One community person commented that the process should have been opened up to participation much earlier. In addition, there were many comments from NIMBY and community participants that the decision had already been made before the public hearings, implying that participation should have occurred much earlier within the process. Finally, two people had commented that it was very difficult to persuade people to turn up to participate at this stage of the process. If input had been permitted earlier, it is likely that more individuals would have participated.

It can be seen that, frequently, participants were relatively content with the approximate location of EARP on each spectrum. However, when criticisms were made, many could be predicted according to the participant’s role within the process. The NIMBY, community and ideological participants (except one NIMBY participant who sympathized with Transport Canada) believed that more effective participation required more even access to resources, a less inhibitory participatory mechanism, a broader scope, and participation at an earlier stage. They had no comments concerning who should be allowed to participate. In contrast, some professional participants’ conception of effectiveness of participation involved placing restrictions on who is allowed to participate, and narrowing the scope of discussions. However, one professional wanted a less restricted participatory mechanism. No professionals commented upon the stage of the process in which public input was solicited, suggesting that they were content with the status quo.
4.4 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to characterize the Vancouver Airport EAR process in terms of the participants and their opinions of the process. A conceptual framework was provided onto which participant groups and their associated roles were superimposed.

Participants' views were elicited of effective participation in practice by evaluating their comments concerning EARP in the light of the five parameters developed in Chapter 2. About one-third of the interviewed participants made no specific comments about the ineffectiveness of EARP, so it was assumed that EARP satisfied their conception of effective participation.\(^{15}\) Of those who considered EARP ineffective in some way, those in favour of the runway preferred a narrower participatory base, and those neutral or against the runway preferred a broader one. This is not surprising given that those in favour of the runway wanted to ensure that the runway is built, and with minimum time delay. Participation potentially threatened both of these goals. Those against the runway and those who were neutral wanted to ensure that their concerns about the runway were fully and adequately addressed. This was most likely to occur through participation. Thus, the importance of self-interest in determining conceptions of effective participation is emphasized.

It was interesting to note that individuals often seemed to assume that their views were representative of the 'public interest'. Sometimes, those individuals who disagreed with them were regarded as being selfish and speaking against the common good. There often seemed to be a lack of comprehension among participants of there being any rational viewpoint other than their own. Those in favour of the runway tended to assume that economic growth was the most desirable goal and they could genuinely not

\(^{15}\) It must be remembered that views of effective participation within this chapter pertain to the five parameters developed in section 2.5. Effectiveness of participation in relation to power sharing is addressed in chapter 5.
understand why others were challenging them. Some of those against the proposal assumed that environmental quality and social equity were highly desirable and the singular goal of economic growth was both unsustainable and irrational. Given this apparent clash of worldviews, it is not surprising that the participants held such opinions of the process and effective participation.

This chapter has characterized EARP and discussed the effectiveness of participation in terms of the five parameters developed in 2.5. The next chapter reviews participants' opinions of effective participation in terms of the ideal level of power sharing between the public and elected officials.
Chapter 5

DEFINING EFFECTIVE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Of course they would want our policies if they could understand all the implications. But ordinary voters are simple people, they don't see their needs, they're not trained to analyze problems. How can they know what's good for them? They need proper leadership to guide them the way they ought to go.

Extract from Yes Prime Minister (1989, 398)

This chapter presents the selected definitions of effective public participation gleaned from interviews with participants in the Vancouver Airport EARP. Building upon the literature cited in Chapter 2, these results will be used, both in this chapter and the next, to develop insights as to why participants selected the definitions of effective public participation that they did.

Definitions of effective participation will be discussed and analyzed on four different levels in an attempt to understand why participants selected their preferred definition of effective participation. The first two levels involve assessing the responses of the interview sample as a whole and are studied in this chapter. The third and fourth levels involve investigating intra-sample variation in conceptions of effective participation, and are presented in Chapter Six.

The first level analyzes the responses concerning effective participation by locating them on the power sharing spectrum developed in Chapter 2. The second level attempts to understand why the interview sample as a whole responded as it did. This will involve discussing how these responses may differ from those of the general public.

However, before discussing participants' preferred definitions of effective participation, I will present an account of the reaction of participants to the question eliciting their
views of effective participation (see figure 5.2 for the question asked). Reactions were both interesting and relevant.

Not one person interviewed admitted to having thought about effective participation before, even those who had spent a large proportion of their lives participating within one process or another. Only one person really articulated the difference between direct decision making and consultation without my having to explain it. He said when comparing a direct decision making process to EARP:

[In] our public meeting, we did the vote and we formed what was happening at the end, whereas at the airport we said what we wanted and someone else went away and decided, we didn't make the decision.

Once the concept of the participatory spectrum had been discussed, one woman drew a useful conceptualization of how she perceived the difference between consultation and partnership, her preferred method of decision making. This is shown in figure 5.1.

Most people selected their ideal level of participation without much reaction at all. However, there were a few individuals who commented that it was an interesting question, and wondered why they had never given it any consideration before. In addition there were three men (two professional and one ideological) who thought the question unnecessary. One of the two professionals commented in a surprised voice, that he preferred:

Consultation obviously, we're a parliamentary democracy aren't we?

The other responded saying he preferred:

Consultation without a doubt. I am a great believer in Edmund Burke, who said something like, I would be making a mistake to let you represent yourself when you've elected me to do it.

Both comments would suggest that these individuals would actually prefer representation to consultation, yet both seemed to accept that environmental decision making without participation was unacceptable.
The ideological man refused to select any point on the power sharing spectrum as ideal, commenting that he disliked every point equally. He regarded consensus decision making (associated with direct democracy) as being "Academic bull shit", commenting that it does not work because, "some people (like himself) have principles and others do not, so the ones with principles cannot compromise." He also disliked the representative end of the spectrum commenting that, "the political elites are morally bankrupt."
Debating the ideal location on the spectrum was irrelevant to him, since he perceived societal problems as being less related to the participatory process, and more due to the nature of society's goals and aspirations. He considered that a reorientation of our socio-economic-political system was needed. This would only be brought about by a fundamental shift in our values. To him, the means (how we make our decisions) are much less relevant than the ends (that we begin to make the right decisions) and until a change in our values occurs, no tinkering on the participatory spectrum will have much effect on the nature of the final decisions.

His point is interesting and pertinent, yet further discussion of it is outside the scope of this study which focuses on participation within the current socio-economic-political structure; that is, within a democratic framework. In contrast, he called for a necessary change in the value orientation of society, whether it is wanted by the majority or not. He assumed that we have to change, due to impending environmental and social crises, whether we want to or not. Therefore his response cannot be analyzed within the framework established.

On reflection, it was surprising that no one had given the question of the ideal level of power sharing in environmental decision making any consideration. It was also interesting that only two people responded that they thought the question unnecessary because we should never have more participation than consultation. Given the increased demands to participate over time noted in Chapter 2, perhaps twenty years ago, nearly everyone would have dismissed such a question. It seems that people are slowly beginning to recognize the validity of such a question, or at least do not dismiss it as unnecessary. Yet, it seems that people have not attempted to formulate such a question in their own minds when participating within environmental decision making.

1 It must be admitted that not all decision making within the current political structure is democratic, for example administrative decisions made by bureaucrats (Torgerson and Paehlke 1990, 7). However, this study assumes the existence of a democratic mechanism in environmental decision making.
5.1 Participant Definitions of Effective Participation

Each interviewee was asked to select her/his preferred definition of effective public participation in terms of power sharing. Each definition was then superimposed on the participatory spectrum (figure 5.2). The results on the spectrum represent only 42 out of the 43 individuals interviewed, as the ideological respondent discussed above refused to select any point on the spectrum.

From the spectrum in figure 5.2, it can be seen that the expressed ideal level of effective participation lay between consultation and citizen control. Individuals replied unanimously that they considered the Vancouver EARP to be 'consultative'. Parenteau (1988, 24) also defined EARP as a consultation process. Therefore EARP could be termed the 'status quo' in this study. Hence, everyone stated their ideal level of participation to be the status quo or further towards direct democracy on the spectrum.

In terms of options on the spectrum that people liked least, representation was least popular. It seems that this form of decision making within an environmental context is no longer acceptable. In addition, many were very suspicious of the citizen control option; those that placed it last did so because they saw it as impractical and unrealistic.
Participants were asked: "With regard to the Vancouver airport public process (1) which one of the following options do you agree with the most strongly? (these may seem to be imperfect options and if you feel you fall in between two categories, let me know) (2) which one do you disagree with most strongly?

a) The elected representative should make decisions without consulting the public.
b) The elected decision makers should consult the public only when they require information from the public. Otherwise, the decision makers should make the decision themselves.
c) When a decision concerning the environment is to be made, the public should always be consulted, but an elected decision maker should make the final decision and should be responsible for the consequences of that decision.
d) The public and the elected decision maker should share the decision making power.
e) The public should reach decisions amongst themselves and then the elected decision maker should be required to implement the decision."
5.2 Explanation of Aggregate Results

When the participants' preferred definitions of effective participation are compared with the academic definitions, it can be seen that participants' views are more consistent with the status quo than the opinions in the literature (figures 2.3 and 5.1). The range of academic definitions on the spectrum is far greater than those given by participants in the EARP. This study does not, however, attempt to determine which set of results reflects more accurately the views of broader society. Academics are often characterized as living in 'ivory towers', being somewhat removed from concerns and issues within society. The vast majority of interviewed participants were white, middle-class, middle-aged professionals. Therefore, both academic opinion and the views of the sample population are clearly likely to be unrepresentative of the views of society as a whole concerning effective participation.

With reference to the responses given during the interviews, it can be seen that nearly 80% of the participants in the EARP were content to keep participation levels either at the 'status quo', or between consultation and partnership. I will attempt to explain why respondents tended to select these options by discussing why participants were neither more radical nor more conservative in their conceptions of effective participation. Such discussions involve debating the ways in which the sample is atypical of the general public, and speculating where the general public's views would fall on the spectrum.

No one professed to preferring a more representative position than consultation. However, there were two male professional participants who chose consultation as their ideal level of participation, yet their views seemed more consistent with representation. One claimed the EAR process was fundamentally flawed, saying:

So if there is one person who represents friends of the longhorn sheep then they get equal time compared with a mayor that represents fifty municipalities across the province.
The second man claimed that the panel should sort out who the important players were, namely those who spoke for the interests of the general public, and that they should be given proportionally more time to speak than the special interest groups.

Although both men questioned the concept of participation without representation, this viewpoint was not expressed when selecting their preferred level of participation. I would argue that this is because they still prefer the consultation option, yet feel that the balance of time and consideration during the consultation should be dedicated to speakers who represent large groups of individuals. These two individuals were in favour of the runway, and those speakers in favour appeared to represent much larger numbers of people than those against it. It is perhaps not surprising that they were concerned that their views could have been sacrificed in favour of the views of a generally more vociferous minority. Thus, these men were advocating a broad consultative framework, but one that pays attention to the relative representativeness of participants.

It seems likely that no one chose an option to the right of consultation on the spectrum because each individual had effectively bought into consultation by participating within the EAR process. By participating, individuals were legitimating a consultative process. However, it is not so clear why most interviewed participants preferred consultation to more radical participatory options. There are four potential reasons as to why this might be. First, it is possible that EARP was so satisfactory that the interviewees considered this the ideal decision making model. Second, participants may have been effectively co-opted into feeling that consultation was a suitable form of decision making. Third, it can be argued that participants, once they have participated within a process, begin to identify with that process and feel grateful that they have participated. They are thus likely to sanction similar forms of decision making in the future. Finally, specific characteristics of the interviewed population may ensure that their perceptions
of effective participation are at variance with definitions that would be given by other sectors of society. These possible explanations will now be considered in turn to determine if there is supporting evidence for each.

Firstly, the evidence does not strongly support the conclusion that the EAR process was perceived to be so good that participants considered consultation to be a perfect form of decision making. Nearly half of those who selected the consultation option conducive to effective participation declared the EARP to have at least some drawbacks. In addition, of the four people who declared EARP to be fundamentally flawed, three had selected the consultation option as preferable.

Secondly, Susskind and Elliott's theory of 'paternalism' (1983, 6) could be used to explain why participants were content with a consultative form of decision making. Paternalism is a form of consultation in which decision making is highly centralized, and advice giving by citizens is either discouraged or closely managed by elected officials. A paternalistic approach is usually adopted when elected officials regard participation as being necessary in order to legitimize decisions and forestall opposition to such decisions. Yet "a paternalistic pattern of participation can lead to whatever outcome the elected or appointed officials have in mind" (Susskind and Elliott 1983, 7). When it comes into conflict with the general public's desire to be heard in decision making, paternalism can be regarded as being manipulative, co-opting the general public into acquiescence. It can be argued that because participants felt that they were consulted, and as they were co-opted into accepting the final decision, it is likely that they felt that consultation was conducive to effective participation.

Several contemporary writers have noted such paternalist tendencies within the governmental approach to public participation. For example, Tester (1992, 34) has commented of the Canadian government:
Recent government responses to citizen participation demands suggest a conscious effort to control the expansion of opportunities for public involvement so that the scope of deliberations is carefully constrained and so that final decision-making authority remains in present hands.

In addition, Torgerson and Paehlke (1990, 9), Ginsburg (1982, 182), Finkel (1985, 893), and Smith (1987a, 221; 1993, 66) have commented that governments have attempted to use participation to legitimize decisions. Smith (1993, 66) wrote,

... public participation is often viewed as a means to legitimize administrative decisions on the assumption that consultation will ease the implementation of policy and have a cathartic effect on dissenters.

Two participants, one professional and one community participant, did comment that they found the process very structured and that opportunities to participate by the public interveners were organized and restricted. As was reported in Chapter 4, several others referred to the limited scope of deliberations by protesting that the process did not adequately address runway need within the broader context of long range growth planning for the Greater Vancouver Regional District. Eight people also said that they felt angry that the panel's recommendations were not binding (hence leaving decision making in traditional hands). Only one individual, the community participant who felt the participants had been organized and restricted, commented directly that he thought participants had been used to legitimize the process. Although several others stated that they believed that the decision to build the runway had already been made before the public hearings, they did not comment that they felt used and that their time and energy was being wasted.

This analysis does not attempt to determine whether paternalist activities did or did not occur within the process. Instead, it explores whether such a theory can be used to explain how participants' conceptions of effective participation have been shaped. The two individuals who did indicate that paternalist activities occurred within EARP selected consultation/partnership and consultation respectively as being conducive to effective participation, thus suggesting that their conceptions of effective participation
were not strongly influenced by their perceptions of paternalism within EARP. With respect to those who preferred consultation but did not perceive any paternalist activities directly, it is difficult to determine whether their views had been manipulated or not. The importance attached to paternalism as an explanation for participants' views of effective participation is very much related to the interpreter's attitude towards, and perceptions of, government and society.

Thirdly, it can be argued that given some degree of participation, people tend to feel part of the process and grateful to have been allowed to participate. By participating they have effectively bought into the consultative model of decision making and hence feel the need less strongly to demand greater influence over the decision making process. Three people (one NIMBY, one community, and one professional participant) stated that they were pleased to be able to participate; one participant commented that she was happy to have been allowed to express her views, irrespective of whether she was listened to or not! Two of these three selected consultation as preferable and one selected partnership. Because only three people made such comments, and one of these three actually selected partnership as being conducive to effective participation, there is only slim evidence for this assertion.

Finally, since the study population is unrepresentative of the general public, this may result in a biased distribution of definitions of effective participation when compared to responses given by the general public as a whole. The sample characteristics may affect conceptions of effective participation in two ways.

(1) Conceptions of effective participation may depend upon the particular experience of participation that the interviewed individuals have when compared to the participatory experiences of members of the general population. It is not surprising that the results of this study are concentrated around the consultation option, towards the middle of the
spectrum, given that each individual has effectively sanctioned the consultative process by partaking in it. In contrast, members of the general public are likely to have attitudes which will range from one extreme of the spectrum to the other. Some may not participate in a consultative process because they feel that it is inadequate and uses participants to legitimize government decisions. Thus, they would tend to prefer the direct control end of the spectrum. On the other hand, Almond and Verba (1989, 132) have recorded individuals in a survey (albeit conducted in 1959-60) who responded that people should leave decision making up to the elected representatives. Perhaps they felt that representative democracy has always served them well, or they did not have time to participate further.

The relative proportion of the general public who would prefer one option over another is unknown. From the results of this analysis it would seem likely that most of the general public would not be keen on either extreme of the participatory spectrum, be it direct democracy or pure representative democracy. This is because not many people are likely to have been involved in consensus decision making, and responses reveal an apparent suspicion of more radical alternatives expressed by those with no direct experience of them (section 6.1.2). In addition, it is now recognized that there is widespread discontent with the decisions that elected representatives have made, thus suggesting a lack of faith in representative democracy. A recent example of this is the 1992 Canadian constitutional referendum where politicians of every party at every level of government called for Canadians to accept the new constitution. One explanation for the resounding 'no' vote has been that the public have felt an increased disillusionment with elected officials (Smith, 1992).

(2) The sample population has distinct characteristics which render it unrepresentative of the general population. Checkoway (1981, 568-9) commented that frequently those who attend hearings are not representative of their area population and that hearings are
often dominated by those whose economic stake ensures that participation is worthwhile. He observed that minority citizens and those on low incomes are less likely to participate in public hearings. In addition, Hague and Harrop (1987, 91) noted that:

Political participation is concentrated among well-educated, middle-class, middle-aged men.

They attribute this to the fact that participation reflects existing inequalities in society. Well educated, middle-class, middle-aged men have greater resources which enable them to participate in environmental decision making and they tend to have more at stake (Checkoway 1981, 91-92; Clarke and Little 1990, 231).

The accuracy of these comments is reflected by the makeup of the participants in the airport inquiry. The vast majority of the participants in the airport process whether in favour of, neutral, or against the runway were well educated, white middle class people, and the majority (74%) were male. The professional participants tended to be representatives from business and governmental organizations. Ideological, community and NIMBY participants tended to also have professional occupations, being teachers, lawyers, engineers, and property developers. In addition, there were some full-time environmentalists and many retirees.

Traditionally, the professional, white, male, middle class sector of society has done very well under our current socio-economic-political system and such individuals have a large stake in the existing political system (Hague and Harrop 1987, 92). Selecting the consultation option within environmental decision making is fairly congruent with selecting the status quo. More radical participatory activity may result in them having to cede power to other interest groups within society who are at present comparatively powerless. Even those who effectively 'lost' their anti-runway campaign would perhaps lose more than the runway debate if they transferred their allegiances to direct forms of decision making.
In contrast, sectors of society who have traditionally fared badly under representative decision making may be more likely to prefer participation under direct democracy. Examples of such sectors are any minority ethnic, social, environmental, economic, or political groups, especially if they are geographically dispersed and there is no form of proportional representation. In addition, sectors of society which traditionally have a low voter turnout rate, for example people who live beyond the 'Culture of Contentment' as members of the underclass (Galbraith, 1992), will also be under represented in a system of representative democracy. Such sectors of society may consider that they have nothing to lose and everything to gain by a change in decision making strategy. On the other hand, the frequently noted feelings of widespread alienation and distrust held by both those of lower socioeconomic status and those of lower education (Milbrath and Goel 1977, 65) may mean that they would totally reject direct decision making.

5.3 Conclusions

This chapter has elicited the preferred definitions of effective participation of the sampled participants in the Vancouver Airport EARP. From this discussion, it has been observed that the sample has selected consultation or the consultation/partnership option as being conducive to effective participation. These results have consequently been less radical and wide ranging than those provided by the academic literature. It is suggested that participants did not select informative or representative decision making as preferable because they had effectively sanctioned consultative decision making by partaking within it. In addition, four possible reasons have been suggested as to why the interviewed participants tended to select consultation or consultation/partnership in preference to direct decision making options. The first reason, that EARP was so good that individuals were content with that form of decision making, does not provide a plausible explanation why participants preferred consultation. Similarly, the suggestion
that participants were so grateful that they had been able to participate that they did not feel the need to demand more radical forms of decision making is also rejected. The importance attached to a theory of paternalism for explaining perceptions of effective participation depends upon the interpreter's opinion of government attitudes towards public participation. Finally, it is concluded that the specific sample of individuals who were interviewed was a major explanatory factor as to why their conceptions of effective participation centred around consultation. It seems likely that both the sociological makeup of these individuals and their specific participatory experience have shaped their views.

Having looked at the general pattern of participant conceptions of effective participation in this chapter, I now turn to look in more detail at intra-sample variations in perceptions of effective participation in Chapter 6.
Chapter 6

EXPLAINING THE VARYING CONCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OF THOSE INTERVIEWED

In Chapter 5, it was discussed how conceptions of effective participation could be analyzed on four different levels. The first two levels were concerned with overall trends in participant responses, and have been discussed. The third and fourth level will be analyzed in this chapter. These involve stepping behind the mask of the aggregate to investigate the varying responses within the interview sample. The third level involves disaggregating the results according to various parameters to identify patterns in the responses. Some of these parameters have been developed from the literature (2.6.1). The relevant literature is sparse, however, and the interviews themselves yield many insights concerning conceptions of effective participation that have not been previously identified in the literature. In addition, the framework conceptualizing participants developed in Chapter 4 will be used as an analytical tool for understanding conceptions of effective participation.

The fourth level will explore whether an individual's environmental attitude influences his/her view of effective participation, as discussed in section 2.6.2. It is, however, crucial to note that at this level of analysis there are many irresolvable difficulties and only tentative insights are possible.

6.1 Reasons for Participation, Participatory Experience, Gender and Definitions of Effective Participation

It is instructive to consider in more detail who gave particular responses within the interview sample. This involves disaggregating the results in order to attempt to
understand some of the motivations behind preferred definitions of effective participation.

Relevant literature is sparse and to a great extent this analysis has had to rely upon studying the results themselves for evident trends. With such a sparse theoretical grounding, observations can only be tentative. Five variables are examined here. Two are identified from the literature; degree of involvement within the process and perceptions of success or failure. Three others have emerged from the results themselves: experience of more radical forms of decision making, motivation for participation and gender.

Each of these five possible explanations for varying conceptions of effective participation embody an assumption concerning the appropriate time scale for shaping an individual's conception of effective participation. It could be argued that conceptions of effective public participation are formulated over the long term, and will remain fairly consistent over time. On the other hand, it could also be argued that perceptions of effective public participation are dependent upon an individual's particular experience of participation, and will thereby be altered every time (s)he participates in a decision making process. Degree of involvement in the process, experience of more radical forms of decision making, and perceptions of success or failure are classed as short term, experiential influences upon conceptions of effective public participation. In contrast, motivation for participation, and gender will be dealt with as more permanent long-term factors influencing an individual's selected definition of effective public participation.
6.1.1 Degree of Involvement in Participatory Activity and Definitions of Effective Participation

As discussed in section 2.6.1, the literature suggests that different degrees of participatory activity are likely to increase a participant's feeling of the legitimacy of the process, and hence increase the likelihood of his/her selecting consultation. Finkel (1985, 909) implied that those who participated only modestly within a process may consider consultation to be conducive to effective participation, whereas those very involved in participation would select more radical options.

From the evidence, it seems that those who wrote letters or just attended the hearings were more radical in their definitions of effective participation than those who were more involved (figure 6.1). Such evidence refutes Finkel's assertion that the more involved within a process an individual is, the less favourable opinion he/she is likely to have of it (figure 6.2). Instead it seems likely that those more highly involved within the process were so because they had effectively 'bought into' the process more extensively, and hence less likely to dismiss it than more marginally involved participants.
**Figure 6.1**

**Definitions of Effective Public Participation and Degree of Involvement in Participatory Activity**
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>66%</th>
<th>High [27]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low [9]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'High' refers to those whose involvement within the process was high. These individuals participated either by giving a presentation, attending the workshop or by writing two or more letters.

'Low' refers to those whose involvement within the process was low. These participants either wrote one letter to the panel concerning the runway, or attended the public hearings without speaking.

Numbers Refer to the Percentage of Respondents who Preferred that Level of Participation.

Bracketed Numbers Refer to Sample Size.
Figure 6.2

**Definition of Effective Participation and Degree of Involvement in Participatory Activity: A Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Participation</th>
<th>Definition of Effective Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Control</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High*
- Finkel
- Evidence

*Low*
- Evidence
- Finkel

'Evidence' Refers to the Evidence in this Study

6.1.2 Experience of Direct Democracy and Definitions of Effective Participation

It has been postulated that conceptions of effective participation may depend upon whether an individual had previously experienced more radical forms of decision making. It seemed unlikely that someone would choose direct democracy as being conducive to effective participation if they could not conceptualize its operation. Accordingly, each interviewee was asked if (s)he had been involved in any other participatory processes and heard of, or had been involved in, consensus decision making\(^1\) (table 6.1).

\(^1\) This question was asked to determine whether an individual's preferred definition of effective participation is bounded by his/her conceptualization (or lack of conceptualization) of forms of direct decision making. Consensus decision making is used as an example because it is probably the most common mechanism used under partnership or citizen control.
Table 6.1

Experience of Consensus Decision Making
and Definition of Effective Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Effective Participation</th>
<th>Comments Concerning Consensus Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4 [31%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation /Partnership</td>
<td>6 [46%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>2 [15%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership /Citizen Control</td>
<td>1 [8%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 [100%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirteen participants (4 professional, 4 community, and 5 ideological participants) responded that they had been a part of various consensus decision making processes, which would fall into the partnership or citizen control categories on the spectrum. It was found that these individuals tended to prefer more radical options than the status quo on the power sharing spectrum. They said that they liked consensus decision making because the end result tended to be more acceptable for everyone concerned, and they felt much more listened to than under the EAR process. Yet they were wary to commit themselves completely to direct decision making, commenting that they found consensus decision making frustrating and acrimonious at times and were doubtful that it would work for all decisions. For example, one professional respondent, who had had experience of consensus processes, said:
I guess the main concern I would have for those [consensus decision making processes] is they're often very very time consuming, and that's not to say you don't perhaps come out with a better decision in terms of more buy in and acceptance of the decision by all of the people who have an opportunity for input.

When comparing the EARP with a consensus planning process she had been involved with, an ideological woman commented:

With consensus you don't feel so ignored.... Everyone had to feel that they were heard... it was quite acrimonious at the beginning.

Those who had never encountered consensus decision making tended to like the idea of it, and thought that perhaps it would work. In contrast, those who had heard of consensus decision making, but had never directly experienced it tended to be much more cynical about it, commenting that they thought it to be impractical. These individuals' comments on effective participation are conservative and support their voiced concerns. Thus, those who had never heard of consensus decision making tended to be more radical when selecting their ideal definitions of effective participation than those who had heard of it, but had not experienced it.

The pattern of reaction of respondents both in terms of their comments and their perceptions of effective participation suggests that individuals thought consensus decision making to be a good idea at first. Once they had given it some consideration, but still have not directly experienced it, they seem much more cynical. However, individuals seemed much more positive concerning its viability once they had experienced it. Yet this latter point must not be overemphasized, only 23% of those who had experienced consensus decision making selected it as being conducive to effective participation and no one selected citizen control as being conducive to effective participation.

---

2 Not all participants who had experienced consensus decision making had used it voluntarily; several individuals had had to use the technique in their professional capacities. Therefore, the suggestion that it is only those individuals who are in favour of consensus techniques who would try them in the first place does not hold.
6.1.3 Perceptions of Success or Failure and Definitions of Effective Participation

As was discussed in section 2.6.1, Leighley (1991, 209), Ginsburg (1982, 182) and Madsen (1987, 571) have suggested that those who were successful in the process (i.e. those who wanted the runway to be built) would have faith in the consultation model of decision making, as it worked for them. Thus, they are likely to emphasize it as an ideal decision making model. On the other hand, those who did not want the runway to be built, having been unsuccessful, may have a less favourable opinion of the effectiveness of the consultation model of decision making. They are more likely to support more radical alternatives, perhaps partnership or full citizen control.

It was found that the vast majority (86%) of those in favour of the runway selected the consultation option as being effective (figure 6.3). Those who were against the runway or neutral about its construction tended to be much more radical in their responses (only 39% who were against the runway and 30% of those who were neutral preferred consultation). Thus, as suggested in the literature, those who were in favour of the runway, having been successful within the process, selected consultation.
Figure 6.3

**Definition of Effective Participation**

**And Position in Relation to Runway Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT DEMOCRACY</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C I T</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>R S T H O</td>
<td>A T I O N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L P I N</td>
<td>N N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% 28% 28% 39%</td>
<td>0% 20% 50% 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers Refer to the Percentage of Respondents who Preferred that Level of Participation

Bracketed Numbers Refer to Sample Size
When the sample population was stratified, it was assumed that those who were against the runway would have a stronger perception of failure within the process than those who had been neutral (3.3.2.1). However, during interviewing, it was found that those who were neutral or against the runway seemed to have a similar perception of failure within the process. These observations are borne out by the similar conceptions of effective public participation given by those against and those neutral to the runway. This was because the majority of concerns which were brought to the hearings by neutral people were perceived as not having been addressed by Transport Canada in their 1992 response to the panel’s recommendations. In addition, those against the runway and those who were neutral had much in common; they were composed of individuals of the same participant groups (as can be seen in table 4.1), and had similar motivations for participation.

Thus there does seem to be some relationship between perceptions of success and failure and conceptions of effective public participation. However, the situation is not so clear cut because, as was mentioned in Chapter 4, those in favour of the runway and those neutral or against the runway had very different motivations for participation. Those against or neutral to the runway had motivations to participate which were NIMBY, community or ideological. In contrast, those in favour of the runway comprised the professional participant group.\(^3\) As a result, it is not obvious whether it was participant role or perceptions of success or failure in the process which determined conceptions of effective participation. The non-random nature of the sample and its size precludes any statistical test of this distinction.

\(^3\) As a reminder, NIMBY participants are locally situated individuals who participated for self-interested reasons. Community participants are locally situated and participated for both self-interested and ideological reasons. Ideological stakeholders participated for ideological reasons and comprise both locals and outsiders. Finally professionals participated for self-interested and ideological reasons and are outsiders.
6.1.4 Motivation for Participation and Definitions of Effective Participation

Every participant was asked whether (s)he had participated within any other decision making processes in the past. From responses to this question, it was found that individuals displayed a remarkable consistency in motivation for participation over time. Thus, those who were involved in the airport for NIMBY reasons also assumed that role in other processes in which they had been involved. The same consistency of motivation was identified for those who had been involved for ideological or community reasons. This observation led me to class motivation for participation as a long term impact upon conceptions of effective participation.

Referring to figure 6.4, it can be seen that professionals were the most conservative of the four participant groups in terms of preferred definitions of effective participation. This is not surprising given that on the whole, EARP as a consultative process, served them well. In addition, half of those who participated for NIMBY reasons also preferred consultation despite the results of the EAR process not favouring their views, in the sense that all but one were against the runway. There are two reasons for this apparent paradox as to why NIMBY participants continued to support consultation despite it not serving their interests. Firstly, none of the NIMBY participants had experienced consensus decision making before. As was shown previously, those who had not directly experienced more radical forms of decision making tended to be more suspicious of them than those who had. Second, given the prosperity associated with having a middle class, professional social status in society, they had much at stake within the existing political system.

4 Professional participants were also asked the same question. Because they were being interviewed within a professional context, they tended to respond by indicating other processes in which they had participated in their professional capacity. However, it is also likely that they participated in some processes in a non-professional role. These they did not allude to, hence it is not possible to comment upon their previous participatory activity accurately.
Figure 6.4
A Spectrum of Definitions of Effective Participation
According to Motivation for Participation
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>[17]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% 8% 16% 76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIMBY</th>
<th>[6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% 33% 17% 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>[12]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% 16% 42% 42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideological</th>
<th>[8]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14% 43% 29% 14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers Refer to the Percentage of Respondents who Preferred that Level of Participation
Bracketed Numbers Refer to Sample Size
Those who participated for community and ideological reasons selected more radical definitions of effective participation. This may be due to their direct experience with more radical forms of decision making. They had often encountered consensus decision making, and tended to have a favourable impression of it. Those whose motivation to participate was ideological tended to be more radical than community actors. This may be because ideological participants are likely to be searching for more fundamental social and political change than community actors.

Again, there does seem to be some relationship between motivations for participation and definition of public participation. Professionals tended to be the most conservative, followed by NIMBY participants, and community individuals. Ideological participants tended to be the most radical in their conceptions of effective participation.

### 6.1.5 Gender and Definitions of Effective Participation

Finally, I investigated whether there is a professed difference in views of effective participation along gender lines. Women are severely under-represented as elected officials in government. If it is assumed that women's issues exist, namely that women hold in common certain basic interests which would not be addressed adequately by men, as Kendrigan (1984, 4-7) argues, then the under-representation of women in government correlates with an under-representation of women's interests within representative decision making. It is possible that this under-representation of women's interests within a representative decision making framework would increase the likelihood of women expressing a preference for direct decision making.

---

5 For example, in March 1991, only 37 out of the 266 Canadian federal and provincial cabinet ministers were women (Hessing 1993, 18).

6 Consultation would be included as a representative form of decision making here, because although women, as well as men have a voice, the ultimate decision is made by an elected representative, who is usually male.
Indeed, it was found that men had a much greater preference for consultation, whereas women tended to be more radical in response (table 6.2). However, the interpretation of these results is complicated by the fact that all the interviewed women except one were NIMBY, community and ideological participants, and against or neutral in relation to the runaway. In contrast, half the interviewed men were professional participants. Therefore, it would be necessary to determine differences in responses given by women and men within the same participant group. The focus of this study is not gender, and given the size of the sample, a detailed gender based study is not possible here. However, it would be of interest to conduct research on different factors shaping perceptions of effective participation along gender lines.

### Table 6.2

**Definition of Effective Participation and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Effective Participation</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>19 [64%]</td>
<td>3 [25%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation/Partnership</td>
<td>6 [20%]</td>
<td>5 [42%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>4 [13%]</td>
<td>4 [33%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership/Citizen Control</td>
<td>1 [3%]</td>
<td>0 [0%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 [100%]</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 [100%]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Numbers Correspond to the Number of Interviewees who Selected that Option and the Percentages Correspond to the Percentage of Men and Women who selected that Option.
6.1.6 Summary

In summary, the available evidence suggests that all five factors discussed above do impact upon the participants' conceptions of effective public participation. (1) In terms of the connection between level of participatory activity and perceptions of effective participation, it can be seen that those very involved in the process tended to prefer consultative decision making, whereas those less involved were more radical. These results appear to contradict the literature. It seems likely that those more involved within the process have effectively sanctioned that form of decision making more strongly than those less involved. (2) Experience with more radical forms of decision making seemed to encourage participants to select consultation/partnership or partnership as being conducive to effective participation. In contrast, those who had heard of consensus, but had not experienced it were much more wary than those who had never heard of consensus decision making. (3) With respect to perceptions of success or failure, the results seem to corroborate the literature, namely that perceptions of success within a process reinforce positive opinions of that form of decision making and vice versa. (4) It is not possible to clearly determine from this study, however, whether it was perceptions of success or failure, or motivation for participation which led to varying perceptions of effective participation because those who were successful were professionals and those who were not were NIMBY, community and ideological actors. It does, however seem likely that it was the interplay of both factors which helped shape perceptions of effective participation. (5) There were gender differences in conceptions of effective public participation. Men and women tended to have different motivations for participation, modes of participation, and different experiences of success and failure. In the context of this study, it is difficult to determine the significance of gender roles in shaping these different conceptions of effective participation.
Of the five potentially very useful parameters for evaluating individuals' perceptions of effective public participation, two were identified from the literature. Three more factors have not been previously identified, and are a new contribution to the literature. Although it may be possible to identify the factors shaping an individual's perception of effective participation, the relative importance of each factor is presumably not consistent between individuals. Therefore it is not possible to determine the relative importance of each of these five factors in shaping an individual's preferred definition of effective participation.

6.2 Environmental Attitude and Definitions of Effective Participation

Finally, this thesis explores whether individuals' environmental attitudes (if they have one) shape their conceptions of effective participation within environmental decision making. The questions used to elicit participants' environmental attitude are found in table 6.3. This section summarizes the results from the interviews, and then discusses the evidence for the existence of an 'environmental attitude'. Finally, an attempt is made to relate any environmental attitudes that do emerge to the individual's selected definition of effective participation.

7 It would also be interesting to assess whether there was a link between the writers' definitions of effective participation and their environmental attitude, for example by using the model proposed by Dorcely (1991, 568-70). However, in order to be meaningful, such a study would involve extensive research into each writer's political ideology and their opinions of the relationship between knowledge and action in society. Such research is beyond the scope of this study.
### Table 6.3

**Questions Participants Were Asked in Order to Elicit their Environmental Attitude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q: About 80% of the total amount of primary air pollutants emitted within the G.V.R.D. come from vehicles. What would you advocate that the G.V.R.D. adopt as a long term planning strategy (i.e. over the next 40 years)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Encourage the development of local neighbourhood services, so that people can work and shop there instead of driving either downtown or to shopping malls. This would reduce the smog, but would cost money to relocate shops and services, and the taxpayer would have to foot the bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do nothing. No policy is needed because external forces will ensure that the technology is developed within vehicles to reduce the pollutants they emit. For example, the Americans are continuously developing vehicles which pollute less and these vehicles will gradually percolate into the G.V.R.D. vehicle market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Pass laws to severely restrict vehicles within G.V.R.D. This may involve banning vehicles from regions of downtown, and closing some roads elsewhere to automobiles while improving the transit service and promoting bicycle use. This again would reduce the smog. Costs would be incurred by vehicle drivers who would have to choose between being inconvenienced or using mass transit or bicycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Increase emission standards for vehicles. This could be enforced by an Air Care Programme. This would reduce pollution. Costs of this action would have to be met by vehicle drivers, not all taxpayers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R: Suppose that B.C. Hydro felt that the current electricity generating capacity in B.C. is vastly insufficient to meet future peak demands. What would you recommend they do as a long term planning policy (i.e. over the next 40 years)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Build a large hydro-dam in a Northern region of the province. This plan will, however cause an adverse impact on the local Salmon and Caribou populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Build a series of small scale dams which have less of an adverse impact upon the both the environment and local communities. This would cost about the same as building a large hydro dam. However, it would not provide enough electricity to be able to meet peak demand and people in B.C. would have to put up with the occasional brown-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Build a large hydro-dam in a Northern region of the province and mitigate against adverse effects on the Salmon and Caribou as much as possible. This would cost more than either option a or b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Not build any further dams, but rely instead on public education programs and practical advice as to how to reduce electricity demand. This option would cost nothing to implement, but would mean that from now on everyone would have to cut their demand for electricity dramatically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S: In Northern B.C. there is an isolated community called Smeltertown which has a local smelter. In the last few years it has been noticed that many of the trees and crops within the community have been dying from the sulphur dioxide emitted by the smelter. The local residents and farmers have been complaining bitterly, yet the smelter provides 70% of the jobs within the town. No other settlement is affected by the emitted sulphur dioxide. Which of the following policy alternatives do you think is the preferable long term solution to this dilemma (i.e. over the next 40 years)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Close the smelter down, the cumulative environmental impact is unacceptable. This would mean that 70% of the jobs in the town would be lost and it would be in danger of becoming a 'ghost town'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Impose a pollution tax on the smelter. This will provide an incentive to reduce pollution, to about 40% of what it is now although it would be expensive for the company which owns the smelter and would mean that the smelter would only just be breaking even. The smelter would be in danger of closing if the market price of the metal produced fell significantly in the long run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Rather than imposing a solution on Smeltertown and the smelter, it is better to provide the infrastructure (for example a mediator, funding) so that the people of the town can meet and craft their own solution to the problem. It is their town and they are likely to have a better idea of how they would like their town to be in the future and what price they are willing to pay for a cleaner environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Insist that the smelter use latest technology available in order to reduce future emissions. If this sends the smelter into bankruptcy, then the smelter is obviously not competitive enough and therefore it should close. If, on the other hand, the pollution level is still unacceptable once the technology has been employed, then there is nothing that can be done about the pollution that is being caused.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In total, 32 participants responded to these environmental questions. Because individuals tended to rank policy options similarly, generalizations concerning responses can be made (see appendix 4 for a detailed breakdown of results). For question Q (the air pollution question), the deep environmental option\(^9\) was most preferred (policy option c), and the cornucopian one was least preferred (option b). The self-reliant and the accommodation options were the middle preference and were liked equally (options a and d respectively). For question R (the electricity question), the same pattern was exhibited. Thus, participants tended to rank policy options similarly and consistently between the two questions.

This pattern, however, was not continued for question S (the smelter question). For this question, participants tended to rank accommodation first (option b), the self-reliant option second (c), cornucopian third (d) and finally, the deep environmental alternative least (option a). When answering this question, participants' replies were still relatively uniform, but the pattern of response had altered. Deep environmentalism had changed from being the most popular policy option to the least. The reason for this response was that participants found the deep environmentalist option too harsh in the Smelter question. They were not willing to make such a high trade-off for the environment. This may be because the costs of closing the smelter would be concentrated in one community, which was considered more unacceptable than the costs being spread over a larger population (as the deep environmentalist response to the air pollution and electricity questions advocated). The self-reliant option was less popular than accommodation (previously, they had been of similar popularity) because several interviewees believed that the Smeltetown community would not make an environmentally sound decision if it was up to them to decide, and this was considered unacceptable.

\(^9\) The terms deep environmental, cornucopian, self-reliant and accommodation are defined in table 2.4.
The popularity of the deep environmentalist option for the air pollution and electricity questions and its decided unpopularity for the smelter question suggested that a 'weak' form of deep environmentalism was the preferred option. It is interesting that interviewees responded in this way, given that they were all involved within an environmental impact assessment (EARP) which has an 'accommodation' approach to the environment. Perhaps this apparent inconsistency is due to the gap between verbal and overt behaviour (Mitchell 1989, 103); where individuals say they like 'weak' deep environmentalism, yet they act in an accommodator way. Alternatively, it could be due to the fact that the accommodator method was the only policy alternative available to participants in the Vancouver Airport context.

No individual met the criterion for a consistent environmental attitude for all three questions, and only three people were even close. The reason for this was the popularity of the deep environmental policy option for the air pollution and electricity questions, and the unpopularity of this option for the smelter question. When the third question concerning smelters was removed, 11 out of 32 participants demonstrated a consistent environmental attitude.\textsuperscript{10} All but one respondent demonstrating an 'environmental attitude' had selected deep environmentalism as their first preference.

It was not possible to determine whether these people with 'environmental attitudes' had consistent definitions of effective participation because they had chosen deep environmentalism, the one ideology with no associated views of effective participation. However, their ideal levels of participation ranged from consultation to partnership. It seems unlikely that the deep environmental ideology would hold consultation, or even partnership, as an ideal level of participation as deep environmentalism is a radical

---

\textsuperscript{10} According to the definition given in section 3.4.1.
ideology and consultation and partnership are fairly consistent with the 'status quo.'\textsuperscript{11}

It was suggested in section 2.6.2 that a deep environmentalist would be likely to support either citizen control or authoritarian decision making.

While no link could be discovered between definitions of effective participation and environmental attitude, this study does demonstrate that people can exhibit a consistent 'environmental attitude'. It seems premature to dismiss the suggested link between conceptions of effective participation and environmental attitude on the basis of this study and it may be worthwhile to do further, more in-depth studies to investigate whether such a relationship can be identified.

Finally, this section ends with brief reference to the apparent disparity between some participants' interpretation of environmental ideology and that of O'Riordan. Given the nature of O'Riordan's environmental continuum, it would be expected that individuals would adopt a consistent rank ordering of preferences. For example, if an individual selected cornucopianism first, it would be expected that they would like accommodation better than self-reliance and deep environmentalism. If this is the case, it can be assumed that the axis selected to define the spectrum (here, technocentrism-ecocentrism) is both a useful and meaningful conceptualization. It was found that 29 of the 32 respondents' preferences did seem to coincide with the concept of O'Riordan's spectrum. However, there were three individuals who consistently selected deep environmentalism and accommodation first and second, and cornucopianism and self-reliance third and fourth (figure 6.5).

\textsuperscript{11} Such an assertion is supported by Evernden (1985, 27), who notes that although deep ecologists (a subset of deep environmentalists) are not necessarily revolutionary in the political sense, they do question the fundamental premises of the dominant social paradigm.
I would suggest that these three individuals' views of self-reliance are more consistent with a political right-wing interpretation of it, as opposed to the environmentalist conception which O'Riordan adopts. In terms of the environmentalist position, self-reliance comes hand in hand with social and environmental consciousness. In contrast, the political interpretation of self-reliance stresses entrepreneurship and maximum independence from state control.

6.3 Conclusions

The interplay of the various factors identified, namely degree of participatory involvement, experience of consensus decision making, the perception of success or failure of one's attempts, the motivation for participation, and gender are important factors determining an individual's definition of effective participation. The identification of the influence of these five factors has resulted in a new contribution to the literature. Three new factors, namely experience of consensus, motivation for
participation, and gender, have been identified here as contributing to participants' conceptions of effective participation. In addition, the other two that had been identified in the literature have been tested in this study. While these results upheld the theory concerning the influence of perceptions of success and failure, they were in contradiction to the literature concerning degree of participation and conceptions of effective participation.

Finally, I investigated whether there was an obvious link between perceptions of effective participation and environmental attitudes. Although it was demonstrated that some people did have an environmental attitude, no link with a definition of effective participation could be established. The reason for this was that virtually all participants who had a consistent environmental attitude had one which was consistent with weak deep environmentalism. As discussed in Chapter 2, it was not possible to identify the likely definition of effective participation which would be given by deep environmentalists.

It has not been the intention of this chapter to state categorically the influences upon an individual's perceptions of effective participation. Given the complexity of human perceptions and opinions, this would have resulted in a misrepresentation of the interviewees. Instead, the analysis has attempted to examine specific sociological factors which influence individuals' conceptions of effective participation. While each level of analysis potentially develops further understanding, simultaneously, conclusions become more speculative.

The next chapter, Chapter 7 will conclude this study by summing up the main findings of this thesis, and presenting some of my own opinions and reflections both on EARP and effective participation.
Chapter 7

SUMMARY AND REFLECTIONS

Reports that public alienation is now at crisis proportions may finally bring the urgency of serious political reform to the political forefront, but I wouldn't hold my breath. What's in it for politicians? Reform entails a loss of power which, in the case of a majority government, is almost dictatorial. And politics is the business of accumulating, not releasing, power.

Letter to the editor,
The Globe and Mail,
July 1st, 1993

This study will conclude by presenting a brief summary of the main findings of this work, and will end with a section concerning my opinions of EARP and effective participation.

7.1 Summary

In order to achieve my three thesis objectives, I developed three conceptual frameworks which had not been previously identified in the literature. Firstly, in Chapter 2, I developed a framework for evaluating effectiveness of participation. This involved conceptualizing participation as consisting of a primary dimension (the degree of power sharing between elected officials and members of the general public) and five secondary parameters.\(^1\) In order to define effective participation, it is necessary to first identify the 'ideal' location\(^2\) on the power sharing dimension. Once this had been done, the further five parameters could be analyzed.

Secondly, in Chapter 4, I developed a classification of the participants in the Vancouver Airport EARP. Participants were classed as adopting NIMBY, community,

---

\(^1\) These five parameters are 'who' is permitted to participate, access to resources, the participatory mechanism, the scope of the participatory process, and stage in the process in which participation is solicited.

\(^2\) Assuming that the definition of effective participation is derived in a democratic fashion, then the 'ideal' level of participation is that which is in accordance with the wishes of a population.
ideological or professional roles within the process. This framework portrayed the participants within the EARP, and it may provide a framework for comprehending the roles adopted by participants within other environmental decision making processes. It is interesting to note that this conceptualization of the participants was more useful than dividing participants solely according to whether they were in favour of, neutral in relation to, or against the runway. This was because those who were neutral and against the runway had much in common as was noted in 6.1.3. This rendered any distinction between them arbitrary. This framework had an additional advantage over the one that classified participants according to whether they were in favour of, neutral, or against the runway. In Chapter 5, I identified a significant consistency of motivation for participation of individuals over time. This suggested that the characterization was both accurate and useful in terms of understanding why participants become involved in environmental decision making processes, and the roles they adopt in them. Such an understanding is useful in tailoring participatory processes to participants' needs and for reaching decisions which satisfy everyone.

Finally, in Chapters 5 and 6, I explored why individuals selected the definition of effective participation that they did. This involved studying the issue at different levels. Firstly, I attempted to understand perceptions of effective participation at the aggregate level, determining why the general pattern of responses was as given. Secondly, I attempted to disaggregate the responses in order to understand the types of factors which may have induced some participants to respond differently from others. Finally, I attempted to establish whether there was any link between an individual's preferred definition of effective participation and her/his environmental attitude. Such a framework for analysis provided a multi-layered understanding of the problem. Each layer revealed additional information and understanding which was not obtainable from the layer before. However, the results from each layer, although leading to further
insight, necessarily became more tentative. It is important to use such a framework for analysis, because discussion which remains at a superficial level can lead to a lack of overall understanding, and even misinterpretation of participant opinions.

Having discussed the analytical frameworks which were developed in this study to achieve my objectives, I will now discuss the major conclusions reached. My first objective was to reach a democratic definition of effective public participation in terms of power sharing for the participants interviewed. Just over half the participants selected the 'status quo' (consultation), as being conducive to effective participation. Assuming a majoritarian democracy, the participants' democratic definition of effective participation was 'consultation'. Consultation occurs 'when an individual or organization consults with other individuals and organizations before making the trade-offs and imposing the decision' (Dorcey and Riek, 1987, 8). The remaining participants selected more radical forms of participation as being effective, although citizen control was not selected by anyone. Similarly, no one thought that informative or representative participation would be conducive to effective participation. Such results contrast with the definitions of effective participation given by academics (figure 2.3).

The second thesis objective was an attempt to understand why participants held their stated views. In general terms, it seems likely that specific sociological characteristics which nearly all the participants had in common (being white, middle class, well educated, professional individuals), were a large determinant of the overall pattern of responses. In terms of response variation within the sample, five factors were identified which seem to have some influence upon conceptions of effective public participation. These were the degree of involvement in participatory activity, experience with consensus decision making, perceptions of success or failure in the process, motivation for participation, and gender. O'Riordan's implication that there could be a link
between an individual's ideal definition of effective participation and her/his environmental attitude was also investigated. It was found that eleven of the 32 participants displayed a consistent environmental attitude for the air pollution and electricity questions and ten of these eleven favoured a 'weak' deep environmental approach to environmental issues. No link between environmental attitudes and conceptions of effective participation could be established in this study. I would not suggest, however, that this is because no link exists in reality. Further research which focuses in more depth on environmental attitudes and conceptions of effective participation could be done to investigate this potential linkage.

Finally, the third objective was to establish participants' views of effective participation in practice. This involved identifying five parameters for evaluating participation and deducing a continuum for each criterion (section 2.5). By locating EARP on the continua and evaluating participants' views of EARP, I was able to suggest how participants perceived effective participation in practice. It was found that one-third of the participants were content with EARP, and felt that no alterations to the process were required. They considered it to be conducive to effective participation. Of those that did criticize EARP, it was found that NIMBY, community and ideological participants thought the process needed to be broader and less restrictive if it was to be effective. In contrast, professional participants who criticized EARP tended to feel that if the process had been less open and narrower in scope, then it would have been more conducive to effective participation.

Thus, for the interview sample, consultation was the preferred option in terms of power sharing. Some participants did have criticisms concerning EARP; however, they selected consultation as an ideal form of decision making. Such comments suggest that although consultation is deemed 'ideal' in theory, there were various constraints within EARP which precluded realization of effective participation in practice. Many
criticisms of EARP were fairly minor, suggesting that for many participants, effective participation could be reached both in theory and in practice if EARP were reformed in some way.

It is, however, important to situate these results. Although 79% of the interviewed participants were content with consultation or consultation/partnership and were to a large extent happy with EARP, there is no reason to be complacent and assume that status quo decision making is conducive to effective public participation. The interviewed sample represented a distinct sector of society, being largely white, middle-aged, middle-class, professional people. As I have argued in section 5.2, this sector of society have fared very well under representative decision making. It is not surprising they support a status quo which serves them so well. I would suggest that in contrast, other sectors of society who have been poorly represented under representative decision making would prefer partnership or citizen control decision making. In addition, it is interesting to note that those who had been most successful in the process (professional individuals) made comments concerning EARP which suggested that they bought into the concepts of pluralism more than those who had been unsuccessful in the process. For example, those who had been successful in the process made no comments concerning uneven access to the process due to an imbalance resource distribution. In contrast, those who had been unsuccessful in the process were concerned to make resource access more even. Yet, nearly everyone interviewed could be classed as being successful within our representative decision making system as a whole. Other sectors of society, who are ill-served under the pluralist decision making model, may therefore be regarded as being 'unsuccessful' within representative decision making as a whole. As a result, therefore, these people are most likely to reject the pluralist model of decision making and may be more radical in their definitions of effective participation with respect to the five parameters (they are more likely to select the left hand extreme
of each of the five continua) than the interviewed sample. Therefore, although I am unable to extrapolate my results to produce a definition of effective participation for the general public, such a definition is likely to be more radical than those given by participants in the process; both in terms of power sharing, and in terms of the five parameters designed to counter the assumptions of the pluralist model. Perhaps the more radical definitions of effective participation given by academics reflects the fact that their definitions of effective participation were produced in order to empower those who currently have no voice in decision making.

7.2 Reflections

Having heard participants' and the panel's views of the Vancouver Airport EARP, I would like to present my opinions concerning the usefulness of this process as a decision making model. The process seemed to be very useful for discussing and considering mitigation measures. However, the process was too narrow and constrained to allow for any genuine discussion of the need for the runway and project alternatives. This was because the public was only allowed to participate late in the process, and the scope was not broad enough, as discussed in section 4.3. From the studies I have carried out, it is my opinion that the hearings were not set up simply to legitimize the decision to build the runway. I was convinced that the panel did listen to the participants and take their views into consideration. The process was seriously flawed, however, because the panel's recommendations were not binding. The process seems to have been fairly successful in the sense that one-third of the participants thought it a good process and could think of no ways to improve upon it. In addition, over half those interviewed selected consultation as being conducive to effective participation. Such a response must, at least to some extent, reflect upon their experiences within EARP.
Having obtained the definitions of effective public participation given by the interviewees, it is only fair that I give my personal definition. With respect to power sharing, I feel partnership to be conducive to effective public participation because it allows the public direct access to decision making whilst the elected representative is still there to insure that the process considers non-participants. At the partnership location on the spectrum, I feel it is important that we are at the far left on each of the five continua designed to counter the assumptions of the pluralist model. As has been mentioned (section 2.5), the most desirable location on each of the five continua (associated with the five parameters) will vary with the degree of power sharing. It is my opinion that the more power sharing that occurs, the more important it is that we move to the left on each of the five continua. When the public have very little input into decision making, the benefits of a broad scope, equal access to resources etc may not merit the cost. However, the more power sharing there is between the public and elected officials, the more important it is that we reach the far left on each of the continua since the vesting of real power in the public will emphasize the unfairness of resource inequity.

The contrast in definitions of effective public participation between academics and the sampled population suggests that it is important that academics turn to the public more frequently in order to ascertain their views of effective participation. In a democracy, where everyone’s views should be equally valid, it is important to canvass perceptions of effective participation in environmental decision making held by non-academics. In particular, having ascertained the views of some participants in the Vancouver Airport EARP in this study (people who have traditionally fared very well within our pluralist society) it is now important that academics begin to listen to the voices of those who are traditionally unheard in society, namely those who have fared badly under representative democracy. It may be argued that the definitions of effective
participation produced by academics were designed to reflect the views of the powerless in society. However, from a democratic standpoint it can be argued that academics must canvass opinions rather than operate as isolated experts writing from their ivory towers.

Effective public participation in terms of the degree of power sharing between elected officials and the general public has been viewed in this discussion as a static phenomenon, to be located at one point upon the spectrum. However, this is not the case. Demands to participate in environmental decision making have evolved over time (section 2.2); it is likely that conceptions of effective public participation will also change. So, do these results represent a snapshot in time, as peoples' conceptions of effective participation are moving along the spectrum towards direct democracy? Have we already travelled as far along the spectrum as is perceived to be desirable?

Today there are several impending environmental crises which have begun to impinge more tangibly upon the general population (for example, the closure of the Canadian East Coast Cod Fisheries). Governments are unable to fully alleviate such problems, and this tends to result in an increasing discontent with, and mistrust of, government. Such perceptions of government may result in increased demands to participate directly in environmental decision making.

Alternatively, there may be limits to the energies that people are prepared to devote to participation. For example, a government employee whom I interviewed who was involved in another consultative process said that participants have been repeatedly coming up to him saying: "When are you going to make a decision? After all, you are the decision makers, and we feel that we have now been consulted too much!"

I cannot determine the direction in which society will be moving in the future. However, both the debate during the Canadian constitutional referendum of 1992
concerning the legitimacy of representation,\(^3\) and the fact that most people I interviewed did not regard the question concerning how power should be allocated within environmental decision making as being invalid or unnecessary,\(^4\) suggest that questions about the level of effective participation in terms of power sharing will move more frequently toward the forefront of the political arena.

\(^3\) Discussed in section 5.2.
\(^4\) Discussed in Chapter 5.
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APPENDIX 1

Interview Questions

A: Name:

B: How did you participate in the Vancouver Airport review?

C: Did you participate in the Vancouver Airport review process on behalf of any organization or were you presenting your own personal views?

D: If you were participating on behalf of an organization, would you say that the views presented tended to be your own opinions or were they ideas generated by the group as a whole?

E: Why are you interested in the airport runway extension?

F: What were your opinions of the participation programme?

G: How would you alter this process if you were able to?

H: Apart from the airport public hearings do you have any other experience with public participation programmes? (whether environmental, social, economic or political).

J: What has been your general impression of these?

K: Have you heard of or experienced consensus decision making?\(^1\)

L: What are your impressions of it?

\(^1\) I explained the meaning of this term to participants who were not familiar with it.
M: With regard to the Vancouver airport public process which one of the following options do you agree with the most strongly? (these may seem to be imperfect options and if you feel you fall in between two categories, let me know)2.

a) The elected representative should make decisions without consulting the public.

b) The elected decision makers should consult the public only when they require information from the public. Otherwise, the decision makers should make the decision themselves.

c) When a decision concerning the environment is to be made, the public should always be consulted, but an elected decision maker should make the final decision and should be responsible for the consequences of that decision.

d) The public and the elected decision maker should share the decision making power.

e) The public should reach decisions amongst themselves and then the elected decision maker should be required to implement the decision.

Which one do you disagree with the most strongly?

Do you have any additional comments?

N: When voting in a provincial election, what priority do you give environmental issues when you consider them alongside other issues such as jobs, crime, education, national debt, taxation and medicare funding?

a) Very Low

b) Low

c) Medium

d) High

e) Top Priority

Do you have any additional comments?

O: Has this priority you attach to environmental issues remained the same over time, or do you feel you attach more or less weight to environmental issues today?

P: If the response is yes the environment has changed as a priority, then; Is it a greater or less priority now? When did this change occur? Why did it occur?

2 This question was copied onto a card, so that the respondent could read it before responding.
In the questions below, I am interested in hearing about your preferred way of tackling various environmental issues.

Q: Please rank the following options from 1 to 4 where:

1 is the option you tend to agree with most,
2 is your second preference,
3 is your third preference and
4 is your least preferred option.

We can discuss any comments or reservations you hold afterwards.

About 80% of the total amount of primary air pollutants emitted within the Greater Vancouver Regional District (G.V.R.D.) come from vehicles. What would you advocate that the G.V.R.D. adopt as a long term planning strategy (i.e. over the next 40 years)?

a) Encourage the development of local neighbourhood services, so that people can work and shop there instead of driving either downtown or to shopping malls. This would reduce the smog, but would cost money to relocate shops and services, and the taxpayer would have to foot the bill.

b) Do nothing. No policy is needed because external forces will ensure that the technology is developed within vehicles to reduce the pollutants they emit. For example, the Americans are continuously developing vehicles which pollute less and these vehicles will gradually percolate into the G.V.R.D. vehicle market.

c) Pass laws to severely restrict vehicles within G.V.R.D. This may involve banning vehicles from regions of downtown, and closing some roads elsewhere to automobiles while improving the transit service and promoting bicycle use. This again would reduce the smog. Costs would be incurred by vehicle drivers who would have to choose between being inconvenienced or using mass transit or bicycle.

d) Increase emission standards for vehicles. This could be enforced by an Air Care Programme. This would reduce pollution. Costs of this action would have to be met by vehicle drivers, not all taxpayers.

Do you have any comments or reservations?

---

3 Questions P, Q, and R are also copied onto a card for the respondent to read.
R: Again, please rank the following options from 1 to 4 where

1 is the recommendation you agree with most,
2 is your second choice recommendation,
3 is your third choice recommendation and
4 is your least favorite recommendation.

Again, we can discuss any comments or reservations you have afterwards.

Suppose that B.C. Hydro felt that the current electricity generating capacity in B.C. is vastly insufficient to meet future peak demands. What would you recommend they do as a long term planning policy (i.e. over the next 40 years)?

a) Build a large hydro-dam in a Northern region of the province. This plan will, however cause an adverse impact on the local Salmon and Caribou populations.

b) Build a series of small scale dams which have less of an adverse impact upon the both the environment and local communities. This would cost about the same as building a large hydro dam. However, it would not provide enough electricity to be able to meet peak demand and people in B.C. would have to put up with the occasional brown-out.

c) Build a large hydro-dam in a Northern region of the province and mitigate against adverse effects on the Salmon and Caribou as much as possible. This would cost more than either option a or b.

d) Not build any further dams, but rely instead on public education programs and practical advice as to how to reduce electricity demand. This option would cost nothing to implement, but would mean that from now on everyone would have to cut their demand for electricity dramatically.

Any comments or reservations?
S: Again, please rank the following options from 1 to 4 where

1 is the policy option you tend to agree with most,
2 is your second option,
3 is your third choice and
4 is your least favorite option.

In Northern B.C. there is an isolated community called Smeltertown which has a local smelter. In the last few years it has been noticed that many of the trees and crops within the community have been dying from the sulphur dioxide emitted by the smelter. The local residents and farmers have been complaining bitterly, yet the smelter provides 70% of the jobs within the town. No other settlement is affected by the emitted sulphur dioxide. Which of the following policy alternatives do you think is the preferable long term solution to this dilemma (i.e. over the next 40 years)?

a) Close the smelter down, the cumulative environmental impact is unacceptable. This would mean that 70% of the jobs in the town would be lost and it would be in danger of becoming a 'ghost town'.

b) Impose a pollution tax on the smelter. This will provide an incentive to reduce pollution, to about 40% of what it is now although it would be expensive for the company which owns the smelter and would mean that the smelter would only just be breaking even. The smelter would be in danger of closing if the market price of the metal produced fell significantly in the long run.

c) Rather than imposing a solution on Smeltertown and the smelter, it is better to provide the infrastructure (for example a mediator, funding) so that the people of the town can meet and craft their own solution to the problem. It is their town and they are likely to have a better idea of how they would like their town to be in the future and what price they are willing to pay for a cleaner environment.

d) Insist that the smelter use latest technology available in order to reduce future emissions. If this sends the smelter into bankruptcy, then the smelter is obviously not competitive enough and therefore it should close. If, on the other hand, the pollution level is still unacceptable once the technology has been employed, then there is nothing that can be done about the pollution that is being caused.

Do you have any comments or reservations?
Appendix 2
Participants' Opinions of EARP

Professional Participants
* EARP was an excellent process. Very comprehensive, fair, meticulous and well done
* The process was fine
* Too long, time consuming and expensive for the tax payer
* I was impressed, it was thorough, people had time to speak although speaking was a bit nerve racking
* A very good process
* It was good but very structured. The public were organized and restricted
* The process was fundamentally flawed. The panel bent over backwards to give equal time and equal voice to anyone, whatever their view. So if there is one person who represents Friends of the Longhorn Sheep then they get equal time compared with a Mayor that represents fifty municipalities across the province. So they built a whole lot of recommendations into it trying to appease all the groups which appeared before them, balancing all the points of view. You ended up with some curious recommendations
* It was a good process
* Knowing the result, I think it worked very well
* The hearings were good although I didn’t feel my concerns were addressed
* The only difficulty with the process is that the Minister of Transport has a say about whether the panel’s recommendations should be adopted. I think the Minister of Environment alone should decide
* Process seemed good
* We got adequate information and everyone was able to speak
* Hearings were fair and fine

NIMBY Participants
* The process is unfair. Transport Canada had far more resources than us. We were exhausted. Transport Canada could keep bringing in paid fresh blood when someone got tired
* Doing a presentation was fairly intimidating and the schedule of the hearings was ambitious and hearings went late into the night. I also got the impression that this giant machine represented by Transport Canada was ‘Goliath’ and those against it were ‘David’ almost to a point of it being overwhelming
* It was OK, but the decision had already been made before we started
* Transport Canada ignored most of the panel’s recommendations and this was the ultimate outrage and rendered the process a complete farce
* The biggest problem with the process is that the recommendations of the panel aren’t binding. Also the idea of giving protest groups money to protest what you’re doing, I don’t know, somehow doesn’t seem right, it doesn’t seem fair. To what extent would you want to go to make it more difficult? These guys [Transport Canada] went through a lot of effort to get this thing
* Most of the local residents had given up fighting years ago. They had had enough. Their attitude seemed to be ‘well build the damn thing if you’re going to’

Community Participants
* I realized after a while and this impression just strengthened until the end that we were being co-opted. They wanted to give an illusion of a public process, of getting the public involved, but in fact it was always carefully managed, they were never listening. We were just tokenism, it was a way of saying look, we did include the public and yet this is what the panel came up with. I used to speak to people who I knew were sympathetic to the community forum and opposed to the runway and begged them to turn out. Most simply told me that the decision had already been taken and to forget it.
* No complaints, except that the panel’s recommendations don’t have to be implemented
* I felt the decision had already been made
* It was fine except that Transport Canada does not have to follow the panel’s recommendations
* The process was good.
* The process was a way to keep people quiet.
* The decision to build had already been made
* The government had already made up their mind to build the runway anyway and it was an empty process to keep people quiet
* I thought the hearings themselves were fine. I was impressed with the panel and the process overall

Ideological Participants
* One has the feeling that it was pretty much staked against any opposition anyway. Sure, give people a chance to make some objections.
* As a public process it was well enough conducted, but the decisions of the panel did not seem to be enforceable
* The process was OK
* Obviously it is good to encourage public participation, but I really feel that they took down what everyone said, produced a very nice booklet and then went off and did jolly well what they liked to do. They ignored public opinion
* The process was good and the panel came up with some good recommendations. The only problem was that the process wasn’t binding.
* There is no requirement for the recommendations to be binding
* The public hearings were intimidating and there was no one to one contact with the panel
* There are several weaknesses of the process. The panel’s recommendations are not binding. In addition the hearings were held in the week, making it hard for working people to attend and there was resource inequity.
Appendix 3

Participants' Opinions Concerning Improvement of EARP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Participants</th>
<th>NIMBY Participants</th>
<th>Community Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* It could not be improved</td>
<td>* You need better funding for the opposition to the project</td>
<td>* The process could be tinkered with in small ways, in particular it should have been opened up to the general public much earlier. But, the trouble is that the process itself is part of a much larger system, with a lot of momentum and with all the economic forces in the community in support of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I would not change it</td>
<td>* Time the process better so that people can speak at a decent hour of the day</td>
<td>* Make the panel's report final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I would keep the process the same</td>
<td>* Well, you would have to start by shredding the whole government and getting rid of half the bureaucracy in an effort to respond to people</td>
<td>* There should be a more basic discussion concerning the need of the runway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Keep the Minister of Transport out of the final decision</td>
<td>* I don’t think you could improve on the process, it was a very good one</td>
<td>* Perhaps adaptive management is a better approach to such issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I think a much better process is one that doesn’t become nearly as public. It still provides an opportunity for all the views to be heard, but in a much more professional and thoughtful way</td>
<td>* The panel’s recommendations should be accepted, not altered by Transport Canada</td>
<td>* Make the panel's recommendations legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I cannot think of a way to improve it</td>
<td>* I don’t think you could improve on the process, it was a very good one</td>
<td>* I do not see how the process could be improved as they had made up their mind to build the runway anyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I would tell the panel to take more of the general public’s views into account and less the views of special interest groups</td>
<td>* I would tell the panel to take more of the general public’s views into account and less the views of special interest groups</td>
<td>* I cannot think of a way to improve the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* No, I would not improve upon it</td>
<td>* I would like to see a two stage process. One stage you deal with all the technical operational arguments. So if you get approved technically, you can go to an environmental panel in terms of your mitigation</td>
<td>* The panel’s recommendations must be binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Its easier to talk from the outside than from the inside. The federal government is faced by many motives and constraints, so it is hard to comment, not being in the federal government</td>
<td>* I would like to see a two stage process. One stage you deal with all the technical operational arguments. So if you get approved technically, you can go to an environmental panel in terms of your mitigation</td>
<td>* Make the panel’s recommendations binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I would not change the process</td>
<td>* I would not change the process</td>
<td>* The process does not need changing as such, but the panel’s recommendations must be binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anyone that had any alternatives. What I think would be great is if they had a relatively short process of honestly looking at alternative schemes.</td>
<td>* I cannot think of a way to improve the process</td>
<td>* I feel that if the process had started by looking for more creative solutions then we might have seen them. But this way we just went the conventional route with all this artillery and bulldozers rolling over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideological Participants

* Panel needs power to make binding recommendations
* Make the panel’s recommendations enforceable
* The process should have two phases. Firstly a personal one with one to one communication with the panel. Secondly some public hearings but the panel should discuss its recommendations with all the users before submitting them to the government
* The panel should be granted final decision making authority
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Summary of Participant Responses to Interview

Questions O, R, and S

**Question O: Concerning Air Pollution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Roles</th>
<th>Response (1 is Preferred, 4 is least Preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2 2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBY</td>
<td>2 2 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>7 4 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>2 2 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13 10 8 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- DE Deep Environmentalist (response c)
- SR Self-Reliance (response a)
- A Accommodation (response d)
- C Cornucopian (response b)

The Numbers in the Table Respond to the Numbers of People within Each Participant Group who Ranked Each Environmental Attitude 1,2,3 or 4

**Question:**

About 80\% of the total amount of primary air pollutants emitted within the Greater Vancouver Regional District (G.V.R.D.) come from vehicles\(^2\). What would you advocate that the G.V.R.D. adopt as a long-term planning strategy (i.e. over the next 40 years)?

a) Encourage the development of local neighbourhood services, so that people can work and shop there instead of driving either downtown or to shopping malls. This would reduce the smog, but would cost money to relocate shops and services, and the taxpayer would have to foot the bill.

b) Do nothing. No policy is needed because external forces will ensure that the technology is developed within vehicles to reduce the pollutants they emit. For example, the Americans are continuously developing vehicles which pollute less and these vehicles will gradually percolate into the G.V.R.D. vehicle market.

c) Pass laws to severely restrict vehicles within G.V.R.D. This may involve banning vehicles from regions of downtown, and closing some roads elsewhere to automobiles while improving the transit service and promoting bicycle use. This again would reduce the smog. Costs would be incurred by vehicle drivers who would have to choose between being inconvenienced or using mass transit or bicycle.

d) Increase emission standards for vehicles. This could be enforced by an Air Care Programme. This would reduce pollution. Costs of this action would have to be met by vehicle drivers, not all taxpayers.

\(^1\) The totals for each of the environmental attitudes do not have to add up to the same number because some individuals did not rank 1,2,3,4, but instead ranked for example, 1,4,4,4.

### Question R: Concerning Electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Roles</th>
<th>Response (1 is Preferred, 4 is least Preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBY</td>
<td>5 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>11 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>6 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27 0 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

DE Deep Environmentalist (response d)
SR Self-Reliance (response b)
A Accommodation (response c)
C Cornucopian (response a)

The Numbers in the Table Respond to the Numbers of People within Each Participant Group who Ranked Each Environmental Attitude 1, 2, 3 or 4

**Question:**

Suppose that B.C. Hydro felt that the current electricity generating capacity in B.C. is **vastly** insufficient to meet future peak demands. What would you recommend they do as a long term planning policy (i.e. over the next 40 years)?

a) Build a large hydro-dam in a Northern region of the province. This plan will, however cause an adverse impact on the local Salmon and Caribou populations.

b) Build a series of small scale dams which have less of an adverse impact upon the both the environment and local communities. This would cost about the same as building a large hydro dam. However, it would not provide enough electricity to be able to meet peak demand and people in B.C. would have to put up with the occasional brown-out.

c) Build a large hydro-dam in a Northern region of the province and mitigate against adverse effects on the Salmon and Caribou as much as possible. This would cost more than either option a or b.

d) Not build any further dams, but rely instead on public education programs and practical advice as to how to reduce electricity demand. This option would cost nothing to implement, but would mean that from now on everyone would have to cut their demand for electricity dramatically.
### Question S: Concerning Smelters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Roles</th>
<th>Response (1 is Preferred, 4 is least Preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0 0 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBY</td>
<td>0 1 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>0 0 1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>2 1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2 2 5 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- DE Deep Environmentalist (response a)
- SR Self-Reliance (response c)
- A Accommodation (response b)
- C Cornucopian (response d)

The Numbers in the Table Respond to the Numbers of People within Each Participant Group who Ranked Each Environmental Attitude 1, 2, 3 or 4

### Question:
In Northern B.C. there is an isolated community called Smeltertown which has a local smelter. In the last few years it has been noticed that many of the trees and crops within the community have been dying from the sulphur dioxide emitted by the smelter. The local residents and farmers have been complaining bitterly, yet the smelter provides 70% of the jobs within the town. No other settlement is affected by the emitted sulphur dioxide. Which of the following policy alternatives do you think is the preferable long term solution to this dilemma (i.e. over the next 40 years)?

a) Close the smelter down, the cumulative environmental impact is unacceptable. This would mean that 70% of the jobs in the town would be lost and it would be in danger of becoming a 'ghost town'.

b) Impose a pollution tax on the smelter. This will provide an incentive to reduce pollution, to about 40% of what it is now although it would be expensive for the company which owns the smelter and would mean that the smelter would only just be breaking even. The smelter would be in danger of closing if the market price of the metal produced fell significantly in the long run.

c) Rather than imposing a solution on Smeltertown and the smelter, it is better to provide the infrastructure (for example a mediator, funding) so that the people of the town can meet and craft their own solution to the problem. It is their town and they are likely to have a better idea of how they would like their town to be in the future and what price they are willing to pay for a cleaner environment.

d) Insist that the smelter use latest technology available in order to reduce future emissions. If this sends the smelter into bankruptcy, then the smelter is obviously not competitive enough and therefore it should close. If, on the other hand, the pollution level is still unacceptable once the technology has been employed, then there is nothing that can be done about the pollution that is being caused.