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ABSTRACT

At a general level, the intent of this thesis is to make a contribution to the increasing body of research on tourism planning as well as collaboration in natural resource management. At a more specific level this thesis looks at the level of tourism collaboration occurring within British Columbia’s Land and Resource Management Planning Processes.

Because of its great beauty and natural diversity, tourism and outdoor recreation have emerged as two of BC’s fastest growing industries (Tourism BC 1996). However, tourism is only one of many competing forms of large scale development that are placing ever-increasing pressure on BC’s lands and resources. In response to this pressure and resultant conflicts, the BC government has developed a strategy for shared decision making processes (SDM). A key element of the strategy is to encourage and support public participation in land use planning processes. This is to occur through collaboration and shared decision-making processes that bring together government and stakeholders to negotiate consensus agreements on land and resource management issues. Adherence to the SDM processes should therefore lead to more meaningful and effective participation by tourism (Williams et. al. 1998). This thesis analyzes the degree of collaboration within one of these SDM processes, specifically the Robson Valley Land and Resource Management Planning Process, from a tourism perspective.

Based on theory and practical examples of community tourism collaboration, a case study interview questionnaire was designed and administered to nine public and one government participant from the Robson Valley LRMP process. The study of the Robson Valley case highlights linkages between the practical realities of a public land use planning process that is
explicitly based upon the concepts of collaboration and the theoretical elements of collaborative planning for tourism.

The results of the research indicate that while there are many opportunities for collaboration in an LRMP, institutional and situational obstacles can hinder it. These obstacles, include; imbalances of power at the table, lack of resources and government support for participation, and lack of recognition by powerful and controlling sectors of their interdependencies with other land use interests. They can be significant enough for tourism to be dis-satisfied with the outcomes of the process and to lose trust with the government over its control of the process.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Life is cooperative rather than competitive and life forms of very different qualities may interact beneficially with one another and with their environment. As Lewis Thomas said in The Lives of a Cell, even: “the bacteria live by collaboration, accommodation, exchange and barter.”

Bill Mollison, 1994

1.0 OVERVIEW

A new vision for tourism development planning is emerging. This vision sees tourism as something to be incorporated into the realm of sustainable development, where the needs and wants of tourism become subservient to the aims of sustainable development. The implementation of tourism where the concerns are wholly a subset of the concerns of sustainable development requires an effective framework for planning the long term future development of an area, whereby a successful match between resource existence/provision and development potential is sought through a cross-sectoral/truly holistic strategy. Utilizing a framework of collaborative community tourism planning, this thesis attempts to provide insight into how tourism is currently being considered within such a strategy. More specifically it aims to address tourism in forest dependent communities¹ in British Columbia (BC), and how forest-based tourism is being considered in the sub-regional Land and Resource Management Planning (LRMP) process.

¹ The term forest dependent communities is used through-out this thesis to refer to communities which are resource-based towns, dependent primarily on the forest industry and relying on activities such as logging, pulp-production, sawmilling etc.
2.0 RATIONALE

2.1 Tourism an Important Growth Industry

Tourism\(^2\) has emerged as a growth industry in many national economies and as a consequence, an increasing proportion of the world’s population is dependent upon the continuing viability of this activity (Faulkner & Tideswell 1997). According to the World Travel and Tourism Council, (WTTC), (1992, as cited in Theobald 1994), ‘Travel and tourism is the largest industry in the world on virtually any economic measure including: gross output, value added, capital investment, employment and tax contributions.’ The WTTC has estimated that 10.9% of global economic production and 11.1% of employment were attributable to tourism in 1995. By the year 2005 these figures are expected to rise to 11.4% and 12.5% respectively (WTTC 1995).

Many sectors of the economy, for example; retail, transportation and hospitality, are attracted to this rapidly expanding industry. National and local governments have embraced tourism as a politically desirable development alternative (Richter 1989). Economic downturn and loss of traditional employment have forced governments, often for the first time to look seriously at tourism and its potential for economic development revitalization. In their haste to promote economic growth, governments often do not consider the negative impacts of tourism development nor consider it in a sustainable development context, essentially overlooking important front-end costs such as planning. Erosion of the resource base, impairment of the built

---

\(^2\) Tourism is the temporary movement of people to destinations outside their normal places of work and residence, the activities undertaken during their stay in those destinations, and the facilities created to cater to their needs (Mathieson & Wall 1986, as cited in Gunn, 1994). For the purposes of this thesis it is purported this definition is broad enough that it encompasses recreators and recreational activity.
environment and disruption of the social fabric of host communities are common indicators of the negative impacts which can ensue from the predatory effects of a mass influx of tourists (Pearce 1994). Planners and designers have been criticized as tardy in putting forward innovative systems of resource use, or creative approaches to environmentally compatible forms of tourism development to deal with these negative impacts.

*It is the absence or weakness of planning which allows the development of types of tourism incompatible with natural systems and permits the expansion of tourism into areas at a rate inconsistent with the capacity of the infrastructure and society to cope with the extra pressure.*

(Pigram 1989: 217)

Fortunately this situation is improving, (Jamal and Getz 1995; Murphy 1994; Gunn 1994) and there is general recognition that it is in tourism’s own interests to be active in the quest for sustainable development and to adopt planning approaches cognizant of tourism’s inter-relatedness with other resource users (Hunter 1995).

### 2.2 The Growing Importance of Tourism in BC’s Forest Dependent Communities

These issues are no less relevant in forest dependent communities in British Columbia. Because of its great beauty and natural diversity, tourism and outdoor recreation have emerged as two of BC’s fastest growing industries (Tourism BC 1996). Concomitant with this is the well documented decline, over the last few decades, of the forestry industry (Ecotrust Canada 1997; CORE 1994). In response to this decline, communities in and adjacent to the forest have had to explore economic diversification strategies, with tourism seen as a development strategy having great potential (Getz 1986). Nuckolls and Long (1992) have suggested that tourism development is one of the few options left to enhance or salvage the economies of many rural communities.
Relatedly, Lane (1994) warns of the over-reliance of rural areas on tourism, promoting policies which work towards a balanced, diverse rural economy.

Regardless, it is widely recognized tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors in the world’s economy and one of the most rapidly advancing segments of tourism includes those activities that are dependent on natural environments (Ewert and Shultis 1997). As a reflection of this growth, the use of the forests for recreation will continue to increase. Importantly however, the multiple use concept may not be appropriate for all forest areas. In fact, evidence suggests that the forest industry appears to be generally insensitive to retaining the integrity of areas that attract tourists (Wight 1988). Conflicts in Clayoquot Sound over forest management and tourism in Tofino is evidence of this controversy (Levin 1990).

Tourism is only one of many competing forms of large scale development that are placing ever-increasing pressure on BC’s public lands and natural resources. As a consequence of this pressure the province has been the site of some of the most contentious land use conflicts in Canada’s history (Williams et. al. 1998). Such bitter and often protracted disputes over land use and natural resource management have proven to be extremely costly and time-consuming. They also have created an unstable and uncertain environment for many tourism communities and investors that are dependent on the pristine quality of the natural resource base for their attractions (Council of Tourism Associations 1993).

3 A variety of forms of tourism have emerged which have a dependence on the natural environment. Many of these, particularly ecotourism, purport to chart an appropriate new direction for tourism. Other include, green, nature, alternative, cultural, soft, progressive, as well as many other forms of special interest or quality tourism (Wheeler 1992; Boo 1990). On an individual level these forms of tourism promote: travel modes and facilities which have a low impact on the environment, businesses that are locally owned and having a formula for guests to contribute to local non-profit efforts for environmental protection (Sem 1996). Arguably these supposedly sustainable forms of tourism are approaching ‘mass tourism’ (Wheeler 1992). To date, there is still widespread confusion, misinterpretation and misuse of the concept these labels represent (Wight 1993).
Complexities and uncertainties in environmental disputes and the need to accommodate very different values reveal the limitations of traditional top-down, scientifically based approaches to public land and resource management (Dorcey 1986). In addition, calls for greater public involvement in decisions concerning public lands have arisen in response to the need to find new ways to reduce land use conflicts. In response, the BC government developed and implemented the Commission On Resources and Environment (CORE) to develop a provincial land use strategy. CORE developed the overall provincial strategy, by working with government and the public to define broad principles for social, economic and environmental sustainability to guide all planning (CORE 1996). CORE consolidated the provincial land use strategy (later renamed the Provincial Sustainability Strategy) in a four-volume series of reports in November 1994. Implicit in British Columbia’s Provincial Sustainability Strategy (the Sustainability Strategy) is the recognition of the need for effective public participation through shared decision making processes (SDM) wherein all public stakeholders play a direct role, deciding on issues to be addressed, assisting in data acquisition, helping to conduct analyses participate in making trade-offs.

Studying tourism in forest-dependent communities in BC is therefore timely. Many of B.C.’s communities (Terrace, Fort St. John, Lillooet, Valemount etc.) have embarked upon comprehensive, sub-regional land and resource management planning processes (LRMPs). These processes are couched in the Province’s Sustainability Strategy (CORE, 1996), and which propose to create plans which designate land and other resource use for a variety of purposes, including tourism, forestry, mining and agriculture. A key element of the Sustainability Strategy is to encourage and support public participation in each of these land use planning processes. This is to occur through collaboration and shared decision-making processes that bring together
government and stakeholders to negotiate consensus agreements on land and resource management issues.

In a Canadian context, most strategic land use planning initiatives have failed to formally incorporate tourism issues into the process. In most provinces of Canada, no government agencies are responsible for ensuring full participation by tourism stakeholders in such land use planning activities. Adherence to the SDM processes should lead to more meaningful and effective participation by tourism (Williams et. al. 1998).

Preliminary analyses of LRMP’s from a tourism perspective however, revealed dissatisfaction with both the process and the outcomes (Williams et. al. 1998). A research project (Williams et. al. 1998) which assessed the efficacy of the Cariboo-Chilcotin SDM process in terms of a series of SDM criteria and in terms of outcomes desired and attained by tourism interests support this statement. The conclusions of this study highlight weak government support for tourism stakeholders and a lack of resources to conduct negotiations which plagued tourism’s participation in the Cariboo-Chilcotin process (Williams et. al. 1998).

As well, tourism representatives had hoped that all stakeholders would be on an equal footing at the planning table, and that participants would work cooperatively to achieve common goals. Tourism, however, was not able to secure a place in land use planning equal to that of many of the other interests. The tourism interests believed that planning for commercial land use was still based largely on the needs of the forest industry (Williams et. al. 1998).

For the tourism stakeholders in the Cariboo-Chilcotin process, the government’s final land use plan did not adequately address the needs of individual tourism sectors or of the tourism industry as a whole. For example, they felt the plan did not go far enough in protecting access corridors, lake shores, viewscapes and wilderness areas (Williams et. al. 1998).
In light of these types of findings any analysis of tourism’s role in LRMPs and other SDM processes, should reveal means for enabling more meaningful input and effective participation of tourism. Given its growing importance in resource dependent communities, effective tourism participation and consideration of tourism’s issues in these land and resource management planning processes is paramount.

3.0 PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

A community-based tourism planning process based on collaboration theory has been proposed as one method that will advance the purpose of sustainability (Marcouiller 1997; Jamal and Getz 1995). Jamal and Getz (1995) suggest that collaboration, as a dynamic process-oriented strategy, is suitable for coordinating regional level planning of tourism resources and destinations. Such an approach, essentially addressing the interdependencies among multiple stakeholders and fragmented control over tourist destination resources, is seen as critical to overcome what is described by many (Gunn 1988; Innskeep 1991) as the lack of coordination and cohesion within a highly fragmented tourism industry. Dynamic collaboration among the stakeholders of the tourism development and planning domain will advance the purpose of achieving sustainability. The application of collaboration theory to community-based tourism planning is a fairly new phenomenon and as yet its potential has not been clearly addressed.

---

4 Collaboration is a process of joint decision making among autonomous and key stakeholders of an inter-organizational domain to resolve problems of the domain and/or to manage issues related to the domain (adapted from Gray 1989, as cited in Jamal and Getz 1994).

5 The term domain is used in collaboration theory to refer to the problem domain, i.e. a situation where problems are complex and require inter or multi-organizational response since they are beyond the capabilities of any single organization or group to solve single-handedly (Trist 1983).
B.C’s sub-regional SDM LRMP processes are also based partly upon the theory and practice of collaboration (Gray 1991), and full participation by tourism stakeholders is encouraged (Williams et. al. 1998). The problem this thesis research proposes to address is: how collaborative, from a tourism perspective, are LRMPs and do LRMPs facilitate collaborative tourism planning? This is addressed by analyzing the Robson Valley LRMP process for evidence of collaborative community tourism planning - both among tourism interests at the round table and between tourism and other sectors involved. Based on a framework of collaborative community tourism planning, the primary focus of this thesis is to provide insight into the following research questions:

- Is there evidence of collaborative tourism planning within the Robson Valley LRMP?
- What are the opportunities for collaborative planning for tourism’s use of land and resources in the context of the Robson Valley LRMP?
- What are the barriers to collaborative planning for tourism’s use of land and resources in the context of the Robson Valley LRMP?

This thesis proposes to address these questions by firstly discussing contemporary theories of tourism planning and in particular, the emergence of theories of sustainable tourism planning. A framework of collaborative community tourism planning is presented as one method for planning and managing tourism development in order to contribute to the sustainable development of a forest-dependent community or region. Contemporary community/regional tourism planning processes are presented and briefly compared to the proposed collaborative framework. This discussion focuses on the shortfalls of traditional tourism planning processes and models, followed by an overview of the applicability of collaborative planning to tourism.

---

6 SDM processes are based on the theory and practice of collaboration as well as interest-based negotiation (Fisher and Ury 1981), and consensus-building (Gray and Hay 1996; Cormick 1989), (Williams et. al. 1998).
Examples are given to illustrate collaborative approaches in planning for tourism in forestry and other resource areas in North America. Based on the theoretical framework, and the working examples, a series of questions for the case study analysis of the Robson Valley LRMP were developed. The analysis leads to further discussion and conclusions regarding the opportunities and barriers to collaborative tourism planning in the context of LRMP processes.

4.0 RESEARCH METHOD

This thesis is based on both theoretical and empirical research. The literature review looks at the theory of tourism planning in the context of sustainable development and the emergence of collaborative tourism planning as a framework for more integrative and participatory tourism planning. Triangulation (or a combination of research methods) was used to seek a convergence of results to the research questions. Firstly, documents detailing a range of collaborative tourism planning case studies from the US were retrieved from the Rural Tourism Foundation and the Colorado Scenic Byways program in Colorado. A review of this literature highlights and validates some of the practical aspects of the theoretical concepts of collaborative tourism planning.

Given this research focused on LRMP SDM processes, background data and the results from other research into this area was reviewed. The background context to these processes and the experiences of other participants in these processes (as recounted in other research)\(^7\) corroborate and provide an understanding to some of the findings from the personal interviews undertaken for this thesis.

\(^7\) Refer to Williams et. al. (1998) and Duffy et. al. (1998).
The third method of data retrieval relied upon personal interviews with key informants in a case study context. The case study approach was taken in order to highlight linkages between the practical realities of a public land use planning process that is explicitly based upon the concepts of collaboration and the theoretical elements of collaborative planning for tourism. As well, this approach allowed the investigation of a contemporary phenomenon (in this case an LRMP) within its real life context (Yin 1989). The importance of being able to study the context is important to an analysis of LRMP’s in B.C given that the conditions and dynamics of LRMPs will differ across the province. The distinctive need for a case study arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena (Yin 1989). The case study allows the investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events (Yin 1989).

In choosing a case study, it was important to select one that was unusual and of general public interest (Yin 1989), as well as one with a traditional forest-dependent economic base and an emergent tourism industry. The Robson Valley LRMP was chosen as a revelatory case - that is, one that reflects some real life situation that had not been studied before (Yin 1989). The Robson Valley LRMP was chosen as a case study because it had faced some serious challenges in reaching consensus on a final land and resource management plan, and could therefore provide some important planning lessons. Additional and concurrent to the LRMP process the two largest forest based communities of the Robson Valley, McBride and Valemount, had each prepared economic development strategies. Tourism development is specifically identified in the Mission Statement of these economic plans recommended by the two communities. McBride’s Economic Development Strategy (1995) and Valemount’s equivalent effort (1993) proposed tourism and ecotourism initiatives for both communities. A stimulated interest in tourism has resulted from these projects and processes. Because it is a case study, the empirical findings are not necessarily
transferable to other LRMP's or tourism planning processes. The empirical results are offered as a foundation for further empirical testing and to provide insights into how tourism is being developed and considered in the forest-dependent communities of the Robson Valley.

As an understanding of the perceptions of tourism participants in this LRMP process is the focus of the research, an interview approach to data collection was used. A semistandardized (Berg 1995) interviewing structure was used. This involved the implementation of a number of predetermined questions which were asked in a systematic and consistent order. The structure of the interviews however allowed for digression in order to go beyond the answers given and to probe various dimensions of the main theoretical concepts developed from the literature review. Interviews were designed to take approximately one hour.

This Thesis is divided into a remaining four chapters. Chapter 2 provides a literature review of sustainable tourism planning processes, the principles for planning and managing tourism in the context of achieving sustainability and the role of collaborative planning in achieving this. Chapter 3 discusses the main theoretical concepts to emerge from the theory on collaborative tourism planning together with some illustrative examples. Chapter 4 documents the case study and the findings of the analysis of the Robson Valley LRMP process. The contributions of this thesis research to the body of knowledge on community-based tourism planning, collaboration and shared decision-making processes are presented in Chapter 5. Specifically this final chapter presents conclusions regarding the research questions and the implications of the findings for policy and practice, further research and theory.
CHAPTER 2 - TOWARDS A FRAMEWORK OF COLLABORATIVE TOURISM PLANNING

1.0 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

A renewed interest in the nature of planning for tourism activities and development has generated a new debate on the extent to which tourism is being integrated into land use planning processes. According to a number of sources (Marcouiller 1997; Dredge and Moore 1992) tourism is not a core element in the planning process, despite its apparent economic significance for many localities. Driving this interest is the popularization of the general concept of sustainable development, and the manner in which tourism addresses or fails to address many of the issues critical to sustainable development.

1.1 Sustainable Tourism Development

Defining and operationalizing what is essentially 'sustainable tourism development' is fraught with as many challenges as implementing sustainable development. Debate on meaning, has made it evident that defining and operationalizing the concept of sustainable development is a difficult task, fraught with complexity and uncertainty about both facts and values (Dorcey
There are many definitions and interpretations of sustainable development, reflecting the differing values and political ideologies held by various interest groups in society. Rees and Roseland (1989) argue that a broad conceptualization of sustainable development, one that gives precedence to the long term maintenance of the world’s ecological capital over the short-term growth of physical or financial capital, is essential. Anything less would be an inadequate response to the warning of both environmental and social scientists. Rees suggests that a “profound shift in societal values and attitudes and the major restructuring of national global economies” is required if this precedence is to prevail.

Adherence to the view espoused by Rees and others would certainly nurture a condemnation of tourism. Tourism (particularly international tourism and forms of mass tourism), are seen as contributing to the looming worldwide ecological collapse, in particular, because of its heavy reliance on the use of non-renewable energy sources for tourist transport modes. On the other hand, adherents to a view of sustainable development as requiring economic growth may promote tourism as an “environmentally sound growth alternative for developing countries and island states which can help them attain sustainable development patterns” (WTTC et. al. 1995).

Regardless, recent years have seen the emergence of a dominant paradigm of sustainable tourism development, one which appears to chart a responsible course, balancing the requirements of tourism development with the protection of the environment. However, as Hunter (1995) argues, this dominant paradigm is too “tourism-centric” in that it encourages

---

8 See Rees (1989) for a comprehensive working definition incorporating ecological, social and economic factors and a sample of other definitions from the literature.
inappropriate and inconsistent consideration of the scope and geographical scale of tourism’s resource base, with little or no explanatory recourse to the actual or potential interaction of tourism with other sectors.

If one accepts the over-riding importance of sustainable development, then a conceptual course that places tourism’s needs as subservient to the aims of sustainable development must be adopted because, ultimately, sustainable development is more important than sustainable tourism (Hunter 1995). This relates easily to the views of others (Butler 1990; Pearce 1994) who propose that tourism should be recognized as only one of many societal “agents of change”, making it difficult to differentiate tourism from other processes of change like, industrialization, urbanization, enhanced physical mobility and the improvements in communication (Hitchcock 1993).

1.2 Planning for Sustainability

Rees (1994a) himself agrees that the massive societal shift such as the one he proposes is not imminent. In the interim, planners are forced, for the most part, to work within existing structures to move towards integrating economic, environmental and social assessment for sustainability. Part of this challenge is for communities and decision-makers to clarify the extent to which they share a common understanding of sustainable development. According to Dorcey (1990) concepts of sustainable development are powerfully conditioned in related ways by beliefs. On this point he proposes that for those that are inclined to believe that facts and values can be distinguished, sustainable development is more likely to be seen in terms of partial and
separable systems (social, economic and natural), and the integration of assessments is more a task for "science and the application of analytical techniques to generate information upon which decisions can be based in the political process" (Dorcey 1990). Conversely, those that believe that facts and values can never be distinguished, would see sustainable development as a value-laden concept that necessitates the explicit and integrated consideration of social, economic and natural systems.

Friedmann (1987) provides a planning perspective on the traditions of political and scientific thought, essentially identifying four major traditions of planning thought. Although we may not agree with the specifics of Friedmann’s analysis it is critically important to planning for sustainability to realize that there are different intellectual traditions which have different implications for the definition and operationalization of sustainable development.

This thesis relies primarily on the ‘social learning tradition’ as being appropriate to the pursuit of sustainability. In summary:

"This tradition focuses on overcoming the contradictions between theory and practice, or knowing and acting...Theorists in the social learning tradition have claimed that knowledge is derived from experience and validated in practice, and therefore it is integrally a part of action. Social learning theorists have asserted that social behavior can be changed, and that the scientifically correct way to effect change is through social experimentation, careful observation of the results, and a willingness to admit error and to learn from it."

Friedmann 1987, pp. 81-82

Although this thesis may draw on some of Friedmann’s other approaches, it is this tradition of social learning that provides the context for an exploration of how collaboration may be used to

---

9 Dorcey (1990) provides a useful summary of these four traditions, selectively emphasizing the distinctions between science and politics and the role of analytical techniques in decision-making in each.
plan for tourism in the context of sustainability. In this context, sustainability is not primarily a technical or scientific challenge\textsuperscript{10}. According to Cormick et. al. (1996) it is about dealing with people and their diverse cultures, interests, visions, priorities and needs.

2.0 PLANNING FOR TOURISM IN A SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

The tourism planning process is similar to that used in structure planning in many countries, following a series of distinct stages in which the outcome is a plan which is monitored and periodically reviewed, see Figure 1 below (Innskeep 1991 provides further detail on this). Getz (1987 as cited in Page and Thorn 1997) has observed that there are four traditions to tourism planning, ranging from boosterism through to a community-oriented approach. Within these various contexts tourism planning has followed a similar approach to that outlined in Figure 1.

Getz (1987) in his evaluation of the tourism planning literature concluded that tourism planning was predominantly project and development oriented; what was required was a shift away from development bias (‘boosterism’) to a more systematic integration of research, planning and evaluation of impacts. Gunn (1988) also suggests that the tourism system must receive better continuous planning and points out that the “go-it-alone” policies of many tourism sectors of the past are giving way to stronger cooperation and collaboration (Getz and Jamal 1994). Page and Thorne (1997) have gone so far as to suggest that a fifth approach to tourism planning has been added - sustainable tourism planning.

\textsuperscript{10} This thesis recognizes the value of scientific based analytical techniques, particularly in learning about how ecosystems work and respond to human activity.
2.1 Sustainable Tourism Planning Principles

Several authors have advanced planning models (see Murphy 1985; Dowling 1993; and Innskeep 1991) which, implicitly or explicitly provide a basis for working towards sustainable tourism. Underpinning these are some common planning principles, foremost amongst which are that tourism planning should be integrated and participatory.

2.1.1 Integrative Tourism Planning

Firstly, as Innskeep proposes, planning for tourism should be systems oriented and integrated within the tourism system itself as well as with local development policies and
objectives, across all sectors. Such an integrated approach facilitates consideration of the broader scope of the tourism resource base. Tourism, irrespective of the scale of analysis, cannot exist in isolation from regional, national and global resource utilization concerns. Even the smallest tourist enclave or destination area depends on the utilization of resources throughout a wider geographical region. It also depends on utilization of resources which are not confined to those with a direct and tangible effect on the quality of the immediate environment (Hunter 1995).

Integrative planning goes beyond the traditional focus on regional marketing and promotion. More integrative approaches assess identified priority tourism products with regard to the regional context of social, economic, cultural and political resources to develop an integrated regional tourism plan. This integration includes important issues of environmental conservation, economic development and sociocultural preservation (Innskeep 1991; Murphy 1985).

Tourism planning must be integrated and consider tourism as only one option in the broader question of optimizing resource allocation (Archer and Cooper 1994). McKercher (1993a) for example, asserts that tourism is in competition for scarce resources with other sectors. In the search for land, in utilization of renewable and non-renewable resources and in the push for new infrastructure investment, tourism is likely to be in competition with other sectors. Hunter (1995) asserts that the management and planning of tourism development should not (ultimately) cannot proceed in isolation from other sectors.

Traditionally tourism planning and management has focused almost exclusively on the tourist destination area, where as Hunter (1995) suggests, management takes on a more meaningful scale. However, as he argues further, highly localized issues need to be addressed within a wider, sub-national context to ensure that what one might term “geographical equity” of
access to the economic and environmental costs and benefits of tourism development is achieved as far as is possible. Operationally the integration of stakeholders, public agencies, outdoor recreation providers and tourism businesses with respect to goals and outcomes is a generally neglected aspect of regional tourism planning (Lankford 1994; Frippendorf 1982).

2.1.2 Participatory Planning and Decision-Making

Innskeep (1991) amongst others (see Murphy 1985; Getz 1994 and Pearce 1994) stresses the importance of participation in the planning and decision-making process by the residents receiving the tourists. A disparate array of individuals and groups (stakeholders) contribute to, or are affected by tourism. Traditionally, failure to address and include the needs of stakeholders has led to conflicts between exogenous organizations (national governments and large corporations), and host communities.

Many authors have argued (see Long 1991; Innskeep 1991 and Loukissas 1983) that as tourism knowledge increases, so too does the demand to include host communities in the decision making process. Troushedale (1996) refers to Hitchcock, King and Parnwell’s (1993) claim that “tourism should be built upon a dialogue with local people, who must be made aware of the likely effects of a tourism project, who must be centrally involved in the decision making process, development and management of the project, and whose voice must carry genuine political weight” as a typical appeal for local involvement. Meaningful public participation, Troushedale (1996) succinctly states, “exposes a great tourism planning challenge: there are powerful differences in preferences and interests between stakeholders within the host community itself”.
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As evidenced by the contentious land use conflicts today (conservation versus economic and industrial interests over the use of public lands), this divergence of preferences and interests extend beyond the realm of tourism, often creating an unstable and uncertain environment for many tourism communities who rely upon the pristine quality of the natural resource base for their attractions (Council of Tourism Associations 1993). Difficult decisions must be made based on trade-offs between stakeholder values (Trousdale 1996). Participation in this context therefore requires more attention to attitudes, values, preparedness and motivation for cooperative action on a range of goals.

2.2 Sustainable Tourism Planning Processes

Within recent theory of sustainable tourism planning, several alternative sustainable tourism planning processes have been developed. Several of these processes have been summarized by Trousdale (1996) and are reproduced in Table 1 below. Each of these processes vary marginally from the preceding model process (Figure 1), and while each incorporates some of the underlying principles of sustainable development, they are all inherently flawed. As Hall (1997) states: “the dominant mode of thinking ... is classic reductionist scientism which, ... does very little to further our overall understanding of the nature and complexity of what it is we are in fact studying”. Except for the Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) Approach, which explicitly defines the problem question, these processes are inherently reactive, implying that some form of tourism development is a foregone conclusion.
These processes barely allude to what Dutton & Hall (1989) recognize as certain preconditions for achieving a sustainable approach to tourism planning (e.g. co-operation, industry coordination, consumer awareness of sustainable and non-sustainable options, strategic planning and commitment to sustainable objectives). Sustainable development really requires the tourism industry and public sector planning agencies to radically rethink both the way they operate and the effects of tourism. Single sector (‘tourism-centric’) planning processes such as those outlined above do not radically differ from the traditional tourism planning process depicted by Figure 1. With the exception of Long’s Socially Sustainable Tourism Approach these processes do not place an emphasis on the need for integration of tourism with other sectors.

Table 1: Alternative Sustainable Tourism Planning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inventory and describe the social, political and economic environment.</td>
<td>1. Study preparation (select multi-disciplinary team).</td>
<td>1. Preliminary assessment</td>
<td>1. Define issues and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Forecast or project trends for future development.</td>
<td>2. Determination of objectives (in close coordination with residents and government).</td>
<td>2. Community participation.</td>
<td>2. Define and describe opportunity classes (identification of special zones).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Select preferred alternative(s) to serve as a guide for recommending action strategy.</td>
<td>5. Policy and plan formulation (including environmental impact assessment)</td>
<td>5. Community education.</td>
<td>5. Identify alternative opportunity class allocations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each process is based on the assumption that the political process will allow and encourage a rational evaluation of tourism costs and benefits and will then make the best decision for present and future generations (Getz 1994). Nelson (1992) argues that the route for tourism in the context of sustainable development lies not so much with management as with ‘civics’ - or an informed, open participatory public process for decision making. He places the blame on the complexity of tourism, with its many interacting groups and conflicting values, as the reason for the failure of management by governments or corporations in the traditional command and control sense or even mainly on the basis of scientific or technically derived rational planning. Nelson suggests that: “a more promising path in such complex and pluralistic circumstances is to build a civics model in which people work together toward sometimes similar and sometimes different goals and objectives in the context of sustainability (Nelson 1991b).

Innskeep also stresses that planning and plan implementation is a critical and largely political process, which requires public-private coordination. Research by Williams and Gill (1994) confirms the problems that often emerge between detached experts and host communities. Their research, involving carrying capacity management, highlighted that inappropriate value judgments are one of the principal causes of limited success in tourism planning. Stankey describes this as a “major gap”, which is expressed among industry professionals as a predisposition geared towards maximizing economic benefits and among academics as an overwhelming concern over adverse social and environmental externalities. Similar to Nelson’s call for a civics model, Trousedale states that “clearly if tourism is to be successful, there needs to be a balance between top down and bottom up approaches where the dynamic influences of knowledge, expertise and values can be distinguished” (Trousedale 1996).
In order to achieve sustainability, it is important to reconceptualize tourism planning and development as a political process within which the numerous stakeholders representing the community, industry and environmental interests can strive together for common objectives (Getz 1994). The above processes fall short of this by leaving certain critical planning questions vague or unanswered, such as: who are the stakeholders and what are their interests, roles and responsibilities, how are the multiple resource use interests integrated with tourism to determine the most appropriate resource use for sustainability; how are decisions made to resolve problems of conflicting interests amongst resource users?

Jamal and Getz (1994) propose that systematic and integrative strategic planning, based on collaboration could provide the basis for visioning, goal setting and management of the tourism domain. They emphasize that a collaborative approach to tourism planning offers an alternative to the confrontational processes typically used to resolve tourism issues. Sustainability and inevitably sustainable tourism is about dealing with people and their diverse cultures, interests, visions, priorities and needs. Unfortunately the approaches that have been used to manage differences - the courts, the ballot box and reliance on expertise and authority - are proving insufficient to address the challenge of creating a sustainable society and within that context sustainable tourism.

3.0 A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO TOURISM PLANNING

Collaboration as a means for dealing with situations where there are complex problems requiring multi-organizational or inter organizational responses emerged from the fields of
organizational theory, policy analysis and organizational development. Several definitions of collaboration are presented in this literature (see Gray 1989; Wood & Gray 1991 and Roberts & Bradley 1991). Jamal and Getz (1994) have researched the applicability of collaboration to tourism planning and advance a definition based on an adaptation of Gray (1989).

"Collaboration is a process of joint decision making among autonomous and key stakeholders of an inter-organizational domain to resolve problems of that domain and/or to manage issues related to that domain."

The problem domain refers to a situation where the problems are complex and require a multi or inter-organizational response since they are beyond the capability of any single group or individual to solve single-handedly (Trist 1983). Trist (1977a; 1977b and 1983) provides an enlightening discussion of the organizational environment, the increasing interconnectedness of this environment and the notion of the turbulent environment. To plan and manage within the 'turbulent environment' requires the management processes to incorporate the perspective of inter-organizational domains. This is the "functional social systems that occupy a position in social space between the society as a whole and the single organization (Trist 1983). Jamal and Getz summarize this by stating that resolving society level issues under conditions of interdependence, complexity and uncertainty then involves developing collaborative strategies that optimize the payoffs to stakeholders in the domain and reduce the turbulence in the field (Trist 1977b as cited in Jamal and Getz 1995).

---

11 Jamal and Getz make an important distinction between cooperation and collaboration. Cooperation means working together to some end (Fouler and Fowler 1964 as cited in Jamal and Getz 1994) and does not contain the detailed process characteristics and preconditions described by the term collaboration.
With regard specifically to tourism planning, Jamal and Getz have further developed a definition of collaborative tourism and a process for collaborative tourism planning, from which this thesis draws liberally.

"Collaboration for community-based tourism is a process of joint decision-making among autonomous, key stakeholders of an inter-organizational, community tourism domain to resolve planning problems of the domain and/or to manage issues related to the planning and development of the domain."

Within collaboration, stakeholders remain autonomous despite decisions being made jointly on a consensus basis. Stakeholders retain their independent decision-making powers while abiding by the shared rules within the collaborative alliance.

3.1 The Tourism Planning Domain

Jamal and Getz sum up the nature of the tourism planning domain as being characterized by an open-system of interdependent, multiple stakeholders, where the actions of one stakeholder impacts on the rest of the actors in the community. The assets and infrastructure of the tourism destination (whether it is a destination community or a region encompassing several communities), can be shared by its inhabitants, visitors, public and private sector interests. As a public good tourism development or attractions are the focus of government activity. The local authorities have the delicate task of juggling private sector interests with local residents needs and wants in order to maintain the economic health of the community and to ensure that

---

12 Whereas Jamal and Getz define community in the narrow sense of people living in the same locality, this thesis adheres to a view that community is not only defined in location terms but also (as)...a community of interests of a group of people bound together by a common fate (Wismer and Pell 1983 as quoted in Boothroyd and Davis 1991).

13 Stakeholders are the actors with an interest in a common problem or issue and include all individuals, groups or organizations directly influenced by the actions others take to solve a problem (Gray 1989).
development is sustainable (Jamal and Getz 1995). Added to this is the influx of external developers, financiers, entrepreneurs, and others who provide additional goods and services, increasing the number of actors and the complexity of the tourism domain. “No single organization or individual can exert direct control over this open-system nor its development process”, conclude Jamal and Getz (1995).

The premise upon which Jamal and Getz develop their collaborative tourism planning process is that the tourism domain is a turbulent one, where conflict over planning and development exists or where mechanisms for sharing ideas and developing directions are required. “Cross-sectoral collaboration for destination planning among key stakeholders should help to reduce turbulence in the domain and increase the likelihood of sustainable tourism development.” (Jamal and Getz 1995).

3.2 The Collaborative Tourism Planning Process

In discussing options to solving domain problems involving multiple parties (including local residents) Gray (1989 as cited in Jamal and Getz 1995), and others (see Jamal and Getz 1994, 1995) propose the collaborative option. This option relies upon the assembly of a representative sample of stakeholders to work out a solution. Gray outlines five key characteristics of the collaboration process: the stakeholders are independent; solutions emerge by dealing constructively with differences; joint ownership of decisions is involved; the stakeholders assume collective responsibility for the ongoing direction of the domain; and collaboration is an emergent process where collaborative initiatives can be understood as
"emergent organizational arrangements through which organizations collectively cope with the growing complexity of their environments" (Gray 1989).

Gray, based on McCann (1983) proposes a three stage model through which collaboration develops (see Table 2). Drawing from the body of literature on interorganizational collaboration Jamal and Getz (1995) advance a model of the conditions and steps for facilitating each stage of a community-based tourism collaboration (see Table 3).

Table 2: A Collaboration Process (Facilitating conditions and actions/steps Gray 1989).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Facilitating Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage I:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-setting</td>
<td>Identifying key stakeholders and issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage II:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction-setting</td>
<td>Sharing future collaborative interpretations; appreciating common sense of purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Institutionalizing the shared meanings which emerge as the domain develops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first stage consists of problem setting (identifying key stakeholders and issues). It is followed by direction setting (identifying and sharing future collaborative interpretations; appreciating a sense of common purpose). The final stage is implementation (institutionalizing the shared meanings and outcomes of the collaboration).
Table 3: A Collaboration Process for Community-Based Tourism Planning (Facilitating conditions and actions/steps based on Gray (1985, 1989)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages and Propositions</th>
<th>Facilitating Conditions</th>
<th>Actions/Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage I:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem-setting</strong></td>
<td>⇒ recognition of interdependence</td>
<td>⇒ define purpose and domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ identification of a required number of stakeholders</td>
<td>⇒ identify convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ perceptions of legitimacy among stakeholders</td>
<td>⇒ convene stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ legitimate or skilled convener</td>
<td>⇒ define problems/issues to resolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ positive beliefs about outcomes</td>
<td>⇒ identify and legitimize stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ shared access to power</td>
<td>⇒ build commitment to collaborate by raising awareness of interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ mandate (external/internal)</td>
<td>⇒ balancing power differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ adequate resources to convene and enable collaboration process</td>
<td>⇒ addressing stakeholder concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ ensuring adequate resources available to allow collaboration to proceed with key stakeholders present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage II:</strong></td>
<td>⇒ coincidence of values</td>
<td>⇒ collect and share information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ dispersion of power among stakeholders</td>
<td>⇒ appreciate shared values, enhance perceived interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction-setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ ensure power distributed among several stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ establish rules and agenda for direction setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ organize subgroups if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ list alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ discuss various options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ select appropriate solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ arrive at shared vision or plan/strategy through consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage III:</strong></td>
<td>⇒ high degree of ongoing interdependence</td>
<td>⇒ discuss means of implementing and monitoring solutions, shared vision, plan or strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>⇒ external mandates</td>
<td>⇒ select suitable structure for institutionalizing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ redistribution of power</td>
<td>⇒ assign goals and tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ influencing the contextual environment</td>
<td>⇒ monitor ongoing progress and ensure compliance to collaboration decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The preceding literature review demonstrates the shift towards more integrative and participatory tourism planning processes. Such approaches to tourism planning are seen as imperative to the achievement of sustainable development. Jamal and Getz's (1995) theoretical framework and process for collaborative tourism planning emerges from this literature as a model for addressing the need for more integrative and participatory tourism planning processes.

Furthermore, and importantly, collaboration occurs when stakeholders embroiled in conflict agree to explore their differences and seek solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible (Gray and Wood 1991). Generally, collaborations are induced either by conflict or motivated by a shared vision, but there is less willingness to collaborate in those situations where conflict already exists or where a common definition of the problem is absent (Kofinas and Griggs 1996).

Collaboration can be used effectively to settle disputes between parties in a multiparty conflict. Often parties in conflict are motivated to try collaboration only as a last-ditch effort when other approaches have reached impasse or have produced less than acceptable outcomes. Parties will try collaboration only if they believe they have something to gain from it (Gray 1989). Jamal and Getz (1994) raise the question as to whether collaboration can be used successfully to resolve planning conflicts with regard to tourism development. They suggest that further empirical study is required in this regard.
successfully to resolve planning conflicts with regard to tourism development. They suggest that further empirical study is required in this regard.

Collaborations induced by shared visions are intended to advance the collective good of the stakeholders involved. Successfully advancing a shared vision, whether in the public or the private sector, requires identification and coordination of a diverse set of stakeholders, each of whom holds some but not all of the necessary resources. To be successful, coordination must be accomplished laterally without the hierarchical authority to which most managers are accustomed (Gray 1989). The importance of visioning through public participatory processes in strategic tourism planning and destination management is being increasingly observed in tourism literature (Jamal and Getz 1994). Although stakeholders in a tourism domain may be joined by an overarching vision, such as, promoting tourism that contributes to local economies and which does not intrude upon the privacy of residents, considerable controversy may arise over specific proposals for accomplishing these desired ends. Also organizing initiatives like these not only involves coordinating the private sector but also requires building new working relationships across sectors and may require launching new referent structures (Trist 1983).

Is it possible to use a theory of collaborative tourism planning to analyze tourism’s role in BC’s LRMP processes? The LRMP processes are based upon the concepts of shared decision-making (SDM). Shared decision-making was founded in the theory and practice of consensus-building (Gray and Hay 1986; Cormick 1989), interest-based negotiation (Fisher and Ury 1981) as well as collaboration (Gray 1991), (Williams et. al. 1998). There is much commonality between Jamal and Getz’s facilitating conditions for collaboration and the underlying premises of SDM processes.
As developed and implemented in British Columbia, SDM processes were those in which participants sought to reconcile competing goals and to identify options through open, inclusive and democratic dialogues (BC 1994b). These processes were developed in response to public criticisms of conventional approaches to decision-making and public involvement which had failed to involve the public in a meaningful way (Jackson 1997, as cited in Williams et. al. 1998). A critical difference between conventional approaches and SDM approaches was the level of collaboration between decision makers and those who had not historically taken part in decision-making. In SDM processes, all public stakeholders played a direct role -- they decided on issues to be addressed, assisted in data acquisition, helped to conduct analyses, participated in making trade-offs and engaged in implementing decisions (Williams et. al. 1998).

SDM processes gained prominence in BC in 1992, when the Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE) was created with a mandate to formulate a provincial land use strategy and facilitate land use planning processes in some of the most contentious regions of the province. Around the same time, provincial resource agencies formalized their own consensus-seeking, multi-stakeholder approach to land use planning at the sub-regional scale with the creation of the land and resource management planning (LRMP) processes (Penrose et. al. 1998). LRMP also benefited from the provincial initiatives (e.g. CORE regional planning processes).

At the time CORE was formed, the Timber Supply Area planning process previously convened by the Ministry of Forests was evolving to include other provincial and federal resource agencies, a broader range of public interests and non-forest resources. Primarily however, the LRMP processes were concerned with defining the forest land base as part of the
process for determining the annual allowable forest harvest levels. Forest planning has a major influence on non-timber resources and recent changes such as forming inter-ministry committees reflect the new broader focus of these planning processes. Given the tradition of forestry initiation and involvement in the timber supply area review and subsequently the LRMP process, the dominance of forestry in these processes is to be expected. The implications of this for tourism are substantial, particularly given that, in most of B.C’s sub-regions tourism is an emergent industry, that lacks the tradition of government support, control and management of the forest industry.

CORE has pioneered the use of interest-based negotiations in regional planning, and land and resource management planning has adopted a similar commitment to consensus seeking methods. Whereas CORE was primarily focused on resolving the conflicts over land and resource use in several major regions in B.C, LRMP’s focus is primarily on reaching agreement over the future use of public land (traditional forest land) in sub-regions of B.C. LRMP’s were mandated only to produce advice and not to make decisions about future land and resource use. This focus subsequently raised alot of criticism from participants involved in LRMP’s around the province. For example;

"It was an ongoing fight with the IPT (Interagency Planning Team) and government to convince them that they are not the ones who should be running the process and making the decision"

(Duffy et. al. (1998) pp. 58)

Key principles of LRMP include requirements for consideration of all resource values, public participation, interagency coordination and the development of consensus-based land and resource management decisions (BC 1993a). Through a variety of participatory approaches, LRMP products include land use plans which provide land use direction and specify resource
management objectives and strategies. These plans provide a "comprehensive, broadly accepted and approved management framework to guide resource development and more detailed planning" (BC 1993a:1 as cited in Penrose et. al. 1998). Currently, LRMP is the most widespread SDM initiative in the province. Up until 1997, public participants have been involved in eighteen LRMPs in four of six regions of BC (Penrose et. al. 1998).

4.1 Community-Based Collaborative Tourism Planning and LRMP's

Jamal and Getz' theory of collaborative community based tourism planning is essentially a framework for a community based planning process. Community based planning processes are not enshrined in legislation, they rely on community involvement and formal facilitation by external support through subsidies. Community economic development processes, community futures, community education programs and community forests could all be placed into this category of community based planning processes. These planning processes are not supported by statute yet are an essential element in the socio-economic well-being of a community.

Jamal and Getz, in recognition of these limitations of community based processes refer to the need for public agency involvement, for process legitimacy and the need for influential stakeholders to influence planning processes and development status quo. For economic development planning for tourism, however, there is also a strong dependency upon the effectiveness of crown land use planning processes. In B.C for example any community based planning for tourism is highly dependent upon the outcomes and effectiveness of the LRMP's. This is related to tourism's reliance upon high quality natural and cultural resources which create the attractions driving the economic activity.
Recent literature documents that when forestry dependent communities in B.C. have been pushed into diversification and a new economy, the tourism sector has been one of the critical initiatives facilitating economic transition (Bugil ND). Planning decisions make a difference in creating attractions. Recent market analysis studies looked at destinations in B.C. and for travelers fitting the "eco-tourist profile". The findings of these analyses reveal amongst other things that:

- The natural setting is the critical factor in the delivery of a quality ecotourism product...
- The marketplace is increasingly seeking products which respect the environment...
- Parks and protected areas rate very highly in importance...
- Of the fifteen factors that were rated, ecotourists rate parks fourth...

(HLA and ARA Consulting Group 1995).

Based on this assertion that community tourism planning processes are dependent upon and need to be linked to crown land use planning processes (such as LRMP) it seems critical to analyze the LRMP to determine the extent of collaboration both within the tourism sectors represented and between the various sectors included in the LRMP. In a Canadian context, most strategic land use planning initiatives have failed to formally incorporate tourism issues into the process. Indeed in most provinces in Canada, no government agencies are responsible for ensuring full participation by tourism stakeholders in such land use planning activities (Williams et. al. 1998).

The LRMP process offers tourism interests an opportunity for participation in land use planning activities. All resource values are considered in the planning process, which is characterized by broad public participation, interagency coordination and consensus-based decision making. The document "Land and Resource Management Planning: A Statement of
Principles and Process” (BC 1993a) outlines the principles and process for the delivery of an LRMP process, and the production of an LRMP document. As outlined in this policy document, the basic principles of LRMP include:

- participation of all resource management agencies (federal, provincial and local);
- meaningful and open participation;
- decision-making by consensus wherever possible; and
- integration with other levels of planning (1993a:1).

A principle which is important for tourism is the requirement that “all parties with a key interest or stake in the plan must be invited and encouraged to participate, including: all levels of government and all members of the public with an interest in land use and resource management; and the public directly affected by the outcome” (BC 1993a:5). LRMP’s focus on tourism only to the extent that they are recognized as another industry dependent on the resource base and that tourism’s interests must be integrated and balanced with the other diverse and competing interests in the process.

This thesis describes the role of the tourism stakeholders in the Robson Valley LRMP. By further analyzing the role of tourism in the LRMP it reveals the extent or existence of collaborative community tourism planning in the Valley and the extent of collaboration from a tourism perspective in the formal crown land use planning process. It is written to build upon previous work (Williams et. al. 1998) which has looked at tourism participation in the Cariboo-Chilcotin SDM process and to contribute to the growing literature and research on collaborative land use planning and shared decision making in particular.
5.0 CONCLUSION

The application of collaboration theory specifically to community-based tourism planning has not been reported as yet, despite its potential usefulness to destination planning and management. Given this, Jamal and Getz highlight a number of areas where further research is required to fully understand the applications of such a framework. Importantly they highlight the difficulties in achieving a collaborative solution as being directly related to the differences in the value orientation between stakeholders and that methods must be devised for finding common grounds for facilitating consensus. In particular, they allude to the need to appreciate shared values, establish rules and agenda for direction setting and ensure power is distributed among stakeholders (refer to Table 3, Actions/Steps).

Regardless, in recognition of it potential usefulness for tourism planning, this thesis relies on collaboration theory for providing a framework to analyze tourism’s role within a regional shared decision-making land and resource management planning process. The following chapter looks specifically at Jamal and Getz (1995) propositions for facilitating community-based collaborative tourism planning. It focuses on the concepts relevant to an analysis of tourism's participation in the joint government, non-government LRMP process in B.C.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

Jamal and Getz (1995) in studying the issues and applications specific to collaboration in tourism planning offer a good set of propositions for facilitating community tourism collaboration (Marcouiller 1997). These include 1) recognition of interdependencies, 2) recognition of benefits, 3) perception that decisions will be implemented, 4) incorporation of key stakeholders, and 5) the need for a legitimate convenor. To sustain the changing administration and adjust to other forces impacting on the tourist system, Jamal and Getz also propose there be an ongoing, flexible and dynamic planning process.

The term 'proposition' is used by Jamal and Getz in reference to the key facilitating conditions for collaborative community-based tourism planning as presented in Table 3. Their propositions are essentially statements about the conditions that must be present for organizations to participate in collaborative efforts. For example; if organizations perceive that significant benefit will result, then they will likely participate in a collaborative effort. Or for example, if organizations recognize interdependencies then they are more likely to participate in a collaborative effort. Another example refers to that of the proposed outcomes of a collaboration. If a collaboration process is effective then it requires the formulation of a vision statement, joint formulation of goals and self regulation of the planning and development domain.
through the establishment of a collaborative (referent) organization. These propositions were put forward by Jamal and Getz as guides to planners, researchers and managers.

These propositions refer to a community-based collaborative tourism planning process. They are based upon the same principles of collaboration put forward by Gray (1985 and 1989) and which provide the basis for SDM LRMP processes in B. C. Jamal and Getz' (1995) propositions are discussed in detail in the remainder of this chapter, particularly in relation to how they will be used to analyze tourism's role in B.C's LRMP process. The propositions are discussed within the three stage collaborative process framework proposed by Gray (1989) and relied upon by Jamal and Getz (1995), (refer to Table 3). Where relevant and possible, the discussion of each proposition is supported by examples of tourism collaboration from forest-dependent communities in North America. Given that Jamal and Getz refer only to the potential of collaboration in tourism planning, it is necessary to highlight some examples of collaborative tourism planning to give credence to their propositions.

The examples cited here have been collected from various sources (a summary list of case studies and their collaborative properties are included in Appendix 1). Many are from USFS’s partnership initiatives with rural communities, documented in case study format and published by the National Rural Tourism Foundation in the US. These case studies were collated by foundation project coordinators and research associates subsequent to discussions regarding the nature of this research. The literature cited for these examples is based on USFS publications prepared in 1995. They were designed to demonstrate the innovations and commitment the USFS has made to working with other partners in developing a sustainable community and regional tourism and recreation program. The case study publications provide a clear overview of the
nature of the various collaborative and partnership initiatives. More detailed information regarding various case studies was sought from key contacts involved in the projects.

Other case studies are based on the Colorado Scenic and Historic Byways Program. The Colorado Scenic Byway Program is administered by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), the Colorado Byways Commission, and economic and tourism development offices. The program is a statewide partnership intended to provide recreational, educational and economic benefits to Coloradans and visitors through the designation, interpretation, protection, promotion and infrastructure development of a system of outstanding tourism routes in Colorado. The Colorado Byways Commission works in partnership with the USFS, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and local byway organizations and public and private resources to serve as a resource in the development of both infrastructure and byway management plans.

For this chapter, Corridor/Byway Management Plans¹⁴ and case study documents were analyzed for their collaborative tourism planning elements. A summary of the community-based collaborative tourism planning elements from these examples are included in Appendix 1. Case study summaries and Management Plans were collated by consultants working from the Colorado Center for Community Development at the University of Colorado. When needed, more detailed information was sought from key contacts.

¹⁴ A corridor management plan (CMP) is a community-based strategy to balance conservation of byway corridors' intrinsic qualities with use and enjoyment of those same resources (Colorado Scenic and Historic Byways Resource Manual 1995).
2.0 PROBLEM SETTING (STAGE 1)

The first developmental stage of collaboration is problem setting (Gray 1985, McCann 1983, Waddock 1989). In this stage, consensus is reached on who has a legitimate stake in an issue. During this stage there must be a recognition of the interdependencies within the tourism planning domain, positive beliefs about the outcomes of the process (mutual and individual benefits to participating), a shared access to power, a legitimate convenor and adequate resources to convene and enable the collaboration to continue.

2.1 Recognition of Interdependencies (Proposition 1)

Jamal and Getz’ (1995) propose that if stakeholders within the tourism planning domain are aware of the interdependencies not only with each other but with the environment then they are more likely to participate in a collaborative process. There are numerous aspects of interdependence in community tourism domains. Mill and Morrison (1985) describe a tourism system that is comprised of four major inter-relating parts: 1) the market (tourists), 2) travel (transportation), 3) destinations (attractions, facilities and services), 4) marketing (information and promotion). Their model holds that these parts are sequentially linked in a system. One sector cannot effectively operate alone particularly at a destination where a critical mass of attractions, facilities, adequate transportation and services are required.

Interdependencies arise from the need to share limited resources. McKercher (1993a) for example, asserts that tourism is in competition for scarce resources with other sectors. Tourism is likely to compete with other sectors in the use of land, in the utilization of renewable and non-
renewable resources and in the push for new infrastructure investment (Hunter 1995). Tourism relies on the hospitality and courtesy of the local residents and shares their facilities such as health services, recreation, restaurants and entertainment. Because of the high degree of interdependence, potential negative impacts of excessive or inappropriate tourist development on the sociocultural or biophysical environments could effect the economic viability of the tourism industry.

Failure to include and address the needs of relevant stakeholders has exposed inequities between organizations such as, government and large corporations, and the residents of tourist destinations. Hitchcock, King and Parwell, (1993) claim that tourism should be built upon a dialogue with the local people, who must be made aware of the likely effects of tourism, who must be centrally involved in decision-making processes, development and management and whose voice must carry genuine political weight.

Ensuring that this range of tourism and tourism interdependent sectors are included in the ongoing and dynamic collaborative planning process is one way of recognizing the interdependencies within the tourism domain. The case studies listed in Appendix 1 demonstrate this. Within these domains, the range of tourism attractions (scenery, hiking, golfing, camping and forest recreation etc.), the transportation enablers, the range and types of accommodations, the community and its facilities, services and residents, marketing intermediaries, and the role of the public and private sector are all referred to as interdependent. Each of these interest groups are given the opportunity to participate, both directly and indirectly (for example through residents surveys), in the collaboration and planning process. Many of these interests continue to participate as ongoing members of a referent tourism organization.
In addition to representative stakeholders from government agencies and tourism organizations, it is important to achieve legitimate resident input as well as that of long-term natives and other cultural groups within a community. The example presented here demonstrates one community's recognition of interdependencies among diverse groups likely to be impacted by tourism.

Curry County on Oregon’s South Coast is working on promoting economic diversification through sustainable nature-based tourism. Steady declines in the timber and fishing industries has prompted County leadership into pursuing this form of economic development. Building the capacity of community members to work together in decision-making about the area's economic future (despite polarizing conservation/timber wars) has been a priority of this strategy. Sustainability planning in the county has been carried out by a steering committee and has involved environmental and social conflict assessments to avoid unacceptable impacts to local resources or established uses. The steering committee is comprised of representatives of local land management agencies, local tourism businesses, conservation organizations and local government. Members of this committee also met with additional groups including timber and fishing industry, real estate, chambers of commerce and senior citizens on a county-wide basis.

In the context of B.C's LRMPs, the problem domain is taken to be the geographic sub-region, characterized by an open system of interdependent multiple stakeholders, where the actions of one stakeholder (for example the forestry industry) impacts on the rest of the actors in the community, (for example the hotels, the guide outfitters and the community services sector). From a tourism perspective, planning and managing this environment requires the management
processes to incorporate the perspective of all tourism stakeholders whose activities will impact
and be impacted by the actions and activities of other stakeholders in the domain. This thesis will
measure the degree of recognition of interdependencies by assessing the range of tourism
stakeholders the tourism interests felt should be included in an LRMP, whether such stakeholders
were in fact included and whether other sectors recognized the tourism interests as legitimate.

2.2 Recognition of Benefits (Proposition 2)

If stakeholders recognize benefits to be gained from a collaborative then they are more
likely to participate. Jamal and Getz' (1995) specifically suggest that collaboration will require
recognition of the individual and/or mutual benefits to be derived from the process. Mutually,
they believe the process can result in more efficient tourism development, greater social and
environmental sustainability and the avoidance of conflict. On an individual organization level,
benefits will derive from more effective representation for some groups (environment and
resident organizations), more resources for these same groups to influence the planning process,
reduced uncertainty for private firms and more effective public sector management of scarce
resources. Gray (1985) suggests that some stakeholders may require incentives to induce
participation, to offset their perceptions that collaborating may reduce their access to scarce
resources. Inducements for community and other volunteer groups derive from their enhanced
ability to influence decision making and additional resources to enable participation. For other
parties, recognition that adversarial arrangements (tribunals and courts) which could alienate
special interests in the community and potentially lead to costly and less than optimal settlements (Jamal and Getz 1995) is an inducement.

Selin and Beason (1991) in a qualitative study of conditions facilitating collaborative tourism planning involving a public natural resource management agency and regional tourism associations of Arkansas state in 1987, demonstrated support for this proposition. Their study indicated that tourism organizations considered collaboration using rules of reciprocity. For example, they expected to be repaid in kind for resources committed to the collaboration.

Recognition of the benefits to be derived from the collaborative process is often what drives the planning in the USFS initiatives and the Scenic Byways. The Gold Belt Byway CMP provides a statement of the benefits to be derived from recognizing the Byway and entering into a collaborative planning process.

### Development of a Community Vision.

- The Gold Belt Byway offers the opportunity for the people of the Byway region to work together to define a common vision and goals for the byway. The clear direction makes it possible for all managers, citizen groups, landowners, business owners, and individuals to work together to achieve their common vision.

### Funding.

- Collaborative planning and management of the Gold Belt Byway region creates additional opportunities to receive funding.

### Communication.

- The byway encourages improved communication between local, state and federal agencies, local businesses, organizations and the general public.


The Colorado River Headwaters CMP also outlines the benefits of Byway Planning.

- Obtaining access to more state and federal resources to enhance facilities along the Byway and manage visitor impacts.
- Properly monitoring and managing visitor impacts to maintain the quality of the environment.
- Enhancing community pride as the area is interpreted and presented to national and international visitors.
- Increasing cooperation among local groups, local government and land management agencies; creating a coordinated tourism program in the area.

(Colorado River Headwaters Interim Byway Management Plan 1994)
The Cloudcroft Area Sustainability Project’s overall goal is to establish partnerships between communities adjacent to the Lincoln National Forest and the National Forest. The perceived benefit being to develop sustainable economies in these communities (Cloudcroft Community Sustainable Development Program Report III: Lincoln National Forest User Survey 1995). Another perceived benefit of the collaborative efforts in the Lincoln National Forest area is the ability to acquire funding. Since 1992 the staff of the Lincoln National Forest has taken an active role in developing collaborative efforts between the federal government and local public and private sector representatives. Their goal is to leverage public and private funds and labor for innovative recreation and tourism related projects that directly and indirectly involve USFS managed land.

In the context of B.C's LRMP's tourism's perceived mutual and individual benefits from the LRMP will be analyzed. The focus will be on whether tourism perceived any benefits to being involved in the LRMP and whether they received any benefits from being involved

2.3 Shared Access to Power (Propositions 3 and 4)

Jamal and Getz (1995) suggest that if stakeholders perceive that decisions arrived at will be implemented, then they are more likely to participate in the collaboration. In this regard they refer to the need for a community-based collaborative planning process to address the issues of power and authority to be vested in the collaboration. This concept is not as important for the LRMP process given that it already has power to influence other planning process by virtue of its being a government convened, sponsored and coordinated public land use planning process.
Regardless, the issue of power is an important one in all stages of the collaborative process. Gray (1991) believes that if there is imbalances of power such that one party dominates the process and outcomes, then collaborative processes will likely fail. Jamal and Getz provide very little insight into the power relations that are likely to emerge in a community-based collaborative tourism planning process. Despite its contribution to understanding community-based planning processes, research on collaborative tourism planning still relies on rather weak theories of power relations within community settings (Reed, 1997). While power relations are included within collaborative theory, it is frequently assumed that collaboration can overcome power imbalances by involving all stakeholders in a process that meets their needs (Reed, 1997).

Jamal and Getz (1995) argue that it is possible (and necessary) to address the issue of power and authority by including legitimate stakeholders and identifying a suitable convenor at an early stage in the collaborative planning process. Successful collaboration will depend on the inclusion of key stakeholders such as; local and regional government, public agencies, tourism industry associations (chambers of commerce), regional tourist authorities, resident organizations (community groups), social agencies (schools boards, hospitals) and special interest groups. This summarizes the fourth proposition of Jamal and Getz (1995). They argue that key stakeholder inclusion is cost-efficient and may help avoid ineffective token resident participation if active participation of community groups is encouraged.

However, the inclusion of key stakeholders does not explain why, how and under what conditions those with power are willing to distribute it to others. As well, there are significant differences in the values and interests between stakeholders within the destination community itself as well as the tourism domain. Difficulties in achieving a collaborative solution relate to
these differences in value orientation (Brown 1991; Gray 1989). Gray, has suggested the use of third parties to assist in achieving resolutions (for example by helping with power imbalances), and to guide proceedings.

Gray (1989) draws a distinction between the various general types of third parties. The term third party generally connotes a variety of roles including, mediator and facilitator. Generally third parties play important roles in shaping conflicts and their outcomes (Gray 1989). In multiparty collaborations, a third party can be anyone acceptable to the disputing parties who is brought in to help them communicate more constructively and to resolve their differences. Generally speaking the third party’s role is to assist the stakeholders in getting to the table, in exploring their differences constructively, and in reaching an acceptable agreement (Gray 1989). To accomplish this, the third party may either serve as a convenor, a mediator or a facilitator.

The identity and the role of the convenor are a critical component in the problem-setting phase. The convenor may or may not be a stakeholder in the problem. The role of the convenor is to identify and bring all the legitimate stakeholders to the table. Thus convenors require convening power, that is, the ability to induce stakeholders to participate (Gray 1989). Jamal and Getz also propose that if there is a legitimate, authoritative, and expert convenor (Proposition 5) in the early stages of a collaborative process then the collaboration is more likely to succeed. Primarily because they may provide legitimacy to a community-based process.

The role of the convenor according to Gray (1989) is critical in bringing all legitimate stakeholders to the table in the very early stages of any collaborative process. In a community-based tourism collaboration the role of the convenor may be assumed by a government agency, an industry firm or a group such as a local tourist organization. Characteristics a convenor should
possess include legitimacy, expertise, resources and authority (Jamal and Getz 1995). Jamal and Getz propose a reliance on government authorities to convene power relations, based on an assumption that these authorities will be neutral arbiters in the land and development process. In the context of LRMP in B.C the provincial government is responsible for convening these processes. CORE was responsible in the case of regional planning such as Vancouver Island and the Kootenays, whilst in the sub-regional context the role of convenor was taken by B.C Forests due largely to the LRMP evolving out of the Timber Supply Review (TSR).

Facilitators represent still another type of third party. The primary role of a facilitator is to assist parties to have a constructive dialogue. Facilitators usually help groups set an agenda and manage the process of the discussion (Gay 1989). Good facilitation of Table and working group meetings can do much to promote balanced and effective participation in the dialogue. An effective facilitator will always be vigilant about how representatives are interacting with each other, and will intervene as necessary to promote fairness (CORE 1996).

In the context of LRMP the role of facilitator is an individual who, as a neutral third party oversees, coordinates and expedites discussions and meetings, ensuring opportunities for fair, orderly and principled dialogue among parties. This role is variously taken by a representative from one of the major government agencies involved in the process, for example the Ministry of Environment Lands and Parks or B.C. Forests. As well, the LRMP has the support of an Interagency Planning Team (IPT) which comprises a group of government officials who are responsible for general oversight, day-to-day management and the provision of technical and administrative support to a land use planning process. Essentially the IPT has a broader facilitating and coordinating role than the facilitator whose focus is primarily on the coordination
and running of the meetings. Given that the IPT and the facilitator in the LRMP processes are essentially the same i.e. government agents, the term process managers will be used in this thesis to refer generally to these agents who have the coordinating and facilitating role.

The convenors and facilitators tasks are distinct from those of a third-party mediator. The mediator has no power to render a decision or to impose a solution. Instead, the mediator helps the parties themselves to work out their differences and to construct a mutually acceptable solution (Gray 1989). Collaborative processes differ considerably from case to case, particularly where there are multiple parties involved. Studies of mediation have found that mediators too vary in their style of operation. For example from assuming a hands-off role allowing the parties to formulate their own decisions, to others who adopt a more proactive role (Kolb 1983).

Interest based negotiation is used in LRMP and broadly refers to decision-making processes based on reaching consensus by focusing on interests rather that positions. A mediator in an LRMP is a neutral third party who is used when negotiation has normally reached an impasse or deadlock. A mediator is often called in to assist in principled negotiation (or interest-based negotiation) which is an approach to “win-win” solutions to conflicts (popularized by Fisher and Ury 1981). A private consultant mediator is used in the LRMP context as opposed to a government agent.

Sometimes power imbalances cannot be leveled out, negotiations fail and participants in a collaboration fail to reach agreement on for example an important land use issue. Fisher and Ury (1981) allude to the danger in these circumstances of stakeholders being too accommodating to the views of the other, more powerful side. They suggest that in these circumstances participants must adopt a bottom line to protect them from a bad agreement. The reason people negotiate is to
produce something better than the results they could obtain without negotiating (Fisher and Ury 1981). Fisher and Ury assert that stakeholders must have a standard or BATNA - Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement - against which any proposed agreement should be measured. They suggest that stakeholders in a negotiation should have a BATNA and instead of ruling out any solution which does not meet the bottom line, they can compare a proposal with the BATNA to see if better satisfies the interests of the stakeholder (Fisher and Ury 1981).

This thesis does not evaluate the mediators or process managers in the LRMP in terms of some predetermined criteria. However, the perceptions of the tourism participants regarding these critical third parties will be sought particularly with regard to whether they were effective or whether they hindered effective collaboration for tourism.

2.4 Adequate Resources to Participate (Proposition 3)

Related to the issue of power is that of the adequacy of resources in the form of expertise, time and money. Jamal and Getz suggest that if there are sufficient resources available to all participates then a collaborative process is more likely to succeed and that stakeholders are more likely to participate (Jamal and Getz 1995). The equitable provision of resources to participate may also help with the issue of power imbalances. While it may not be possible to eliminate power imbalances completely, government and process managers can help to address power imbalances through the provision of key resources to public participants for example, funding, training and information (Penrose 1996). Participants in a collaborative process should have the perception that adequate resources in the form of expertise, time and money are present in order
to ensure that the collaboration will not be interrupted due to a lack of resources (Jamal and Getz 1995). Funding must be provided to all participants to ensure that they have access to a process and can participate effectively (Niezen 1989, Brenneis et. al. 1990).

In many of the USFS Partnership Initiatives and in the CDOT Scenic Byway Program there is a clear external mandate by public agencies (the USFS and CDOT), that initiate collaboration at a community level. These agencies not only provide funding and incentive but also guidance, technical support and clarity of purpose for collaborating on tourism planning. These factors are instrumental in motivating participation in collaborative processes and providing legitimacy and power to the process. They also help to ensure that all the participants in the process have adequate resources to participate effectively. In the context of B.C's LRMPs, the adequacy of resources and support from government for tourism will be analyzed.

3.0 DIRECTION SETTING (STAGE 2)

Collaboration next evolves into a direction setting stage where participants begin to identify and appreciate a sense of common purpose (Gray 1985, McCann 1983). If the collaboration is to be effective, then joint formulation of a vision statement and joint formulation of goals must occur at this stage. This process is facilitated by a dispersion of power among stakeholders, appreciating shared values and joint information search activities where participants mutually examine relevant data. Achievement of a shared vision/strategy/plan through consensus is fundamental to the direction setting stage (Jamal and Getz 1995). Operationally goals are established, ground rules set and subgroups organized to examine
specific issues (Selin and Chavez 1995). Jamal and Getz allude to the need for methods for finding common grounds to facilitate consensus. They suggest the use of independent mediators and facilitators for this.

While Jamal and Getz allude to the need to arrive at a shared vision or plan/strategy through consensus, they provide little insight into how this stage of the collaboration ought to be managed. Literature and research on interest-based negotiation and consensus decision-making is more insightful in this regard. A number of evaluations of public participation in land use planning in BC have been conducted in recent years (Wilson 1995, Penrose 1996, Tamblyn 1996, Jackson 1997). The most recent research, (see Duffy et. al. 1998) provides a comprehensive review of literature on the theory and practice of public participation, consensus decision-making and interest-based negotiation. Out of this review they developed a set of criteria for designing public participation processes such as LRMPs. In developing this criteria, Penrose et. al. (1998) place much emphasis on process design and process management. An area that Jamal and Getz (1995) allude to but provide very little detail. It is critical that some of this detail be presented to supplement the gaps in Jamal and Getz’ framework.

In particular, Jamal and Getz refer to the need for: devising methods for finding common grounds for facilitating consensus, ensuring power is distributed among several stakeholders and establishing rules and agenda for direction setting. However, little detail on how to proceed in these area is provided. Penrose et. al. (1998) provide much detail on these issues. With regard to the issues of balancing power and setting rules and agendas for direction setting, Penrose et. al. (1998) give much attention to the specifics and the importance of process design. Process terms of reference, scope of mandate, geographic scale and time frame must be clear, appropriate and
accepted (Penrose et. al. 1998). In this regard they propose that a comprehensive procedural framework must be developed which delineates clearly, amongst other things; a participant code of conduct and meeting logistics; consensus; and a dispute settlement process (Penrose et. al. 1998).

**Participant code of conduct.** Successful processes should set a standard or rules for communication and behavior (Cormick 1987, Crowfoot and Wondolleck 1990). Participants should develop and agree to a code of conduct including agreement on sharing information, cooperation, confidentiality, willingness to listen and test new ideas, and intention to work towards consensus (BCRTEE 1991a, Kofinas and Griggs 1996). Day-to-day meeting logistics should be settled early. Issues to be resolved include: Where will meetings be held and how often? How will agendas be set? Will minutes be kept and by whom? (Susskind and Cruikshank 1987).

**Defining consensus and a dispute settlement process.** The process for deciding issues must be clear to all parties. Parties must define consensus clearly and understand how it will be implemented in day-to-day decision-making (Cormick 1991a). Procedural ground rules must define a means by which disputes will be settled in the event of an impasse (BCRTEE 1991a).

Duffy et. al. (1998) also suggest the development of a structured and integrative decision-making framework. Such a framework is proposed to address what Jamal and Getz refer to as power imbalances and is fundamental to facilitating consensus. In particular all participants must be involved meaningfully in decision-making. All affected interests must perceive that they have had an opportunity to participate effectively in deciding substantive issues (Cormick 1987, Kofinas and Griggs 1996). A structured and comprehensive decision-making framework must
help reduce decision complexity and allow participants to address substantive issues in a manner that integrates all social, environmental and economic interests (Penrose et. al. 1998).

In this analysis of tourism in the Robson Valley LRMP, attention will be given to the tourism stakeholders' perspectives of the dispute settlement process, the training in consensus decision-making and its effectiveness in terms of tourism's desired outcomes and perceived benefits.

4.0 IMPLEMENTATION

For problems that require a sustained commitment to collaboration, the need emerges to manage stakeholder interactions in an increasingly systematic way (Gray 1985, 1989, McCann 1983). If the collaboration is to be effective then there needs to be an emergent, ongoing (referent) organization to manage the problem domain. Conceptually this stage involves institutionalizing the shared meaning of the group and devising a regulatory framework to guide future collective action (Selin and Chavez 1995). Legal forms of organizing are instituted, roles assigned and formal agreements reached to monitor and assure collective compliance to the goals of the group. While the goal of structuring is to create a "negotiated order" (Gray 1985) to control stakeholder interactions, it is still conceptualized as a dynamic process.

Jamal and Getz sixth proposition refers to key points for suitable structures for institutionalizing processes, and in particular, self-regulation of the planning and development domain through the establishment of a collaborative (referent) organization to assist with ongoing adjustment of strategies through monitoring and revisions (Jamal and Getz 1995).
Jamal and Getz (1995) posit that stakeholder collaboration is most effective in the overall
destination planning process if it is ongoing. To adjust to and sustain disturbances created by
changing administrations and other forces impacting on the tourist system, Jamal and Getz
(1995) strongly promote the formation of a collaborative organization. If an existing structure
(local tourist organization) cannot be adapted to the collaborative task then it may be necessary
to form a new structure. In the absence of such an organization, local authorities may be left with
the responsibility of formulating and implementing tourist goals and policies. Research has
shown (Woodley 1993) that while government documents emphasize community involvement,
extensive community consultation occurs only on an individual project base, with no overall
vision of the community’s future and no consultation on the cumulative impacts of developing
numerous individual facilities. Based on these types of findings, Jamal and Getz believe that
stakeholders should not only be involved in the visioning process but also in the formulation of
tourism goals and policies and that “methods must be devised for finding common grounds for
facilitating consensus and for implementing the collaboration’s results.”

Trist, (1979, as cited in Jamal and Getz 1995), argues that groups and temporary systems
that arise out of networks provide the greatest leverage for change, because individuals change
faster than organizations and the values likely to beneficially shape the future are emerging in
individuals. In the United States (US) a number of programs have been carried out with small
rural communities to facilitate and encourage planning in a tourism domain. Examples of these
include the United States Forest Services (USFS) Partnership Initiatives and the Scenic Byways
Programs (national, state and agency programs). These programs, while having a rural tourism
development focus, promote a collaborative approach that enables tourism to be integrated with broader regional and community planning, including the use of public lands.

An overview of some of these initiatives demonstrate that in addition to promoting and sustaining various tourism activities and development, organizations developed to manage tourism, typify a self-regulating referent organization through which sustained transformation of the tourism domain can occur (Trist 1979, 1983). The referent organization is described by Trist (1983) as a self-regulating, collaborative body that could form consciously or unconsciously to collaborate on domain related issues and may have several functions: regulation, appreciation of trends and issues, providing leadership and direction and infrastructure support. Keller (1987) believes in a “functioning and powerful peripheral tourism organization”. Such organizations would require the support of all sectors of the tourism industry and would successfully maintain local control and a sustainable pace of development. Because of the broad representation of stakeholders in these organizations, the collaborative process requires communities to look at tourism development in relation to how tourism fits in with broader regional development goals. Structuring in this way can be illustrated by way of example of the Colorado Scenic and Historic Byways Program.

The Scenic Byways Program in Colorado requires the creation of a byway planning group and encourages the development of a Corridor Management Plan. The byways planning group is charged with preparing the nomination for scenic byway designation and from then on makes the determinations, conducts the research and assembles the individuals necessary to develop the corridor management plan. The work of the byway planning group begins with the development of the goals that will work toward the implementation of the vision and continues to
the selection of the management entity. In many communities, the byway planning group will continue after the selection of a management entity as an advocacy group supporting the scenic byway. In some communities, the byway planning group may become the management entity (Colorado Scenic and Historic Byways Resource Manual 1995).

The byway planning group’s purpose is to direct and guide the process of corridor management. The group often comprises a membership of a range of representative stakeholders, including for example; local elected officials, road managers, resource managers, community organizations, community leaders, local business owners and employees and landowners. The Scenic Byways Resource Manual (1995) proposes that the byway planning group’s activities move from establishing broad general concepts to stating specific objectives and implementing projects. The vision statement establishes the grand, sweeping concept and direction for the scenic byways future.

A different form of collaborative organization is the Coalition for Unified Recreation in the Eastern Sierra (CURES). This is an informal partnership that has formulated a vision and tourism goals. The partnership consists of recreation providers, local businesses, the environmental community, federal, state and local governments and local Chambers of Commerce. The partnership advocates “a collaborative effort is considerably more responsible and effective than individual efforts”. The coalition was formed in 1991 with a range of general goals and objectives, that include: sharing information, improving coordination with government agencies, improving natural resource management, minimizing conflict among recreationists, and approaching planning and public service holistically. In 1992 CURES defined a mission statement and vision. Amongst other things, an important part of CURES vision is that:
"Co-operative partnerships and forums, such as CURE, provide a foundation for constructive discussions and common ground decision making among government, the private sector and individuals."

CURES is an informal partnership which has no "official" jurisdiction or responsibility, no specific funding or staffing and voluntary participation. In order to focus on and undertake mutually beneficial projects task groups have been formed. These task groups provide leadership with funding and support coming from several areas with CURES facilitating and consulting.

The emergence of a collaborative structure for tourism or the potential for such a structure in the context of LRMP processes will be analyzed in this research. In particular, the research will focus on whether tourism interests believe that such an organization emerged from the LRMP process, and if such an organization is considered necessary for the future planning and management of tourism particularly in the context of land use and development.

5.0 SUMMARY

Jamal and Getz provide a framework of community-based collaboration for tourism planning. Based on their examination of collaboration literature, they have proposed an adaptation of a collaborative process for tourism. This process is provided as an option for multiparty tourism development problems, where a representative sample of stakeholders, that can affect or be affected by tourism, can be assembled to work out a solution. Essentially, Jamal and Getz highlight the importance of a community-based and a multiparty approach to tourism planning. They identify the range of stakeholders likely to be affected by or affect tourism planning and the need to recognize the interdependencies within and between the various
government agencies, business groups, community organizations, tourism associations and individuals.

The important contribution of Jamal and Getz is their recognition of and attempt to, provide a framework for a more integrative and participatory approach to tourism planning by adapting collaboration theory to the tourism context. Essentially they provide a normative process for planning the management and development of tourism. Jamal and Getz theory provides what is an over-simplification of the collaborative process and collaborative designs for resolving conflicts as proposed by Gray (1989). However, their theory focuses on the challenges facing tourism in communities and offers a touristic perspective to collaboration, particularly in terms of the types of tourism stakeholders who ought to be included in a collaborative process, the proposed outcomes and the nature of referent tourism organizations.

Duffy et. al. (1998) and Penrose (1996), provide greater detail on those aspects of process design for consensus-decision making that Jamal and Getz allude to but provide very little detail. The SDM procedural framework (Penrose 1996) in particular supplements collaboration theory in general by providing a tested set of process design criteria for interest-based negotiation, and consensus-decision-making within a collaborative context.

Jamal and Getz (1995) refer to the potential of collaboration for community-based tourism planning stating that the application of collaboration theory specifically to community-based tourism planning has not been reported. The case studies from the U.S provide a perspective on community-based tourism collaboration that is not available in current research or relevant journals. This perspective is important not only to illustrate some of the elements
proposed by Jamal and Getz but to also validate their claims as to the potential of collaboration in community-based tourism planning.

Whether collaboration theory is relevant, from a tourism perspective, to B.C's sub-regional LRMP processes will be analyzed in the remainder of this thesis. A series of questions have been designed around the main propositions of the theory as outlined in the preceding sections. The goal is to establish the relevance of the general issues expressed in the literature to the perception of the tourism interests involved in an LRMP process in B.C. The range of questions underpinning the empirical research are attached in the analytical framework in Appendix 2. The questions have been broadly categorized according to the theoretical concepts outlined above which each question proposes to provide insight into.
1.0 THE ROBSON VALLEY LRMP PROCESS CONTEXT


The Robson Valley LRMP area covers approximately 1.3 million hectares. It encompasses the Robson Valley Timber Supply Area (TSA), Mount Robson Provincial Park and Mount Terry Fox Provincial Park. These parks amount to 14.68% of the LRMP plan area. The plan area is bounded to the west by three contiguous provincial parks (Bowron Lake, Mitchell Lake-Niagara and Wells Gray), to the north by the Kakwa and Monkman Recreation Areas, and to the east by the Willmore Wilderness Area (Alberta) and Jasper National Park (Alberta).

The population of the Robson Valley is approximately 4000. Total human population in the valley declined about 14% over the 1981-1991 period due to declines in forestry industry employment. Since 1991, population has grown slowly due to immigration of retirees and “urban refugees”. About half of the total human population live in Valemount and McBride, the two largest communities. The remainder of the population live in the smaller communities in the valley including, Dunster, Tete-Jeune Cache, Crescent Spur and Loos.
Valemount with a population of about 1,200 and located near the junction of Highway #16 and #5 is the region's primary growth center. McBride, with a population of about 719, is located 80 km northwest of Valemount on Highway #16. There are no First Nations communities in the planning area, although the Lheit-Lit’en and the North Thompson Indian Band claim traditional territories in much of the Valley.

The valley supports a diverse range of resource values including timber, tourism, fish and wildlife, recreation, agriculture and spectacular scenery. There has been a gradual historic trend away from goods-producing to service industries in the Valley due to declines in forestry employment, tourism growth, aging population, in-migration of “urban-refugees” and retirees, and displacement of some imported goods and services by local entrepreneurs (Duffy et.al. 1998). Forestry has been the single most important sector in the Valley’s economy. Forestry employment declined between 1981 and 1991 due to technological change in sawmilling. Forestry will remain a dominant economic sector, but will continue to decline in relative importance. Tourism is the fastest growing sector in the regional economy.

Conflict between extractive and non-extractive users of the Valley’s resources was evident for a period of time prior to the initiation of the RVRT. In an effort to resolve some of this conflict two Local Resource Use Plans (LRUP) were completed and approved by the Ministry of Forests. The intent of the LRUPs was to better integrate all resource values and uses to maximize the social, economic and environmental benefits. Given this history of attempts at more integrative land and resource use planning the Robson Valley LRMP was adopted by the BC Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE) as a pilot project with the objective to test and evaluate shared decision-making in the context of sub-regional land use planning.
1.1 Tourism in The Robson Valley

Tourism, which accounts for about 6% of income and 16% of employment in the Valley, is the strongest growth factor in the regional economy. This potential is based on a diversity of recreation opportunities, spectacular scenery and proximity to Mount Robson and Jasper parks. These parks help to draw about 1 million visitors annually through the Valley. Data provided on park use and by commercial operators also indicate strong historical growth in recreation demand (Robson Valley Round Table 1996). Tourism-related growth is expected to be particularly important to the Valemount economy.

McBride’s EDS (1995) and Valemount’s equivalent effort (1993) proposed tourism and in particular ecotourism initiatives for both communities. The authors of the Valemount EDS Report state:

"The major industry sectors in the area include forestry, forest product manufacturing, tourism, and agriculture... The main industry in Valemount is lumber manufacturing, which has experienced adjustments due to fluctuations in markets in the past few years and will continue to face continuing pressures in the future. In 1991 the major mill in Valemount was forced to close and in 1992 started up again... Threats continue to pressure the wood manufacturing industry. Tourism for Valemount is a growth industry and may hold the best opportunity for a successful future if developed properly. Positioned on the main tourism corridor (Yellowhead Highway #5) and beside a World Heritage Site (MT Robson Park) and a National Park (Jasper National Park), Valemount has a competitive advantage in the tourism sector. Recent trends towards ecotourism, outdoor adventure travel and a general ... element of environmental awareness bode well for Valemount and area” (pg 7).

The authors of the Tourism/Recreation Strategy in the McBride EDS Report concluded:

"The areas of concern (for our) strategy and actions are specific to backcountry tourism, ecotourism and natural features, recreational activities and sports, arts and culture, service and infrastructure, and coordination and planning...” (pg 39).

and

"Tourism represents the most significant area for potential economic growth and a future source of diversification. Presently, the Valley’s pristine mountain scenery has led to
tourism operations in lodging, guided back-country trekking, heli-skiing and heli-hiking, snowmobiling, cross country skiing, golfing, and hunting which are attracting an increasing number of tourists. Developments are planned for adventure holiday resorts, snowmobile lodges, more golf courses, more white water rafting and several varieties of mountain touring...

Tourism and recreation activity in the Valley rely heavily on not only the parks and protected areas but on the forestry areas. Current tourism products and features are diverse. These include: fishing and hunting; skiing (telemark and cross country); snowmobiling; heli-hiking and heli-skiing; hut-to-hut hiking and guided wilderness travel; alpine touring; wildlife viewing; rock/ice climbing; hang-gliding; kayaking, canoeing and rafting; and outdoor education and interpretive guiding. The Robson Valley contains the world’s only interior temperate rainforest. This feature has become the focus of the “Save the Cedar” trails campaign and is an attraction for wildlife viewers and for its natural scenic beauty. Many tourism operations in the region, especially back country businesses depend on the ongoing availability and accessibility of pristine landscapes.

2.0 EVOLUTION OF THE ROBSON VALLEY LRMP

The Robson Valley LRMP was adopted by the BC Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE) as a pilot project with the objective to test and evaluate shared decision-making in the context of sub-regional land use planning. CORE public assessed the willingness and commitment of interested parties to participate in the Robson Valley LRMP and to use a shared-decision making approach. After meetings and interviews with stakeholders in the Robson Valley in March and April of 1993, consensus was reached to proceed with a planning process and the Robson Valley Round Table was formed (RVRT) and charged with developing a
land and resource management plan for all crown land in the Robson Valley Timber Supply Areas (TSA). Participation was open to all individuals or groups who had an interest in, or might be affected by, the outcome of the plan. The RVRT was made up of 22 public interest sectors\textsuperscript{15} representing a broad range of interests including, fisheries, conservation, timber, access, culture, heritage, recreation, tourism and water. Each sector had one seat at the table which was occupied by a designated spokesperson. Participation in one or more sectors was not intended to limit or constrain the ability of any individual or group to have their interests heard and incorporated. Interest sectors were asked to develop “interest statements” which articulated their hopes, fears, and concerns regarding land use in the Robson Valley.

A provincial government staff member of BC Lands was assigned to coordinate and facilitate the Robson Valley LRMP. As well, the provincial government contracted an independent, professional, Vancouver-based mediator initially to provide training in interest-based negotiations. The mediator remained with the process until its end to help mediate contentious issues between sectors and to assist the government facilitator with process management.

The mandate of the provincial government included provision of information, explanation and clarification of government policies and communication to government concerns of the table about existing government policy with the purpose of affecting a satisfactory resolution. The provincial government provided staff and resources to manage the table’s information requirements. A multi-agency team of government staff formed the Resource Support Team, later the Interagency Planning Team (IPT), drawn from provincial and federal agencies. For

\textsuperscript{15} An interest sector is a group of individuals who hold common values and who have common interests, needs and concerns.
tourism, the BC Ministry of Small Business, Tourism and Culture was part of the IPT. The IPT was responsible for managing the collection, analysis and dissemination of information as directed by the table.

As the process unfolded, most sectors organized themselves into two large coalitions: resource coalition and conservation coalition, as indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Sectors</th>
<th>Conservation Sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Advisory Group</td>
<td>Commercial Heli-skiing and heli-hiking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Institute</td>
<td>Community of Tete Jaune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Subcommittee</td>
<td>Crescent Spur-Loos Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA Canada 1-417</td>
<td>Dunster Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range/Habitat Subcommittee</td>
<td>Environment Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robson Valley Category 2 SBFEP Holders</td>
<td>Outdoor Recreation Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robson Valley Independent Harvesting Group</td>
<td>Tourism Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robson Valley Mill Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobile Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McBride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Valemount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those non-government sectors who did not align themselves with one or other of the two major sectors included:

- Forestry Workers for Sustainable Forests
- Resource Advisory Group
- Youth Subcommittee
- Shushwap Nation Tribal Council
- Lheit-Lit'en Nation
- Canim Lake Band
- Williams Lake Band

The existence of these coalitions was known to all participants and became an established feature of the process. The Robson Valley LRMP Options Report (1996) makes explicit reference to the resource and conservation coalitions. Given tourism’s reliance on the accessibility and availability of the wilderness areas, most of the tourism and recreational
interests aligned themselves with the conservation coalition of the round table. Effectively the coalitions stood to represent extractive versus non-extractive use of the forests. The RVRT negotiated over a three and a half year period between May 1993 and July 1996. The process timeline had been 18 months.

The general planning sequence followed seven steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Step Description</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March - July 1993</td>
<td>Preliminary Organization</td>
<td>• public participation assessment conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Robson Valley Round Table formed; Interagency Planning Team formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. - Nov. 1993</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
<td>• Terms of Reference document developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1993 - Nov. 1994</td>
<td>Information Assembly and Resource Management Zone Formation</td>
<td>• issues and overall goals defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• resource and land use issues identified and qualitative or quantitative resource mapping information gathered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• land base divided into resource management zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1994 - June 1995</td>
<td>Scenario Development</td>
<td>• alternative land and resource management plans with area specific management objectives and strategies for each resource developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July - Dec. 1995</td>
<td>Scenario Evaluation</td>
<td>• resource and multiple accounts analysis of land use and management scenarios and effects on social, economic and environmental condition undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan - July 1996</td>
<td>Building Agreement</td>
<td>• consensus on a and use plan and/or agreement on options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1996</td>
<td>Preparation of Recommendation Plan</td>
<td>• agreement recommendations and options for approval submitted to government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the end of the three years, the RVRT were deadlocked over a number of issues. In particular there was a gulf between the two coalitions regarding the percentage of land that was to be designated as protected areas, the application of biodiversity ratings to a number of key areas and the establishment of visual quality objectives (VQOs) concerning various levels of forest retention to provide appropriate protection of landscape views. After three years of negotiation the table met for final negotiations in May and July of 1996. Ultimately the RVRT was unable to reach consensus on a land use plan.
2.1 Tourism Interests in the Robson Valley LRMP Process

Commercial tourism and touristic values were represented either directly or indirectly by a variety of participants in the LRMP. For example, commercial tourism operators were represented by the Tourism Sub-committee (representing commercial tourism and front country tourism), the heliski/helihiking companies, and the snowmobile association. The Range and Habitat Sub-committee represented amongst other things, guide outfitters and trail riding, which is also a commercial activity in the Valley. The Outdoor Recreation Sub-Committee represented back country recreation, hiking, rock climbing and alpine recreation. Although this sub-committee primarily represented the recreational interests of the local population, they also recognized and represented the commercial value of backcountry recreation in the Valley.

Visual quality is integral to the tourism industry in the valley. The maintenance of visual quality objectives was a major issue for various interest groups in the roundtable. As well as the recreation sub-committee and the tourism sub-committee the Dunster Community Association and the Resources Advisory Group were referred to (by a former member of the IPT who was consulted for this research) as having a strong position on visual quality objectives.

The different sectors representing tourism were therefore not mutually exclusive. Other examples of the cross-representation in groups include, for example, the Resource Advisory Group. Until a representative of the snowmobile association joined the round table late in the process, (January 1995), only the Resource Advisory Group represented snowmobiling interests. An owner of a horse guide outfitting operation was a member of the tourism subcommittee, whilst another was a member of the range and habitat sub-committee. A brief description of the tourism interests and the groups that represented each are summarized in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Sector</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Tourism Related Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outdoor Recreation | • local outdoor enthusiasts e.g. Yellowhead Ski Club, Ozaalenka Alpine Club  
• commercial and non-commercial backcountry hikers, alpinists, wildlife viewers, photographers and naturalists  
• recognition of potential for commercial operations at the edge of remote wilderness usually accessible by road | • development of trails and huts for cross-country skiing and hiking on public lands  
• access restrictions to limit snowmobiling in areas such as Bell Mountain  
• increase the amount of large protected areas  
• reduce conflicts between backcountry users |
| Tourism (general) | • bed and breakfasts, guide outfitting operations, commercial tourism operations generally  
• front country operations primarily located along the highway corridors and some backcountry operations such as guided horseback riding | • reduce uncertainty about access to public lands  
• reduce uncertainty about future extraction of forests  
• establish areas where tourism could occur alongside other compatible activities |
| Range-Habitat | • operators and owners of horseback guiding facilities  
• primarily seasonal operations | • multiple use of trails for guiding, horseback riding, and hiking  
• recognition of horse use on trails in protected areas  
• certainty about future use of public lands, security of tenure |
| Village of McBride | • Council of the Village of McBride  
• McBride is an incorporated community of approximately 719 people | • resolution of conflict between extractive and non-extractive uses of public lands  
• recognition of forestry as primary resource industry for McBride |
| Heliski/Heli hike | • commercial heli-hiking and heli-skiing operators and guides  
• the heli operations have tenure over their ski and hiking areas  
• the region is growing in importance for heli skiing and hiking | • future certainty regarding tenure on public lands  
• reduction in conflict between backcountry users  
• increase the amount of area tenured for heli operations |
| Snowmobile Association | • local recreational snowmobilers  
• the areas, particularly around McBride attract large numbers of snowmobilers from B.C and Alberta | • certainty over access to public lands |
| Resource Advisory Group | • residents of non-incorporated areas around McBride  
• non-incorporated residents often ignored  
• apolitical group | • maintaining or enhancing visual quality  
• mismatch of issues -drinking water quality in community watersheds, berry pickers, snowmobiling... |
| Dunster Community Association | • residents of Dunster  
• community members who wanted to resolve issues without government intervention | • increase the amount of protected areas  
• equal treatment for all interests at the Table |
2.2 Tourism Related Recommendations

The Robson Valley Round Table: Recommended Land and Resource Management Plan and Options Report (1996) provided management recommendations for almost every aspect of crown land use in the Robson Valley. It also includes an economic transition strategy designed to mitigate the impacts of proposed changes in land use. The IPT prepared this report, based on the information and agreements received from the RVRT up to July 1996. The report included all recommendations upon which the RVRT reached consensus, the options submitted by sectors for areas where consensus was not reached and the IPT-recommended options for non-consensus areas. A meeting was held on October 5 1996 to address the final details. Although the RVRT reached "general" agreement on many overall management objectives, there was considerable disagreement on key aspects. The recommended plan was described as a "partial consensus".

The plan divided the Robson Valley area into 23 Resource Management Zones (RMZs) of which there are five categories: Settlement/Agriculture/Rocky Mountain Trench Resource Management Zones, Resource Development Emphasis Zones, General (Multi-Value) Emphasis Management Zones, Special Resource Management Zones and Proposed Protection Resource Management Zones. The plan recommended the designation of 10 new protected areas.

The IPT-recommended plan stated that "the plan provides for land use certainty, better protection of environmental values, opportunities for tourism and recreation and improved guidelines for access management and domestic water use." A number of recommendations included in the LRMP Options Paper (1996) were of particular significance to the range of tourism interests included in the RVRT. For example, the following excerpts from the Options Plan outline some of the suggested benefits to tourism if the Plan is adopted.

*The Plan would be more supportive of long term backcountry tourism growth by creating additional parks (e.g. the Raush, Small R. Caves, Swift Cres., additional to MT Robson).*
The Plan would better manage non-motorized recreation and high quality wilderness opportunities as a result of Special Resource Management Zones (RMZs) and access restrictions in a number of key areas (e.g. Tete Creek, Ozalenka Valley and the Cushing Drainage). The additional VQOs and the emphasis on partial cutting methods in the Valley Trench proposed in the Plan could encourage longer stays in the Valley which could generate additional tourism spending and job gains. (Pg 128)

The Plan provides clearer direction with respect to the identification and management of recreation values such as trails and recreation sites, so that visual impacts of timber harvesting are minimized. For example 65% of high potential commercial backcountry and other recreation sites are located in special management RMZs recommended by the Plan. Also new trails are to be located where possible outside the timber harvesting land base (THLB). (Pg 128)

Existing motorized recreation activities would be allowed to continue in most Protected Areas (PAs) and other areas with motorized access restrictions, although expansion of these activities will be constrained. There is sufficient potential to accommodate growth in motorized recreation for a number of years outside PAs and restricted areas. Traditional snowmobile use areas will also be supported and retained in the Plan. (Pg 128)

From a provincial perspective, protection of the Betty Wendle drainage is very important to ecological, recreation and tourism values in the Bowron Lake Park adjacent to Robson Valley. The new Betty Wendle PA would protect the wilderness backdrop to the Bowron and water quality and fisheries habitat streams feeding the Bowron and Isaac lakes. (Robson Valley Round Table Recommended Land and Resource Management Plan and Options Report: December 1996) (Pg 128)

Further, an overall objective of the Plan is to provide opportunities for growth within the tourism industry. Strategies to achieve this include the preparation of a tourism development strategy for the plan area and to identify suitable tourism areas and maintain future tourism opportunities. The plan also has an objective of maintaining a balance between commercial recreation, public recreation and other uses through the protection and maintenance of backcountry areas. As well, the Plan proposes the promotion of environmentally sustainable tourism through the identification of acceptable practices and potential conflicts associated with sustainable tourism.
3.0 FINDINGS OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

An analysis of the Robson Valley LRMP in terms of Jamal and Getz (1995) process model of collaborative tourism planning follows. It relies upon the empirical findings from interviews with ten key informants who participated in the Robson Valley LRMP. This analysis of collaborative tourism planning is presented in the context of the three stage model put forward by Jamal and Getz (1995), and focuses primarily on their six main propositions for collaboration.

Research was carried out in the field during the month of July 1998. A member of the Interagency Planning Team (IPT) for the LRMP (previously with BC Forests, now with the Forest Renewal Board of B.C) was first asked to provide a list of participants in the LRMP process who represented the various tourism sectors outlined in Table 1. The informants were chosen from the these interest sectors to represent the broad range of tourism activities and values that would be affected by the LRMP. One government agency representative of the IPT was interviewed to gain his agency’s perception on tourism collaboration in the process. This provided the total ten key informants for the empirical research, which exhausted the possibilities of tourism interests in the Valley who were representatives in the RVRT.

Three non-tourism participants were initially questioned, however their perceptions of tourism and tourism issues were such that the semistandardized questionnaire was not able to be completed. On this basis questioning non-participants was not continued. The views of these three non-tourism participants however were recorded and have been used in the analysis to provide further understanding to the responses of the tourism representatives in the LRMP.

The ten key tourism informants were drawn from the following interest sectors\(^\text{16}\):

\(^{16}\) It was a weakness of the field research that a member of the Snowmobile Association could not be interviewed. One of the LRMP representatives from this group had since left the region and the other was not able to be contacted during the field research time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Sector</th>
<th>Number/nature of Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism sub-committee</td>
<td>⇒ Chef, bed and breakfast owner/manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Guide outfit owner/operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation sub-committee</td>
<td>⇒ President Ozalenka Ski Club, alpinist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range/habitat sub-committee</td>
<td>⇒ Realtor, farmer, guide outfit owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McBride</td>
<td>⇒ Councilor, local business owner (bookstore, souvenirs etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heli-ski/heli-hike operations</td>
<td>⇒ Heli operation owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Heli operation guide/manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-agency planning team</td>
<td>⇒ B.C Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Advisory Group</td>
<td>⇒ Artist, photographer, naturalist, historian, wildlife viewer, museum curator, community activist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunster Community Association</td>
<td>⇒ Wood craftsman, environmentalist, community activist, backcountry recreationist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All key informants who were selected had been involved in the LRMP through-out the duration of the process. Potential interview respondents were contacted by phone from the CREDA offices in either McBride or Valemount, and were explained the purpose of the interview, and how the information would be used. Interview respondents were provided with assurance that their individual responses would not be attributed to their particular business, organization or to them personally. This was done to increase the probability that respondents would express their opinions fully and freely. All respondents whom were contacted were agreeable to being interviewed. Interviews were conducted on their terms, generally at their place of business or in their homes. Interviewees appeared very happy to talk about their experiences with the LRMP and most interviews proceeded well beyond the one hour time frame allotted for each.

Data was recorded using shorthand and transcribed into a separate word processing file. A qualitative content analysis of the interview data was conducted. Responses were compressed into a table format indicating the question and a brief summary that captured the essence of the response. Responses were then grouped according to the main theoretical perspectives being analyzed: for example, whether participants perceived benefits, whether they recognized
interdependencies, the adequacy of resources and the outcomes. A full range of perspectives were included in order to represent the complete set of tourism interests and perspectives. When reporting the interview data in the detailed analysis, responses and “quotable quotes” were attributed to a key informant but not to an individual representative or a sub-committee. For example, comments were not attributed to the tourism sub-committee representative or the representative from the Resource Advisory Group. This is because the informants were given an assurance of confidentiality. The data was analyzed for significant trends and issues. Because of the qualitative nature of the responses, no attempt was made to quantitatively analyze results beyond indicating the number of respondents who raised an issue.

In analyzing interview responses, attention was paid not only to overall average responses or majority responses, but also “minority” opinions. This is because the opinions of all stakeholders are critical to the analysis particularly to reveal some of the barriers and opportunities for collaboration for tourism in the process.

3.1 Problem Setting (Stage 1)

3.1.1 Legitimacy of Stakeholders (Proposition 4)

The Robson Valley Round Table was formed in the spring of 1993 after preliminary negotiations. Participation was open to all individuals or groups who had an interest in, or might be affected by, the outcome of the Plan. The RVRT negotiated the structure of the planning process, including the terms of reference in an effort to ensure that the LRMP satisfied the needs of all interested parties. The negotiated terms of reference articulated, amongst other matters, principles of participation, table membership, participant roles and responsibilities.
When asked who has a legitimate stake in such a process as the LRMP, most (9/10) key informants agreed that it should be inclusive of all sectors of the community. Several key informants noted that there was ample opportunity within the process to get involved and that all who should have been there were at least invited. One informant mentioned that inclusivity was not the issue with the LRMP but rather the balance of power.

"Tenured organizations such as forestry and the heli operations who had a vested economic interest in the outcomes of the plan appeared to have more power at the table".

While successful collaboration depends on including a broad spectrum of stakeholders to mirror the critical components of a problem (Gray 1989), they may not all participate to the same extent in the process. Many of the tourism sectors (5/9) in the LRMP process were basically a one or two man show, that is, these representatives really represented themselves rather than a formal group or organization. For example, the tourism subcommittee was never an established committee that the representatives reported back to.

A stakeholder is viewed to have legitimacy when this individual or group is perceived by others to have the right and the capacity to participate. Capacity derives from (amongst other things) the ability to represent constituencies. The lack of a recognized constituency for some of these interest sectors, and their lack of power generally in the region, could have contributed to these tourism interests being viewed by others as not being legitimate stakeholders.

While tourism was invited as a legitimate stakeholder to the process, several key informants (7/10) felt that not all legitimate interest groups for tourism were represented in the LRMP. Tourism in the Robson Valley relies heavily on the “rubber tire” tourist, those passing through to Vancouver or Prince George from Jasper/Banff and stopping for a night in a hotel. Regardless, the hotels and other front country operations such as restaurants, gas stations as well
as the Chambers of Commerce were specifically mentioned (by three key informants) as not being represented. Two out of the seven key informants who stated that tourism was poorly represented, specifically mentioned that snowmobilers as a group had poor representation. One informant believed too many people were involved, making the process cumbersome.

3.1.2 Recognition of Interdependencies (Proposition 1)

During the problem setting stage, participants start to appreciate the interdependencies that exist among them and realize that problem resolution will require collective action. There was a high degree of recognition of the interdependencies between each of the tourism sectors at the Round Table and the natural environment and the activities of the forest sector. The heliski/helihike operations, the back country interests and the tourism subcommittee were motivated to participate because of their recognized interdependencies with other resource use sectors. A representative from the heliski industry mentioned that their desired outcomes were linked to the actions of both the forestry industry and the snowmobilers. Thus, their motivation for joining the LRMP was to ensure the security of their tenure over existing and future heliski areas and to make sure this was not threatened by decisions over logging or access to snowmobilers.

Five of the ten key informants referred to the need to resolve conflicts between the various users of the forest lands. Four of these five key informants alluded to the reliance of tourism on forestry land and the need to reach agreement between extractive and non-extractive use of forests. According to the key informants, however, the forestry sector appeared not to recognize interdependencies with tourism. Several mentioned they were involved in the LRMP because of concerns that when forestry made long term plans, they rarely considered the
activities of others in the backcountry. Interesting insights into tourism’s perceptions of forestry management emerged from discussions with the key informants. Motivations for getting involved in the LRMP related to:

"Concerns about forestry’s open house kind of dealing with the land and not taking the concerns of the general community into account".

Another was:

"Worried about forest companies making decisions and not informing other commercial operators using the back country."

A member of the tourism subcommittee participated because he wanted to raise awareness of the interdependencies between forestry and other backcountry uses.

"If forestry are going to lay down the rules, then we need to be in those rules! Forestry needs to know that the outfitters are out there."

One key informant believes that in the interim at least, tourism should be involved in forest development planning.

Stakeholders within the tourism planning domain must be aware of the interdependencies with each other as well as with the natural environment. Within the tourism system - the market, the transportation enablers, the destination’s attractions, facilities and services and the marketing intermediaries are all linked. One sector cannot effectively operate alone (Mill and Morrison 1985). When asked who should be involved in planning for the management of tourism all ten key informants believed that all tourism businesses and operations, chambers of commerce, as well as community groups, public land managers and the councils should be involved. As previously stated, tourism and touristic values were variously represented by a number of different sectors. As well, a number of important tourism sectors did not participate in the
process e.g. the snowmobilers, tourism facilities operators and services, the Chambers of Commerce and other front country operations.

According to informants, there was no history of collaborative planning for the tourism domain in the Robson Valley. One informant mentioned:

"There is a fragmented view of tourism in the valley, no-one knows what it really involves. There have been some attempts to get people together through things like the EDS (Economic Development Strategies) but they have not gone very far".

One informant specifically mentioned that the LRMP provided, (for the first time) a forum for snowmobilers and alpinists to get together and try to resolve their conflicts over trail use in the backcountry. Resolving conflicts in the backcountry was an interest shared by a number of the sectors at the table. When asked if a collaborative planning process for tourism and the existence of a shared vision for tourism would have enhanced all the tourism interests roles at the RVRT nine of the key informants agreed.

On the same point, one informant believed that the Villages of McBride and Valemount were at odds with tourism operators, and that they simply played lip service to businesses (other than forestry). Similarly another informant stated that the populations in the outlying areas were more favorable to tourism than the Villages, particularly McBride. When pressed on this issue two informants believed that this attitude was related to the traditional primacy of the forestry industry in the Valley. Reference was made (by an informant) to a civic leader who once stated in the context of the LRMP that "tourism was marginal to forestry". Another key informant stated:

"The Villages were parochial, except when it came to wood!"
This relates to the forestry focus of the process and the Timber Supply Review that had commenced previous to the introduction of the Robson Valley LRMP. These processes only were mandated to produce advice and not make decisions, a message that was not made clear, according to the participants in the RVRT.

The non-tourism participants who were initially interviewed for this thesis provided some insight into other sectors views of tourism. Essentially they viewed tourism as poorly paid service sector jobs, and were adamant that tourism was marginal to forestry in the Valley. From their perspective tourism had a very low profile, despite its being an increasingly important economic sector and the potential for tourism as recognized in the EDS for Valemount and McBride. The lack of recognition of the interdependencies within the tourism system and between tourism and the forest industry is implied by one informant’s attempt at summarizing the current state of tourism affairs in the Valley:

“In my mind there are three distinct areas of conflict for tourism: the largest conflict is between the extractive industries (forestry) and tourism, the second largest area of conflict is between motorized and non-motorized users of the backcountry and the third area is between Valemount and McBride. The two Villages themselves are in competition for the tourist dollar.”

3.1.3 Perception of Benefits (Proposition 2)

Stakeholders will remain committed to the process if they believe benefits from participating will outweigh the costs (Selin and Chavez 1995). The key informants identified a range of perceived benefits to being involved in the LRMP. In response to the question; why did you get involved in the LRMP (expectations about benefits or outcomes)?, many had more than

---

17 Representatives from the Farmers Institute, the Forest Workers for Sustainable Forests and the Robson Valley Independent Harvesting Group were interviewed. Because this thesis primarily sought tourism perspectives the line of interviewing non-tourism participants was not considered integral to the research based on the responses from these three.
one perceived benefit for getting involved. Only one informant had no perception of any benefits to be derived from participating. The majority of the informants (8/10) were apprehensive of the possible outcomes of the LRMP. In some cases this apprehension was related to a self-interest (e.g. the heliskiers concern about their tenure). Others, were related to a more altruistic concern for the environment, the future of the community and the options for having a tourism industry based on the use of forested land. Therefore, most informants thought they would benefit by contributing to decisions and having more certainty about the future use of public lands in the Valley.

Certainty about the future use of the land and resolution of conflict was a prominent reason for being involved in the LRMP (8/10). Key informants were generally seeking security over the future use of the forest land for various purposes and were concerned that traditional (non-inclusive) forest planning practices would continue and jeopardize other uses or values for the land.

When asked if their expected benefits or outcomes had been realized most (8/10) said no. The informant who had little expectation of the process stated that this is what they got, “very little”. Key informants expanded their responses by suggesting that there was still no certainty of tenure to backcountry areas, that there was no certainty about the use of trails and that there was recognition for but no resolution of the conflict between mechanized and non-mechanized uses in the back country. The informant who believed that expected outcomes had been realized, believed that subsequent to the options report being prepared, decisions were being made within the general intent of the plan.

Regardless of expected outcomes or benefits not being realized, most tourism stakeholders believed that some benefits had resulted from participating in the LRMP.
"The LRMP provided a forum for alpinists and snowmobilers to get together. The need for getting people together to resolve issues in the alpine was raised."

Other key informants (6/10) agreed that tourism had gotten better representation than before and the LRMP gave tourism some exposure. For example:

"Tourism benefited by exposure to the government"; and

"Tourism got better representation than ever before, there was recognition that tourism is an important industry in the Valley."

Some key informants (3/10) maintained that there were absolutely no benefits or positive outcomes to come from the LRMP. There was a feeling that the backcountry recreationists lost out on all fronts. Another believed that tourism as a whole gained nothing from the process. The reason being that no-one was treated equally at the table. The timber industry and government were felt to have all the control.

Most of the key informants (9/10) agreed they gained some individual benefits from participating in the LRMP. Some (4/10) said they learned and developed new skills, alluding to their training in consensus based decision making and negotiation. Others (3/10) became more vocal, whilst others (2/10) maintained that they had gained knowledge and awareness of the other issues at stake in the process. Several (5/10) believed they had made connections or become more connected to the community. Only one informant believed he had gained nothing from the process and stated that if anything he felt that the community had become more polarized and he felt less connected to a number of different sectors.

Overall, key informants in the LRMP process perceived individual benefits to participating. Most tourism operators or interests, as well as the community and recreational
interests tended to get involved due to the interest or stake of the organization in the outcome. Most of the private firms (heliskiers, outfitters) were motivated by a desire to have reduced uncertainty in their business environment (i.e. they wanted to know about the security of their tenure on public land). Special interest groups, e.g. the Community Associations and the Recreation sub-committees joined the LRMP due to the importance of the planning issues (especially protected areas, water quality and visual quality) to long term environmental sustainability (potential mutual benefits).

3.1.4 Resources and Government Support (Proposition 3)

The LRMP as a process had legitimacy and power. It was convened by the provincial government, it had an external and an internal mandate and it included key stakeholders. Other elements are also important including sufficient resources to participate effectively. The ten key informants were questioned about the effectiveness of the LRMP in terms of the adequacy of resources to participate and government support in the RVRT.

When asked generally about challenges to being involved in the process, a majority (6/10) believed that having the time to participate was difficult. All of the tourism representatives were volunteers to the process and were not paid to be there. One informant mentioned that they were foregoing income to participate in the process. Other significant challenges mentioned included the difficulty representing constituencies in a neutral way (2/10), and gaining credibility for the tourism industry (2/10).

Key informants were asked about the type of support they received from the government for being involved in the LRMP. While the overall process had legitimacy in the sense of government support and the power to influence planning decisions, tourism participants in the
process felt that government support for their sector was lacking. Most informants (7/10) believed that government support for tourism in particular, was lacking or non-existent. A common response (5/10) was that there was little credence given to tourism as an economic activity and that more support from the government along the lines of guidelines, particularly for small tourism operators, was necessary. "A government advocate for tourism would have been useful"; was a suggested response. One informant believed that government support for the process in general was great, but not particularly for tourism. The resource support team were mentioned as being a great support, but two informants cautioned that the government agents' bias crept into the reports prepared after each meeting.

When asked if representatives received enough information, resources or training only a few (3/10) maintained that they received enough information. Seven of the ten key informants believed that insufficient information, data and maps were provided during the process. Of the seven, one key informant believed that nobody, not even the forestry industries had sufficient data, and that only the government appeared to be equipped. In particular, important information such as biological inventories and information on ecological processes was mentioned as being lacking. Two informants mentioned that there was insufficient economic data to support tourism's importance in the valley. In summary, tourism participants were constrained by a lack of resources and were challenged by the time needed to be involved in the round table.

Most key informants (9/10) believed the training was appropriate and necessary. Within the first six months of the process public and government representatives received one day of training by CORE in interest based negotiations and consensus-building. The training was not mandatory and some public representatives were either unable or chose not to attend (Duffy et.
Early in 1995, the RVRT received additional training in interest-based negotiation delivered by the mediator. Again, not all representatives attended (Duffy et. al. 1998).

Several informants alluded to the fact that the consensus decision-making and negotiation only works if everyone attends the training. Several representatives were mentioned (by name) as deliberately avoiding training on the basis that they did not believe in the process or that they did not need the training. Other interest sectors (for example the snowmobile association) came late to the process and missed all the training sessions which took place early in the first year of the round table's existence. Other interest sectors representatives changed over the duration of the process, and new or substitute representatives missed the training all together.

3.2 Direction Setting (Stage 2)

The operational aspects of the Robson Valley LRMP conform to the proposed model. The RVRT negotiated the structure of the planning process, including the terms of reference, which articulated, amongst other things, the RVRT's vision, objectives, the plan area, principles of participation, the planning steps, table membership, principles of consensus building, dispute resolution procedure and the plan approval process. When needed, Round Table sectors formed sub-committees which met more frequently to tackle more challenging issues like biodiversity and visual management. Sub-committees reported back to the Round Table where final discussions took place.

The key informants for this research were questioned about the achievement of a shared vision for the Robson Valley and the role of tourism in that vision. The role and effectiveness of

---

18 A cross-check of the names given as those who did not attend the training revealed that many represented timber related interest sectors.
the process managers i.e. the facilitator from B.C. Lands and the process support team (Interagency Planning Team) was also addressed. Legitimacy of the process will also depend upon the dispersion of power among the stakeholders. Without any prompting, several of the key informants raised the issue of power imbalances at the Round Table, particularly when asked about the shared vision and the role of the process coordinators.

3.2.1 Facilitator, Mediator and Interagency Planning Team (ITP) (Proposition 3)

Most key informants, when asked if those responsible for the ongoing management of the LRMP were effective replied no (6/10). There was a suggestion that the coordinators from the IPT were biased particularly given that they had the mandate to go away and write up the minutes and the reports of the meetings. Key informants challenged the neutrality of the IPT and believed that government support for tourism was insufficient.

"The forestry coordinators bias would end up in the reports."

Others (3/10) suggested that the mediator and facilitator did not know much about tourism and other issues that were at stake. Two informants were adamant that the LRMP was not an effective process and the mediator and facilitator were in over their heads. Others (3/10) believed that the third parties to the process were spread thin and did the best they could with what they were working with. They suggested that there were too many lay people around with issues and no knowledge.

3.2.2 Shared Vision and Balance of Power (Proposition 3 and 6)

Most of the key informants (9/10) agreed that there was no shared vision either for tourism, or for land and resource management as a whole, after the LRMP process was completed. Only one informant replied positively to the question about the evidence of a shared
vision. The LRMP process according to four key informants exposed the conflicts within tourism as well as the conflicts between tourism and the extractive resource industries. One informant suggested that there was more of a vision now than there was before regarding tourism. Specifically they suggested that the vision was to balance logging with tourism. Three key informants suggested that there was a fragmented view of tourism in the Valley and lack of information or understanding of what tourism actually involves.

When asked why they thought a shared vision wasn’t reached, most informants variously referred to power imbalances and bureaucratic control of the process. One informant stated that he thought the LRMP was totally the wrong type of process to resolve these issues, yet was unable to offer an alternative. In terms of the collaborative theory, the LRMP lacked some legitimacy and effectiveness in the sense that several key informants referred to the imbalances of power at the table.

"Trying to achieve legitimacy for tourism in the process, when other sectors such as forestry were heavily resourced and supported, was challenging."

"I expected all interests to be treated equally, but no-one was treated equally. The timber industry had all the control"

Other key informants also believed that the power imbalance was the problem with the process.

"The tenured organizations and those with a vested economic interest in the land appeared to have all the power."

Along the same lines another informant mentioned:

"The tourism issues were probably dominated by the heliskiers because they were best represented and were supported by legislation."
Others felt let down by the process in the sense they were denied the decision-making power they were led to believe they would have. One informant stated:

"It was just a smoke and mirrors game, we were just there to give the impression of public input" whilst another said,

"Decision-making power we did not have. Recommendation making power yes."

Another informant stated that the community had no empowerment, that the government saw logging as the primary industry in the Valley and fell in line with the timber companies. The same informant believed that tourism was "swept aside".

This is corroborated by the findings of the research undertaken by Duffy et. al. (1998) with regard to public participation in the Robson Valley LRMP. Their research revealed that public representatives in the RVRT felt that a consensus-based process was not effective because of government interference and control. “Government just came in and told us what to do”, was a response recorded in this research. (Duffy et. al. 1998 pp. 143).

Other findings from Duffy et. al. describes how public representatives in the RVRT had been told by the initial convenors (CORE) that it was “their process” and that it was “their opportunity” to send “their message” to government about land and resource management in “their area” (pp. 145). A representative in the Duffy et. al. study noted that we (the participants in the RVRT) were led to believe that the table would make the decision but this was not the case. Duffy et. al. summarize that in the end many public representatives felt that the LRMP became the provincial government’s process, not a process of the citizens of the Robson Valley. They state for example that some public representatives indicated that government actions, such as setting a protected areas target, undermined what they thought was an appropriate role for the
government. Respondents in their research felt that the process was very political and driven for the sake of public relations. Even a government representative in the Duffy report stated that government tended to change its mind as things evolved -- for example, with the protected areas strategy in particular. The evolving policy discouraged some people because just when that thought they were going to get something it would change (pp. 146).

The government representatives at the round table were in for some tough criticism from the key informants in this research. One criticized the ministries for using their own ‘jargon’. He saw the government representatives and those controlling the process as:

"Specialists speaking their own language, which was not the language of the communities of the Robson Valley. The process placed greater emphasis on the people at their desks in Victoria and not on the community at all."

Along these lines a few informants alluded to the inability of the bureaucrats to be flexible to the demands of some of the interests at the table.

"The government’s expected outcomes were too structured, they had policies and guidelines in place and would not budge from those. In particular they had a cap on protected areas which set limits." and

"We were asking for ministerial accountability and willingness to change, but we did not get that."

Still others commented:

"The difficulty was that the bureaucrats took away people’s initiatives"

"Government dominated the process."

"Bureaucracy shouldn’t be flaunting their recipe books, they have to be more flexible".
3.3 Outcomes and Implementation (Stage 3)

3.3.1 Structure for Ongoing Collaboration (proposition 6)

For tourism, Jamal and Getz recommend the establishment of an ongoing tourism support organization for planning and managing tourism. When asked about the need for such an organization most key informants (9/10) agreed that some type of a collaborative community led organization was necessary. Government support (in terms of funding) was seen as important to the structure but there was a general wariness of too much bureaucratic control. Two key informants perceived a role for the FRBC in funding and supporting such an organization. One informant believed that the communities needed a tourism resource/support officer to assist such an organization.

Few key informants were happy with the overall outcomes of the plan. Most believed that nothing had changed. Given that the plan was not yet approved, the tourism interests were still uncertain about the future of their land and resource base. Several mentioned that tourism had gained nothing from the plan and that their desired outcomes had been “watered down”. Most key informants (8/10) believed that the LRMP had done little to improve the level of trust and cooperation between government and non-government interests in the land. From a tourism perspective the LRMP had resulted in a decline in trust for the government.

4.0 SUMMARY

Although the Robson Valley LRMP was a long and difficult process nine of the key informants stated they would participate in future planning processes. Two qualified their response by adding that they would not get involved in an LRMP, but would get involved in
other types of processes. The informant who would not get involved again believed that it was too long of a process and he did not have the time. When asked how the process could be improved or what could be different, several insights were provided. Three key informants believed that there should be less bureaucracy involved. In particular less emphasis on what people sitting at the desks in Victoria want and more on what the community wants. The bureaucratic vision was criticized as being too far removed from the community. Bureaucracy was also criticized as being way too inflexible in addressing the concerns and desired outcomes of the non-economic sector groups. The process could be improved if greater decision-making power was given to the community, and the process did not just have the appearance of public input.

Overall in terms of collaborative tourism planning theory there is evidence of some of the elements proposed by Jamal and Getz. There was a recognition of certain interdependencies of tourism (especially with the environment), the process was inclusive of legitimate stakeholders and did have power and legitimacy to influence other planning processes. However, as the outcomes of the process suggest these things are not adequate for achieving a collaborative success. The lack of resources and government support for tourism, the challenges of dedicating time to participate, the power imbalances at the table (reinforced by government’s support of forestry) and the bias among the process managers could have contributed to this lack of success.

In emerging tourism domains, such as the Robson Valley, it may be necessary to specifically implement a collaborative community-based planning process and form an organization to manage tourism development affairs in the communities and the region overall. The idea of such an organization was certainly supported by key informants in the LRMP process.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This thesis has examined the collaborative aspects of SDM public land use planning processes from a tourism perspective. It has done this by looking at a theory of collaborative community-based tourism planning. This theory (Jamal and Getz 1995), is based upon the same theory of collaboration (Trist 1977; Gray 1985, 1989 and 1991; and Gray and Wood 1991) as the SDM processes advocated by B.C's Sustainability Strategy. In summary, SDM processes based on interests, consensus and collaboration - focus on encouraging stakeholders to collaboratively seek outcomes that accommodate rather than compromise the interests of all concerned (Williams et. al. 1998).

Jamal and Getz place an emphasis on who should be involved in a collaborative effort involving tourism, and the types of outcomes that ought to emerge for tourism (for example, a shared vision for tourism and an ongoing tourism management organization). This aspect of Jamal and Getz' theory makes it particularly useful for analyzing collaboration in the LRMP from a tourism perspective. Their theory proposes a model for more integrative and participatory tourism planning processes and emerges from literature that focuses on the role of tourism in the achievement of sustainable development. As well, it proposes to provide a process for resolving conflict and/or advancing a shared vision in the tourism domain, where stakeholders recognize the potential advantages of working together.
Jamal and Getz' theory (1995) has been developed to describe community-based processes. In this regard they place an emphasis on the importance of achieving legitimacy for the process and ensuring that recommendations are able to influence other (local or provincial) planning processes. The Robson Valley LRMP (and other LRMPs) process is a joint government/non-government planning process, initiated by CORE and coordinated by an interagency planning team (IPT). In this regard, the aspect of achieving legitimacy for the collaboration as a whole is not as important as if the process were a community-based (grassroots) planning process.

Regardless of these two aspects of Jamal and Getz' theory, the basic premises and that of B.C's SDM processes are, inherently the same. That is, collaboration occurs when stakeholders embroiled in a conflict agree to explore their differences and seek solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible (Gray and Wood 1991). Where the needs of the stakeholders are not truly interdependent, or if there is an imbalance of power such that one party dominates the process and outcomes, collaborative processes will likely fail (Gray 1991).

Based primarily on the theory of collaborative tourism planning an analytical framework containing a semistandardized interview questionnaire was developed (see Appendix 2). A series of interviews were held with a range of key informants who might be expected to hold well-articulated positions for tourism's involvement in the Robson Valley LRMP. Interviews were exploratory and informal. Questions were designed to capture post-process reflections regarding the opportunities and constraints to collaboration for tourism in the LRMP. These questions probed various dimensions of the relevant propositions put forward by Jamal and Getz as facilitating conditions for collaboration and outcomes for ongoing collaboration. These included: recognition of interdependencies; adequacy of resources and government support for tourism in
the process; the role of neutral convenors, process managers and facilitators; perceived benefits for collaborating; the legitimacy of stakeholders; as well as the perspectives of the ten key informants on the outcomes of the planning process (Jamal and Getz 1995).

Overall the questioning provided insight into the research problem regarding: the level of collaboration, within LRMPs from a tourism perspective and the level of collaboration among tourism interests involved in the process. The research provided insight into this issue by addressing the following questions:

- What are the opportunities for collaborative planning for tourism's use of land and resources in the context of the Robson Valley LRMP?
- What are the barriers to collaborative planning for tourism's use of land and resources in the context of the Robson Valley LRMP?
- What were the positive aspects, from a tourism perspective, of participating in the LRMP process?

The case study of the Robson Valley LRMP process reveals elements of collaboration as well as highlighting many of the opportunities and constraints to implementing collaboration.

2.0 CONCLUSIONS ABOUT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

2.1 Opportunities For Collaboration

Despite the inability of the RVRT to reach consensus on a land use plan, the LRMP process created a number of opportunities for tourism interests to potentially collaborate in the future with each other and other land use sectors. The tourist representatives at the table were: able to enhance their recognition of interdependencies with forestry; were invited as legitimate stakeholders in the process; and were able to have direct input into land use decision making. As well, the participants demonstrated a willingness to collaborate and perceived many potential
benefits, for tourism, to collaborating, particularly to gain certainty for their long term interests in
the land and resource base.

2.1.1 Recognition of Interdependencies

Jamal and Getz (1995) propose that collaboration will require recognition of a high
degree of interdependence in planning and managing for tourism. There was a high degree of
recognition of tourism’s interdependency with forestry. Further, the LRMP process enhanced this
recognition by giving tourism the opportunity to get together with forestry to move towards
overcoming conflict over visual quality objectives, existing and potential areas for motorized and
commercial backcountry tourism and the allocation of protected areas. Those tourism interests
who participated also recognized the interdependencies within the tourism system. Tourism
representatives recognized that all elements of the tourism system should be involved in a
process such as an LRMP, and were vocal in their recognition of the non-participation of certain
sectors such as hotels, the Chambers of Commerce and other small businesses and the poor
representation of other sectors such as the snowmobilers.

The findings from the research (Chapter 4 - 3.1.3) revealed that personal contacts were
made between tourism interests and there was a general increase of awareness of the other issues
at stake in the process. Most tourism interest groups joined the conservation coalition in the
process. Thereby, the process helped the tourism representatives to finally recognize
commonality among the interests and to realize the advantages to be gained by working together.

2.1.2 Inclusion of Key Stakeholders

The LRMP process created the opportunity, for the first time for most tourism
representatives, to participate in strategic land use planning decisions which related directly to
their long term interests in the land and resource base of the Robson Valley. Tourism was
recognized as a legitimate stakeholder and therefore, all tourism interests were invited to
participate. The process gave tourism in the Robson Valley much needed exposure and raised
awareness among the government agencies of the growing importance of tourism to the economy
of the Valley. The LRMP brought together a diverse array of tourism interests, many of whom
had never gotten together to resolve conflicts (especially backcountry alpinists and mechanized
backcountry users), and raised awareness of the need to work together towards resolution.
(Subsequent to the LRMP process a backcountry recreation committee has formed, comprising
of alpinists, snowmobilers and forestry to try to resolve some of the conflict.)

2.1.3 Willingness to Collaborate

The LRMP process was important in highlighting the need for collective decision-making
for tourism. Tourism interests were fragmented at the Round Table yet the process highlighted
the need to overcome fragmentation of tourism interests whereby participants saw a role for a
collaborative organization for the planning and management of tourism. Such an organization
was potentially seen as vital and needed to be a community-based organization without
bureaucratic control.

Tourism interests recognized that a shared vision for tourism, prior to the LRMP, would
have enhanced tourism’s collective position at the Table. Prior to the LRMP there was no sharing
of tourism information or ties between tourism operators. The LRMP process brought a
realization to the tourism participants of the need for a shared vision and collective decision-
making for tourism. Tourism interests admitted a willingness to enter into collaborative
processes in the future but expressed a lack of faith in government sponsored processes.
2.1.4 *Perceived Benefits to Collaborating*

Stakeholders will remain committed to a collaborative process if they believe the benefits will outweigh the costs (Selin and Chavez 1995). The tourism participants in the Robson Valley LRMP perceived many benefits to being involved. Primarily participants perceived they would benefit because they thought they would have some decision-making power through the LRMP process and have some certainty about the future use of resources and land in the Robson Valley. Past land use planning practices had marginalised interests such as tourism, and had been dominated by forestry. The tourism sector wanted to know about future decisions to log areas of the Robson Valley because it related to their own long-term interests in the land and resource base. These benefits, though not realized, were important given both the historical lack of opportunities for tourism to be involved in land and resource decision-making and the growing importance of tourism to the Robson Valley. These perception of benefits were important as motivation for tourism representatives to participate in the RVRT. This research has shown that stakeholders are motivated if they think they are going to have some decision-making power. In this regard a community-based process that enables participants to make decisions was supported by the tourism representatives interviewed from the RVRT. Being involved in the process however, did bring some benefits to the tourism representatives, in terms of training, a greater understanding of other sectors interests in land use and bringing the tourism sectors together for the first time.
2.2 **Constraints To Collaboration**

Despite the forces discussed above that operated to bring parties together, there are substantial institutional and circumstantial obstacles to collaboration evident in the Robson Valley LRMP. Significant power imbalances, as well institutional factors were highlighted by tourism interests as being prevalent during the process. Weak government support for tourism and a paucity of resources also hindered tourism’s effectiveness at the table.

### 2.2.1 *Imbalances of Power*

As suggested in the theory, collaboration is hindered when significant power differences exist among parties or when certain parties are not perceived as having a legitimate claim to participate in a consensus forum. Tourism felt that despite being invited as legitimate interests to the round table, they were challenged during the process in trying to maintain that legitimacy. Tourism felt that the forestry sector failed to recognize the interdependencies between forestry and other land use interests and values for the public land resource and failed to recognize the legitimacy and forcefulness of the well distributed power. Quite often those sectors who were representing visual quality objectives and other non-economic values were accused of having nothing better to do!

Having a BATNA (Fisher and Ury 1981), in this LRMP context may have assisted the tourism interests collectively to protect them against agreeing to the Robson Valley LRMP Options Report proposals and to help them make the most of what resources they had in terms of enhancing their power. Fisher and Ury (1991) suggest that the better the BATNA the greater the power in interest-based negotiation. Had the tourism interests at the table collaborated on a vision for tourism in the valley and developed a BATNA prior to the process, this may have
improved their strength in the Round Table. Tourism interests could have agreed that if the
negotiation was not going to produce an agreement that would satisfy their interests they should
collectively leave the Round Table and agree to challenge the LRMP for the Valley at every
opportunity they could.

2.2.2 Institutional Constraints

The institutional culture within agencies often hinders collaboration. Despite the SDM
processes being convened by government, agencies in the process lacked the flexibility to
consider many of the requirements of different interests at the table. Agencies were confined to
adhering to existing policies and land use decisions that preceded the LRMP. For example the
Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks (MELP) were accused of being committed to a recipe
book procedure for assigning protected areas. Gray (1989) decried the inertia that hinders large
government bureaucracies from innovating in implementing agreements that arise out of
collaborations.

2.2.3 Resource Constraints

Achieving legitimacy is hindered by resource limitations, particularly when other sectors
at the table are heavily resourced and supported by government. Compared to other interests at
the table, especially the forestry sector, tourism was lacking in support from the government.
Tourism lacked policy guidelines and support as well as the ongoing presence of a government
advocate for tourism. Tourism interests also felt that government sided with other interests
(_forestry_) at the table. Tourism information, socioeconomic studies and mapped data was lacking
and unable to be provided by the interest groups. These resource requirements were not met by
the provincial government or the IPT.
Tourism, as a relatively small and fragmented interest group had neither the staff nor the financial resources to manage a coordinated effort. Because interests were widely dispersed across a large geographical region meeting with constituents was difficult. The different tourism interests groups at the table therefore, tended to be geographically defined.

2.3 Positive Aspects Of Participation

In summary many of the positive aspects, from a tourist perspective, of the Robson Valley LRMP relate to the opportunities for collaboration. The tourism interests at the table demonstrated a willingness to potentially work together and recognized the need for collective decision-making with regard to the future planning and management of tourism in the Valley. The LRMP enhanced tourism's recognition of their interdependencies with each other and the natural environment. The LRMP brought the many tourism interests together mostly for the first time and raised awareness of each others values and reliance upon the land and resources of the Robson Valley. Tourism gained exposure as an important economic sector in the Valley, particularly to the government agencies involved in the land use planning processes.

3.0 CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The LRMP process purports to provide a new approach to decision-making, one in which tourism, for the first time in British Columbia, is able to participate and supposedly have direct input on an equal level with other land use interests. Given the importance of this, analyzing and understanding how effective tourism is in this capacity and how effective planning processes are
in facilitating tourism's participation is critical to the achievement of better decision-making both for tourism and for the management of land and resources.

The insights learned from in-depth interviews with the tourism representatives and tourism related interests have helped gain an understanding of the underlying forces that both facilitate and inhibit collaboration, both amongst tourism interests and between tourism and other interests within a public land use planning process.

While there were many opportunities for collaboration in the Robson Valley LRMP, significant institutional and situational obstacles hindered it. These obstacles, such as the imbalance of power at the table, the lack of resources and government support for participation, and the lack of recognition by powerful and controlling sectors of their interdependencies with other land use interests, were significant enough for tourism to be dis-satisfied with the outcomes of the plan and to lose trust with the government over its control of the process.

Together with a need for tourism to be integrated with broader land use planning processes is a need for greater coordination and cohesion within the highly fragmented tourism domain. This research chose to explore the degree to which tourism interests themselves collaborated in the context of the Robson Valley LRMP. With regard to this aspect of the research, which was to determine if the tourism interests at the table collaborated with each other, the outcomes were more positive. Regardless of the high level of fragmentation among tourism interests at the table, the LRMP provided for the first time an opportunity for many of the tourism interests to get together to discuss common issues. The tourism interests exhibited a desire to resolve conflicts and recognized the importance of working together towards a resolution. The tourism interests also demonstrated a high degree of recognition of their interdependencies with each other and between tourism and other land use interests in the Valley.
The same representatives perceived a number of benefits to collaborating in land and resource management and planning.

4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY

4.2 Elements of Collaboration in the LRMP

In terms of a theoretical model of collaboration, such as that proposed by Jamal and Getz (1995) and based on Gray (1985 and 1989), there is evidence to suggest that in operational terms the Robson Valley LRMP process approximated a three stage model of collaboration. For example the RVRT went through a process of problem setting and direction setting similar to that proposed in the model outlined in Table 3 of Chapter 2 of this thesis. Regardless of the RVRT reaching only a ‘partial consensus’ during the direction setting stage, the IPT progressed with the submission of a final plan detailing structures for implementing the various land use recommendations.

It should be emphasized that the model process describes the ideal set of circumstances, which, in the case of the RVRT were attenuated by many internal and external barriers to collaboration as described in the preceding section. Amongst other factors, this research has revealed institutional constraints and power imbalances as hindering optimal outcomes for tourism in the LRMP.

Despite its contribution to understanding tourism and collaboration, Jamal and Getz’ theory, while alluding to power relations, assumes that collaboration can overcome power imbalances by involving all stakeholders in a process that meets their needs. Building on work by Gray (1989) who writes about organizational theory Jamal and Getz present a table suggesting
that power relations must be addressed at all stages of a collaborative planning process. See Table 5 below (modified from Table 3 of Chapter 2 of this Thesis).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages and Propositions</th>
<th>Facilitating Conditions</th>
<th>Actions/Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Setting</td>
<td>Shared access to power</td>
<td>Balancing power differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction Setting</td>
<td>Dispersion of power among stakeholders</td>
<td>Ensure power distributed among several stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Redistribution of power</td>
<td>Select suitable structure for institutionalizing process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citing a study undertaken by Gray and Hay (1986), Jamal and Getz argue that “power imbalances and legitimacy issues related to the stakeholders can inhibit both the initiation and the success of a collaboration”. However, they argue that power can be viewed as an instrument to be managed and balanced. For example they suggest that it is possible to address the issue of power and authority by including legitimate stakeholders and identifying a suitable convenor at an early stage in the collaborative process. The theory suggests that where power is not initially equal, government (local in Jamal and Getz’ theory) may be a suitable convenor when the issues revolve around resolving land-use and development problems.

Jamal and Getz’ propositions do not explain why, how and under what conditions, those with power would be willing to distribute it to others. As this research has shown, reliance on the provincial government to convene power relations dispelled the assumption that these agencies would be neutral arbiters in the land use and resource management process. Referring to Chapter 4 -3.2.2 of this thesis, key informants are quoted as to the bias in reporting, and to government falling in line with timber companies during the process. The implications of this in terms of further research are discussed below.
4.2 Support for Community-Based Collaborative Tourism Planning

Synthesizing recent research on collaborative processes (such as Gray 1985 and 1989) Jamal and Getz (1995) developed a process model of collaboration (refer to Chapter 2) for community-based collaborative tourism planning. While there was no evidence of community-based collaborative tourism planning among the interests interviewed for this research, a strong need for such a collaborative effort emerged. As well, the key informants demonstrated a commitment to collaboration and a willingness to collaborate to resolve conflicts surrounding tourism/recreational uses of land and resources in the Robson Valley. In terms of the theory, there is evidence, among tourism interests in the Robson Valley, to support Jamal and Getz (1995) assertion that a collaborative approach can help overcome the lack of cohesion and coordination of the highly fragmented tourism industry.

4.3 Two Levels of Collaborative Planning

What the evidence suggests in terms of theory is that there is potential for tourism to be involved in two levels of collaborative planning in the context of land use and resource management, in B.C. One is a community-based collaborative tourism planning process. Jamal and Getz allude to the need for community-based collaborative tourism planning to overcome the lack of coordination and cohesion in the fragmented tourism domain and to overcome conflicts that may exist in that domain. As well, the theory suggests that the more integrative and participatory approach offered by collaboration will lead to more sustainable forms of tourism. Certainly in the Robson Valley there is evidence of a fragmented tourism industry and a lack of
cohesion and coordination in planning tourism development, as well as evidence of conflict between the various tourism sectors. Further to this, the research reveals a general support for and willingness on the behalf of the tourism interests to collaborate in the planning of tourism.

The other level is the provincial government’s, SDM planning process where stakeholder representatives come together with a shared goal to collaboratively develop a land use plan, that reflects consensus among the parties. From a tourism perspective, the evidence suggests that some of the obstacles (referred to above) that hindered tourism’s collaboration in the Robson Valley LRMP may have been overcome if a community-based collaborative tourism planning process had preceded or occurred coincidentally with the LRMP. For example barriers such as the lack of recognition of tourism as a legitimate stakeholder and resource limitations may have been overcome if stakeholders in the tourism domain had formulated a vision on desired tourism management and growth and had established a collaborative organization to self-regulate the planning and development of the tourism domain. Conceptually these two levels of planning need to be linked.

Discussing sustainable tourism planning, Gunn (1988) stated that continuous tourism planning must be integrated with all other planning for social and economic development, and could be modeled as an interactive system. In the case of the Robson Valley LRMP there was little evidence of any coordinated or structured tourism planning - although there was agreement that such planning was necessary. In this regard tourism was integrated with other planning (in this case the LRMP) in a fragmented and uncoordinated way. This is depicted in the model outlined below, which shows the various tourism interests as separate sectors at the RVRT. The planning process in this case is conducted as a collaboration between government and non-
government interests. Figure 2 outlines the Robson Valley Round Table as it appeared during the LRMP process.

Figure 2: The Robson Valley Round Table

Figure 3 details an interactive system whereby community-based collaborative tourism planning - as proposed by Jamal and Getz and supported by tourism interests in the Robson Valley LRMP - is intrinsically linked with the LRMP process. This alternative model requires ongoing community-based collaborative tourism planning. In order for the tourism plans to be endorsed as strategic government policy there will inevitably be a need for government to be involved in approving and implementing the plan. Thus the interactive model as proposed by
Gunn (1991), where continuous tourism planning is integrated with all other planning is essential. The following model is developed as possibly being able to improve tourism’s representation in future LRMP’s or other joint government, non-government strategic land use planning processes.

Figure 3: Collaborative Planning for Tourism In B.C.

While such a model may help overcome some of the obstacles to collaboration faced by tourism in the Robson Valley LRMP, in some cases, obstacles to collaboration may be too formidable to overcome. According to Gray (1989) this is particularly true under conditions where conflict is rooted in basic ideological differences as was observed in the context of the Robson Valley LRMP.
While Jamal and Getz (1995) have provided an adaptation of collaboration to the tourism context, their theory is focused on a community-based process. As this thesis has demonstrated tourism is being invited and must participate in integrative and joint government/non-government planning processes. The community-based collaboration theory has limitations in being able to analyze tourism’s role in a government initiated and controlled collaborative process. However, tourism’s ability to participate in these processes is paramount. What is needed is developments of Jamal and Getz’, theory that deal with the issues of power relations and constraints to tourism’s participation in collaborative land use planning processes. This is critical for improved tourism involvement in all government planning process, not just the processes that pertain to principles of shared-decision-making and collaboration.

This thesis has gone part way to suggest how tourism can strengthen its position in a joint government/non-government planning process, that is, by collaborating as an industry prior to or coincidentally with a public process. However further research regarding the nature of power relations and institutional constraints needs to be underpin any further theoretical assertions regarding tourism, collaboration and tourism’s ability to participate in government land-use planning processes.

5.0 IMPlications FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The propositions outlined in this paper could be further tested in future research. Analytical case studies of LRMP’s where full consensus was reached are necessary to fully capture the essence of tourism participation in shared decision-making processes. As well, the
stages and implementation of community-based tourism collaborations need to be investigated with attention paid to linkages between the community-based process and other public (formal) land use planning processes. Such research could help identify strategies whereby the recommendations and outcomes of community-based planning processes are better integrated into formal planning processes of government.

The tourism sector's collaboration in other LRMP's might be more effective and the outcomes might be more acceptable to tourism with regard to certain stakeholder groups in LRMPs or in certain situations. Ongoing research through in-depth case studies would provide answers to how tourism can overcome barriers to collaboration or how process design and management deal with the barriers and accommodate tourism interests.

Although there appeared to be support for and a willingness to collaborate among the tourism stakeholders in the Robson Valley this did not occur. The facilitators and inhibitors to collaboration for community-based tourism planning need to be further identified in empirical research, in order to understand the conditions under which collaboration can be used as a process to resolve problems and advance shared visions for tourism. In emergent tourism settings, such as the Robson Valley, the lack of institutional support for tourism may allow conventional power holders in the community (such as public land management agencies, the forestry industry and local government) to retain their influence in key decisions involving collaborative processes (Reed 1997). Reed (1997) in looking at power relations and tourism planning, says that if collaboration fails to yield optimal solutions, analysts risk attributing this result solely to failure of individuals or individual processes rather than considering broader structural features within which the processes are embedded. This research has revealed some such structural features as contributing to the failure of the Robson Valley (and LRMPs in
general) to yield optimal solutions for tourism. Further research could focus on the power relations operating in community settings to advance explanations of not only community-based collaborative tourism planning but also joint government/non-government collaborative land use planning processes (such as SDM process).

6.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

The practical implications of the above observations and concepts require both government resource managers and the tourism sectors to take steps to facilitate more effective participation in government SDM processes and thus solutions to resource problems.

6.1 Practical Implications For Tourism Businesses /Tourism Organizations

Collaboration theory is relevant to the needs of the tourism interests in the Robson Valley to become involved in the ongoing planning and management of tourism in their region. The tourism sectors need to seek out participants who are motivated to advance a shared vision of tourism development and management in the Valley. Partnerships or volunteer agreements (refer to the examples in Chapter 3 of this thesis) can be designed to formalize the responsibilities of each stakeholder to address the tourism resource problem or carry out the vision.

Collaboration among the tourism interests may become an effective strategy for invoking the sense of social responsibility to share in the overall management and planning for tourism in the Valley of the hoteliers, the Chambers of Commerce, and other tourism sectors who did not participate in the LRMP. As well, collaboration among the tourism stakeholders could lead to more effective representation and participation in government shared decision-making processes.
Importantly if tourism collaborates as a sector prior to an LRMP and resolves its own conflicts and agree upon a BATNA this would enhance their position in the negotiations over land and resource use and management.

6.2 Practical Implications For Government

Collaboration theory is also relevant to the methods used by the government and its process managers to involve tourism and other land use interests in SDM processes, such as LRMPs. While collaboration has been conceptually defined as a three stage process this research has shown that there can be significant institutional barriers that hinder collaboration from tourism’s perspective. In this regard the following suggestions are addressed to government and the process managers responsible for coordinating collaborative based processes to facilitate solutions to resource problems involving tourist interests.

Government may need to ensure that public agencies with responsibility for tourism be represented directly in LRMPs and that these representatives are able to assist with information management and coordination. In particular base information such as maps and resource inventories for tourism should be available prior to the process in order to identify information gaps. Government should support and encourage interest sectors involved with tourism to work together as a single sector to make more effective use of limited resources. Support as needed should be provided to encourage and assist in community-based collaborative tourism planning. This may assist tourism in achieving legitimacy at the round table and help secure a level playing field for participating in LRMP’s.
Stakeholders in the LRMP's need to be made aware prior to the process of the potential lack of flexibility within government agencies for implementing agreements and procedures that may arise out of the collaboration. Potential stakeholders should be informed as to the nature of existing government policies and decisions that potentially constrain the freedom of the round table to make decisions. Stakeholders will lose faith in the process and lose trust with government if they are led to believe they have decision-making power and are not forewarned of the parameters within which they must work. This was a critical issue in the Robson Valley LRMP. Participants were led to believe they had decision-making power which was a primary motivation for involvement. This power was never intended and government needs to be clear about this message if it is to avoid alienating public representatives involved in LRMPs.

7.0 FINAL COMMENT

The literature suggests that collaboration conceptually follows a three stage process of problem setting, direction setting and implementation. Regardless of whether it is a community-based collaborative process or a joint government non-government collaborative process sponsored by the government, certain facilitating conditions for collaboration are proposed. This research showed that there is utility in the theory of community-based collaborative tourism planning. However the research has shown that reality is more complex than the conceptual models imply. Primarily, structural features, within which the joint government, non-government LRMP processes are embedded, such as power relations, can be significant hindrances to effective participation by tourism. Finally, in the context of British Columbia's forest-dependent communities, there appears to be the potential for tourism to be involved in two levels of
collaborative planning, that is, a community-based planning process and the government
sponsored SDM process. This suggests the need for pilot studies and further research about
tourism’s involvement in LRMPs.


Commission on Resources and Environment (1994) *Vancouver Island Land Use Plan*. Victoria, BC.


### APPENDIX 1: CASE STUDIES OF TOURISM COLLABORATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Actions/Steps</th>
<th>Case Study Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of a high degree of interdependency.</td>
<td>➞ Clearly defined purpose and domain, emphasizing the interdependencies between sectors.</td>
<td>➞ Nearly all the collaborative case studies define the purpose of the collaboration, the tourism domain and within these recognize a high degree of interdependencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ Detailed outline of the relationship of the tourism management plan to other policies and statutory documents.</td>
<td>➞ Gold Belt Back Country Byway Partnership Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ Goal of the collaboration to promote an understanding of inter-relationships and interdependencies.</td>
<td>➞ Flattops Trail Scenic and Historic Byway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of individual or mutual benefits.</td>
<td>➞ The corridor management plan states recognition of the benefits of entering into a collaborative planning process.</td>
<td>➞ Gold Belt Scenic and Historic Byway; Lincoln National Forest and Cloudcroft Community Sustainability Project; and Colorado River Headwaters Scenic Byway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that decisions arrived at will be implemented.</td>
<td>➞ Federal or state agency has a mandate to initiate, encourage and guide collaborative tourism planning efforts.</td>
<td>➞ The Colorado Department of Transport, Scenic and Historic Byway Program; and The Idaho Recreation and Tourism Initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ Adequate financial resources available through grants and seed money from federal and state agencies and foundations.</td>
<td>➞ The Virginia Southwest Blue Ridge Highland Inc. Congressional Appropriation to the USFS; and USFS grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ Prospect of an award.</td>
<td>➞ All American Road designation; The National Association of Development and Organization Innovation Award; and The National Rural Community Assistance Award (USDA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ An internal mandate to ensure power distributed among the stakeholders.</td>
<td>➞ Ozark &amp; Ouchita National Forest and Scenic 7 Byway memo of understanding; and Gold Belt Backcountry Byway Partnership Plan - cooperative agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ Memoranda of understanding with affected cultural groups.</td>
<td>➞ Nez Perce First Nation and USFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of key stakeholders</td>
<td>➞ Address stakeholder concerns by undertaking environmental and social conflict assessments.</td>
<td>➞ USFS Curry County Sustainable Nature-Based Tourism Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ Recognition of special cultural groups</td>
<td>➞ National Forests and Multi-cultural Tourism Partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A convenor is required to initiate and facilitate community</td>
<td>➞ USFS is convenor for forest-service sponsored programs.</td>
<td>➞ Cloudcroft Area Sustainability Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ A statutory commission fulfills the role of convenor.</td>
<td>➞ Columbia River Gorge Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➞ A collaborative process is convened by</td>
<td>➞ Gold Belt back Country Partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An effective collaboration requires formulation of a vision statement, joint formulation of tourism goals and objectives and establishment of a collaborative organization.

- Establishment of a collaborative tourism management organization.
- Arrive at a shared vision or strategy using various strategies.
- Ongoing management of the tourism domain by a collaborative tourism management organization.
- Various methods and structures for implementation; including using existing legislation such as bylaws and volunteer groups.

| Establishment of a collaborative tourism management organization. | Most Byways and USFS partnerships. |
| Arrive at a shared vision or strategy using various strategies. | Coalition for Unified Recreation in the Eastern Sierra (CURES); Gold Belt Back Country Byway. |
| Ongoing management of the tourism domain by a collaborative tourism management organization. | Same examples as above. |
| Various methods and structures for implementation; including using existing legislation such as bylaws and volunteer groups. | New Mexico Rails to Trails Program (use volunteers); and San Juan Scenic Byway (use existing bylaws). |

**List of Case Studies referred to:**

- Caribou and Nez Perce National Forests and Idaho’s Statewide Recreation and Tourism Initiative; Caribou National Forest, Idaho.
- Cloudcroft Area Sustainability Project; Lincoln National Forest, Alamogordo, New Mexico.
- Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area: Interagency Agreements and Regional Marketing; Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Hood River, Oregon.
- Fishlake National Forest and Utah’s Paiute ATV Trail: Cooperative Resource Management; Fishlake National Forest, Richfield, Utah.
- Flattops Trail Scenic and Historic Byway, Corridor Management Plan; Colorado.
- Gold Belt Back Country Byway Partnership Plan; Colorado.
- Inyo National Forests, Recreation and Local Coalition-based Partnerships; Inyo National Forest, Bishop, California.
- Ozark & Ouachita National Forests and Scenic 7 Byway: Small Scale Marketing and Local Partnerships; Ozark-St. Francis National Forest, Russellville, Arkansas.
- Siskiyou National Forest and Local Sustainable Nature-based Initiatives; Siskiyou National Forest, Grants Pass, Oregon.
- The Colorado River Headwaters Scenic Byway; Colorado.

**WWW Sources - Case Study Sites**

- Lincoln National Forest - Cloudcroft Area Sustainability Team
  http://www.emnrd.state.nm.us/resource/Story-16.htm

- Forest-Based Partnership Initiatives: Forest Based Community Tourism and Recreation by United States Forest Service
  http://www.nalusda.gov/ric/cases/fscases.htm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/concept being analyzed</th>
<th>Relevant question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General Background Questions** | What tourism business/organization did you represent in the LRMP?  
Provide some insight into the nature of the organization/constituency |
| **Recognition of Interdependencies (Proposition 1 - Jamal and Getz 1995)** | What is the range of interests groups needed for an inclusive process considering resources and land uses effecting tourism?  
Do you believe all legitimate interest groups for tourism were represented in the process? Yes/No? |
| **Recognition of Benefits (Proposition 2 - Jamal and Getz 1995)** | Why did you get involved in the LRMP?  
Ask about expectations of benefits and outcomes.  
What areas of benefit for tourism as a whole did you think would result from the process?  
Do you feel that tourism as a whole benefited from the process. Y/N? If yes how?  
How did you think the process would benefit you individually?  
What benefits did you as an individual gain from the process? |
| **Adequacy of Resources and Government Support (Proposition 3 - Jamal and Getz 1995)** | Do you believe there was provincial government (e.g. Ministry of Small, Business and Culture) support for tourism's role in the LRMP?  
Did you receive adequate information, resources or training to participate in the LRMP?  
Were there any government guidelines needed to support tourism's role in the process?  
Were these guidelines already in place?  
Were they clearly explained to you?  
What were significant challenges to being an effective representative to the LRMP Round Table process? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion of Key Stakeholders (Proposition 4 Jamal and Getz 1995)</th>
<th>Do you believe that all legitimate interest groups for tourism were represented in the process? Yes/No?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structuring Ongoing Collaboration (Proposition 6 Jamal and Getz 1995).</td>
<td>Do you see the need for an ongoing tourism support organization for planning and managing tourism in your region? Should this be a community-based or government coordinated organization?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reaching Consensus on a Shared vision (Proposition 6 Jamal and Getz 1995). | Do you think process managers (facilitator and IPT) and mediators were knowledgeable about tourism planning and management? Were they effective?  
Was the training in consensus-based decision-making effective?  
After the process was completed, was a shared vision for tourism evident?  
If yes, do you think this vision can be effectively achieved?  
If no why?  
Did participants agree on a common perception of the tourism issues at stake in the LRMP process. Yes/No?  
The development of a community vision for tourism prior to the LRMP would have enhanced tourism's place at the table? |
| Outcomes | Do you think future planning processes will be different in the Robson valley?  
Has the level of trust and cooperation between government agencies and tourism interests changed since the LRMP? |