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Abstract

Water use planning today necessitates an integrated approach that includes sustainability considerations. We rely upon our water resources to satisfy a lengthy list of needs yet we often mistreat this irreplaceable, vital resource. Members of society are acknowledging the situation and are increasingly expressing their interest in being involved in processes to address these issues. It is the planner’s responsibility to respond with a method that is capable of involving the public in complex planning issues such water use planning.

The identification and application of a suitable methodology can commence with the articulation of indicators of success. By being conscious of desired goals, the process necessary for their attainment is more readily identified. A study of existing literature indicates empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency are regular indicators of success. Communicative facilitation, the product of unifying the fundamentals of communicative planning and effective facilitation, is a means of working toward the realization of these success indicators. These process components are both complemented and promoted through a collaborative effort. Both the process methodology and its application influence the likelihood of achieving the identified process success indicators.

Analysis of a case study, in this instance the Coquitlam Buntzen Water Use Planning process, allows extrication of recommendations and caveats that are applicable not only to collaborative water use planning but also to complex planning processes in general.

• A process should focus on reaching the best agreement possible. Allowing a range of levels of agreement while documenting points of disagreement is recommended.
• A process’s potential to contribute to the development of a positive precedent should be recognized. Every effort should be invested to maximize opportunities to improve levels of trust and perceptions of fairness since current processes affect future efforts.
• Process facilitators should be adept in the role of facilitator, analyst, mediator and negotiator while practicing the principles of communicative planning.
• It is difficult for a process to manage its schedule and budget to the satisfaction of all participants; however, the evaluation of efficiency is critical to assessment of overall process success.
• To avoid confusion and frustration, it should be clearly established prior to process commencement whether a process involves the public generally, stakeholders or representatives.
• Scope should be as broadly defined as possible. Although the level of complexity can be expected to increase, the benefits of an integrated approach as well as the frustrations associated with scope limitation support its expansion. Once boundaries are set, they should be explicitly articulated.

As the world becomes in increasingly complex place, the planner is faced with the task of facilitating efforts for interests to work together to make good decisions through quality processes.
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1 Introduction

Larson and LaFasto’s summary of the irony of our age provides an appropriate point from which to launch the following analysis.

For several decades now social scientists have been urging us to confront a sad paradox in our collective evolution. On the one hand, we possess the technical competence, physical resources and intellectual capacity to satisfy all the basic needs of mankind. There is little question that we have the wherewithal to provide food, clothing and shelter for every individual on this planet. In fact, having spent more than three years studying teams and team achievement for this project, we now find it difficult to identify any goal that the collective “we” would be incapable of achieving.

On the other hand, we seem to lack the essential ability to work together effectively to solve critical problems. In fact, the potential for collective problem-solving is so often unrealized and the promise of collective achievement so often unfulfilled, that we exhibit what seems to be a developmental disability in the area of social competence. The potential is there. The realization of that potential too often is not. Our lack of ability to collaborate successfully has been lamented … (13: 1989)

It is the challenge of collectively solving a problem that is the focus of the following analysis.

Societies on all continents face undeniably complex issues; at times they seem overwhelming. Quick scans of any major newspapers and/or current events journals chronicle an ever growing list of issues vying for attention. While the challenges may at times be daunting, close examination of news headings and subheadings reveal a method that is increasingly being applied with a level of success in the quest to address multifaceted issues in a complex world. This method, is a multi-stakeholder approach.

The urgent need for a multi-stakeholder method capable of addressing a multitude of often competing interests in a water use planning context is undeniable. Water is essential for human life, for agricultural and industrial production, and for water-based recreation and transportation. In addition, it is central to many national concerns such as energy, food production, environmental quality and regional economic development (Dzurik: 1990). Even a cursory examination of related literature reveals that the fundamental difficulty facing water use planning is the issue of water allocation. The problem is one of allotment, supply and management (deVilliers: 1999). A diverse set of
people and issues struggle to gain access to water resources, complicating decision-making.

Fortunately, a method capable of addressing the convoluted issues associated with water resource planning exists. Those with interests at stake are being involved in generating and implementing technically feasible strategies. Although environmental issues have functioned as the catalyst for increased involvement, other areas of governance, such as community development and social policy have also been included in the trend toward greater public involvement. The level of interest and commitment to stakeholder involvement has not remained constant; the intensity of its application comes in ebbs and flows (Dorcey and McDaniels: 1999; Connor: 1996). However, the fact that multi-stakeholder processes continue attests to their strengths and capabilities. BC’s recent history of multi-stakeholder processes confirms their value.

1.1 Land Use Planning Within Watersheds

Provincially, BC has made a concerted effort to address the changing realities of natural resource planning by focusing on long term economic, environmental and social sustainability. Although each process was unique, all shared a commitment to public involvement. In 1990, the provincial government established the BC Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (BCRTEE). It used multi-stakeholder mechanisms and consensus in drafting recommendations on sustainable development strategies (Dorcey and McDaniels: 1999). The Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE) was an ambitious multi-stakeholder process (Williams, Day and Gunton, 1-3: 1998). The initiation of the CORE process, in 1992, was an attempt to resolve widespread land use conflict through shared decision-making processes. It further articulated the nuances of a shared decision-making process (Penrose, Day and Roseland: 1996). Neither the BCRTEE nor the CORE processes are active today. They were discontinued as interest in citizen involvement decreased in the mid 1990s.

With the cancellation of both the BCRTEE and CORE processes, Land and Resource Management Planning (LRMP) remains as the primary functioning large scale effort to organize stakeholder involvement in land use planning in BC. LRMPs remain committed to producing land use plans that provide land use direction and specify broad
resource management objectives and strategies while requiring public participation, interagency coordination and consensus-based decision-making (Duffy, et al., 15: 1998). They have become the primary forum for public involvement in strategic land use planning in BC. Initially, the debate surrounding public involvement focused on whether the public’s involvement served a legitimate function. The focus has more recently shifted to questions of how and how much public involvement should be used (Dorcey and McDaniels, 10: 1999). Focusing on effective means of including stakeholders is not only the question for government, but also for this analysis.

1.2 Definitions

The involvement of the public in decision-making processes can take a number of different forms and serve a variety of functions, which make it difficult to adopt a universal definition. The range of different words used to communicate the concept of involving the public in decision-making processes is a primary difficulty. The words, “public”, “civic”, “community”, “citizen” and/or “stakeholder” may be used to convey the same or different messages. “Engagement”, “consultation” and/or “involvement” are similarly interchangeably used to express similar or dissimilar ideas (Dorcey and McDaniels, 2: 1999). Therefore, the terms and their associated usage require articulation.

For the purposes of this study, Dorcey and McDaniels’s definition of “citizen involvement” is applied to “public involvement”. Therefore, in the context of this analysis, public involvement means:

Processes for the involvement of the public in advising and making decisions on matters under government authority, that augment or supplant decision-making through established channels of representative government (as adapted from Dorcey and McDaniels, 2: 1999).

A related yet separate definition that is used in the following pages is the term “stakeholder”. Barbara Gray’s definition of “stakeholder” is adopted by this study. In this analysis stakeholders are defined as:

Parties with an interest in the problem. Stakeholders include all individuals, groups, or organizations that are directly (emphasis added) influenced by actions others take to solve the problem. Each stakeholder has a unique appreciation of the problem (Gray, 5:1998).
The stipulation that an individual, group or organization should be able to prove they will be directly influenced by a decision leaves room for interpretation while limiting the number of participants.

The process of identifying stakeholders assumes that there are some people who have a “legitimate” stake in the outcome and; therefore, a right to be involved while others do not have a valid claim (Connor: 1999b). Multi-stakeholder processes are situated within the broad spectrum of public involvement. They are structured processes which involve a number of stakeholders representing the interests of a segment of society considered to be directly influenced by actions others take to solve the problem. This is contrary to public involvement, which presumes that the issue affects all members of the public in some way and that all have the right to comment after obtaining relevant information (Connor: 1999b; Marshall and Roberts: 1997). Once the ideas being represented by these terms are clarified, it is possible to move forward with the analysis.

1.3 Research Questions

This study addresses several questions. The main goal is to analyze collaborative multi-stakeholder processes in water use planning. The associated objectives are:

- To review literature on public involvement, collaboration and water use planning;
- To identify indicators of a successful multi-stakeholder process;
- To assess a collaborative multi-stakeholder process for water use planning through a case study; and
- To make recommendations on the use of collaborative multi-stakeholder processes in water use planning.

The value of such an analysis is inextricably linked to the quality of the discussion. A discussion which is sufficiently detailed, while remaining focused on the target issues can offer insights, stimulate enlightened thinking and function as the foundation for recommendations and general cautionary clauses. Improving understanding is a necessary prerequisite of improving procedure and application. It is the intention of this
study to ultimately contribute to better collaborative efforts in water use planning specifically and collaborative processes generally.

To achieve this goal, the study begins by considering why public involvement processes are prevalent in planning and the variety of methods of incorporating public involvement that exist. This labyrinth of possible methodologies is navigated by identifying desirable outcomes and then identifying a methodology that can incorporate these criteria in a water use planning context. The facilitator’s role in a water use planning process is articulated. A case study has been selected to allow evaluation of theory.

The Coquitlam Buntzen Water Use Planning (CBWUP) process was selected as the case study. The study is undertaken through a qualitative analysis of interview responses, meeting minutes and other distributed meeting materials. The CBWUP process was selected because it typifies the difficulties common in water use planning. The issues are complex, a variety of stakeholders are involved and the process structure is dictated by guidelines that are conscious of good public process while allowing flexibility in final process design. By evaluating the CBWUP process against a collaborative framework and common success indicators, insights into collaborative multi-stakeholder planning can be gained. This discussion is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter I: Introduction
- Chapter II: Establishing the Link Between Public Involvement and Water Use Planning
- Chapter III: Fundamentals of Collaboration
- Chapter IV: Case Study Background
- Chapter V: Methodology
- Chapter VI: Study of the Phases of Collaboration & Facilitation
- Chapter VII: Achievement of Success Indicators
- Chapter VIII: Final Comments
The investigation of these research questions is undertaken by studying the context, the process employed by the case study and developing outcomes. Context attributes are those that are largely outside the control of agencies or participants. Process attributes are those over which agencies and participants have considerable control when designing and executing participatory efforts (Beierle and Konisky: 2000). Since multi-stakeholder processes are increasingly being used to address difficult situations, it is to everyone's advantage that their effectiveness be maximized. Improvements can occur only once understanding is achieved.

1.4 Scope

The scope of this study is bound on one side by public involvement literature and on the other by water use planning. The focus is on how public involvement fits into water use planning. The case study further focuses the discussion to how collaboration fits into a WUP process. Water use planning is an exceedingly broad topic, the CBWUP process confines issues for discussion to a specific geographic area (from the mouth of the river to the dam) and to changes to facility operating procedures. Participants became well acquainted with operating details, river hydrographs, fish life stages and other particulars associated with the interests represented. Although this information was a critical component of the process, its discussion is limited in this study to prevent becoming encumbered by the details. Effort has been made to contain this study's scope to a manageable size.

1.5 Chapter Summary

By uniting our efforts, we are able to maximize our ability to manage and address difficult problems; however, as a society, we have shown our inability to act collectively. Despite our individualistic tendencies, multi-stakeholder processes have proven themselves to be an effective means of addressing difficult issues. Evaluation of land use planning in watersheds demonstrates the effectiveness of multi-stakeholder processes. Water use planning frequently addresses complex problems that consequently tend to be a strong candidate for the application of a multi-stakeholder process. It is the intention of this study to analyze collaborative multi-stakeholder processes in water use planning. To initiate this study, an understanding of water use planning and public involvement must
first be established.
2 Establishing the Link Between Public Involvement and Water Use Planning

Recognition of the need to involve stakeholders in decision-making processes associated with water use planning is the founding theme upon which this research is based. Therefore, the interrelated and complementary nature of water use planning and stakeholder involvement needs to be clearly established at the outset. The intention of this chapter is to articulate the need for water use planning and discuss means of incorporating the public in the process. While selecting an appropriate process methodology, the success indicators identified in this chapter should be considered since they are commonly found in notable processes. To guide the process, a suitable facilitator is required. A facilitator who employs the principles of communicative planning is recommended. Uniting the principles of water use planning and public involvement establishes the foundation upon which a multi-stakeholder process ought to be built.

2.1 Water Use Planning

Water use planning has been practiced since antiquity. Recorded histories of water use planning depict a relatively sophisticated system of planning and engineering based on scientific principles of hydrology and hydraulics. The Indus, Tigris and Euphrates Rivers were all hosts to river basin planning over 9,000 years ago. During the seventh century A.D., a sophisticated system of engineering structures for irrigation using both ground and surface water was prevalent in China (Dzurik, 6: 1990). Although most early water use planning was not as grand in scale and technical aptitude, recognition of the need to manage water resources was acknowledged and acted upon. With the progression of time, the demand for water has multiplied and correspondingly, the effort and complexity of managing water resources has also intensified.
2.1.1 Integrated Water Management

Increasingly, functions of the hydrological cycle are being compromised as interests vie for available water. A number of factors influence both how, and how much freshwater is used for human purposes. These include:

- Political, legal and institutional structures (water rights; institutional arrangements to manage water);
- Technological and managerial capabilities (efficiency of water delivery technology, rate of uptake of efficient technologies; management techniques);
- Socio-economic conditions (land-use patterns which determine agricultural and industrial activities, location of residential areas in relation to water supplies; land-use impacts on watershed conditions);
- Environmental conditions (variations in natural hydrological cycles);
- Regulatory controls (efficiency standards);
• Cultural habits (landscape and gardening practices; domestic water use patterns); and
• Economic practices (price of water and tariff structures) (Geyer-Allély: 1998).

These aspects are commonly inter-related. The difficulty of managing these diverse issues necessitates cooperative efforts. The interconnections between these issues strengthen the argument for an integrated approach to water resources management.

For the purposes of this study, integrated water resources management is defined as a framework for planning, organizing and controlling water systems to balance all relevant views and goals of stakeholders (Grigg, 528: 1999).

This definition includes two interdependent dimensions. The views and goals of stakeholders are considered within the context of managing water systems. Social interdependence is taken into account alongside ecological interdependence. The merits of the definition become obvious with contemplation of the variety of rationales inherent in water use planning. Integrated water management is comprised of multiple objectives, including the desire to:

• Minimize water waste;
• Maximize the efficiency of water use;
• Maximize water availability by limiting the degradation of water supplies, and through reuse;
• Optimize water allocation to competing users, including the environment; and
• Limit access to sustainable levels.

To achieve these broad objectives any one or combination of the following approaches can be applied:

• Institutional reform/modification of water allocation policies and mechanisms;
• Influencing the behaviour of water users;
• Restructuring of water pricing and tariffs;
• Development of efficient technology and its dissemination;
• Improved environmental management related to water use; and
• Protection of ground and surface water quality and/or improved information on water resources and use (Geyer-Allély, 21: 1998).

An integrated approach involves balancing the ecological needs of rivers and aquatic ecosystems with the demands of other users (Geyer-Allély, 47: 1998). Ensuring water supply longevity is the foundation of integrated water management.

2.1.2 Sustainability

Sustainability is central to an integrated management approach. An integrated management plan that disregards sustainability has only limited value. The identification and implementation of a plan that results in sustainable management is fundamental. To understand the implications of sustainability as a goal, a common understanding of the term is necessary. The Brundtland Commission’s report *Our Common Future* promotes an encompassing definition of sustainable development:

> Humanity has the ability to make development sustainable – to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Brundtland as quoted by the Task Committee on Sustainability Criteria, Water Resources Planning and Management Division, 1: 1998)

Although this definition outlines a worthy goal, a definition of sustainability that better addresses the specific concerns involved in water use planning has been articulated by the Task Committee on Sustainability Criteria (1998):

> Sustainable water resource systems are those designed and managed to fully contribute to the objectives of society, now and in the future, while maintaining their ecological, environmental, and hydrological integrity (44).

However, even this definition must be tailored to suit the specific scenario being considered. For example, at river basin or regional levels, it may not be possible to meet the needs or demands of even the current generation. Barriers to sustainability occur in cases where demand is greater than what can be obtained on a continuing basis at acceptable economic, environmental and social costs. (Task Committee on Sustainability Criteria, Water Resources Planning and Management Division: 1998). Society’s best interests are served when a sustainable approach to water use planning is incorporated in an integrated management plan. To ensure the inclusion of sustainability considerations,
stakeholders should jointly consider the definition of sustainability and ensure that it best reflects the specific situation and objectives.

Effective water use planning is a holistic means of caring for one the world's most precious common goods. Integrated water management that incorporates sustainability considerations creates space for greater involvement of water users including the private sector and communities. By involving stakeholders and/or the public, information and expertise from a range of disciplines becomes available to develop viable plans. Because of the potential impact associated with public involvement, or the absence of public involvement, a need exists to carefully consider how the public is involved in policy development and implementation (Geyer-Allély, 22: 1998). A critical niche for public involvement exists within the context of water use planning.

2.2 Public Involvement

2.2.1 Process vs. Product

Since the process affects the product that results from public involvement, it is an appropriate place to focus discussion of public involvement. When asked to articulate their reservations or criticisms related to a process, in which they have participated, participants most often cite problems related to how the process was conducted. Process limitations are directly correlated to failure to achieve success indicators (Skuba Jackson and Wood: 1999). Studying the process offers a means of anticipating outcomes.

2.2.2 The Public-An Active Member of Society

The planning process is influenced by the prevailing conviction that decision-making processes should incorporate space for the public to become involved. The public's increased demand for involvement has been explained as resulting from changes during the past decade to the social, political and economic climate of society. According to Connor (1997), communities today are typically larger and experience faster social change than was the case in the past. The population is heterogeneous and people tend to distrust authorities and experts. A general frustration with the limitations of conventional top-down government decision-making is also prevalent. Higher levels of general anxiety and a shift in attitude to one that is intolerant of negative side-effects also
contributes to the increased likelihood of the public becoming more aggressive in their demands (Connor, 1997).

This change in public attitude has forced an adjustment in process approach to one that is more accommodating of the changing nature of the public’s expectations. Traditionally, a decide-announce-defend (DAD) approach was applied (Walesh: 1999). A DAD approach is one in which professionals decide and announce an approach, which they subsequently defend in front of the public. Defending projects often involves spending thousands of hours and millions of dollars when the public threatens delays and possible blockage through their intervention (Walesh: 1999). Proponents of public involvement are quick to recognize the limitations of a traditional DAD approach.

### 2.2.3 Public Involvement- Benefits for Everyone

Supplementing public interest in public involvement is the number of positive outcomes associated with its application. By providing an opportunity for the public to become involved, the potential to break away from customary patterns is created while space is created for innovation and creativity. Public and community groups are often motivated and well equipped to provide the sort of integrated thinking which, in numerous instances, top-down government structures have been unable to provide (Geyer-Allély, 47: 1998). In addition, the decisions that are generated have a greater likelihood of being accepted as legitimate because of perceived increases in accountability. Those involved in the process tend to feel a sense of ownership of the decision, which increases the likelihood that decisions will be followed by action (Glicken, 302, 304: 1999; Lauber and Knuth: 1999). Citizens and officials who have been informed and given an opportunity to participate often contribute to the plan’s level of innovation, and assist in its interpretation and implementation.

Importantly, traditional decision-makers can also benefit from public involvement regardless of whether the public is functioning as
information providers or decision-makers. Participants are normally knowledgeable and capable of making positive contributions to data collection (Connor: 1999a). The information collected is as valuable as it is associated with heightening levels of commitment from participants. Public interest can result in advantageous byproducts. Because of the often-nebulous nature of the planning stage’s product, the public’s interest can be used as leverage to gain needed support. Too often, the planning stage is neglected in terms of funding and resources because its results tend to be less obvious than those of an implementation project. If the public is supportive and involved in the process, funding agencies and governments will undoubtedly be more attentive (Walesh, 540: 1999). By involving the public, interaction between government and the public increases, thereby providing an opportunity to establish relationships capable of future impacts (BC Round Table on the Environment and the Economy: 1994). The list of potential benefits associated with a public involvement process is long and diverse.

The trend toward greater public involvement is bolstered by an increase in regulations mandating its inclusion. The old DAD strategy is being replaced by a strategy that stresses the exchange of concerns, ideas and information between traditional decision-makers and associated professionals, individuals and organizations representing various interests. Forester defends the trend by stating:

In a democratic society citizens should be able not only to find out about issues affecting their lives but also to communicate meaningfully with other citizens about problems, social needs and alternative policy options (Forester, 22: 1989).

Involving the public constitutes part of the proper conduct of a democratic society (Glicken, 302: 1998). Although the positive outcomes associated with involvement of the public function as a solid case for its use, the argument is further strengthened by the nature of democratic society. To maximize benefits, a quality process must be undertaken.

2.2.4 Necessary Process Components

Regardless of the level of involvement and whether the process involves the general public or limits participation to stakeholders, some key components are required to
ensure a quality process. The process must be aware and make every effort to incorporate the following criteria:

• Representation – inclusive representation of interests;

• Independence – the process should be conducted in an independent, unbiased manner. Participants should be free to conduct themselves in a self directed manner and process management should be neutral;

• Influence/accountability – it should be clear that the output is capable of genuine impact. Action should follow decisions and designated parties should ensure their follow through;

• Transparency – the process should be transparent and the information understandable;

• Accessibility – all participants should have access to needed resources and should be involved in the process as early as possible;

• Mandate clarity – the nature and scope of the task should be articulated; and

• Structured and integrative decision-making framework – mechanisms for structuring and working through the decision-making process should be clear and conducted in a coordinated manner (Rowe and Frewer: 2000; Duffy et.al: 1998; Province of BC: 1993).

Regardless of the specifics of the process design selected, to acquire the benefits associated with public involvement, the method used must strive to include the above listed criteria to ensure a quality process. The advantages of undertaking public involvement processes are well known and the necessary components understood. Despite the public’s interest in inclusion and the recognized benefits of public involvement, criticism of including the public does exist, leaving proponents of public involvement in situations where they must defend their ideals.

2.2.5 Addressing Critiques of Public Involvement

Campbell and Marshall (2000) have questioned whether society’s best interests are addressed through public involvement. They challenge whether a necessary tradeoff exists between process and substance and whether some issues are too complex to tackle
through a public process. In addition, they have stated that focus on process and procedure may divert decision-makers' attention away from more challenging questions related to substance. Their concerns are valid; however, they do not substantiate an argument for the dismissal of public involvement but rather, function as an useful reminder that a suitable method for involving the public should be identified. Those implementing a public involvement process need to understand the different methodologies and frameworks available in order to determine the best combination to apply to a specific situation (Glicken, 307: 2000). It is not public involvement processes that are flawed but misapplication of a particular methodology to specific circumstances that can lead to poor results.

Even the most ardent critics of public involvement cannot overlook the benefits associated with public involvement. The critical discussion is the selection of a participatory model that addresses everyone's needs. The specific method of involvement should be chosen carefully; its selection will have numerous implications.

### 2.2.6 A Taxonomy of Public Involvement

Once it has been decided that the public should be involved in a process, it is necessary to carefully consider which involvement methodology to apply. Sherry Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation is a long-standing initial reference point in the discussion of forms of public involvement. Arnstein's Ladder is principally concerned with the relationship between process design and the level of participant empowerment. It should be kept in mind that the taxonomy is affected by the context in which it was developed. Arnstein's intention was to offer the public and proponents of public involvement, in the United States, a tool to assist them in lobbying for greater citizen control. It was introduced in the late 1960s. The early 1960s were a time of social activism in the United States; followed, in the late 1960s by measures to limit public involvement to traditional channels (Friedmann: 1990). The Ladder of Citizen Participation hierarchically organizes eight types of involvement based on the extent of citizens' power in determining the end product. Briefly, from the top (greatest level of public involvement in Arnstein's opinion) to the lowest rung of the ladder:
Figure 2: Arnstein's Ladder

**Citizen control:** People demand a degree of power and/or control which guarantees that participants or residents can govern a program or an institution, be in full charge of policy and managerial aspects and be in a position to negotiate conditions.

**Delegated power:** Delegated power arrangements can take a number of forms. Typically, such arrangements are characterized by conditions in which citizens are in a dominant decision-making position.

**Partnership:** In instances where a partnership relationship has been established, citizens and powerholders agree to share planning and decision-making responsibilities through structures such as joint policy boards, planning committees and mechanisms for resolving impasses.

**Placation:** At this level citizens begin to have some degree of influence; however, tokenism remains apparent. In scenarios where placation is present, ‘worthy’ participants are included but their ability to advise is limited and powerholders retain the ability to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice.

**Consultation:** People are most frequently consulted through attitude surveys, neighbourhood meetings and public hearings. Although inviting citizens’ opinions is a positive action, consultation that is not combined with assurance that citizen concerns and ideas will be taken into account remains ineffective. Participating in participation has little value.

**Informing:** The act of informing citizens of their rights, responsibilities and options is limited by the tendency to undertake the action as an exercise in one-way communication and can be further hindered by providing information late in the process.

**Therapy:** A therapeutic approach is argued to be both dishonest and arrogant. Under a masquerade of involving citizens in planning, experts attempt to redirect citizens’ thinking and actions.

**Manipulation:** At this lowest rung on the ladder, people are placed on advisory committees or boards without being given authority. The purpose of their inclusion is limited to facilitating their education or engineering their support. Arnstein describes this level of participation as ‘illusory’ (Arnstein: 1969).

These divisions are fluid and can overlap; however, the assumption which remains constant is that participation methodologies located at higher rungs on the ladder are more progressive. According to Arnstein (1969), participation without corresponding
redistribution of power is an empty and frustrating process for the powerless. However, careful consideration of the taxonomy reveals the need to consider more than just empowerment in process design.

2.3 Success Indicators

The level of participant empowerment is a criterion for the assessment of process success; however, if the appraisal is limited to only this measure, it will be shallow and only marginally useful. A study of water use planning processes that have been celebrated as successful reveals that empowerment is just one of the commonly identified process success indicators. In addition to adapting the approach to best suit specific goals, objectives, limitations and specific situations, some common elements are present in processes celebrated as successful. Facilitating participants’ attainment of a level of empowerment should be considered in conjunction with acceptance of the process being fair, the presence of trust, and conducting the process in a manner that is arguably efficient. Although these are four distinct elements, they complement one another and it is difficult for them to exist in isolation (Chrislip and Larson: 1994; Lauber and Knuth: 1999; Smith, Nell and Parystupa: 1997; Susskind and Cruikshank: 1987). Many methodologies are available to promote public participation. They vary in terms of their intent, their use of information, the “public” they involve and the level of participation they encourage. Articulating desired process outcomes assists selection of the most suitable process methodology (Smith, Nell and Parystupa: 1997). To effectively judge the quality of a process, indicators of success need to be specified. The inter-related concepts of empowerment, trust, fairness and efficiency have been identified and selected to function as process success indicators.

2.3.1 Empowerment

Empowerment constitutes two separate yet inter-related perspectives. Empowerment is a form of power. It can be experienced in a variety of ways (Rocha: 1997). Commonly, discussion of empowerment centres on topics related to ability to affect a reaction, and/or efforts to obtain or maintain power. The less celebrated component is the process of building capacity and the associated increase in levels of empowerment that result. To develop a complete appreciation of empowerment, both
aspects should be taken into account. To discuss the level of empowerment achieved by
the process the concept of empowerment must be understood and a method of
determining its presence clarified. The effort is justifiable; empowerment contributes to
the development of trust, perceptions of fairness and establishment of a positive
precedent.

Arnstein’s Ladder focuses on the extent participants are able to exert influence. The
ladder implies a better quality process is associated with the ladder’s higher rungs. It is
this suggestion that prompted McDaniels, Gregory and Fields (1999) to express concern.
They have communicated unease related to the hierarchical nature of Arnstein’s Ladder
and the message it sends. They caution the decision to use a ladder as a metaphor may
detrimentally affect expectations. Concern stems from the insinuation that allowing the
public to make the decision is the “highest” form of public involvement and may thereby
indirectly contribute to heightening expectations. The public’s anticipation of shared
power may not come to fruition for a number of reasons. Opportunity for empowerment
may be limited.

Power may not be willingly relinquished. In some cases, converting the public from
information providers to decision-makers is seen as a direct challenge to the role or
legitimacy of decision-making officials. To gain support from traditional decision-
makers, the process may have to concede to process types that offer modest levels of
empowerment (Glicken, 303: 1999). A hitherto unmentioned factor in the consideration
of empowerment is recognition of the political climate. Shifts in power balances involve
consideration of the political context (Forester: 1989; Gray: 1989). Whether real gains or
losses in power distribution are achieved and whether such gains and losses are feasible
and/or suitable must be evaluated in light of the broader context in which the process
occurs. Equating the quality of public involvement with the level of redistributed power
is overly simplistic.

If it is accepted that power must be shared, converting the concept into reality can be
a challenge. The probability that the need to share power will be recognized increases in
complex situations. In such instances, an organization is more likely to recognize that
they lack the legitimacy, power, authority or intelligence to act alone and still make
substantial headway to address problems (Bryson and Crosby: 1992). Even if traditionally powerful organizations and agencies are convinced to share power, a sense of apprehension may exist that the relinquished power will not empower the majority.

Among the more serious critiques of public involvement is the role of special-interest advocacy groups. Their expression and pursuance of self-interests, not the collective welfare of the community, is a potential problem. Advocating a minority’s perspective on problems and solutions leads to oversimplification, which in turn, limits ability to implement solutions. All parties shift their focus to stopping others from implementing their solutions rather than on finding ways to solve problems (Chrislip and Larson, 21-22: 1994). An additional risk is the opportunity for the process to degenerate into a networking exercise geared to fulfilling aspirations of establishing power alliances. This solidification of an ‘insiders’ network does not further, but instead hinders both current and future processes (Campbell and Marshall, 330: 2000). In order to be beneficial, actions to distribute power must be undertaken in a planned and supervised manner.

Examination of the number of citizens affected and included in the participation process, as well as taking into account their relative influence begins to attend to the issue of the value of shifting power. To provide a true indication of the situation, the influence wielded by the public should be considered against the influence exerted by the proponent representatives, “traditional” policymakers and experts. To make a credible judgement, the real dynamic among participants should be studied (Parenteau, 23-24: 1988). Although the level of influence wielded by participants is an important consideration, it is a complex issue and should not be considered as the sole means of judging empowerment. Empowerment entails more than assigning and redistributing influence.

Although redistribution of ultimate decision-making power is a component of the evaluation of empowerment, personal empowerment should also be examined. In some cases, a dramatic shift in decision-making power is not a feasible option. The benefits and potential of empowerment through participation in the process should not be overlooked. Measures to facilitate a continuum of empowerment within a community
create an informed, participating and empowered citizenry that continually expands and reinforces community capacity (Rocha, 41:1997). In some instances, distribution of decision-making power is necessary; however, this is not always the case (Syme, Nancarrow and McCreddin: 1999). In comparison, building capacity of process participants is universally valuable. Regardless of whether the ability to be influential in decision-making is attained, capacity building provides a valuable means of empowering participants.

2.3.2 Fairness

To ensure decision longevity, the process must be perceived as fair. The importance of conducting a process that instills a sense of fairness in the public cannot be overstated. Public support can be expected when the procedure used to generate the decision is perceived to be the result of fair participation. Research suggests that people make judgements about the fairness of policies and actions distinct from their assessments of whether they benefit from those policies and actions. Therefore, the contribution of process design and implementation to the perception of fairness cannot be overstressed (Syme, Nancarrow and McCreddin: 1999). Perceived fairness hinges on participation (Susskind and Cruikshank: 1987). To ensure buy-in from the public, the process needs to be viewed as having been conducted fairly.

Fairness is associated with a process embodying a combination of both procedural and distributive aspects of decision-making. Clear and honest communication and mutual respect demarcate procedural justice (Hillier, 17: 1998; Burroughs: 1999). The process must offer participants a genuine opportunity to participate. Occasions for systematic review and improvement of the decision process in open problem-solving sessions, which allow participants a chance to hear one another’s ideas and suggestions, are critical components in a fair process. At no point in the process should there be any opportunity for participants to be manipulated or taken advantage of. The process should set a positive precedent (Susskind and Cruikshank: 1987). These components have been identified as central to generating fair, cooperative decisions.

Procedural justice should be accompanied by distributive justice. Distributive justice, the evaluation of whether an outcome is just in terms of the distribution of a
resource between stakeholders, is an equally important consideration. Identified indicators of distributive justice, particularly in a water management context, include the management of the resource for future generations, acknowledgement that the resource is owned by everyone, acceptance of the rights of the environment and emphasis on efficient use of the resource to ensure resource availability for the future (Syme, Nancarrow and McCredden, 57: 1999). Both procedural and distributive aspects are considered in fairness evaluation. A process that is considered just, is a strong contributor to the development of a sense of trust.

2.3.3 Trust

The development of trusting relationships is a natural outcome of a fair process. Establishing trust is necessary to ensure buy-in and follow through. Presence of a trusting relationship has been identified as the most critical indicator of whether plans are implemented and whether future processes will be effective (Skuba Jackson and Wood, 7: 1999). Trust promotes efficient communication and coordination, and effective use of time and energy. The presence of trust leads to compensating. It occurs when a stakeholder picks up the slack that occurs when another falters. Compensation explains why unexpected success sometimes results in unlikely situations. (Larson and Lafasto, 87-93: 1989). Recognizing the value of the presence of trust provides incentive for its inclusion.

While the benefits of establishing trust are clear, it is consideration of the impacts associated with its absence that often drives efforts to establish trust. Lack of trust has been credited for the rise of Not-in-My-Backyard (NIMBY) groups. These groups formed as a response to a lack of trust in the decision-making process (Smith, Nell and Prystupa, 140: 1997). Trust is an integral component of teamwork that allows team members to focus on the problem. Its absence diverts mental concentration and energy away from performance objectives and onto other issues (Larson and Lafasto, 87-93: 1989). The benefits of trust and the barriers its absence creates provide ample motivation to invest in efforts to nurture its development and presence.
A considerable amount of effort is required to develop trust. Trust is fragile. According to Larson and LaFasto (1989), it can only be produced in a climate where the following four elements are present:

- Honesty- integrity, no lies, no exaggerations;
- Openness- a willingness to share, and to receive information, perceptions and ideas;
- Consistency- predictable behaviour and responses; and
- Respect- treating people with dignity and fairness.

If any of the elements are omitted or violated, even once, the relationship will be severely compromised or even lost (Larson and LaFasto, 84, 85: 1989; Lauber and Knuth: 1999). A trusting relationship is not something that spontaneously occurs, it must be purposefully nurtured and cultivated.

Ideally, involving the public creates an opportunity to increase the public’s understanding of environmental problems and increase the substantive quality of decisions; however, history may hinder efforts to build trust. A mistrusting environment can have long term effects. Negative sentiments and an unwillingness to cooperate can linger for extended periods of time, making further efforts at problem solving virtually impossible. One of the few viable means of rebuilding trust is through a process that is both informed in its design and its implementation (Beierle and Konisky, 589: 2000). Therefore, investing in the development and follow-through of a liberal public involvement process will affect the outcome of the current process, set precedent for future processes and may even begin to remedy historical distrust.

2.3.4 Efficiency

The quest to identify the most efficient methodology capable of empowering participants, nurturing a fair process while building trust is a challenge which is multiplied by the interest of both participants and process organizers to use time and resources efficiently. For participants, this includes consideration of the correlation between the amount of time they invest and the level of accountability and representation they experience in the process (Smith, Nell and Prystupa: 1997; Lauber and Knuth: 1999). If cynicism develops, it can have wide effects. Since cynicism is directly
correlated to low levels of trust, a process that is perceived as inefficient will hinder efforts to cultivate trust (Berman, 105-106: 1997). Attention needs to be focused on whether time and process funds are being resourcefully utilized.

The nature of public involvement processes predisposes them to incurring high costs, which are usually a result of drawn out processes. The challenge facing process organizers is the need to identify and implement a process that is both time and resource effective while maintaining quality. Spending large amounts of money and time on participatory endeavours with few perceived benefits will be seen by participants as a pathetic attempt to legitimize decisions. Such instances can provoke costly delays incited by those opposed to the process (Smith, Nell and Prystupa: 1997). At the same the time, the process must be wary of being stingy in the short term at the expense of the long term.

True long-term benefits associated with process outcomes and design should not be overlooked in favour of apparent short-term gains (Roberts, 60: 1995). Making quick decisions without participant support may at first appear to result in a timely decision but can result in months or even years in court, disputes and a legacy of distrust. However, in some circumstances, timeliness is a primary consideration and potential negative affects to trust, fairness and empowerment are validly risked. There are instances when a tradeoff between the attributes of fairness and efficiency may be unavoidable such as in emergency situations which necessitate quick decisions (Susskind and Cruikshank: 26-28: 1987). The issue of timeliness is a fundamental consideration in the evaluation of efficiency.

Decisions made related to issues of efficiency will have long-term impacts. It should be remembered that the relationships that are established in one process affect all future processes as well as process implementation (Chrislip and Larson: 1994). Therefore, the process must occur in a timely manner and expend resources in a manner that participants accept. Senseless expenditures of time and money contribute to the development of cynical attitudes in participants, the general public and process conveners. If time and resources are not effectively used and invested, the entire process will be detrimentally effected.
2.4 Success Indicators and Communicative Planning

As mentioned, the identified process success indicators are inter-related. In addition, they are all considerations in a communicative approach to planning. Communicative planning stresses the need for stakeholder involvement and is especially concerned with ensuring the nature of communication facilitates quality interaction. Communicative planning as described by John Forester in *Planning in the Face of Power* (1989), complements a process aspiring to empower participants, to be perceived as fair and to instill trust while working to efficiently execute objectives. Communicative planning takes precautions to prevent the development of cynicism. Therefore, to address the difficulties inherent in water use planning, the process facilitator should allow for the incorporation of the principles of communicative planning.

2.4.1 Communicative Facilitation

To assure a communicative approach that empowers participants is conducted fairly, develops trust and is efficient, a capable leader is needed. The word “leader” conjures images of someone in charge of a bureaucratic organization engaged in rational planning. This is not the type of leader that is required. To achieve the desired results, a leader focused on promoting and safe-guarding the process, rather than taking decisive action is needed (Chrislip and Larson, 125: 1994). A leader who may or may not have a position of authority but who uses methods other than traditional command and control to motivate is desired (Bryson and Crosby, 20-21: 1992). Situated within the broad designation of leadership, are facilitators, who, when applying the principles of communicative planning, are ideally suited to guide a multi-faceted, complex process.

A facilitator is a type of leader. A facilitator that embodies the principles of communicative planning is the type sought. According to Kaner et al. (1996), a facilitator is an individual who enables groups and organizations to work more effectively; to collaborate and achieve synergy. She or he is a “content neutral” party who by not taking sides or expressing or advocating a point of view during the meeting, can advocate for fair, open and inclusive procedures to accomplish the group’s work. A facilitator can also be a learning or a dialogue guide to assist a group in thinking deeply about its assumptions, beliefs and values and about its systemic processes and context (xi).
To live up to this description, a facilitator must adeptly perform a number of functions. The facilitator must manage two seemingly contradictory tasks. Divergent thinking, the process of generating alternatives and allowing open expression of views and convergent thinking, the process of evaluating alternatives, summarizing issues and making decisions must both be part of the process. This is a demanding task that requires skillful application of a number of facilitative skills including:

- Paraphrasing – rephrasing what has been said;
- Drawing people out – following paraphrasing of a speaker’s statement with an open-ended non-directive question;
- Mirroring – repeating the speaker’s comment verbatim;
- Gathering ideas – following a concise description of the task, suggestions and ideas are recorded without judgement;
- Stacking – inviting speakers to address the group in the order in which they expressed interest in speaking, usually by raising their hands;
- Tracking – stepping back from the conversation and listening, later the facilitator summarizes the conversation and checks for synopsis accuracy;
- Encouraging – asking open ended questions to stimulate participation without singling out individuals to make comments;
- Balancing – helping the group round out its discussion by asking for other views that may be present but unexpressed. Balancing is a response to the false assumption that silence necessarily means consent;
- Making space – being aware of body language or facial expressions which may indicate a participant’s desire to speak;
- Intentional silence – using silence to allow participants a moment to think about what has been said, refocus or allow agitation to dissipate; and
• Listening for common ground - summarizing the group’s differences and similarities then noting areas of common ground. Once the synopsis and analysis are complete, the facilitator checks for accuracy (Kaner et al, 44-54: 1996).

A facilitator who is able to deliver this demanding list of responsibilities complements Forester’s description of a communicative planner.

Forester places emphasis on mechanisms communicative planners use to shape participation, particularly efforts to establish trust and equalize power imbalances, and assist in the promotion of a process that consciously strives to achieve the identified success indicators. A principle component of a communicative approach to planning is recognizing the power of information. The planner must ensure information is available and understandable. It is the planner’s role to anticipate sources of misinformation and concerns of less powerful stakeholders. In addition, the planner must be able to function as a resource, practice shuttle diplomacy and operate as a mediator. The attention focused on information, and anticipation of concerns and obstacles to participation is undertaken to reduce the likelihood and/or effect of power imbalances (Forester: 1989).

Conscious development of an empowering, fair, trusting, efficient process does not imply results are insignificant. All successful facilitators pursue strategies that lead to results. It is important that a facilitator encourages participants to celebrate successes and the attainment of goals. This will contribute to healthy morale and encourage participants to recognize their progress, thereby improving their sense of accomplishment and efficiency (Chrislip and Larson: 1994). A process facilitator capable of attaining the identified success indicators is an individual, or a team that takes a communicative approach to facilitation.

2.5 Consensus
As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the value of the product is frequently influenced by the quality of the process. Although the process itself is important, it must ultimately make decisions, frequently through consensus. An excerpt from Building Consensus for a Sustainable Future: Putting Principles into Practice by Cormick et al. (1996) offers an explanation of consensus.
...consensus decisions are often reached through “negotiations”.
Negotiations are a process whereby the participants enter into face-to-face
discussions of their views, interests, positions, and preferences for the
purpose of finding a mutually acceptable resolution or an “agreement,” that
is, a “consensus” (10).

As interest in public involvement has increased, so has the popularity of consensus.

A number of benefits are associated with consensus decision-making processes.
Among the arguments for the application of a consensus process is the assumption that in
a consensus process, everyone counts. This is a liberating and powerful assurance.
When the issues being discussed are complex, it is common for participants to have
different views on what the facts really are. Consensus processes allow discussion and
debate of these different perspectives to allow agreement or the venue to propose further
methods of investigation or data collection. Frequently, when consensus is interjected,
the nature of a process shifts its focus from confrontation to accommodation. Consensus
requires participants to look for common ground in spite of their differences because all-
or-nothing decisions are not an option. The focus placed on developing an empathetic
understanding of other interests aids the building or rebuilding of relationships based on
trust, respect and understanding. Consensus processes tend to result in agreements that
can feasibly be implemented. Consensus decisions are different than those made in
legislatures, bureaucracies or judiciaries, those involved tend to report to a more focused
constituency; therefore, accountability tends to be focused and direct (Cormick, et al.: 1996). A communicative facilitator can contribute to the development of a climate that is
appropriate for a consensus process. Clearly, the decision to pursue consensus can result
in substantial rewards; however, it is not universally suitable.

Despite being associated with a number of positive outcomes, the decision to make
consensus a mandatory component of a public involvement process must be carefully
considered. A number of conditions make the pursuit of consensus impractical.

• Consensus should not be applied in instances where a participant wants to delay
  matters. The other participants will quickly recognize they are participating in bad
  faith; everyone’s interests will be damaged.
• If the motivation to pursue consensus is a public relations attempt to create an appearance of openness, as compared to an honest effort at consensus, the credibility of the process will ultimately be undermined.

• If a participant feels there is a crucial principle at stake over which defeat is preferable to compromise, consensus is not suitable.

• Consensus processes do not complement scenarios where participants feel their interests can be fully satisfied without negotiations.

• Prior to making a decision to pursue consensus, potential practical limitations should also be considered. For example, an important party may not be suitably prepared or a community or stakeholder group may require more time to allow representative leadership to emerge.

• In instances when an important interest is not involved in the process, others may become cautious about going ahead with the process.

Importantly, these conditions may change with the passage of time and the suitability of consensus can be reconsidered (Cormick, et al., 17-19: 1996). In addition to these conditions when consensus is not recommended, the contention of its necessity has also been questioned. Gregory, McDaniels and Fields (2001) have made a case that fixation with achieving a consensus decision can lead to the adoption of inferior policy choices. Certainly, it is worthwhile to strive to achieve consensus, but it may be advisable to settle for informed, visible, majority support (Connor, 35: 1999a). The decision to pursue consensus must be based on careful consideration of its suitability.

The pursuit of consensus decisions must be as carefully considered as selection of an appropriate public involvement methodology. If consensus is not incorporated in a situation where its application is appropriate, a major opportunity will be lost. However, if it is forced upon an inappropriate scenario, the affects can be unsuccessful in terms of the quality of the decisions made, and associated negative impacts on future processes and relations between interests. The decision whether to incorporate consensus decision-making must be considered in a situation specific manner.
2.6 Chapter Summary

Inspection of water use planning and public involvement strategies reveals public involvement is an essential complement to water use planning. By selecting an appropriate multi-stakeholder framework and applying it in a skillful manner, stakeholder demands can be incorporated in a process that empowers participants, is perceived to be fair, builds trust and results in an equitable and efficient plan. A facilitator employing a communicative approach is an integral component in developing and executing a process capable of achieving the identified success indicators. In suitable situations, the facilitator should consider making decisions through a consensus process. Principles, criteria and identifiable indicators of water use planning, public involvement, articulated success indicators and communicative facilitation have been outlined in this chapter. A quality process structure capable of addressing the complex nature of water use planning that recognizes the importance of both process and outcome is required. Collaboration theory offers a response to these requests while providing space for the application of the principles and criteria outlined in this chapter.
3 Fundamentals of Collaboration

The previous chapter united the concepts of water use planning and public involvement and discussed the variety of methodologies that can be applied, the common indicators used to assess process success, and the need for communicative facilitation. Pursuing a collaborative endeavour allows opportunity to apply these findings. This chapter provides a detailed introduction to collaboration theory including reasoning for its inception, situation applicability, reasonable expectations and implementation guidelines. The following overview of collaboration concludes with a synopsis of the phases of collaboration.

3.1 A Response to Our Times

Today’s society functions in a complex place. Collaboration is gaining popularity because it is a suitable response to complex situations. Application of a collaborative framework is a logical and necessary response to turbulent conditions. Turbulence cannot be individually managed because disruptions and their associated causes cannot be adequately anticipated or averted by unilateral action. In the face of turbulence, the ability of any single organization to accurately plan for its future is limited by the unpredictable consequences of actions taken by other organizations, which may appear unrelated at first glance. Individual attempts at adaptation are severely constrained because all stakeholders vie for the same limited resources and block others’ attempts at adaptation. By building collective capacity, which reduces unintended consequences, collaboration offers a means of addressing turbulence. Organizations are able to increase variety in their repertoire of responses to environmental change by building collective appreciations and sharing resources. Therefore, their incentive to collaborate increases (Gray: 1989; Bryson and Crosby: 1992). A complex world has created both the space and the demand for organized collaboration.

3.2 Appropriateness of Collaboration

In instances where it has been accepted that it is not feasible for an individual organization to act unilaterally to solve problems, the stage has been set for the implementation of a collaborative process (Gray, 1989). Collaboration is a form of
public involvement that offers a means of addressing two of today's most prominent
demands. These include the need to create a venue for facilitating stakeholder
involvement to be included in the planning process and a means of bringing competing
interests together to foster common understanding and a spirit of cooperation. The most
frequently cited definition of collaboration comes from Barbara Gray (1989) who states:

Collaboration is a process through which parties who see different aspects of
a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for
solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible. The
objective of collaboration is to create a richer, more comprehensive
appreciation of the problem among the stakeholders than any one of them
could construct alone (5). Collaboration enables parties to identify
underlying interests and to reframe the problems and search for a solution
that addresses as many interests as possible (239).

Problems requiring multi-stakeholder participation are well suited to collaboration.

3.3 Collaboration Expectations

Although collaborative processes are demanding, the potential returns are worth the
effort. Tangible results are achieved in instances where collaborative process has been
adhered to. Problems are addressed, programmes are implemented, structures are
changed, plans are created and precedent is established in terms of how future issues will
be resolved. After the process, participants tend to take on new and different leadership
roles in their communities. The way communities function when faced with complex
results are expected of a collaborative process

3.4 Motivation to collaborate

A number of scenarios create an impetus for collaboration. These include:

• Rapid economic and technological change;

• Declining productivity growth and increasing competitive pressures;

• Global interdependence;

• Blurring of boundaries between business, government and labour;

• Shrinking federal revenues for social programmes; and
• Dissatisfaction with the judicial process for solving problems (Gray, 1989).

Many of these factors are interconnected or partial causes and/or consequences of others. Some of these contextual factors are rooted in institutional norms and practices; therefore, we can expect to see their continued presence (Sharfman, Gray and Yan 1991). Although the demand for greater involvement and the effects of living in a generally complex world set the stage for collaboration, a range of specific circumstances are typically associated with its application.

3.5 Approaches to Collaborative Planning

Motivation to broach a collaborative process varies, as do the potential outcomes. To achieve different ends, process design necessarily varies. Although overlap between the distinctions exists, it is possible to divide the approaches into appreciative planning, collective strategies, dialogues and negotiated settlements. Appreciative planning and collective strategies are designed to advance a shared vision while dialogues and negotiated settlements are designed to develop conflict resolution (Gray, 1989).

3.5.1 Shared Vision

Appreciative planning and collective strategies focus on promoting a shared vision. Appreciative planning is commonly initiated when it is recognized that taking action on a problem or taking advantage of an opportunity hinges on pooling complementary resources from several stakeholders. Two commonly employed approaches are search conferences and community gatherings. A search conference brings stakeholders together to explore possible scenarios for the future of the domain. The venue is designed to encourage communication between stakeholders, offer the group an opportunity to articulate and identify a set of ideals and facilitate the acknowledgement of shared values. Community gatherings can take a number of different forms. Commonly they are inspired by the efforts of a local group or individual for a limited purpose but eventually assume a larger community agenda. Appreciative planning is undertaken with the expectation that explicit agreements will be reached or that action will follow. It is an exploratory and analytical process (Gray, 1989).
A related approach is a collective strategy. Collective strategies move beyond appreciative planning by creating specific agreements to address the problem or fulfill a vision. Collective strategies can represent solely private sector interests or be comprised of cross-sectoral interests. These strategies include public-private partnerships, joint ventures, research and development consortia and labour-management collaboration. Collective strategies can emerge from appreciative planning, which explains why it can be difficult to concretely separate the two (Gray, 1989). Working towards a shared vision can assume a variety of forms.

3.5.2 Conflict Resolution

In situations where conflict is present, dialogues and/or negotiated settlements are a more suitable option. Dialogues bring conflicting parties together to explore differences, clarify areas of disagreement and search for common ground without the expectation that binding agreements will result. Dialogues can take different forms such as formal or informal public meetings and/or policy dialogues. In comparison, negotiated settlements are intended to produce outcomes such as binding agreements or recommendations. Three kinds of negotiated settlements are common, these include site-specific disputes, negotiated rulemaking and mini-trials (Gray, 1989). Theoretically, the distinctions can be clearly expressed; practically, considerable overlap exists.

Table 1: Designs for Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTED OUTCOME</th>
<th>Exchange of information</th>
<th>Joint agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Appreciative planning</td>
<td>Collective strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>Search conferences</td>
<td>Public-private partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>Community gatherings</td>
<td>Joint ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>R&amp;D consortia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor-management cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Another outcome</strong></th>
<th>Dialogues</th>
<th>Negotiated settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Policy dialogues</td>
<td>Regulatory negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>Site-specific disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mini-trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Gray, 179: 1989)
Facilitating Collaboration

Principles of communicative planning are a natural complement to collaborative planning. The same facilitation characteristics capable of nurturing an empowering, fair, trusting and efficient process are critical components of a collaborative process. Specifically, these characteristics consist of a facilitated process that incorporates the principles of communicative theory. To assume that participants in a collaborative initiative will accept tactical (commonly utilized by military commanders, coaches, surgeons and commanders of law enforcement teams) and/or positional (commonly utilized by the CEO of a corporation, the head librarian, the supervisor of a construction crew, the manager of a restaurant and “my boss”) leadership is a mistake (Chrislip and Larson: 1994).

Situations that complement a collaborative approach are problems that necessitate understanding the complexity of the issues while acknowledging uncertainty about what to do. Therefore, tactical or positional leadership will ultimately be unsuccessful. Participants must be able to admit the complications and ambiguity which requires recognition of an inability to “know” what to do; necessitating experimentation and learning to derive solutions. An inappropriate leadership approach will inevitably result in a failed collaborative venture (Chrislip and Larson: 1994). Therefore, a facilitator who practices communicative planning is a key component of a collaborative process.

In collaborative endeavours, where the issues are complex, a facilitator that is capable of assisting learning and communication is more important than a leader with ‘the right answers’ (Chrislip and Larson: 1994). A communicative approach to process implementation ensures the process is not compromised. The emphasis is on addressing the difficulties people face when attempting to work together constructively; the substance of the issues or problems is a secondary concern. This is an important distinction:

It means the primary focus of leadership when people have to collaborate needs to be on the “process” of how people work together to solve problems, not on the “content” of the problem itself (Chrislip and Larson, 63-64: 1994).

At each stage in a collaborative process, opportunity exists either to promote the ideals of communicative planning and enjoy the associated results, or to allow imbalances of
power to occur unchecked and lessen the possibility of positive outcomes. A facilitator practicing the principles of communicative theory is a necessary component in a collaborative process.

3.7 Implementation

Collaborative designs are not generic; their functions and associated possible conclusions offer a range of options. The context in which they are initiated will impact the design chosen and the likely outcome. Despite these differences, there is agreement among scholars that although certain phases may be more significant for some collaboration than for others, a fundamental set of issues must be addressed in the course of any collaboration. The following is a brief introduction to the phases and their components, as identified by Barbara Gray in *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*. Means of incorporating a communicative planning approach follow each component. These succinct interjections, outlining means of incorporating communicative planning are derived from John Forester’s *Planning in the Face of Power*. The task of incorporating communicative planning is primarily the responsibility of the facilitator.

3.8 Gray’s Phases

3.8.1 Phase I: Problem Setting

The Problem Setting Phase serves as the foundation for the process and can be the most difficult step. It is primarily concerned with bringing issues to the table so that face-to-face dialogue can begin. This phase includes the following components.

3.8.1.1 Common definition of the problem

Overlap in terms of how the parties define the major issues of concern needs to be articulated. This process will often require delicate diplomacy by a third party or by convening stakeholders.

At this initial stage, the facilitator has an opportunity to anticipate problems. If objectives are improperly identified or are misunderstood, problems will be likely in the future. It is the facilitator’s responsibility to anticipate and counteract miscommunication and misinformation. The facilitator must be acutely aware of his/her responsibility and capability to frame problems selectively and thereby influence what others regard as relevant in the case at hand. To ensure mutual understanding, discussion needs to be comprehensible, sincere, legitimate in terms of the context and accurate.

3.8.1.2 Commitment to collaborate

Simply sharing a common definition of the problem may not be sufficient to get stakeholders to the table. The stakeholder’s interest in collaboration is strengthened if the present situation fails to serve his/her interest, collaboration will produce positive outcomes, it is possible to reach a fair agreement,
there is parity among the stakeholders and the other side agrees to collaborate. Time can be a factor. Some parties may be playing several possible alliances against each other and may want to buy time to determine which alliance will be more favourable to his/her interests. Essentially, the stakeholder needs to be aware of his/her Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA). Awareness of one's BATNA is being conscious of what you will do if you fail to reach an agreement. It is the standard against which any proposed agreement should be measured (Fisher and Ury, 100: 1981).

The facilitator should be aware of any cues indicating a commitment to collaborate. These cues may be verbal or nonverbal.

3.8.1.3 Identification of stakeholders

The selection of participants can have serious implications on the outcome of the collaboration process. The collection of stakeholders should include individuals whose expertise is essential to constructing a comprehensive understanding of the problem. It is better to err on the side of too many participants than too few (Chrislip and Larson: 1994). Acceptance of any solution is enhanced when those who must abide by it are included in designing the solution. Stakeholders who can be held accountable during implementation are ideal candidates for inclusion. Tradeoffs between the number of stakeholders and the ease of managing the process is a consideration.

The facilitator must recognize the implications of stakeholder selection; however, his/her focus is developing and guiding the most effective process possible with the assembled group. Facilitators can prepare participants for the planning process by sharing facts, sources of misinformation, questions and expertise. Anticipation of confusion is also important.

3.8.1.4 Legitimacy of stakeholders

Stakeholders with a right to participate are those impacted by the actions of other stakeholders. They become involved to moderate those impacts. In addition, others must perceive these stakeholders as legitimate. The issue of legitimacy has the potential to become contentious; third parties may be needed to mediate disputes related to stakeholder inclusion.

Forester takes pains to address problems associated with legitimacy. Discrepancies related to legitimacy lie in power imbalances. To address the problem, the facilitator can:

- Anticipate the less powerful stakeholder's concerns and act accordingly;
- Act as a resource;
- Practice shuttle diplomacy; and
- Function as a mediator.

3.8.1.5 Convener characteristics

The role of the convener is to identify and bring all the legitimate stakeholders to the table. The convener does not have to be a stakeholder in the process. Conveners require the ability to induce stakeholders to participate. Convening power may come from holding a formal office, a long-standing reputation of trust, or experience. The convener's tasks are different than those of a third-party mediator; however, it is possible to assume both roles.

The convener must be trusted. Building trust is a complex undertaking that involves information sharing, anticipation and power sharing.

3.8.1.6 Identification of resources

An important aspect of problem setting is securing enough resources to ensure that stakeholders may participate equally in the proceedings. The costs incurred and hardships born by individual stakeholders need to be minimized.
Working with limited resources, whether it is time, money, information and/or manpower places a participant in a disempowered state. The facilitator must anticipate the situation and work to equalize resource imbalances.

3.8.2 Phase II: Direction Setting

This phase has been called direction setting because during this period, stakeholders articulate the values that guide their individual pursuits and begin to identify and appreciate a sense of common purpose or direction. During Direction Setting, each side has an opportunity to develop a realistic understanding of how the other stakeholders view the issues and to understand their interests.

3.8.2.1 Establishing ground rules

A vital component of the Direction Setting Phase is reaching agreement about how the stakeholders will interact. Outlining acceptable and unacceptable behaviour is part of this process. By setting ground rules, some of the potential for misunderstanding is reduced. Ground rules assist in setting a tone for the meetings and may signal how the proceedings will differ from other processes. All parties should agree on the ground rules. Some ground rules may be influenced by the specific context, for example, some ground rules may be prescribed by statute.

The establishment of ground rules provides blatant opportunities for power inequalities to develop and broaden. Every effort must be made to prevent such occurrences.

3.8.2.2 Agenda setting

Agenda setting is a delicate task that must be addressed early in the Direction Setting Phase. Generally the agenda will reflect the breadth of the issues being discussed and will parallel the number of stakeholders. Caution should be exercised when addressing issues that some stakeholders perceive to have already been settled or are the domain of someone else to solve.

Agenda setting is a potentially powerful and influential task. It allows the agenda setter an opportunity to confuse and/or conceal issues through a number of mechanisms such as the use of jargon, misinformation, selective information, selectively scheduling meetings, avoiding issues, etc. The facilitator must be wary of unchecked agenda setting power.

3.8.2.3 Joint information search

To ensure stakeholders are working with similar sources of data, or to rectify situations where parties have insufficient data, it is useful for stakeholders to undertake a joint information search. An integral component of a collaborative process is agreement amongst stakeholders on the facts supporting the problem definition and proposed solutions. The goal is to avoid wasting time arguing about whose facts are right. When complex technical problems involving scientific terminology, perceptions of risk and large quantities of data need to be addressed, a panel of technical experts may be invited to help the stakeholders sort out the facts. Choosing the panel may be contentious.

Information accessibility and quality are priority concerns to a facilitator practicing communicative planning. Information is a primary determinant of power relations and associated outcomes. The importance of anticipating problems associated with information accessibility, offering information and expertise, and ensuring accessibility of credible information cannot be stressed too often.

3.8.2.4 Exploring options

Stakeholders should be encouraged to generate and explore a number of options. Judgement should be suspended while gathering ideas (Kaner et al., 47: 1996). A process that forces the parties to think in terms of tradeoffs among interests and to be creative in recognizing a range of possible solutions is preferred.
While exploring options, the facilitator should ensure all participants understand the options, have had access to sound information and opportunities to explore questions, and communication has been open to facilitate active listening. He/she must listen to both project proponents and opponents and explore possibilities that have not yet been considered by any party.

3.8.2.5 Reaching agreement and closing the deal

Reaching agreement means gaining commitment from all the parties to a single option or to a package of options. It is noteworthy that some level of consensus is assumed; participants agree to a single option or package of options. This assumption does not recognize situations in which consensus decisions are not suitable. Therefore, Gray’s understanding of reaching agreement and closing the deal should be slightly altered to first consider the applicability of consensus prior to necessitating its inclusion. It may be advisable to settle for informed, visible, majority support (Connor, 35: 1999a).

Simply reaching a decision does not indicate a sound process. Precautions must be taken to ensure decisions are not deliberately ambiguous, confusing, simply symbolic, or unrepresentative. More than an appearance of democratic process, representiveness or objectivity is needed. Differences of opinion can not be suppressed and committee decisions can not be controlled.

3.8.3 Phase III: Implementation

To ensure agreements are acted upon, deliberate attention needs to be focused on the following components of the Implementation Phase.

3.8.3.1 Dealing with constituencies

Representatives must be conscious of the ultimate need to ensure their constituencies understand that the agreement is the best they could secure. They must make certain that constituents understand the rationale for the tradeoffs that were made.

Again, information is the critical component. The same level of dedication to anticipation of misinformation and power imbalances, and to the collection and presentation of sound information that was present during stakeholder meetings must be extended to the public. Selective information, misinformation, strategic scheduling, or any of the other previously mentioned tactics to silence and confuse individuals and/or groups must not be used to manipulate constituents. The criteria for mutual understanding (comprehensibility, sincerity, legitimacy and accuracy) must be present.

3.8.3.2 Building external support

It is crucial that support from those who will be charged with implementing the agreement is obtained.

As is the case in any scenario requiring the establishment of trust, information sharing, anticipation and power sharing must be sincerely pursued.

3.8.3.3 Monitoring the agreement and ensuring compliance

Despite the stakeholders’ good-faith efforts during consensus building, organizations do not always follow through on their commitments. It is wise to include provisions for monitoring stakeholders’ compliance. Problems can arise that none of the parties anticipated, which can lead to a violation of the agreement. In some cases, collaborative agreements may be enforceable through the courts.

The principles of open information exchange continue to apply at this stage. If improperly pursued, monitoring can provide ample opportunity for purposeful mismanagement of data. Accuracy of data collection and comprehensible dissemination of results is critical. Also, the facilitator must ensure measures of compliance are discussed and responsibility for their incorporation articulated.
3.9 Chapter Summary

Although the list of criteria involved in a collaborative process is lengthy, the potential returns are well worth the effort. If the appropriate people are brought together in a constructive process with good information, they will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the shared concerns of the organization and/or community. Interjecting communicative facilitation increases the likelihood of achieving these positive outcomes. Considering the prospective results of its application, effort invested in developing the most effective collaborative process possible is a wise decision. The principles of effective multi-stakeholder processes, specifically collaboration, have been articulated; however, prior to applying the theory to evaluation of the case study, an understanding of the case study must be developed.
4 Case Study Background

As mentioned, in the first chapter, the case study selected for analysis is the Coquitlam Buntzen Water Use Planning (CBWUP) process. To understand the analysis of the case study, it is necessary to be familiar with the details of the case including the Coquitlam system, its history, the evolution of Water Use Plans (WUPs) and what they are, and the stakeholders involved. Only after these aspects are understood can analysis be undertaken.

Figure 3: The Fraser Basin
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4.1 The Coquitlam System

4.1.1 The Coquitlam River - a Component of the Fraser System

The Coquitlam River is part of the Fraser Basin. It, along with the Nechako, Stuart, Quesnel, Chilcotin, Thompson, Lillooet, Bridge, Chilliwack, Pitt and Harrison Rivers make up the greatest salmon producing river system in the world (Douglas College Centre for Environmental Studies and Urban Ecology: 1999). The Fraser River Basin drains approximately 238,000 km$^2$ or twenty five percent of British Columbia. It flows for 1,368 km from the Rocky Mountains to the delta shores and into the Strait of Georgia (Douglas College Centre for Environmental Studies and Urban Ecology: 1999).

The Coquitlam system is a noteworthy component of the Fraser River Basin. It begins 45 km north of the Fraser at Disappointment Lake, which is located high in the Coast Mountains and flows through alpine forests to the Coquitlam River Reservoir. Once the water arrives at the Coquitlam River Reservoir, it is held back by an earthen dam at the south end of the reservoir. At this point, the water is primarily used for hydropower generation and as a drinking water source.

The use of water within Coquitlam Lake is carefully allocated. All of the available water from the Coquitlam Lake watershed is fully allotted to existing water licences held by BC Hydro and the Greater Vancouver Water District (GVWD), which is part of the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD). BC Hydro is authorized to divert, for power generation purposes 830,100 Mm$^3$ (673 thousand acre feet) of water a year from Coquitlam Lake at a maximum rate of 58.64 m$^3$ (2,071 cubic feet) per second. BC Hydro supplies a maximum of 165,800,000 m$^3$ (134,452 acre feet) of water a year to the GVWD for its waterworks requirements (Ministry of Environment and Parks: 1988). After BC Hydro and GVWD’s requirements are satisfied, a relatively small amount of water is released into the lower river. The water winds down through the lower reaches of the watershed between Coquitlam and Port Coquitlam. Urban streams and storm pipes feed this flow until it reaches the Fraser River (Coquitlam River Watershed Community Initiative: 1997). Water becomes a coveted commodity as it enters Coquitlam Lake.
4.1.2 Coquitlam River's Contribution to Hydro Power

Currently, the water is primarily used to produce hydropower. BC Hydro's rights to use the water are secured by Water Licences No. 8430, 8432, 8434, 17613, 17614 and 17616. These licences each specify the allowable quantity of water per annum and its use. To generate hydropower, water from the Coquitlam Reservoir is diverted through a tunnel, beneath Eagle Ridge Mountain to Buntzen Reservoir. Prior to passing into Indian Arm, the water is diverted through one of two powerhouses. The water is used at Buntzen generating stations #1 and #2 to produce electricity. The amount of water that is captured, stored and released through its turbine generators determines the amount of electricity that is produced. The water from the Coquitlam Reservoir produces approximately seventy-two megawatts of power. This amounts to only 0.4 percent of BC Hydro's generating capacity (GVRD: 1999). While BC Hydro is interested in producing power, the GVRD is interested in a secure drinking water supply.
4.1.3 Coquitlam River's Contribution to Water Supply

Today, the Coquitlam Reservoir is one of three sources of drinking water for the Lower Mainland. It provides twenty percent of the Lower Mainland’s drinking water supply while the Capilano and Seymour watersheds provide forty percent each. Although it has the clearest water of the three water sources, the Coquitlam watershed supplies less water because BC Hydro owns most of the water rights. Up to thirteen percent of the water in the reservoir is piped to homes in the eastern part of the Lower Mainland. The Coquitlam Reservoir supplies eighteen municipalities with water, at an average of 160 million litres a day. The GVRD manages the land in the upper watershed area and restricts public access based on their assertion that water quality would
otherwise be compromised (GVRD: 1999). This clearly articulated series of allocation policies are just the latest chapter of the Coquitlam River’s water use history.

**Figure 6: Lower Mainland Drinking Water Sources**
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GVRD: no date available

### 4.2 History

Consideration of the Coquitlam Watershed’s past provides context that allows better understanding of the present situation and competing interests. Unless otherwise cited, Will Koop’s historical compilation, *A Presentation of the History of the Coquitlam Watershed and River from 1898-1914, for the Port Moody Ecological Society* (1994) is the source of the following historical synopsis. The commencement of rapid change in the Coquitlam Watershed was a direct result of the far-reaching influence of the discovery of electricity in the 19th Century. This discovery instigated a competitive race to harness potential energy sources. The Coquitlam River was a predictable target for the development of hydropower.

To understand the history of events, some explanation of BC Hydro’s history is necessary. BC Hydro’s predecessor was the British Columbia Electric Railway Company
(BCERC). It was established in 1897 with the assistance of financial backing from British capitalists in London. BCERC acquired electric street railways and electric power facilities that had been initiated by local entrepreneurs in Vancouver, New Westminster and Victoria. While conducting required hydrological and engineering investigations, the BCERC formed a subsidiary, the Vancouver Power Company (VPC), to take charge of initiatives to develop hydropower in the Coquitlam watershed.

It was the VPC who gained access to water rights from the Coquitlam Water Works Company. By promising a steadier supply of water, better water pressure and other fringe benefits, the VPC gained approval to build a small dam that would raise the lake by only five feet. Approval of the small dam was followed by the government’s decision to grant the VPC a water licence equaling approximately one half of the minimum flow during the dry season run-off, or about one seventh of the flow during high water. Although water supply issues promoted initial changes in the water system, it was the quest for electrical power that ultimately had the most impact.

Initially, Greater Vancouver’s electricity was supplied by a steam power plant. However, by 1898, the BCERC was searching for a cheaper and more powerful alternative. By the summer of 1902, the VPC began a three year project to build a tunnel, 3.86 km (2.4 miles) in length, from the southwestern shore of Coquitlam Lake to the northeastern shore of Trout Lake, now known as Buntzen Lake. However, this tunnel and the associated diverted flow put the project in contravention of federal legislation. The Dominion Act stated that any water taken from a river must return to the river. This was not possible since water was diverted through Buntzen Lake into Indian Arm and ultimately Burrard Inlet. The BCERC eventually had the legislation altered to protect their business venture. Despite physical and legal hurdles to development, the project continued.

Work on the first Coquitlam dam began in April 1904 and was completed in September 1905. Initially, it satisfied Greater Vancouver’s electrical power needs and New Westminster’s city water supply demands. However, when the dam began to leak in 1906 and again in 1908, proposals to build a new dam commenced. In January 1910, the Federal Justice Department intervened because a dam would interfere with both
navigation and fisheries. At the same time, the VPC was vigorously lobbying the federal government to redraft BC government legislation to appease their demands for increased rights to water. These demands amounted to almost the entire Coquitlam run-off; their requests were eventually granted. The first dam’s inability to meet demands launched a period of intense political wrangling characterized by questionable tactics.

Interest in guaranteed water supply and hydropower prevailed in this dispute. A larger dam was built in 1914 to keep up with increased demand (Douglas College Centre for Environmental Studies and Urban Ecology and City of Coquitlam: 1999). The resulting changes to natural flow and human settlement patterns necessitated a major dyking project to protect urban areas in the lower river floodplains following a large flood in 1960. Decisions that were made in the early 1900s have resulted in substantial modification of the Coquitlam River. These changes resulted in an array of impacts.

4.2.1 Impacts

The introduction of new structures and operation facilities, in addition to changes in water flow had dramatic effects. Predictably, it became increasingly difficult for fish to survive. The VPC actively lobbied for the eradication of fish in the reservoir, they put forward a case depicting salmon as detrimental to water quality in a drinking water context, which made fish unwanted visitors to the river system. Electricity interests had detrimental impacts on the ecosystem.

Industrial development of the watershed began during the late1800s with the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway along the banks of the lower river. From the 1950s to the 1960s, the river below the lake was channeled and mined for gravel. An estimated 800,000 cubic metres of spawning gravel was removed from the river. Major hillside gravel mines were developed adjacent to the lower river in the 1970s. As a result, high sediment loads entered the lower river during rain events (Foy: no date available). The watershed was at the mercy of the demands being made of the developing urban environment.

Logging and agricultural interests cleared and dyked much of the lower river as early as 1900. The logging industry proposed transporting the logs by floating them through the tunnel to an existing mill beside Buntzen Lake. The government posted a notice of a 12, 200 acre area in the upper Coquitlam Lake forest in January 1906, which would allow
a logging company to log in the area. VPC Director, Johannes Buntzen was opposed to logging in the Coquitlam watershed. The notice was withdrawn as a direct result of his objections to logging in the watershed. The federal government passed an Order-in-Council that created a 22,660 hectare (56,000 acre) forest reserve in the Coquitlam watershed. This order was amended in 1973, at which time the Greater Vancouver Water Board and local politicians consented to commercial logging in the Coquitlam watershed. The dispute over logging in the watershed has existed for a century.

Figure 7: Historical Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897 – BCERC acquires electric street railways and electric power facilities from local entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902 – BCERC’s subsidiary, VPC gains access to water rights from the Coquitlam Water Works Company. Construction of a tunnel between Coquitlam Lake and Buntzen Lake commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904 – VPC begins to build a small dam and the government grants the VPC a substantial water licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 – VPC starts to build a second, larger dam as well as needed dykes to protect urban areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative impacts on the ecosystem
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Negative impacts were experienced by the entire ecosystem. The plight of fish can be used to gauge the negative impact on not only fish populations but also the entire ecosystem during this period. Reduced water flow downstream and loss of estuary rearing habitat in the lower river led to the extinction of Sockeye salmon stocks and Chinook salmon may have also gone extinct for a time. Pink salmon numbered in the
thousands as late as 1954 but collapsed and became extinct shortly after this time. Chum salmon populations shrunk to less than one hundred adults in 1961 from a population of 7,500 in 1952. Coho populations declined to less than one hundred fish by 1978; previously they numbered 1,500 in 1953. Callous treatment of fish continued until the 1970s at which time stronger environmental regulations decelerated habitat destruction and associated detriments to fish (Foy, no date available). An appreciation for the watershed’s history allows a more complete understanding of the current situation and explains the need for a comprehensive water use planning process.

4.3 What is a WUP?

To address the need for informed management of watersheds used to produce hydropower, a planning process designed to develop a Water Use Plan (WUP) was introduced. A WUP is a technical document that defines the detailed operating parameters to be used by facility managers in their day-to-day decisions. A WUP is undertaken within the confines established by the Water Act of BC, which governs the construction, operation and maintenance of works to ensure the beneficial use of water. The Water Act is interpreted by the Comptroller of Water Rights who regulates the storage, diversion, or use of water as authorized by a water licence. In his/her interpretation, considerations of the rights of not only the licencee but also the general public are taken into account. While recognizing existing legal and constitutional rights and responsibilities included in legislation and court decisions, a WUP clarifies how rights to provincial water resources should be exercised and accounts for the multiple uses of these resources. (WUP Guidelines: 1998). Development of a WUP creates opportunity to make direct suggestions relating to water use preferences. Support for these processes is a result of a number of factors.

4.4 Instigation of WUPs

4.4.1 The Ward Report

The Province of BC launched the WUP initiative in November 1996, to “deal with fish and other non-power issues at all the hydroelectric facilities, where the priority issue is fish.” (Canada’s July 1997 Response as quoted by the Commission for Environmental
The motivation to develop and implement WUPs was predominantly the result of the Ward Report findings. Ward and Associates were hired to review water releases and their compliance to associated water licences at the Cheakamus Power Plant. The consultants found that the volume of water diverted exceeded the licenced amount in thirty-two or thirty-three out of thirty-eight years. In one or two years it remained uncertain whether the volume exceeded the licence stipulations. Between 1958 and 1995, the mean annual volume through the turbines was 1026 to 1099 Mm$^3$ (equal to 832 to 891 thousand acre feet). This amount exceeded the licenced amount by nineteen to twenty-seven percent (Ward and Associates: 1996). In addition to water release violations, a stipulation in Licence No. C.L. 22284, articulating the need to specify the quantity and time of water releases was not adhered to. It was specified that compliance to this condition was to have been completed before June 1, 1956 (Ward and Associates: 1996). Results from the Ward Report increased and fueled public concerns related to habitat impacts (Commission for Environmental Cooperation: 2000). The Ward review's findings at Cheakamus were a major impetus for the establishment of WUP processes.

4.4.2 Existing Fish Legislation

The fact that hydropower generation is inherently detrimental to fish, which are protected by law, further stresses the need for WUP processes. Hydroelectric facilities and operations can result in a range of detrimental impacts to fish including:

- Blockage of upstream and downstream movements of resident and migratory fish;
- Entrainment$^2$ of fish into penstocks, turbines and spillways;
- High concentrations of dissolved gas in water created by turbines and spillways and algae blooms in reservoirs;

$^1$ The Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) is an international organization created by Canada, Mexico and the United States under the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC). The CEC was established to address regional environmental concerns, help prevent potential trade and environmental conflicts, and to promote the effective enforcement of environmental law. The Agreement complements the environmental provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). http://www.cec.org/who_we_are/index.cfm?varlan=english (read October 2001)

$^2$ Entrainment refers to small fish being sucked into turbines and spillways by the flow of water. The process can kill or injure fish and displace them into unsuitable habitats.
• Toxicity created by decomposition of organic material in reservoirs;
• Excessive water turbidity;
• Loss of spawning and nursery areas beneath reservoirs;
• Insufficient water releases or large fluctuations in water releases;
• Changes to water temperature;
• Trapping of nutrients in reservoirs while depriving downstream areas;
• Poor littoral\textsuperscript{3} productively;
• Blockage of fish migration into and out of reservoir tributaries;
• Armoring and simplification of channel morphology; and
• Loss of side channel and off-channel habitats (Commission for Environmental Cooperation: 2000)

Although these impacts may not exist at every BC Hydro dam and reservoir, the nature of hydropower generation does create circumstances prone to develop these problems. As a result, the generation of power tends to create situations that do not conform to the federal Fisheries Act. According to the Fisheries Act s. 35 (1), “No person shall carry on any work or undertaking that results in the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat.” (Department of Justice: S. 35 (1)). Therefore, a legislated need existed for the development of a management plan that was conscious of the Fisheries Act.

Although WUPs are not solely concerned with fish related issues, fish concerns are a dominant component because of the Fisheries Act.

4.4.3 Public Scrutiny

The mandate to develop WUPs was further spurred by public objection to BC Hydro operating practices. While operational procedures were being more closely scrutinized, public inquiry into BC Hydro’s power generation practices was increasing. The debate over water flow levels, especially in the Cheakamus River was well documented by the media (Georgia Straight: June 9-16, June 20-27, July 7-14: 1995; Vancouver Sun, June

\textsuperscript{3} The littoral zone is the area where light is able to penetrate the water and stimulate plant growth.

On behalf of the public, an attack on hydropower generation in BC was launched. In 1995, the Sierra Legal Defence Fund was prepared to fight BC Hydro in court if water flows in the Alouette River, a watershed east of the Coquitlam watershed, were not increased (Georgia Straight: June 9-16: 1995). In an effort to increase flows, Sierra Legal Defence Fund spearheaded an effort to have BC’s fish protection record brought before a panel of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC). The complaint was made based on charges that Canada was violating the environmental standards of NAFTA by not responding to BC Hydro’s violations of laws protecting fish and fish habitat (McIlroy: 1998). The public climate demanded flow issues be addressed. Public demands for more accountability were a contributing motivator to develop WUPs.

4.5 WUP Guidelines

A damaging report, existing legislation and public pressure combined to compel the initiation of the WUP process. To ensure a WUP satisfies the various demands placed upon it, WUP Guidelines were developed to guide WUP processes; they were released in February 1999. They articulate a series of steps through which the process must progress (see Appendix I). The guidelines were strongly influenced by the process used to develop a water use plan on the Alouette River (Gregory, McDaniels and Fields: 2001). For the purposes of this study, a few points articulated in the WUP Guidelines should be kept in mind. A public announcement must accompany the initiation of a WUP process. The guidelines specify the need to include regulatory agencies, First Nations, local governments and key interested parties in meaningful consultation. Although the process methodology is not specified, a multi-attribute tradeoff analysis is recommended. The method selected must allow for the contemplation of fish and aquatic habitat protection, flood control, power generation and First Nations concerns; other issues can also be included. A WUP’s primary objective is to ensure facility operating parameters that satisfy the regulatory requirements. Importantly, the guidelines state consensus is a goal
but not a requirement (WUP Guidelines, 1-5, 10: 1998). WUP processes are guided by a series of thirteen steps outlined in the WUP Guidelines.

4.6 Coquitlam Buntzen Water Use Plan (CBWUP)

Considering the history and the current issues facing the Coquitlam system, it is predictable that it would be selected for a WUP process. The CBWUP began in the fall of 1999. The process was convened by BC Hydro, a role they were obligated to fulfill by order of the provincial government. By the end of summer 2001, the period during which interviews for the study were undertaken, the process was launching into the consideration of tradeoffs between alternatives. By late fall 2001, the group was making decisions. Earlier, the process had moved through the identification of issues and concerns, and the development of objectives, performance measures and alternatives. A decision analysis approach was applied to the CBWUP process. The design of such a process is well suited to evaluating the multifaceted ecological impacts of resource management decisions as well as providing opportunity for the consideration of economic, social and institutional impacts (Prato, 216: 1999). Advancement was accomplished through the combined efforts of the Consultative Committee (CC), Working Groups, process consultants and the convener.

The primary objective of the CBWUP process is to write a report. The CC directs writing of a report that will be considered by both BC Hydro and the Water Comptroller. The act of writing the report is a task undertaken by the consultants (Figure 9 graphically represents this process). It is important to note that the report that is developed under CC direction does not necessarily communicate decisions arrived at through consensus; however, reasons for lack of consensus must be documented. During a CC meeting, members were assured that they would have an opportunity to review BC Hydro’s Water Use Plan prior to its submission to the Water Comptroller (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: January 15, 2000). The task was undertaken by a number of individuals working together in a systematic manner.

4 Reference to the comprehensive meeting minutes produced during the course of the process provide case details, which have been relied upon to provide case study background.
4.6.1 Consultative Committee (CC)

The CC is a large collection of individuals consisting of twenty-nine participating stakeholders. During the course of the process, CC membership composition changed. Initially, approximately forty people attended CC meetings. This number stabilized at twenty-nine active CC participants. Some members shifted to the Minutes Only Group. The Minutes Only Group consists of thirty-four individuals and agencies. Members of this group receive CC meeting minutes but do not actively participate at the CC table. The City of Coquitlam and First Nations made the most notable shifts in participation from membership in the CC to the Minutes Only Group. During the bulk of the process, the City of Coquitlam was an active CC member. However, by the summer of 2001, their representative had changed twice and his/her status as an active CC participant was unclear. Ultimately, they participated in the process as active observers (see Appendix II for more background on participants).

Table 2: Active CC Members as of Summer 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active CC members and the number of representatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allard Contractors Ltd 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Federation of Drift Fishers 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Hydro 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buntzen Ridge Wilderness Recreation 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Mountain Naturalists 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam River Watershed Society 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fisheries and Oceans 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Regional District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Stewardship program 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, Water, Air Protection (formerly MELP) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Resident 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fraser Salmon Assistance Project 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam Fishing and Hunting Club 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody Ecological Society 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Watch 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 First Nations

The unique circumstances associated with First Nation participation necessitate consideration. Coquitlam Lake has served the needs of human populations for the last several thousand years (Wright: 1996). Sale, treaty or war never ceded the land and resources; therefore, Aboriginal title remains and underlies any other form of title.
CBWUP participants accepted Aboriginal rights; however, the boundaries of their interpretation remained unspecified. As a result, the CBWUP process was placed in an awkward position attempting to address issues that have been overlooked for decades. The confusion that ensued was foreseeable.

First Nation participation in the WUP process was necessarily different than that of other stakeholders. First Nations’ participation in the WUP process was based on the understanding that Aboriginal rights and title to all lands and resources within the Coquitlam-Buntzen watershed are unextinguished (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris, 2: 2000). Originally, the Kwikwetlem, Katzie, Sto:lo and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations were involved in the CBWUP process. Their involvement was instigated through contact related to the archaeological study. However, as the process progressed, the various groups left the process until only the Kwikwetlem First Nation remained. In May 2001, the Kwikwetlem First Nation deemed participation in the CBWUP non-workable and requested reallocation to the Minutes Only Group (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: May 14, 2001). By the summer of 2001, First Nations were no longer active participants in the CBWUP process despite past and present interests in the watershed.
4.6.3 Dividing the CC into Smaller Groups

Early in the process, it became clear that the number of CC participants, which was approximately forty individuals at that time, made meetings unwieldy. CC members, the consultants and the convener, expressed concern related to the number of participants. Their solution to the problem was to divide CC members into random small groups during regular CC meetings to discuss specific issues. Dividing the CC into small working groups was done during the early meetings, particularly when objectives were being discussed and refined. In this way, CC members were exposed to and had an opportunity to consider each of the identified areas of concern. Eight specific issues were identified for further discussion. They included fisheries, recreation, flood control, domestic water, industry and economic development, wildlife and environment,
hydroelectricity, and archaeology, history and culture. Of the eight areas of focus initially identified, four, domestic water, fish, flood and power became primary concerns (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: May 14, 2000). Recognizing the difficulties of working as such a large group, participants were divided into small groups to facilitate discussion during CC meetings early in the process.

Later, the practice of dividing the CC evolved into structured working groups. Eight working groups were established to address the issues of interest. CC members comprised their membership. Solidification of their composition began in March 2000. The working groups were primarily responsible for the articulation of objectives and performance measures, which reflected the interests involved in the watershed (for a list of objectives see Appendix III). When assigned a task, working groups were expected to provide answers or a reason why an answer was unavailable and stipulate whether it could be supplied in the future. Their findings, discussions and accumulated information were shared with the CC who chose whether to accept working group recommendations.

The working groups were largely successful at addressing specific issues. However, issues related to fisheries were deemed to require greater investigation than could be accomplished by the Fisheries working group. As a result the Fish Technical Committee (FTC) was formed to access agency expertise and technical knowledge unavailable within the Fisheries working group. The CC permitted FTC membership to include not only CC members but also outside technical experts who would function as resource people (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: October 30, 2000). Recognizing the Fisheries working group’s limits, the FTC was created.

The CC demonstrated their flexibility again in July 2001 when it was decided an impromptu working group would be assembled to explore means of altering and expanding existing alternatives to satisfy a greater range of interests. Dividing into smaller groups was an approach that was developed early in the process and used whenever considered helpful. The CC’s willingness to be flexible in their approach allowed them to develop a process that was capable of dealing with a large number of CC members and cope with often technical information, two common impediments in multi-stakeholder processes.
4.6.4 Facilitation

Process consultants guided the process forward. Composition of the facilitation team changed during the course of the process. A BC Hydro employee, Charlotte Bemister facilitated initial WUP consultation meetings (September-November 1999). Consultants took over facilitation from BC Hydro in December 1999. Part of the consulting team changed in February 2000. William Trousdale took over as project manager and facilitator of CC meetings and Maria Harris, who was part of the initial team, facilitated FTC meetings and some other working group meetings (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: November 22, 1999; March 6, 2000). Although the consulting team was reduced from three to two, it remained larger than most WUP processes, which usually have only one consultant (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: March 6, 2000). An additional source of support was the BC Hydro Project Team, which convened with the consultants, participated in and coordinated meetings, undertook considerable responsibility for compiling and generating information and assisted in the coordination of meeting logistics. The CBWUP process is comprised of a number of individuals carrying out specialized roles.
Figure 9: WUP Organization Chart
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4.7 Chapter Summary

Stakeholders involved in the CBWUP process faced complex, multi-issue problems, many of which have extensive historical roots. A turbulent history of arguably poor decision-making occurred early in the Coquitlam Watershed’s history. This past and comparable occurrences in other watersheds combined with the Ward Report findings, existing legislation and public interest in water use planning to instigate the codification of the WUP process. Although WUP guidelines exist, each WUP process interprets its application to suit its needs. The CBWUP is comprised of a Project Team, a CC, working groups including a technical committee and consultants, all of whom have come together to address the issues in the Coquitlam watershed. To evaluate their collaborative efforts, a qualitative research approach was selected.
5 Methodology

Prior to launching into analysis of the CBWUP's aptitude as a collaborative multi-stakeholder process, discussion of the analysis methodology is required. Justification for the selection of a qualitative research methodology is provided. This rationalization is followed by details related to participant selection, data sources and evaluation methodology. This summary of the analysis process is followed by discussion of limitations of the analysis.

5.1 Application of a Qualitative Approach

A qualitative research method is employed in this study. The method was selected for its ability to address the research goal. Qualitative methodologies have been identified as the most suitable for process studies (McCraeken: 1988; Creswell: 1994). Although various techniques may be used by different researchers, both qualitative and quantitative researchers are engaging in science, provided that science is defined as a specific and systematic way of discovering and understanding how social realities arise, operate, and impact individuals and organizations of individuals (Berg: 2001). The following analysis concentrates on evaluating process. Since process effectiveness is a central issue in this study, the choice to pursue research through qualitative techniques is a rational decision.

Table 3: Differences Between Qualitative and Quantitative Research Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capture and discover meaning as the researcher becomes immersed in the data</td>
<td>Test hypothesis that the researcher begins with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts are in the form of themes, motifs, generalizations, taxonomies</td>
<td>Concepts are in the form of distinct variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data are in the form of words from documents, observations, transcripts</td>
<td>Data are in the form of numbers from precise measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory can be causal or non-causal and is often inductive</td>
<td>Theory is largely causal and is deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis proceeds by extracting themes or generalizations from evidence and</td>
<td>Analysis proceeds by using statistics, tables, or charts and discussing how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizing data to present a coherent, consistent picture.</td>
<td>information relates to hypotheses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neuman. 329: 1997
Research is conducted to discover answers to questions through the application of systematic procedures, not to simply amass data (Berg, 6-7: 2001). Therefore, careful research design and application remain critical areas of concern throughout the analysis. A range of qualitative data collection approaches exists. Selecting the most appropriate method is important. Qualitative research falls into four major domains or categories: participant observation, non-participant observation, interviewing and document research. Each domain applies different and therefore, distinguishable methods. Participant observation is comprised of ethnography and field study. Personal relations are established and nurtured. Non-participant observation necessitates that the researcher remains in the background watching and listening to what others do, what they say and the circumstances in which they occur. The researcher is unlikely to form personal relationships with those being studied. Most interviewing designs include investigative journalism, biographies and oral histories. Public documents such as meeting minutes, newspapers and private documents can provide a wealth of readily available information but can be difficult to locate and obtain (Lee: 1999; Creswell: 1994). The selection of the specific qualitative data collection approach applied was based on suitability to the study and accessibility of information.

5.2 Qualitative Analysis – As Applied to the CBWUP

5.2.1 Information Collection

This analysis relies most heavily on interviews and documentation for information. Participant observation occasionally enters the analysis but is substantiated by referencing interviews and documentation. The CBWUP process was chronicled in comprehensive minutes, which were available for analysis. Meetings were often preceded by information related to the upcoming meeting. This information was also accessible for study and to provide context. In addition, the process generated a series of technical studies, which were also available for perusal. E-mail correspondence was not considered public correspondence; therefore, it could not be cited. Face-to-face interviews were conducted to provide additional information and to test interpretations based on information from documented sources. By combining information obtained from documentation and interviews, a credible analysis is possible.
Interview participants were selected through a combination of purposive (also known as judgement sampling) and systematic sampling. The goal was to approach individuals with a strong understanding of the process. A list of individuals who were most involved in the process, based on the number of working groups in which they participated was generated. Next, this list was cross referenced with a list I generated used my knowledge of personalities and personal views gained during my time attending CC and working group meetings to generate an interview list. In this way, individuals who were actively engaged in both the CC and at least one working group were identified. They were initially contacted by a letter, which was followed by a phone call. The selection process was premised on the assumption that greater involvement in the process would increase the individual’s familiarity with the process and their ability to comment.

Throughout the course of this study, interview respondents are not identified by name. Instead, a pseudonym has been assigned. The codified system used is listed below.

Table 5: Respondent Coding System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent assigned pseudonym</th>
<th>Interest represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-B</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-C</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-D</td>
<td>Non-government Organization (NGO) representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-E</td>
<td>NGO representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-F</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: CBWUP Meeting Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultative Committee (CC)</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries/Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife &amp; Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroelectric</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Technical Committee</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This compilation of interview respondents provides a fair representation of the perspectives present in the CC with the exception of municipal government and First Nations. Unfortunately, requests to interview a municipal representative were declined. The municipality felt that since the process was still in progress, evaluative commentary was premature and potentially politically sensitive. Also, a formal interview with a First Nation group was declined. I was able to speak with one Band member who was formerly a CC member; however, the interview consent form was not signed and the discussion could not be included in this study.

Two questionnaires were prepared for the interviews. One set of questions was designed for interviews with the consultants (see Appendix IV). A separate questionnaire was prepared to guide discussion with process participants (see Appendix V). Prior to beginning the interview, participants were asked to sign a consent form allowing the substance of the discussion to be used in this study. To ensure authenticity and allow participants an opportunity to reconsider their statements, interviews were transcribed and the transcriptions sent to the participant for comment. The University of British Columbia Ethics Committee approved this process. A semi-standardized interview approach, as outlined by Berg (2001), was utilized. A number of prearranged questions and/or topics were prepared in advance but I did permit, and sometimes even encouraged interview participants to digress and to probe the issues and questions in more detail. The questions reflect the analytical framework’s focus on Gray’s three phases of collaboration, the identified process success indicators and process facilitation. Interviewing individuals who represent the range of issues within the CC and who have been active not only in the CC but also in working groups offers a reliable perspective that has been augmented through document analysis.
5.2.2 Data interpretation

The process of reducing and interpreting data is as important as the collection of valid data. A voluminous amount of information must be reduced in a systematic manner through the extraction of patterns, categories and/or themes (Creswell: 1994). In this case, information was clustered into themes complementing Gray's three phases of collaboration, facilitation, and the related sought after outcomes of empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency. The results are discussed in the same systematic pattern.

5.2.3 Methodological limitations

Study limitations are commonly associated with the research approach selected. Quantitative studies are judged by their consideration of the accounts, accuracy, level of generalization and possibility of replication. The criterion for judgement of a qualitative study is different; validity and reliability are the key measures for critiquing a qualitative study. Considerations related to validity and reliability need to be articulated both at the time the research method is being designed and when results are being analyzed (Creswell: 1994). Circumstances specific to the research and analysis performed warrant consideration.

My association with the CBWUP process in a capacity other than that of thesis researcher may have resulted in undesired effects. I joined the CBWUP process as the Communications Coordinator at the end of March 2001. My job primarily consisted of attending CC, working group and technical group meetings, which occurred after March 2001, as the meeting recorder. I also managed e-mail correspondence, which was not public information. Although I joined the process relatively late, I was concerned that during interviews participants would see me as an employee as opposed to an independent researcher. To address this concern, the different roles were carefully explained to interview participants both when the interview was being arranged and at the start of the interview.

My position could have predisposed me to bias. My exposure to the contents of e-mails may have influenced my perceptions. This issue was addressed by ensuring proper referencing which limited the possibility of using information contained within e-mails. Meeting minutes, interviews or other public documents generated by the process...
substantiate statements made within this study. My interaction with process participants allowed me to more knowledgeably approach individuals for interviews but at the same time, it created the potential of tainting the results. Being familiar with personal stances on issues created the opportunity not only to choose interview participants with a range of values but also to selectively choose the opinions represented. To address this concern, effort was invested in systematically selecting individuals for interviews. In addition, the nature of a qualitative study predisposes results to a serious limitation; the findings are subject to personal interpretation, which in my case, could have been influenced by my exposure to personalities involved in the process. All studies are influenced by limitations; awareness of their existence can reduce their impact.

Process analysis is generally undertaken once a process is complete, the fact that research and evaluation was undertaken while the process was still occurring is unique. Studying a process in progress means participants express opinions and observations without the benefit of having had time to reflect and reconsider events in a detached manner. For example, if a stakeholder was upset in a recent meeting, those sentiments could taint the views expressed during an interview. However, the advantages associated with studying a process that is taking place also merit consideration.

The timing of the interviews does impact the findings of this study. The interviews were conducted during the summer of 2001 just as the CC had begun to focus on the alternatives. Likely, the responses would have been different if the interviews were conducted after the final CC meeting (after October 22, 2001) or prior to the summer of 2001. For example, during the interviews, participants were generally uninterested in consensus; however, during the last CC meeting, consensus became a focal issue and effort was invested in its attainment. Researching a process in progress presented a distinctive circumstance.

5.3 Other WUP Studies
This study of the CBWUP process is not the first analysis of a WUP. Gregory, McDaniels and Fields (2001) have written a thought provoking article, “Decision Aiding, Not Dispute Resolution: Creating Insights Through Structured Environmental Decisions” which focuses on the Alouette water use planning process as its case study. Jim
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Vanderwal also documented the Alouette process in his thesis, *Negotiating Restoration: Integrating Knowledges on the Alouette River, BC* (1999). This thesis offers an in-depth, thorough analysis of the Alouette process. By logging onto the BC Hydro website (http://www.bchydro.com) and doing a little searching, WUP related articles and webpages are easily located. Certainly these sources assisted me in my research; they were sources I explored, especially during the early stages of the study.

5.4 Chapter Summary

To assure the reader that a credible analysis follows, the research methodology that was applied has been described in detail. A qualitative approach was selected. Data was gathered from a combination of meeting minutes, meeting materials and personal interviews. Interview participants were selected based on their range of perspectives and level of involvement in the process. Although the process methodology was carefully developed, limitations are likely; their possible sources have been articulated. Measures have been taken to ensure a sound analysis.
6 Study of the Phases of Collaboration & Facilitation

As mentioned in the preceding chapter, a qualitative research approach has been applied to the CBWUP process to analyze a collaborative multi-stakeholder process. The following is a study of the CBWUP context, process and facilitation. The examination is based upon interpretation of interview responses and study of meeting minutes and materials. Considering the diversity of the interview participants selected, variance in opinions is predictable. In rare instances, unanimous opinions were expressed. To better understand the process, its progression through the phases of collaboration, as assisted by facilitation, is assessed. In Chapter 3, Fundamentals of Collaboration, mechanisms of including communicative planning follow each subsection of Gray’s phases of collaboration. In an effort to increase readability, discussion of characteristics of communicative planning are predominantly mentioned in section 6.6, Facilitation.

6.1 Context

6.1.1 Motivation to collaborate

The decision to pursue a collaborative effort was motivated by a number of factors. A history of rapid change and frequent clashes between interests, increasing competition over water allocation for a variety of uses and functions, and government pressure and support of WUPs all combined to prompt pursuit of a collaborative approach. The decision to utilize collaboration was further bolstered by the WUP Guidelines which stipulate WUPs are to “be prepared through a collaborative effort” (WUP Guidelines, 6: 1998). Circumstances combined to create a context suited to collaboration.

Process participants shared a variety of reasons for becoming involved in the process. A sense of civic duty and a desire to improve the current situation was mentioned as a motivating factor during all interviews. Some speculated that this was due to the tendency to associate fish with a healthy system. Several individuals mentioned personal attachment to place and a desire to improve or return the river to a previous state as their motivation for involvement. One individual reminisced about the pink wild roses that at one point grew everywhere, the dense foliage that made just
getting to school an adventure and spawning salmon with moving intensity. His/her participation was strongly motivated by his/her desire to provide an opportunity for, "kids to experience what I experienced" (R-B). One respondent articulated his emotions more colorfully than others,

Deep down in my own heart, I'd love to see a fisheries survive in my own naïve world, in a fairy tale where we can all be happy."(R-H).

Emotional attachment to the Coquitlam system was a major factor in inciting stakeholder involvement.

While interview responses indicate motivation to participate in the CBWUP process was dominated by personal attachment to the watershed and a desire to help fish, other reasons for becoming involved were also present. One individual felt obligated to represent industry because he/she believed it was, “time someone stood up and said it the way it is” (R-G). Clearly, information exchange was a factor in his/her decision to become involved. In other cases, participation in the CBWUP was a component of the individual’s official employment (R-J), (R-H). For an NGO representative, participating in the CBWUP process was the result of a series of events that culminated in involvement (R-E). A variety of motivating factors bolstered emotional reasons to participate in the CBWUP process.

6.2 Process

6.3 Phase I - Problem Setting

6.3.1 Common definition of the problem

Ensuring common definition of the problem is a challenge. To comprehend the problem similarly, the purpose of undertaking development of a WUP must be clear. The WUP Guidelines clearly state:

Water use plans are meant to clarify how rights to provincial water resources should be exercised, and to recognize other social and environmental values associated with those resources. WUPs will specify the operating conditions relating to water licences issued under the Water Act. Licences grant a right to construct and operate works, and to store, divert, or use a specified maximum amount of water for particular purposes. (WUP Guidelines, 8: 1998)
A copy of this clause was distributed to the CC; however, considering the generally defined parameters of a WUP's function, diversity in its interpretation is predictable.

Interview respondents expressed various interpretations of the purpose of a WUP. One individual was aware that he/she was defining the function of WUPs to best suit his/her interests.

I can tell you what Hydro says and I can tell you what I think. Hydro, and I disagree with Hydro, Hydro says it is balancing the interests in water use planning. I think it is more about defining what the public interest is. I think that the public interests...is to provide better habitat and more productive conditions for salmon because public opinion polls have consistently said that salmon are an icon that they are willing to spend more in terms of taxes and things like that and they are willing to endure greater regulations in terms of acts to protect fish and things like that in order to have salmon around. (R-D)

The apparent discrepancies in interpretation were summarized by one respondent's reply, "Depends on how we want to define the problem." (R-J). When asked to discuss the problem being addressed, each interview respondent offered a distinctive response.

Interestingly, discussion of the problem being addressed, in most cases, launched a spontaneous discussion of process scope. Although, the process scope was commonly regarded as inadequate, one stakeholder was especially upset by the limitations.

It (scope) can't be limited. Why should the scope be limited? All those things are still happening (R-B).

Scope related concerns were echoed, although not as passionately, in the minutes. Issues related to scope were an issue from the process onset. Comments either lamenting the limitations of scope or explaining process confines appear throughout the minutes (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: November 22, 1999; December 13, 1999; January 15, 2000). WUPs are to address issues related to the operation of facilities as they currently exist, and incremental change to operations to accommodate other water uses.

When suggestions outside the scope were made, those who were better familiarized with the mandate of WUPs regularly reiterated the scope of a WUP process. However, the reoccurrence of scope related issues and the reactions such discussions elicit indicate scope limitations have not been accepted by all participants. For at least one interview
respondent, the desire to discuss alternatives, beyond the confines of the process scope, was so strong that they were discussed during our interview and followed by a telephone conversation to clarify the suggested alternatives.

Tidal energy should be considered more carefully...The problem is the water coming from everyone else and the storm drains. The flushing flow won't work they won't be able to keep it clean enough...From the first meeting I went to, I've been saying you've got to get the storm drains out of the river. ...development on this side (of the river) should have individual or even cluster sewage treatment plants...Ballard power batteries and hydrogen need to be considered. Investigation of these options may mean we don't need to use hydropower at all (R-B).

Clearly, this individual is brimming with suggestions; however, the ideas are outside the scope of the CBWUP process. He/she felt frustrated by the process. Dis appointment stemming from scope limitations was also a key factor in the Kwikwetlem First Nation's decision to withdraw from active participation in the CBWUP process. Sockeye restoration above the dam was deemed to be outside the scope of the process; the Kwikwetlem First Nation decided to discontinue their participation in the process until issues related to Sockeye restoration above the dam were discussed to their satisfaction (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: May 14, 2001). Limitations in scope had direct impacts on the process.

The importance of the issue was recognized and efforts were made to address scope limitations. Issues outside the scope of the process were documented (see Appendix VI). During late winter 2000, the CC was asked what they would like to do with the list of issues outside the scope of the WUP that had been generated. The CC decided to recommend a formal presentation be made to the City of Coquitlam and the City of Port Coquitlam through an existing organization such as the Environmental Task Force (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: December 11, 2000). However, this decision was not mentioned during any of the interviews. Respondents seemed to be unaware of the plan. Scope has been a source of discontent throughout the process.

6.3.2 Commitment to collaborate

Commitment to collaborate derives from dissatisfaction with the present situation. For an assortment of reasons, none of the interview respondents were satisfied with the current situation.
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What we were looking for, is potential water sources and of course, any water use decision that affected us getting more water or affecting our ability to have more water, we would obviously have an interest in... Since we have been working on a drinking water management plan, the Coquitlam water supply looks even more important, especially now considering some of the other options and their economical, environmental or even social implications. (R-H)

We hope to achieve a greater recognition of the value of water for fish in river systems. And basically, we hope to achieve greater flows, which will increase productivity (R-D).

One respondent maintained he felt physically ill when confronted with the current situation. His revulsion to the current state was so intense it was difficult for him to look at the surrounding environment.

Just like every time I used to drive over the Coquitlam River I would just close my eyes and think about what it was like before (R-B).

Universal dissatisfaction with the current situation predisposed participants to be committed to a process with the potential to remedy outstanding issues.

The CBWUP process was regarded as capable of providing an opportunity to address frustrations related to the Coquitlam system. An interview respondent employed by the convener summarized this chance.

I think we made it clear that there were no promises about how much would come out of all of this, but there would be some potential to improve fisheries. There were no promises up front – just an open process that people could buy into and could see it's very clear, the process involved these steps. Everyone would have a voice in making their objectives known and what they would like to see happen, put the issues on the table and have a chance to make a difference. In the end it may not be everything they wanted (R-J).

The possibility of affecting change, despite the lack of assured outcomes, was sufficient to entice stakeholders to commit to the process. Even those who did not believe participation would result in tangible benefits were able to recognize the value of partaking in the CBWUP process.

Why am I sitting there? ... I'm not going to get nothing (R-G).

This individual answered his/her own question, “to correct the record”. Although the gains to be obtained from participating in the process may not be substantial in every case, they must be present to some extent to entice commitment.
The process demanded commitment. During the initial meetings, the convener stressed that those interested in being involved in the process should be prepared to remain for the duration. Interestingly, in the summer of 2000, CC members raised the issue of member commitment and requested that members both attend and remain for the duration of the meeting. It was requested that the consultants remind members of the level of commitment required by the process (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: July 6, 2000). In addition to attending meetings, active and informed participation was expected not only by process organizers but also by participants.

All I can say, is those that are there should make sure they understand what has happened at the last meeting... It has frustrated me once or twice, listening to people who maybe come to a whole bunch of meetings but then miss a whole bunch and are out of the loop. The people that are there should be making sure that they are committed to being there and not just there once in a while (R-E).

Emphasis on commitment from the process convener and consultants is predictable, but the interest in commitment by participants is noteworthy. It functions as an indicator of the intense level of dedication invested in the CBWUP process.

During every interview, commitment to the process was evident. The majority of respondents indicated that their level of commitment had increased through the duration of the process. However, the decline in CC members attending meetings since process commencement may indicate that individuals and agencies whose commitment waned ceased to attend meetings. Their commitment may have decreased because they identified an alternative means of addressing their interests or they determined the CBWUP process was not capable of addressing their interests. None of the stakeholders who removed themselves from active CC status were interviewed during this study. The Kwikwetlem First Nation’s decision to shift to the Minutes Only group was motivated by limitations related to the process’s capacity to affect change in Sockeye populations above the dam. Until land claims issues are addressed, it will remain difficult for First Nations to work in a venue such as the CBWUP process. The City of Coquitlam declined to be interviewed; therefore, their reasons for changing their status during the summer of 2001 are unknown. Stakeholders that remained CC members were committed to the process.
6.3.3 Identification of stakeholders

Development of a CC began with a mail-out to over seventy organizations and two open houses in September and October 1999 (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris, 1: 2000). As a result, a group of interested individuals, which is large by WUP standards, was assembled. Over time, the group’s size declined from approximately forty to approximately twenty-nine active members. The number of individuals on the CC was generally considered a challenge. As late as April 2000, the issue of CC size was being revisited. The impact of the number of participants on effectiveness and efficiency was discussed. Ultimately, it was decided that the number of CC members would not be reduced (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: April 17, 2000). The number of CC members was a defining characteristic of the CBWUP process.

The CC agreed to move forward as a relatively large group. Despite their familiarity with the challenges associated with working as a large CC, interview respondents were generally quick to stress the importance of inclusion. An interview respondent articulated a typical sentiment which conveys the tension between wanting to be inclusive, yet not wanting to be involved in a lengthy, cumbersome process.

Well, the bigger the group, the more ideas that do come out. If a representative, say for fisheries, (he/she) might also represent their particular bias within that particular dimension or element of fisheries so with a bigger group you do get a broad cross-section but at the same time, it slows the process (R-H).

The composition of the CC was deemed large and at times unwieldy; however, CC members were adamant in their commitment to involve a wide range of interests. The CC recognized that if the range of interests was not sufficiently broad, the process could be criticized as lacking representation (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: January 15, 2000, January 24, 2000). The consultants were also aware of the implications associated with the number of people participating in the process.

It was clearly not a balanced representation but it also did allow the people who really cared about their issues to come forward and try to make a difference. It did make the process a bit more challenging and I think that recognizing that representation is an important criteria in coming up with a committee is something that probably needs to be looked at in a little bit more detail (R-K).
The group decided to err on the side of too many participants than too few, as suggested by Chrislip and Larson (1994). Generally, recognition of the need to be inclusive outweighed the desire to reduce the committee's size.

Despite the number of participants, the CC did not equate size with thorough representation and actively sought involvement from those they felt were missing. To ensure representation, the Project Team actively pursued involvement from stakeholders who were not involved in the process. In this way, a representative from industry was recruited into the process (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: February 7, 2000). As late as December 2000, efforts were made to invite participation from absent stakeholders (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: December 11, 2000). Active CC membership from the City of Port Coquitlam was desired by some CC members; however, throughout the process, the municipality limited their involvement to receiving CC meeting minutes. The CC was ultimately unable to include all of the interests they would have liked and had to be content with some stakeholders limiting their participation to receiving minutes. CC members demonstrated acute understanding of the difference between numerical representation and interest representation.

The limited participation of the municipalities was noticed. The City of Port Coquitlam was never a member of the CC. For the bulk of the process, the City of Coquitlam was actively represented on the CC; however, as the process entered the summer of 2001 the City of Coquitlam's position became unclear. Initially the representative altered his/her status from CC member to observer. At the next meeting, the CC learnt the representative was being replaced by another individual who was ultimately replaced by yet another person who joined the process under the impression he was a CC member (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: June 11, 2001, July 9, 2001). The uncertainty of municipality involvement was not well received by the CC. There is a sense that the CC is exasperated by wavering commitment from the municipalities (R-E). The CC remains aware of the absence of active involvement from the relevant municipalities,

...there should be more city reps...I think that they should definitely attend, if they are really interested in the Coquitlam River. This is a planning process, it's not something that the city puts together. This is a major public
process on what is happening and what should happen with the river. And I
don’t think the city is plugged into it very well (R-D).

The effort invested by the CC in identifying and recruiting stakeholders has been
substantial.

6.3.4 Legitimacy of stakeholders

A factor in building legitimacy is establishing an appreciation of the views held by
other stakeholders. Respect for the values of other stakeholders was evident in the
interview responses. When asked whether the process had allowed participants to
understand the views and interests of other CC members all interview respondents
responded positively.

…it has helped in hearing someone else’s views. It helps in understanding
where they are coming from (R-C)

One respondent asserted not only an understanding but also an ability to anticipate the
actions of other CC members.

I can usually predict what someone is going to say or how they are going to
react (R-E).

However, gaining an appreciation for one another’s views does not ensure total
acceptance of stakeholder participation.

The number of fish representatives caused some uneasiness and initiated discussion
related to the possible affect on process methodology of group composition. Concern
was expressed that the number of individuals representing fish interests could skew both
the process and the outcome.

I don’t know that we need all those fish representatives. I think you have a
huge duplication in the group. How many guys does it take to represent
fish?... It’s crazy (R-G).

…the balance is not right. And that is why I was saying, maybe if there
were one or two representatives from the NGO (fish interests) rather than
five or six I think that would have balanced it better. But as long as
everyone recognizes that – I don’t think some of the fisheries people do
actually. Some are more hard-core than others (R-H).

While some expressed reservations related to the number of fish representatives on the
CC, one interview respondent justified their numerical superiority. An interview
respondent stated his/her belief that certain interests legitimately warrant additional influence.

I don’t think that all interests are equal here and I think that is where we start to get a little off track here. I think this is mainly about restoring some damage that has been done in the past for fish. It is less about how much drinking water there is, it’s less about issues such as flood control and those types of things. It goes into NAFTA and the CEC complaint, that water use planning is established to address past abuses to fish habitat. And I agree with that, I think that hasn’t been front and centre (R-D).

Whether fish interests were over-represented in the CBWUP process and exerted unjustifiable influence was a contested issue within the CC.

While there was some debate surrounding the issue of fish representation at the table, First Nations’ participation was accepted. From the beginning of the process the CC expressed appreciation for the importance of including First Nations and recognizing their distinctive standing. It was suggested during an early CC meeting that the mandate and terms of reference include a separate paragraph acknowledging First Nations and their unique position as outlined by the Delgamuukw Supreme Court decision (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: December 13, 1999). However, First Nations remained concerned that their interests were being considered only within the confines of archaeological, historical and cultural considerations. They made a request that their interests be accepted as relevant in all areas of discussion (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: April 17, 2000). Despite efforts by the CC, convener and consultants to maintain First Nations participation, First Nation representatives began to withdraw from the process. During the final months of the process, only the Kwikwetlem First Nation remained an active CC member. Ultimately, they also left the CC, opting to join the Minutes Only group. Among CC members, there was empathy for the First Nations.

...they have certain legal rights and traditional rights and they have rights we don’t even know about. They have title we don’t even know about and I think they are finding their place. But at the end of the day, if anyone has been screwed, it is the First Nations people, big time (R-G)

As long as they (First Nations) were in there, I think it was great that we could try to work towards some of their interests. But I think ultimately it comes to the federal government and the land claims issues.... WUPs are not cast in stone so if there are changes to come because of First Nations, say there is a treaty or some other sort of settlement then the WUP will have to be opened (R-H).
Although First Nations withdrew their membership in the CC, fellow CC members considered them legitimate participants.

Interestingly, different stakeholders saw themselves as representatives of the general public. A NGO representative felt their organization was representing the public interest and fortified their belief by referring to public opinion polls that indicate high public interest in fish habitat (R-D). A GVRD representative felt responsible for representing citizens’ interests in securing safe drinking water,

In the far-reaching sense, our constituents are the citizens of the GVRD. And they are being represented by the politicians and we are the technical group supplying information to the politicians, for them to make decisions (R-H).

In addition, a BC Hydro representative felt responsible for representing the interests of hydro electricity rate payers, but not at the sake of all other interests.

I think the key people we need to negotiate with are the agencies and the special interest groups. It’s a very good cross section meeting at the WUP table but to assume we have everyone’s consensus because we have these people there is probably a bit misleading. I think we need to balance that. And that is where the corporate reps. responsibility lies a little bit too. We need to keep our rate payers in mind and when we talk about how much water is being released for fish, the dollars that that costs, we need to be aware of that and we need to be sure our rate payers’ interests are taken care of, but we sort of do that for them. But again, you could say that they are taken care of, but we aren’t fully representing all interests by any means. We just have the key people there. It’s a good process in terms of getting the key people there that we need to deal with. …I think it is a lot easier to understand what they (other stakeholders) are trying to achieve than what BC Hydro is trying to do. We are seen as just trying to protect the bottom line dollar and really that is not the case but we have an obligation to our shareholder and the province to make sure we do the reasonable thing, the balanced approach is not just about fish (R-J).

Several interview respondents felt they were legitimately representing the interests of the general public.

6.3.5 Convener characteristics

In the CBWUP process, BC Hydro functions as the convener, as they do in the other WUP processes occurring in the province. The provincial government mandated this responsibility. In addition to convening the process, BC Hydro is an active, major
stakeholder. They are in an unique position compared to other participants in the CBWUP process.

BC Hydro’s dominant position in the Coquitlam River and the tumultuous history of river management, much of it predating BC Hydro’s acquisition of water rights, created a situation where BC Hydro was frequently in a defensive position. Although they were mandated to function as the process convener, BC Hydro’s dissatisfaction with the current situation bolstered their incentive to ensure the process’s success.

Being confronted on various issues at various times, from different people, DFO, Ministry of Environment, fisheries, public, volunteer groups that are working on the river system, so they could be coming at you from different issues or the same issues. It wasn’t a very efficient way of dealing with it. That was the problem for us, we wanted to try and get operating certainty around our facilities so we could say, this is what we have agreed to to operate. (R-J)

As the primary target of criticism, regardless of whether it was warranted, BC Hydro had an interest in resolving issues which went beyond being mandated to undertake the initiation of a WUP process.

BC Hydro recognized their actions, as process convener, would be scrutinized; therefore, they were cautious in their dealings. BC Hydro employees who were involved in the process were aware of their specialized roles and did not interfere with issues outside their jurisdiction (R-J). Although the convener can opt to facilitate the process, BC Hydro decided to invite an outside party to undertake the task.

It (facilitation) brings credibility. It raises the old question, should we facilitate our own process or public consultation process? I think it adds credibility right up front when you bring in a different outside facilitator. We allowed the CC to be involved in selection so it’s an unbiased approach to doing that sort of thing. I think that adds credibility. It also off-loads BC Hydro from that responsibility and puts them in a better position to not have a conflict. I don’t think you’d want to do it any other way with such a big group (R-J).

BC Hydro has taken measures to increase their credibility as the process convener.

6.3.6 Identification of resources

According to Gray, most multiparty negotiations require resources and unless they are being conducted under agency auspices, the parties themselves will incur the costs (Gray, 73: 1989). The CBWUP process conforms to this generalization.
Comments made during interviews, indicate that those who came as representatives of large agencies did not face the same difficulties obtaining resources as those representing smaller organizations or coming to the process as individual residents. Comparison of a response made by a BC Hydro employee and representatives from smaller agencies typifies the discrepancy of access to resources.

BC Hydro, even though everyone is extremely busy and has a heavy workload on their plates, was quite able to provide the support I needed (R-J).

There are a lot that don’t have time or money. It’s really stretched the limits of many people. As you can see on the Coquitlam there are a lot of people that can’t come because it’s stretching their budgets and time (R-E).

Listen, you take a look around that table. For how many people is it a job or career in which they are getting paid? And how many are truly volunteers? I don’t see a whole bunch for which it is money out of their pockets to sit at that table. But it is for me. Hey, I don’t get anything from anybody. I don’t get anything from my company. That is just time that I take away from the company when I should be working for the company (R-G).

It was commonly accepted that participation in the FTC increased hardships.

You almost need a whole new hard drive for the amount of files. Being on the FTC brings a lot more paper than just being on the CC (R-E).

The group was aware of the implications associated with accessibility of resources.

Disparity between resources available to different CC members was reviewed by the CC (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: March 5, 2001). During this discussion, concern was expressed that NGO and community members, who did not necessarily receive compensation were at greater risk of having difficulty keeping up with the pace and number of meetings, which some felt were beyond what was originally implied. Also during this meeting, a CC member stated that he would not be attending any future FTC meetings held downtown due to costs associated with attending the meeting. The CC agreed that these issues should be brought forward to the Inter-Agency Management Committee responsible for managing the WUP processes. It was also noted that the issue had already been brought before the committee. Interview responses indicate discrepancy between stakeholders in terms of access to resources was a hindrance to participation.
Although inconsistency in terms of access to resources between stakeholders is virtually impossible to eradicate, participants may have been better able to manage the challenges associated with obtaining resources if they had been aware of the demands in advance. One interviewee who faced the difficulties associated with limited resources offered a solution.

…what expectations were being made that may have scared off some people but may have made things a little more certain for some groups who may have said, “Hey, I'm going to be asked to print out all this material over the eighteen months that we're going to be involved in this so I have to review my budget and make some budget predictions and projections and maybe go out and get some more money.” And things like that. I think that if that had been done up front, that may have been useful (R-D).

Some members would have benefited from advanced notice of the demands that would be made of their resources as a result of participating in the CBWUP process. Once the problem was recognized, some efforts were made to address imbalances in access to resources. Due to the costs associated with meeting downtown, the FTC agreed to meet closer to Coquitlam (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: March 5, 2001). Minutes indicate that periodically, NGOs made announcements to inform other NGO CC members of funding sources (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: June 15, 2000). A Watershed Watch representative encouraged CC members to speak to them directly regarding funding received by the NGO to promote capacity building of NGOs and First Nations. During later stages in the process, the convener made paper, for printing process related material, available. Inequalities in terms of access to resources were recognized but equalization remained elusive.

6.4 Phase II - Direction Setting

6.4.1 Establishing ground rules

The group developed and articulated process ground rules incrementally. Their articulation began in January 2000. In April 2000, the Guiding Principles, were more comprehensively articulated and specified procedural rules for participant alternates, new CC members and changes to the ground rules (see Appendix VII). These amendments were submitted to the CC and feedback was solicited. It was stipulated that they could be
adjusted at any time contingent upon consensus approval (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: April 17, 2000). Despite articulating this set of Guiding Principles, the CC members interviewed, with the exception of one individual, did not mention them. Instead, participants interviewed considered the 7 Principles of Good Process to be the ground rules. Mutual respect was highlighted in the 7 Principles of Good Process and functioned as the basis for managing participation and behaviour. The group was frequently reminded of the 7 Principles of Good Process, particularly mutual respect (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: October 30, 2000). Although official Guiding Principles existed, mutual respect, as highlighted in the 7 Principles of Good Process, was the functional means of directing interaction.

In addition to being used to manage interaction, mutual respect was frequently mentioned during the interviews as a successful outcome of the process. Two interview respondents commented that their involvement in the process had given them an opportunity to gain the respect of other participants.

I feel like I have gained a level of respect from the table that I didn't necessarily have when I first got there...I feel like I've gotten some good respect and people listen to what I'm saying (R-E).

I think there is a certain amount of respect. I think it has really grown. To start with there was some nasty hostilities, especially towards me. At the very beginning to have the raper and pillager of the Coquitlam Valley sit with the stakeholders was unacceptable (R-G).

Although there was a low level of awareness of the official Guiding Principles, the 7 Principles of Good Process, particularly its emphasis on mutual respect, were taken seriously and well utilized by the group.

---

**Table 6: 7 Principles of Good Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Focus on interests, not positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Separate people from the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Treat all members with mutual respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Listen carefully to all members and learn (whether you agree or not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Speak and be understood: KISS (keep it short and simple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Inform yourself – read materials and attend meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Explore alternatives and seek agreement across all interests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EcoPlan International and Maria Harris
6.4.2 Agenda setting

Agenda setting was officially undertaken by the consultants and the BC Hydro Project Team; however, minutes indicate CC members voiced their comments and suggestions related to agenda items and periodically requested time be set aside during a meeting to allow them to bring an issue forward. In addition, throughout the process, CC members were asked for their input related to work plan development. Whether this was considered sufficient opportunity to contribute or allowed too much opportunity to influence the process depended on the perspective of the individual who answered the question. Comments related to agenda setting indicate mixed feelings on the topic.

There was one occasion near the beginning where I wished to make a brief presentation, and it never happened, it felt a little like the agenda had already been set, and I wasn’t part of it (R-F).

I don’t think there are any problems with the agenda. The Process Team (consultants and BC Hydro Project Team) usually sets the agenda...Certainly, if we wanted to see something on the agenda I would bring it up at the CC meeting so everybody could hear it. I think there is always that opportunity as a CC member to bring up issues and get them on the agenda (R-J).

I think there are already opportunities to do that (contribute or comment on the agenda). I haven’t been disappointed or anything like that. No, I’m fine with that. I think that there is opportunity to do that (R-H).

I think that our interests have been pretty much there (on the agenda). But there hasn’t been a lot of opportunity to make suggestions on what should be on the agenda, no (R-D).

You know, this is one of the things that I find quite nasty, I’ll have a long conversation with X or Y, or Z and I would expect them to take the time to digest what I have said and try to incorporate it wherever it should go because they are getting paid to do that. I really don’t see it happening. That bothers me a little bit...(R-G).

Interview responses disclose a range of opinions on the issue of agenda setting practices. A possible explanation may come from issues pertaining to scope.

The variety of opinions on the issue of agenda setting was as diverse as on scope. Those who accepted the agenda setting process were also more inclined to be accepting of the process scope. One respondent who was comfortable with the agenda setting process offered an explanation for others’ dissatisfaction with the scope.

5 Pseudonyms X, Y, Z have been substituted for names.
As far as other stakeholders, I think they are somewhat frustrated by the confines of the scope of it (the process). They want to turn it into a watershed management issue and we are saying it's strictly an operational issue focusing on our existing facilities (R-J).

In comparison, one of the respondents who was the most vehemently opposed to the agenda setting process felt unable to sufficiently stress how upset he was about the process scope, irrespective of how many times he mentioned the issue. Virtually every question related back to what he considered to be the inherent process fault, its scope.

(the problem) in my opinion, it's not being addressed. ...The whole thing has to be restarted at the other end and they have to take into consideration the wider range of what can we do. ...The measures you can take now is like going into a boxing ring with your legs tied together and one hand tied behind your back (R-B).

Interview results indicate a correlation between satisfaction with agenda setting procedures and process scope.

### 6.4.3 Joint information search

The substantial amount of information compiled during the process was commented upon during every interview and frequently mentioned during CC meetings. Participants were involved in collecting information in a number of capacities. During the interviews, all respondents were able to list information they had collected or introduced to the group. The minutes indicate instances when CC members offered to locate or distribute information to the rest of the group (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: December 13, 1999, January 24, 2000, February 5, 2001, May 14, 2001). A few examples of the range of shared materials includes a report prepared by the Coquitlam River Watershed Community Initiative entitled “Final Report for the Groundwork Phase”, a submission by the Aggregate Producers Association of BC, “The Importance of Aggregate”, various information leaflets and a calendar that highlights environmental groups operating in the area. Members also offered to search for information. One member volunteered to do a search of the Archaeological Branch in Victoria for archaeological studies. In addition to information sharing that was documented in the minutes, it was usual for CC members to informally distribute information at CC or working group meetings. A substantial amount of information was compiled through the collective efforts of CC members.
The CC was kept informed of issues related to information gathering and had opportunities to comment on what information was collected and by whom. From the beginning of the process, CC members were kept informed of future presentations, meeting dates and sources of information (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: November 22, 1999). It was decided in November 1999, that BC Hydro would conduct the necessary modeling and information gathering when feasible (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: November 22, 1999). An important task assigned to BC Hydro, which ultimately could not be completed prior to conclusion of the process due to non-conducive weather conditions, was the In-Stream Flow Need (IFN) study. Despite the absence of flows appropriate to complete this study, BC Hydro produced a substantial amount of information used in decision-making. Study of the FTC meeting minutes reveals a seemingly endless list of new and continually revised documentation in the form of meta-analysis modeling results, transect modeling results (by reach\(^6\) and by fish life history), charts of daily flows recorded in “wet” and “dry” years in the river and iterations of alternatives.

In addition to the abundance of information that was collected by participants, the convener and the facilitators, it was still necessary to employ outside agencies and consultants (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: September 25, 2000). The CC was involved in ranking the importance of studies and associated costs. When strong differences of opinion occurred, members were guided through prioritization exercises geared to assist consideration of how particular studies related to performance measures and how information obtained could be used to rank alternatives (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: September 25, 2000). When suitable, presentation or clarification by individuals or agencies who were not members of the CC presented directly to the group. These sessions occurred throughout the process and included discussion of issues such as dam safety, flooding and fisheries. Also, a meeting with a representative of the Water Comptroller was arranged (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: September 14, 2000). A field trip for all CC members into the Coquitlam watershed, including restricted areas, and a tour of a gravel pit was organized in late October 2000 (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: September 25, 2000).

\(^6\) The river was divided into 6 reaches based on physiology (Reach 0, 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4). This assisted discussion by making it more precise and allowed individualized contemplation of river sections which
Maria Harris: September 25, 2000). CC members actively engaged in information collection.

Although CC members were interested in scientific data, its acquisition was sometimes difficult. The plan was to complete the IFN study by the end of January 2000, however, after several schedule changes, which attempted to accommodate unusually low flows, it was accepted that the study would not be completed during the course of the CBWUP process. Although the group was not able to proceed as planned, with primary data, they did ultimately manage to move ahead. Reluctantly, participants accepted an alternate means of gathering information. The modeling and meta-analysis of flows and associated impacts on fish was based on professional judgement, data collected previously on the Coquitlam River and information collected at other rivers in the province. This change of plans was accepted as a means to progress toward tradeoff analysis with the caveat that field data be collected when possible (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: September 25, 2000; February 5, 2001; March 1, 2001; March 26, 2001). In at least one instance, the group had to improvise methods of obtaining needed information.

Despite the fact that not all members were comfortable with the improvised methodology, by combining different sources of information, the FTC worked to answer questions related to fish productivity and water levels asked by the CC. All interview respondents who commented on the issue stated they would have preferred primary data to professional judgement and information previously collected at the Coquitlam and other rivers. The extent to which they were comfortable proceeding without all the primary information initially expected varied. One respondent was comfortable with information collected, as long as dramatic changes were not suggested.

...I think that we could study that river for another fifteen to twenty years and still not have enough information, you have to go on some gut instinct on some of this. When you are talking about the mean annual discharge (MAD) on a natural river system and compare that to what we have there, you can assume that a little more water is going to be good. And you are going to get gains so there are not problems, probably, around putting more water down there and expecting some gains. But when you start to talk about tripling and quadrupling the amount of water we are putting down...

were not all considered equally sensitive or significant.
now, then I start to get pretty uncertain about what that is going to get us for the money (R-J).

A different interview respondent stated he/she would “absolutely” have preferred primary data as opposed to professional opinion (R-D). Despite efforts to collect requested information, it was not always possible due to uncontrollable circumstances.

Comments associated with information collection, unrelated to the IFN study, were generally positive but some criticism was expressed. Two interview respondents had complaints related to the collection of information. One individual sent information to one of the consultants but was told the information applied to issues outside the scope of the process. The incident was a defining moment for this stakeholder; his frustration with the scope of the planning process was strengthened and escalated (R-B). Another interview respondent was also frustrated that information he had brought to the consultants did not reach the CC.

...when I send research papers that I find on my initiative, I don’t see them circulated or sitting at the top of the agenda (R-G).

In this instance, the interview respondent did not mention the reason the information was not distributed. Some disapproval of the information collection process exists.

6.4.4 Exploring options

The exploration of options began with the articulation of objectives. Objectives were identified by dividing CC members into small groups during the meeting and during working group meetings (for a complete list of objectives, see Appendix III). In these groups, objectives were brainstormed then brought to the larger group for discussion. Throughout the process, the group applied the approach they felt was most suitable for the current task. Considering the number of active CC members and the variety of interests they represent, it is unsurprising that a number of options were generated.

As the summer neared completion, the CC was presented with two options. The Share the Pain Alternative meant a monthly upper and lower range of water for BC Hydro, fish interests and the GVRD. The monthly amount was influenced by seasonal considerations that would determine how much water each interest (power, fish, or consumptive water) would be allocated. The second option, the Reshaped 4 Fish Valve Alternative, would require alterations to one of the low level outlets (LLO) so that the
volume of water passing through the structure would be equivalent to having four fish valves constantly open (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: August 14, 2001). However, as this CC meeting concluded, it was decided that the two options did not address all interests satisfactorily. Therefore, a small group was formed to further work with the alternatives to adjust them to better address interests (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: August 14, 2001). The small group had retooled the alternatives and expanded the list of possibilities from two to four. During the final meeting the list of options were further modified. A commitment to developing alternatives that encompass the breadth of interests involved in the CBWUP process was present.

When asked to comment on the process of exploring options, interview respondents articulated a variety of responses. One individual was adamant that the scope was so limiting that there was no possibility of exploring options that would have any real impact (R-B). Several individuals were content with the list of options generated by the CC but felt confused by stages in the process which assisted the development of options. Another respondent felt the process used to ultimately generate options was unjustly promoted as a scientific approach.

The data collection phases have implicit limits in the accuracy of information (depth of opinion) that can be conveyed, but it goes into a mathematical process and comes out with a false sheen of "rigorous science"...There are technical things and there are human/social things. Attempting to apply technical analysis to human/social things, especially when the data sets are small, can be misapplication or misappropriation of technical process (R-F).

Commentary on the exploration of options was relatively vague and guarded, which may be because at the time the interviews were conducted, the CC had just begun to evaluate the options.

6.4.5 Reaching agreement and closing the deal

Despite the increasing popularity of consensus processes, the WUP Guidelines do not insist decisions be made by consensus. The guidelines state consensus on an alternative is a goal but not a requirement. However, the consultative report must fully document areas of agreement and contention and in cases of non-consensus, disagreements and reasons for them (WUP Guidelines, 5: 1998). Although consensus is
not a firm requirement, throughout the process it has been stated that reaching a decision by consensus is a process goal (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: May 14, 2000). Consensus decisions are not a requirement of WUP processes.

Interview responses indicate, consensus was generally considered to be inconsequential. During the interviews, only one participant stressed the importance of consensus.

...the only reason we are going through this process is to try and reach consensus. We see value in reaching consensus. That is why we are doing this...This is right near the end of the process and we are hoping people are thinking consensus and trying to achieve consensus and then you get those types of comments (references to the WUP Guidelines stating consensus is not mandatory). People make comments that we don’t need consensus, we’ll just go ahead with whatever we can get and just write that down, the fact that there is not consensus. So you make comments like we are here to find consensus and try to remind everybody that there are benefits in that for everybody in getting approval. Like I said earlier, the WUP process is geared up for consensus, if you get it, it’s far more likely that the Water Comptroller is going to approve that (R-J).

Contrary to the importance placed on consensus by this individual, none of the other interview respondents were excessively concerned about consensus. A typical position, on the far end of the continuum, was stated by one interview respondent, “I think consensus is really highly overrated.” (R-D). The majority tended to be more moderately disinterested.

I think there is too much focus on making a consensus decision. Because we may never come to consensus and not everyone is going to agree. It doesn’t have to be a consensus, this water use plan (R-E).

I always want to get consensus but even with my own colleagues, I don’t get consensus. So, how important is it? I think you just take your best shot, you take the information and, it’s hard to please everybody. In life it is hard to please everybody (R-H).

Some recognized the advantages associated with making consensus decisions but that was the extent of their interest.

Responses from the consultants indicate they also did not equate consensus with the best possible decision. When asked whether consensus is necessary, one consultant responded:

No, I don’t think so. The quality of this particular consultation report will depend on how well the committee can articulate and come to an
understanding of why people hold different values in this watershed. ... Our point is to try and learn about what lies behind the tradeoffs and the reasons for those tradeoffs and it’s very difficult to elicit those and I think if we have non-consensus, it will be more difficult but it’s not the end of the world because it is at that point that BC Hydro and the Comptroller will have to say, we are now going to look at the reasons. What we are trying to create here is a document that forms the basis for informed decisions. That is more important than consensus. ... if people are disagreeing then you need those reasons and this is the purpose of these consultation processes. I think that is why the guidelines say you don’t have to reach consensus. And I think, frankly... what would happen if you forced consensus in a process like this... you would end up with a compromise. ... The focus would be on horse-trading and not on the understanding and the reasons. Both fly in the face of the purpose of it (the WUP) (R-L).

...this is an interesting process because it is not consensus based. We don’t have to reach consensus. There is a lot of incentive to reach consensus, which is actually, I think a better way to address the problem. A lot of time with consensus, you may end up reaching the least common denominator because that is the only thing anyone can agree on. So with a non-consensus based approach, used by Water Use Planning, is a way you can really highlight what the true tradeoffs are and who is being affected. And also, there is a lot of incentive for people to come to consensus to try and find that common ground and to search for ways to come to agreement so that the plan that is finally approved will get approved quicker and be implemented quicker and all the objectives and interests of all the stakeholders will be more quickly satisfied. That incentive is very strong, although there are a number of participants that don’t necessarily see it that way. With this WUP in particular there is a reasonable chance that consensus will not be achieved. ... There are opportunities for hard and soft kinds of consensus. It’s not so black and white, which no problem really is. So we are providing opportunities where people can say, I could go along with this although I hold serious reservations or this is great, I agree with everything. It allows us to reach maybe some sort of consensus and address serious outstanding issues later or not at all (R-K).

Certainly, the consultants were determined to produce the best product possible; however, they did not feel that the quality of the final outcome was contingent upon the achievement of consensus although it remained their goal.

Despite varying levels of interest in consensus, recorded minutes indicate effort was invested in gaining consensus support at decision points during CC meetings. The most poignant demonstration of commitment to consensus occurred during the final CC meeting in October 2001. During this full day session, participants’ commitment to consensus shifted from indifference to passionate commitment as they worked through difficult issues. Every participant present, with the exception of one individual, approved
the operating plan. As the meeting concluded, several stakeholders expressed sentiments of frustration associated with their inability to gain full consensus. Two major stakeholders clarified that since full consensus was not reached by the participants at the meeting, they might have difficulties convincing their constituents to accept the concessions made in the spirit of coming to a consensus decision. The next day, the individual who had decided to ‘block’ the recommendation of the CC submitted a statement indicating his willingness to accept the group’s decision as long as his reservations about the agreement were documented (EcoPlan International/Maria Harris: October 22, 2001). The events that occurred during the October 22nd meeting indicate that despite comments made by several participants communicating indifference to consensus, an understanding of the influence and benefits associated with consensus decisions was present and actively sought.

6.5 Phase III - Implementation

6.5.1 Dealing with constituencies

In applicable situations, communication with constituents is imperative. According to CC minutes, the convener actively encouraged CC members to share information and process progress with constituents and even reminded members that BC Hydro was available to make presentations to groups. To ensure appropriate management of information, each CC member received a one page outline of Public Communications Procedures at a CC meeting in June 2000 (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: 15 June 2000) (see Appendix VIII). All interview respondents with constituents were able to articulate their process of communication.

Expectedly, the communication process was more complex for large agency representatives; however, they were quick to offer assurances that they were operating with their constituents’ knowledge and approval.

...I don’t think some people realize that some of these decisions will take a long time to move through the political process – we’re talking another 4-5 months... Say someone on the Water Committee - we may approach and say this is what we are considering, we may be giving up this much water but we gain this much, we think this is the right thing to do for all the interest groups, it’s a good compromise or whatever. Then the politician or the Water Committee member and the GVRD person dealing with that
A politician will look into it and say well yes this is a good idea or no, it’s not a good idea. And how will we sell it to the Committee and how will it be sold to the Board? There are a number of stages it has to go through. We don’t usually surprise the Water Committee on these things. Usually they have been informed, it doesn’t mean they will agree to it but at least they’ll provide some background input (R-I).

We have a steering committee, Corporate Rep. Steering Committee, that are all Hydro employees and those people are involved at a higher level and they deal with things like the Interagency Steering Committee between the agencies, etc. They bring information to the table that we aren’t necessarily privy to and have a better understanding of what the bigger picture might look like in terms of all the WUPs in the province and how it’s supposed to come together in the end. And the agencies have to deal with that and the Water Comptroller has to deal with that aspect. When you talk about just one WUP you can lose sight of that because there is a balancing act and in the end there is only so much money to go towards fisheries improvements or recreational improvements (R-J).

Participants in the CBWUP process assumed responsibility for communicating with their constituents.

In addition to keeping their constituents informed, efforts were undertaken to provide the general public with a means of monitoring the CBWUP process. BC Hydro developed a website that included a basic summary of complete and current WUPs, including the CBWUP. The majority of the site was kept up to date. Watershed Watch, a CC member, initiated a comprehensive website featuring an overview of WUP processes, particularly the CBWUP. The website also included associated linkages to other useful websites. Both websites were accessible to anyone with internet access. The internet was skillfully used to provide an opportunity for the general public to be informed of the CBWUP process.

7 To access the information visit the following web addresses (read May 2001):
http://www.bchydro.com/wup/coquitlam/events.html,
http://www.bchydro.com/wup/coquitlam/background.html,
http://www.bchydro.com/wup/coquitlam/quickfacts.html,
http://www.bchydro.com/wup/coquitlam/progress.html,
http://www.bchydro.com/wup/coquitlam/involved.html

6.5.2 Building external support

External support is an unquestionable pre-requisite of process implementation. Considering that the CBWUP is part of a provincially mandated WUP process that has been undertaken with the knowledge and support of the Water Comptroller and government organizations, it is reasonable to expect high level support. A favourable record of implementation following past water use planning processes, both WUP and pre-WUP, implies the existence of support required for implementation. However, to obtain a true sense of how participants appreciated the situation, their comments were requested.

Some CBWUP participants require further evidence of support, while others are satisfied. A range of options were expressed in terms of the level of external support for the process and its anticipated outcomes. Some interview respondents were not confident that process participants were supported by their associated agency/organization management.

The people in there, are all fabulous people. But they are doing what they are told to do and that depends on ego-trips and where the money is. I feel like I am out at sea without even an oar. Everyone is certainly trying their best, if you look at the list of people involved in the WUP, they are all beating their heads against a wall when the people who are influencing decisions are way over their heads (R-B).

In comparison, others felt external support was present. Two of the large agency representatives were confident of external support. One respondent felt particularly confident that recommendations would be implemented by the Water Comptroller’s office.

The recommendations from the CC – I would say they (chance of implementation) are excellent because of what we have seen so far on the Stave WUP and the Alouette WUP (R-J).

Interestingly, another respondent was not interested in discussing external support, instead he/she preferred to discuss the attributes of self-regulation (R-G). While yet another interview respondent perceived external support to have increased as the process progressed.

One does get the feeling, particularly more recently, that there is (external support) (R-F).
Interview respondents expressed a divergence of opinions related to the level of external commitment to the CBWUP.

6.5.3 Monitoring the agreement and ensuring compliance

Successful implementation is subject to monitoring and other measures that ensure compliance. The WUP process is aware of these criteria. Steps 12 and 13 of the WUP Guidelines make provisions for inclusion of monitoring and periodic review (see Appendix I). Unfortunately, at the time this study was completed, monitoring remained only a cursorily mentioned issue.

Interest and understanding of the importance of monitoring was present; however, the issue had only been vaguely explored at the time this study was completed. CC and working group members were sensitive to the importance of monitoring. Minutes indicate they frequently highlighted issues they were interested in monitoring. Issues highlighted for monitoring, especially by the FTC, include turbidity, water temperature, and affects of low mainstem flows, off channel and tributary waterways (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: May 9, 2000; July 6, 2000; September 25, 2000; November 23, 2000; November 29, 2000; February 5, 2001; March 1, 2001; March 5, 2001). Interview responses indicated anticipation of monitoring. Only one respondent mentioned that costs associated with monitoring were only vaguely discussed (R-C). A statement made by a consultant refers to the limited attention monitoring and compliance had been granted to date.

The facilitators in this process will have almost nothing to do with the development of monitoring plans because of the budget constraints under which we are working. Monitoring has been mentioned again and again. This should be a monitoring item, this should be a monitoring item. I'll be interested to see what actually comes up. .... There are going to be costs constraints...(R-L).

These issues were explored during the final CC meeting in October. The CC recommended a Monitoring Committee be established. It was decided the group should include representation from: GVRD, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, BC Hydro, Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection, Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management, First Nations, municipal governments and representatives for the CBWUP CC (EcoPlan International/Maria Harris: October 22, 2001). Monitoring and compliance
measures cannot be conclusively commented upon until the FTC articulate the course of
action and monitoring is instituted.

If the process is unable to fully address monitoring and compliance, it may be
necessary for the general public to become more actively engaged. Past examples of
non-compliance with water licences have taught the public to be wary. Those individuals
who have been watchful in the past will undoubtedly monitor changes to water licences
and operating practices. Their watchfulness is important regardless of how well the
CBWUP process articulates monitoring and compliance measures; however, in cases
where the process is unable to adequately address these issues, the vigilance of the public
becomes critical. Monitoring and compliance measures are critical and deserve
comprehensive consideration.

6.6 Facilitation

In Chapter 2 and 3 it was mentioned that a distinct type of facilitation approach is
required to guide a collaborative process. It is while discussing process facilitation that
the degree to which the principles of communicative planning have been incorporated
become evident. Although BC Hydro representatives assisted process facilitation,
evaluation of facilitation is focused on the two consultants who were most involved in
process implementation and active facilitation. The following discussion of facilitation
of the CBWUP process incorporates the opinions of not only the two primary facilitators
but also process participants who were interviewed.

6.6.1 Consultant perspective

The consultants were placed in a challenging role that required skillful application of
a variety of skills. To understand the breadth of tasks entrusted to the consultants, they
were asked whether they agreed with the definition of facilitator used by this study.

A facilitator is an individual who enables groups and organizations to work
more effectively; to collaborate and achieve synergy. She or he is a
“content neutral” party who by not taking sides or expressing or advocating
a point of view during the meeting, can advocate for fair, open and inclusive
procedures to accomplish the group’s work. A facilitator can also be a
learning or a dialogue guide to assist a group in thinking deeply about its
assumptions, beliefs and values and about its systemic processes and context
(Kaner et al., xi: 1996).
One consultant agreed with the definition then proceeded to expand on the duties for which he/she was responsible.

I facilitated the fisheries group and the role was definitely one of moving the process forward, of education, in the sense that you are providing the participants with the organized form of the material they came up with. You aren’t necessarily bringing them new ideas but you are saying to them, here is what you said, here are the different ideas you’ve had, here is how you’ve tried to organize them. ... Then it is also a role of helping people stay focused and on track while at the same time not squashing ideas. ... So, I hope to enable people to come up with ideas that are going to be useful somewhere in the process and then bring things back on track. ... It was very, very challenging to separate the roles of analyst and facilitator (R-L).

The other consultant felt the definition was incomplete.

The facilitator at the Coquitlam is also the analyst, sort of crosses the bridge between being a facilitator and providing analytical support to the process. ... I think it (role in the CBWUP process) also gets into mediation and negotiation just sort of as the process goes on. There is tension between those roles. They are not necessarily consistent with each other. You are facilitating it while providing analysis which leads in certain directions, there is a tendency to steer the process towards a more efficient process, to facilitate it towards the analytical results while at the same time trying to maintain openness and inclusiveness and then at some point you start to get into mediation and negotiation which is really where we are at now. ... With the Coquitlam, for example, we’ve hit the point where it’s clearly a value conflict that needs to be resolved. If it can be resolved, the use of negotiation is really the only opportunity. So, a little more than just facilitation. ... The way this process is set up, especially in the early stages, is really not clearly defined. It becomes more defined later as you start to actually conduct analysis but during the initial stages when you are structuring the problem, it’s combining the facilitation, education and analysis in terms of structuring the problem, so I guess it’s more coherent. Later in the process it becomes more clearly defined. Here is the analysis, now I’m facilitating a discussion around this analysis (R-K).

The consultants fulfilled a number of fundamental functions that allowed the process to move forward. Clearly, the task of facilitation was complex and demanding. Clarification offered by the consultants of their role reveals the difficulty of simultaneously managing divergent and convergent thinking. To justly recognize the tasks fulfilled by the consultants, the definition of facilitator in the context of the CBWUP process should be expanded to include the functions of analyst, mediator and negotiator.
The demanding nature of the facilitators’ role is further confirmed by the consultants’ responses when asked to discuss the challenges associated with facilitating the CBWUP process. The number of people engaged in the process was an issue not only for participants, but also for the facilitators.

One (challenge) has definitely been the size and structure of the group. ... Well, the one thing they didn’t want is to be the person who might have to walk out of that room or the person that would have to delegate. So they were willing to put up with the process model that included everybody. ... There may have been an opportunity at the outset of the process to limit committee size. However, once things had got started, there would have been a lot of ill feeling if the group had been forced to a smaller size (R-L).

...one of the initial challenges which was the size of the CC, in trying to maintain the integrity of the process being open, inclusive and participatory while at the same time moving it forward and allowing people to have access to all the information without overloading them. Which isn’t possible basically. ... I think it did make it a little less participatory simply because we don’t have time during a four hour meeting for forty people to speak their mind about all the issues (R-K).

The number of participants in the process did affect facilitation. The consultants were aware of the implications of working with a large group and were willing to continue contingent upon support from process participants. An understanding of the positive and negative implications of a large committee was present.

One of the means employed to manage the large number of participants was to break the larger group into smaller units. Division was used in a number of instances and to varying levels of success. To promote understanding of participants’ point of view, the CC was randomly divided to discuss issues regardless of individuals’ personal perspectives, although an inventive strategy, the method was resisted.

So, at the outset we just broke the whole table into random discussion groups. Just numbered off, 1,2,3,4, 1,2,3,4 around the table and said here are our categories of issues, can you come up with concerns? There were fisheries people there who were being asked to come up with things that might be of concern to industry. We felt that if you aren’t actually trying to put yourself in the shoes of somebody else, you probably aren’t as tuned into listening and this was a tool to help people tune into listening. ... The point of this process and the value is that people begin to make educated tradeoffs and in order to make an educated tradeoff you need to know not only what you want and what you are going to get but also understand what others around the table want and need and why it is important to them or to society. ... But a number of participants did not like it and we were asked to discontinue these types of break out sessions (R-L).
Although this approach was discontinued at participant request, it may have broadened the perspectives of some and begun to establish an appreciation for the perspectives of others, which has developed throughout the course of the process. The decision to establish working groups was more successful. However, some concern did remain related to the composition of the working groups.

We were faced with the challenge of having working groups where there is a risk that fish people will talk fish and wildlife biologists will talk wildlife and nobody will know what domestic water is about. To encourage people to understand all points of view, everybody was welcome to attend or to sign up for any working group and then we began to see some cross-fertilization. ... There was enough cross-fertilization, I think, to come up with some decent ideas in those groups and then the onus was on us, because we had broken up, to provide really good briefing documents for the main table (CC) (R-L).

The consultants were conscious that the value of breaking into smaller groups to accomplish a task was contingent upon the ability to share the information with the larger group. In an effort to avoid being stifled in attempts to move forward, the facilitators maximized the potential of dividing into smaller groups while remaining aware of the inherent difficulties of such action.

The most influential division of the CC was the FTC. This group was a major contributor of information and the CC heavily relied on their suggestions. However, its establishment was not straightforward.

... at the first meeting we facilitated in December '99, a committee member suggested we establish a small FTC. When we asked who would like to be on this FTC, thirty hands went up. ... To me, that was an indication that trust had not been built between the players. They did not know each other, they did not know who might represent their views or through whom they could channel their views. I felt it was a signal to wait. We ended up going to a model of a fish working group where anyone who was interested in working on fish related issues was able to attend. That became a group of thirty who got to know each other and became smaller. Then there was this period of trust building again when the smaller fish group reported to the bigger fish group and the bigger fish group reported to the main table (CC) (R-L).

A primary means of managing the number of participants was division into smaller groups. The passage of time, development of trust among participants and application of different means of dividing the group eventually resulted in increasing the acceptability of division into smaller groups. When it was suggested that a small group be formed to
work with the identified alternatives to further develop them to fulfill more of the represented interests, the CC was quick to approve the proposal (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: July 9, 2001). The number of participants partaking in the process necessitated specialized attention.

In addition to the number of individuals assembled, the composition of the group also presented challenges. Individual participants brought different skills and weaknesses. The consultants were quick to recognize sources of imbalances related to these distinctions.

Clearly an imbalance in every group is people’s ability to articulate, their willingness to speak and come forward and how defensive, how willing they are to make a response. So the whole psychology of talking in a group ends up giving you huge differences in a group. So, we had people who could do a presentation but couldn’t answer questions, you had people who were the peacemakers in a group. You had people who bubbled forth with anger but you knew they were trying to make a point that might have some relevance. We had people who were very quiet and withdrawn (R-L).

There were clear imbalances, there are always imbalances. There were imbalances of power, it’s a BC Hydro process, there are obviously some interests that have more power in the process based on how the guidelines are presented and how the plan is approved. … Some of the participants are PhDs who spend a lot of time with the material and are quite articulate and they are vocal, then there are some that aren’t necessarily so educated but are still quite vocal and tend to dominate in the meeting (R-K).

Imbalances were plentiful and diverse. To address these issues, a variety of techniques were employed by the consultants.

To manage discrepancies in participants’ level of understanding, the consultants invested considerable effort into ensuring the quality of information exchanged. Disseminating the volume of information that was collected was further complicated by the often technical nature of the information. The consultants were responsive of the need to work to ensure information clarity.

The other thing that is a big challenge is this committee (FTC) was supposed to be a technical committee which was charged with telling the main table (CC) what are the main implications for fish - taking complicated technical information about fish, culling it down to the essence of what the main table needed to know – it was challenging to get the FTC to communicate technical results in this way, both to other FTC members and to the main table. … I ended up doing a large amount of that (R-L).
Acknowledging that in some cases, information would need to be reworked to increase comprehension, the consultants frequently took on the task of modifying the information.

(regarding the volume and nature of the information) Some people will be overloaded, some people will feel they didn’t get all the information, some people feel they got too much, and so on. The way we did it is try to document everything and supply everyone with as much information as was out there. We spent a lot of time formatting documents and making them more readable and user friendly. And really relying on the participants to determine what information was important and what wasn’t. And we did highlight and summarize. We provided summaries but then also had all the technical information available (R-K)

Study Briefs were regularly distributed prior to meetings. They were easy to read, concisely written documents that cited references. This carefully compiled information was diligently distributed. At the request of stakeholders, information required to prepare for meetings, whenever possible, was distributed a week in advance (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: December 11, 2000). The manner in which the information was circulated was customized to suit the needs of individual participants. The consultants coordinated the dispersal of information by e-mail (Word attachments or RTF), post, fax and courier. Undoubtedly, management and distribution of information was a challenge.

According to the principles of communicative facilitation, simply making information available is insufficient. A communicative facilitator is responsible for ensuring the information distributed is credible. To reassure those worried about document authentication, briefing documents were well cited and their origins disclosed.

If a study on floods was done by X, then they could see X had signed the report and know where it comes from. Or if it comes from BC Hydro, that source is clear or if it comes from Y or myself, that source is clear. They knew where the information came from and then they could question it and they did question it, especially early on during the trust building stages of the process. There was a lot of questioning of Hydro. But it was based more on a belief than on a need to validate sources, sources were trusted. Which is also, I think, an important role of a neutral facilitator (R-K).

The consultants also anticipated likely points of confusion.

...if I was sitting at the table, what would be the questions in my head? Try and anticipate what the sensitivities are, what, for the people, are the questions, where they need convincing, where they might not need

---

9 Pseudonyms X and Y have been substituted for names.
convincing, so that you can actually anticipate what people need to know to make a decision (R-L).

We tried to do that (anticipate) with everything. We tried to make everything as clear as possible and anticipate when technical information would be too confusing. How successful we were at that is something you would probably have to ask the Consultative Committee (R-K).

The combination of disclosing information sources and anticipating sources of confusion contributed to the effectiveness and usefulness of the information compiled.

Communication is a fundamental component of information exchange. During the interviews, the facilitators mentioned some of the strategies they employed while facilitating communication between different interests.

If someone makes points that the rest of the group skips over, then as a facilitator you can re-articulate. ...I found myself trying to rephrase things people said to make sure that what people heard was what that person said (R-L).

In addition to employing basic facilitation methods, the consultants also had to deal with instances of conflict. Expectedly, conflict did occur and these events necessitated specialized treatment.

Yeah, there are standard operating procedures of how to address conflict in a group situation and it is much easier in a group situation. ... During meetings, addressing conflict through a series of steps which – several times there was conflict that was quite emotional, which is fine, there are going to be emotions, things people care about. So once the exchange takes place, try to identify the issue and then try to look to the group as a whole to try and respond to it and try to come up with ideas for addressing that conflict which disperses a lot of the personal head-butting that tended to occur. Once that takes place, if no resolution can be found, we then, not forget the issue, but set it aside for a later date, until perhaps new information or new priorities come forward and see whether that issue is something that we can address or it may be resolved through other conclusions or if the process brings out new information. And then for conflict that took place outside the meetings, although it is better to have these things take place in the meetings, some conflict takes place outside on the issue. What is the issue, what can we do about it, what are our options, either one on one or with – between the parties that had conflict. That was actually important because if there is conflict that is not redirected to the process that we are trying to get through, we don’t want to waste the committee’s time with it (R-K).

There were lots of conflicts, there were lots of strategies too. I would often turn to people who I knew were the peacemakers and the leaders in the group. ... If the group (of disputants) was small, I might stand back. Sometimes we took a break. During the break, I would pull in a couple of key people and would write something on a flip chart or a board – a
summary, a possible way of looking at things, a clearing up of the issues, that happened a lot. Sometimes I would be able to see my way through to a possible resolution to the conflict. Often between meetings, I would look at it and think about what everybody had said and then talk it through with some key players and then try to bring it to the group. You almost know within a group, that if you have certain players on side you will not have conflict. You need to know who those players are and work with them. That took time (R-L).

Considering the range of interests involved in the CBWUP process some level of conflict was inevitable. The facilitators took its inevitability in stride and managed situations, when they arose, in a professional manner.

In addition to assisting communication between participants, the facilitators made themselves accessible to those interested in discussing or clarifying issues. According to responses from the consultants, they were readily available and easily accessible.

Open phone line, open e-mail. They had 100% access to us (R-K).

... I think, yes (in response to whether he/she was accessible to participants outside of meetings). That was something we did that was different than in the other WUPs in terms of the facilitation process. Groups varied, I understand there were some groups where the facilitators did not talk to the committee members or any of the people, except during the meetings while minutes were taken - at all. I felt it really important to talk to people outside in order to develop relationships, to understand where they are coming from... By talking to them, you can understand their concern, you can discuss it and then you can work through it, or around it and determine if it is critical. I spent a lot of time talking with people, e-mailing people and trying to get groups together in order to have people ultimately be able to communicate and articulate their ideas better (R-L).

Clearly, the facilitators made themselves receptive to comments. As suggested by Forester (1989), the facilitators recognized the implications associated with the composition of the group and focused on facilitating the most effective process possible with those assembled.

As a result of this effort, substantial achievements were realized. Accomplishments deserve recognition and it is the facilitator’s responsibility to encourage such celebration. Honouring achievements bolsters morale and allows participants to recognize the positive accomplishments of their efforts. In the CBWUP process, achievements were primarily celebrated through acknowledgement of participant efforts.

In a quiet way there is celebration. ... interest and enthusiasm has been maintained for two years and its not lagging. ... There are a whole lot of
people who are working hard and have found their niche and they are recognized for it. Everyone involved knew that we are breaking new ground in BC and this should be a learning process. There is cause to celebrate because we have indeed all learned a great deal through the CBWUP process (R-L).

There were a few milestones in terms of coming together. One was the recognition that we needed to take a look at 200 cms flushing flows and there's lots of contention and controversy about this issue and fears and anxiety. It was quite an emotional issue for everyone. Then at the end of it, we did a round where people could make final comments and there was general recognition that the FTC had done an excellent job, they had done a lot of work, they had come forward with some very good information to work with. There was recognition of BC Hydro and their reponsibility to the public and public safety. There was recognition from GVRD, their role in the Greater Vancouver Regional District. After that round, they just about broke into a round of Kumbaya - a defining moment for the committee (R-K).

Although recognition of process and participant accomplishments was not celebrated with balloons, streamers and champagne, efforts were recognized through quiet celebration. The obvious next step is to investigate whether these efforts to facilitate a quality process had the desired results. To answer this question, the opinion of participants was sought.

### 6.6.2 Participant perspective

Interviewee comments and meeting minutes suggest information dissemination was conducted thoroughly and effectively. Efforts to ensure everyone received information were recognized and appreciated by stakeholders.

An extremely simple thing is I don't have an e-mail address, so I've had to receive information by fax. And that has been trouble sometimes. But they (consultants) have been more than kind in accommodating me (R-C).

The information, particularly information compiled by the FTC, was predominantly accepted as reliable. Although interview responses indicate general satisfaction with the quality of information assembled, at least one individual was skeptical of the quality of some of the distributed information.

I have a lot of interesting information, I don't know that it's good and I don't know that it is accurate. I believe some of it is quite good but I would be just devastated if I found out that the data we got on the water had been manipulated (R-G).

Another stakeholder was also unsatisfied with the information distributed.
They (the facilitators) are trying to sort out all this information. I think they are doing a fairly good job with what they are trying to sort but they are not feeding everything into it. ... I didn't find it in the minutes, I wonder what notes they keep. The minutes aren't detailed (R-B).

Other stakeholders did not echo these concerns. The minutes are full of references to information requested during previous meetings. Follow-up of these tasks was always assigned to an individual or organization by name. Despite the efforts made by the consultants, some concern was expressed related to information.

During the interviews, several respondents commented on the effort involved in understanding the information.

Today I would have said that most people were confused. I was looking around at a lot of people and lot of them, even myself at times, who was on the committee (FTC) was just like, what are we talking about here? (R-H)

Interview responses indicate that although the information was sometimes confusing, the consultants were aware of this tendency and acted appropriately.

You just figure it will work itself out and that is where the facilitator comes in and sort of re-educes us. Oh, I thought we were going that way, oh, now I get it. And that has happened with everybody, from PhDs to non-PhDs (R-H).

Interviewed stakeholders conveyed their impression that consultants either anticipated or addressed points of misunderstanding. All respondents stated the consultants were accessible, which allowed opportunity to discuss issues requiring further clarification.

Ensuring understanding of information and limiting misinterpretation is a critical component of communicative planning, especially in a process, such as the CBWUP, that is dependent upon information.

Although the consultants were receptive to being contacted outside of CC meetings, stakeholders were most familiar with the consultants in a facilitator's role. The hours in facilitated CC meetings qualify stakeholders to comment on facilitation skills. During every interview the difficulty of facilitating the group was appreciated and in most cases, the facilitation was considered skillful. As one participant put it, "They are doing as well as they can" (R-B). Improvement during the course of the process was noted.

At the beginning of the process, I was less confident in them...I think they have gotten better (R-H).
The difficulties associated with facilitating group meetings were unanimously appreciated; however, differences of opinion were expressed related to facilitation style.

Interview respondents were split in their opinion of time set aside for open discussion, which was frequently dominated by discussion of past operating practices and issues outside the scope of the CBWUP. One interview respondent clearly stated his/her appreciation for allowing some unstructured discussion.

I think there is a point to having people’s suspicions and criticisms laid out a little more bluntly (R-F).

This perspective was commonly expressed during the interviews; however, the time taken by such discussion was an unpopular by-product. One interview respondent was clear about his/her preferences.

I’m a little more hard nosed about how to move through things in a little more timely fashion. I think they could have probably been more directive with some people and referred them to the fact that we are here to discuss a particular issue – cut them off at some point if they are going to go on about things (R-J).

In comparison to interview respondents who felt general discussion should have been curtailed, one interview participant was frustrated by the constraints on discussion,

I never have the time. For instance, we could discuss this for an hour (just one small issue). It (discussion) has just been shut off (R-B).

In addition, there was some concern that because the convener employed the consultants, they wielded additional influence.

At times I feel they (the consultants) are listening more to Hydro than to the CC (R-E).

Partiality was also insinuated by a couple of other stakeholders. Only one interviewee expressed a strongly negative opinion of facilitation skill and time management.

I think they are probably very kind people, very hard working and trying hard...I think the whole process, and they are part of the process, I think suffers from a lack of vision and leadership and lack of setting deadlines and that is what a facilitator has to do. I think they just warbled all over the place... Different people run meetings in different ways. To me, I would like to see a very strong, dynamic, let’s get the job done type of leader (R-G).
Interview responses indicated that although the benefits of open discussion were commonly appreciated, stakeholders would generally have preferred less time being set aside for unstructured dialogue.

6.6.3 Keeping the context in mind

Although the comments made by interview respondents relating to process facilitation are generally positive, some criticism does exist. Recognizing the value of these comments and without any intention of qualifying their concerns, it is worthwhile to consider some possible explanations for dissatisfaction. Some of the challenges the consultants faced have already been mentioned; the following consideration of the context is intended to provide further understanding of the difficulties associated with facilitation.

Process scope is a reoccurring topic throughout this study; it is also an issue in the discussion of facilitation. Scope limitations restricted the issues discussed and explored. The facilitators were aware of some participants' dissatisfaction with the process scope.

It (scope) is more clearly defined now than when we started the process so it is actually easier to address the issue with the committee now... When we first started, the issue of scope was something that took a lot of time, because it would be easier and make more sense, from a holistic planning perspective to include all factors that influence the watershed and try to get parties that have influence on the watershed to agree to implement actions based on this plan. But that is just not the reality of the situation. ... We always had the guidelines, which were fairly clear but there was still a number of outstanding issues. I think that the participants who complained about the scope not being wide enough were completely legitimate because it makes much more sense (to have a wider scope). But that is not the way it is, that is not how the guidelines are set out, that's not the process that BC Hydro is paying for (R-K).

What I think would have helped is if the scope had been really clearly defined early on. And that being said, it may have been impossible, or very difficult with this particular group because this group came in with a lot of issues related to BC Hydro and water and the watershed at large and they were burning concerns and they were looking for a home for them. They weren't about to let go (R-L).

Scope related issues were present from the beginning of the process and continued for the duration of this study. These issues affected everyone involved in the process.
Although they are empathetic, it is beyond the ability of the facilitators to extend the scope. However, they did make efforts to address scope related issues.

We had to keep returning to what is in the scope and what isn’t and why and to make sure that these things are documented. ...There was an effort made to find responses, to find homes for these things. We were discussing operating alternatives, there were all sorts of views that were brought up that were not operating alternatives for BC Hydro, things like, conserve more water, then the GVRD won’t need so much. So then, participants such as GVRD supplied a response to those suggestions. ...Many have found other homes and if they haven’t, they are documented and people can point to it in the report. This WUP is not the end of the world, this is the end of this little part of this process (R-L).

Considering the numerous impacts and contexts in which scope limitations have been mentioned by interview respondents, it is unsurprising that it would also have impacts on facilitation efforts. Recognizing the influence of scope designation, the consultants made an effort to respond.

A further constraint was limitations on resources available to the consultants, namely time and money. While discussing alternative means of managing the size of the CC, ensuring the distribution of quality communication and providing opportunity for comment, one of the facilitators commented that the options were limited by budget constraints despite increases to the initial budget.

The possibility would be- if you have to report back to such a big group and have to get buy-in, is to put an enormous budget into communication where you are either making sure you have people on the technical committee who are really united in what the main table (CC) has to hear or you provide them a big huge budget. The CBWUP budget was increased enormously over what was originally intended and I think to good value because we were able to provide communication links that furthered understanding and trust in the group (R-L).

An additional issue was time since time invested in one task was not available for other actions.

One of my big challenges in terms of time, was I felt if you could package things in useful form of communication you could make headway. But that takes time and that takes effort (R-L).

The consultants had to operate within a predetermined schedule and budget parameters, which influenced their facilitation of the process. Facilitation can be evaluated through assessment of perceptions related to information exchange and communication. Eliciting
the perceptions of both the consultants and the process participants contributes to developing a comprehensive understanding.

6.7 Findings

The CBWUP process has applied the phases of collaboration skillfully. Progression through all of the phases has occurred in a generally adept manner. Certainly, the process facilitation aided application of the phases of collaboration. The Problem Setting Phase was predominantly successful despite some negative affects related to scope delineation, the number of CC members and the interests they represented, absence and/or withdrawal from the process, lingering distrust of the convener and disparity in access to resources. The dominant issues the Direction Setting Phase had to contend with included issues related to agenda setting, difficulties collecting specific primary data and varying opinions of consensus. Because issues remained for further investigation at the time this study was completed, two of the three components of the Implementation Phase, external support and monitoring could be only preliminarily assessed. The application of communicative planning principles by the facilitators actively contributed to the positive effect of facilitation on the process. The most glaring hindrance to the CBWUP’s movement through the phases of collaboration is the issue of scope and the related difficulties and uncertainties its limited delineation caused. Table 7 summarizes the process’s strengths and weaknesses as it moved through the phases of collaboration. Whether scope, or other factors, reduce the likelihood of process success can be better determined once attainment of success indicators is investigated.
### Table 7: Summary Evaluation Table of Collaboration Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Evaluation summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Common definition of problem  | +/- broadly defined definition of ‘problem’  
- debate and uncertainty related to process scope                                           |
| Commitment to collaborate     | + dissatisfaction with current situation  
+ process capable of facilitating change  
+ participation recognized as valuable  
+ stakeholders demand commitment from one another                                             |
| Identification of stakeholders| + extensive, open search for stakeholders  
+ recognition of the value of a representative body  
- large number of CC members  
- some stakeholders absent/withdrew from the process                                             |
| Legitimacy of stakeholders    | + appreciation of others’ views  
+ accept unique circumstances of First Nations  
+/- large number of fish representatives                                                        |
| Convener characteristics      | + aware of trust issues  
+ restrict involvement to specified roles  
+ individuals have gained trust  
- continuing distrust in the crown corporation                                                   |
| Identification of resources   | + sharing of funding information, availability of paper  
- continuing disparity in access to resources                                                   |

+: positive characteristic; -: negative characteristic; +/-: both positive and negative aspects
### Direction Setting

| Establishing ground rules | + Guiding Principles  
+ extensive use of 7 Principles of Good Process  
+ mutual respect |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda setting</td>
<td>+/- opportunity to contribute to the agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Joint information search  | + involvement of all CC members  
+ CC involved in selection and work delegation to outside agents  
+ information presentation and distribution  
- inability to collect IFN data  
- scope designation affects information collection |
| Exploring options         | + variety of options generated  
+/- method of exploration of options |
| Reaching agreement and closing the deal | + commitment to consensus during the final CC meeting  
+ associated benefits of investing effort in striving for consensus  
+/- varying opinions on consensus until final meeting |

### Implementation

| Dealing with constituencies | + CC members communicate with constituents  
+ use of internet to communicate with general public |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building external support</td>
<td>+/- extent of agency support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Monitoring the agreement and ensuring compliance | + discussed and Monitoring Committee established  
+/- extent of implementation |

+: positive characteristic; -: negative characteristic; +/-: both positive and negative aspects
6.8 Chapter Summary

Application of a collaborative methodology to the CBWUP process has been generally successful. The context was suitable for the application of a collaborative effort. Guided by effective facilitation, the process has competently moved through the phases of collaboration. Although the different stages were not equally successful, their cumulative effect has culminated in a high quality process. Although this analysis does comment on the Implementation Phase, to ensure complete consideration of the issues, a couple of the phase’s components should be revisited when more information is available. At the time this study was undertaken, complete information related to external support, and monitoring and compliance was not available. The commentary on these components of the implementation phase should be interpreted with this caveat in mind. The ability of the process to facilitate development of the identified success indicators, empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency contributes to analysis of the process.
7 Achievement of Success Indicators

The preceding chapter reviewed the context, process and facilitation of the CBWUP process. It followed Gray's phases of collaboration in its analysis of the CBWUP's progress through a collaborative process and relied on Forester's views on communicative planning to discuss facilitation. This chapter studies the process's attainment of identified success indicators. By combining the findings in this chapter with the examination undertaken in the previous chapter, dominant themes and suggestions can be extracted.

7.1 Success Indicators

As expanded upon previously, the success indicators selected for this study, empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency were selected based on a study of water use planning processes that have been celebrated as successful. Their articulation assists the selection of a suitable methodology. If the CBWUP process is accepted as being adept in the attainment of these success indicators, positive outcomes can be expected.

7.2 Empowerment

Analysis of empowerment is dominated by two criteria, the extent power is shifted and the increase in capacity that results. By considering these two measures, a reasonable investigation of empowerment in the CBWUP process is possible.

Importantly, the WUP Guidelines stipulate WUPs must result from a consultative process (WUP Guidelines, 2: 1998). Consultation is situated in the middle of Arnstein's Ladder (see Figure 2) indicating it is most commonly associated with moderate levels of power redistribution. The report generated by the CC will be taken into consideration by BC Hydro as they draft their report for the Water Comptroller. BC Hydro is not obligated to endorse CC recommendations. However, there is a strong interest in submitting a report to the Water Comptroller that is similar to the one written by the CC, especially if the CC comes to a consensus decision (R-J). Although BC Hydro will submit its own report to the Water Comptroller, there is awareness that dismissal of CC recommendations may lead to public backlash along with other negative impacts.
Although the CBWUP process is officially only a consultative process, there is suggestion of a greater level of input and influence.

Perceptions related to being consulted as opposed to being granted a higher level of decision-making authority varied considerably. One interview respondent felt being consulted was “fine”.

There are things I make decisions on and there are things I am consulted on. In this case, this is just the right process for being consulted (R-H).

In stark comparison, when a different respondent was asked to comment on being consulted his reply was simple, “I hate it” (R-G). While another respondent’s statement made his sense of disempowerment clear, “Like I feel helpless” (R-B). Yet another interviewee replied with a series of philosophical questions.

The people involved in the process would like guarantees, some sort of legal right. Is that realistic in a democratic society where officials are elected? Why should a volunteer committee of citizens and specific interests, why should they gain any sort of legal right? Is there a legal right that could exist? (R-F)

The individuals interviewed were split in their opinions related to the amount of influence they had in the CBWUP process.

Interestingly, several respondents followed our conversation of consultation with a discussion of the difficulties associated with gaining increased power. In every interview comments were made which predicted BC Hydro would have to give something up after the process was complete. One interview respondent was especially conscious of BC Hydro’s situation.

Like a comment I made before, that someone said the power generation stations are going to shut down. When BC Hydro hears that, they must think, what have we gotten ourselves into. Really BC Hydro has really the most to lose... (R-C)

In addition to recognizing the disincentives to BC Hydro associated with sharing power, several interview respondents mentioned the influence wielded by politicians. One interview respondent was uncertain of how the CBWUP would be affected by the changes.

...there was not a high level of confidence (that decisions would be implemented) even with the NDP government, now with the change, there is a lot of uncertainty of what will happen with the new government now. We
can be hopeful but we are still very uncertain as to what is going to happen (R-D).

Interview respondents exhibited a clear understanding of the organizational impediments to gaining decision-making power.

Although decision-making power was officially confined to a consultative capacity in the CBWUP, the second element of empowerment, capacity enhancement, was present. One of the few universal statements made by interview participants was their intention to use the knowledge and experience gained in the CBWUP process in other capacities. One respondent was particularly aware of the potential long range benefits.

I think the whole process has potentially enhanced the capacity for planning in BC, there are a lot of people involved in this whole thing (R-D).

Regardless of other issues related to participation in the CBWUP process, all interview respondents were able to appreciate the process’s facilitation of information gathering and learning.

7.3 Fairness

To evaluate fairness, procedural and distributive elements need to be assessed. Discussing issues of procedural and distributive fairness with process participants is considered the most effective way to evaluate fairness (Susskind and Cruikshank, 21: 1987).

Procedural fairness is dominated by the evaluation of perceptions of process fairness and mutual respect. When asked to comment on process fairness, discussion shifted into consideration of opportunities to participate. With the exception of one respondent, interviewees felt all CC members had equal opportunity to speak. Generally, domination of discussion was not accredited to a conscious bias.

Certainly there are those who speak up more and those whose interests are getting more time but I can’t say that I’ve seen a bias in terms of the facilitator, no. I guess you could say the time seems to be proportioned to the significance of the issue. It does come down to mostly fish and energy, and water too (R-F).

There are always the people who either have questions or have more comments than others. I don’t think they are treated better than anybody else (R-C).
I think it has been a fairly open process and that there has been ample opportunity to speak (R-D).

The one respondent who felt the process was unfair felt comments made by some CC members carried more weight than those made by others (R-G). In terms of communication, the process is predominately considered fair.

As mentioned in the evaluation of ground rules, the CBWUP process was keenly aware of the need to instill a sense of mutual respect. Interview discussions indicate the process successfully established a respectful environment. During two interviews, instances when a CC member was disrespectful to another were mentioned. In both cases, an apology quickly followed the lapse. In one case, the CC member apologized on his/her own initiative and in the other case, one of the consultants intervened. Only two respondents felt the level of respect could have been improved. Keeping in mind the number of CBWUP CC members and the inherently contrary interests represented, the generally positive commentary on the level of respect in the group is commendable.

Only a preliminary evaluation of distributive fairness is possible at this time since it is better assessed once a decision is reached. However, the group has demonstrated acute environmental awareness and appreciation of the need to manage resources in the watershed wisely. Comments related to the need to consider future implications were common both during interviews and group meetings. The demonstrated awareness of current and future impacts on the watershed’s ecological, environmental and hydrological integrity demonstrates the inclusion of the principles of sustainability. In addition, CC members expressed their understanding and appreciation of the different interests and their individual claims to legitimacy. The foundation for a process that results in just distribution of resources is in place.

7.4 Trust

Trust is a fundamental component of a successful process but can be elusive. One of the major issues complicating the establishment of trust in the CBWUP process is the river system’s history. Opinion of how past management of the Coquitlam system has affected the CBWUP process was divided. At one end of the spectrum was the belief that the past was not sufficiently considered.
I think to understand where anyone is going, you need to understand where they have been. I think the where we have been part is not being emphasized at the WUP committee stage at all. I can see why Hydro doesn't want to talk about it, because they have abused the system and many systems for many, many years. ... If we had that clearly and honestly on the table, which we haven't, then I think there would be much greater sympathy for WUPs as a way of addressing past wrongs to fish habitat. At the WUP, it is up to NGOs to bring it forward and when it is brought forward it is not very well received, I can tell you that (R-D).

While on the other end of the continuum was the conviction that the water system's history had been adequately addressed and the group should concentrate on other issues.

...talk about old baggage and old history. That could be cut off, that serves no purpose – talking about things that happened fifty years ago. BC Hydro built the dam and killed all the fish kind of talk, when it wasn't even BC Hydro, it was BC Electric, a separate company, separate time in the history. We're here to look forward (R-J).

Comments made by other interview respondents related to history and trust fell between these two extreme points of view. Historical events continue to influence the development of trust.

Sentiments of trust varied within the CC. One respondent felt the entire process was insincere (R-G) while another discussed his increasingly “jaundiced” view of the actions taken by governing bodies which diminished his general level of trust in the process (R-B). In contrast to these sentiments, most respondents indicated a moderate level of trust was present and that some level of distrust typically persisted (R-J). As one respondent stated, “There will always be people who will always distrust others to an extent…” (R-C). Essentially, most stakeholders felt trust required further development.

I think that the trust of some of the other stakeholders still has to be earned and hasn’t been earned yet (R-D).

One stakeholder expressed a liberal view on the issue of trust.

I think you have to come to the table with some trust. You can leave feeling distrustful but you've got to come with some faith in the process (R-H).

Reasons for trusting or distrusting other stakeholders, the convener, the facilitators and/or the process were as assorted as the interests represented in the CC.
7.5 Efficiency

Review of the utilization of time and funds is a common approach to evaluate efficiency. It is uncommon for a process that is deemed inefficient to be considered successful regardless of benefits associated with the process or ultimate outcomes. To guarantee support, a process must be perceived to be efficient.

The amount of time some CC members invested in the process was frequently discussed both during meetings and interviews. Everyone would have preferred the process take less time. However, several interview respondents made statements indicating they understood that the time required to develop an understanding of the issues varied between CC members. As well, a few interview respondents acknowledged that data collection was sometimes justifiably slow.

It is tiring and there are lots of other commitments besides this that we all have. In that sense, I wish the process could somehow be shorter but you know there are a lot of (knowledge/information) gaps, there are a lot of unknowns so I understand why it has taken so long (R-H).

Although there was a level of tolerance for the pace of progress, stakeholders remained committed to the need to maximize effective use of time invested in the CBWUP process.

When asked about the greatest barrier to their participation, the single most common response was the amount of time demanded by the process. Since time management was a dominant topic in the CBWUP process, it is predictable that some interview respondents had ideas about how to reduce the amount of time required by the process. Suggestions focused on means of reducing the number of CC members.

...I’ve talked to people that say, they find the other WUP processes more effective because they are smaller. ... I think to make it more effective, I think really there should have been less fisheries interests there (R-H).

It was going to take that long because of the shear number of people involved. Again, I would just go back to a different model, trying to have limited representation as far as numbers, certainly representation of everyone but through certain individuals, more or less select someone to represent them (R-J).

While there was interest in reducing the time required by the process, none of the respondents were willing to sacrifice representativeness or quality. While the majority wanted to reduce the amount of time they invested in the process, one individual felt strongly that the process already allowed insufficient time to express ideas (R-B).
Generally, stakeholders were interested in reducing the amount of time they spent involved in the process.

As the process advanced, participant satisfaction with time utilization improved slightly. Generally, the later stages in the process were perceived to use time more efficiently. In addition to the amount of time invested in single issues early in the process, interview discussions indicate some participants were unclear about the usefulness of some of the earlier meetings and questioned the investment of time.

A lot of time was spent on what I call set up time...It just seems the process was slow moving at the start, even though we had a lot of meetings at the start and a lot of information. It just seemed really slow and I don't know how much use those first few meetings have come into play, later in the process (R-C).

In this case, the interview respondent decided to wait to pass judgement on process efficiency until a decision is reached and he can accurately state whether the proceedings early in the process contributed to the output. Discussions indicated stakeholders’ interest in seeing their earlier efforts used later in the process. Despite attempts by the consultants to explain the process, some lingering confusion remained. How information and discussion that was generated early in the process affects the final outcome is a factor in determining the efficiency of the time invested in the process.

Spending practices are a consideration in the evaluation of efficiency. The CC was kept informed and involved in making spending decisions. The convener made the budgetary restraints clearly known to the CC. The CBWUP budget was originally set at $847,000. It was increased first by $1.1 million and then by an additional $200,000 (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: May 14, 2001). The CC was involved in deciding how a portion of this money would be spent on research. Minutes and meeting materials document a steady supply of information related to the costs associated with requested studies. In addition, costs linked to alternatives were well documented and included in the decision-making process. When BC Hydro employees came forward, during meetings later in the process, to remind participants resources were being exhausted, interview responses indicate participants were predominantly understanding of the need to limit the process budget and impose time constraints. Process expenses
were openly discussed and CC members were able to influence spending decisions in some capacity.

Although the availability of economic evaluation was not criticized, interview respondents had some passionate comments related to expenditures. One respondent was especially upset by the amount of money invested in the process, which he considered inherently flawed.

It really is a waste of time. And time is money and the money that is being wasted away there makes you want to puke (R-G).

In contrast to his/her comment, most interview respondents offered suggestions to improve spending efficiency. One respondent felt some of the money would have been better invested in further investigation of alternatives (R-B). Another suggestion was to hold the CC “accountable for their budget and for coming in on time and on schedule” (R-J). Likely, CC members will have more comments related to cost efficiency once the process is complete; however, at the time interviews were conducted, their comments were limited to a few impassioned responses.

7.6 Cynicism

A discussion of the prevalence of cynicism augments analysis of the CBWUP’s achievement, to date, of identified success indicators. If participants become disillusioned with the level of empowerment, fairness, trust and/or efficiency, there is a danger they will develop a cynical perspective, which affects levels of commitment and buy-in. They must be able to distinguish effects of their participation. Unfortunately, interview discussions revealed that some stakeholders harboured a degree of cynicism. To determine an appropriate response, the source of the problem must first be understood.

Scope limitations of the process were identified as a source of dissatisfaction during analysis of both the process’s movement through the phases of collaboration and achievement of success indicators, predictably it was also a source of cynicism. Issues related to scope were commonly mentioned during the interviews and during meetings. One individual’s disparagement stemmed from a feeling of helplessness to affect change in the broad scope of international trade, political wrangling and environmental
degradation (R-B). The confined scope of the CBWUP process was especially troubling to this individual. Scope is a reoccurring issue in the context of the CBWUP.

Questioning of the sincerity of the process is a fundamental source of cynicism. During three interviews, respondents voiced suspicion that the CBWUP process was an empty act. One respondent was not convinced that even decisions made within the confines of the limited scope would be realized and felt the process was predominantly a token gesture (R-B). A similar attitude was echoed during other interviews.

Sometimes you get the feeling that, since BC Hydro is basically running the show, you do start to feel that now, are they doing this in the best interest for BC Hydro or are they doing this in the best interest of everything in the watershed. That is sometimes a bit of a question (R-C).

Again, it is negotiation by exhaustion...I think it is a plan as opposed to a ploy. I think the plan is you keep plugging along and at the end of the day, when the final decisions are made, there are going to be some people that drop off. The people that are left at the table will get what they want (R-G).

One respondent’s opinions related to empowerment reveals underlying concerns associated with stakeholder processes.

“empowerment”: one of those trendy words I love to hate. From my involvement with civic issues, one can get the feeling from these public processes that the objective is not to “empower” people, but to make them FEEL “empowered”. One way or the other, empowerment is not the issue, results are (R-F).

Once a participant regards a process as a nominal gesture, the credibility of the process becomes questionable. According to the Province of British Columbia’s, LRMP Public Participation Guidelines (1993), the first principle of effective participation is process credibility. Therefore, allegations asserting the process is a token act need to be taken seriously. Understanding the source of skepticism allows development of viable responses.

### 7.7 Findings

The CBWUP process has been reasonably successful in developing a sense of empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency. The positive comments outweigh the negative; however, some concern remains associated with the nature of consultation, the history of the watershed, trust amongst stakeholders, scope, and scheduling and spending practices. All of these issues limit the participants’ influence. As a result, some
participants did exhibit a cynical attitude. As was the finding of analysis of the process’s movement through the phases of collaboration, scope limitations, as articulated by the WUP Guidelines are a contentious issue. When the success indicators are not attained, the risk of developing a cynical attitude increases (see table 8). Past disappointment is the most likely cause of their skeptical attitude. To rebuild their trust and confidence it is important that the CBWUP process sets a positive precedent and that all future decisions and processes continue in the same communicative tradition.

Table 8: Summary Evaluation Table of Attainment of Success Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Evaluation summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Empowerment       | +understanding of power sharing  
|                   | +capacity building  
|                   | +/- “consultation”  |
| Fairness          | +opportunity to speak  
|                   | +mutual respect  
|                   | +sustainability consciousness  |
| Trust             | - history continues to be an issue  
|                   | +/- presence of trust  |
| Efficiency        | +/- open discussion of budget and spending  
|                   | +/- time management  
|                   | +/- spending practices  |

Cynicism

-scope  
-process as token gesture

+: positive characteristic; -: negative characteristic; +/-: both positive and negative aspects

7.8 Chapter Summary

The CBWUP process has facilitated a commendable level of empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency. Although the process was a collaborative effort, it did allow space for personal development. Generally, the process was perceived as fair. The development of trust remains hindered, predominantly by historical events. However, the CBWUP process offers an opportunity to establish a positive precedent. Of the four
selected success criteria, comments related to efficiency are the most uncertain. Expressed dissatisfaction stems from issues related to management of time and funds. Analysis of the context, process, and achievement (to date) of success indicators is now complete. The following chapter amalgamates the findings and offers concluding ideas.
8 Final Comments

Having completed the analysis of collaboration, facilitation and achievement of the success indicators in the CBWUP process, it is time to reflect on the extractable lessons. It is the intention of this chapter to review the aspirations of this study and to offer broad suggestions and cautions. Although these comments are especially applicable to WUP processes they also have value in a wider context. The extractable lessons should be considered not only during water use planning but also during any complex planning process that involves a form of public involvement.

8.1 Goal and Objectives Review

To achieve the stated goal of this study, which is to analyze collaborative multi-stakeholder processes in water use planning, a series of tasks have been undertaken. It was necessary to examine literature on public involvement, collaboration, and water use planning generally to develop an understanding of the normative issues related to both topics. This research was used to identify indicators of a successful multi-stakeholder process. Once this was accomplished the scope was narrowed and focus was directed at collaborative efforts in the context of the CBWUP process, which limited examination of water use planning issues to a specific geographic location and possible operational changes. What is the value in such a discussion? This study has allowed the identification of issues that should be approached with care in the future as well as the extraction of approaches and principles that can be generalized and applied to other contexts.

This analysis has facilitated discussion of public involvement generally and collaboration specifically, water use planning, and indicators of a successful process. The importance of this discussion is premised on the assertion that process outcome is directly linked to process quality. By developing an understanding of the nuances of a public involvement process, particularly a collaborative effort in a water use planning context, improvements and general cautionary clauses can be extracted. Having completed the analysis, it is now time to extract general statements that may be of use in
future water use planning contexts, particularly future WUPs, or in more broadly defined contexts.

Figure 10: The Analysis Process

8.2 Extractable Lessons

The CBWUP process’s level of attainment of the identified success indicators, empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency indicates a strong process was facilitated. However, room for improvement is always present. Based on the responses from interview discussions, study of minutes and other process documentation, and the principles of good process that have been discussed throughout this study, the following compilation of recommendations and caveats have been compiled.

The CBWUP process is associated with a number of positive attributes. Strategies that worked effectively should be incorporated in future processes. Dedication to communicate with constituents, sincere interest in including affected stakeholders in the process, efforts to involve participants in information collection, establishment of a
respectful environment by both facilitators and participants and application of communicative facilitation are all significant achievements. These efforts assisted the development of the perception of fairness and trust. They also support the assertion that the process of articulating objectives, performance measures and alternatives is both compatible and capable of contributing to a collaborative process. Working through the phases of collaboration is not only a means of facilitating a collaborative process but also a means of working towards attainment of the identified success indicators.

The manner in which decisions were made in the CBWUP process is worthy of further discussion. Interestingly, despite the number of positive outcomes associated with consensus, the WUP Guidelines do not stipulate its necessity. This clause may cause some initial concern because stakeholder involvement and consensus building have become near synonymous phrases (Gregory, McDaniels and Fields, 416: 2001). It could be that the WUP Guidelines were written with instances when consensus is not feasible or appropriate in mind. However, by recommending but not mandating consensus, a process may fail to benefit from the outcomes associated with a consensus process.

In the case of the CBWUP process, the focus was on reaching the best agreement possible by providing space for a range of agreement while documenting interests and points of disagreement. This approach did allow for the discussion of different perspectives, and for levels of trust, respect and understanding to develop. Whether the level these positive effects were achieved would have been different if consensus had been mandated is unknowable. The effects may have been positive; they could also have been negative, keeping in mind that consensus is inappropriate in some circumstances. Allowing a range of approval to decisions (block, accept with major reservations, neutral, endorse with minor reservations, fully endorse) served the process effectively during the period studied. Encouraging a range of approval helped to facilitate the CC’s final agreement, which was endorsed by all participants present at the final meeting. Interest and commitment to consensus became absolute during this meeting. The benefits associated with a consensus decision, and for some stakeholders its virtual necessity, became a fundamental issue. The lesson to be learnt is the decision whether to pursue consensus or allow gradations of agreement is dependent on the specifics of the context and the methodology applied. However, study of the CBWUP process implies that if
participants are aware and understand the benefits associated with consensus they will strive to achieve consensus on important decisions.

The opportunity to establish a positive precedent occurs with the initiation of each process. At the same time, the chance to dismantle any previously established progress in terms of trust is also a possible outcome. In this case, the process allowed a level of trust to develop; however, distrust remains. Future processes should build on the moderate level of trust established. Every effort must be invested to maximize opportunities to improve the level of trust and the perception of fairness by facilitating chances to develop both procedural and distributive fairness in a process that is honest, open, consistent and respectful. A further means of establishing a positive precedent is providing opportunities for participants to engage in capacity building endeavours. These efforts may not immediately result in high levels of trust; it is critical that the incremental nature of trust building is recognized. Therefore, the effort invested during the CBWUP process will be most recognizable when future processes or collaborative efforts begin. It is the precedent that is set during the current process that will work to eventually diminish cynicism and perceptions of the process as a token gesture. Conscious efforts to include fairness, trust and empowerment into a process make major contributions to establishment of a positive precedent.

Although all participants invested considerable time and effort in the process, the consultants fulfilled an especially critical and essential role. They not only facilitated the process and worked to apply the principles of communicative planning, but also functioned as analysts, mediators and negotiators. Skillful management of divergent and convergent thinking undoubtedly contributed to the extent to which the process success indicators were attained. Similar processes should follow the example set by the CBWUP facilitators in terms of their attention to information dissemination, efforts to anticipate points of confusion and respond with clear and understandable information, approachability both during and outside meetings and commitment to work with the group assembled. Some participants expressed reservations on the issues of information credibility, and time management and budget expenditures. To some extent, these issues are beyond a facilitator’s circle of influence. However, maintaining commitment to the principles of communicative facilitation and building positive precedent does address
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these issues to a degree. Skilled facilitators, who are often required to function in an expanded capacity, are critical players in a collaborative process.

Study of the CBWUP process confirms the influence wielded by the dominant determiners of efficiency, time and money. Expectedly, caps on the amount of time and the budget available to the process had effects. The outcomes were numerous and diverse, scheduling and budgets affected:

- The duration of the process and; therefore, the amount of open discussion;
- The information distributed since budgetary impacts were considered while determining the necessity of studies and bids presented by external consultants;
- The ability to digest information since stakeholders often had difficulty finding time to read the distributed information which was recognized by the consultants in their preparation and dispersal of information;
- The likelihood of decision implementation since the CBWUP process set aside a modest amount of time to discuss monitoring plans; and
- The perception of efficiency by participants. Some felt too much or too little time was set aside to address certain issues, others felt the process was or was not a good investment of funds.

During every interview a negative comment related to time and/or money was expressed; however, no opinion was commonly expressed. If the schedule was extended and the budget increased some participants would become increasingly cynical and vice versa. Therefore, each process should carefully make decisions related to time management and budget expenditures that take into consideration the particular nature of the process remembering that perceptions of efficiency or inefficiency will impact both the current process and future processes. Unanimous approval of decisions is elusive; a moderate level of criticism is no reason to become disappointed with the entire process.

The composition of the CBWUP CC created a situation that warrants further discussion. Participation in the CBWUP process was open to anyone interested in participating. All participants were stakeholders in the sense that they would all be directly influenced by actions taken to address the problem (Connor, 58: 1999a).
However, fish interests dominated the composition of the group. The question is whether the number of individuals representing fish interests was influential and if so, was it legitimate? Interview responses indicate a range of opinions on the issue. The primary concern is the fact that CC composition was a reoccurring topic. The lesson to be learned is that conscious decisions need to be made related to group makeup at the initiation of a process.

A decision could be made to open participation to anyone with an interest in the process, making it a public involvement process. Alternately, participation could be limited to those who can legitimately argue they will be affected by the process. Another tactic is to limit membership to representatives who report back to a constituency or a group of interests, in this way the number of individuals representing an interest would be reduced. Participation could be even further organized by establishing a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) as a means of maintaining broad representation while working with a smaller main committee. Whether participation is open to the public, limited to stakeholders or takes the form of organized representation is an important decision; each option can result in a workable situation. The key point to remember is the need to make these decisions at the outset of the process and communicate this information clearly to those interested in the process. Participants and consultants alike spent considerable time and effort discussing and improvising strategies to manage the number of CC participants. Some of this effort could have been reduced with a clearly defined vision of participant composition earlier in the process. Selecting between public involvement, stakeholder participation and structured representation can be difficult because of the associated strengths and weaknesses of each but it is necessary and should be done early in the process.

A reoccurring issue that was frequently discussed both during CBWUP meetings and the interviews is scope. Extraction of lessons related to scope is important because of the extent of its impact. Scope related issues impacted efforts to define the problem and obtain commitment to collaborate, were associated with disagreements related to agenda

---

10 To be effective, the process of selecting the CAC, establishing its size and defining its role must be clearly articulated in advance otherwise it may become a mechanism of limiting public/stakeholder input and result in disempowerment and negatively affect the perception of fairness and trust (Lynn and Busenberg: 1995).
setting and affected the establishment of perceptions of fairness and trust. The delineation of scope was increasingly accepted as time passed; it was positively influenced by efforts to redirect and address issues that were beyond the process scope to another venue. However, for some, it remained a contentious issue and damaged their overall impression of the process.

Either the scope should be increased or the boundaries explicitly articulated. Ideally, the scope should encompass all issues and facilitate integrated planning; however, it is often difficult to find support for far reaching processes. If possible, the scope should be expanded to allow a more integrated planning process. The issues will undoubtedly become more complex but collaboration has proven itself to be effective in difficult situations. Increasing the scope of a planning process, while taking into consideration the suggestions and caveats outlined in this section, will undoubtedly culminate in positive results. When an expansive scope is not an option, the limitations need to be clearly expressed and understood by potential process participants prior to the commencement of the process. If participants enter the process with unattainable expectations they will inevitably be disappointed and efforts to promote empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency will be negatively affected. In the case of WUPs, changes to the guidelines are required to reduce confusion related to scope. Ideally the scope should be expanded but if this not a feasible option, clearer articulation of scope restrictions are needed. Scope should be as extensive as possible while clearly defining its boundaries.

8.3 Further Study

Due to this study’s scope limitations and the fact that the investigation continued only until the final CC meeting in October 2001, some points remain for further study. The following issues would benefit from additional consideration once the process concludes. Because interviews were conducted before the CC decided on the recommendations to be included in the report and the Water Comptroller had not yet made decisions, distributive fairness could be only partly explored. Also, monitoring and implementation had only been cursorily discussed during the period of time this study was underway. The FTC will articulate monitoring practices for inclusion in the CC report. Since monitoring and implementation are critical to implementation and the
associated success of the process, this topic deserves further consideration. A related issue is the level of external support. Interview respondents expressed their feelings and speculations but it is during the implementation phase that a true indication of the level of external support can be appreciated. Early in this study it was stated that analysis would focus on the process not the product; however, it would be enhanced by analysis of what happens once the process concludes.

8.4 Implications for Planning

This study allows the extraction of some basic principles that apply not only to a WUP process or water use planning more generally but also to any and all planning processes endeavouring to address complex issues through a form of public involvement. Clearly, there is an overwhelming desire and need to expand the scope to its furthest possible limit. Undoubtedly this will result in increased complexity and associated difficulties. Ensuring the process is representative, transparent and accessible while allowing independence in a process with a structured decision-making framework complete with a clear mandate will be difficult. Although the task may be challenging it is possible.

To meet this challenge, planners will need to become increasingly adept at facilitating a process capable of satisfying a range of public interests while producing a viable plan. A key ingredient in this strategy is the ability to skillfully apply the principles of communicative facilitation to a structured methodology. Since collaboration was designed with the complexity of today's issues in mind, it is the obvious process to apply. The message is clear, we live in an increasing complex world whose inhabitants want to be involved in processes to address these issues. It is the planner's responsibility to respond to these needs.

8.5 To Conclude...

The potential positive outcomes associated with a collaborative multi-stakeholder process in a water use planning context warrant the intense level of commitment and dedication invested by process participants, process facilitators and the process convener. To ensure maximum returns, the phases of collaboration should be dutifully incorporated
into the process. Guided by communicative facilitation, the process can be expected to attain a level of empowerment, fairness, trust and efficiency. The quest will undoubtedly be complicated by a list of challenges including but not limited to budget and time limitations, challenging personalities, scope delineation, inherently antagonistic issues and interests, and difficult to understand information. However, if successfully completed, the final outcome will have been well worth the effort.
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Appendix I

**WUP Guidelines** as written in the *Water Use Plan Guidelines* by the Province of British Columbia (1998).

**Step 1: Initiate a WUP process for the particular facility**

A request to initiate a WUP can come from the Comptroller, a licencee and/or other interested parties. The initiation of a WUP process must be accompanied by a public announcement.

**Step 2: Scope the water use issues and interests**

The licencee or proponent will meet with regulatory agencies, First Nations, local governments and key interested parties to identify issues and interests, review and summarize available information, identify gaps in information and explore appropriate approaches to consultation.

**Step 3: Determine the consultative process to be followed and initiate it**

The Guidelines stipulate that WUP consultations must be advisory, providing information and facility operating proposals for use by the Comptroller when it is time to make a decision. The process should be designed to encourage inclusion and representation, flexible, meaningful consultation, two-way communication and mutual respect and early and ongoing consultation. The WUP Guidelines suggest consultation occur through stakeholder committee processes, open houses, public/town hall meetings, site visits and other techniques such as survey questionnaires, interviews and focus groups.

**Step 4: Confirm the issues and interests in terms of specific water use objectives**

Participants define specific water use objectives as well as quantitative and/or descriptive measures for assessing their achievement. Every WUP must consider fish and aquatic habitat protection, flood control, beneficial use of the water (e.g., power generation), and First Nations. Other issues such as recreation and navigation may be taken into account depending on the facility.

**Step 5: Gather additional information on the impacts of water flows on each objective**

Results must be based upon technical studies, which can be undertaken specifically for the WUP process, and other sources of information. The submitted draft WUP must specify data gaps and specify a research program to fill these gaps.

**Step 6: Create operating alternatives for regulating water use to meet different interests**
Participants in the WUP process specify alternatives. However, the range of alternatives needs to recognize facilities as they exist and the need to balance multiple water uses.

**Step 7: Assess the tradeoffs between operating alternatives in terms of the objectives**

Compiled information needs to be used by participants to frame discussions about choices and tradeoffs among conflicting water uses by participants. Analytical tools, such as multi-attribute tradeoff analysis, can assist the tradeoff assessment.

**Step 8: Determine and document the areas of consensus and disagreement**

The Guidelines clarify that consensus on an alternative is a goal but not a requirement. However, the consultative report must fully document areas of agreement and contention and in cases of non-consensus, disagreements and reasons for them.

**Step 9: Prepare a draft WUP and submit it to the Comptroller for regulatory review**

A concise technical document detailing the operating parameters to meet a proposed operating regime must be submitted. If consensus is achieved, a signatory page may be added. If consensus is not achieved, the selection of an alternative will be done by the licencee/proponent.

**Step 10: Review the draft plan and issue a provincial decision**

The Comptroller and licencee/proponent will work together on any required modifications to the draft plan. If those affected by the plan do not approve of the decisions, they can appeal to the Environmental Appeal Board. In cases where the Comptroller’s decision is rejected, the Environmental Appeal Board can either make the decision or refer the matter back to the Comptroller for further review.

**Step 11: Review the authorized WUP and issue a federal decision**

The Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) must agree with the WUP. If it does not, it may exercise other regulatory options at its disposal. DFO’s role is sanctioned by Section 22(3) and 35 (1) of the *Fisheries Act*.

**Step 12: Monitor compliance with the authorized WUP**

The plan must specify a monitoring program. The licencee is accountable for meeting the WUP operating parameters but not for achieving objectives for other uses of water.

**Step 13: Review the plan on a periodic and ongoing basis**

The WUP should specify a scheduled review period and key trigger issues. A WUP can be reviewed by the Comptroller at any time but the extent of the review will depend on the water use conflicts, non-compliance issues, etc., in question.
Appendix II

Participant Details

The CC was comprised of a range of stakeholders. This collection of stakeholders included representatives from large organizations, smaller local interest groups and residents. The following offers a basic level of background information on the smaller agencies/organizations involved in the process. Web addresses have been included when available. The large agencies have not been discussed in any level of detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active CC participants</th>
<th>Background information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allard Contractors Ltd.</td>
<td>Allard contractors are an independent sand &amp; gravel producer with five gravel pits, three processing plants and two ready mix concrete plants. The business was founded in 1945. Today the company employs over 100 people and operates an equipment spread comprised of three crushing, screening &amp; washing plants, two ready mix concrete plants, twenty wheel loaders, thirty gravel and concrete trucks and a range of support machinery. <a href="http://www.mybc.com/sites/bctel/bctel/allardcontractors9442556/about_allard.html">http://www.mybc.com/sites/bctel/bctel/allardcontractors9442556/about_allard.html</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Federation of Drift Fishers</td>
<td>Formed in March 1996, the group is primarily concerned with protecting and promoting the interests of drift fishermen and other user groups while preserving, protecting and enhancing anadromous trout, salmonids and other freshwater trout. <a href="http://www.bcfdf.com/constitution.htm">http://www.bcfdf.com/constitution.htm</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Hydro</td>
<td>Is the process convener. <a href="http://www.bchydro.com/about">http://www.bchydro.com/about</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buntzen Ridge Wilderness Recreation &amp; Parks Association</td>
<td>The purpose of this non-profit society is the protection and enhancement of wilderness recreation and park areas in select area. Buntzen Lake is one of the group’s identified areas. Educating the community and participating and providing input in planning processes for the identified areas are among the tasks they have taken upon themselves. <a href="http://www.anmore.com/BRWRAP.html">http://www.anmore.com/BRWRAP.html</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Mountain Naturalists</td>
<td>The group holds monthly meetings with guest speakers, organizes field trips, family walks and hikes throughout the years. The group is well known for the organization of the annual Colony Farm Walkabout and the annual Bald Eagle Excursion. <a href="http://www2.vpl.vancouver.bc.ca/DBs/cod/orgPgs/5/5407.html">http://www2.vpl.vancouver.bc.ca/DBs/cod/orgPgs/5/5407.html</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coquitlam</td>
<td>One of two municipalities within the watershed. Status is currently unclear. <a href="http://www.city.coquitlam.bc.ca">http://www.city.coquitlam.bc.ca</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam River Watershed Society (CRWS)</td>
<td>CRWS was formed as a result of a series of public workshops on the Coquitlam River Watershed held in 1996 and 1997. This non-profit society’s main goals included coordinating information, educating the public, advocating important issues in the watershed and sponsoring events and activities to promote watershed awareness. <a href="http://www.city.coquitlam.bc.ca/Parks(Environment)/Parks2.htm">http://www.city.coquitlam.bc.ca/Parks(Environment)/Parks2.htm</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries &amp; Oceans Canada</td>
<td>With an interest in safe, healthy, productive waters and aquatic ecosystems, DFO is a natural stakeholder in the process. <a href="http://www.ncr.dfo.ca/home-accueil_e.htm">http://www.ncr.dfo.ca/home-accueil_e.htm</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Regional District</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/">http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Program</td>
<td>The program is interested in establishing partnerships to enhance habitat protection and expanded community capacity to steward fish habitat resources <a href="http://www-heb.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/english/programs/hcsp/default.htm">http://www-heb.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/english/programs/hcsp/default.htm</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fraser Salmon Assistance Project</td>
<td>Representing the interests of fish No web address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam Hunting and Fishing Club/RACE</td>
<td>This group is interested in preserving individual’s access and ability to hunt and fish. <a href="http://www.pcdhfc.org">http://www.pcdhfc.org</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moody Ecological Society (PMES)</td>
<td>The PMES is a non-profit society that operates a salmon and trout hatchery, a water quality lab and public awareness/community outreach programs. <a href="http://www.vcn.bc.ca/pmes/aboutus.htm">http://www.vcn.bc.ca/pmes/aboutus.htm</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Watch Salmon Society</td>
<td>The group’s primary interest is increasing the breadth and depth of dialogue surrounding wild salmon and salmon habitat and improve the chances of saving salmon. <a href="http://www.watershed-watch.org/">http://www.watershed-watch.org/</a> (read May 2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Objectives as outlined in the Issues Paper: Coquitlam/Buntzen Water Use Plan (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: 2000).

Archaeology, culture and history
Maximize access for:
First Nations’ traditional uses
Recovery of artifacts
Inventory of archaeological, cultural and historical sites
Maximize protection of archaeological cultural and historical sites from:
Shoreline erosion
Pot hunters
Flooding

Domestic water
Maximize reliability and flexibility of access to water supply
Seasonal demands
Peak demands (daily, hourly)
Long term (e.g. 50 years)
Annual variations
Minimize cost
Water restrictions
Modifications to existing systems
Developing new sources
Maximize water quality
Suspended particles
Contamination

Fish
Mimic natural hydrograph (Coquitlam River)
Maximize the availability of suitable (fish) habitat (Coquitlam River)
Optimize secondary productivity (Coquitlam River)
Maximize water quality (Coquitlam River)
Minimize direct mortality (Coquitlam River)
Maximize availability of suitable habitat (Coquitlam River)
Optimize secondary productivity (Coquitlam River)
Minimize direct mortality (Coquitlam River)
Minimize direct mortality of fish (Indian Arm)
Maximize water quality (Indian Arm)

Flood control
Minimize adverse effects of flooding
Flood damage and
Public safety
**Hydroelectricity**
Maximize the financial value of power generation
Minimize the loss of generating capability in the Lower Mainland Region
Maintain the availability of the Buntzen facilities for the purpose of emergency black start OR minimize cost of providing emergency black start capability
Avoid other environmental impacts (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions)

**Industry and economic development**
Improve gravel industry storm management through sediment dilution
Improve gravel industry storm water management in retention/detention and disposition areas for sand, silt, and sediment within areas affected by river flows

**Recreation**
Maximize opportunities for recreation on Coquitlam River
Maximize opportunities for recreation at Buntzen Reservoir

**Wildlife and environment**
Maximize the area and suitability of aquatic and riparian habitat for indigenous wildlife, including species at risk and organisms not captured by fish objectives
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Questions for Facilitators

Before we begin, I would like to clarify the definition of ‘facilitator’ that I am using. A facilitator is an individual who enables groups and organizations to work more effectively; to collaborate and achieve synergy. She or he is a “content neutral” party who by not taking sides or expressing or advocating a point of view during the meeting, can advocate for fair, open and inclusive procedures to accomplish the group’s work. A facilitator can also be a learning or a dialogue guide to assist a group in thinking deeply about its assumptions, beliefs and values and about its systemic processes and context (Kaner, et al. 1996).

Is there anything that this definition does not include, but should?

What do you feel is your role as a facilitator of the CBWUP process?

What has been your greatest challenge as a CBWUP process facilitator? What was your response to this difficult situation?

The CBWUP process necessitated consideration of a range of complex issues, what was your strategy for management of this range of issues?

A great deal of information was compiled and distributed during the process, can you comment on how you worked to ensure the information was understandable and credible?

Were you ever approached to authenticate data/information?

How did you make yourself accessible to participants outside of meetings?

Do you feel imbalances between participants existed? If so, what was your response?

Did you encounter any participants who tended to dominate meetings? If so, how did you manage the situation?

Were any strategies to address sources of conflict consciously incorporated?

Were you able to anticipate when your expertise was needed? For example, information clarity...

The issue of consensus was frequently discussed during CC meetings. What are your thoughts on consensus (necessary/unnecessary)?

Another issue that was frequently raised is scope. What are your thoughts on the delineation of CBWUP scope?
Participants frequently commented on the number of individuals involved in the process. Did you find the number of participants unwieldy or manageable? Do you feel representativeness would have been sacrificed if the number of participants were reduced? Would it be a valid sacrifice?

Can you provide any examples of instances when the group’s achievements were celebrated and how were they celebrated?
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Questions for Process Participants

Introduction/Your role:
I’m interested to hear how and why you became involved in the CBWUP process. Does the current situation address your interests?
Will you please tell me a little about the interests you represent? If you have constituents, how do you communicate with them?
What do you hope to achieve by being part of this process? What are your expectations?
Do you have any expectations related to what you would like to personally gain from your participation in this process?

Timeliness
Considering you have participated in the process for more than a year, would you say it is fair to state you are committed to the process? It is my understanding the process was not scheduled to take this much time. Has your level of commitment changed during the course of the process?
BC Hydro representatives have come forward during meetings, it seems more frequently lately, to remind the group the process is on a fixed budget and timeline, how does this make you feel?
Can you talk a little about the benefits, or if you prefer, the disadvantages of the amount of time the process has taken. Trust, understanding of others’ point of view...

Social dynamics/relationships
I would like to ask a few questions related to social dynamics, since by this time, I expect you know one another, and one another’s views well. Is that a fair statement?
What problem is being addressed in the CBWUP? Do the existing working groups represent the issues?
Do you think the Consultative Committee and associated Working Groups comprise, in your opinion, the right people? If you could select participants, who would you include/exclude and on what basis would your selection be made? (legitimacy, identity of stakeholders)
Do you trust the other stakeholders/the convener? Has anything been done to promote a sense of trust?
Are all stakeholders treated equally? If not, how could the situation be rectified? Do some stakeholders dominate the process? Do you have opportunity to speak and be listened to? What is the facilitator’s role?
What is your opinion of the way in which the facilitator manages the group?

More process specific questions:
Are your interests reflected in the agenda? Do opportunities exist for you to contribute to agenda formation?
Do opportunities exist for you to offer input that is related to process direction? Is the direction in which the process is headed clear to you?
Do you feel the multiple attribute decision-making process allows sufficient space for the exploration of options? Do you understand the options? It seems that at every meeting I have attended, at least one person expresses a desire to revisit an issue or slow down – is a sacrifice being made in the name of timeliness?
Does the articulation of goals, values and objectives clarify the issues and make them more understandable? How do the facilitators ensure the issues are understood?
What do you think of the decisions you are making and the way in which they are being reached? What are your thoughts about consensus?
Although you are still in the process, you are coming to decisions and frequently noting things you recommend be monitored, what is your level of confidence that monitoring and compliance measures will be followed through? Do you see the CBWUP as having external support?

**To make decisions, you need information:**
Do you feel you have been provided with sufficient information? Can you tell me how you contributed to information gathering/provision of information?
Can you comment on any resources you feel you have been lacking? – Re: resources, what efforts were made to equalize imbalances?
Have the facilitators been available when needed and able to address your concerns?
Was the information understandable? What efforts were made to make it more understandable?

**About the way the process is run:**
Do you feel the process is being conducted in an honest, open, consistent, respectful manner? Do you have any suggestions for improvement?
What has been the facilitators’ greatest contribution to the process?
Ground rules?

**Generally:**
What do you feel you have gained from being part of this process?
What is the biggest hindrance to your participation?
CBWUP strengths/weaknesses?

Anything to add?
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Issues For Resolution Outside the WUP as documented in the Issues Paper: Coquitlam/Buntzen Water Use Plan (EcoPlan International and Maria Harris: 2000).

- Direct management of all areas with First Nations archaeological and cultural values by First Nations;
- First Nations to provide management for recreation areas such as Buntzen Lake and provisions of eco-tourism opportunities for First Nations within the watershed;
- Compensation to the Fist Nations for destruction of the Coquitlam River salmonid populations;
- Water conservation;
- Change of water licence from BC Hydro to GVRD or other users;
- Drinking water quality standards;
- Logging operations and potential impacts on water quality;
- Restrictions on human use of the Coquitlam Reservoir;
- Quality of water flows into the Coquitlam River downstream of the dam;
- Sub-surface water table may be available as an alternative source of water to achieve objectives;
- Quality of water flowing into Coquitlam Reservoir;
- First Nations have expressed an interest in capacity building and employment in fisheries research as well as other areas;
- Emergency preparedness (effects of seismic event on dam);
- Standards for construction of provincial dams and dykes along Coquitlam River system;
- Energy conservation;
- Maximize the socio-economic value of resources and land downstream of the Coquitlam Reservoir for: gravel extraction, land development, eco-tourism opportunities and other potential development;
- Explore potential for gravel extraction to create additional spawning channels;
- Explore potential for disposition of sand, silt and sediment from gravel pits to be used for the benefit of wildlife/environment;
- Education on the potential for containment of gravel pit discharge;
- As part of a larger watershed plan, impacts to the areas to the north and west of Burke Mountain need to be considered;
- Long-term monitoring of suspended sediment;
- Expansion of watershed tours by the GVRD;
- Damage caused by transmission line right-of-ways feeding into the Meridian Substation;
- Quality of water flows into the Coquitlam River downstream of the dam; and
- Quality of water flowing into Coquitlam Reservoir.
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Guiding Principles as outlined in the CC Meeting Minutes (April 17, 2000).

Alternates:
Committee members may appoint an alternate (including another CC member) to represent them when they are unable to attend a meeting or on issues where the alternate has more relevant experience or knowledge. The following procedure will apply to committee members who decide to appoint an alternate:
The consultants must be informed prior to the meeting as to who will be attending as an alternate, and which member he/she is representing.
Committee members should ensure that their alternate is familiar with the terms of reference and the ground rules for the process and that he/she is up to speed on issues that have previously been addressed and issues currently being discussed.
Committee members and alternatives may not participate simultaneously at the CC meeting.

New Committee Members:
Individuals or organizations may apply to become CC members by:
Submitting a request for committee membership to the BC Hydro process coordinator.
The process coordinator will then schedule the membership request as an agenda topic for the next CC meeting.
Applicants must be present at the meeting where the application is considered and be prepared to describe the interests they represent and the reasons why they believe those interests are not adequately represented in the process.
Committee members will consider new applications based on the principle of a fair, open and inclusive process.

New Committee members will be required to:
Abide by the ground rules;
Become familiar with the past work completed by the committee;
Accept agreements previously made by the committee.

The committee may periodically review its membership to ensure that full ranges of interest are represented.

Sub-Groups:
To expedite the completion of tasks identified by the committee, sub-groups (or working groups) may be established to undertake work between committee meetings. Sub-groups may be established as needed to address specific issues or complete specific tasks. The sub-groups will:
Be open to all committee members (and non-committee members as appropriate and confirmed with the consultants), with the understanding that the sub-group will focus on the tasks identified;
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Schedule meetings to optimize opportunities for attendance;
Be attended by consultants/facilitators
Prepare options and/or recommendations for consideration by the committee and be
prepared to discuss the process by which those options and/or recommendations were
reached; not make decisions on behalf of the committee.

**Changes to the Ground Rules:**
The ground rules may be amended at any time based on a consensus decision of the
committee.

**Technical Support and Education:**
BC Hydro will provide technical experts, modeling, clarification, and action item follow-
up.
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Communication Process as distributed at the June 15th, 2000 CC meeting

The purpose of a public communication procedure is to create an environment at each water use planning (WUP) table that is conducive to shared decision-making. A process which, at times, entails sharing confidences and documenting interests which may change through the process. Therefore respect for each participant’s contribution and creating and environment which encourages understanding and learning is essential.

Public communication is defined as “any and all communication in the public realm including print, film, electronic and spoken records”. The following guidelines are recommended with respect to public communication for Project Water Use Planning

Public Communication Guidelines:
Committee meetings are open to observers and guests.
Information sharing with Consultative Committee Members’ constituents is encouraged and recommended.
WUP information if released prior to becoming finalized by the Main Consultative Committee must be noted as being in “draft” form and/or feedback purposes.
Confidential or sensitive information must not be released without the prior consent of the participant(s) responsible for its stewardship and review and/or approval by the Main Consultative Committee.
A BC Hydro representative will be the official spokesperson on behalf of the Coquitlam-Buntzen Water Use Plan process. Press releases, media updates and advertisements describing the water use planning process and progress may be occasionally prepared and issued.
Consultative Committee members are free to speak to their participation in the WUP process and will ensure that their representations to the public and media are respectful of others and of the process.
Committee members will describe their points of view as interests rather than positions and will not discredit the views of other participants in the process.