


Principles of Successful Civic Engagement in the National Park Service

By Molly Russell

8/10/2011

This document provides a number of civic engagement case studies that were collected from a number of parks and programs within the NPS. These case study successes provided data that was analyzed to get at the heart of what makes civic engagement work.

The Civic Engagement Web



This web, which is thoroughly explained on page 19, depicts the relationships among the civic engagement principles that were identified during this project. Principles highlighted in blue are those that are ‘core,’ meaning that they are central to any civically engaged project. Those highlighted in green are ‘secondary’ principles, meaning that they are extremely important in supporting core principles, though are not individually essential in every engagement.

Acknowledgements

The work performed for the following report was made possible through a cooperative agreement between the Department of Applied Anthropology at the University of Maryland, College Park and the National Park Service's Archeology Program. I am indebted to both my project supervisor, Dr. Barbara Little, for her support, guidance, and patience, as well as my academic advisor, Dr. Paul Shackel, for his insight and feedback.

I am grateful to all of those who made this study possible by contributing their insights and experiences. Specifically, I thank Mike Allen, Brady Bourquin, Doug Carr, Debra Credeur, Charles Cuvelier, Jennifer Dierker, Lynne Dominy, Mary Pat Doorley, Kathy Faz, Alan Foster, Bridget Garvin Ambrisco, Craig Glassner, Erik Kreusch, Lisa Leap, Jen Nersesian, Laura Rotegard, Tracy Swartout, Anna Tamura, Jennie Vasarhelyi, Jacilee Wray, and Frank Young.

Thank you to those within the NPS for your interest, support, and dedicated civic engagement work: Roger Anderson, Beth Boland, Carol Cook, Katie Durcan, Steve Elkinton, Rich Fedorchak, LuAnn Jones, Marcia Keener, Desmond Lee, Nora Mitchell, Teresa Moyer, Celinda Pena, Joy Pietschmann, Rick Potts, Martha Raymond, Dean Reeder, Heather Scotten, Carol Shull, Rebecca Stanfield-McCown, Corita Waters, and Diana Ziegler.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
What is ‘civic engagement’ and what does it mean for the National Park Service?	7
Cuyahoga Valley National Park example	7
What does civic engagement look like in the National Park Service?	8
Strategy: Collaborative Interpretation.....	8
Alcatraz Island	9
Olympic NP	9
Bandelier NM	9
New Bedford Whaling NHP.....	9
Strategy: Collaborative Planning and Decision-Making	10
Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor.....	10
Kalaupapa NHP.....	10
Atchafalaya NHA	10
Strategy: Creating Relevant and Effective Programming.....	11
RTCA.....	11
Congaree NP.....	11
Great Smoky Mountains NP.....	11
Strategy: Collaborative Resource Preservation and Conservation	12
Blue Ridge Parkway	12
National Capital Parks-East.....	12
Grand Canyon NP	12
Strategy: Intra-agency collaboration.....	13
Law Enforcement Program.....	13
What does all of this information mean?	13
Case Study Collection Methodology	14
Civic Engagement ‘Principles’	15
Secondary Principles	15
Core Principles.....	17
Conclusions	20
Appendices	22
References and Related Materials	71

Executive Summary

In the past decade businesses, organizations, governments, etc. increasingly have used civic engagement as a means to promote relevancy through democracy. In several ways the National Park Service has joined the myriad others in embracing this belief. For example, *Director's Order 75A: Civic Engagement and Public Involvement*,¹ first released in 2003 and renewed in 2007, declares the agency's commitment to the practice. Civic engagement is also prominent throughout the Park Service's *Management Policies 2006*², which state that "the Service will embrace civic engagement as a fundamental discipline and practice," (14). These guiding beliefs are evident in several events that have either been hosted or sponsored by the NPS over the past decade. In December 2001³ the Northeast Region convened a workshop in New York City where over 50 participants gathered to discuss the role of civic engagement within the agency. In 2006 a number of academic's gathered at the *Scholar's Forum* to contribute their expertise on why the NPS should embrace collaborative decision-making⁴.

Despite these early efforts, civic engagement projects within the agency continue as isolated and episodic events, most likely because many in the Park Service remain intimidated by, and/or unsure of the civic engagement process. This study was undertaken, in part, to demystify the practice. In it, a number of sites and programs that use civic engagement are recognized, but by no means is civic engagement limited to the projects featured. Rather, the number of projects represented in this study provides insight into civic engagement's applicability to a number of varying programs and disciplines. From these very different civic engagement experiences, I was able to analyze the commonalities among case studies so that the practice is more easily applied. These shared characteristics get at the heart of why apparently differing projects and tactics were successful. They also provide a springboard from which other parks/programs could embark on their own civic engagement endeavors.

Methodology

This project was structured after Gillian Bowser's *Community Study Report* (2000)⁵. In the *Community Study Report*, a number of parks and programs from around the National Park Service described how they used civic engagement. The 15 projects that were reported on are inspiring. In the report, each example was written by a park/program contributor, and therefore some resulting nuances among the examples made scientific analysis difficult. I wanted my project to follow Bowser's example, but include more systematic documentation so that a comprehensive, scientific analysis could take place.

¹ <http://www.nps.gov/policy/DOrders/75A.htm>

² <http://www.nps.gov/policy/mp/Index2006.htm>

³ NPS, *The National Park Service and Civic Engagement: The report of a workshop held December 6-8, 2001, in New York City* (2002)

⁴ NPS, *Scholar's Forum, The National Park Service and Civic Reflection: A Summary Report* (2006)

⁵ Bowser, Gillian, *Community Study Report*, NPS (2000)

I collected data for 15 case studies from throughout the National Park Service. They represent programs like Archeology, Ethnography, Interpretation and Education, National Heritage Areas, Law Enforcement, Park Planning, along with several natural and cultural resource sites. I collected the same information from interviewees about their projects – background information, strategies, results, and lessons learned. Then, I wrote a short case study (2 to 3 pages), emailed it to the contributors to ensure data validity, corrected the returned case studies, and then began analysis.

Analysis consisted of coding themes (“Previous levels of engagement”, “Strategies”, “Principles implemented”) in a qualitative analysis program, ATLAS.ti. I tracked individual case study results through an Excel Spreadsheet, which later allowed for their comparison. In comparing the analysis results I was struck by the lack of correspondence among themes. For example, it appeared that a park or program’s previous level of contact with the communities that they were engaging had little to do with the type or number of strategies that were implemented. Similarly, implemented strategies had no bearing on the principles with which the park/program approached the experience. The only striking similarities among the 15 case studies were the principles that practitioners exhibited.

Results: Principles of Successful Civic Engagement

“Principles” are actions that were undertaken not as strategies, but as additional efforts meant to supplement the civic engagement process. They were not part of an action item or a ‘how-to’ list, but rather they were a means by which project strategies were supplemented and more easily achieved. Oftentimes, study contributors specifically identified these principles as the primary reasons why their projects were successful. These principles allowed practitioners to have their work more effectively and accurately represent the wishes of the audiences with whom they were working. Principles don’t represent check-list items, but rather something more ambiguous that must be practiced and achieved over the long-term. In this way, principles represent a mindset and overarching intention rather than action items.

The list is divided into two sets of principles – those that are “core,” and those that are “secondary”. The distinction between the two lists centers around perceived necessity in each example. Secondary principles were often avenues by which core principles could be achieved, but each was not always present in every example. The principles are as follows:

Secondary Principles

- Diversity of opinion
- Understanding communities
- Open communication
- Transparency

Core Principles

- Trust
- Relationships
- Active listening

Unlike the secondary principles, core principles were clearly evident in each of the examples, with several contributors specifically identified them as integral in a project's success. These principles are generally interwoven, and thus cannot be properly applied without the application of the others. While these principles may seem obvious and elementary, they are incredibly important and, at times, challenging to implement.

These findings suggest that there is no check-list for civic engagement, but rather an important mindset that one needs to bring to their project. These findings also clarify that there is room for creativity and innovation within civic engagement projects because there is no "recipe" that that one must follow. They solidify the importance of creating and maintaining. Lasting relationships contribute to more systematic and sustainable civic engagement, which in the long-run can only serve to benefit the NPS and the communities with which they work.

What is ‘civic engagement’ and what does it mean for the National Park Service?

This is a pivotal time in the National Park Service. The American public is becoming more and more diverse, yet NPS visitation statistics don’t represent of this trend. Is this indicative of the growing irrelevancy of the Park Service? If so, what does this mean for the cultural and natural resources that the agency is charged with protecting?

Many units and programs within the NPS are turning to **civic engagement** as a mechanism to increase relevancy and connect the public to natural and cultural resources. *Director’s Order 75A: Civic Engagement and Public Involvement* (2007) defines civic engagement as:

“a continuous, dynamic conversation with the public on many levels that reinforces that commitment of both NPS and the public to the preservation of heritage resources, both cultural and natural, and strengthens public understanding of the full meaning and contemporary relevance of these resources.”⁶

Civic engagement is part of a larger spectrum of public participation, on which practices range from “public involvement” – or a one-sided, one-way information share with the public, to “civic engagement,” – a highly collaborative and sustainable endeavor that implies full participation by, and accountability to, the public. The two-way sharing of information, values, insights, and concerns is essential in understanding of civic engagement. The NPS serves to benefit from civic engagement through the increased relevancy of its resources and programs. The public will benefit because their needs have been understood and accounted for in project plans.

Consider the following example:

Partially located in Akron, Ohio, *Cuyahoga Valley National Park* (CUVA) is an oasis of natural resources in an otherwise urban setting. However, staff noticed that local Akronites weren’t going to the park, and they were concerned that children – the audience that the park’s resources could most benefit – were largely absent. CUVA staff, in partnership with numerous organizations throughout the city, set out to solve lagging participation by going straight to the source – the city’s middle school students.

Park staff contacted a local middle school teacher who wanted to increase the exposure her students had to the outdoors. The teacher assembled a panel of middle school students to serve as an advisory board for the park and its partners. The board of students offered information that

Did you know...?

...that in addition to having its own Director’s Order, civic engagement is also heavily supported and referenced throughout *Management Policies, 2006*? Under section 1.7 civic engagement is asserted as “a fundamental discipline and practice” because “[it] is founded on the central principle that preservation of the nation’s...resources relies on continued collaborative relationships between the Service and American society,” (2006: 14).

Civic engagement was also prominently featured in the *National Parks Second Century Commission Report* (2009). The commission suggested that civic engagement be embraced as the agency approaches its 100th year as a means to increase public stewardship of resources.

⁶ Director’s Order 75A can be found at: www.nps.gov/policy/DOrders/75A.htm

would help structure a developing program for area children. Advisory board suggestions included: providing interpretation that wouldn't detract from the program's fun-level; and that snacks be given out during the program to alleviate mid-afternoon hunger. In addition to logistical information the kids also provided insight into the challenges that many students would face in trying attend the program. Most notably, they notified staff to the difficulty that transportation posed for many of the area's children and their families.

The advisory board's insight was used to structure the educational program "Get Up, Get Out, and Go!" For example, because they were aware of transportation needs, the park and its partners established a number of bus pick-up points throughout the city to ease student concern about transportation. For the past five years the program has given the area's 11 to 14 year olds the opportunity to participate in various outdoor activities. In return, the park has experienced telling signs of the program's success. The number of children – and adults – who attend the program has increased in recent years, with an average nightly attendance of 100 kids and 34 adults in 2010. Because families who attend "Get Up, Get Out, and Go!" are more aware of the park and its resources, they have visited it on their own time. In addition, staff report that former program attendees have returned in following years to volunteer as program helpers. For more information on "Get Up, Get Out, and Go!" please see Appendix A.

What does civic engagement look like in the National Park Service?

This example from Cuyahoga Valley illustrates just one of the myriad ways that civic engagement is applied within the National Park Service. In addition to this example from Cuyahoga, I collected 14 other case studies in the summer of 2010 to provide a snap-shot of the state of civic engagement within the NPS.

In this report those examples exhibiting similar strategies have been grouped together to show that there is no one-size-fits-all methodology according to programmatic area. You'll see that in each example practitioners needed to assess their needs, understand who they were engaging, and be cognizant of their desired outcomes. There is no detectable civic engagement recipe according to program, type of resource, or other factors, but rather a series of considerations and principles to effectively employ.

Following an overview of civic engagement efforts occurring within the NPS is a comprehensive analysis about why these examples were successful. I systematically coded 15 case studies in a qualitative analysis program in order to identify thematic congruencies. Resulting was a number of interdependent principles that were present in each example. Collaborative projects aren't easy, but the featured examples prove that by implementing the interdependent principles (discussed at length starting on page 12) civic engagement can be made a more manageable and productive experience.

Strategy: Collaborative Interpretation

NPS lands were designated as such because of the significance associated with the natural and cultural resources they encompass. These resources are presented and interpreted to the public so that the resource's importance will be understood by a large audience who will, ideally, become resource stewards. But what happens if the presented interpretation is one-sided? That is, what if it doesn't present other cultural interpretations of the site? Or what if the visitors to the site are not representative of American demographics? The examples that follow present situations in which NPS employees have looked to the public to help answer such questions. "Collaborative interpretation" is used to supplement and inform resource interpretation. So that interpretive themes are more relevant to a larger portion of the population. Below are examples of how civic engagement is being used to improve upon interpretive products:

Large-scale collaboration:

An interpretive ranger on *Alcatraz Island* used collaborative interpretation as a means to more fully examine the American Indian Occupation and its effects on the American Indian Movement. Over 15 years of intensive collaboration with indigenous people from the United States and Canada materialized in a video exhibit entitled "We Hold the Rock." Civic engagement allowed NPS staff to gain the support of the Occupation participants and American Indian filmmakers, thus allowing for a more comprehensive and complete examination of the Occupation and its impact on American Society. For more information, see Appendix B.

Collaboratively correcting interpretive information:

In Olympic NP an anthropologist discovered that the park's interpretive histories presented for its eight affiliated tribes – the Makah, Lower Elwha Klallam, Jamestown S'Klallam, Port Gamble S'Klallam, Skokomish, Quinault, Hoh, and Quileute – were based on questionable sources. Civic engagement was used to collaboratively produce and endorse corrective literature. The Olympic Peninsula Cultural Advisory Committee (OPICAC), which acts as a consulting agency that provides expertise on tribal histories, served a major role in putting forth such corrective literature. Presently, many peninsula forms – including the park – have changed their representations to reflect tribal accounts. For more information, see Appendix C.

Re-working exhibit displays and museum information:

When *Bandelier NM* received money to re-do their Visitor Center they immediately contacted the park's six affiliated Pueblos: the Cochiti, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, San Ildefonso, Santa Clara, and Zuni. Together the Pueblos and the park collaborated on the constructional design of the new Visitor Center, along with the informational development for its new exhibits. Civic engagement was employed to determine what objects could be displayed, as well as the kind of information that could be shared with the public and how it would be communicated. Since the process of developing the Visitor Center began about 10 years ago, NPS staff have noticed that local Pueblos are more willing to participate in park activities. For more information, please see Appendix D.

Preserving the past through oral histories:

An oral history project was undertaken to record and preserve different cultural perspectives on the whaling industry at *New Bedford Whaling NHP*. During the process researches were made aware of the rich narratives relayed by the local Cape Verdean community. The park has been able to forge numerous partnerships through their use of civic engagement. The social ties that have been formed and strengthened during this process have produced a more rich understanding of the Cape Verdean community's role and influence on the development of the city. For more information, please see Appendix E.

Strategy: Collaborative Planning and Decision-Making

Civic engagement is often at the base of the belief that public should play a more prominent role in the decision-making that determines how federal resources are managed and cared for. Implementing civic engagement in the planning stages is integral because it gives NPS staff insight into how the public relates to resources, what they value about the resources, and how the resources can be made more relevant. As with collaborative interpretation, collaborative planning ensures that various ideas and concerns are heard and accounted for in foundational documents. Below are examples of how collaborative decision-making is used throughout the NPS:

Creating a Cultural Heritage Corridor:

In 2000 Congress signed legislation that enabled a Special Resource Study (SRS) in the development of the *Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor*. Civic engagement practices allowed the SRS team to gain public opinion at open meetings and through ethnographic fieldwork, as well as determine the public's ideal preservation plan for Gullah/Geechee resources. Public input extended beyond the initial drafting process, and largely informed what the final document to be presented to Congress would look like. For more information, see Appendix F.

Collaboratively creating a park's GMP:

Currently, *Kalaupapa NHP* communicates the peninsula's history with a specific focus on the period when it served as a patient settlement. In preparing for the development of the park's new General Management Plan (GMP), the *Pacific West Regional planning team* recognized the importance of working closely with patient residents, their family members and descendants, local communities, and the general public. Civic engagement practices allowed the team to implant patient residents' views and ideas into the GMP, as well as hold public meetings in which the public contributed their input into how they would like to see the park function in the future. For more information, please see Appendix G.

Supporting a National Heritage Area:

Atchafalaya NHA was created as a means to communicate the unique cultural and natural resources of south central Louisiana. Since its enabling legislation Atchafalaya has drafted a Management Plan to guide the NHA's development. The planning team was already aware of

the various groups that would be impacted by the Heritage Area, so team members were able to convene a number of meetings at different times and locations convenient to a large and diverse number of people who could contribute their ideas and concerns about the Management Plan. For more information, see Appendix H.

Strategy: Creating Relevant and Effective Programming

Several sites and programs throughout the Park Service rely on educational programming to convey the importance of resources and advocate for stewardship practices. However, if formal programming doesn't connect to intended audiences it quickly becomes ineffective. Civic engagement is the means by which sites can build relationships with the public to better understand how their interests and goals overlap. It enables sites and programs to improve programming so that it excites and invigorates participants, and motivates them to adopt the stewardship ethic. For examples of how this is already happening, please see the following briefs:

Identifying and addressing community preservation needs:

Many of the natural and cultural resources associated with *Palo Alto Battlefield NHP* are situated on lands outside park boundaries in both the United States and in Mexico. The park requested the aid of the *Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA)* program to extend preservation efforts beyond park borders. The resulting project identified landholders of the areas on which the resources were situated, and allowed NPS staff to work with these parties to determine suitable preservation strategies. Civic engagement practices helped the team understand the preservation needs and challenges of the stakeholders, thus allowing them to plan and implement preservation programs that would address such concerns. This equipped landholders with the necessary preservation skills, and also contributed to a larger network aimed at furthering the preservation of associated resources. For more information, see Appendix I.

Connecting the public to natural resources through the use of cultural history:

Located just outside of Columbia, South Carolina, *Congaree NP* is charged with conserving and communicating the importance of its natural resources. Its strategy for doing so was expanded after the park recognized that its cultural history would facilitate connections between the public and the area's natural resources. Congaree created a living history tour to communicate the different ways that populations have used the area's landscape and its resources over the past 500 years. The park contacted descendant communities to share their own stories and participate as actors along the tour. The program encourages participants to consider their own connections to natural resources. For more information, see Appendix J.

Collaborating with tribes to create archeological programming:

Archeologists from *Great Smoky Mountains NP* and the University of Tennessee have worked with the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (EBCI) to create a field school for the tribe's high school students. The resulting field school has helped the park communicate the importance of

archeological research and stewardship, as well as address the school's science and education needs. For three years the students and tribal elders have been invaluable resources, providing numerous artifact and site interpretations. Many students have even expressed interest in pursuing a degree in archeology after their experience in the field school. For more information, see Appendix K.

Strategy: Collaborative Resource Preservation and Conservation

At times the public wants to join in the Park Service in its mission to preserve natural and cultural resources, but they either don't know how to get involved; they don't feel welcomed; or they have felt snubbed in the past. Several places are overcoming this schism in various ways. For many of these sites/programs civic engagement is a mechanism to build trust and form positive relationships. It helps them understand how they can work with the public to preserve resources and, as a result, promote future collaborative efforts to protect and care for public lands. Following are examples of how this is already happening:

Collaboratively advocating for the protection of scenic vistas:

Blue Ridge Parkway, in collaboration with UNC Asheville, developed a survey to assess the quality of the road's vistas as a mechanism to combat development that would be detrimental to scenic views. Local residents volunteered to take the surveys, which were they analyzed and presented to local communities and governments along the Parkway. The presentations showed the quality of the road's viewsapes, and subsequently showed the impact that development on adjacent lands would have on both the landscape and on the local economy. To date, a number of counties have passed ordinances to mitigate development within a few miles of the Parkway and limit the number of cell phone towers that can be placed near the Parkway. For more information, see Appendix I.

Working with local communities to care for green-space:

The *Maintenance Division at National Capital Parks-East (NACE)* cares for the green-spaces throughout Washington, DC that are generally used for the recreation and enjoyment of local residents. For the past few decades maintenance staff have, as a courtesy, alerted residents to future work and grounds-updates that may temporarily affect the residents' use of these spaces. In doing this, NACE staff noticed that the local public was more than happy to respond with their suggestions and willingness to assist crews in maintenance work. This has grown into more active engagement as locals have helped lay sod, water plants, and have even collaborated on the development of a playground under NACE's jurisdiction. For more information, see Appendix M.

Engaging with tribes to collaboratively research and preserve archeological resources:

When adverse affects from the Glen Canyon Dam threatened archeological resources at *Grand Canyon NP*, archeologists knew they would need to work closely with the park's associated tribes to excavate affected resources. Through previous collaborative projects, archeologists

were able to easily contact tribal representatives to review and develop research questions that would inform excavation. In addition, archeologists invited tribal members to participate in excavations, as well as provide the artifact and site interpretations that will be used in concluding reports. For more information, see Appendix N.

Strategy: Intra-agency collaboration

When people think of civic engagement, they generally think of working with the public. However ‘civic engagement’ also includes collaboration with other programs/offices/disciplines to improve the quality of the intended product. Collaboration across disciplinary boundaries allows for multiple skills and greater levels of knowledge to be integrated, and ensures the consideration of different theoretical perspectives. The creation of a broad knowledge base increases success through heightened awareness and support for the project and its goals, as well as a wider understanding of the factors that could create and affect outcomes.

Benefiting from intra-agency collaboration:

The Law Enforcement Program had, in the past, solely collaborated with other protection agencies to mitigate marijuana cultivation on public lands. In recent years it has begun working with natural resource programs to increase both staff and public understanding of the hazards of destructive growing practices. This collaborative force has been working on a compelling campaign against such cultivation by strengthening public understanding of its destructive nature. To date, they have had Rep. Nunes (CA) sponsor legislation H.R. 5645: Federal Lands Counterdrug Strategy and Enforcement Enhancement Act, which would require that the Office of National Drug Control Policy develop a strategy to combat the presence of illegal substances on federal lands. For more information, please see Appendix O.

What does all of this information mean?

The quantity of programs using civic engagement and the various ways civic engagement is implemented can be surprising. But what does the collection of all of these case studies mean for the National Park Service? What can we take away from them?

The analysis of these examples has shown that civic engagement is not reliant upon the program, unit, or office that is using it, nor is project success dependent upon the level of prior engagement, the types of strategies implemented, or the

Why We Did What We Did.

A number of people helped determine the type of information gathered through case studies. Information provided by case studies was initially meant to provide models from which practitioners could begin to shape their own projects – hence the level of detail and advice to potential users.

The systematic collection of data allowed for an in-depth analysis of the findings. Initially, we didn’t believe that the analysis would allow us to draw conclusive results.

During the analysis process I looked at a number of combinations to see if there were any striking similarities. For example, would the level of prior engagement affect the strategies that were implemented? Would the “lessons learned” differ according to the techniques used? However, the only similarity found dealt with the principles exhibited throughout the engagement process.

results that are sought. Rather, in order to have a successful civic engagement experience, **it is integral to institute a number of inter-dependant principles in a project.** These principles will help address uncertainties that are often expressed when civic engagement is used. They help to answer the question: “how do I *do* civic engagement?”

To better understand the analysis that produced these key principles, we must first describe the methodology used to collect the data.

Case Study Collection

Case studies were systematically collected to ensure that the produced data could be subjected to meaningful qualitative analysis. Each participant answered the same questions about project history, methodology, and lessons learned, and subsequently reviewed the resulting case study to ensure accuracy. Upon receiving the edited document and making the necessary changes, I uploaded each case study into the qualitative analysis program, ATLAS.ti. This program allows users to code data for a number of different themes and store the results for further analysis⁷. By using ATLAS.ti I was able to highlight potential congruencies, thus making it easier to identify points at which each example could intersect. Coded data fit into the 3 following categories:

1. Previous level of engagement
2. Strategies implemented
3. Principles used

I then classified the data further, using subcategories, to better highlight variation. This level of categorization allowed for a more sophisticated examination of the data within each case study. Thus, comparing several examples and subsequently identifying correlations was much easier. Below, for example, are the subcategories for “Strategies implemented”:

- Advisory group/committee
- Cast wide net
- Consideration given to audience
- Establishing/building on relationships
- Facilitating visitor action
- Intra-agency collaboration
- Partnerships
- Pre-meeting consultation
- Pre-scoping meetings
- Presentation of results (formal rather than interpretive)
- Scoping meetings

⁷ For a more in-depth discussion of project methodology, please see Appendix P

- Seeking feedback
- Select Group
- Stakeholder self-representation/interpretation
- Surveys

After I had coded each case study and identified their various categories and subcategories, I entered the results into a spreadsheet to facilitate a thorough examination of the information. Initially, I expected to see correlations between the various identified categories that would allow us to understand why certain strategies were used in different situations. For example, I thought the types – or at least the number – of strategies implemented would reflect the previous levels of experience with civic engagement that each site/program had. That is, if a site had already recorded high levels of engagement, they would record using fewer strategies aimed at making the project civically engaged as compared to a site that had never done civic engagement before. This proved not to be the case.

I had also expected correlation among the various categories. For example, I had assumed that those case studies featuring archeology would have used similar civic engagement strategies – but there in actuality there was no such link. The only similarities among any of the case studies lay in the category of “Principles used.”

Civic Engagement ‘Principles’

“Principles” refer to those actions that were undertaken not as strategies, but as additional efforts meant to supplement the civic engagement process. They were not part of an action item or a ‘how-to’ list, but rather they were a means by which project strategies could be supplemented and more easily achieved. Oftentimes case study contributors specifically contributed their project’s success to these principles. They allowed practitioners to have their work more effectively and accurately represent the wishes of the audiences with whom they were working. They aren’t check-list items, but rather something more ambiguous that must be practiced and achieved over the long-term. In this way, principles represent a mindset and overarching intention rather than action items.

The list of principles has been divided into two lists – those that are “core”, and those that are “secondary”. The distinction between the two lists was determined by their presence and perceived necessity in each example. As you will see, secondary principles were often avenues by which core principles could be achieved.

Secondary principles

Secondary principles are those that were present in many – but not all – of the examined examples. These secondary principles are:

- Diversity of opinion

- Understanding communities
- Open communication
- Transparency

These principles are considered ‘secondary’ because they were more heavily relied upon in some situations as compared to others. In other words, while they were important in many case studies, they were not essential in all.

Diversity of opinion

This refers to gathering a number of different opinions so that a variety of perspectives can be heard and understood. Diversity of opinion means that all perspectives are reflected in the final product.

Why is this a secondary rather than a core principle? Part of civic engagement is understanding that, at times, there will only be certain communities of interest at the table. For example, if archeologists are preparing to excavate an American Indian settlement in Missouri, they may need to only have affiliated tribes at the table rather than all of the area’s surrounding communities. Because a very specific community was sought out and engaged, the level of diverse viewpoints and experiences drops.

Understanding communities

Many examples of successful engagement show that staff were aware of the public’s knowledge, culture, challenges, wishes, etc. In several instances practitioners went into communities and developed a sophisticated understanding about their viewpoints, values, concerns, etc. to ensure the communities’ proper identification and representation throughout the engagement process. This level of intimate understanding ensures that the final product is a reflection of the wants and needs of those participating.

Why is this a secondary rather than a core principle? This principle is to be used in situations where identifiable and a finite number of communities are involved. When large-scale engagement is taking place it is practically impossible to fully understand everyone’s specific needs and potential contributions on a deep level. In such situations public meetings are provided so that those in attendance can speak for themselves. Public meetings become a way to gather all interested parties so that you can begin to work on project-specific goals. While in-depth community understanding isn’t achieved, there is still some level of understanding required. Such knowledge informs meeting logistics, such as what times would be best to hold public meetings, the locations that would most likely draw the largest and most diverse participation, and what groups need to be at the table so that their views will be represented.

Open communication

Open communication reflects the ability of all parties involved to openly communicate their views and provide their feedback. This includes providing multiple avenues (email, telephone, mail, etc.) by which all stakeholders can access and/or receive information about the project. It also requires that they are supplied with ample time, opportunities, and forums in which they can voice their opinions.

Why is this a secondary rather than a core principle? At times projects are informed largely by the understanding that had been established through prior engagements. Therefore, practitioners – while they would be communicating with stakeholders – don’t pursue the wide communication levels required for processes that involve large-scale informational exchange, like scoping meetings.

Transparency

Transparency refers to the public’s level of accessibility to information regarding project details, and whether or not they are provided with opportunities to react to how the project is progressing. It is a means by which trust can be established, and is essential in good communication. Transparency provides a system of checks so that those involved can be sure that their perspectives and opinions are being properly identified and integrated into the final product. Transparency makes practitioners accountable to the public they are serving.

Why is this a secondary rather than a core principle? This is a ‘secondary’ principle because oftentimes collaboration takes place with select communities. That is, if a park/program works with a specific community, they practiced transparency with that community. So, while the involved parties are completely aware of how a project progresses, the larger public may not have any access to the evolution of such a project. This characteristic limits the level of transparency practiced during engagement.

A main characteristic of these secondary principles is the scale on which they were practiced. That is, the extent to which they were relied upon in each case study was dependent upon the number of local and/or cultural communities that were engaged.

Secondary principles were also classified as such because of their relationship to the primary principles. In figure 1, secondary principles support and reinforce the principles that were central in every engagement that was documented. Secondary principles may not have been present in each case study, but when used they supported at least one of the core principles. For a more in-depth discussion of this, please see above.

Core principles

Many of the secondary principles were integral because they supported three core principles. These are:

- Trust

- Relationships
- Active listening

These three principles were clearly evident in each case study, and several contributors specifically identified them as being largely responsible for project success. These core principles are inexorably interwoven, and thus cannot be properly applied without the others also being applied. While these principles may seem obvious and elementary, they are incredibly important and, at times, challenging to implement. The descriptions below will serve to reinforce their importance, and help flesh out each principle's place within a civically engaged project:

Trust

At the heart of collaborative projects is a level of trust that those participating have not only in each other, but in the process that they are undertaking. Trust implies that people can come together and participate in a collaborative process because they know that the proposed final outcome will come to fruition, and because they know that they had an impact on that final outcome.

Trust encourages communities to contribute their opinions and knowledge to a project. They recognize that they will be taken seriously and that their input will affect the outcome, so they are more willing to make such contributions. In difficult situations it makes compromise easier because those involved trust that each participant will hold up their end of the agreement.

Relationships

Relationship-building is closely related to trust. Many contributors explained that establishing face-to-face familiarity made the collaborative process much easier. Establishing this level of familiarity was beneficial because it makes participants less abstract and much easier to relate to, which opens the door for more positive interactions. Personal connections and rapport are easier to form through face-to-face contact, and the resulting relationship makes it easier to consider and understand other perspectives.

Active Listening

'Active listening' is characterized by listening with the intention of responding to the ideas and concerns expressed. Understandably, this skill can be the starting point to achieve both trust and relationships. It builds trust because the ways in which comments/concerns are addressed reassures participants that they have a voice and that their voice has meaning. This, in turn, helps to build relationships because the involved parties better understand others' perspectives and are thus more apt to collaboratively work towards the most attractive goal for all participants.

An important feature of these core principles is their sustainability. Once relationships and trust have been built, they can be maintained through regular contact. This means that civic

engagement can become a common function in parks and programs as they realize the various ways they can continue to collaborate after the initial project’s conclusion. The skills identified by the core principles allow for trust, relationships, and active listening to extend beyond project deadlines, and truly become a normalized way of getting-things-done.

These three core principles revolve around forging positive working environments and are closely linked to the secondary principles. While secondary principles were used in many case studies, core principles were involved in every case study and were often identified as the keys to project success. Secondary principles were the means by which core principles were implemented.

Interdependence of Core and Secondary Principles

These core and secondary principles are interconnected and, at times, completely dependent upon one another. For example, it is difficult to have a good relationship without first forming trust. At the same time, it is also nearly impossible to gain trust without first meeting people where they are (physically, mentally, or emotionally) and trying to form some sort of positive relationship. However, neither trust nor a positive relationship can be properly achieved without first actively listening and trying to respond to stakeholder concerns, etc. Consider the relational web (figure 1) below:




Figure 1: Civic engagement web. This web exhibits the interdependence of core and secondary principles.

The core principles (trust, relationships, and active listening) are those upon which civic engagement directly depends. There are connections among the core principles and the secondary principles. Secondary principles stem from, and are influenced by, the core principles. For example, in order to fully understand communities and their diverse opinions, you must first be able to listen to their concerns and opinions.

Not having a ‘recipe book’ for civic engagement may make the process seem daunting and potentially impossible, these principles will make it easier. Think of them as a meal’s main ingredients – you have the keys to make an amazing meal, but it is up to you to put them together without a recipe. That means you are given a little room to experiment and try new things, but having the base for the meal makes doing so that much easier.

Let’s get back to the initial question, “**What does this mean for the National Park Service?**” Civic engagement and its application – which is achieved through the implementation of these principles – create a mechanism for change. More specifically, it can change the way that the larger public views and interacts with natural and cultural resources as well as with Park Service staff. It can diversify the Park Service’s visitorship and workforce. It can even change the way we see and understand each other through collaboratively designed projects.

Concluding Thoughts

This is a pivotal time in the National Park Service, and the Director’s four priorities (relevancy, education, stewardship, and workforce) reflect this. Civic engagement allows us to work towards and achieve these priorities while also working towards achieving the agency’s mission. The presented case studies exhibit how collaboratively embarking on projects can easily touch on each of the Director’s goals. Take, for example, the creation of “Get Up, Get Out, and Go!” at Cuyahoga Valley NP. The collaborative team, consisting of CVNP partners and middle school students, was able to create fun and effective **educational** programming to make the park and its resources more **relevant** to a larger audience. Since the program’s inception, communities have been participating more and more. Students and their families, who are now more aware of the park’s resources and its relevance in their lives, are now more likely to become **stewards** for these resources. Former program attendees have even begun to volunteer to help run “Get Up, Get Out, and Go!” and are more aware of future **employment opportunities** through the NPS.

Civic engagement is not an easy, straightforward concept to implement. The cases collected for this study have each demonstrated the importance of key principles – like trust, relationships, and active listening – in effectively working with the public. Following these principles will make civically engaged projects easier to carry out, and thus ensure that the final product is reflective of those involved. Sustaining relationships is also an important aspect because it makes the prospect of future engagements more feasible and easier to take on.

Civic engagement is implemented for a number of reasons and by myriad sources. However, it is also an extremely daunting task. Civic engagement is about collaboration and understanding that in order to reap its benefits you may need to share project control. The wants and needs of those with whom you are engaging largely determine the project's outcome. Keeping this, as well as the principles that are at the heart of civic engagement, in mind when undertaking work with the public will not only help the National Park Service become more relevant, but it will help further the NPS mission.

Appendix A

Making Cuyahoga Valley National Park relevant to urban youth through civic engagement

Cuyahoga Valley National Park's (Cuyahoga) visitorship was not representative of the populations residing in nearby communities. To make itself more relevant to local populations Cuyahoga used civic engagement by connecting with area schools and organizations to develop programming that would encourage local youth and their families to make use of the natural resources available to them.

Introduction

Partially located in the city of Akron, Ohio, Cuyahoga Valley National Park has successfully instituted programming to reach the underserved populations in and around the city. The free program, entitled "Get Up, Get Out, and Go!" (GGG) is the brainchild of partnerships established to engage with urban youth and their families to spread awareness of the recreational and natural resources of area parks. Five years after the program's inception the partnership has done just that. Program attendance continues to grow along with the community's awareness of Cuyahoga's resources. Cuyahoga has credited "Get Up, Get Out, and Go!" with the increased number of urban families making use of recreational assets, and with youth who opt to stay involved in the park by volunteering.

Background

"Get Up, Get Out, and Go!" is a program for kids aged 11 to 14 that was established in 2005 to combat the trend of urban youth and their families' unawareness of – or discomfort with – resources that local parks provide. The idea for this program sprouted after Cuyahoga had received a grant through the NPS to promote healthy living through outdoor recreation.

GGG functions as a free program that runs Tuesdays and Thursdays, from 6pm to 9pm, for five weeks during the summer. By 2010 attendance has grown from past years, with average nightly attendance of about 100 kids and 34 adults.

Strategy/Outcomes

To create relevant and effective programming Cuyahoga partnered with a local middle school. A teacher and principal helped establish a student advisory group to devise activities that would be enjoyed by urban youth. These students suggested program ideas, identified logistical concerns (programs needed to have snacks, take place during a certain time of day, and be fun) and provided insights into the challenges that they and their families would face in trying to participate in programs. It was during these working group sessions that Cuyahoga learned a key factor for programmatic success – they needed to provide transportation to the program site.

To remedy the transportation concerns, Cuyahoga established three pick up points around the city. Surprisingly, by 2010 the number of children being driven to the program location by their families to the program site had increased, accounting for roughly 40 to 50 percent of program attendance, as compared to 10 percent in previous years. This increase in family involvement is

attributed to the provided transportation. Children who had taken the bus would tell their families about their experience, leading families to accompany the children either by using the provided transportation or using their own transportation resources.

In getting GGG off the ground, Cuyahoga worked with a number of partners throughout the city. Partnerships were based on services that would be complimentary to the mission of GGG. For example, local recreation centers and the public housing authorities supplied information about and support for the program to youth and their parents, and local schools provided a venue for Cuyahoga staff to introduce students to program details.

Lessons Learned

Many factors contributed to program success, but none more notable than the effort to make participants feel comfortable and gain their trust. In this example, trust could only be gained after Cuyahoga really knew their target audience. By working with a student advisory group, they were not only able to get youth input on program design, but were also given a window into the difficulties the children would face in trying to participate. Understanding these challenges allowed Cuyahoga to plan for and provide transportation to ensure easy access to the program site, and made it apparent to local communities that the park was making a concerted effort. This advisory group also made Cuyahoga aware that activities needed to stress fun and recreation – not be bogged down with content. In other words, fun activities would get kids outdoors, into the parks, and feeling comfortable, while providing bits of interpretation would ensure that they were learning about Cuyahoga’s resources and to value green space.

Another aspect contributing to the success of “Get Up, Get Out, and Go!” has been program consistency. Program participants feel more comfortable when the faces they see at each program stay the same. They begin to form relationships with those staffing the event, and thus have a more personalized experience.

Conclusions

Cuyahoga has been able create a program from which urban youth and their families have begun to explore natural and outdoor recreation spaces more frequently. In developing “Get Up, Get Out, and Go!” the park knew that success lay in meeting the needs of the intended audience. This understanding led them to develop youth work groups to give input on activities and give staff insight into cultural factors that the park may have otherwise not considered. And so, the trust that was gained, the quality of the programming produced, and the relationships that Cuyahoga has been able to establish within the community have all contributed to the effectiveness and success of “Get Up, Get Out and Go!”

Information provided by Bridget Garvin Ambrisco (Director of Volunteer Programs), Brady Bourquin (Park Ranger and current coordinator for GGG), Jennie Vasarhelyi, (Chief of Interpretation and Education), and Mary Pat Doorley (Interpretive Operations Supervisor) from Cuyahoga Valley National Park. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by

Molly Russell on July 15, 2010. For more information on the 2010 GGG program, please visit www.nps.gov/cuva/get-up-get-out-and-go.htm.

Collaborative Interpretation

Appendix B

***“We Hold the Rock”*: Remembering Alcatraz’s American Indian Occupation through Civic Engagement**

The Indian Occupation on Alcatraz Island between November 1969 and June 1971 was significant both in the development of the Red Power Movement, as well as in the shaping of American policies towards American Indians. To communicate this story, Alcatraz Island – a part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area – has used civic engagement to design a video exhibit in which events surrounding the Occupation would be interpreted.

Introduction

Many visitors go to Alcatraz Island with the intent to learn more about the island’s penitentiary history – due in no small part to its immortalization through popular media. While popular culture may have imbedded “the Rock” in the American public’s imagination, the Island’s occupation by the Indians of All Tribes (1969 to 1971) has had a much greater impact on contemporary American society. To communicate this fact park staff have engaged American Indian film-makers and Occupation participants for over 15 years. Together, their purpose is to document the events and impact that the Occupation has had on Federal-tribal relations. Their efforts have coalesced into a video exhibit entitled “We Hold the Rock” – a name derived from a quote by the Occupation’s leader, Richard Oakes.

Background

Events at Alcatraz Island were rooted in a growing urban and educated Indian population, and their response to termination policies that were eliminating Federal aid to, and the recognition of, American Indian tribes and bands. Termination policies were formally enacted in 1953 with the signing of House Concurrent Resolution 108. HCR-108 broke governmental ties to the Menominee, Klamath, Flathead, Potawatomi, Turtle Mountain Chippewa, and all the tribes in the states of California, New York, Florida, and Texas. In the following 11 years the government would terminate its formal recognition for 109 American Indian tribes and bands. Affected peoples were encouraged to move into urban areas and abandon their tribal heritage and affiliations. The assumption was that these populations would fare better if they became thoroughly assimilated into American society.

A total of three occupations occurred on Alcatraz Island in an effort to reclaim Indian identity and bring recognition to their plight. The first happened on March 9, 1964 when Richard McKenzie led five Sioux in the take-over for a total of four hours. McKenzie and his followers based this act on an 1868 U.S.-Sioux treaty that granted Sioux people any unused or abandoned land held by the government. The second occupation, on November 9, 1969, was led by Richard Oakes and a group of mostly young, urban American Indians who called themselves “the Indians of All Tribes.” They only occupied the island for a few hours, but in this short time they were convinced that a longer occupation was possible.

Growing levels of unrest culminated on November 20, 1969, when Richard Oakes and the Indians of All Tribes returned to Alcatraz with the intention to stay. They demanded the government grant them the title to the island so they could establish an Indian university and cultural center. Oakes served as the movement leader until January 5, 1970, when the death of his 13-year-old stepdaughter drove him to leave the island. Eventually the Federal government cut off water, food, and electricity to the island, leaving the occupiers to strip and sell copper wiring for food. The occupiers' ordered removal took place after two oil tankers collided in the San Francisco Bay in January of 1971 – regardless of the fact that the accident was not caused by the lack of a lighthouse or fog horn from Alcatraz. Federal marshals, FBI agents, and Special Forces removed the last of the unarmed protestors – five women, four children, and six men – on June 10, 1971.

The occupiers may not have directly achieved their goals, but these events would have resounding effects on American policy. Their actions inspired the Red Power Movement, put an end to Federal termination policies, and made way for self-determination policies.

The lack of interpretation about these occupations – arguably the most influential portion of the island's history – spurred park staff to consider an exhibit about the events that led up to, and occurred during, the Occupation.

Strategy/Outcomes

Park staff quickly recognized an exhibit would need the support and input of those who were involved in the Occupation. In the mid-1990s park staff began attending powwows and other events hosted by the Bay Area's Intertribal Friendship House. They saw it as a way to gain contacts, form relationships, and build trust within the local American Indian community. The contacts made during this time would eventually provide their input and document their experiences so that the exhibit would be a holistic representation of the events surrounding the 19-month occupation. In all, this process of building trust within the community occurred six years before exhibit research commenced, and the maintenance of relationships continues into the present.

Park staff were able to connect with and gain the interest of numerous American Indians and First Nation Natives – some of whom participated in the occupation – to create a video exhibit that would provide background and first-hand accounts for events that occurred on Alcatraz Island. After funding was secured through the park's partner, the Golden Gate National Park Association (now the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy), project participants began looking for more people to share their experiences during the American Indian Occupation. Information about the project was posted on the internet, and from there a number of additional participants were recruited.

During the filmmaking process park staff provided research and materials, and ensured that the filmmakers and participants would have the greatest influence over the direction of the film. In

addition to articulating their experiences, participants were able to weigh-in on how the film would be edited and produced. The resulting video exhibit, “We Hold the Rock,” portrays the events surrounding the Occupation, as well as the actions taken by both the Federal government and the Indians of All Tribes.

The park provides a free copy of the documentary to all American Indian schools that are interested. These schools are also hosted on free educational visits so the events that were so important in changing the nation’s view on the preservation of Native American cultures are not forgotten among the youth.

Lessons learned

This project could not have taken place without gaining the trust of those whose who would eventually participate in the project – namely, local American Indians. Gaining the trust was no easy task. It required attending events hosted by Native American groups; making NPS affiliations and intentions known; self-awareness and the recognizing one’s ignorance of others’ cultures; humility, and; the willingness to create and maintain strong working and personal relationships.

Perseverance and dedication to a principle – the accurate and holistic portrayal of events surrounding the American Indian Occupation – were integral in the completion of this project. Efforts were never abandoned when uncertainty arose, such as when funding sources seemed scarce. Rather than giving up, the team kept looking until they were able to find the funding required.

Conclusions

Alcatraz Island’s contributions to history stretch much farther past its time as a penitentiary. It was a catalyst for the Red Power Movement, which changed the course of governmental policies. They changed from policies that reflected a cultural termination mentality, to policies that recognized the importance of self-determination for Native American tribes. This portion of the Island’s history, though extremely socially significant, had failed to be fully interpreted at the park. In-depth interpretation was not presented until individuals who were dedicated to communicating the Occupation’s importance recognized the lack of information presented to the public. Resulting was a truly collaborative effort that featured NPS staff and American Indians who were dedicated to communicating a firsthand account of the events leading up to, and during, 1969 to 1971. The video exhibit “We Hold the Rock” has immortalized events surrounding the Occupation in the public’s imagination as they have already been immortalized in U.S. policy.

Information provided by Craig Glassner, a ranger at Alcatraz Island. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on August 16, 2010. For more information on the history of the Occupation, please see <http://www.nps.gov/alca/historyculture/we-hold-the->

[rock.htm](http://www.pbs.org/itvs/alcatrazisnotaniland/nativeland.html). For information on additional media, please explore <http://www.pbs.org/itvs/alcatrazisnotaniland/nativeland.html>.

Appendix C

Communicating Tribal Histories through Civic Engagement

Oftentimes, when parks represent resources associated with living groups they benefit by collaborating with these traditionally-associated peoples to ensure that a holistic and accurate representation is communicated in park programs. In the case of Olympic National Park, an ethnographic report spurred civic engagement efforts with eight traditionally associated tribes to correct inaccuracies in the way tribal history was understood.

Introduction

Designated by Congress in 1938, Olympic National Park (Olympic) is currently made up nearly one million acres. Further recognition of its extensive natural resources was gained in 1988 when it received a wilderness designation for 95% of its land base. However, it also includes important cultural resources for eight tribes – the Makah, Lower Elwha Klallam, Jamestown S’Klallam, Port Gamble S’Klallam, Skokomish, Quinalt, Hoh, and Quileute – who are traditionally associated with lands encompassed by the park. Native occupation of the area dates back at least 12,000 years, so understanding and communicating the historic and contemporary Native associations with parklands is crucial to fully understanding the history and use of the land. Until recently, however, the interpretive history presented for the eight tribes included historical accounts of living patterns that were based on a few questionable sources. An Ethnographic Overview and Assessment (EOA) identified such misinformation, at which time park staff engaged with the tribes to work together to correct these misperceptions. Soon, this collaborative force’s dedication to communicating more accurate historical accounts paid off in the form of new interpretive exhibits at the park, which also spurred greater understanding of the associated tribal histories throughout the region.

Background

In 1997 an Olympic’s anthropologist published an EOA for the eight tribes associated with Olympic National Park. EOAs are comprehensive studies that examine practices by associated peoples and how their practices use or affect resources encompassed within NPS sites. Olympic’s EOA was an analysis of the relationships of eight tribes that are traditionally associated with the park and its resources. Specifically, the EOA examines the tribes’ use of park resources; histories; belief systems; social organization; the basis for their relationship to park lands; and their treaty rights. This report also serves as an analysis of the effects of federal law and policy, and how these may or may not conflict with or affect traditional tribal practices.

While research for this report was being performed, staff noticed a divergence between the recorded and tribal histories. The main discrepancy lay with settlement patterns. The common belief was that the tribes historically dwelled solely along the coast, while tribal history indicates that their ancestors travelled between both the coastal and mountainous regions. This divergence

has since been linked to one published historical account ⁸ – which has been carried over into a number of other published sources – that describes the peninsula tribes as coastal dwellers who never ventured into the mountains.

Strategy/Outcomes

Once these inaccuracies were discovered, park staff began engaging with tribal members – with whom a positive relationship had already been established – so that the collaborative entity could work to dispel this misrepresentation of peninsula tribal history. Together, they have been communicating a more truthful chronicle to a broad audience by using various forums and media. The anthropologist has made her findings more widely known by sharing them through many public presentations and other forums, while also working with the tribes to publish a book that both parties can recommend as an accurate source for tribal history. Their persistent efforts have benefited from the already-formed Olympic Peninsula Intertribal Cultural Advisory Committee (OPICAC), a strong and well-respected team of informational experts who receive numerous requests for this corrected information. Since this reformative effort occurred, many peninsula forums, including park representations, changed to reflect the accounts that were communicated in the various oral histories that were presented by the eight associated tribes.

Lessons learned

The involved parties were able to change common misconceptions of tribal histories as they were understood throughout the region. Without certain contributing factors it is arguable that these successes would have been achieved. For example, the initial trust and relationship established between park staff and the Makah, Lower Elwha Klallam, Jamestown S’Klallam, Port Gamble S’Klallam, Skokomish, Quinalt, Hoh, and Quileute added to their ability to work together and advocate for a more accurate representation of the tribal history. Also, the credibility that the park had gained within the region contributed to their capability to influence information that was communicated outside of the park’s borders.

Transparency and consistency of action were important in this collaborative effort – and almost certainly contributed to the growth of trust that was integral in achieving the goal that had been agreed upon. Transparency meant that the park’s and the tribes’ intentions could not be questioned, thus gaining both parties’ credibility and trust during their efforts. Consistency of action was similarly important because it allowed for the growth of trust. Members within this collaborative force could be trusted to do what they agreed to do or what was asked of them. This honesty and consistency contributed to a web of support in which the already established trust could be strengthened.

Determination and dedication to the specific goal of communicating accurate information to the public was also important in achieving success. Their perseverance ensured that the presentation

⁸ Semple, Eugene. The Olympic Mountains. Westshore, August (1888), 428-29.

of accurate information, specifically the tribal histories as they were presented by the informational experts – the tribes, would be communicated throughout the region.

Conclusions

Olympic National Park is charged with protecting natural and cultural resources that hold traditional significance to eight local tribes. When it was recognized that interpretive accounts presented throughout the area were not accurate, park staff and the tribes formed a bond over the same goal of accurate tribal histories. The relationships and trust that formed – based largely on honesty and consistency – and the determination they showed resulted in the shifting of interpretive representations to reflect historical accounts as they were communicated within the Makah, Lower Elwha Klallam, Jamestown S’Klallam, Port Gamble S’Klallam, Skokomish, Quinault, Hoh, and Quileute tribes.

Information for this example was provided by Jacilee Wray, Olympic anthropologist who also serves the North Coast Cascades Network. This write-up has resulted from two interviews conducted by Molly Russell on July 14 and 28, 2010. For more information, please see Olympic National Park: Ethnographic Overview and Assessment (1997) at http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/olym/wray.pdf. To access more information about the eight tribes associated with Olympic NP, please see Native Peoples of the Olympic Peninsula: Who We Are, edited by Jacilee Wray, University of Oklahoma Press (2002).

Appendix D

Pueblo Perspectives in Creating Bandelier National Monument's Visitor Center

While planning for the renovation of their Visitor Center, Bandelier National Monument staff recognized the need to develop inclusive interpretation with the six Pueblo nations affiliated with the park. Through the use of civic engagement, the park was able to publicly exhibit the continuity of Pueblo cultural traditions, as well as provide the Pueblos with a mechanism by which they could see themselves as being a vital part of the park.

Introduction

Since 1916 Bandelier National Monument (Bandelier) has been charged with protecting a site that has seen over 10,000 years of human occupation. The passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in 1990 – which mandated the return of sacred objects from institutions receiving federal funds to the appropriate American Indian tribes – required that park staff establish a relationship with area Pueblos. After the repatriations had taken place, Bandelier staff made a concerted effort to continue the relationships that had formed during the repatriation processes. One such way that the park continued, and continues, to actively engage with affiliated Pueblos was through the renovation of the Visitor Center and a renewal of the interpretation presented within it.

Background

For hundreds of years the four-corners of the United States, in which Bandelier National Monument is located, has been home to the Ancestral Pueblo people. Presently, twenty-one Pueblo nations are located in New Mexico, six of which (Cochiti, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, San Ildefonso, Santa Clara, and Zuni) are affiliated with the lands encompassed by Bandelier.

When Bandelier had funds available to renovate their Visitor Center it was obvious to staff that each of the affiliated pueblos, with whom the park had previously established an impressive level of trust, would be heavily involved in the process.

Strategy/Outcomes

Initial contact for the project began in 2001. Park staff approached the affiliated Pueblo nations to inquire about what they would like to see result from the massive renovations. More specifically, Pueblo representatives were asked how the Visitor Center's interior should look, as well as what and how they would like materials about them presented. Each Pueblo was met with on an individual basis and in conjunction with all affiliated Pueblos. During these initial meetings park staff learned that two of the six pueblos did not want to be featured in the exhibit. Taking this into consideration, Bandelier staff were able to formulate an interpretive plan that respected these wishes, but could also easily allow for their future integration if it were requested in the future. Eventually, four of the Pueblos appointed one member to serve on an oversight committee that guided the park through the remainder of the process.

This committee met once every few months to discuss issues of representation. Meetings featured a number of complex topics, such as what objects should and should not be displayed. Following are a number of challenges, and their resolutions, that were presented during the committee meetings.

The first step in the interpretative process involved holding a meeting so that the committee could go through the park's museum collections to determine what would be appropriate to use in displays. This exercise helped determine that most of the objects held by the park were appropriate to use in the new Visitor Center exhibit. However, the next task – at times – was challenging in that object presentation was not always easy. At times it was necessary for the committee to include other Pueblo members to clarify how to create culturally inclusive displays and content.

The committee was very concerned with the presentation of language within the Visitor Center. Pueblo languages are oral languages, and thus have no definitive written equivalent. The committee wanted the Pueblo language to be heavily used within the new exhibit so that visitors would be made aware of the lasting importance that language has to the Pueblo people. To further explicate the importance of language, the committee wanted Pueblo place and material names to be used rather than the place and material names commonly used today. These translations needed to be easily accessible and pronounceable by visitors, which meant they needed to labor over the phonetic spellings of this oral language.

Committee members felt that visitors should be exposed to Pueblo cultural perspectives. Oral and written quotes from Pueblo members were recorded and used throughout the exhibit to emphasize their histories and traditions. To supplement this, paintings and crafts were commissioned to emphasize Pueblo culture and artifacts. By putting forth this level of Pueblo interpretation, visitors are exposed both to a different world view and the understanding of cultural continuity within Pueblo nations.

Engaging with the park's six affiliated Pueblos gave Bandelier the ability to communicate the continuation of strong Pueblo traditions within the present, as well as the deep connections of the Pueblo people to their ancestors and ancestral homelands. In addition, it appears strengthened the existing relationships with the Pueblos.

Lessons Learned

There were many factors that contributed to the successful collaboration between Bandelier NM and the six affiliated Pueblo nations. Central to the process, however, were constant communications and transparency. Pueblo input was integral throughout the planning stages because they were able to provide the park not only with the overall perspective of the Pueblo people, but also with the information that would make the exhibit a success. These open lines of communication thus resulted in a high-level of transparency.

Also key within this project was the integrity shown on the part of the park. By honoring the requests of Pueblos they were able to show the high level of respect that the park had for them, which only built on the trust that had existed. Follow-through on commitments was critical.

These practices were not only incredibly important in achieving the best results possible for both Bandelier NM and the Pueblos, but they also contributed to the Pueblo people seeing themselves as being fully represented in the park. Since initial consultation commenced, visitation to the park by nearby Pueblo members has grown tremendously, indicating that Pueblo people feel more comfortable in the park context and are interested in strengthening their relationships to this sacred place.

Conclusions

The renovation of Bandelier's Visitor Center provided a mechanism from which the growing relationships between the park and the Pueblo could be strengthened. By including affiliated Pueblos early in the planning process, they were able to communicate their concerns and wishes for the interpretation that would be disseminated to the public. As a result, the Visitor Center now features information that was formulated by a team of Pueblo representatives and park staff that presents both Pueblo histories and the continuity of their traditions from the past into the present. More importantly, however, is the meaning that this process has had in the solidifying Pueblo connections to Bandelier National Monument.

Case study information was provided by Lynne Dominy, who is currently at Acadia NP but was responsible for the work done on the Visitor Center. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on September 8, 2010. For more in-depth background on this project, please see the 2009 Spring/Summer publication of "The Tuff Times" at <http://www.nps.gov/band/parknews/newspaper.htm>.

Appendix E

Using Civic Engagement to Gain New Perspectives on New Bedford's Whaling Past

New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park was legislatively designed as a “partnership park,” meaning that it was charged with establishing working relationships with institutions that had similar missions. However, since its inception the park has been able to use civic engagement to extend these working relationships to include the local and diverse communities of New Bedford – as is demonstrated by their recent ethno-historical project to document local Cape Verdean history.

Introduction

Since its creation in 1996, the New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park in Massachusetts (New Bedford Whaling) has been no stranger to civic engagement – featuring extensive collaboration between the park and local organizations. Comprising of 34 acres and covering 13 city blocks, New Bedford Whaling encompasses a number of institutions (including the NPS) that work together to preserve and interpret the history of New Bedford's whaling industry. This collaborative spirit has benefited the park in that park staff have been able to gain access to local ethnic communities to improve the depth and quality of work that they produce. Most recently, the park has been working with the city's local Cape Verdean community to record their oral histories to preserve their memories and influence on the local whaling and fishing industries.

Background

New Bedford is a diverse city in which many of the local ethnic communities have strong ties to the area's history as a whaling power. As part of a larger ethno-historical study, New Bedford Whaling conducted oral histories to document the experiences and perspectives of selected local ethnic communities. The information obtained from these interviews would then be used in a new Visitor Center exhibit about the local whaling and fishing industries. This ethno-history project featured five local populations: Cape Verdean, African American, Azorean, Wampanoag, and West Indian. Three researchers were hired to carry out the ethno-history project, with each researcher being assigned to one or more local groups.

Although interviews proceeded smoothly for four of the groups, mild conflict arose between the interviewer and members of the Cape Verdean community who were being interviewed. To remedy the conflict, and try to prevent future disagreement, New Bedford Whaling decided to replace the former researcher with a local Cape Verdean writer who was already trusted within the city's Cape Verdean community. The remainder of the project was completed successfully by the new hire. Upon review of the project's results, New Bedford Whaling staff noticed especially rich information from interviews that were conducted with the Cape Verdean participants. The park decided to extend the oral history project within this community so that more of their knowledge and experiences could be recorded and preserved.

Strategy/Outcomes

To fund the new oral history project, New Bedford Whaling applied for and received a grant from the National Park Foundation that covered the project's 2010 duration.

Throughout the process New Bedford Whaling has been very involved with the Cape Verdean population of New Bedford. This visibility has not only given the public an opportunity to recognize and know park staff on a more personal level, but it has also given staff the chance to become involved with and understand the public they are charged to serve. For example, park staff attended local Cape Verdean celebrations, such as the annual Cape Verdean Parade. Additionally, they have also held events to support Cape Verdean history. In the winter of 2009 they sponsored a lecture about Cape Verde, and in 2010 they cosponsored an event with New Bedford Whaling Museum in which community members put together a celebration for the 550th anniversary of the discovery of Cape Verde and the 35th anniversary of its independence.

In addition to being a prominent institution within the city, New Bedford Whaling works with a number of partners to interpret New Bedford's history. These partnerships have been integral in the civic engagement processes that the park has utilized. Partnering institutions include: the New Bedford Whaling Museum, which interprets the history of whaling as it relates to New Bedford; the Schooner Ernestina, a schooner built in 1894 that was given to the city by Cape Verde in 1982 that currently serves as a museum and educational resource; the New Bedford Historical Society, whose mission it is to interpret the histories of peoples of color who have lived in and shaped the city; and the Cape Verdean Association of New Bedford where New Bedford Whaling serves as a member of their Advisory Board.

Lessons Learned

The seemingly easy nature of New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park's and the local Cape Verdean community's relationship stems from the respect and trust that the park had gained through partnerships and involvement in the city, along with their continued effort to understand the public that they serve. Trust, as it was achieved by New Bedford Whaling, has been gained in various ways.

Before the oral history project commenced the park had been very visible in the community. New Bedford Whaling was legislatively designed to be a "partnership park," and from its inception has partnered with other local organizations charged with similar missions. These initial partnerships provided park staff with access to community members with whom they could begin to establish their own long-term relationship.

Establishing these connections with the local public meant that staff needed to venture out of the park borders. Staff would attend community events so that the public could begin to get to know them more personally, and, conversely, staff could begin to learn about the community. They were able to gain knowledge about, for example, the modes of communication the public generally preferred; what they valued; and services that then needed. Staff have learned that the role as a park employee should extend beyond only spreading the park's message to include

skills in which they listen, facilitate, are flexible and adaptable, and get to know and understand the local communities.

Conclusions

New Bedford Whaling NHP exemplifies the benefits of gaining and renewing public trust and the importance of continuing to learn about and partner with the various communities that live in a local area. Not only did their reputation contribute to their ability to conduct the initial ethno-history project, but their open communication with the communities with which they were working allowed them to respond quickly when mild conflict arose. This quick response led to even richer information about the local Cape Verdean community's experience with the whaling industry, resulting in attempt to further preserve their history.

Case study information provided by Jen Nersesian, Superintendent of New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on July 6, 2010.

Collaborative Planning and Decision-Making

Appendix F

Civic Engagement that Created the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor

The unique Gullah/Geechee cultural heritage of the southeastern United States was preserved in large part to the isolation of Gullah/Geechee communities. When increased development threatened the preservation of cultural resources, park staff, grassroots organizations, and other local entities used civic engagement to develop the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor.

Introduction

The Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor (Heritage Corridor) is charged with protecting and preserving Gullah/Geechee history and culture that exists along much of the coastal waters of the southeastern United States. It encompasses areas that stretch from southern North Carolina (Wilmington) to northern Florida (St. John's River). Beginning in the mid-20th century, Gullah heritage sites and cultural traditions – which had been isolated due to the areas' remote locations – were increasingly threatened by escalating development and tourism. In the late 1990s staff of Charles Pinckney National Historic Site on Sullivan's Island, South Carolina recognized the necessity of preserving and interpreting tangible and intangible cultural resources and began working fervidly with local entities to determine how best to preserve these resources before they were lost. The results of this collaborative effort would establish the Heritage Corridor as well as build pride in, and acceptance of, a cultural identity.

Background

Gullah people (also known as Geechee in Georgia and Florida) are descended from enslaved West Africans whose varying traditions and languages would meld to create the Gullah culture that is widely recognized today. This unique blend of West African traditions has been remarkably preserved due to its general isolation and inaccessibility of Gullah/Geechee communities along the coasts of southern North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and northern Florida.

Increased road and bridge construction that began in the mid-20th century served as a catalyst for the loss of Gullah traditions and ways of life. Cemeteries, archeological sites, fishing grounds, and cultural landmarks were destroyed to make way for development and tourism industries. To combat these threats and provide education about Gullah culture, Charles Pinckney NHS staff began speaking with local organizations about ways to best preserve and interpret Gullah's distinctive history and traditions. These efforts were soon brought to the attention of U.S. Representative James Clyburn, who introduced the enabling legislation for a Special Resource Study (SRS) that was authorized by Congress in 2000. The SRS required the NPS to develop a plan to present to Congress as a recommendation for the care of these resources. Work was quickly undertaken on this study.

Strategy/Outcomes

From the outset it was known that the local communities would need to be involved in the development of preservation alternatives if a feasible and sustainable solution was to be created. Park staff held seven meetings throughout four states that were sponsored by local organizations and churches. Sponsors provided a trusted connection to local communities to quell any suspicion of outsider intentions. Meetings commenced with remarks from a member of the sponsoring organization, which was generally followed with the Gullah/Geechee tradition of collectively saying a prayer. The meeting proceeded with an explanation of the goals and objectives of the SRS study, followed by the questions: what does the Gullah/Geechee culture represent to you?; what do you feel are the main threats to the Gullah/Geechee culture? and; how should Gullah/Geechee history, heritage, and culture be preserved? Meeting information was always supplemented with visual aids, and both Gullah and English were welcomed so that a greater portion of attendees would feel comfortable speaking. All meetings were both video- and audio-recorded to provide documentation of proceedings and comments. After the first series of meetings were complete all of the transcripts were analyzed, with comments recorded, tallied, and ordered to indicate subject importance. These comments would later form the area's mission, vision, goals, and interpretive themes.

The SRS team quickly realized that public meetings would not draw together a representative portion of the population. To combat this shortcoming, project members selected five communities in which to do fieldwork. However, general local distrust of outsiders required the SRS team to do an extraordinary amount of trust building. They participated in local preservation efforts, fundraising, and other community events that eventually led to positive relationships to make soliciting public input on the project easier. This process – the gaining trust and contacts within the selected five communities – ensured that the final product would feature the wishes of these community members.

Public meetings and fieldwork informed the development of seven alternatives for the preservation of Gullah/Geechee resources. These options were presented to communities through informal community events, over lunch, at churches, at local organizations, etc in which the public was asked to advance the alternatives they preferred.

Three alternatives, which were selected during the aforementioned public meetings, were presented at a second round of community meetings. Materials about the three alternatives were located at stations around the room, with project team members at each station to describe the alternatives and answer questions. Easels were provided, and participants were encouraged to either write down their comments or have a team member write their comments for them. Through this process, the alternative that featured the area's designation as a National Heritage Area was selected. In this option the NPS would provide the area with assistance, but local entities would oversee the area's development until the area became self-sustaining.

After the SRS was drafted it underwent several rounds of public comment and was edited to reflect the public's wishes. It was presented to Congress and designated as the Gullah/Geechee

Cultural Heritage Corridor in 2006. The Corridor's Commission was established in 2007, and they are currently developing the Corridor's management plan which is scheduled to be completed in 2012.

Lessons Learned

Relationships that had been formed before the SRS was required were integral. Charles Pinckney NHS staff had been heavily involved with local historic sites about the preservation – and issues of representation – of Gullah heritage, and were able to gain the support of these various organizations. They had also been able to make connections with community members who were confident and proud of their Gullah heritage who, in turn, helped to educate, create awareness, and build pride in Gullah heritage. Their collaborative efforts have helped people to reclaim and show pride in their Gullah heritage. These connections were able to make park staff gain legitimacy within the communities and seem less like outsiders, which helped the SRS team to begin to build trust. This led to the drafting of an SRS recommendation that would be feasible, sustainable, and desirable for the communities that would be overseeing the Heritage Corridor's development.

Conclusions

The Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor was created from the simple vision of preserving tangible and intangible resources before they were lost. Park staff began engaging with local entities and grassroots organizations about how to preserve and interpret Gullah/Geechee heritage, from which eventually came the required SRS report. For any preservation effort to be successful, local organizations and communities needed to be involved in decisions about how resources located in their communities would be handled. Resulting has been the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor, which to this day continues to rely on the public in decision-making to guide the Corridor's development.

Case Study information provided by Michael Allen, who is currently a Community Partner Program Specialist for Charles Pinckney NHS and the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor coordinator. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on August 17, 2010. For more information, please see the SRS report at www.nps.gov/sero/planning/gg_srs/gg_process.htm, and explore the Corridor's website at www.nps.gov/guge/.

Appendix G

Using civic engagement to remember Kalaupapa

The primary story being told at Kalaupapa National Historical Park is the forced isolation from 1866 to 1969 of peoples from Hawai‘i afflicted with Hansen’s disease (leprosy) to the remote northern Kalaupapa peninsula on the island of Moloka‘i. The site’s legacy remains strong throughout the Hawaiian Islands. In creating the park’s new general management plan (GMP), civic engagement has been used to integrate the voices of current Kalaupapa patients, interested individuals, and local residents for the future management of the park.

Introduction

Kalaupapa is a peninsula that functioned as a location to isolate people who suffered from Hansen’s disease, also known as leprosy. Currently, Kalaupapa National Historical Park (Kalaupapa NHP) communicates the peninsula’s history with a specific focus on the period when it served as a patient settlement. In acknowledging the public’s vested interest in this site, a team working on developing the park’s new general management plan (GMP) recognized the importance of engaging the public throughout the process in addition to following the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements for public involvement.

Background

Kalaupapa NHP is located on the Hawaiian Island of Moloka‘i. The peninsula and associated valley’s rugged landscape leaves it isolated from the rest of the island, thus contributing to the preservation of the area’s numerous natural and cultural resources. The park’s enabling legislation was signed in 1980 and established the 10,000+ acre park. The NPS only owns 23 acres, and the remaining lands are owned and managed by several State of Hawai‘i agencies working collaboratively with the NPS to preserve and protect the site’s resources.

Persons diagnosed with Hansen’s disease were first sent to Kalaupapa in 1866 after the Hawaiian King Kamehameha V signed an act entitled “An Act to Prevent the Spread of Leprosy” in 1865. The peninsula’s remote location was meant to isolate patients, while they sustained themselves using the area’s abundant natural resources. However, the first settlement on the east side of the peninsula – a village known as “Kalawao” – didn’t progress as hoped, and conditions soon grew dire. They would begin to improve in 1873 when Father Damien arrived and garnered public support by bringing the plight of leprosy victims to the world stage, as well as through the support of the Hawaiian kings, William Charles Lunalilo and David Kalakaua.

Beginning in 1900 as facilities were moved to the west side of the peninsula at Kalaupapa conditions improved and expanded to include individual cottages, dormitories, health facilities, water treatment, power facilities, houses, and roads. These developments were facilitated by growing humanitarianism movement. Today, such improvements are reflected in the in the normal day-to-day activities of those patients still residing in Kalaupapa.

After World War II Hansen’s disease treatments were developed and were becoming more readily accessible. Isolation restrictions in Hawai‘i were eased until, in 1969, the isolation laws

were lifted. Since then the population of resident patients have experienced a decrease, with 14 Hansen's disease patients continuing to live at Kalaupapa today. These residents are the last remaining individuals of a legacy of isolation at Kalaupapa. Of the 5,000 people who were sent to Kalaupapa, about 1,200 are buried in marked graves on the peninsula; the remaining individuals rest in unmarked graves.

Strategy/Outcomes

The planning team cast a broad net to involve patient residents, their family members and descendants, local communities, and the general public in the planning process through regular public meetings and correspondence. The first step that the planning team took was to set up 28 scoping interviews with patients at Kalaupapa in 2007. Interviews were conducted by an NPS anthropologist, NPS historian, and a Department of Health social worker who knew and were trusted by the patient residents. In these interviews patients discussed topics related to the future management of Kalaupapa, such as: how they would like to see Kalaupapa remembered; issues within the park that they felt should be resolved in the GMP; what the visitor experience should be like; and what interpretive themes they felt should be used to capture the essence of the park. Responses were recorded, written-up, and analyzed so that they could be integrated into the drafting of the GMP. As of 2007, 11 of the patients have passed away.

In 2009, the GMP public process was initiated with a round of 12 "pre-scoping" meetings with partners and the public on five of the major Hawaiian Islands. These meetings provided the partners and public with in-depth information about the upcoming formal scoping meetings. Meeting attendants were asked to sign up for the mailing list so they could be provided with updates, and were then told about the formal scoping process that would take place in the near future.

Formal scoping meetings held in mid-2009 provided the public with information about the GMP's purpose and the planning process. The meetings were communicated through flyers, mailing lists, press releases, newspapers, and various other forms of media. After short presentations that provided background information about the park, participants were asked to break up into small groups to discuss questions that had been prepared by the planning team beforehand. Each break-out group was provided with a facilitator and a scribe to ensure that everyone had the opportunity to speak and have their opinions recorded. After the formal scoping meetings had concluded, write-ups of public suggestions were provided online.

The formal scoping process was followed by a "results of scoping newsletter" to the public and post-scoping meetings. In these meetings the public was presented with general suggestions and ideas that were accumulated during the scoping process. Attendants were then asked to provide any additional comments or ideas before work commenced on drafting the range of alternatives for the GMP. It is expected that in the spring of 2011 the alternatives for the GMP will be presented at public meetings, at which time the public will again provide their input and suggestions.

The final stage of public involvement will be a review of the Draft GMP/EIS expected in 2012. The length of this engagement underscores the necessity for civic engagement to be an on-going and necessary process that far extends short-term compliance, such as that required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Lessons Learned

The planning process is on-going and lessons are still being learned at every stage of public involvement. For example, the public initially approached meetings with skepticism, and some were unsure or unconvinced that their input would be used. The team exercised active listening during the meetings, and meeting notes were made available online following the meetings. Establishing this public record, along with holding the post-scoping meetings and continuing to meet with the public in the future, show the public that their voices and suggestions do matter in crafting a final plan for Kalaupapa's future.

Conclusions

The Kalaupapa a planning team conducted an impressive number of public meetings to gain the input of patient residents, family members, Moloka'i residents, topside and neighbor island residents, and the general public because of the strong ties the public had to Kalaupapa. These meeting details were heavily publicized to reach a large audience. Results from a series of scoping meetings will be used to develop a range of possible futures for Kalaupapa, which will again be presented to the public for review.

Information provided by Anna Tamura, landscape architect at the Pacific West Regional Office.

This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on August 10, 2010.

For more information on the history of Kalaupapa, please visit

www.nps.gov/kala/historyculture/index.htm. For more on the site's GMP planning, please explore links provided on the PEPC website at

<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/documentsList.cfm?parkId=313&projectId=24883>

Appendix H

Collaboratively Creating Atchafalaya National Heritage Area's Management Plan

Atchafalaya National Heritage Area, located in Louisiana, was established in 2006 and is in the process of creating a Management Plan that will guide the Area's development over the next 15 years. So, this Heritage area has heavily used civic engagement to ensure that the Management Plan is reflective of the residents' ideas, and, therefore, easier to accomplish because of the population's investment in Atchafalaya.

Introduction

Atchafalaya National Heritage Area (Atchafalaya; Heritage Area) includes a total of 14 parishes in south central Louisiana – stretching from the northern parish of Concordia south to the parish of Terrebonne. This Heritage Area is charged with protecting and preserving the area's "significant natural, scenic, cultural, historic, and recreational resources." More specifically, it promotes stewardship for the region's diverse ecology and cultural heritage. Atchafalaya was initially designated as a State Heritage Area by the Louisiana State Legislature in 1997, and gained national designation in 2006. Its enabling legislation declared that the Heritage Area would be overseen by a "local coordinating entity," the Atchafalaya Trace Commission (ATC), consisting of representatives from each parish within the Heritage Area. This entity, in collaboration with local residents, has been working ardently to establish a Heritage Area Management Plan (Plan) that will guide Atchafalaya's development for the next 15 years.

Background

Atchafalaya was created as a means to protect and preserve "the South's last wilderness." It is the continent's largest river swamp and ranks among the nation's top wilderness areas. It is known for its diverse ecology and wild-life, which consists of over 200 species of bird, deer, mink, black bear and alligators – to name a few. Additionally, the region's habitat provides numerous recreational activities for both locals and tourists, from canoeing to hunting. This portion of Louisiana is also known for its unique culture, which is derived from African-American, Caribbean, Native American, and – perhaps most notably – Cajun heritage and traditions. These distinct cultures have blended in interesting ways that have created the vibrancy that the area is known for – from its architecture to its music and cuisine.

The purpose of the Management Plan is to establish a clear vision that incorporates an integrated and cooperative approach for interpreting, protecting, and enhancing the resources within the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area. It will identify the preservation priorities of the region, along with how the Heritage Area will manage the allotted money to work towards these priorities. It will also identify the partnerships on which the Area will depend to develop and sustain the goals set forth in the Plan. The Heritage Area began developing this plan in the spring of 2008 after the Federal enabling legislation and they were able to contract the Denver Service Center to aid in the process.

Strategy/Outcomes

The Heritage Area has broken the Plan process into 5 sections: project startup; scoping; development and evaluation of preliminary alternatives; preparation and publishing the Management Plan/Environmental Assessment; and the implementation of the approved plan. Prior to the commencement of this series of meetings, coordinators from the Heritage Area had been in discussion with civic leaders (with whom they had already worked closely during its life as a State Heritage Area) from each parish so that they could determine meeting logistics. From these preliminary meetings the Heritage Area was able to designate locations and times that were most convenient to a majority of local residents, as well as the meeting style that would encourage the largest amount of participation.

With this information the Area hosted 14 public kick-off meetings (also known as the “scoping” phase) in which staff began to talk with the public of the Plan process. These meetings featured short power-point presentations about the process and how it would affect local populations, followed by facilitated break-out groups. In these smaller groups participants were able to express their ideas, concerns, and expectations for the Heritage Area. This phase also provided a networking opportunity so that the Heritage Area could build new and existing partnerships with the hosting organizations that would be mutually beneficial within the Area.

Following this process, staff from Atchafalaya went to work researching and following up on the concerns that had been articulated during the series of scoping meetings. They wanted to know how – if at all – these concerns would be affected. Staff also took this time to look into constituencies that were not represented at the initial meetings and began speaking with tourism directors and local organizations in pursuit of solving the problem. Through this work, staff from Atchafalaya determined that the Heritage Area’s visibility both at local events and through newsletters would be beneficial. So, they began going to these events to establish an on-the-ground relationship with local residents for the purpose of both disseminating information about the Heritage Area, and to gain a broader local perspective. They also mailed over 2,000 newsletters by using a mailing list that was compiled using the lists of their various partners, leaders, and officials from around the area. The newsletter explained the prior planning stages and outlined the purpose of the “development and evaluation of preliminary alternatives” phase. It also included a mail-in pamphlet that encouraged new participation.

The next series of meetings introduced the popular themes that were determined after the phase two meetings. After reviewing these topics, participants were asked how they would like to see the Heritage Area function. Questions asked during this phase included: “What direction should we go?” “What are your concerns?” and “What do you value the most?” These suggestions informed the drafting process, from which alternatives for a management plan have been developed, and the preferred alternative selected.

Lessons Learned

The establishment of Atchafalaya as a State Heritage Area nearly 10 years before it gained its designation as a National Heritage Area has been an asset throughout the planning process. This time allowed the Heritage Area to gain the recognition of many residents within the parishes, while staff were also able to establish connections with different organizations and community members that made the process more fruitful. These connections have given Atchafalaya insight and access to portions of the population that may have otherwise been difficult to reach. Insight from these connections has also contributed to the accessibility of meetings and the opportunities for participation after a meeting has taken place. Post-meeting participatory opportunities include the use of the Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website and/or the mail-in responses included in the newsletters – both of which ensure transparency during all of the planning steps.

This example also clearly identifies the importance of easy access and open-communication. Not only have Heritage Area staff exercised extensive listening skills during the scheduled meetings, but they have also ensured that the lines of communication would continue to operate after meetings happened. In this way, staff have also exhibited their awareness of the public and the resources that should be used in order to properly reach them. Such awareness will only make the final plan more reflective of what the residents want and, therefore, make it a more attainable goal.

Conclusions

Atchafalaya staff are still reviewing the draft of the Management Plan, but it is obvious to see their dedication to representing local concerns. They have not only implemented an impressive number of meetings with the public, but they have actively sought the participation of constituents who were not represented. They have done this through learning about the local populations; knowing where these residents go and how they can be reached. Resulting will undoubtedly be a Plan that will set the path for the Area's development through the next 15 years that will be widely supported throughout the parishes.

Case Study information provided by Debra Credeur, who is currently the Director of the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on September 1, 2010. For more information, please explore the Area's website, <http://www.atchafalaya.org/>

Creating Relevant and Effective Programming

Appendix I:

Engaging an International Audience at Palo Alto

Palo Alto Battlefield National Historical Park is charged with protecting resources from the Mexican-American War. However, park staff recognize that resources from this conflict span far beyond park borders. In order for these related resources to be properly preserved staff knew that they would need to collaborate with those whose land contains such resources so that their importance would be understood, and the resources properly preserved.

Introduction

Palo Alto Battlefield National Historical Park (Palo Alto) is located along the Rio Grande in Texas's southernmost tip. The park was created to preserve and interpret the events leading up to, and those which occurred during, the Mexican-American War. However, many related natural and cultural resources are situated on lands outside parklands – in both the United States and Mexico. In an effort to extend preservation efforts beyond park borders, Palo Alto requested the aid of the Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA) program. The resulting project would identify the stakeholders of such resources and work with these parties to determine suitable preservation strategies. The legacy of this project can easily be seen in the present. More specifically, it helped build and facilitate relationships among numerous landholders, resource managers, and park staff, who continue to collaborate in their preservation efforts.

Background

The Mexican-American War spanned from years 1846 through 1848. The conflict originated when, in 1845, President James K. Polk inaugurated Texas into the Union as the 28th state. Mexican President Joaquin Herrera, however, maintained that the territories encompassed by Texas were still the property of Mexico (the country did not recognize the area's claims of independence in 1836). Shortly after Texas's installation into the Union, President Polk ordered some 4,000 troops to the Rio Grande to secure the newly formed American border. Seeing this as an invasion deep into Mexican land, President Herrera ordered his army to purge the area north of the Rio Grande of American troops. On April 25, 1846 Mexican troops attacked an American scout party on the north side of the river. Similar skirmishes continued through early May, and included the famous battle at Palo Alto on May 8, 1846. On May 13, 1846 Congress formally declared war.

The treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which ended the war in 1848, practically doubled the land mass of the United States – and nearly decreased the size of Mexico by half. The National Park Service manages only one of many significant sites scattered along the Rio Grande corridor associated with this war. Employees at Palo Alto recognized that a number of sites had been left unprotected with no interpretation of their significance. They thus identified a need to gather various land owners and resource managers – from both the United States and Mexico – together

to identify and work towards preserving these sites. In preparation for their work they applied for and received a grant that supported work in parks with an international scope. They subsequently enlisted the help of the RTCA because of its reputation for engaging with, and forming relationships among, a variety of stakeholders.

Strategy/Outcomes

After RTCA staff commenced work on this project (which was formally known as the Mexican American Conflict Heritage Collaborative) one of their first tasks was to understand the park's concept of 'community.' That is, who did the park see as the potential stewards of these sites? Identified were a number of members from the professional preservation community (museums, archeologists, etc), and public and private land managers. However, staff also made sure to involve land owners and professional organizations who had sites on their lands, but had not previously shown interest in the preservation of such resources. Ensuring the participation of a large, diverse group of viewpoints would allow for the park to understand the challenges they faced in trying to spread the stewardship ethic, and would also eventually contribute to widespread, collaborative preservation efforts.

Participants were determined and contacted, after which a series of meetings were planned. These meetings would eventually become a forum where identified parties could gather to talk about collaborative possibilities based around the preservation of known battlefields, archeological sites, wilderness areas, etc. Eventually, as the meetings wore on, attendees began to identify the challenges they faced in preservation efforts. Collectively they also began to brainstorm solutions to these identified challenges. These meetings provided these parties an opportunity to gather, begin to create relationships and partnerships among themselves, and begin to think about ways in which these newly formed partnerships could be used to protect the concerned resources. After each meeting the resulting notes were typed up and made available through mailings and emails.

A document entitled "Best Management Practices" was developed after these meetings concluded. It contained information on how meeting participants should keep in touch and how they could continue to keep forming and building relationships in the future. This publication was created as a mechanism to continue and build upon the work that RTCA had done even after their work had ceased. It would later be distributed to everyone who had attended the series of organized meetings.

A workshop that was specifically designed to address the identified needs of the stakeholders resulted from these meetings. This workshop was widely advertised and made available to anyone located within the concerned area who wanted to attend. It featured training on how to: assess cultural landscapes; apply for funding; and apply various preservation techniques to the concerned resources. They also received extensive training on objects collections. This workshop was meant to reach a large and varied audience so that the preservation ethic and necessary skills could effectively be implemented by a wide population.

Lessons Learned

In trying to involve a wide variety of diverse viewpoints, the RTCA representatives noted a number of factors that made – and continue to make - the process a success. Perhaps most notable was the role of active-listening. The organizers recognized that listening to and putting the interests and needs of participants first was integral in gaining their trust and participation in the process. It also assured those involved that they would be heard and that subsequent workshops/documents would be designed to best suit their needs. Structuring the participatory process like this oftentimes produces more beneficial results because participants are more likely to take the process seriously because they themselves feel that they have been taken seriously. Eventually, harnessing this dedication to preservation was achieved by encouraging participants to build and sustain connections. These connections have served to participants engaged in issues of preservation.

This project's general purpose was to create a network among a wide array of people. This required that RTCA and Palo Alto helped to form and build relationships among participants so that they could easily collaborate after the project's termination. This endeavor has been successful because collaborative projects have continued into the present and because park staff are now aware of new collaborative possibilities. For example, they have recognized that this project has attracted and provided a link to new people and audiences with whom it would have been difficult to work in the past, so they continue to attend community events that introduce them to other partnerships, program ideas, and collaborative project ideas. The park has also responded by increasing their attendance at local events – like those hosted by the Mexican consulate – to ensure that these connections are made stronger.

Conclusions

Palo Alto and RTCA have been able to successfully engage an international audience in an effort to preserve and interpret sites associated with the Mexican-American War. The initial meetings held by the Mexican American Conflict Heritage Collaborative provided Palo Alto with information on where their partners were coming from, thus allowing the park to offer pointed workshops on interpretation and preservation that would best serve attendees. The program also presented the park with a growing network of partners to continue preservation efforts. Now, the park has a large network of American and Mexican partners with whom they can collaborate to provide more holistic and complete interpretation of the Mexican-American War, as well as ensure that the War's associated sites are properly preserved.

Case Study information provided by Kathy Faz, who is currently a Community Planner for the Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program at Pecos National Historical Park, Pecos, NM. This write-up has resulted from interviews conducted by Molly Russell on August 13 and November 18, 2010. For more information, please contact Kathy at Kathy_Faz@nps.gov.

Appendix J:

Connecting the Public to Nature through Cultural History at Congaree National Park

Natural resource parks aren't often considered as having been heavily used and altered for human use. Congaree National Park, however, has recognized the historical human uses of its lands and has chosen to emphasize these untold stories in their program "Congaree Campfire Chronicles." This program not only allows visitors to experience the different functions of the floodplain forest over the past 500 years, but it also draws them into thinking about how they themselves make use of the landscape.

Introduction

Congaree National Park (Congaree) is no stranger to preserving and communicating the importance of natural resources. It was established as Congaree Swamp National Monument in 1976 after grassroots organizations were able to successfully lobby Congress to impart measures that would protect the area from increasing logging in the late 1960s. Its designation changed in 2003, and it became a National Park charged with protecting the largest intact tract of bottomland floodplain forest in North America. Through the years the park has focused its efforts on connecting visitors to the importance of its natural resources. Its strategy for doing so was expanded after research for a 2008 park documentary concluded. This research allowed staff to recognize the land's cultural elements as a mechanism to attach visitors to the area's natural resources. They believed that communicating the ways in which humans have used the floodplain environment in the past 500 years would, in turn, cause the public to recognize how they themselves utilize natural spaces. Resulting was the candlelight living history program "Congaree Campfire Chronicles," a walking tour that gives visitors the opportunity to learn about the cultural aspects of the floodplain's history.

Background

"Congaree Campfire Chronicles" is a two-hour interpreter-led walking tour that takes visitors along a portion of the park's boardwalk trail. During the tour participants encounter a dozen sites in which costumed volunteers act out scenes depicting specific periods from the area's past. After the one-mile journey, the program concludes at a campfire where visitors are invited to relay their own experiences and perspectives about the swamp.

The concept for this program came from a similar evening tour that was offered at Bandelier National Monument. At Bandelier visitors were led on a guided tour at night that allowed participants to traditional Native American singing, drumming, and poetry. It was meant to provide visitors with an engaging experience that they may not have had otherwise, and impart them with a better understanding of an American Indian tribe's traditions.

Strategy/Outcomes

In preparation for the program, park staff began ardently researching the park's human history so that they could begin re-constructing the various ways that the area had been used. During their research, staff began to concentrate their efforts on specific uses and time periods of the

floodplain forest. These would serve as historical vignettes for visitors to experience during the program, and would eventually include: a Native American encampment; marooned communities of escaped enslaved persons; moonshine manufacturers during Prohibition from 1920 to 1933; loggers, hunters, and fisherman who sought out the area's natural resources; local church baptisms; and environmental activists in the 1970s who were trying to protect the forest.

In addition to using primary and secondary documents, staff contacted local residents who had personally used, or were descended from those who used, resources encompassed by the park. Personal accounts (in addition to documentary research) have widely informed the interpretation, and these stakeholders were asked to participate in guided tours as costumed actors. In preparation for the commencement of the program, training sessions on effective interpretation and story-telling were held. These training sessions would equip Campfire Chronicle guides and costumed volunteers to not only impart the park's cultural history on visitors, but also provide the visitor with an unforgettable experience.

The program has received very positive feedback. Congaree Campfire Chronicles kicked-off on September 25, 2009, and saw over one-thousand visitors take part in groups that departed every 15-minutes.

Lessons Learned

This program's ability to attract diverse audiences to experience the presented histories can be attributed to the relationships that the Park has been able to establish with local residents. These relationships not only provided the Park with first-hand experiences with Congaree-associated lands, but they have also granted park staff access to oral histories that they may not have otherwise not been able to obtain. Additionally, these connections have benefited stakeholders in that they have been able to present generally unknown or misunderstood aspects of the area's and, therefore, their own histories. In effect, residents no longer see the park as a separate entity from their communities, but rather they now see themselves as deeply involved and connected to the park and the story it communicates.

Congaree Campfire Chronicles engages visitors with aspects of the Park's history that are often overlooked, and it provides them with a forum in which they can relay their own park experiences. Visitors are thus confronted with thinking about the ways in which they themselves utilize the natural landscape, causing them also to consider the impact they have on the land. By listening to other's stories, visitors are also exposed to diverse insights, perspectives, and experiences that they may not have otherwise acknowledged. It expands one's view of history beyond their understanding to consider how and why other people's opinions and experiences may differ.

This program is significant because it uses cultural resources to connect visitors with the natural landscape that the park is known for. Oftentimes the public finds connecting solely with natural landscapes difficult because they may not understand their impacts on that landscape. Congaree

is using history to establish such a connection, leading visitors to recognize the park's importance for myriad cultural groups as well as, hopefully, the landscape's importance in their own lives.

Conclusions

Congaree National Park is utilizing the human history of the landscape as another way to connect visitors to the area that the Park is charged with protecting. In addition, they have been able to leverage the support of local communities, who, in turn, have provided the Park with valuable information and time to make the program even more successful. Visitors, then, are exposed with personal family accounts of how this swamp has been subjected to human use through the centuries, and are similarly provided a forum in which they can relay their own experiences. This program causes visitors to consider ways in which the natural landscape has provided cover for various cultural groups, as well as provides them a mechanism to consider landscapes' impacts within their own lives.

Information provided by Tracy Swartout, Superintendent of Congaree National Park. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on August 26, 2010. For more information on the history of Congaree National Park, please see <http://www.nps.gov/cong/historyculture/index.htm>.

Appendix K:

Engaging Tribal Youth in Great Smoky Mountains Archeology

While Great Smoky Mountains National Park is best known for its mountainous terrain and biodiversity, it holds thousands of years worth of buried human history. Archeological work at the park has not only enabled an understanding of this history, but it has also helped build a relationship with the Eastern Band Cherokee Indians so that a more comprehensive understanding of the human landscape can be achieved.

Introduction

Comprising over 521,000 acres, Great Smoky Mountains National Park (Great Smoky) is the most visited national park in the United States, hosting nearly 10 million visitors per year. While visitors flock to the region to appreciate its majestic views, many, arguably, aren't aware of the human elements inherent in the parklands. Areas currently designated as parkland were once home to the Cherokee and continue to be used by a descendant tribe, the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (EBCI). The park has been able to form and build a relationship with the tribe in pursuit of improving upon the care of park resources. The existence of such a relationship is perhaps most evident in recent archeological excavations that have taken place within Great Smoky. Within the past four years the park, in partnership with the University of Tennessee, has been able to host three archaeological field schools in which local EBCI students have been able to participate.

Background

Since 1971, leaders of the EBCI have periodically approached the NPS with requests that up to 200 acres of land held by Great Smoky be made available to the Eastern Band. The Tribe proposed the construction of new elementary, middle, and high schools on the property, which is known locally as the Ravensford Tract or Floyd Bottoms.

The Ravensford Tract was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1982 as an archeological district. This designation was based upon a cursory survey that revealed buried deposits of historic and pre-contact Indian sites. The remains of the village of Ravensford, along with the lumber mill that existed in the early 1900s, were present on the property. Portions of the Tract also contain wetlands, stream banks, and various other natural resource systems. This site - the proposed school location - would require extensive clearing, grading, and excavation, all which would severely damage the aforementioned resources.

In January 2000, then Director Bob Stanton committed the Park Service to undertake the natural and cultural resource evaluation and value appraisal processes needed to determine the legal feasibility of a land exchange involving the Ravensford Tract. The land exchange was authorized by Congress in 2003, prior to the completion of environmental studies. The exchange provided the tribe with the 143-acres of land necessary for the construction of the school

adjacent to tribal lands, in exchange for a 218-acre parcel of land that would provide a scenic easement for the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Prior to the Congressional authorization, a Historic Properties Plan (HPP) between the NPS and the EBCI was developed. This document provided the foundation for the resolution of any adverse effects by the proposed construction of a school on archeological sites. The Congressional authorization included the HPP as a requirement for the land exchange to occur. A work group was established so that Great Smoky staff and EBCI tribal members could work together to develop and implement the HPP. This working group included tribal educators, park and tribal archeologists, site planners, and park and tribal school administrators. The diverse backgrounds of the working group participants – both professionally and culturally – provided discussion points that eventually evolved into providing opportunities for Cherokee students to become participants in archeological excavations, rather than viewing the process as bystanders.

Concurrent with the Ravensford land exchange, discussions were undertaken with archeologists at the University of Tennessee’s Archeological Research Laboratory, particularly Dr. Boyce Driskell. They explored opportunities for a “public archeology” program for college students, which would also help the park in completing archeological surveys for projects under planning. This program, however, was in competition with other field schools offered by the university. Therefore, student enrollment and interest quickly waned.

This was seen as an opportunity to refocus the field school towards the needs of tribal science education and stewardship, park resource goals, and faculty interests. Under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth Kellar-DeCorse, the partners focused field school recruitment on enrolled Cherokee high school students. EBCI students were given the opportunity to participate in a full archeological excavation and gain extensive experience in the field.

Strategy/Outcomes

The first step in this project was for archeologists to begin talks with the Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) to determine whether or not hosting such a project for EBCI students was a possibility. Through these preliminary talks the THPO pledged their support for the endeavor, and the archeologists quickly began pursuing partnerships and applying for various grants that would fund this project. Project partners were also able to obtain funding for three of the past four years, resulting in a total of three different field schools. For the 2010 field season they were able to secure a cost-share program that allowed the park to provide participating students with a \$600 stipend in exchange for their work.

To gain student interest in the field school, archeologists began visiting high schools to talk to EBCI students and teachers about the opportunity to gain training in archeological methods while also learning about ancestral Cherokee. Students were able to sign up and, in exchange, would spend two weeks in the summer excavating sites that had been inhabited by the Cherokee centuries earlier. For example, the first season’s project revolved around assessing the

archeological resources of sites that would be affected by the new water and sewer lines. These new lines would serve both park facilities and a portion of the EBCI reservation. The former lines had failed North Carolina standards and had been polluting the water used by the tribe. So, students not only helped prepare for a project that would directly affect them, they also gained invaluable experience working closely with professional archeologists to determine the cultural resources that would be destroyed by the lines' installation.

After each of the past three excavations were complete the participating students were required to write an essay about their experience. These essays confirmed the overwhelming interest that the field school instilled in its participants. A majority of students even declared that they were interested in pursuing a college degree in archeology.

Lessons Learned

The ability for Great Smoky to hold these field schools has had great affects on the ways that the Park and the tribe work together. More specifically, it has taken a positive experience between the two parties, which took place during the land exchange agreement, and was able to leverage support for this archeology project through that contact. This archeological field school has thus contributed to a growing level of trust between the tribe and the Park, and has opened up new opportunities for the two parties to work together.

Also important within this project is the fact that the outcomes would not only be assets to the Park, but there were also benefits for the tribe. The field school was advantageous to the Park because they were able to do the archeology required for the water and sewer lines project while exposing young EBCI tribe members to archeology. Aspects of the project also took EBCI needs into consideration, like the water and sewer lines project would benefit the tribe. Conversely, archeologists have benefited because they have been able to garner support for their work by exhibiting the discipline's importance to the tribe.

Conclusions

This example highlights the importance of collaboratively leveraging resources to benefit the involved parties. Field schools both exposed EBCI high school students to the possibilities of pursuing archeology as a career, while also providing them the opportunity to interpret their own Cherokee history. This project not only resulted in exposing the tribe to the methods and benefits of archeology, but it also built the level of trust between the Park and the tribe, thus providing numerous opportunities for the two to work together in the future.

Information provided by Erik Kreusch, archeologist at Great Smoky Mountains National Park. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on September 1, 2010. For more information on EBCI archeology within the Park, please see the article <http://www.nc-cherokee.com/theonefeather/2010/04/23/parks-as-classrooms/>.

Collaborative Resource Preservation and Conservation

Appendix L:

Civic Engagement that Protects Scenic Views at the Blue Ridge Parkway

Blue Ridge Parkway is a scenic stretch of road that has become a key contributor to the local economies in Virginia and North Carolina. When the Parkway's iconic viewsheds were threatened by development, park staff used civic engagement in the form of volunteer surveys to gather local knowledge, perceptions, and experience to form and drive more effective visual landscape preservation efforts.

Introduction

The Blue Ridge Parkway (the Parkway) runs 469 miles to connect Shenandoah National Park in Virginia to Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina. The Parkway was opened in 1935 as a recreational motor road, but in the years since its scenic views have been threatened by encroaching agricultural development. The Parkway measures, on average, 800 to 1000 feet in diameter. This means that a vast majority of the landscapes that give the Parkway its visual appeal are not under control of the National Park Service. Increasing land development along the Parkway concerned staff and spurred them into action in order to raise local awareness about the importance of the natural and visual resources. To determine the visual quality of the surrounding landscape, Blue Ridge Parkway, with the University of North Carolina at Asheville, designed, implemented, and analyzed a volunteer survey. The survey results, and the stewardship ethic the results instilled in participants, were used by the Parkway to work with local counties to preserve the surrounding landscape.

Background

Farmlands, and the views associated with them, are among the fastest changing landscapes within the United States. In 1948, 4,800 acres of working farmland surrounded the Parkway, as compared to the 1,000 acres in the late 1990s – a 75% decrease in just under 60 years. The late 90s also witnessed the rapid installation of cell phone towers, which threatened to impede the rugged, natural landscape that has become iconic of the Parkway. These factors were of real concern for the Parkway because a majority of its 26 million annual visitors attribute their visit to the area's scenic views. If these natural vistas were to be lost, so too would a large amount of capital for the surrounding regions. The preservation of the visual landscape became of the upmost importance for the Parkway. In 1999 a project commenced that used local volunteer troops to assess the state of Parkway vistas, and thus contributed to the preservation of the landscapes surrounding the Parkway.

Strategy/Outcomes

A survey was determined to be the best mechanism for volunteers to assess the state of the visual resources and prepared in collaboration with UNC Asheville. They were chosen because they are easy to complete while still providing compelling evidence to spur preservation. In preparation for the surveys, the Parkway and UNC Asheville created maps, according to county, that marked

locations of Overlooks and their visual condition (visual resources present, overgrowth that may affect view, etc.). After mapping was complete, a rating system from one to 18 was included so that volunteers would be able to rate the quality of the view provided at specific Overlooks.

To assemble volunteers a Parkway employee contacted county planning staffs, with whom there had already had been an existing, friendly relationship. The project purpose and scope were explained, and county staff provided names of county residents who should be contacted to participate in this project. After lists of potential volunteers had been gathered, the contacts were called to ask for their involvement in the survey process. When contacting the provided individuals, the staff member established familiarity with the contacts by naming the planner who recommended them for the project, thus giving them a common tie. This technique resulted in everyone who was contacted to agree to volunteer.

Volunteer teams were assembled according to county, and they were asked to work one, eight hour day in their home county. As part of their repayment, they were provided lunch by the Parkway. In the morning, volunteers were introduced to the concepts of what made a landscape visually appealing. The remainder of the day was dedicated to driving to the Overlooks so that volunteers could rate the quality of the vista on a scale from one to 18. Questions of survey objectivity and validity were assuaged when, upon completion, the surveys proved that volunteers overwhelmingly gave similar ratings to particular Overlooks.

After the surveys had been compiled and analyzed (surveys were categorized according to county) results were presented in each of the counties to the planning boards and residents. The purpose was to present the larger public with evidence of the quality of the visual resources and the forces (such as development or cell phone towers) that threatened them. From these presentations, many counties passed ordinances to mitigate development within a few miles of the Parkway and limit the number of cell phone towers that could be placed near the Parkway. Also resulting was the collaboration of a number of local land trusts who began working together to ensure that the visual landscapes indicative of the Parkway would be preserved.

Lessons Learned

Blue Ridge Parkway was able to enlist the aid and talents of local volunteers to preserve the landscape for future generations. In doing so, Parkway staff recognized the need to harness volunteer talents and enthusiasm to result in increased stewardship for resources surrounding the Parkway.

The Parkway staff learned that in working with community members it is paramount to gain their trust, earn their respect, and show them the proper respect in return. The Parkway was able to connect with volunteers through existing relationships with county planners and leaders. Mentioning these common threads was essential in gaining the trust and participation of volunteers in the project. After the project commenced, Parkway staff also recognized that the treatment of volunteers through the duration of the project would affect the opportunities to work

with locals in the future. To ensure that the relationships established during this project would grow, staff took pictures, provided food, and followed-up with volunteers through hand-written thank-you notes and photos to express their gratitude and respect for the work that they did.

The diversity of volunteer opinion of the Parkway was sought and important to the development of this project. Rather than request the participation of community members who were familiar with the Parkway, they asked for reliable recommendations from county officials that would accurately represent their communities. This ensured that the Parkway was not just hearing the opinions of local Parkway enthusiasts, but also those in the area that may be opposed to the Parkway. This mixture of Parkway-supportive and Parkway-opposed citizens could voice their views, thus allowing staff insight into local perceptions. These insights informed the Parkway as to how they could be more amiable and relevant to neighbors, as well as how they could go about instilling a stewardship ethic into larger segments of the local population.

Conclusions

Blue Ridge Parkway was able to use surveys to influence local counties reactions to land management. Engaging local volunteers in assessing views throughout surrounding counties made the volunteers more aware of the surrounding resources while also equipping them the tools to promote resource stewardship in their communities. Presentations using survey results were made to the county planners and local residents to illustrate what could be lost through increased development. These presentations spurred action from several counties and local land trusts to quell development along the Parkway, thus preserving the visual and economic resources that the Parkway offers

Case study information provided by Laura Rotegard. Ms. Rotegard is currently serving as the Superintendent of Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site. During her time at Blue Ridge Parkway, serving both as community planner and management assistant, she was a driving force behind this project. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on July 14, 2010. For more information on visitor survey use in Blue Ridge Parkway to preserve landscapes, please see the Scenic Experience Project documents provided under the park planning section of their website, <http://www.nps.gov/blri/parkmgmt/planning.htm>.

Appendix M:

DC Democracy: Using Civic Engagement to Care for Washington's Green Space

Public parks in Washington DC serve as relaxing or recreational destinations for area residents. The concern expressed by local communities for the upkeep of the parks prompted the National Capital Parks-East Maintenance Division to employ civic engagement practices to maintain and improve the city's green spaces.

Introduction

In addition to its numerous museums, monuments, and memorials, Washington DC features a multitude of parks and squares that are cared for by the National Capital Parks-East (National Capital Parks) Maintenance Division. These smaller park units often serve as leisure points for DC area residents, taking the place of yard space that is commonly difficult to come by in large cities. Because these green spaces serve an important role for communities, many members of the local public express concern over the maintenance of these spaces. To address public interest in these issues, park staff have devised email listings and contacts within the communities to inform local residents of work being done in the parks, which serves as a mode of communication and a mechanism to encourage civic engagement.

Background

The numbers of green spaces that abound in Washington DC are due to two major planning periods within the city's history. Pierre L'Enfant's initial plan for the city featured a number of parks located at intersections. These spaces were improved and expanded upon with the McMillan Commission of 1901, which is credited with reforming the look of the National Mall and created spaces for the Lincoln and Jefferson memorials.

In the present day, these green spaces serve as recreational destinations for residents who want to walk their dogs, jog in a scenic area, or provide a playground for their child. These areas, in many ways, serve as the backyards to many DC locals looking for outdoor areas to enjoy. So, with these parks serving as public spaces from which many can benefit, residents have become concerned with the upkeep of these green spaces. Interest in the maintenance of these parks is nothing new, with the current email list of contacts having evolved from former written correspondence with local citizens.

Strategy/Outcomes

National Capital Parks-East uses an email list and other contacts – made either through prior contact, recommendations from the councilman's office, or staff attendance at public meetings – to inform residents of projects taking place on the grounds that they oversee. While the public has nearly always shown interest in the care of these areas in their neighborhoods, current correspondence is viewed by park staff as, at the very least, a necessary courtesy. The response to email updates has been surprising, if not overwhelming. Locals not only appreciate knowing about the goings-on in the spaces that they frequent, but they often volunteer their suggestions, praise, criticism, and labor in areas relating to maintenance. Offers to aid National Capital Parks

staff comes in many forms, from offers to water trees so that the maintenance staff's burden can be lessened, to contributing volunteered labor in larger, more coordinated efforts.

Residents who are known to have shown a consistent interest in helping to care for green spaces have at times been offered valve keys to access water sources. These valve keys attach to the water line, allowing the key keeper to turn the water on or off so that they are able to water trees, plants, and sod during the hot DC summers.

Larger-scale community coordinated efforts are also common in National Capital Parks. For example, Marion Park, located next to the Metropolitan Police Headquarters, was the site of a large effort between residents and park staff to improve upon a children's playground in the memory of a slain police officer in the 1990s. Community members approached National Capital Parks with their idea to revamp and dedicate the new playground, and staff worked with them to make the prospect a possibility. Locals raised money for the project and worked in tandem with National Capital Parks architects on the design of the park.

Lessons Learned

Through the years there have been many factors that have contributed to the current transparency and responsiveness shown by the Maintenance Division. Key in the development of this transparency is the recognition of the public's interest in the upkeep of the parks and the awareness that they should be involved in the care of the areas they frequent. Residents have been vocal in their desire to be made aware of what is happening in the parks, and the National Capital Parks has given heed to their requests and established multiple lines of communication.

This constant line of communication, as established by National Capital Parks, has been the main mechanism by which public concerns have been recognized and addressed. Updates are disseminated through email lists, postings on community bulletin boards, correspondence at local meetings, and contact and dialogue with elected officials. Keeping the public aware of projects taking place allows for them to voice their opinions and offer their help, thus allowing for potential conflict to be avoided. More importantly, however, it assures residents that they are considered, respected, and listened to.

Conclusions

National Capital Parks-East, in caring for tracts of land often thought of by Washingtonians as yard space, maintains communication networks with local residents so that they can work together to make DC's parks better. This level of transparency and communication have allowed for locals to take care of park resources, thus alleviating the workload of National Capital Parks maintenance staff. The local public has also used these networks as mechanisms to voice their suggestions for park improvements, such as the playground upgrade and dedication at Marion Park. Such examples demonstrate the importance and benefit in allowing the public to be actively engaged in the care of park resources.

Information for this example was provided by Doug Carr, Chief of Ground for National Capital Parks-East; and Frank Young, Chief of Maintenance for National Capital Parks-East. This write-up has resulted from an interview conducted by Molly Russell on July 15, 2010.

Appendix N:

Integrating Tribal Knowledge and Interest into Grand Canyon Archeology

Archeology of federal lands requires compliance under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in the form of consultation. Some archeologists, however, opt for a more inclusive practice in the form of civic engagement. At Grand Canyon National Park the use of federal funds not only meant that tribes would be consulted, but that their concerns and interpretations would be integrated through many different levels of the project.

Introduction

Lands encompassed by Grand Canyon National Park (Grand Canyon) have seen human occupation for close to 12,000 years and boast over 4,800 recorded archeological resources. However, these archeological deposits weren't taken into consideration when the Glen Canyon Dam was installed on the Colorado River in the 1960s. Since the installation of the Dam, sediment that had at one time been deposited along the river banks is now trapped behind the Dam. The natural system of deposition and erosion has been disturbed, thus resulting in increased sand erosion that exposes numerous cultural resources and contributes to their destruction. Reactive measures to preserve the disappearing archeological resources have spurred the partnership between the NPS, the Museum of Northern Arizona, and tribes associated with the Grand Canyon, who are all working together on many different levels – from the creation and implementation of research questions, to the interpretation of recovered cultural resources.

Background

Archeologists at Grand Canyon NP have worked closely with tribes associated with the Grand Canyon for a number of years. For example, in 1995 archeologists created a Check Dam Erosion Control program where Zuni tribal representatives were employed to construct traditional Zuni soil conservation check dams to curb erosion that would adversely impact cultural resources. In 1995, on the first trial run of building checkdams, a 26-member team constructed over 70 checks along the Colorado River in the course of four days.

It was clear that after 15 years of monitoring that some archeological sites were beyond preservation, and excavation was recommended for these sites. So, when archeologists were provided with approximately \$1.2 million dollars 2006 from the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA), it was obvious that area tribes were to be involved in the impending excavations. This FLREA money provided archeologists the means to excavate the ancient sites that were continually facing destruction due to adverse affects facilitated by the operation and presence of the Glen Canyon Dam. Program coordinators quickly developed research questions and a research design for nine sites that were to be excavated.

Strategy/Outcomes

Though project coordinators formed the research plan, the team ensured that the 11 tribes associated with the park were sent a copy of the document. Then the project team met with individual tribal liaisons and/or tribal councils so that tribes would have the opportunity to voice their concerns over the project and provide additional research questions that they felt were important. After the tribes met with NPS archeologists, their concerns, suggestions, and additional research questions were integrated into the plan's redraft so that their interests would help to guide the approaching excavations.

Varying opinions about the archeology had been expressed. Some tribes welcomed and encouraged these excavations, while others were opposed. The project coordinators wanted to be respectful to tribal wishes, so they met with opposed tribes to discuss and negotiate the excavation techniques. Tribes were also invited to attend other excavations going on in and around the park so they could witness the nature of excavation first-hand. After this process tribes were again asked for their participation in the project, to which they agreed.

During excavation tribes were invited to participate on site with NPS and the Museum of Northern Arizona archeologists. Generally, due to the sites' remote locations or various other difficulties, few tribal members participated.

The interpretive expertise of tribes has been essential after the conclusion of excavation. A tribal interpretation workshop was held where tribes could provide their expertise and interpretation on what the sites resources were used for and the significance and meaning of the artifacts that had been found. The information gained in this workshop has been used in site interpretation as it is presented to the public, and will be included in the concluding report of this project.

Lessons Learned

The integration of Native expertise and perspectives into this project's excavation and final interpretive reports was the result of long and established relationships between project staff and members of the different tribes. The trust on which these relationships are based have resulted from time, patience, and making the effort to be personable. Tribal governments are required to meet with numerous federal, state, and private agencies, and therefore, to begin establishing trust, Grand Canyon archeologists made a personal connection to the tribes with which they needed to work. This was accomplished through more personal modes of communication, such as face-to-face and phone calls, rather than impersonal emails and letters.

Through the project's duration transparency and inclusiveness were consistently demonstrated. Transparency ensured that everyone would be aware of what was being produced, and that they would have the ability to comment on and affect those products. For example, tribes were asked to review any documents written about the project, and they were actively sought for their participation in excavation and interpretation. This example also required that the park staff needed to be very flexible. They considered the comments and suggestions they received and were able to integrate them into the document redrafts.

Finally, making people feel welcome was important in gaining their participation. Tribal members not only knew about the project and its details, but knew that their participation would be sincerely welcomed and enthusiastically received. Letting people know about participation opportunities is not always enough – they need to know that they will not be in the way on site, and that their participation will serve to benefit the project.

Conclusions

This example of Grand Canyon archeology describes an instance where already existing relationships made civic engagement a natural decision. Existing trust and asking associated tribes to take a more active role – through voicing their suggestion on the project’s research plans, participating in excavations, and providing their informational expertise for interpretation – misunderstandings, which can sometimes plague these projects, were avoided. Rather, the project benefited by including multiple perspectives that could give new insight into the oftentimes elusive archeological record.

Case study information was provided by Lisa Leap, formerly an archeologist at Grand Canyon; and Jen Dierker, archeologist for Grand Canyon National Park. This write-up has resulted from interviews conducted by Molly Russell on July 28 and August 13, 2010. For more in-depth background on this project, please see <http://www.nps.gov/grca/historyculture/archeology-excavation.htm> or check out the virtual tour of the excavations at: <http://www.nps.gov/features/grca/001/archeology/index.html>. For more on the BOR projects, please explore the “Archeology River Monitoring Program” website, <http://www.nps.gov/grca/historyculture/archeology-river-monitoring.htm>. Tribal interviews are available for viewing at <http://www.nps.gov/grca/historyculture/archeology-along-the-colorado-river-video.htm>.

Intra-agency Collaboration

Appendix O:

Intra-Agency Connections: Civic Engagement that Eradicates Illegal Activity on NPS Lands

The illegal use of parks, namely the cultivation and trafficking of marijuana on parklands, poses a serious threat to the natural resources that NPS has been charged with protecting. The NPS's Law Enforcement program has recognized that civic engagement – in the form of intra-agency collaboration – is necessary to communicate the serious nature of this activity to the American public.

Introduction

In the Pacific West Region there are currently 9 parks that are being used intensively by Mexican drug trafficking organizations (DTOs) for marijuana cultivation. These clandestine operations not only contribute to billions of dollars crossing international borders – functioning much like a global commodities exchange – they also pose a significant threat to park resources and the safety of visitors and employees. The Law Enforcement Program needs widespread and informed support of the American public to further develop the momentum and resources needed to eliminate marijuana cultivation on park lands. To gain the public's attention they have collaborated extensively with other NPS staff, including natural resources, GIS, and media communications specialists to examine and communicate the impact that cultivation is having on the natural resources that the NPS is charged to protect.

Background

In response to the tightening border security of the 1990s, Mexican DTOs began recruiting and sending growers into the United States to cultivate marijuana where it could be more easily incorporated into the American market, thus reducing the need for cross-border smuggling. As these DTOs moved north, from southern California into the northern section of the state, they increasingly utilized NPS, other public, and adjacent private lands to set up their cultivation operations.

Once on parkland, DTOs set out to begin the cultivation of marijuana plants. To do this they clear and terrace land (sometimes eliminating rare and endangered plants), import pesticides that are often illegal within the U.S., and use chemical fertilizers to increase drug production. They alter the natural landscape by diverting brooks and streams for irrigation purposes, and all too often they kill wildlife in and around the site. This poses a serious problem for affected parks because it severely damages their natural resources. These destructive cultivation practices have increased every year, spreading into new areas with alarming frequency. In the past three years alone over \$1 billion worth of potential product was eradicated from federal land.

Initially, the NPS's Law Enforcement Program had only been collaborating with other law enforcement organizations in eradication efforts. However, they quickly realized that use of NPS land for the cultivation of marijuana was not only a legal problem, but also a significant

resource problem. Therefore, the Law Enforcement Program began reaching out to other programs and stakeholders – specifically those in natural resources – so that they would be better equipped to communicate to the public the urgency with which this problem should be addressed.

Strategy/Outcomes

Law enforcement plans to collaborate with other disciplines and concerned parties was influenced by and modeled after work that was going on in specific parks. A few parks that had dealt with issues relating to cultivation and had been able to form connections between the Law Enforcement Program and the natural resource staff that were employed within each park. So, a new working group was created in 2007 that featured a number of law enforcement, natural resource staff, and other various stakeholders from within the agency. They would engage with one another to create and communicate a message that would show the public the damage being done to the resources, as well as leverage support and take action against DTOs on parkland.

This working group meets once a year to discuss the project’s technical aspects (fiscal allotments, database information, etc.), policy initiatives, techniques for spreading employee awareness, and they develop an annual working plan to guide their eradication and communication efforts for the upcoming year. They also conduct quarterly conference calls so that working group members can communicate, troubleshoot, and stay on track with the implementation of the working plan.

The working group is not an unchanging body – it develops and is refreshed by new participants. As Park Service employees shift and change, so do the stakeholders who are dedicated to seeing marijuana cultivation eradicated on NPS lands. New voices and perspectives for this group are always sought, which was exemplified during a panel discussion at the George Wright Society’s 2009 conference that the working group conducted. Session participants were encouraged to make suggestions about how the working group can better to communicate with the public.

This inter-disciplinary group has seen many successes in the past few years. They were able to develop and publish “Marijuana Framework and Goals,” which functions as a new communication, coordination, and planning tool. Their work has also led to growing concern for cultivation on public lands, and they recently had U.S. Representative Devin Nunes (California) sponsor the legislation H.R. 5645: Federal Lands Counterdrug Strategy and Enforcement Enhancement Act. As of June 30, 2010, it has been recommended to the House of Energy and Commerce. This bill would require that the Office of National Drug Control Policy develop a strategy to combat the growth, manufacture, and transport of illegal substances on federal lands.

Lessons learned

The success of this collaborative effort may be attributed to different factors, but communication has been a central theme in this project. Without effective and constant communication, this group would not have been able to achieve their current accomplishments. Communication

allows for strong working relationships and ensures that the group continues to meet, plan, and work towards their eradication goals. Of course, intrinsic to communication is the skill of listening. With a number of members from different disciplinary backgrounds it is essential that all perspectives are understood and considered so that the best possible outcome can be achieved.

Another contributing aspect to this project's success has been the establishment of common concerns and goals. Established concerns and goals allow for a large group to create a plan that can be worked towards collaboratively, thus improving the potential for success.

Conclusions

The Law Enforcement Program has collaborated with different stakeholders within the agency to guide eradication efforts and leverage public acknowledgement and support of their endeavors. They recognize that cultivation is not only an illegal activity, but that it is also detrimental to the NPS's natural resources. Therefore, representatives for those affected resources have been heavily involved in this project. Together, this working group develops materials that will guide measures for the upcoming year. In just a few years they have been able to garner support from government officials, have legislation introduced in Congress, and secure some funding. The achievements that have taken place between disciplinary boundaries shows that when people are actively and respectfully engaged in a process, they can work in tandem to achieve their goals.

Information for this example provided by Alan Foster (Special Agent; Investigative Services Branch, WASO) and Charles Cuvelier (Chief Ranger; Yosemite). This write-up has resulted from an interviews conducted by Molly Russell on July 21, 2010 and July 27, 2010. For more about H.R. 5645, please see <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h111-5645>.

Appendix P:

Collection methodology

This project was modeled after the *Community Study Report*⁹ by Gillian Bowser. The *Community Study Report* was compiled at the request of then-Director Robert Stanton, and provides a snapshot of civic engagement efforts that were occurring throughout the Park Service in 2000. Contributions were made by the parks and were meant to cover a broad range of projects – from collaborative endeavors undertaken with the National Parks Conservation Association to reports that were solicited through emails. Parks provided their stories and then had the opportunity to look over submissions and make any edits that they felt necessary. In total, 15 parks, regions, and programs were included in the final report.

While this project was modeled after the *Community Study Report*, I wanted to gather case studies more systematically in order to analyze them scientifically. My approach extended beyond providing a number of examples from which those with similar projects could draw inspiration. It meant that the same information needed be gathered from each submitter so that thorough analysis could be performed to identify similarities among case studies. It meant that a number of parks and programs would need to answer the same questions so that an examination could be performed to check for congruencies in practice.

Initially, a template was collaboratively developed to guide contributors on what should be included in their submission. Several programs and offices at WASO – including the Archeology Program, the Office of Policy, and the New Superintendent’s Training Academy – developed several questions that submitters should answer in order to provide insight into their civic engagement experiences. Questions included: Who was involved? Why was the engagement necessary? What strategies did you use? What worked well, what didn’t? What most influenced the outcome of the engagement? Etc. The template, which was preceded by a contextual article, was released on the NPS intranet site, InsideNPS, on July 2, 2010.

The response to the InsideNPS call-out was lackluster. In all, one person showed interest in submitting a civic engagement example. It seemed that the only way to gather the information that was needed was to find examples of civic engagement happening across the NPS, and then try to schedule interviews from which more specific and systematic information could be gathered. Potential case studies were found by referring to the National Park Foundation’s website for their grant program “America’s Best Idea,” which grants money to parks that propose projects to connect with the public. The George Wright Society’s 2009 conference schedule was also consulted, and session participants who presented on civic engagement in the NPS were solicited for interviews. In addition to these two sources, word-of-mouth recommendations, as well as previous InsideNPS articles provided an ample number of people who had participated in civically engaged projects on behalf of the National Park Service.

⁹ Bowser, Gillian. “Community Study Report,” www.nps.gov/community/community_report.htm (2000)

After contacts had been identified, a number of inquiry emails were sent to gather more information about the projects, and thus determine whether a phone interview should be scheduled. Only two in-person interviews were scheduled, and they took place during a trip I took to Massachusetts in early July 2010. In all, I conducted 24 interviews, resulting in 15 case studies. Interviews ranged from 45 minutes to two hours, during which all interviewees answered the same questions so to ensure that all information gathered would be comparable. After each interview – or series of interviews that pertained to one example – concluded, I drafted each case study and then sent back to contributors so that they could edit for content, and then returned so that they could be finalized. After each draft had been edited and sent back to me, I went through each example once again to finish up any editing that needed to take place. After each of the 15 case studies was complete, they were uploaded into the qualitative analysis software, ATLAS.ti.

ATLAS.ti is computer software that allows users to organize data and analyses. However, prior to analysis I identified three categories present in each example: (1) previous levels of engagement, (2) strategies implemented, and (3) principles used. I had collected each example with those three categories in mind, and during analysis was better able to flesh out the subcategories in each.

I uploaded each case study into ATLAS.ti and coded them for categories and subcategories. Coding, in this program, allows the analyst to highlight, identify, and link like data. That is, I was able to find every instance in the case studies where the principle of ‘trust’ was exhibited. When trust was identified, it was highlighted and directly linked to every other portion of each case study in which trust was demonstrated. After every example had been coded, I reviewed, and re-reviewed each to ensure the validity of results.

The next step required that I set up a spreadsheet in which I could track the various coded data for presence/absence. Case study contributors (according to location) were input as row-headings, and the categories and subcategories utilized were put into the left-most column. Then, a simple ‘x’ was input for every case study that exhibited specific subcategories. This allowed for the data to be analyzed once it had all been included so that any correlations could be identified. However, the only correlations that existed were contained within the category ‘principles’.

After the various principles had been further analyzed for their relationship to one another, I used ATLAS.ti to create a visual web that would provide a visual for their interdependence. At this point I reviewed case studies so that I could better understand the how each of the principles informed the others. Core principles, or those that had been present in every example, had their importance reinforced through the web because each of the secondary principles were found to have supported a core principle. The resulting web can be found above in section entitled “Civic Engagement Principles.”

References Cited

- Bowser, Gillian
2000 *Community Study Report*. Electronic document,
http://www.nps.gov/community/community_report.htm. Washington DC: National Park Service.
- Diamant, Rolf; Laura J. Feller; David L. Larsen (eds.)
2006 *Scholars Forum: The National Park Service and Civic Reflection*. Philadelphia, PA: Northeast Region, National Park Service.
- National Park Service
2002 *The National Park Service and Civic Engagement: The report of a workshop held December 6-8, 2001, in New York City*. Philadelphia, PA: Northeast Region, National Park Service.
- National Park Service
2006 *Management Policies, 2006*. Washington, DC: Office of Policy, National Park Service.
- National Park Service
2007 [2003] *Director's Order 75A: Civic Engagement and Public Involvement*. Washington, DC: Office of Policy, National Park Service.

Further Information on Civic Engagement

National Park Service Publications

- Duffin, M.; D. Laven, E. Pranis, N. Mitchell and M. Camp
2009 *Engaging Young Adults in a Sustainable Future: Strategies for National Parks and Other Special Places – A front end evaluation report*. Woodstock, VT: Conservation Study Institute, National Park Service.
- Little, Barbara and Nathaniel Amdur-Clark.
2008 *Archeology and Civic Engagement*. Electronic document,
<http://www.nps.gov/archeology/pubs/techbr/tch23.htm>. Washington, DC: Archeology Program, National Park Service.
- Tuxill, Jacquelyn L. and Nora J. Mitchell (eds.)
2010 *Leading in a Collaborative Environment: Six Case Studies Involving Collaboration and Civic Engagement*. Woodstock, VT: Conservation Study Institute, National Park Service.
- Tuxill, Jacquelyn L.; Nora J. Mitchell, and Delia Clark.
2009 *Stronger Together: A manual on the principles and practices of civic engagement*. Woodstock, VT: Conservation Study Institute, National Park Service.
- Tuxill, Stephanie L. and Jacquelyn L. Tuxill

2007 *Learning to be Better Neighbors: Case Studies in Civic Engagement between National Parks and Neighboring Communities*. Woodstock, VT: Conservation Study Institute, National Park Service.

Other Referential Publications

Atlee, Tom et al.

2009 *Core Principles for Public Engagement*. Boiling Springs, PA: National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, with the International Association for Public Participation and the Co-Intelligence Institute.

Blatt, Martin.

2002 Civic Engagement at Sites of Conscience. *The George Wright Forum*, 19(4): 9-14.

Farrell, Betty and Maria Medvedeva

2010 *Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums*. Washington DC: American Association of Museums.

Force, Jo Ellen and Deborah J. Forrester.

2002 Public Involvement in the National Park Service Land Management Issues. *NPS Social Science Research Review*, 3(1):1-12.

Fung, Archon and Elena Fagotto

2009 *Sustaining Public Engagement: Embedded Deliberation in Local Communities*. East Hartford, CT: Everyday Democracy, with the Kettering Foundation.

Heierbacher, Sandy

2010 *Resource Guide on Public Engagement*. Boiling Springs, PA: National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation.

Leighninger, Matt

2010 *Creating Spaces for Change: Working Toward a "Story of Now" in Civic Engagement*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Leong, Kirsten M., John F. Forester, and Daniel J. Decker.

2009 Moving Public Participation beyond Compliance: Uncommon approaches to finding common ground. *The George Wright Forum*: 26(3): 23-39.

Linenthal, Edward T.

2008 The National Park Service and Civic Engagement. *The George Wright Forum*: 25(1): 5-11.

Masur, Jenny

2009 *Working with Traditionally Associated Groups: A form of civic engagement*. *The George Wright Forum*, 26(3): 85-94.

McMahon, Edward J.
2010 Heart and Soul Planning. *Shoreline*, 23(10): 1.

Potts, Rick
2007 *Changing Human Relationships with Wilderness and Wildlands: Implications for Managers*. *International Journal of Wilderness*, 13(3): 4-11.

Wood, Michael R.
2005 *Standards of Excellence in Civic Engagement: How public agencies can learn from the community, use what they learn, and demonstrate that public knowledge matters*. Bethesda, MD: The Harwood Institute.

Resources for Engaging Visitors in Difficult Dialogue

Abram, Ruth J.
2007 Kitchen Conversations: Democracy in Action at the Lower East Side Tenement Museum. *The Public Historian*, 29(1): 59-76.

Bormann, Tammy
2009 *The Art of a Good Question*. New York, NY: International Coalition of Sites of Conscience.

Sevcenko, Liz.
2004 *The Power of Place: How historic sites can engage citizens in human rights issues*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Victims of Torture.

Additional Case Studies

Craighead, Sarah
2002 Civic Engagement with the Community at Washita Battlefield National Historic Site. *The George Wright Forum*, 19(4): 44-49.

Gates, Laura and Nancy I.M. Morgan
2003 Report from the Field: The Whole is So Much Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts. *The George Wright Society Forum*, 20(2): 60-67.

Hays, Frank.
2003 The National Park Service: Groveling Sycophant or Social Conscience? Telling the Story of Mountains, Valley, and Barbed Wire at Manzanar National Historic Site. *The George Wright Forum*, 20(4): 73-80.

Society for Applied Anthropology
2002 *Restoring the Florida Everglades: Social Impacts*. *Environmental Anthropology*, Society for Applied Anthropology.