

Engaging Communities in Deliberative Dialogue for Success

Submitted by T Allan Comp and Kirsten Hagemann, November 2017

Contents

Introduction	3
Issue Guides	6
Animas Watershed Partnership – Ann Oliver	6
Appomattox Courthouse – Robin Snyder	8
Groundwork Hudson Valley - Nathan Hunter	11
San Antonio Historical Missions National Park - Anna Martinez-Amos, Melea Taylor, and Kristian Browning	13
Western Slope Conservation Center – Alex Johnson	16
United General Hospital District 304 –Marjie Bell	20
Learning Exchange Summaries	24
Learning Exchange #1 Summary	24
Learning Exchange #2 Summary	28
Learning Exchange #3 Summary	33
Learning Exchange #4 Summary	38
Learning Exchange #5 Summary	44
Final Interviews	50
Animas Watershed Partnership - Ann Oliver	50
Appomattox Court House - Robin Snyder	53
Groundwork Hudson Valley - Nathan Hunter	57
Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument – Jackie Leyba	61
San Antonio Historical Missions National Park - Anna Martinez-Amos, Melea Taylor, and Kristian Browning	65
Alex Johnson and Karen Ortiz – Western Slope Conservation Center	66
United General Hospital 304 - Marjie Bell	70
Reflective Questions	74
Animas Watershed Partnership - Ann Oliver	74
Appomattox Court House National Historical Park – Robin Snyder	77
Groundwork Hudson Valley – Nathan Hunter	84
Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument – Jackie Leyba	88
San Antonio Historical Missions National Park - Anna Martinez-Amos, Melea Taylor, and Kristian Browning	92
Western Slope Conservation Center - Alex Johnson	93
United General Hospital District 304 - Marjie Bell	100
Themes	107

Impact of Internal Support for the Engaging Communities for Success Projects.....	107
Unexpected Outcomes of the Engaging Communities for Success Project.....	110
Successes of the Engaging Communities for Success Project.....	113
Federal and Non-Profit Challenges.....	117
Biographies	120
Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Park	120
Western Slope Conservation Center	124
United General Hospital District 304.....	128

Introduction

This final report consists of two main sections. The first includes summaries of each of the five workshops, the issue guides developed by each site, interviews by the researchers with each of the participants, and personal reflections from each of the participating sites. It is meant to provide the background data and reflections that should be useful in addressing what follows. In the second section the researchers have developed four themes we found in analyzing the experiences of the sites and developed three biographies of individuals from three different sites that also provide insights into the experiences of the participants.

As a reminder, the researchers really had three goals, two both overt and obvious, the third perhaps more of an aspiration. The first hoped to introduce the participants to the whole world of Kettering research and experience around meaningful community engagement: naming and framing, developing issue guides, helping participants learn how to go far beyond their past experience in effectively engaging their communities with their respective organizations. The second goal was to introduce alignment as a contributing element in the community engagement process, to encourage not only deliberative dialogue around common interests, but bring new collaborative community action around the projects that addressed the issues developed and discussed. The third goal, at least for this researchers, was to expose the Kettering staff involved with this work to the potential utility of addressing alignment as a critical element in the Kettering community engagement process. It is the judgment of the two researchers that the first two goals were met with considerable success, even in some very challenging situations. Any success for the third goal will only be determined in the future.

The Kettering Foundation had its own goals for this project, which they revealed at the last learning exchange of the project. Their main goal was to learn what occurs when organizations go through the community engagement process. Previous research had indicated that professional groups had difficulty actually talking to their communities. The Kettering Foundation wanted to discover the extent, if even possible, an organization can be a part of the community as opposed to serving their community. What blocks or accelerates organizations from being a part of their community?

One important note about the sites and their participants needs to be made at the outset. While initially envisioned as a VISTA-and-Supervisor team effort for each site, it quickly became evident that a Supervisor-and-Board-Member participant team was both more effective and more likely to sustain any learning over time. Equally important, every one of the participating sites was initially a VISTA site, a poor community accustomed to neglect by decision-makers and seldom experienced in making decisions or carrying out actions on their own. Some participants were federal employee/leaders, others non-profit leaders, but all were determined, within their own context and capacity, to break with traditional top-down community engagement efforts and to better engage with their local community and to find ways to address common issues if possible.

The four themes presented here by the researchers were derived from our combined experiences in working with all these sites and their respective participants and reflecting on their experiences and the sometimes transformative changes we observed over the course of this two-year project. The SUCSESSES theme presents some of the most obvious and rewarding experiences of the participants. UNEXPECTED OUTCOMES surfaces the unanticipated and most welcome results

of community engagement coupled with a serious effort at alignment. INTERNAL SUPPORT examines the varied and critical role of support from both peers and supervisors and the consequences of changes in that support over the course of the project. Finally, FED/NON-FED examines the differences and challenges presented by the structures and requirements of Federal agencies (or at least their local expression as in a single park or monument), and non-profit or other collaborative organizations. To observe that the basic organizational structure of any participant will directly impact their strategy in building community participation and their potential for successful alignments is obvious and clearly confirmed in this theme.

Following the discussion of these four themes, we also offer three brief biographies of individual participants the researchers thought particularly illuminating – for the challenges they faced in creating and developing their issue guides, for the differing ways they were able to assemble a core of support and for the range of successes in alignment. ALEX is the classic non-profit in a small rural community, pulled in many directions, often forced by the decisions or processes of others into action, suspicious of “experts” from outside the community and deeply committed to both his community and his own organization. MARJIE is an unassuming but committed staff person serving an outside organization but living in the community and remarkably willing to reach beyond her experience with stunning success. Finally, ROBIN is a new National Park Service (NPS) Superintendent taking over a largely do-nothing park and determined to engage her community and find ways to align, even when NPS practice or policy might discourage such engagement.

We must observe that in each of these themes and each of these biographies, the importance of alignment—only as a part of the process, not a stand-alone effort -- in creating the successes these sites experienced cannot be over-stressed. All of the sites in this effort found the Kettering process stimulating, sometimes rigid, and ultimately rewarding – but those rewards were consistently defined as the result of new alignments created by a determination to transform issue-identification into action. It is those actions that transition community commitment into real alignments/actions of real benefit to the community. It is the observation of these researchers that communities, at least those in this project, clearly need to find the ways to openly discuss concerns and potential ways to address those concerns considered common. But they also need actual projects supported not only by the community but by those in a position to assist that community, no matter how poor, in actually addressing those concerns to enable new alignments and positive actions. Only the combination of community dialogue around issues and subsequent alignment with supportive organizations created the sustainable actions we can celebrate in this report.

Next steps?

This project is now at an end and it will be up to the Kettering Foundation to determine if further research around alignment is useful to the Foundation. For this two-year, five-workshop research, we found the basic organization workable, but would offer that in the basic division of time and thought to the Kettering Process and to Alignment (using an unfair stereotype term for both) to be slightly skewed. The first three workshops concentrated on the Kettering process and were indeed valuable to the participants. There was a brief introduction to Alignment in the third session, but only the fourth was able to address the topic in depth and the last session as almost totally devoted to hearing from participants. That basically means that 60% of the session time went to Kettering, 20% to Alignment and 20% to hearing from sites, not the balance the researchers initially anticipated. Should Kettering consider further research, we would suggest not less time for Kettering, but more

time for Alignment with no reduction in the time spent hearing from sites. While it is challenging to keep up the momentum of learning and community engagement over many months, it is equally challenging to develop an experienced understanding of the Kettering process, to then apply that process to alignment potentials and then extract some clear action of benefit to the community, an action that allows the sponsoring organization and its new partners a new sense of accomplishment and the community a clear benefit in addressing their concerns.

Respectfully submitted: T Allan Comp and Kirsten Hagemann, November 2017.

Issue Guides

Animas Watershed Partnership – Ann Oliver

What is the problem?

Many who live near the Animas River share a concern that the river is polluted by sewage and may not be safe to for people or fish. Residents question whether the river is able to withstand much more abuse and still support our quality of life. They wonder whether the Animas remains a resilient system capable of recovering from human-induced pollution. Some feel that the answer lies in more regulation of polluters and stronger enforcement of existing regulations. Others feel that more monitoring and education and better communication of information can address these concerns. Still others believe that individual voluntary actions will be sufficient to clean up the river. How can we protect the safety of our river for people and for fish?

Option 1: Increase regulation of polluters and strengthen enforcement of existing regulations.

Option Explanation: There are regulations at the Federal State and local level intended to prevent pollution. There are local examples of lax enforcement of these regulations and of a lack of punishment for violators. Some regulations and codes enacted by other communities have not been enacted here. Environmental regulators should be given more resources and support, and/or held accountable to enforce existing and enact new regulations. With more and better regulation, the river would be cleaner and safer.

But, some regulations are difficult and costly to enforce and can result in such high operating costs as to be detrimental to businesses, municipalities and communities.

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
Require more rural housing to connect to sewer systems	The cost of connecting some rural subdivisions to existing or new sewer systems may convert currently affordable housing to unaffordable housing for some residents.
Wastewater discharge violators should not be tolerated and should stopped and fined immediately.	Some wastewater problems take time to fix and service must continue or a larger problem is created. Also, small wastewater systems serve low income housing, e.g. privately owned trailer parks and closing them down will displace low income people who are not at fault.
Require regular maintenance of septic systems, with periodic inspections by the local Health Department.	The local health department staff is already overtaxed and underfunded. Some private landowners cannot afford to maintain or replace their septic systems.

Option 2: Enhance monitoring of and education about water quality, with improve communication and transparency of information.

Option Explanation: Not everyone understands the importance of water quality nor the risks of pollution. Distrust of some entities leads to distrust of data.

But, education and outreach cannot change the behavior of some of the most significant polluters.

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
Engage citizen scientists in data collection.	The quality of the data may not be sufficient for regulators or may not be trusted by the public.
An array of entities can work together to share and provide multiple sources of information.	Changing an institution’s culture can be difficult. This requires a degree of letting go of control and roles. It may be time consuming to develop partnerships around data, as well as difficult to sustain maintain.
Work with teachers to develop and implement curricula aimed at building a “water ethic”.	While important, educating school children on the best ways to steward their river takes a long time to pay off in terms of changes in behavior that create significant improvements in water quality.

Option 3: Encourage people, businesses and agencies to take voluntary action to improve water quality.

Option Explanation: People, businesses and governments depend on the services and quality of life provided by the river. They recognize and value the river as an integral part of their economic, environmental and social wellbeing. They will do what it takes to take care of it before it crosses any thresholds of health and resilience.

But, not all entities will or can voluntarily invest in cleaning or reducing their discharge or runoff.

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
Provide incentives to landowners, businesses and municipalities to clean up their discharge or runoff.	The scope of funding available for financial incentives may does not match the scale of the need for clean- up.
Celebrate and reward good water quality practices and stewards.	Recognizing appropriate or desirable behavior may not change the majority of polluters’ behavior. While they may (or may not) have a strong desire to adopt best practices they may not have the education, expertise, funding, staff or political support to implement those practices.
Publicly shame or bring legal action against violators.	This approach may be unevenly applied due to political forces and may create a negative and polarized atmosphere around water quality that could be counter-productive in the long run. Legal action is costly and does not always result in a change for the better.

Strengthening Economies and Building on Local Assets in a Small Town *How can we increase tourism and build community support in our region at the same time?*

Many rural communities and small towns are facing challenges with lack of industry and job opportunities. While these communities are looking for ways to strengthen their economies, provide a better quality of life, and build on local assets, many residents and community leaders do not readily see the value of tourism to stimulate the economy. Located in Central Virginia, Appomattox County is the home to Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, one of 417 units of the National Park System. A population of more than 15,000 is unaware that the Park annually serves 75,000 visitors who travel from across the country to see the site where General Robert E. Lee surrendered to Lieutenant General Ulysses S. Grant, effectively ending the American Civil War. Very few of these visitors include members of the local community.

Tourism partners and civic organizations in the county experience similar challenges. These community organizations are struggling with the capacity to market the natural, cultural, and recreational resources that make Appomattox special. They also struggle with their efforts to be relevant and to serve the local community. The Appomattox community comprises a variety of organizations that offer local audiences and visitors' opportunities for youth engagement, healthy recreation, arts and theater, and heritage tourism.

While the tourism groups represent a wide spectrum of programs and activities, they all agree that they have something special to offer. However, the majority of people in the region are not engaged in activities and events, nor do they support these organizations. As a result, the Town and County governments have not prioritized tourism in their annual budgets, specifically in the area of marketing the region.



Lack of interest and community participation can create operational challenges for the organizations who desire to serve the community. These same groups see an opportunity to benefit from the Park's annual visitation to meet their own goals of community engagement and increased economic development for the region.

This Issue Advisory presents a framework that asks: How do community organizations leverage their resources to be relevant to the community members they serve and to increase the economic development of the region?

OPTION ONE: Focus on the history.

Option	Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade- Offs to Consider
<p>Appomattox, VA already has a national story focused on the fighting and surrender that was the symbolic end of the Civil War. Most community members are aware of the Park and commonly refer to the Park as the Surrender Grounds.</p> <p>Since the Park attracts 75,000 visitors annually and is the focal point of the experience, area tourism sites should capitalize exclusively on the region’s Civil War History to market the region.</p>	<p>Require one marketing tag line that highlights the region’s Civil War history among all tourism entities and community organizations.</p>	<p>Other organizations without a direct connection to the park’s story will not benefit from this approach.</p>
	<p>Programs and activities of other organizations should provide a connection to the Civil War story.</p>	<p>Ignores the diversity of resources and stories among tourism and civic groups and assumes that everyone coming to the park is interested in the Civil War.</p>
	<p>Outreach to local audiences can be enhanced by offering free historical events at the “surrender grounds.”</p>	<p>Free events compete with partner organizations that need financial support for their programs. Assumes that local audiences are only interested in history.</p>

OPTION TWO: Use current demographic trends to guide decisions.

Option	Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade- Offs to Consider
<p>Millennials (born after 1980) are the new generation to watch. They are surpassing Baby Boomers (born 1946 – 1964) as the largest U.S. generation. They are also the most diverse generation in American history, with 43% being non-white.</p> <p>Multiple tourism groups and community partners are already engaging young people in education, employment, and service programs. They will benefit from focusing their individual brochures, websites, and Facebook Pages to this younger, diverse audience.</p>	<p>Target the experiences to younger, diverse audiences to attract new audiences to the region.</p>	<p>This ignores the primary visitor base of individuals 30 and above that are currently visiting tourism locations.</p>
	<p>Use youth focal groups to identify clever ways to market sites through a diversity of social media outlets.</p>	<p>Excludes other traditional methods of marketing and perspectives that are significant to a smaller, rural community.</p>
	<p>Community youth can offer perspectives to community organizations on how to target greater numbers of young people for their programs.</p>	<p>Youth participating are not reflective of the diversity in the community, so valuable perspectives will not be represented.</p>

OPTION THREE: Target ONE digital marketing campaign for the region.

Option	Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade- Offs to Consider
<p>To represent the varied community organizations with diverse interests and programs, a digital marketing campaign including a video, website, and Facebook Page can showcase multiple resources and leverage community offerings. This digital outreach can potentially serve both community members and visitors to the region.</p> <p>This option will require a “pay to play” process to ensure that funding is raised to manage the social media and digital marketing elements of the campaign.</p>	<p>Video can showcase a variety of tourism offerings including healthy recreation, youth programs, Civil War history, arts and theater, and local attractions for community members and visitors.</p>	<p>Video will only be able to showcase 6-7 resources within a 2 minute time slot, so many sites and organizations will not be represented.</p>
	<p>One website and Facebook page highlighting the Appomattox Experience will provide community members a one stop shop to learn about current events in the area.</p>	<p>Community members may not readily access social media for information about what is in their own backyard.</p>
	<p>Website and Facebook pages will provide visitors with comprehensive information about regional attractions so that they can plan their stay.</p>	<p>The cost to maintain this website and pay to play process may prevent key tourism partners from being represented in this campaign.</p>
	<p>A digital marketing campaign can reach increased numbers of visitors traveling to the area for greater reach to establish Appomattox as a tourist destination.</p>	<p>Many community members are currently not supportive of increased tourism as they do not want visitors interfering with their way of life.</p>

Groundwork Hudson Valley - Nathan Hunter

Food: How to offer healthier options and access to food items in Yonkers

In Yonkers, specifically on the west side, accesses to healthy food options are very limited. Most would agree that one of the largest challenges to accessing healthier foods is cost. Many see the easy availability of cheap processed and fast foods as being the reason for poor diet. Others see the limited number of grocery stores and lack of transportation as a road block to healthy food. In the end, most agree that high rates of heart disease, diabetes, and poor nutrition call for change to our food system.

Option 1: Affordable Healthy Food

Many site the main reason for not choosing healthy food is that it costs more. Increasing accessibility to healthy quality produce and food items is acknowledged by many as a human right.

What Might Be Done:

1. Working with state food agencies to extend subsidies or healthy food discounts to individuals who need the assistance
2. Explaining/Educating communities about true cost of food (why food is “so” expensive)
3. Offering free spaces to grow food

Trade-offs:

1. Although they may be healthy, prepared food is normally exempt from these subsidies and discounts
2. Educating lower income individuals about true cost of food could offend or come off as insensitive
3. Many may not know how to grow food or grow the most in a limited space

Option 2: Offer New Selections

Extending the offering of healthy food options in already available local shops and stores would creating opportunity for individuals to gain access to healthy foods.

What Might Be done:

1. Currently existing stores and food venues could extend their offerings to include healthier food options
2. Current stores could offer popular fresh produce items
3. Offering free recipes with food items

Trade-offs:

1. Embedded habits will prevent people from picking healthier options
2. Store owners would take on the risk and would take on loss if items are not bought
3. Individuals may not have access to cooking materials and tools

Option 3: Increase New Healthy Food Outlets

What Might Be done:

1. Create a Yonkers based food cooperative
2. Encourage city to attract additional healthy grocery stores
3. Make local CSA and Farmers Market options available for community members

Trade-offs:

1. Resources to start a food cooperative are be limited to nonexistent

2. City politics may cater to incoming gentrification wave and prices may be too high for local community members
3. Food items may be culturally irrelevant to the diverse community population

San Antonio Historical Missions National Park - Anna Martinez-Amos, Melea Taylor, and Kristian Browning

Green Spaces in America

How Do We Address a Growing Problem?

Many Park Rangers/COSA Parks and Rec employees/environmental stewards share a sense that something is wrong with how we address the problem of connecting people to parks to create the next generation of stewards.

This Issue Advisory presents a framework that asks: How can we better connect people to parks? How can we increase the number of park visitors? How can we help people care more about the environment?

What the issue is: Some segments of the community do not use parks, loss of green space/results in loss of protection of heritage identity, NPS irrelevant/ not diverse, parks becoming irrelevant, parks aren't cared for, parks protect natural/cultural heritage

Why something must be done: conservation, ecosystem, jobs/future careers, health, diversity, inclusivity

Option One: Discuss PEOPLE and concern about FAIRNESS

Option	Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
<p>Individuals with undiagnosed or untreated nature-deficit disorders create difficulties for themselves</p> <p>This option is attempting to remind people that parks are for everyone...natural and cultural community</p> <p>But many actions are expensive and there would be a co-opting of culture.</p>	<p>In person, personalized invitations and increased outreach to church/school groups</p>	<p>Cost increase, more staff needed</p> <p>Must talk to every group or else people will feel left out</p>
	<p>Require community service for all 4th grade students who receive an Every Kid in a Park pass.</p>	<p>“field trip mindset”</p> <p>People will only visit once and will not establish connections</p>
	<p>Create a media campaign to promote the use of parks</p>	<p>This will cost more money and people will question why</p>

	and educate people about the World Heritage designation. World Heritage-this is your heritage San Antonio	we are spending funds on this
--	--	-------------------------------

Option Two: Discuss PROGRAMMING/FACILITIES and concern about PERSONAL FREEDOM

Option	Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
People would be more likely to visit parks if there were more programs and facilities to use but it would be expensive and require more employees/contractors and could result in the “parks being loved to death.”	Trash, increase litter patrol and create penalties/fines for littering	More money and staff
	Diversify activities Selena movie Fishing classes	Some people will feel that this is not an appropriate use of the park Full classes-some people will sign up for all activities Funding Limited transportation
	Create more parking/loading zones	Lose green space More traffic Pedestrian accidents

Option Three: Discuss SAFETY and concern about COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Option	Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
Some people do not come to the park because they deem them unsafe. This option attempts to address that issue. If we add	Deal with the city-wide problem of stray animals which is especially pronounced in parks with more shelters, euthanasia	Public outcry, we’d be hated

<p>lighting, more patrols and capture stray animals people will feel like we are invading their privacy and view us as inhumane</p>		
	<p>Increase lighting and install security/surveillance cameras</p>	<p>Light pollution, higher bills, people will think parks have extended hours, invasion of privacy</p>
	<p>Increase patrols by law enforcement rangers</p>	<p>Park might seem like an armed camp Some in the community will feel uncomfortable, or even endangered by the presence of LE personnel Higher personnel costs</p>

Western Slope Conservation Center – Alex Johnson

Public Land planning on the Western Slope

What is the problem?

Residents of the North Fork Valley of Western Colorado are very worried about the future of their local economies, livelihoods, quality of life, and environmental health due to the rapid change in local, regional, and national energy development. Specifically, our communities are facing difficult decisions regarding how we actively manage public land planning with oil and gas pressures increasing within the North Fork of the Gunnison watershed.

The first option that local citizens have is to rely primarily on the pre-existing governmental decision-making framework for community engagement, which includes public comment periods for leasing, management plans, and other developments based on federal, state, and local laws and policies. The second option is to actively oppose the decision-making framework, through legal, political, and public methods, in order to create new frameworks and currently unlikely outcomes for public lands. The third option is to collectively engage in values-based creative placemaking as a community in order to inform and shape all relevant decision-making regarding the future of our public lands.

There is no simple answer to the problem of managing oil and gas activities within the North Fork Valley. However, our local communities and governing bodies must make difficult decisions regarding whether they support, oppose, or wish to engage in management of oil and gas activities and their impacts. Unfortunately, the question of oil and gas is polarizing community residents, organizations, and governments. This problem is not going away, and so there is significant need for collaborative, deliberative, and effective democratic decision-making regarding the future of oil and gas activities in the North Fork Valley.

Three Options

Option 1: Rely on the existing governmental decision-making framework for engaging local citizens in public land management planning

With the sharp decline in coal mining within our communities over the last two years, the local municipalities and counties are facing massive shortfalls in their annual budgets. Basic public services, including adequate policing, road repair, and utilities infrastructure, are being sacrificed, with local municipalities laying off staff. Oil and gas development would provide much needed tax revenue as well as job prospects for laid off miners. It does not appear that other local economies, like agriculture and tourism, will be able to fill the economic gap any time in the near future. For these reasons, our communities can support and trust federal decision-making framework to assess and mitigate negative impacts from oil and gas development.

But, there will most certainly be some negative impacts to our local air, water, wildlife, and economies from increased oil and gas activities. What’s more, it is impossible to know what those negative impacts will be until after they have occurred.

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
As communities, engage in status quo public land oil and gas leasing process by submitting comments during public comment periods, notifying authorities of concerns, interests, and possible impacts	Leasing, and corresponding oil and gas activity, would likely occur within the watershed. Agencies would assess concerns and impacts identified by community member. Some amount of tax revenue would be provided to counties and state
Encourage engagement of many individuals in public land management processes	Puts the responsibility on us, as individuals, to become educated and engage in highly bureaucratic processes; creates administrative burden on federal agencies to sort through comments
Support diverse and sustainable economic development, allowing laws and policies to assess and mitigate impacts of development on public lands	Requires trust between public and federal agencies regarding oversight to protect water and air; economic diversification takes many years, and would not directly support employees and their families currently hurt by decline in coal mining
Create a collaborative oil and gas group to keep lines of communication open between individuals, organizations, governing bodies, and oil and gas companies	Limited by federal laws governing information sharing; no direct authority of a body to affect outcomes; dependent on mutual trust which is currently non-existent

Option 2: Actively oppose the existing decision-making framework, through legal, political, and public methods, in order to create new frameworks and currently unlikely outcomes for public lands

The North Fork Valley is an incredibly unique region that boasts spectacular natural beauty, pristine rivers and air, world-class hunting and fishing, the highest-elevation viticultural area on the continent, the highest density of organic farms in the state, brand-new fiber-to-the-home Gigabit internet, and a burgeoning tourism and small business economy based on all of our remarkable amenities and quality of life. The known and unknown impacts of possible oil and gas activities within the area are entirely incompatible with the economic and cultural future of our communities.

Meanwhile, federal and state agencies have consistently proven that they are not effective at limiting industrial development and the corresponding negative impacts to water, wildlife, and air. For these reasons, our communities should actively oppose the current decision-making framework, which is rigged against our local culture, economies, and lifestyles.

But, this option can be very costly, burn political and cultural bridges, and result in a shortfall in short-term tax revenue and job growth from extraction industries

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
As communities, swamp oil and gas decision-making through a deluge of public comment in federal and state public land management processes	Would slow decision-making framework; would increase conflict with local oil and gas proponents and governing bodies; would require large amount of organizational and community organizing capacity; limited precedent for success
Litigate against land management agency decisions which allow oil and gas activities to continue	Could take years, with negative impacts occurring in the meantime; huge amount of financial and organizational resources required
Protest against oil and gas activity - using traditional and social media outlets as well as on-the-ground - to delay and stop oil and gas activity	Would put individuals in legal and physical risk; would escalate conflict between local community members

Option 3: Collectively engage in values-based creative placemaking as a community in order to inform and shape all relevant decision-making regarding the future of our public lands.

Based on what we know now, it is clear that there are real and direct negative impacts from oil and gas activities on surrounding land, water, air, wildlife, and communities. It is also clear that it is currently impossible to stop any and all oil and gas development from occurring within a given region of the western US. Our communities possess a deep, nuanced, and diversity of relationships to our surrounding public lands.

For these reasons, our communities should actively engage in a process of assessing, identifying, and publicly demonstrating the many values attached to the various places within our landscape. This creative placemaking will help inform future community discussion; empower individuals to engage in the existing decision-making framework; and find new solutions to managing our surrounding public lands into the future.

But, this option could take valuable time while existing decision-making processes move forward, risking irrelevance at best, and unchecked negative impacts to public lands at worst.

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
As communities, continue discussion of the North Fork Alternative and other “citizen alternatives” in land management processes	The North Fork Alternative (NFA) was developed based on specific resource concerns in the context of the BLM Resource Management Plan. Future discussions could expand the concerns, context of the plan, and other updates for addressing those concerns; the NFA is currently tied to BLM decision-making, and is focused on oil and gas
Include oil, gas, and coal companies in discussion of which lands are most valuable for industry, and look at the areas of greatest conflict with wildlife, recreation, and other concerns	Could be viewed by concerned citizens as negotiating away prime lands; may be unable to get all parties to the table
Host public meetings for creative placemaking and mapping to produce functional materials for managing lands for common values	If not carefully facilitated, could exacerbate deep-seated conflicts; some individuals may be unlikely to disclose highly-valued locations; Could be difficult to cultivate engagement if outcomes and relevancy are not clearly defined at
Develop long-term landscape-level plan for permanent protections of highly valued locations	Could take years, with negative impacts occurring in the meantime; dependent on Congressional or Executive action; huge amount of resources required

United General Hospital District 304 –Marjie Bell

Issue Guide:

What is the problem?

Communities in Eastern Skagit County, of which the Town of Concrete is the hub, suffer from a number of persistent problems typical of a community that owed its economic stability to resource extraction industries. The closing of the cement plant and quarry in 1970, followed by declines in the logging and fishing industries in the 1980's created a void in organized community enrichment projects. In earlier years, the local industries were often the real impetus for many civic improvements and services. The closing of the main industry and the dramatic curtailment of the others also created an ongoing shift in the demographics and employment opportunities. As workers were forced to disperse over a wide area to find employment, their commute times were stretched to sometimes hours each way. Those lost hours, in an earlier time, were spent being involved in community activities. Workers no longer worked together, ate lunch together, or shared stories and feelings about the successes and failures in their lives. They lost the sense of connection to their neighbors, which is the foundation for community--of belonging to something more than your individual self. Some piecemeal projects have been attempted to solve specific shortcomings, but the real answer is to develop projects that re-establish that sense of community, of becoming citizens again in the much larger sense of the word--people who take active interest and participate in the civic life of their community.

The shift in demographics has resulted in some positive changes, but has also compounded some others. At the same time locals were searching for new jobs in able to survive, large numbers of more affluent arrivals began settling in the community. The culture clash with these new arrivals continues today because they threaten the old ways of life and old values that were part of the area's rich tradition. The families already established there are traditionally blue-collar workers, where the newcomers are white collar workers, or are retired. The open spaces and remoteness of the area have been an attraction to another segment that has grown dramatically over the past few years--that of the unemployed and unemployable. A lack of local education/training and employment opportunities, as well as the other programs to help people out of the cycle of homelessness, drug abuse and addiction, and other self-destructive behaviors, has done little to stem this growing tide. This growth has spawned, not just tension, but resentment, towards those needed services and those who don't.

Several approaches are being taken to address some of the specific issues that keep the different factions apart, but so far, they lack pursuing the uniting theme of community development as a whole. Notable successes are: 1) United General Hospital District 304's partnership with Concrete School District to coordinate the Community Prevention and Wellness Initiative and Concrete Resource Coalition, Farm to School, and Concrete Summer Learning Adventure programs; 2) Community Action's activities providing a safety net for those in dire need; and 3) the Town's emerging Economic Development initiative. The focus of both Community Action and the Town is largely on the adult population. Those efforts focus on current needs. If we want to put an end to some of these issues in the future, our first priority should be to focus on the youth. No stand-alone approach will be an effective long-term solution. For that, an integrated collaborative effort to improve outcomes for the community must logically build on

successful existing partnerships to build a greater sense of community. To be successful, such an initiative must include a wide range of partners from industry, school, health, recreation, government, social service, foundation, civic, and community sectors. That raises the question: How do we maximize limited resources to support the youth, the community, and future economic development in our east county communities?

The challenge was identifying a common interest from which to develop some cohesion for a single project to start unifying the different factions.

Option 1: Create Educational and Developmental Opportunities for Youth.

Option Explanation: Concern for our youth is one of the most common bonds between people. Using that common concern and addressing it, can begin to strengthen the bond to others in the community. The strategy of how this Option is implemented is crucial because it can become the foundation on which to build participation and cooperation in the other ventures laid out in Options 2 and 3. A high percentage of youth leave the area because they see few local opportunities for either personal or professional growth. Those that remain tend to remain at subsistence level, meeting their basic physical needs, but unable to achieve what has become the American dream. Those opportunities should not just focus on preparing the youth to leave, but to stay, to become involved, and to make the community grow. Adults collaborating on a common concern will encourage citizenry, which involves more than just your legal status; it’s about responsibility to others.

But, creating jobs without addressing work readiness skills and related support would be shortsighted. Existing employers already struggle with finding and retaining qualified workers who have the basic skills they need to be a reliable employee, and residents consistently cite lack of child care as a barrier to employment.

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
Establish collaboration between the Concrete School District and the Boys and Girls Clubs, to open a facility in the community.	Creating a structured, safe place for children to go before and after school while their parents work, will allow more parents the ability to participate in both the workforce and efforts to advance their employment opportunities. Operation of such clubs requires the cooperation of parents, volunteers, and established agencies.
Provide a location for other programs to develop or be hosted.	Utilizing the structure of an existing youth organization will promote the presentation of other programs.
Use the club as a basis to re-establish contacts between the adults in the community.	Initially, the percentage of adults willing to volunteer or to participate in the programs will be small.

Option 2: Rebuild a Sense of Community and Citizen Involvement.

Option Explanation: A society (and community) is only as strong as its weakest link. This option helps people understand they are more than just individuals; they are part of a community of other people with differing likes, opinions, needs, and abilities. Each person has something to

contribute to a community’s success. Deliberate efforts to organize volunteer efforts and cooperation on mutually beneficial projects will help bridge gaps between people and provide a sense of pride that has greatly diminished over the years. The Concrete community has a small band of stalwart volunteers that are aging and few people have the same, learned spirit of volunteerism. An essential skill that marks a volunteer is the willingness to work together with others and to cooperate. This is sorely missing.

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
Through community input, identify small projects that have a wide basis of support. Enlist new volunteers for small, manageable portions and pair them with compatible veteran volunteers as mentors.	Expanding the volunteer pool will prove difficult and finding the right projects to garner interest may prove contentious.
Establish a community skills data bank to utilize not just the best at a particular skill, but the best mentors.	Currently, the volunteer base is small and people avoid getting “sucked-in,” for fear of a continuing commitment.
Provide incentives for those unemployed to participate and ensure proper credit is given to them via news releases and job recommendations.	It will be difficult to define the value of participating to many who have grown to believe that their entitlements don’t come with responsibilities.

Option 3: Prepare a Skilled Workforce, Ready for Economic Opportunities.

Option Explanation: Preparation begins at an early age. United General District 304 and Concrete School District have partnered in developing a Farm to School and Concrete Summer Learning Adventure program for youth development and food systems experiences. This early exposure to not only work, but the fruits of their labor could be a catalyst for growing youth who are skilled and ready to work. Additional collaboration with the Town, Community Action, local employers and other organizations would enable us to build on existing successes, share resources, and align existing and future efforts. Partners working together to develop a seamless continuum of learning and supporting experiences, in and out of the classroom, could prepare today’s students for tomorrow’s job and career opportunities—especially within the local food economy.

Examples of What Might Be Done	Some Consequences and Trade-Offs to Consider
Implement food systems workforce development internships and jobs in tandem with a wide range of school and community partners.	Partner organizations might experience “mission creep” and be unable to dedicate resources outside their primary mission.
Develop farm business incubators to create entrepreneurship opportunities.	Participants might not possess the interest, skills, and financial resources this option requires.
Prepare students with basic job skills to work in a service economy.	Low-wage service jobs do not contribute to long-term health and prosperity.

Bring back community college classes that are held in the local area, rather than 35 miles away.	If direct education classes are not feasible, explore the options for tutored, distance learning.
Proactively work with the Town of Concrete in the process of encouraging businesses and industry to locate in the Upper Skagit Valley.	Some potential new companies will not materialize. Initially, work skills training and education should focus on non-specific, transferable skills.
Develop higher expectations for themselves, their families, and their community.	Unless more economic opportunities are created, higher expectations will only speed the exodus of youth seeking them.
Offer high-quality job and career fairs, mentoring, and internship/apprenticeship opportunities.	There may not be enough mentors or work-related or opportunities to go around.
Coordinate with Community Action and local employers to develop a social business enterprise.	The same employers will be continually tapped into, potentially leading to burnout and compassion fatigue.
Coordinate with Community Action to launch an intensive wrap-around program for the most vulnerable: chronically unemployed, high school dropouts, etc.	Might experience a backlash from residents who resent resources being allocated in this way. Does not lead to long-term self-reliance.

Learning Exchange Summaries

Learning Exchange #1 Summary

Dayton, Ohio

February 24th-25th 2016

Learning Exchange #1

The first learning exchange began with introductions of the participants to the researchers and the moderators from the Kettering Foundation. Each participant stated their name, their site, the work that they do at their site, and why they were interested in the Engaging Communities for Success research initiative. Dr. Comp relayed the story of how he came to think of this project, at a Kettering workshop back in 2011. He then explained how he chose the participants and that they were selected from over 100 possible OSMRE/VISTA and DOI/VISTA sites.

After the introductions, Dr. Comp and the moderators from the Kettering Foundation went over what the project was going to attempt to accomplish and how they were going to do it. For the researchers, Dr. Comp placed significant emphasis on the accomplishments of the project. He wanted to ensure that the participants knew that having tangible results from better engagement and effective alignment are the outcome expected from the project. The project participants to have a process that they can utilize over and over again in their communities and as a model for other sites as well. During this time, the project was reviewed - the timeline, projects, and homework - so all of the participants were on the same level before the workshop really began. The moderators showed the “Blobs & Squares” video to the participants. It described the relationship between community members and the establishment. “Blobs & Squares” is an example of challenges people face when thinking in practical ways and about how to deal with problems in a more democratic way. The video was not universally accepted - some participants pushed back against the video because it is only one way to engage and they had different experiences with the democratic process.

After the introduction of the Kettering Foundation and what it actually does, the learning exchange moved into the nature of public problems. The moderators asked each participant to state, from their memo questions, how decisions get made at each site. The participants had a variety of answers, but most stated that important officials and stakeholders made the decisions. The moderators posed the following questions to the participants:

- What have you observed in your communities when experts attempt to engage citizens around collective problems?
- What kinds of problems are amenable to public deliberation?
- How might we help surface compelling problems?

In regards to the first question, representatives from National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management were in agreement with the small nonprofits that attended. For both, the communities resist the opinions of experts because the experts are speaking on a different level than community members or experts are simply not trusted. By starting the engagement process from the community, experts would not be the main decision makers - citizens would be. They were excited to move forward with the project. The participants focused in on the discussion amenable problems for public deliberation - “wicked” problems. A wicked problem does not

have a simple solution and the cause is multi-faceted. It cannot be solved definitively by a single answer. Wicked problems lend themselves well to public deliberation. Once participants understood wicked problems, it gave them ideas as to which issues to consider for the deliberative dialogue and alignment process.

After the questions were discussed, the learning exchange moved towards an exercise. Participants were split up into four different groups, with a moderator from Kettering taking the lead. The moderator told their small group to think about how they typically make decisions and then decide what the decision making process would be from a community based approach. Answers were generally the same for the typical decision making process. The participants stated that they would bring in experts or go through managers before the public even knew what was going on. They would frame issues through outreach and events before going into an online comment period, which is underutilized by the public. In the community deliberation column, participants began to realize that conversations with the community were the necessary first step. They also discussed building up networks and alignment as an important step in the decision making process. Through this exercise, participants began to see how their own decision making approaches either mirrored a typical decision making process or the community based approach. Internal reflection regarding meaningful public engagement proved to be an important theme across the whole learning exchange.

The participants were selected because they are deeply involved and cared about their respective communities. It was no surprise that during the decision making exercise they began to look at their own internal process and criticize it. One participant shook her head and was shocked by how rigid her site was about engagement. For her site, engagement was a top down process. Her site had been providing solutions for problems that the community did not even believe to be problems. For the sites that utilized comment periods, the participants felt that it was a bureaucratic way of checking the box for engagement but it did not really engage the community. Some felt that their sites were just going through the motions of “engagement”. These types of realizations happened to all of the participants during the first learning exchange. They were all willing to try to help their communities and were learning that they were dictating the help, rather than communities voicing their own concerns.

Moderators then explained how to convene concern gatherings and provided two worksheets for participants. One worksheet was a survey example that participants could use to hand out during town meetings or when community members visited their site. The questions are open-ended as to not lead community members to problems that the participants want to hear from them. The second worksheet was a script for participants to utilize when convening their concern gatherings. It provided questions and how to bring up the issue that participants are trying to gather concerns around. After these worksheets were handed out, the moderators and researchers took questions regarding concern gatherings. Some questions revolved around what was appropriate as a concern gathering. Other questions were around the issue that participants would choose. They had been confused that they had to revolve their project around huge issues, like mental health in their community. The moderators and researchers reassured participants that they could narrow the issue. An example of an appropriate, narrower issue would be “What are your concerns about the river?” These questions closed out the first learning exchange.

Participants enjoyed having a place to think and to discuss community engagement without having ideas or deadlines pushed upon them to deliver a perfectly engaged community. The first learning exchange introduced the Kettering Foundation - both as an organization and their approach to democracy - to participants. Moderators, researchers, and participants got to know each other, the sites they work at, and the challenges in relation to engagement and alignment. Participants also began to realize differences between the typical decision making process and the community based decision making process, which added to the context of the research process. The concern gathering that turned into a deliberative dialogue provided participants with an example of how to go about the naming and framing part of the research project. As it was the first learning exchange, there was an exchange of ideas and opinions, but the main focus was getting to know one another and the Kettering Foundation.

For the researchers, this learning exchange was the realization of an idea that had begun in 2011. To see the idea in action is an opportunity to learn how community engagement and alignment can be utilized in each community. While the first learning exchange focused on community engagement, the researchers learned that while many participants were trying to engage with their communities, they were stuck in a typical top down decision-making process. Researchers noticed that the participants were quick to accept the Kettering Foundation's naming and framing process as well as the foundation as a whole. Researchers gained context about the participants and the naming and framing process.

Participants

Animas Watershed Partnership

Ann Oliver, Watershed Coordinator

Appomattox Courthouse National Historic Park

Robin Snyder, Superintendent

Groundwork Hudson Valley

Curt Collier, National Youth Programs Director

Nathan Hunter, Assistant Director to Land and River Programs

Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument

Jackie Leyba, Monument Supervisor

Abran Alvarez, Lead Park Ranger

San Antonio Missions National Historical Park

Anna Martinez-Amos, Park Ranger for Community Outreach

Melea Taylor, Park Guide

Kristian Browning, DOI/VISTA

United General District 304

Marjie Bell, Program Planner/Grant Writer

Western Slope Conservation Center

Alex Johnson, Executive Director

Karen Ortiz, Board Member (Treasurer)

Researchers

T Allan Comp, PhD

Kirsten Hagemann

The Kettering Foundation

Phil Lurie, Program Officer

Alice Diebel, Program Officer

Brad Rourke, Program Officer

Kentucky Environmental Foundation, Fiscal Sponsor

Betsy Taylor, Executive Director, Livelihoods Knowledge Exchange Network a program under
Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Heather Warman, Executive Director, Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Learning Exchange #2 Summary

Washington, D.C.

April 28th-29th 2016

Learning Exchange #2

The second learning exchange began with reintroductions of the participants. For some, it was their first time at a learning exchange with the Kettering Foundation as they had been unable to attend the first learning exchange. The learning exchange delved in to content following the introductions with the moderators of the exchange discussing the content of the concern gatherings sent in by participants. Participants tended towards having one on one informal interviews with community members as their concern gatherings, or large gatherings with more than five people. Both of these types of concern gatherings are acceptable as additional concern gatherings, but should not be the basis of what is drawn for the issue statements. The moderators from the Kettering Foundation were concerned about how the participants posed questions and how the concerns gathered by the participants were expressed. Previous concern gatherings are also included in a supplemental fashion. Redefining a concern gathering and giving participant's time to convene more concern gatherings course corrected the project for many participants.

The first day of the learning exchange was spent in a concern gathering exercise around the question of the nature of engagement between what participants represent and their community. This issue is perfect example of a complex issue with no definitive solution, the cause of the issue is unclear, and every solution has tradeoffs. Participants voiced their concerns surrounding the issue. Some concerns were:

- Most agencies don't reflect the demographics of the community
- Defining what the community is? What distinct groups make up the community?
- There are deep cultural traditions that can thwart efforts and exacerbate the problems but are real and must be understood and respected.
- How to reconcile agency goals with community-based problems? Is a national park going to solve mental health problems? What is the role of the park related to this problem, if any?
- What does community engagement do for solving the problem? Is this an effective and appropriate use of my time, given the problem?

The concern gathering exercise was easy for participants; they spoke freely of the concerns regarding this issue. There was a noted focus on government and their relationships to communities. This focus might have been due to number of representatives from National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management within the participant group or due to the fact that a nonprofit has less rigid rules of engagement with their local community. By the end of the morning, the group had voiced over forty concerns.

While the morning had gone smoothly, it was during the afternoon exercise that participants began to question the process. Voicing opinions is easy - everyone is entitled to one and no one had to disagree or agree with the opinions were stated. The clustering process - taking those opinions, figuring out the concern, and then grouping the concerns into a column, was the most difficult part of the learning exchange. To cluster properly, participants had to parse out the

underlying concern underneath the opinion. There were three types of concerns: an actual concern, a diagnosis of a problem, and what we need to do is x, y, and z. The third type of concern is usually spoken by experts. The moderators jumped from concern to concern while instructing participants that when they cluster, they should go in order of the concerns listed. This led to confusion regarding the proper procedure when clustering and participants struggled to discover the real concerns underneath the opinions. The participants all agreed that clustering was a difficult process and should be done by a small group of people. During the exercise, there were twenty people weighing in on what the real concerns were and which column they should be clustered under. This led to frustration for the participants, but all agreed that it was due to such a large and like-minded group. But the frustration was a good thing. It allowed the group to question the process with moderators from Kettering and researchers present. Therefore, it gave them a chance to ask questions and go through examples so when participants are going through the clustering process on their own, they have already hit and passed the roadblocks.

In addition to grouping concerns, the cluster process should also consider the drawbacks to each column. This will ensure that each column has tradeoffs and that one column is not the easy answer to the overall issue. These columns provide the base for an issue guide that will be written by participants before the third learning exchange. Near the end of the day, the group clustered the following concerns into three different columns:

Heal & Hear	Internal Processes & Mechanisms: Reworking Mission	Building Capacity for Better Decisions
Elites are controlling what the agenda is People are hard to reach Us vs. them disconnect Inclusivity Make voices heard Dirt floor - respect and empathy for poverty.	Bureaucracy Too technical Missions too narrow Our community is not clearly defined We are not representative of our communities Solutions sometimes ineffective “We are not doing the work” The onus is on us Cultural traditions	Culture People don’t know what they want Hierarchy of needs - what is most important and least important to the community
Draw Backs		
Disconnect between two groups	Staff changes Mission for a reason	Paternalistic Treats citizens as consumers
Institutional inertia informs all 3 columns		

Language emerged as an important theme in the first day both in discussions around concern gatherings and clustering. The language participants and community members utilize in this research process illuminates the difficulty of community engagement. The word “engagement” has an impact on how community members perceive the project and the participants. During a one on one discussion in a concern gathering, a participant (Groundwork Hudson Valley) interviewed Citizen A. Citizen A is a concerned citizen who believes that organizations think “outreach” is the same as “engagement”. Outreach according to Citizen A is

short term and wide reaching with high turnout and just as high turnover. Engagement for Citizen A, on the other hand, is long term and deep, requiring the building of relationships and sustainable partnerships. During the second learning exchange, participants reflected deeply on Citizen A's "engagement or outreach" distinction. What emerged from that conversation was participants realizing that what they were really trying to do was engagement - but using the word "engagement" was important. Participants realized that language is important to the deliberative dialogue process. Which words are deployed by participants and community members during concern gatherings will impact future deliberative forums. For Groundwork Hudson Valley, the words outreach and engagement are now going to the foundation for the issue guide and how their organization interacts with the local community.

The discussion of word use did not end with "engagement" vs. "outreach", it continued to the clustering exercise. Participants voiced their personal concerns about the nature of engagement between what the participants represent and the communities they serve. These concerns ranged from how to locate invisible communities to working with deep seated cultural traditions - within their own organization and within the communities. Going back to unpack their personal statements and to find out the real concern behind their frustrations was difficult for the group, even though they had just voiced them the same day. The clustering process proved to be a struggle with the group. Some participants felt that certain concerns should be phrased differently or that a concern was the same as another concern, only worded differently. Once the concern had been phrased in a way everyone agreed, it then had to go into a column that all the participants agreed upon. These issues of language bogged down the clustering process almost to a halt. This halt happened with a group of like-minded and similarly educated participants. This clustering exercise demonstrated that language is essential to the success of the project moving forward. Language can create, ease, or harden the process of clustering. Language can reveal biases from community member or participants. It can also prevent participation in the engagement process if community members feel the concerns or the issue guide are in a language too difficult to understand.

The second day of the learning exchange focused on the second aspect of the research project: alignment. Dr. Comp, the lead researcher for the project sponsor, the Friends of the OSM VISTA Team, presented on a nonprofit project, AMD&ART. The impetus was to create a passive treatment site for acid mine drainage in a small town of Vitondale in Pennsylvania and the nonprofit wanted to create something that was more than just a passive treatment site. Dr. Comp and his AmeriCorps assistants led the project over many years. Dr. Comp worked with the community, through surveys and community meetings, to give citizens the chance to voice what they want. Almost every suggestion they came up with ended up in the site. This was the first time that the community was able to voice what they wanted. Vitondale was a classic old coal mining town; it was managed completely by the coal company and once the coal company left, the town struggled to create a democracy. Dr. Comp met with all different sections of the community to try and build new partnerships for the success of the project. Dr. Comp described the process of gaining partners from both expected organizations, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, and unexpected organizations, such as a construction company to donate their time to create roads and diverse funding interests. His advice was to look at whom you normally talk to, then think of groups you've never thought to speak of and get a meeting with them. Alignment is the building of networks to create tangible results in the community and

working only with the same people an organization has always worked with will hinder that effort. The AMD&ART project was the stepping stone for other similar projects in different regions and showed the universality of the alignment process. Participants gained insight and understanding of alignment, which until this point had been a vague concept. Providing multiple examples and pathways to create alignment cleared up what alignment is and how it works in tandem with naming and framing.

In the example of AMD&ART, Dr. Comp and his team were able to build internal and external support for the project. The support system that participants receive from their own organizations also emerged as an important takeaway from the second learning exchange. Some organizations, such as Groundwork Hudson Valley, have sweeping support for the Engaging Communities for Success Project and the organization believes in community engagement and learning from community members. Groundwork Hudson Valley has changed how it interacts with community members just from the experience of the first two learning exchanges. They are more conscientious of their language and how they approach community projects. Other organizations that have strong support have utilized the tools from this project to benefit the community, such as when creating a survey, to have open ended questions so citizens are not lead to the answers that the organization wants.

But support for the project is not universal. Others struggled internally with their organizational bureaucracy to recognize the importance and relevancy of the project. This hindered their process of concern gatherings and put the project in danger. The internal support from organizations has proven to color the process for participants. Researchers moving forward will be checking in with each participant to ensure that their organizations are continuously behind the project and work with participants who are having difficulties.

The second learning exchange emphasized the importance of language during the naming and framing process - both how words are used with community members and how organizations, funders, and partners are all trying to help, but might be speaking at different levels. The terms “engagement” and “outreach” were a focus. Language can also impact the research process, exemplified by the clustering exercise. Participants found it difficult to phrase the concerns and be in agreement with each other. Clustering is a task that participants will have to do at their site, but not without the support of the Kettering Foundation and the researchers. Aside from language, internal support proved to be an important aspect of the research as well. Those that had the support were doing significantly more than those without support and the different was evident in the second learning exchange.

Researchers had working knowledge of how language affects community engagement and alignment prior to this learning exchange. The importance of language was included in the research proposal. This does not mean that researchers did not learn from this second learning exchange. Researchers gained perspective on how even simple words in everyday use, such as “outreach” vs. “engagement” can have an effect on communities that have been promised help continuously over decades. One participant stated that his community is traumatized from repeated broken promises under the guise of “outreach”. The use of language goes beyond semantics in the places that the participants and researchers work. Researchers also felt that participants learned about alignment in a non abstract sense for the first time. Alignment does not

have a set process - it depends on the community and the participants. Participants gained an example of alignment and researchers learned that it is important to emphasize that this is new for both participants and Kettering. It was encouraged not to follow the AMD&ART example completely, but to simply think more broadly about the network of wider interest that are the community and how to best include as many of those interests as possible in any public decision-making process.

Participants

Animas Watershed Partnership

Ann Oliver, Watershed Coordinator

Appomattox Courthouse National Historic Park

Robin Snyder, Superintendent

Groundwork Hudson Valley

Curt Collier, National Youth Programs Director

Nathan Hunter, Assistant Director to Land and River Programs

Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument

Jackie Leyba, Monument Supervisor

San Antonio Missions National Historical Park

Anna Martinez-Amos, Park Ranger for Community Outreach

Melea Taylor, Park Guide

Kristian Browning, DOI/VISTA

United General District 304

Marjie Bell, Program Planner/Grant Writer

Western Slope Conservation Center

Alex Johnson, Executive Director

Karen Ortiz, Board Member (Treasurer)

Researchers

T Allan Comp, PhD

Kirsten Hagemann

The Kettering Foundation

Phil Lurie, Program Officer

Alice Diebel, Program Officer

Brad Rourke, Program Officer

Scott London, Consultant

Kentucky Environmental Foundation, Fiscal Sponsor

Betsy Taylor, Executive Director, Livelihoods Knowledge Exchange Network a program under Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Heather Warman, Executive Director, Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Learning Exchange #3 Summary

Dayton, Ohio

October 17th-18th 2016

Learning Exchange #3

The third learning exchange in the series focused on moderator training and analyzing the issue guide drafts that participants had been asked to complete prior to coming to Dayton. This changed from the original learning exchange that had been proposed near the beginning of the project. It was deemed that analyzing the issue guides would need to take up most of what had originally been allocated to alignment. Thus, alignment was only mentioned for “homework” for the next learning exchange, which will completely focus on alignment.

The learning exchange began with participants introducing themselves and presenting a three minute Power Point with only pictures of their respective sites. This presentation was meant to give other participants and researchers context to the places that each participant talks about. The purpose of the presentations was to show everyone in the group a real place and the context in which each participant is coming from. The presentations were also a reminder of how diverse the backgrounds of the participant group are and that diversity benefits the project. All agreed this was a useful presentation that probably should have been one at learning exchange 2. The first day focused on moderator training from Martin Carcasson, a new researcher we have not met before and a professor at Colorado State University. The training focused on the basics of moderation a deliberative forum due to time constraints. Martin stated that “lots of people are communicators but can’t elevate communication”, which provided the backbone of the training. Participants were provided with guides on how to facilitate, so when they go back to their sites, they are able to reference the training that was provided. An important point that was made was that each person has their own style of moderating and that they will discover their own style.

There were group exercises where each participant got a chance to be the moderator with feedback from other group members. Many participants were unsure of how the group exercises would go, as they were confused and slightly overwhelmed by the process. When they got into groups and really started to have a conversation about the sample issue guide, which was about the wicked problem of drug abuse, the participants were surprised about how easy it was to get into deep conversation. Each participant had a chance to moderate for one of the options and get feedback from other members of the group. The participants realized it not about providing additional information to the group, but asking open ended questions that helped facilitate the conversation. Once they felt comfortable, some participants tried to deliberately do the wrong thing so they would have feedback from others. Nathan Hunter from Groundwork Hudson Valley directly contradicted a researcher’s comment while facilitating, which lead to a conversation about how to insert a possible “right” answer without appearing to have a bias as a moderator. Rosa Rodriguez from Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument stated that while it was a difficult exercise, she found it very helpful after everyone had given her advice. Participants gained confidence during the group exercises and by the end of the session, they felt somewhat more comfortable going back to their sites and moderating their own forums. It did occur to the Researchers (Dr. Comp and Ms. Hagemann) that this learning might have been better placed prior to the issue guide development.

After learning how to moderate a deliberative forum with a sample issue guide, the learning exchange moved on to the analysis of participants' issue guides in preparation of participants holding deliberative forums with their own issue guides. One theme that emerged from the analysis of the issue guides was "public" vs. "private" issue guide questions. A private issue may be technical in nature and has a "how can we serve you" emphasis while a public issue should be wicked and ensure that everyone has a stake in the issue. The issue guide from Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument focused on the budgetary restrictions of access to public lands. While it has a component of a public issue, it is in fact a private issue. The budgetary restrictions are an administrative or technical issue and are something the public cannot deliberate on the best option to go forward on. The only option is to fix the budget therefore the question does not cultivate civic engagement like a more "public" issue question would. Many private issues end up being focused on the organization that is asking the questions rather than the public. These issues can be solved through problem solving - something that wicked problems cannot be solved by. The options within private issues tend to have a "status quo" option, which asks people to choose to keep things as they were. This is to be avoided in creating an issue guide, as keeping the status quo is not an option to fix a wicked problem. A way to change Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument question to a public issue is to ask instead "How do we increase access to public lands?" It does not limit the public's engagement and does not focus on an organization problem solving a simple issue. The discussion of private issues lead the participants to discuss the difficulties of mandates and working within the context of the federal government. While not all of the participants work within the federal government, all of them have direct partnerships with government agencies. Even between Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument, a BLM site, and San Antonio Missions, a NPS site, the mandates are very different and lead to different perspectives when dealing with the public. BLM's "how to do we manage" vs. NPS's "How do we make sure parks are ____" makes any issue guide between the two more complex than just access to public lands. While many participants are focusing on access to public lands, these different mandates and contexts within which each participant operates will ensure that the specific question and options created will be quite different.

While the distinction between public and private issue guides is important, participants also discussed how their options can be either action-based or value-based. Researchers at Kettering reminded the participants that they should not mix strategy with options. The options should be value-based and broad ideas rather than an action plans that try to solve the problem. The public needs to decide on which values they deem appropriate to attempt to solve a wicked problem before they should decide on actions. Participants were encouraged to get out of the expert mindset and out of thinking they needed to fix everything right away. Giving action options to the public does not tease out the underlying tensions. Robin Snyder of Appomattox Court House expressed concern that all of her options were action based and that she had to redo her concern gatherings because she had only spoken to entities rather than the public. Other participants disagreed with the idea of the participant having completely redo their concern gatherings because those entities are part of the community as well. The researchers believed that Robin just needed to go back to their concern gatherings and reconsider what she knows and the information she has already collected.

During the discussion on Robin's action based issue guide, Anna Martinez-Amos of San

Antonio Missions brought up how she struggled with how to connect to the public went with a broader question of all parks rather than just their park. This increased the amount of entities and public that they could meet with. Anna mentioned that many more people attended the concern gatherings and that many of their concerns regarding access to public spaces were outside of just the National Park system. In this case, a tension might emerge between what San Antonio Missions' mission is and can do, and what the public wants from the San Antonio Missions. This possible tension could become commonplace with the other participants who are working for a federal agency.

The analysis of San Antonio's issue guide lead to a deeper discussion about roles and how the roles of the participants may have caused the issue guides to be more action-based. Alex Johnson of the Western Slope Conservation Center noted that he was struck by how different the roles of participants in the group were. Some are decision makers while others are part of the "public" and do not have any authority. The discussion then lead to how federal entities can be seen as having no action and participants who are part of this research group are fixers. It occurred to the Researchers that it was not surprising that many participants had action-based issue guides, as they are go getters in their organization.

Another type of issue guide emerged, which sparked a bigger discussion of the Kettering process was the "for - against - middle" type of issue guide. Scott London, who is a consultant with the Kettering Foundation, stated that this type of issue guide does not work due to the fact that the public would probably chose the "middle" option, which almost always ends up being the status quo option. For-against-middle issue guides do not have any values assigned to them, just stances on an issue that might not even be a wicked problem. The discussion of these types of issue guides lead to a bigger discussion on the use of Kettering techniques in a community that is sharply divided. Western Slope Conservation Center is located in an area that was just informed of a BLM's Land Management Plan for the area with only a few months to comment on it. This has brought out animosity among residents of the area and the plan surfaced deep divisions on energy and resource exploitation in the area. It was within this context that Alex Johnson from Western Slope Conservation Center held their own versions of concern gatherings and created their own version of an issue guide.

During the analysis of Alex Johnson's issue guide, a question of values and how to define those values was thoroughly discussed. The participant discussed the difficulties of trying to stay in the middle of the divide on the question of oil/gas. The Kettering researchers suggested moving away from the question of just oil/gas and asking "What concerns you about energy?" But Alex Johnson felt that everyone in their community only wants to focus on oil/gas because it is part of a BLM's Land Management Plan. The Kettering researchers also pushed for Alex to focus on the values of the community so that they might cut across different options, but Alex Johnson felt that it would be challenge and that talking about values can become very partisan and he doesn't want the Western Slope Conservation Center to be painted on any side of the issue. For example, job security is a value, but what job security means in the town can cause people to argue and not decide on any option related to job security. Values are also difficult to discuss in the community because of what words have become code for things like "development" or "conservation". Alex also struggles with people who won't even come to a concern gathering because it is hosted by an organization with the word conservation in the

name. Alex's current struggle with values within his community will be followed and reported on by the researchers to find out how the organization moves forward with the issue guide. The overall feeling of participants when they left the learning exchange was one of struggle. Even those who had been praised for their issue guides felt that they needed tweaking. It was important for the researchers to remind participants that the issue guide was a living document and is supposed to be edited along the way and to not focus too much on it once the project moved into alignment. Many of the discussions forced the Kettering staff to explain or defend the practices that they utilize in civic engagement. These discussions helped flesh out the reasons behind the processes that Kettering Foundation and give the project more depth. Overall, there was a deeper appreciation for the complexities and nuances of public engagement from both the Kettering Foundation and the participants, a better understanding of the roles that can be played by site leaders and the more appropriate ways to play these roles to enhance real public engagement.

The last half hour was spent on a quick set of preparations for the next learning exchange, this time centered on alignment, while not the optimal approach to the topic, primarily because a one day discussion excludes any developmental, over-time thought, sites were asked to come up with three small (less than \$5,000) ideas from each of their issue guide options. Researchers will set up a meeting between a grants specialist to see what type grants are out there for those small ideas. Participants will also edit their list of internal and external partners to categorize them as partners who want something from the organization and partners who give something to the organization. These lists, the small ideas, and alignment will be thoroughly discussed at the next learning exchange.

Participants

Animas Watershed Partnership

Ann Oliver, Watershed Coordinator

Appomattox Courthouse National Historic Park

Robin Snyder, Superintendent

Groundwork Hudson Valley

Curt Collier, National Youth Programs Director

Nathan Hunter, Assistant Director to Land and River Programs

Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument

Jackie Leyba, Monument Supervisor

San Antonio Missions National Historical Park

Anna Martinez-Amos, Park Ranger for Community Outreach

Melea Taylor, Park Guide

Kristian Browning, DOI/VISTA

United General District 304

Marjie Bell, Program Planner/Grant Writer

Western Slope Conservation Center

Alex Johnson, Executive Director

Karen Ortiz, Board Member (Treasurer)

Researchers

T Allan Comp, PhD
Kirsten Hagemann

The Kettering Foundation

Phil Lurie, Program Officer
Alice Diebel, Program Officer
Brad Rourke, Program Officer
Scott London, Consultant

Kentucky Environmental Foundation, Fiscal Sponsor

Betsy Taylor, Executive Director, Livelihoods Knowledge Exchange Network a program under
Kentucky Environmental Foundation
Heather Warman, Executive Director, Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Learning Exchange #4 Summary

Dayton, Ohio

February 28th- March 1st 2017

Learning Exchange #4

The fourth learning exchange built on the foundations of three prior exchanges. The others were somewhat more philosophical in nature, focused on how naming and framing could be used in participants' communities and how holding issue forums could help to identify broader, more inclusive understanding. In this exchange, participants brought real examples of projects that had come from discussing the issue guides with the community. The purpose of this exchange was to learn by doing, to think like other interests in their community, and to learn how organizations work with others in the pursuit of a shared understanding of the problem and what should be done. Understanding how people can develop democratic ways to encourage productive interaction among distinct organizations can help participants better align interests with a variety of stakeholders, especially nontraditional prospective partners. Participants gained more insight into their communities and the process of democratic community engagement as a whole.

The learning exchange started with a case study from Front Royal, Virginia. Sonja Carlborg, a resident and founding chair of the Front Royal/Warren County Appalachian Trail Community committee found herself naming and framing issues and seeking alignment with the interests of different stakeholders to resolve a conflict. Front Royal is a gateway community to the Shenandoah National Park, host to 100 miles of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, a National Park unit. As a condition of earning official Appalachian Trail Community designation in 2012, the town and county had committed to support trail-friendly locally-owned business development.

The first business attracted to the area by the designation was a B&B whose owners promised to restore a derelict historic mansion for that purpose on property adjacent to the Trail. Conflict arose with a Home Owner's Association (HOA) just across the road, who claimed that hikers were vandals, trespassers on their lake, and a menace to their children's safety. Discussion revolved around naming and framing the issues (personal freedom and business concerns vs. safety/security), identifying the larger wicked problem, understanding the perspective of others, and learning how creative partnerships can help to address the situation, even when parties (in this case, the HOA) refuse to participate in dialogue. Conclusions from the case study included the following:

- Relationship building is an ongoing process that must be constantly renewed and monitored;
- Conflict is not black and white;
- Controversy can paradoxically lead to better relationships and new solutions;
- Controversy can identify new resources and alignments. As an example, the AT Community committee created a partnership with Warrior Hike, a supported thru-hike that reconnects veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan with their homeland. Aligning with HOA values of security and patriotism, the committee partnered with the local VFW and Warrior Hike to host a goodwill community barbeque, to

which HOA members, town/county elected officials, and the press were invited with great success.

Participants then discussed their own similar experiences. Jackie Lebya from Tent Rocks National Monument talked about his experiences with the Pueblo, discovering that the biggest community concern wasn't the climate change threat to their way of life, but feral dogs, opening an opportunity for the Monument to work with the community in addressing the problem and building trust for future projects. Curt Collier from Groundwork Hudson Valley held meetings about opening homeless shelters in an affluent community. Prospective residents of the homeless center were honest with the community about advantages and disadvantages, which eventually contributed to approval of the shelter, which certain compromises agreed to by all. These two examples demonstrate how naming and framing successfully engaged disparate parties in the community in creating deliberative dialogue about controversial issues and then finding ways for this shared understanding to open productive interaction.

Allan Comp cautioned that completing issue guides is not enough – everyone needs to work on building relationships to ensure alignment with partners. The Kettering Foundation moderators also pointed out the need to build those relationships that bring people to the table, reminding all of the importance of the issue forums. Discussions illuminated differences between the learning exchange's philosophical space and the physical space, the actual communities, where participants work. Kettering focuses on formulation of broad questions for community, while participants emphasized the reactive nature of their response to sudden community crises. In these cases, they must work to solve or mitigate an issue, much like Sonja's experience in Front Royal. She did not ask a big question; her community presented a conflict, and her group identified and tried several ways to reach a *détente*, all of which eventually led to both better understanding of the community and alignment with new partners and resources in pursuit of better understanding and compromise, as well as several positive outcomes, many unanticipated at the outset.

The researchers and consultant Sonja Carlborg developed two breakout sessions focused on alignment. The first was to develop an approach to a real grant Request for Proposals for *“art projects that seek to enrich and inform the public on important subjects such as the environment, social justice, civil rights, and other contemporary issues that other organizations might hesitate to fund. The foundation also gives special consideration to communities and school districts underserved by the arts. For the purposes of this RFP, the foundation will consider projects from individual artists and organizations working within the visual arts, dance, music, theater, photography, film/Video, writing, poetry, and public interest platforms.”*

Participants had to connect a project chosen by the researchers from the ones they submitted to partners that would help strengthen the grant. There were two projects chosen, the first from Chara Ragland from the Animas Watershed Partnership, who was standing in for Ann Oliver. The Animas Watershed Partnership seeks to collaborate with array of river monitoring entities to develop an Animas River Report Card to engage decision makers and the public in learning about river health. The conversation started with a proposal that engaged only their usual partners to one that might engage the entire community through a contest idea by asking artists to submit their ideas for the river health report card. In addition to the art-driven report

card contest, participants suggested the report card should become a living document, one which community members could add to over time. As examples developed by the group, to bring in students, the report card could add a poetry or essay contest to interpret the scientific jargon. Morphing the original project idea for the grant application allowed for more partners to be considered, expanding the shared understanding of the problem in new ways. It allowed for the project to go outside of the normal suspects that an organization would turn to, and in that process, engage the community in new ways that could strengthen community ownership in the river and its health.

A second group addressed the same grant RFP with a project presented by the San Antonio Historical Missions, initially proposing to develop a calendar of on-site, recurring wellness, fitness, and nutrition activities and events, open to the public. Dance and music performances were deemed expensive one-time activities for passive audiences with specific interests. Sonja encouraged participants to consider “artists as people who can turn other people into artists,” who stimulated the kind of discussion actual artists would have about art making. Yoga-based dance stations interpreting Mission themes would encourage audience interaction. Visitors could create small flags representing their own health mission/commitment, which could be hung along the bike trail, like prayer flags, connecting each to the Mission. Here again, the possibility of taking what seemed a restrictive RFP and engaging community interests identified in the naming and framing process brought new perspective and the potential for expanded community engagement.

The researchers did note that the discussion among participants focused on how to utilize the community more than finding out how to align with different partners. The researchers think that this was due largely to time constraints. The participants in both initial sessions spent most of their time developing an idea and only near the end of the time allowed did they finalize it. The researchers believe that both exercises were a success, as it taught participants how to add an under-utilized element – in this case art – to a project and transform it to something greater than it was before, engaging participants in seeing how shared understanding can lead better insights and broader community engagement,

The second exercise proposed a fictitious nontraditional partner for a real participant project, again previously submitted by the participants.

The researchers chose Appomattox Court House’s project of encouraging healthy parks, healthy life, in their local community through finishing a trail and organizing a passport program with several state parks nearby. Ashton Farrell was standing in for Robin Snyder during this workshop. The fictional partner that was assigned by the researchers was the National First Bank, which had a prominent board, a matching grant program and a CEO that was an officer in the local Rotary.

The group was able to give Ashton lots of ideas that he stated he would never have thought of before, such as working with the regional branches of the bank, or a bank-based grant through the Community Reinvestment Act. While these were all great ideas and sprung from a narrow partnership, the researchers saw that the group continued to make suggestions about partners they already knew and had worked with, rather than thinking about how to align with the bank and the larger community interests. Researchers had to steer the conversation into

thinking about the Rotary club or the board members of the bank and their wider community contacts and not just focusing on groups that could come in and build a trail. But at the end of the learning exchange, Ashton had written down two important aspects of alignment: 1) the more partners who are brought in, the more goals, missions and motives they may have. Find common ground and find ways in which different partners can benefit each other as well as the project. 2) Build relationships with individuals and small groups at events. You never know who knows who. So while the conversation may have gotten off track, Ashton was able to take away some important ideas that transcend partnering with a fictional bank and actually lead to broader community dialogue for his site.

The second group, the Western Slope Conservation Center, was challenged to develop meaningful alignment with a fictional predominately Hispanic immigrant congregation of a local Catholic Church for a Center project built around a land mapping project focused on the Gunnison River in Paonia, CO. Participants agreed that the messenger needed to be a bilingual peer and that youth and priests were the most likely candidates to serve as bridges. This dovetailed with research already conducted by the Center identifying swimming lessons and recreational access as the water issues most important to the area's actual Hispanic residents. This led to a hypothetical framing of the issue as a larger community sense "belonging" in the community. This "belonging" means that values are understood and shared among all residents, a significant challenge in dealing with an Hispanic population that is largely set apart, by language, economics and tradition. The participants' discussion of belonging then led to a discussion of inclusiveness – and the researchers noted that the two terms are not mutually exclusive and that the participants aligned potential partners as if they were. Alignment can have both – but when forming partnerships, it is important to acknowledge the difference. Participants discussed aligning their message with existing church language, ritual, values, and events, for example, holding a blessing of the waters, coming together to share meal at the church, highlighting the use of water in liturgy.

The last session focused on discussing one project from each participant whose project had not been discussed in previous sessions. Like the others, these came out of community discussions based on the issue guide and concerns of community members. Participants were to practice the skills gained in the previous sessions. Several themes surfaced:

- **Great ideas may have occurred to participants, but reframing as a broader question may elicit insights and new ideas.** Jackie Lebya from Tent Rocks National Monument considered creating a brochure or passport type document for senior visitors. When discussing the project, Jackie realized through the conversations that he might not need to cater to a specific population unless it becomes necessary. Participants and researchers also asked if he has the senior community support for the project, and if not, changing the project a bit to cater to what the community wants. In addition to these big takeaways, Jackie also got partner ideas so he can align his idea to help connect interested seniors with other support organizations and bring both to better engagement with the Monument
- **The community may want something other than what an organization can provide.** Marjie from United General did her concern gatherings and issue guides trying to surface concerns about the economic development in the town. However, these meetings identified a more pressing problem, which was childcare for working families. As a

result, Marjie had approached the Boys and Girls club about the possibility of a satellite childcare center in the local community, largely because the Boys and Girls club was already a licensed childcare provider. The participants came up with the idea of a co-op model because a free service might not be deemed valuable. They also discussed how it is important to identify how the community can collectively address the needs and what other partners United General could collaborate with instead of shouldering the project by itself. Because Marjie and United General had responded so quickly to an issue identified in the issue forums they conducted, the project idea brought about a different type of discussion with the participants – instead of focusing on whom to align with, they focused on the feasibility and logistics of the project. While it may not have been exactly what the researchers had in mind, these conversations are real conversations that a community has to discuss when they want to tackle a wicked problem. The community wanted a big fix for what they viewed as a big problem. While the discussion was insightful, it did not yield the same level of alignment ideas. The researchers believe this is because participants had a specific project and got stuck on the idea of logistics and the scope of the project.

- **Members of the community can be a project’s most important resource.** Nathan Hunter from Groundwork Hudson Valley’s project, which is reforming their youth business projects, such as teaching young people how to make and sell jam from local sources and giving them the materials and skills to build their own businesses. This project discussion really focused aligning with partners that he previously had not thought of. Allan Comp suggested using “venture capitalists” that were a part of the community who believe in the work of Groundwork Hudson Valley. He also got advice to connect with local chefs and entrepreneurs who can become mentors within the program. One of the biggest takeaways from Nathan and for this project was that he should connect with community resources because so much of the time we (the organization, the community, outsiders) devalue community members and discredit their experiences. Nathan realized he can use their knowledge to build up his program and help his community beyond his target demographic; again using broad deliberative dialogue to develop understanding that can lead to productive interaction.

The fourth learning exchange gave researchers, participants, and the Kettering Foundation an excellent space to discuss the philosophy of naming and framing, issue forums and aligning with real life, on-the-ground projects. The researchers think that this gave each something to think about outside of the boxes in which they would normally confine themselves. Participants seemed to recognize recognized the purpose of alignment is to align the interests of partners – those inside and outside one’s normal collaborators in a constant and continuing effort to work with others in the pursuit of shared understanding –and ultimate success. This learning exchange helped push participants to think about alignment from the Front Royal case showing how seemingly divided communities can come together and solve an issue, to stretching their definitions of partners who could help them bring their projects to larger successes and to give participants take-home insights that they could begin to implement the next day.

Participants

Animas Watershed Partnership

Ann Oliver, Watershed Coordinator

Appomattox Courthouse National Historic Park

Robin Snyder, Superintendent

Groundwork Hudson Valley

Curt Collier, National Youth Programs Director

Nathan Hunter, Assistant Director to Land and River Programs

Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument

Jackie Leyba, Monument Supervisor

San Antonio Missions National Historical Park

Anna Martinez-Amos, Park Ranger for Community Outreach

Melea Taylor, Park Guide

Kristian Browning, DOI/VISTA

United General District 304

Marjie Bell, Program Planner/Grant Writer

Western Slope Conservation Center

Alex Johnson, Executive Director

Karen Ortiz, Board Member (Treasurer)

Researchers

T Allan Comp, PhD

Kirsten Hagemann

The Kettering Foundation

Phil Lurie, Program Officer

Alice Diebel, Program Officer

Brad Rourke, Program Officer

Scott London, Consultant

Kentucky Environmental Foundation, Fiscal Sponsor

Betsy Taylor, Executive Director, Livelihoods Knowledge Exchange Network a program under Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Heather Warman, Executive Director, Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Learning Exchange #5 Summary

Dayton, Ohio

May 24th-25th, 2017

Learning Exchange #5

The fifth learning exchange in the Engaging Communities for Success project was the final one in the project. The final learning exchange focused on the progress with the small projects from the fourth learning exchange, the state of the issue guides, and a discussion on the role of participants in their community. In addition to these topics, the participants and the researchers discussed what they have learned in this process and what they will take with them moving forward. The purpose of this final exchange was threefold. First was to endcap the alignment section of the project and find out if participants had gone forward with the small projects. Secondly, was to investigate the state of the issue guides and see if any of the participants had engaged with their communities with the guides. Finally, the researchers wanted to discover what worked and what did not work for the participants during this entire process. The researchers hoped that at the end of the exchange, both the researchers and participants walked away with a deeper and more impactful idea of community engagement.

The final learning exchange opened with the question of what happened after the participants left the fourth learning exchange. Who and how did you align with others? What do those new partnerships mean in the greater context of community engagement? While not all of the participants had done any further work with the small projects that had been the focus of the fourth learning exchange; all had new partnerships and new other projects that have been developed because of this process. Jackie Leyba who works in Tent Rocks National Monument was able to partner with the Rio Rancho School District due to his concern gatherings. The school district was one of the stakeholders that had been invited to a concern gathering. This partnership is different than other partnerships that Jackie engages in because instead of him reaching out, the school is reaching out to him on mutually beneficial projects, such as taking school kids out to the National Monument. This partnership came about because of discussions in the concern gatherings that revealed mutual goals. Jackie hopes to replicate this partnership with others and to further align with members of his community. Marjie Bell of United General's community has taken their small project idea and ran with it. During this process, Marjie found out that childcare was a real concern of the community. Therefore, she rewrote her issue guide to focus on that issue within the community and created a project idea around it. Her idea was to create a childcare center, which has now developed into a partnership with the Boys and Girls club who will fund the center for five years. The idea is going further than that by bringing in other partners to teach skills at the center. Overall, her community of Concrete, WA has embraced being asked what concerns them and the process has even taken root in the community outside of the issue guides. Concrete held a superintendent search and there was high volume of participation by the community members who chose an outsider who will not let things continue as they currently are. United General is an example of a participant's organization still taking the lead on this project, but other small projects by participants have been taken over by others in the community.

Robin Snyder from Appomattox Courthouse had a small project idea revolving around the slogan of “Healthy Parks, Health People”. The object of the project was to collaborate with other parks to increase local visitors and promote healthy living. Robin worked with six other state parks to develop a passport booklet featuring the trail systems for visitors to use while they visit any of the national and state parks in the region. Due to Robin’s position in her organization, she can now only be in the background of this partnership. But the partnerships are still going strong and are looking move forward to align the local community on a deeper level. While the participant may not be able to take the idea further, she has given other partners the tools to keep engaging in the community. Nathan Hunter and Curt Collier from Groundwork Hudson Valley are also in a unique situation like Robin. Groundwork Hudson Valley is an extension of the City of Yonkers and the National Park Service whose purpose is to be able to better serve community members on the ground. Nathan had to overcome mistrust from both being associated with the government and for broken relationships from before his arrival in the organization. There were many lost opportunities for alignment before this process. Nathan spent a lot of time learning and building up those partnerships again rather than focusing on the small project ideas. For those small project ideas that he had, he will need partners and buy in from the community. Because of this process, he has been going to monthly meetings in the community and Groundwork Hudson Valley’s reputation within the community has been reestablished. Nathan will continue to work on his small project ideas after this project is over. It’s important to invest in partnerships, especially if an organization is overcoming a reputation within the community.

Some have taken the small projects idea and re-envisioned the entire name and framing process. For Alex Johnson in Western Slope Conservation Center, the fourth learning exchange changed how and what he wanted to engage his community with. Originally, Alex had thought that the broad topic of energy in Paonia, CO would be the perfect for this process. However, due to the politics of other groups in the region and the Bureau of Land Management revising their land management plans, energy as a topic became too difficult to really engage Paonians in. During the fourth learning exchange, Alex had an idea of a place-making project. He wants to ask the community “What does this place mean to you?” While it is not “What concerns you about the community?” it may bring about issues that may not have been uncovered otherwise. From those conversations, Alex will further develop his place-making idea. There were a few participants who had not had any further developments in either partnerships or small projects. The researchers recognize the short timespan between workshops, but wonder what this will mean long term for the success of the project within those communities.

The moderators moved the conversation from the small projects and the developments in between learning exchanges to focus on the issue guides. The researchers had asked the participants to submit the latest version of their issue guides. Most participants have not updated the issue guides since the third learning exchange because of the focus on alignment. While there is no prescribed correct way to create an issue guide, the moderators noted that many of the participants issue guides were mission driven rather than driven by the community. This would become a point of discussion between the moderators and the participants. Many participants are bound by their organization to engage with their community in a way that is dictated by their mission. It becomes difficult to follow what the community wants to move forward with if it is completely outside their mission. Some participants are bound to constraints like funding and

their job description. These constraints shaped the issue guides and the conversations with community members. Despite these constraints, the issue guides do reflect issues within the community. However, when discussing the issue guides, many of the participants pushed back against the moderators.

Many of the big concerns in communities, such as food, clothing, and shelter do not relate to the participants' missions at all. Curt Collier pointed out that their base concerns may need to be framed in a way that the needs and the mission are being met. Ann Oliver from the Animas Watershed Partnership wrote an issue guide about the health of the river. The original issue was technical and the options were not complex nor did they have any real drawbacks. During this exchange, Ann realized that her organization could do more than just worry about the health of the river. The river is the lifeblood of her town, Durango CO. Her next iteration of the issue guide will focus on reframing the river, like Curt had suggested. Another option, which Nathan Hunter brought up, is giving the issue guide to another organization when one has reached the limitations of their own organization. For this option to work, an organization has to find the bandwidth to essentially teach another organization the naming and framing process. The bandwidth problem is one that all of the participants struggled with and kept going back to throughout these conversations. The participants felt that the moderators did not understand the limits of time and money with their organizations and walked away from the learning exchange unchanged in their opinion.

The moderators revealed what the Kettering Foundation had wanted to learn from this process. With any project with the Foundation, both the participants and the moderators learn from each other. The Foundation wanted to know was what happens when organizations go through this process? What extent is it possible for an organization to be a part of the community as opposed to serving it? What things block or accelerate organizations being a part of the community. The moderators revealed that Kettering has noticed that with professional groups, there is a distinct resistant to actually talking to the community. For the participants who are involved in the government, this was very true. Jackie Lebya had to create a nonprofit and had to have a non-government employee talk to the community for him because of mistrust between the two. Robin Snyder only met with her partners instead of the community and she is hindered by structures put in place to protect the government. The government has a rigid engagement system, which can hinder actual engagement. Robin stated that she could not be "real" with the community because of the structures and rigidity. The issue of government and engagement was only briefly discussed and was never solved.

With the revelation of what they were looking to learn, the moderators followed up with another question. What do the participants do next? Do they see themselves next to the community serving or in the community? For Karen Ortiz, from Western Slope Conservation Center, this revelation took her aback. She had always viewed her organization as part of the community, end of discussion. But the moderators' comments made her reflect on her organization and found that while it is a part of the community, it operates alongside it serving it more than being a part of it. The original issue guide for Western Slope Conservation Center came from a place of serving rather than being a part of the community. Karen was not alone in this thought process nor in the fact that her organization was held back by serving the community.

Many of the participants created their issue guides through the lens of their missions, therefore viewing it through serving their communities rather than being a part of them. Going back and redoing them in the framework of being a part of the community – would everything turn out differently? Or would some communities end up with the same result? The moderators cautioned participants from deciding that they already know what the public is thinking and thought that not all of the issue guides would work in the actual communities. It was also revealed that frameworks like this take several issues and the moderators did not expect a perfect issue guide the first time. It takes going through this entire process several times to fully develop (although the issue guide is a living document, so it is never complete) and use it to solve issues within the community. The measure of success for an issue guide is that it will generate conversation.

The last part of the learning exchange was the lessons learned throughout this process. Everyone was to give the 3 things that they have taken away from this entire process. Anna Martinez-Amos from San Antonio Historical Missions National Park found the actual “step by step” process to engagement and it has changed how she engages with any community member. One of those ways to change engagement is to really figure out what the community is saying. They had labeled the community’s concerns as health related, when really the community was worried about cleanliness in the community. Anna moving forward will try different ways of framing a problem or reiterating a community’s issue to ensure that she is framing and engaging the right issue. Marjie Bell had struggled with the issue guide. Her group who helped her put together the issue guide was trying to fit every issue in Concrete, WA into one guide. She decided that what Concrete really needs is five issue guides to address all the community concerns. She will take away all of the concerns and build more issue guides to begin making a difference in her community.

For Robin Snyder, her biggest takeaway is a change within herself. She has learned a lot about herself during this process. Robin stated that she has learned to listen better. Instead of being the decision maker and fixer in any situation, she has learned to take a step back and let others speak first. She had wanted to engage in the community right away and fix the problems. Now, she wants to redo this process all over again and really go into the community and listen. Even if there are areas where she is unable to engage, she still wants to have authentic conversations with the community. She wants to build that trust in the community. Robin has already begun to build trust with her stakeholders, but she wants to take it further now and take this process to wherever she goes next in her career. Jackie Lebya also had lessons learned about engaging and listening. During his concern gatherings, he was able to align a few partnerships because he was unable to lead the conversation due to his role. Stepping back and listening helped him see mutual goals and objectives within the community. During this project, Jackie was reassigned to a different national monument. He is now working to replicate his work in Tent Rocks in his new location.

Karen Ortiz and Ann Oliver hope to use this process within their own organizations with their boards. They both see the value of doing an internal naming and framing to figure out the concerns of the board. It will strengthen their organizations and bolster support for further community engagement. It will give both of them an organization that has a stronger foundation

to react to any crises in the community. Karen and Ann's organizations had crises to deal with during this process, so reinforcing their organizations will be key to engagement moving forward. These two sites did not have that much recorded issue with organizational support for this project, so it is surprising that this was a major point of discussion for them.

For Nathan Hunter and Curt Collier from Groundwork Hudson Valley, they had known about a variation of the naming and framing process prior to joining the project, so their revelations were focused on language and context. Nathan really reevaluated his role in the community and wants to move from serving a grant to getting resources that the community actually needs. He really focused in on what the community was really saying in their concerns and during his interactions, he had to change his language to match that of the community. Language matching was an important aspect of naming, framing, and alignment. Many organizations come into communities utilizing language that the community can't or won't understand and the organizations fail to engage. Nathan was able to realize that the Kettering language can be a barrier and changed how he approached his community. Curt brought up that context is one of the most important aspects of engagement. Change the context and people's response or their problems may change and therefore change how an organization approaches engagement.

The final learning exchange brought the participants together for final discussions on alignment, the process, and the lessons that they have learned. Every participant was able to gain something from this process, even if it was small. The researchers do wonder if these lessons will continue after the project is completed. Which parts of the process will participants keep? Which sites will continue to engage in this process for every issue in the community? Only time will tell. During the learning exchange, Curt Collier brought up the question of why do this? Why engage? He thinks that to be relevant to the community, you have to be involved in their issues. That you need to be part of the solution and use resources to meet what challenges you can and believe that your organization is benefiting at the same time. Because of this process, researchers hope that participants can become part of the solution in their communities.

Participants

Animas Watershed Partnership

Ann Oliver, Watershed Coordinator

Appomattox Courthouse National Historic Park

Robin Snyder, Superintendent

Groundwork Hudson Valley

Curt Collier, National Youth Programs Director

Nathan Hunter, Assistant Director to Land and River Programs

Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument

Jackie Leyba, Monument Supervisor

San Antonio Missions National Historical Park

Anna Martinez-Amos, Park Ranger for Community Outreach

Melea Taylor, Park Guide

Kristian Browning, DOI/VISTA

United General District 304

Marjie Bell, Program Planner/Grant Writer

Western Slope Conservation Center

Alex Johnson, Executive Director

Karen Ortiz, Board Member (Treasurer)

Researchers

T Allan Comp, PhD

Kirsten Hagemann

The Kettering Foundation

Phil Lurie, Program Officer

Brad Rourke, Program Officer

Scott London, Consultant

Kentucky Environmental Foundation, Fiscal Sponsor

Betsy Taylor, Executive Director, Livelihoods Knowledge Exchange Network a program under Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Heather Warman, Executive Director, Kentucky Environmental Foundation

Final Interviews

Animas Watershed Partnership - Ann Oliver

Final Interview

05/17/2017 5:30PMEST

1. Do you feel that the issue guide has been a document that you have continuously used throughout this process?

[Pause] In the sense that – do you mean issue guide as a concept or issue guide developed?

As a concept – yes. In terms of development, she hasn't really been using that. With the workshops – yes she's focused on it. But she hasn't specifically used that issue guide here on site in this community. She has used the concepts through the Kettering process frequently comes back to them and applies them here.

2. Do you think your community has buy in on the issue guide? Or the concepts?

Ann feels like has it increased buy in is a longer-term answer than she can give right now. She hasn't had enough time applying the tools and the concepts to say it has increased. But it's certainly changed the approach or informed our approach on different efforts that she's involved in. Recognizing that much more than she ever did, how we as an organization is missing a big piece of the puzzle – which is not knowing what people think about the things we think about all the time. This process opens the door and to find out what people really think about this stuff and help get a handle on it.

3. Has your community changed how they discuss issues? If not, why do you think that is?

[Pause] The only change is in bringing in recognition of “hey maybe we ought to find out what the people we are trying to influence and what they are really thinking about these issues.”

(Allan: have you noticed the recognition has changed the way you address or nature of issues?)

Yes. Most concretely in terms of way we address them. Added another step in the process/tool in the toolbox. Let's first try and talk to people and find out and then understand what language they're using. Part of that is many of the partners that she works with – they are all frustrated at what we perceive/feels like inability to really engage the community and how it's really preaching to the choir or rather engaging with the choir. Maybe that's the way it will always be. Feels like now something people are turning to a lot – focus groups, surveys, and 1:1 interview to actually get at what people think and what the obstacles are for engaging people. Ann feels like she really values learning about the Kettering tools and approach. Doesn't know if this comes just from Kettering side and her involvement in that and work in partnerships – seems like there are other forces at work driving us towards that approach. The general timing of social efforts is that there is a convergence on need to foster more deliberation. Begin by understanding/having that conversation with people.

4. Do you think project is adequately serving the end goal of achieving alignment?

Yes. The most obvious example is helping the Gold King Mine Partnership was born – that was local government, nonprofits, agencies all coming together to try to communicate data and information to the public. Just what we had learned with Kettering was definitely timely and helped align what we were trying to do. Gave us/me perspective on that process. Informed some of the things that they ended up working on in that forum partnership. More recently – one of the

small projects proposed to us was watershed wide campaign. Just finished talking with city of Farmington – reached out to us – thinking about a watershed campaign so Ann just met with him and he’s talking about his background and marketing. There will be a synergy there about messages and what they are trying to work on in the community.

5. Is the naming - framing - alignment process one that you will continue to use in your community? If you leave your community, would you bring that process with you?

Yes. She uses it in whatever she is working on. The process makes so much sense and it’s also useful and pretty easy to do if you remember to do it. Ann feels like there are instances where we are like ‘oh yeah we forgot this step we need to go back and do that’ but now it’s just part of her thought process now.

6. Has your organization changed the way they interact with their community? If yes, in what ways?

Pause – some of the partners in the group have. Some have not. There is one partner: Mountain Studies Institute. They are in one of the projects we’ve been working on under Arc forum (partnership formed after gold king incident). One of the committees is trying to engage with the community on the current status of the river. Chara – is a part of that effort – now the Kettering process is part of her thought process too. She comes from social science communications background. She may have been familiar with his approach anyways. But she and Institute have taken this approach and applied it to her projects.

7. Do you think that the community views your organization differently now that you have done the naming - framing - alignment process?

No. Not yet.

(Allan: Might be nature of animas partnership and partners who are governments?)

They just don’t struggle with this issue that she struggles with it. They don’t take it on the way she does.

8. Have you created any new partnerships in this process? If yes, then with whom? If not, why?

She can’t point to a new partnership. But she can think of new partners she would like to reach out to as a result of this. We had a conversation that might lead in that direction with our Arc forum partners were meeting the other day – who were the communities that we would really like to be reaching but we aren’t. She’s thinking about developing new partnerships.

9. Have you had results from the small project ideas discussed at the last workshop? If yes, what kind of results? Do you feel that because of the workshop, you approached the project ideas differently? If not, what has prevented you from moving forward on that project?

Yeah. In the watershed report card– in those conversations we actively and constantly thinking about the tools from the Kettering process. Good example of trying to apply what we’ve learned. We did a survey that included some interviews to ask people what their concerns are about various aspects of the river. In doing so – that generated some specific language and clarity on what people are concerned about and used that to identify questions. Now they will present what data is available that can address those questions in some kind of report card format. Looking for

some funding to continue with that. This is the watershed wide campaign around stewardship and water quality.

(Allan: is the larger campaign pulling in more partners?)

Idea would be to pull in as many people as we can. And incorporate art into some aspect of that. That is based on what she shared with the group – got talking about neat ideas for incorporating the arts into the projects that we are working on together.

1. Do you feel that the issue guide has been a document that you have continuously used throughout this process?

Yes, the whole process has been very eye opening and to look at a way to do listening differently. Through the whole process, Robin has developed deeper relationships with community members. The structure of the issue guide has made it easy to conversations about where we can go and what we can do to solve some of these problems. She has continued to struggle with the fact that in our discussions with Kettering that we are looking at things that are bigger societal problem. It's difficult for a federal agency to engage in bigger societal problems. She has stayed on the periphery on the issue guide and hasn't done the deep dive by with the types of people that you chose to initiate this process with.

(Allan: One of the things he's seen is that all of the participants have struggled with an issue guide and asking themselves if they really got it right. There is no right way. It needs to be what works for you. I thought that you picked exactly the right people because they all essentially are representatives of community groups. Don't apologize for it at all.)

She appreciates Allan saying that. Stark difference between how we handle "mental health" with a federal agency. She's coming back from the learning exchanges and thinking if she is hitting the mark with how she's lead this process and how her issue guide has developed.

(Allan: It's about what you can do on your site. How to get community better engaged in your site.)

The issue guide is an evolving document. It's a good gage point to go back to. She continues to meet different partners during this process. The two small projects have stemmed from the issue guide. The projects were born of having conversations with these groups. Some of these groups have morphed into committees and working with specific projects. The issue guide gave great/not great discussion with different entities. Group really bought into how they laid it out. State park managers haven't been able to meet as much as she'd like as a group. She has used the issue guide to have conversations. The Carver Price Legacy Museum – it resonated but they weren't ready because dealing with internal organizational issues. Experience Appomattox committee was born from issue guide and they have buy in on the issue guide. They will continue to build on this concept of digital marking campaign for this group.

2. Do you think your community has buy in on the issue guide?

She hasn't discussed issue guide outside of the initial conversations with her groups. She has been discussing the concepts that came up in the issue guide and asking people about what they would be interested in seeing more of in their community. Why are they coming to the park, why are they not coming to the park? How can we engage community members with the park? She's had lots of informal conversations. Some of the conversations documented, some not documented on strategies. Healthy Parks Healthy People is slow growing project. For example, target digital marking campaign. One partner is the theatre company and they are working on marketing video. From that and other ways, Appomattox Court House is engaged with youth from other park programs. Theatre company came up with idea to offer a theatre camp at the park this year. Appomattox Court House has a strong living history in the park so it's a good fit. They are getting ready to advertise week long camp for high schools students to learn about civil war, outdoor recreation and living history presentations, and writing of these productions. Bigger

vision for them to learn about theatre and park, gain some skills, participate and get internships at Appomattox Court House in the summer.

3. Has your community changed how they discuss issues? If not, why do you think that is?

That is hard to answer. Robin was a new superintendent when she started the process. Only way to adequately answer is through the example of Experience Appomattox. She is walking a line working in a federal agency – don't want to show favoritism but there is an engaged group of people. Robin is doing this because it's the right thing to do and great for tourism. The community wasn't having those conversations before she got there. This process has informed how we had those discussions.

4. Do you think your issue guide is adequately serving the end goal of achieving alignment?

Yes and she would like to try this process again. Robin would like to do a dive with the community and figure out ways to get different people who have a stake in the partnership but also have opinions and thoughts on how these institutions would better serve their community. She interviewed with partners and they laid out issue guide – allowing to accomplish key project goals. Not only are they achieving alignment but they are continually finding more ways to achieve alignment.

5. Is the naming - framing - alignment process one that you will continue to use in your community? If you leave your community, would you bring that process with you?

Yes to both. The time between meetings has given her time to work on these things. For her and her impatience and following it more fluidly has been a benefit. For somebody who loves to talk and run a meeting and has many ideas, this process has taught the value of stepping back and shutting the hell up and really listening. The initial deliberative dialogues – naming and framing those issues and the evolution was very educational and helpful to her. It's a model to use anywhere you go. When she does move on and has a whole new cast of partners and people, she'll be having honest conversations from the get go. Robin wants to continue this with community not just partners. She thinks it would be interesting to see the different results between the issues guides.

6. Has your organization changed the way they interact with their community? If yes, in what ways?

Yes. The reason she is pausing is because before she got here the superintendent was very exclusive and didn't like people. Therefore, the surface answer is yes but she would have done her thing anyway. She's always interested in engaging the community and partnerships. Appomattox Court House is not an island and needs to be part of the community. Because of timing of this, she had some relationships with partners already and some partners she had none. This project has really framed how the park communicates with the community. It was always "this is our idea" and then we would do our idea. This process has helped change that. Appomattox Court House did not generate the two small project ideas.

7. Do you think that the community views your organization differently now that you have done the naming - framing - alignment process?

Robin was talking to her admin assistant who said that they have never seen how much Appomattox Court House is in the papers and that level of engagement with the community. Her

office is a revolving door of partners coming through and sharing ideas and conversations. The Chamber of Commerce had an issue on an outside person pushing ideas through and they wanted Robin at the meeting – that would never had happened before. Ashton (the VISTA) started library in community based on dialogue from the issue guide. Daniel (the new VISTA) heard from two other communities and wanted to join in the library project.

8. Have you created any new partnerships in this process? If yes, then with whom? If not, why?

Experience Appomattox – Wolfbane Theater Production, local hotel, local B&B. Appomattox County, the Town of Appomattox, 1865 Foundation, Virginia state parks: Holiday Lake State Park, Bear Creek, Highridge Trail, Twin Lakes State Park, Appomattox library system, Campbell County and Charlotte County library systems. Carver Price Legacy Museum – can align as soon as they get internally organized

9. Have you had results from the small project ideas discussed at the last workshop? If yes, what kind of results? Do you feel that because of the workshop, you approached the project ideas differently? If not, what has prevented you from moving forward on that project?

Experience Appomattox hired an outside company – all partners gave a small sum of money and have the company build out the website and marketing video along with target advertising. They hit a roadblock with the company not providing service. The video then became a collaborative experience with her partners. They hired a small group to reframe out the video and went frame by frame with the partners to finish the video. All of them are too busy so they need to have a funding stream to do the general maintenance. The group met and got a charter and mechanism for people to join. They are outreaching to see if other communities want to be a part of experience. Overall, there has been a collaborative approach to it.

Healthy Parks Healthy People: Some of the money from Kettering has been put towards the passport project. It's a slow grow project but all of state parks are on board and addition to passport the state parks have done a rack card to advertise the programs. They had a PR person put together marketing piece to get more info out there and start tagging different activities. Bird and dog walk is the next idea for the Health Parks Healthy People project.

Areas of alignment: another area we are looking at is our friends group and volunteers in the park started to volunteer for local animal shelter and go get animals and hike with them and bring them out to the shelter. They are looking to partner for a bark in the park day. Maybe working with the animal shelter and get some of the dogs adopted.

Ashton appreciated the feedback during the learning exchange. It's always good to think outside the box. Robin appreciated the AMD and Art project and how Allan was able to design park landscape and address environmental issues. Robin thinks she tries to look beyond leveraging resources and finding alignment. Sometimes it's hard to do. This process has been valuable because it put "us" outside of decision maker roles. One of Ashton's last grants was a trail Cliffbar grant that he got from Sonja which is geared around signage and safety issues but Ashton was able to use the tools from the learning exchange to align his project to what the grant was looking for.

10. What are you looking to gain or discuss during the last workshop?

Looking forward to listening and learning from Marjie and Nathan and from different people about types of projects. The learning exchanges have given her some ideas that they could do at

Appomattox Court House. Her expectation is to walk away sharing issue guide and feeling like she's missed the mark but recognizing it's about who she chose to interview. She wants to feel that she has completed this process and showcase and highlight the accomplishments they made. Robin would like to have a chance to talk about lessons learned. See what everyone liked about the process and what they would do in that process again. She also wants to hear what they have achieved and where it has taken them. Robin is interested in how to keep this going without someone guiding you into different discussions from Kettering. She's also interested in recommendations for keeping the conversation going.

Groundwork Hudson Valley - Nathan Hunter

Final Interview

4/26/17 8AMEST

1. Do you feel that the issue guide has been a document that you have continuously used throughout this process?

Yes – Nathan used other Kettering Foundation issue guides when working with his community to show them examples of other types of issue guides. He also used them to show his coworkers what the Kettering Foundation is about. Community members might not completely understand what the issue guides are, but he has gotten people hooked onto them. People have been accessing and reading – even though they are resources that are unrelated to Nathan’s topic of food. He showed his coworkers and community members issue guides about the environment that were relatively connected to Groundwork Hudson Valley’s work. A few issue guides were about policy making – they just clicked for his organization.

His own issue guide on food security reminds him to stay on the path and think about the how the issue has been framed. He doesn’t heavily depend on it but has it as a resource if needed or if he wants to recall something when having conversations about the issue. The naming is done, but framing is something they always go back to.

(Allan’s Comment: Allan asked Nathan about his thoughts on the Kettering Foundation having “the” way to write and implement the issue guide. Allan senses in every case the issue guide are constantly evolving.)

Nathan struggles to be put inside a box and work in the Kettering Foundation idea and model. He sees the model in different ways and it’s frustrating to have to use the framework, but he enjoys being challenged that way. The main question is what are some other ways to work with people of color who are low income and are less educated since the Kettering Foundation language doesn’t translate. If you talk about how community members can work together – that’s an example of language easier for community members to understand. It’s been helpful to learn how “experts” think about these same issues. It’s been interesting and eye opening.

2. Do you think your community has buy in on the issue guide?

Yes – when Nathan pulls out the issue guide they do feel that it’s their document and they were part of the process. The community feels represented within document.

(Allan: Is the community going silent and saying oh god here were go again?)

Nathan has been careful not to get to that point. He has reframed how he presents issue guide from “community members have said x which means they’re concerned about y”

(Allan: Does mentioning issue guide keep the ship on course?)

Nathan guesses so. He feels that he really understands community’s concerns. Now it’s second nature to discuss it at community meetings. When x is happening in the community we need to make sure food security is thought about. Lot of it is about the process and listening that guide the issues in his head.

3. Is the issue guide relatively same to when you first created it?

Minor word tweaks but the content has stayed the same. The main topic is still around food security. The options like food cooperative are still being talked about and understood.

(Allan: Are those language changes to better fit within the community?)

There was a slight change in words and those changes were a group decision.

4. Has your community changed how they discuss issues? If not, why do you think that is?

Nathan hasn't documented it too much. In a couple meetings – weighing pros and cons has diffused arguments. The community's citizen farmers group was used for the issue guide. They are strong minded and tend to topple over each other while talking. They've created more space for one another and are excited to hear the counter argument. Using that as a basis yes it has helped. But Nathan honestly haven't done too much of a study or focused on that.

(Allan: Is it unconsciously that the community has tried to practice that dialogue or at least listen to each other?)

Yes, Nathan thinks its subconscious. They are trying to understand better.

5. Do you think your issue guide is adequately serving the end goal of achieving alignment?

The naming and framing process was on point – Nathan thinks that it's hard to know moving forward if it will adequately serve achieving alignment. If he continues to refer to it with the same group and development in Yonkers continues at the rate it is; who knows if it will stay aligned or not. But he thinks it will because the issues are deep and the gap is getting larger.

(Allan: Has that alignment helped you in translating in what community members want to do and funders?)

Nathan himself is stepping away from grants. But it is something he was cognoscente of and was part of the FY 18 planning process. He's been doing simple things at not much cost. The grants Groundwork Hudson Valley is applying for FY 2018 are more youth oriented that are general – 50,000 for youth programs each year. He is currently working with developers to get money out of them and trying to get unrestricted funds. Groundwork Hudson Valley is moving opposite direction because they saw they were misaligned – the new Executive Director who allowed for realignment.

6. Is the naming - framing - alignment process one that you will continue to use in your community? If you leave your community, would you bring that process with you?

Yes. It's something that was part of our work. The project has helped do this better. It's our role to advocate once we've named and framed the issues. That's our role and if we stop doing that then we have to take a step back and think about that.

Yes Nathan would bring the process with him. This whole process has been enlightening. With this administration he doesn't know what's going to happen.

7. Has your organization changed the way they interact with their community? If yes, in what ways?

For a while there might have been misalignment with older comfortable staff members. Nathan has been very vocal and hasn't held back in what he wanted to say. The reason Groundwork Hudson Valley is there is to serve our constituents, which is the everyday person on the ground. There has been in a new energy and a new insight in Groundwork Hudson Valley.

Accountability has been a big topic. There's always a concern that it is not his space to remind

people while we are here - now he's not afraid to do so. Groundwork Hudson Valley needs to respect their community.

However, his coworkers haven't been using same process. But Nathan does discuss the naming and framing and alignment in the staff meetings so they know about the issue guide and how to use it – i.e. for essays for youth etc. He's made it available but doesn't know if anyone will take it on.

(Allan: do you have a sense that the old coworkers were excited or apprehensive about you going being a part of this project?)

They were excited that he went to Kettering. He thinks it might be hard for them to hear things that he said in the learning exchanges, for example race conversations about appeasing whites in a majority poc community. Its baby steps.

8. Do you think that the community views your organization differently now that you have done the naming - framing - alignment process?

There has been – because of grant funding- a lack of accountability and follow up. Nathan did a lot of repairing of partnerships when he came on. His dedication to the project and repairing those relationships – this work has helped repair some of those relationships. The history of Yonkers is long and deep, there's a lack of forgiveness and trust and there's skepticism of the organization. He thinks that's good to not be complacent. But as a whole he doesn't know if Groundwork Hudson Valley has fixed relationships. There has been many direct experiences with people in Groundwork Hudson Valley and they still have a bad taste in their mouths.

(Allan: If working through this process has helped move you and Groundwork Hudson Valley forward, what rough percentage would attribute that to the process?)

The things at Kettering were not brand new to him. Nathan's coworker helped a lot with art and trauma. Kettering has just made it more obvious. Kettering taught him that everything he has learned is true and saw it through different lens. A percentage would be about 15-20%. This isn't the first time he's heard a lot of this.

9. Have you created any new partnerships in this process? If yes, then with whom? If not, why?

Nathan's been reaching out to other sections of Yonkers. The sentiment is that Groundwork Hudson Valley is geopolitically stuck in one area. A lot is being done to try to find mover and shakers in different organizations. He's meet with different leaders and is on good terms with them. He's working to include more leaders.

(Kirsten: Would you have done these partnerships without the project?)

The Executive Director learned that we haven't met with other people and she wanted a presence on the east side. It is Kettering a little bit but would have happened regardless with a new Executive Director.

(Allan: does the Kettering project help to inform or engage the way you work in expansion communities?)

If the topic of food security comes up, Nathan can easily use this project as a resource. Yes, it has had influence over those partnerships. They wouldn't have been created the same way without having gone through the aligning process.

(Allan: As you extend out in terms of geography – is there any effort to extend out your work. Do you deal with same kinds of supporters in different places?)

Both. The science barge always brings in science and food people. Groundwork Hudson Valley

fits in everywhere – youth program has allowed us to do that. You can teach youth in various topics in various means. For example, when he teaches gardening but he brings in other topics.

10. Have you had results from the small project ideas discussed at the last workshop? If yes, what kind of results?

Nathan wrote a grant for the jam making – small community grant done by local junior league of Bronxville. It would be \$2,000. He has not heard back on the grant yet.

(Allan: if the fruit comes in and the money doesn't will you still do it?)

Yes they would probably go forward and his partners are awesome, for example the farmer would give them damaged fruit that he can't sell.

(Kirsten: What is the feeling at Groundwork Hudson Valley on the venture capitalism brought up at the learning exchange?)

It's not something he has pursued but did relay the information to the development team but hasn't had a chance of follow. People were like "huh maybe we will do this".

11. Do you feel that because of the workshop, you approached the project ideas differently?

Nathan's sure it impacted how he went about the project ideas. He hasn't done a tremendous amount of work on them as of right now. Just thinking about alignment, it has been incorporated into the meetings since then.

12. What are you looking to gain or discuss during the last workshop?

He's wondering as a group – we were all brought together i.e. vista program and the background. He is curious as to next steps as a group and if this is it. He's wondering if there would be a part two

(Allan: why should Kettering care about this group?)

We are doing stuff down on the ground. Now more than ever Kettering should be interested in how we get citizens engaged. There's a huge contingency of white liberals who are protesting. The people who are most depressed – what's going to happen to his neighbors who are 12 to a house. How do we give them ownership over the decisions that have been given to them? How do we give them agency?

(Allan: What are 1 or 2 real things that Kettering has brought to Groundwork Hudson Valley?)

The alignment exercises were really important to think about. Even to align within organization. Solidification of understanding what community engagement can look like and be done right. He feels stronger in where he stands and what the right thing is.

Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument – Jackie Leyba

Final Interview

05/17/2017 3:30PMEST

1. Do you feel that the issue guide has been a document that you have continuously used throughout this process?

Jackie ended up doing 3 issue guides. His last issue guide in particular helped quite a bit with the Rio Rancho Public Schools. He made a partnership because of the issue guide and the processes that he is using now. Overall, Jackie has used the issue guide quite a bit. He's used for framework for a grant from the National Park Service Foundation. The last issue guide, he has used more than the other issue guides he was batting around. The issue guide has been a tool that he has used since he's completed it and up until now. Jackie plans on using for further grants, aligning partners, and school districts.

(Allan: What did the issue guide end up producing?)

The issue guide is about engaging youth on public lands. It's a set up for a framework and information for when he goes to partners. It illuminates ways to engage communities and the need some of these communities might have in getting individuals/school groups to go on public lands. The issue guide helps Jackie reach out to a decision maker in school district to get them on board the idea of getting students to public lands.

(Allan: Did you develop that issue guide with school district?)

Jackie had a few concern gatherings. One was with Wings for Life which is an organization for families of incarcerated and Outdoor Afro which works with youth in metro areas. These are important partners because BLM is currently not seeing other races come to the park. Jackie also had a concern gathering with a couple Pueblos, YMCA, and the public schools. The concern gatherings and issue guide developed together. Access to public lands was a significant issue for all of these groups because they didn't have funding to get to the public lands. KTTR is not immediately in their backyard.

2. Do you think your community has buy in on the issue guide? What happened to the other two issue guides?

Those whom he has shared the issue guide with have buy in, primarily the YMCA and public schools that he is reaching out to. He hasn't shared completed issue guide with the Pueblo or Outdoor Afro yet because hasn't found a mechanism for funding to reach out to them but once he does he will.

First issue guide: physical cost of public lands

Second issue guide: was deemed too technical

3. Has your community changed how they discuss issues? If not, why do you think that is?

Jackie thinks so because before he would have to reach out to the community, especially YMCA and Rio Rancho Public Schools. After the concern gatherings and the issue guide, they keep trying to get a hold of him and asking what can we do to solve x? YMCA now has a group to get youth to another monument. Rio Rancho Public Schools is intrigued about other locations to take the kids. Jackie is currently working at El Malpais National Monument– on a detail to utilize partners to increase leverage. Before he didn't have an open line of communication. His partners

now feel more comfortable with that line. It's not just about successes where BLM comes in and fixes, his partners are now coming to him to ask how do we fix this together. Jackie is still having concern gatherings and finding solutions to the problems. There's a lot of support for this in his area. The Kettering process has changed the way those partners/community is working with BLM.

4. Do you think your issue guide is adequately serving the end goal of achieving alignment?

Yes. One of the ways they did that –because of the concern gatherings and issue guide – is that they identified partners to target. BLM had vested partners to be the fiscal agents that could provide letters of supports – they have the recourses behind them to adequately facilitate the grant. One of the advantages is not working in the federal grants/agreements processes and shift all responsibility to supporters. BLM just oversees data and general oversight. Thankful that the partners identified in issue guide are targeting different partners and figuring out who will be useful partners in the grant(s).

5. Is the naming - framing - alignment process one that you will continue to use in your community? If you leave your community, would you bring that process with you?

Yes, Jackie will continue to use it. It's a good tool to identify partners and community members. It's a way to get everyone to know who's vested and opens up a dialogue. Everyone who knows the issues now see where we could potential align. Jackie has already changed communities, having been moved from KTTR to El Malpais National Monument. He's going start doing the Kettering process at El Malpais. He'll use the issue guide and concern gatherings to help identify name/frame issues and to identify and build a coalition of partners to move forward on issues.

(Allan: Does KTTR continue in your absence?)

The partnerships are still there and grants are active. It's not as functional – it's limping along. The interim manager needs to get acquainted with going on. Partnerships with Pueblo have collapsed since Jackie has left. He is trying to utilize partnerships from KTTR with El Malpais but can still push resources back to KTTR.

6. Has your organization changed the way they interact with their community? If yes, in what ways?

It's mostly Jackie who drives change. He had one concern gathering and district manager found out about it – she invited herself. The conversation turned political about executive orders and administration in Washington DC and that wasn't the intention of concern gathering. The partnerships aren't being fostered the way they used to be. Until the district manager leaves, Jackie's the only one maintaining partnerships. Partners try to reach out to other managers and to the district manager– the partners know for these programs to stay alive, they need to have news articles and keep it front and center so that way the managers resistance to what the partners do is more difficult.

(Allan: It's fun every now and then to get upper management to have to say you've done a good job.)

Lots of opposition comes from managers – partnerships are a lot of work. They like to say that Jackie's stretched too thin – but Jackie says that's what his job is. They complain about his workload. It's almost the Peter Principle. Dealing with manager's egos and self-esteem can be

difficult.

7. Do you think that the community views differently now that you have done the naming - framing - alignment process?

Yes. He wants to build a coalition and put a name behind it. He doesn't have anything solid yet. Maybe have a pre-meeting just to inform them on the process and give them some concepts behind it. For Jackie, the informal naming and framing – where we talked about mental health in America in the first workshop got Jackie thinking about how we are doing this. This turned the whole process for him. It was difficult for him and he was lost at first – but seeing it in action got him to understand. He would like to have intro session with partners to get everyone on the same page.

8. Have you created any new partnerships in this process? If yes, then with whom? If not, why?

Wings for Life, Outdoor Afro, Rio Rancho Public School System – they are the 3 main ones that have been created because of this process. A few more that were at concern gatherings who were interested but our mutual goals haven't aligned them with. That requires a bit of funding so they can show accomplishments right away and build on the partnership. It doesn't take a whole lot of money – Rio Rancho was \$1000 from a grant from Hands on the Land. Jackie has already received another grant to align for more grant money with children with disabilities. Jackie has worked with Hands on the Land previously and KTTR is one of their sites. He has received grants before from them.

(Allan: Explained Robin Snyder's Appomattox committee: exploring potential of doing new things together – some ideas with the part and some without the park. Jackie might find it an interesting discussion with Robin.)

Jackie established Amigos Alliance, which is similar to Robin's committee. The idea was to have a group of partners that have mutual goals and objectives for providing opportunities and engaging with communities. The group consists of BLM, Forest Service, NPS, YMCA, and nonprofits. There's a Board of Directors – some voting and some non-voting depending on affiliation with the government. Amigos Alliance was made up of partners that had resources, had funding, and had a whole network of partners. He could only do so much ethically and the ethics counselors wouldn't let him move forward. Currently, Amigos Alliance is at a stalemate due to 3 positions being vacant. It was the Amigos Alliance who moderated the last concern gathering. One good thing was that there was a couple of tribes in the discussion with us – they have a contentious relationship with the government, so having the Amigos run the concern gathering – that worked out really well.

9. Have you had results from the small project ideas discussed at the last workshop? If yes, what kind of results? Do you feel that because of the workshop, you approached the project ideas differently? If not, what has prevented you from moving forward on that project?

KTTR is seeing an increase in baby boomers – continue to sponsor activities. Hasn't moved forward in that one. Jackie did create the Senior Ranger Program – now more tailored towards adults so that way we don't alienate any of those groups. He did have a rough draft of the program into visual artist specialist – she is very backlogged and haven't the funding to contract those services out. He did look at the grant for \$3000 and if he can apply for that grant to fund

that Senior Ranger Program that would be a good way to move forward on that small project idea.

Yes, he looked at the project differently because of the workshop. By getting all these like-minded individuals in the room – shows the benefit of targeting individuals in the community that are forward thinking and have vision on where to go. By having the workshop you can see the outcomes and potential with targeting audiences and doing legwork to getting partners. Overall, it's helpful to really focus on groups that care and want to be there makes a big difference when discussing ideas. One concern gathering wasn't a targeted audience – so wasn't beneficial as the last one he did.

10. What are you looking to gain or discuss during the last workshop?

Looking for paths forward and ways that we can align in that room. How do we continue? List serves, Kettering Foundation newsletter, etc. He doesn't want this work to go to wayside and he wants to continue to align. Jackie's not sure how to do that because of location and demographics. But these friendships should continue. He wants to see the results amongst all of us.

11. What are the successes of the project thus far that you have not mentioned before?

He can't think of anything off the top of his head – if you ask question again he'll have an answer.

San Antonio Historical Missions National Park - Anna Martinez-Amos, Melea Taylor, and Kristian Browning

San Antonio Historical Missions National Park has withdrawn from the project and never responded for interview inquiries.

Alex Johnson and Karen Ortiz – Western Slope Conservation Center

Final Interview

April 26, 2017 10AM

1. Do you feel that the issue guide has been a document that you have continuously used throughout this process?

Alex: The short answer is no. We talked on every call about the document itself. He still thinks a document needs to be produced that's functional in our community and that isn't so directly correlated with oil and gas per conversations with Kettering. Naming and framing pieces of process have been used continuously in the organization if not always implemented in the community. For him, it's been so challenging because they aren't going to cover lots of new stuff. The timing has been interesting and challenging due to federal decision making policies. It sucks air out of the room and affects the capacity of an organization and community to engage in a specific document. The process of evaluating shared values and to name and frame them is an ongoing process.

Karen: The naming and framing has been struggling – when we first started the project it changed from coal to other energy. There is another organization working on oil and gas issues who backtracked on where they stood and their agreements with the county and BLM. That has changed how Western Slope Conservation Center does their work. Everything spirals from there. Not to blame the circumstances but the circumstances with only one real staff member made it impossible to go to a deeper level.

(Allan: That deviation is strongly encouraged. He wonders about issue guide itself. Do you have some hope of producing something by the time we do the next workshop?)

Alex: He does have that hope that they will produce something. He got to a point in the last workshop with creative placemaking and that could be useful for an issue guide. That's something that could be of real value for the community as a whole. It would all be about whether the shared values on the landscape and what those are. It's interesting because our concern gathering and engagement with community has been talked this issue about but not in the context of an issue guide. They could do extrapolation through that process but Alex doesn't want to create an artificial document. It's hard to find the capacity to create the meetings surrounding the values of the landscape itself.

(Allan: Mediating between the federal government, community etc. is no small task. We would like you to create a rough issue guide.)

Alex: Scale has been one of the hardest parts for us. We have to go through the process to then start over and do the process correctly.

Karen: There's a disconnect between the academic world and the real world. It's one thing to have documentation and then another to have it match on the ground or be a super valuable exercise. This is one of the challenges we faced.

(Allan: It's about place and real people and real community opposed to the academic definition of community. It's good to hear the exercise was invaluable. Whether or not it produced a real issue guide, it's more important to produce change.)

Karen: The issue guide provided structure that we didn't have before to at least start with.

Alex: He agrees with some of the concepts and the theories of conceptual structures have been really valuable to him as a leader of the organization and in the community. Everything is sinking consciously and "deliberately" is a very important term. To provide structure, those sort

of tools are invaluable. Those pieces we have already benefited from the process in direct/indirect ways. The part difficult has been implementation. Creating documents have been more difficult than the actual process.

Karen: We both are perfectionists. We are hitting a wall with trying to figure out how to get something we feel is good enough for us at that level. At the end of the day just trying to put some ideas down that are place based and coherent is probably a good thing.

2. Do you think your community has buy in on the issue guide?

Alex: We literally have had very little buy in on the community wanting to engage in producing an issue guide. They have attempted and came up empty. There are people who want to engage with their agendas involved. Ironically, more people want to engage with Western Slope Conservation Center. Willingly or not, they are participating in naming and framing. Western Slope Conservation Center is thriving in exciting new ways with the board and coalition groups. As far as the document itself, if it were taken very literally there wouldn't be a whole lot of community engagement.

Karen: We probably wouldn't engage in community until we were comfortable enough with document but they community has been engaged in the issues and thought process. Most engagement with the community on issue guides has been indirect.

3. Has your community changed how they discuss issues? If not, why do you think that is?

Karen: In some regards yes. From her point of view, the prior chair used to process issues by talking. So many times you end up having conversations that would lead nowhere. So that whole idea to hone down to a wicked problem and asking what is the problem is great. Honing in on strategies to discuss and issue before figuring out the problem. It helped her to have that organized ahead of time so people don't walk away from the table feeling time was wasted. They reached a low point with the board on dialogue during the process. The democratic process has been interesting and she's been trying to figure out how to make this process work on big issues.

Alex: Now there's more commitment by the organization and board for real grassroots input that is deliberative and conscious. The Kettering ideas are helpful and relevant. Alex noted that Kettering is concerned about civic life and these larger shifts in democratic power and civic society. It's interesting to him because civic life is alive and well in Paonia. Alex is more appreciative of that now. Kettering has helped the Western Slope Conservation Center realize how valuable their role is and unique the civic engagement in Paonia.

Karen: Sometimes it's hard to see the connection. This doesn't necessary meet Phil's purpose but it has some unexpected positive consequences.

4. Do you think your issue guide is adequately serving the end goal of achieving alignment?

Alex: It's hard to tease out what/how the artifact of an issue guide directly effects alignment. But he will say that the process we've been going through and really focusing on how to name and frame the community concerns in a way moving forward and having actions in response to wicked problems. He has been seeing alignment pieces already. There has been correlations with process and now having a major donor program talking about values that we all share. Overall, it has been pretty successful. Now Western Slope Conservation Center is going to have a program with multiple events a year focusing on shared values and really getting people excited and selling destinations. Alex has gotten some good support with the development from other organizations. That alignment is exciting. Also Western Slope Conservation Center has partnered

with other groups specifically tied to public lands and values around public lands. Karen and Alex have been seeing other organizations become much more interested in engaging with Western Slope Conservation Center such as other foundations, state wide groups, etc. The other organizations want to get into the action on North Fork and what the values are here locally. They are reaching out because they sense we have a better sense of the community in Paonia. We name and frame around the work we do and the work becomes transparent.

Karen: What we observed is that other organizations have spiraled out of control and are creating a sense of paranoia. They've been holding their ground and we understand our priorities. By understanding the community we know what our hard and fast line is in the sand.

5. Is the naming - framing - alignment process one that you will continue to use in your community? If you leave your community, would you bring that process with you?

They both answered yes to the first question without going into further detail.

Alex: He doesn't ever see leaving the community. He would say that yes professionally and otherwise he would certainly take these ideas with him. Western Slope Conservation Center is doing all this work locally, but also along with alignment successes we are also finding greater relevance on regional, state, and national level. Brining that process to different scales would be interesting to think about. The idea and concepts are valuable and take with/have into these larger conversations on larger levels on how to engage communities on regional and national levels.

Karen: She sees herself down the road helping that. It helps to know the questions that might asked and to move in a more intentional manner.

(Allan: It's hard to go through all this without permanently changing perspective on your work.)

Karen: It's good to have tool box to ask questions and see whether to engage in an issue.

6. Has your organization changed the way they interact with their community? If yes, in what ways?

The both answered yes without going into further detail.

(Allan: He's noticed other organizations find that your organization has figured out how to work with the community and want to tap that for your perspective)

Alex: People want to have a sense that there's looking to the future. We can collectively find shared concerns and work through that to find some sort of common actions that will address those issues. Very different then "our home is under threat and everything will be ruined if we don't stop xyz right now." They are competing against reactive and fear based engagement with community. Alex and Karen are getting satisfaction out of believing in future and common concerns and power of community to address concerns together. That has changed with us as an organization.

Karen: It has clarified the organization's own resolve and confirm our convictions. In improving relationships with political people, we really enhance our position with them.

Alex: We haven't talked a whole lot about where power resides. That's an alignment piece that we have been very conscious of, especially over last few months.

(Allan: now that org is a bridge builder, what % of that is attributed to work on Kettering?)

Alex: We are fortunate to have a legacy organization that has managed different forms of conflict. Gains are part of the legacy of organization. He estimates around 15%. Karen and Alex are new in leadership roles and the timing of this project has been really good for them.

7. Do you think that the community views your organization differently now that you have done the naming - framing - alignment process?

Inclusion of bigger stakeholder groups and the increase of members are indicative of that. They were searching for identify and leadership within organization when they started. Has been really helpful in moving forward in that direction to realize our strategic plan and hone those goal areas down a little bit more. They were finishing up the strategic plan when the project came along and some deliberative dialogue and the process was indirectly effecting the honing of the goal areas in the strategic plan.

8. Have you created any new partnerships in this process? If yes, then with whom? If not, why?

They've been strengthening partnerships. They've been working with Delta county commissioners. In general, they've been working on low hanging fruit with partners. Another interesting piece for Western Slope Conservation Center is the larger network of other organizations on state, regional, and national levels. Western Slope Conservation Center has been brought into those higher level conversations. They've been partnering with Conservation Land Foundation, Friends Grassroots Network, state groups, Conservation Colorado. Wilderness Workshop and Wilderness Society have been important partners to navigate larger policy pieces. Western Colorado Congress was a regional group to support groups like ours who didn't have staff. They have been at the table with us because it's important to do so.

9. Have you had results from the small project ideas discussed at the last workshop? If yes, what kind of results? Do you feel that because of the workshop, you approached the project ideas differently? If not, what has prevented you from moving forward on that project?

Alex: He reviewed project ideas afterwards. In the exchange, we talked about placemaking. This will shape the public lands organizing. Western Slope Conservation Center is moving forward with river park workshop and river float fest in early June. They have been really more deliberate than they would have been in trying to engage with community members in the projects. Also, have they have an opportunity for the community itself to reflect on what's been accomplished. What are the ongoing needs and how do we work on alignment moving forward? He has approached projects differently because of the learning exchange. He's been looking deliberately and producing one event and including a working group that they've had trouble keeping alive over the past few years. The ideas from the learning exchange will hopefully spur a working group that has legs.

11. What are you looking to gain or discuss during the last workshop?

Alex: He's interest in the relationship with the cohort of other participants. That is something that could be lasting and enduring legacy of the project. Some of the relationships, specifically Ann Oliver of Animas Watershed Partnership have been very beneficial. It's also interesting to think about the federal agencies relationships that are professional and personal. Somehow figuring out how to create some closure way to stay in touch and maintain those relationships could be really valuable. An idea would be semi-formal peer coaching. It could be worthwhile to do again semi-formal in n the last exchange. The researchers could provide which groups might be helpful to each other to remain in contact with each other and utilize face to face technology.

United General Hospital 304 - Marjie Bell

Final Interview

05/17/2017 4:30PMEST

1. Do you feel that the issue guide has been a document that you have continuously used throughout this process?

Actually yes and it's been modified a number of times. Mainly adapted it for depending on what we are using it for. Marjie submitted as a supporting document for USDA grant to show how involved the low-income community members' voices were in this project. The issue guide was referenced in drug free communities grant as demonstration of community engagement.

(Allan: and that has been helpful?)

One of the most helpful pieces – one of community members who had insightful contributions – they are the one who noted that you can create jobs but I hear for employers that they aren't job ready. Their input has caused it to be modified times. The community member has a better on the ground sense of conditions than Marjie.

2. Do you think your community has buy in on the issue guide?

The advisory group does. They have been really engaged in modifying the issue guide and discussing options and tradeoffs. She's not sure about larger community yet. First forum is scheduled for June 19th. Then Marjie will see how they have bought in to the process and what the feedback is. With the concern gatherings and the naming and framing, people were engaged and seemed like they had bought in.

(Allan: How many people are you talking about?)

The advisory group is about 10. Several dozen who provided in put in concern gatherings.

3. Has your community changed how they discuss issues? If not, why do you think that is?

Well, Marjie thinks during the times she facilitated those sessions, she tried really hard to redirect people who just wanted to keep talking about problems. Sure it's very common with this process. There was not that many hours of direct contact in discussing issues in this format. She can't say there's any permanent change unless we do this over and over and change the way it's facilitated. Marjie thinks talking about options and tradeoffs were starting to shift away from hammering problems. It has changed the way they view the process. Then again, it would need to be a much longer-term effort.

(Allan: Trying to change a community's culture habits isn't an overnight process.)

No it's not and you guys know that. One thing I didn't notice was the school district started superintendent search late last year. The same time concern gatherings were being held. She saw that process with people who discussed school problems. Seemed to her voicing their opinions got the community to be more prepped for superintendent search. People were prepared to be heard and attended community forums. Someone contacted Marjie that they need to write a letter of support to school board to look for superintendent who will value Food to School program. The school board had 3 finalists and they passed up a native son who didn't want to be an agent of change. The board selected the one who Marjie was hoping they would. The new

superintendent is a strong professional who wants to make a change. She holds on to a thread in the project might have helped spark people to be so engaged in the search. They saw how we were taking concerns and moving towards options for solving those.

4. Do you think your issue guide is adequately serving the end goal of achieving alignment?

Long term – yes. The process of creating/tweaking the issue guide has helped form new networks and engages with new networks/stakeholders to pursue mutual goals. Also allowed us to pull together a number of stakeholders who are working separately to bring them all into a room at one time. There's a lot of people doing same thing who don't talk to each other.

(Allan: just that alone is a significant accomplishment in small community. Will this last for a while?)

Yes. Collaborating on more projects and sustaining the ones we have. She hopes to add more partners.

5. Is the naming - framing - alignment process one that you will continue to use in your community? If you leave your community, would you bring that process with you?

Yes, she does. She really likes this process. It served community well. One of the ideas that she had that a community member suggested was doing this process with youth. This is their community. They are idealistic and come up with some great ideas. One of things they would like to see is creating opportunity so kids don't feel like they have to leave to have a life.

(Allan: How far is most useful job center?)

20 miles and it is a commute that a lot of people make. Locals rely on seasonal work. Industrial/manufacturing is big in the county.

6. Has your organization changed the way they interact with their community? If yes, in what ways?

Well – because this process was prescriptive, yes. It created an intentional interaction. At the same time we were pretty involved before that. We would get out of the office and make things happen in community. It gave United General a little boost and got to dig deep and question underlying assumptions and motivations.

(Allan: Moments when you realized you were telling them rather than asking what they really want to do?)

Marjie's not sure. Often we go in with health hat on. Many community members just want to have their families graduate from school. Interesting to have these sessions. Guess what we are trying to do is find common ground and get needs met and making progress in some way.

(Allan: They are making progress?)

Yes I think so.

7. Do you think that the community views your organization differently now that you have done the naming - framing - alignment process?

United General has earned another level of credibility. Beneficial to our organization because we have gotten a lot of kudos for showing up the community. The community has enjoyed the process and appreciated being asked their opinion. Marjie also sees the resources coming into the

community. Both before, during, and following up to this project.

(Allan: Has this project brought more resources that they recognize?)

Yes they are working with Boys and Girls Club. They are working with them to do 21st century learning center and would get Boys and Girls Club to help with programming. That right there is huge.

(Allan: it will be huge if you can just get it started.)

The exciting thing about that is the Boys and Girls Club will assume responsibility for operations and fundraising. Sustainability will be on them not the community. Marjie met with the State Director of the Clubs. He is very positive of being funded and stated that “a drastic intervention” is needed and his club can meet that need. One of the bonuses is that it also aligns with a lot of ideas that came out of naming and framing, which is kids in the community need mentors and learn practical skills. We can fold them into after school programming and clubs. That way they will honor things heard in concern gatherings and issue guides.

(Allan: Also honors skills that will go away if someone doesn't pass them on. Gardening in coal country being lost.)

8. Have you created any new partnerships in this process? If yes, then with whom? If not, why?

The Boys and Girls Club. Community Action of Skagit County to cohost forum and help provide dinner, community advisory group came out from them. Concrete School Board, Puget Sound Energy (funding for van), Seattle City Light, Farm to School has reached out to new partners to innovate a teaching and learning kitchen. Tremendous effort to hold donor dinner last month – raised \$1600 first try, new work with lots of people to put that on. Pacific Tonewoods – mill high-end wood for instruments. They donated butcher-block counter top for the kitchen project.

9. Have you had results from the small project ideas discussed at the last workshop? If yes, what kind of results? Do you feel that because of the workshop, you approached the project ideas differently? If not, what has prevented you from moving forward on that project?

Boys And Girls Club moving forward on. Looking at data for proposal for them. Bringing in mentoring useful skills into the project. Expanding the Farm to School and Summer Learning Adventure Program. Leveraging funding to reach countywide funding.

Got an active trails grant – forming hiking club for youth and families and guiding for hikes. Trying to get toehold in physical activity and getting more people to the parks.

United General doesn't do direct service. They don't have clients or kids. That forces them to go out and network and collaborate on projects. Because that's our MO – the project gave us extra motivation to do what we do.

(Allan: did it enable to you do it smarter/better?)

Yes.

10. What are you looking to gain or discuss during the last workshop?

More ideas and inspiration, for example tapping into Jackie like Allan mentioned. A million dollars to sustain the projects that she loves and starts new ones. She's happy to get together with

everyone again. The workshops have been valuable.

11. What percentage would you attribute your success to the Kettering process?

33%. Some of success is still unknown. Still waiting on big grants. Her percentage could change depending on those.

12. What are the successes of the project thus far that you have not mentioned before?

This project has been really helpful. Expanded her circle of contacts and gained deeper understanding of dynamics and learning from their perspectives. She's realized the tensions between natives and new rich retirees. Retired people are the movers/shakers.

Reflective Questions

Animas Watershed Partnership - Ann Oliver Reflective Questions

1. What challenges are you facing in trying to shift toward a more deliberative politics in your community? How are community networks changing, if at all?

The challenges we face in shifting toward a more deliberative politics in the Animas River community are apathy, relative few active people, leadership, and issues which are significant and/or urgent. There is also the sense that “people are working on that, so what more can I add?”

Although I am not sure this is universal in our community, my sense of how community networks are changing includes that, for instance the water management/conservation network, is broadening to include more regional and statewide connections. At the same time the network of people with concerns about the Animas watershed has broadened locally to include emergency management personnel, people involved in the arts, and to some extent, local businesses. In other words, the Animas network has become more diverse in terms of interests. However, it remains a network of low diversity when it comes to socio-economic backgrounds, although individuals and agencies of the Navajo nation have become more involved and active since the Goldking Mine Incident.

2. Did you do any research, either internal or external, that actually changed your efforts to align toward some shared purpose? Do you think your community looks at its abilities any differently?

Yes, I connected with a staff member of the City of Farmington Parks and Rec Department. He has expertise in “Social Marketing” and interest in involving community members more in implementing water conservation and water quality improvement measures. We had not been focusing much effort on aligning our work with municipal recreation interests in this way, but this connection has opened the door (and the minds of some of my members) to a shared purpose of influencing community behavior toward the Animas River.

Also, my own and my partner’s participation in the Kettering Workshops has expanded our thinking about aligning efforts with the arts community to engage community members in sharing, learning about and taking action for the Animas River.

I think our community may feel a bit more resilient and more connected due to the changes that have been occurring in the last two years, but this is truly difficult to gauge. I at least feel that we are.

3. Has your community been able to translate their needs into the language of any potential partners? If so, please explain the needs and the process you used.

So far I would say that we have not focused effort on translating our needs into the language of new partners. Of course we do this regularly in our grant writing, adapting what our goals and desired outcomes are to the interests and language of the funding agency. However, I consider those granting agencies to be “the usual partners” not new potential partners. Part of the reason for not having reached out formally to new potential partners is timing, inertia and lack of need. To date our usual (and easy) partners are able to fulfill our most immediate needs. This is not to

say we have no needs unfilled. We certainly do! These include the need for longer term operations funding, the need to overcome apathy and engage people more effectively and consistently, and the need to develop more capacity for community engagement.

4. How did you capture and share the outcomes of the forums? Who did you share those outcomes with?

While we have not yet held a deliberative forum, we plan to do so in January 2018, in lieu of our annual Steering Committee retreat. We plan to invite community members active in the arts, education, business, and in social interests such as living wages, affordable housing, as well as the Native American and Latino communities. We will share the outcomes with all participants as well as with our steering committee and membership, that of the San Juan Watershed Group and the ARC Forum membership, which includes local and state government officials and agencies, public lands managers, businesses.

5. Do you think your community now sees some organizations and government partners as receptive to their needs and working to address said needs? Please give as many specific examples as possible.

In general I would say yes. Two examples are that our partners at Durango Nature Studies call us to see if we have any new or up to date information about water quality in the Florida River before they take their children's summer camps to the river, and people have become aware that two good sources of information about the safety of the Animas River are our partners in ARC Forum: San Juan Basin Health and Mountain Studies Institute.

6. What new partnerships have been formed because of alignment? Have there been significant benefits from these new partnerships? Please list each new partnership and the benefits derived, whether short or long-term.

New partners include San Juan Basin Health, Great Old Broads for Wilderness, Fort Lewis College, City of Farmington Parks and Recreation and Colorado Parks and Wildlife: in the short term we have all partnered to raise awareness about the Animas River and to engage community members in learning about and adjusting behavior to help keep the river resilient.

7. Have you found that other organizations and governments are responding to your community work so that your community's goals can be achieved?

Yes, although this is mixed. Some more so, while from others we still hope for a greater response.

8. What significant challenges do you still face in describing your work in creating meaningful partnerships with other organizations? What made this difficult? Tell us what you tried, what is working and what is not working, please.

I would say we still face the challenges of sustaining and broadening the level to which community members are engaged in our and others efforts to foster stewardship of and action for the Animas River. We have tried hosting volunteer days to replant willows along river banks. These are fun and productive, but we tend to get the same faces volunteering, with only a few new people to the activity and our organization. We have tried reaching out to teachers to develop activities with them and their classrooms, but this has been difficult to sustain for both

them and us. We have hosted river movie nights and had good turnout. We are currently working diligently in a sustained effort to develop an “Animas River Report Card”. This is working well as a partnership effort and our plan is to use the product as a tool for deliberative engagement with other community groups and members.

9. When reflecting on using the issue book, what went well and what was more challenging? What changes would you suggest for the future?

I think it was challenging to develop an issue book for Animas River Water Quality that included options that were both realistic and in tension with one another. It was difficult to avoid kind-of exaggerating the type of actions that might be taken in order to develop adequate tension between the options. I think I might try broadening the problem and redrafting the options to include more realistic actions.

10. Overall, was the time and talent devoted to this project worth it? Here we are looking for your candid overall impression, more than specifics, please.

My partners and I have gotten a lot out of our participation in this project, and have truly appreciated the time and talent that others devoted to it. We have learned new tools, and come to understand and value deliberation as a means of meaningful and real engagement of our community. Our understanding and appreciation for the ways to achieve alignment has broadened as a result of this project, and we have applied and especially benefited from the process of naming and framing the issues that we are working on within the community. We have also benefited from and valued the opportunity to meet and learn from both the Kettering staff and the participants from around the country. Sharing our challenges, frustrations and successes has been very worthwhile and valuable. While all these benefits have been worth my time, I do feel that the time and particularly the considerable travel devoted to the project could have been significantly reduced, and still would have provided nearly the same benefits. Specifically, I feel that the time spent in Ohio was not as well organized and productive as it could have been.

Appomattox Court House National Historical Park – Robin Snyder

Reflective Questions

1. What challenges are you facing in trying to shift toward a more deliberative politics in your community? How are community networks changing, if at all?

The deliberative dialogue process is a different approach for both me and members of the local community. The challenge with this process is shifting from the normal way that we all do business. At the beginning of this process, I reflected that the decision maker is often the Park when engaging partners and community organizations. While that is often the case, partner and community groups also have their own goals and ideas related to tourism efforts and economic development projects in the region. The challenge of deliberative politics in the community is that people come to the table with their own goals, ideas, needs, and assumptions that make it difficult to have an open dialogue about what might work best.

The best example of how community networks are changing is the group of tourism partners who came together to fill a void in this effort in the community. While each entity also had their own ideas, goals, and assumptions, they came to the table with an open mind about how to tackle the challenge of making the Appomattox community a tourism destination instead of a pass-through. This open-minded approach allowed a more honest dialogue to take place to establish a strategy to reach this goal.

Other community networks are not changing in their way of conducting conversations and doing business. Governmental groups like the Town of Appomattox, County of Appomattox, and the Virginia Department of Transportation still approach conversations with their own interests in mind.

2. Did you do any research, either internal or external, that actually changed your efforts to align toward some shared purpose? Do you think your community looks at its abilities any differently?

I did engage in research to seek ways to align Park efforts toward a shared purpose. The research I conducted was internal, as I was examining ways to engage a new partner in arts in the park type activities. The ability for a designated unit of the National Park System to engage communities in new and creative ways is still dependent on the Park's enabling legislation – the reason it was established. When engaging with a key partner, Wolfbane Productions, about hosting a play for four weeks in the Park in which they would charge a fee and sell concessions, I had to research the regulations around this type of use. Further, I had to justify this use in a Park whose primary purpose is to commemorate the surrender of General Robert E. Lee to Lieutenant General Ulysses S. Grant and the effective termination of the Civil War.

While this research process did change how the Park engaged in this activity to host this production for the local community, it still provided a legal framework for the Park to align its efforts with the partner to achieve a shared purpose. In the future, the Park may engage in a more formal partnership relationship to allow for more freedom to align Park purpose with the goals of the theater company. That said, the research also led to the Park establishing criteria for artistic endeavors, so that it can enter into partnership with groups but still stay true to the Park

purpose and mission. I was careful not to set a precedent for the Park that would have negative or unintended consequences.

I think that the community does look at its abilities somewhat differently, as I think that at least in this example partners have a deeper understanding of how important the significance of the Park is to the activities in which it engages. I am hopeful that they regard the Park as a friend and a willing participant in community engagements with the understanding that there are considerations and regulations that the park must adhere to when engaging in creative ventures. The result of this play in the park was a successful community engagement venture that was well-received by members of the community who rarely came to the Park and/or had not attended a Wolfbane Production. The entire production instilled a sense of pride in Appomattox for people who grew up here and do not realize how significant this National Park Site is to the nation's history.

3. Has your community been able to translate their needs into the language of any potential partners? If so, please explain the needs and the process you used.

This question is difficult to answer as I engaged only partner groups and individuals for this deliberative dialogue process. Throughout the course of the research project, I wished that I engaged a wider variety of viewpoints, primarily discussions with citizens at large. Instead, I opted to interview the wide variety of partner groups that I was working with in my capacity as the Park superintendent. This project began at a time when I was just establishing myself in this new role, following the long tenure of my predecessor who was not particularly engaged in community partnerships. In this role, I work with a number of partners in the community – all with varying interests. I targeted this process with the partners because I wanted to learn about their ideas and goals for the community and how the Park could contribute to tourism and economic development efforts. For the first time in my twenty year NPS career, I am working in a park that is regarded as a big deal in a small town – particularly among the partner groups that I interviewed for this project.

This process of engaging partner groups in conversation about their needs and goals and how the Park could be a partner in those efforts certainly allowed for a deeper level of conversation. As a result, there were successes including the establishment of the Appomattox Tourism Advisory Board, a group of interested partners who want to promote the region more widely to community members and visitors to the area. Each partner in this group identified different needs and skill sets resulting in increased tourism efforts for the community playing to their strengths and skills. The group understands the Park's potential role in this group and its limitations in a way that it did to seem to previously.

4. How did you capture and share the outcomes of the forums? Who did you share those outcomes with?

After engaging partner groups in the deliberative dialogue process, I clustered their comments in categories that were recorded during the concern gatherings and created the issue guide that identified three major approaches to the issue of strengthening economies and building local assets in a small town. During the forums which consisted of several different meetings of partner groups, I presented the question: How do we as community organizations leverage our resources to be relevant to the community members that we serve and to increase economic

development of the region?

After initiating the discussion by highlighting three potential approaches, I simply took notes on a pad and paper of people's thoughts on these approaches. Through their discussions, the nuances of the options were identified and more concrete ideas emerged. I shared these outcomes with two different working groups that were already forming as a result of the original dialogue sessions to address different ideas for creative partnership opportunities. One of these groups was the state parks and healthy recreation proponents, while another group was forming to examine the one digital marketing campaign for the region. This group, the Appomattox Tourism Committee enjoyed hearing the outcomes of the forums as it helped them identify a strategy to approach marketing the region. This group is still meeting monthly and increasing its participation at this time with new entities. The website and Facebook page is established; the group elected officers, and is identifying budget needs for 2018.

5. Do you think your community now sees some organizations and government partners as receptive to their needs and working to address said needs? Please give as many specific examples as possible.

Again, it is challenging to answer the question of how the community sees organizations and government partners as receptive to their needs and working to address these needs. As echoed in meetings and discussions with this Kettering Research Group, the next step in this project would be to engage in this process with the community at large rather than the tourism groups and partner organizations who are already working in Appomattox. I do feel that the community organizations that are working together as a result of this process feel that it was valuable and that their needs are being addressed to a greater degree. Unfortunately, I feel that these partner groups have a strong vision, a strategy for getting there, and a sense of community with one another that they did not previously have. However, to be honest, there is still a rift with the Town Council members and the Appomattox County Board of Supervisors. These two government entities are providing minimal support of the tourism efforts, but not nearly enough from the perspective of the organizations involved. The partner groups want to see greater involvement from the region's government groups as well as increased monetary support for the tourism goals. Currently, most of the partners feel that they are operating independently of the Town and county governments and that the regional promotion of the partners groups is something that the local governments should embrace.

6. What new partnerships have been formed because of alignment? Have there been significant benefits from these new partnerships? Please list each new partnership and the benefits derived, whether short or long-term.

New partnerships have formed because of this alignment with significant benefits for the community, increased tourism, and economic development of the region.

a. A partnership of six Virginia State Parks and the National Park Site, Appomattox Court House NHP. The six state parks include Holliday Lake State Park, Bear Creek Lake State Park, High Bridge Trail State Park, James River State Park, Sailor's Creek State Park, and Twin Lakes State Park. This partnership launched the Central Virginia Public Lands, Healthy Parks, Healthy People Program in the late winter of 2017. The mission is to showcase healthy recreational opportunities on public lands in Central Virginia to increase awareness of the national and state

parks, encourage stewardship of these places, and to promote the parks' importance in tourism and economic development in their communities. Currently, each park is handing out passport booklets for community members and visitors to track their visits to the parks and to encourage them to get outside for recreation and exercise. While the NPS designed and printed the passport booklets for each site, the State Parks does a monthly printing of rack cards promoting activities in each event. The partners will evaluate participation in these events and activities at the end of the calendar year to determine next steps for the program in 2018.

b. The Appomattox Tourism Committee launched the Experience Appomattox Campaign which features a video, a website, and a Facebook Page to share information, promote packages, and market the region to destination tourists. This partnership includes the Town of Appomattox, County of Appomattox, VA State Parks, Appomattox Court House NHP, the Appomattox 1865 Foundation, Appomattox Inn and Suites, Wolfbane Productions, Appomattox Chamber of Commerce, The Babcock House Bed and Breakfast, Carver Price Legacy Museum, the American Civil War Museum, Eastern National, and Falling River Country Club Golf Course. New partners are currently joining the group after a presentation was made at a recent Chamber of Commerce luncheon. As the group continues to grow in partners, it has formalized by writing a charter, electing officers, and establishing a budget and goals for the upcoming year. Packages were sold for a few major events in the area including the annual Civil War Anniversary. The group is working on the 2018 calendar to identify seasons and tourism opportunities throughout the year for a variety of visitors.

c. A partnership of Appomattox Court House NHP and Wolfbane Productions launched a first ever theatrical performance at the Park of Romeo and Juliet in the Civil War. A Wolfbane Productions founder wrote the script of the play that incorporated the story of Appomattox, VA during the American Civil War. The play had 15 productions during the month of June with the historical buildings of the Park as the set. Nearly 2000 people attended the production, with an informal analysis showing that many were from the local and surrounding communities. The play featured actors from New York and locally who provided a wonderful twist on this Shakespeare favorite. It was such a success for the Park and the theater company in establishing themselves in the mindset of the local community, encouraging tourism, and instilling pride in the region's significance to the nation that the partners are targeting a second production of the play in June 2018.

7. Have you found that other organizations and governments are responding to your community work so that your community's goals can be achieved?

There has been a positive response to the partners work on the initiatives stated above. The community response to the production of Romeo and Juliet was invaluable. For Wolfbane, it put this theater company on the map for community and regional residents who were previously unaware of whom they were. For the Park, this alignment provided another way for community members and visitors to understand the significance of Appomattox in the Civil War and why this is preserved as a unit of the National Park Service. Further, it provided the Park a creative to engage the community to participate in arts in the park related activities. The Park is expanding this reach into the exploration of the arts to tell park stories. The local government entities were entirely supportive, and the County Board of Supervisors is even calling for another production next year.

Members of the local community are also participating in the Park's fun runs, dog walks, and bird walks that are being offered for the first time ever because of the Healthy Parks, Healthy People Initiative. Further, this program has improved the relationship and cooperation among parks in the Central Virginia Region.

The Experience Appomattox Campaign is increasing its membership from partner and community groups who also recognize that Appomattox has much to offer visitors. While this initiative could see greater support from local governments, it is building momentum and bringing people to the region.

8. What significant challenges do you still face in describing your work in creating meaningful partnerships with other organizations? What made this difficult? Tell us what you tried, what is working and what is not working, please.

While I feel that there have been positive results in working with the variety of partners that the Park engages regularly, challenges remain. Finding common ground with the partner groups has not been an issue. However, partners often have high expectations and sometimes an unrealistic view of what the National Park Service can offer them or do in their role. For example, as successful as the partnership with Wolfbane Productions was in serving nearly two thousand people with a theatrical production with the park as the stage, there were many complications that were addressed during the process. Partners often get frustrated with the restrictive involvement of the Park due to the fact that it is a federal agency. There is a constant push and pull to find common ground and manage expectations among creative and visionary partner groups.

Even the Park's participation in the Experience Appomattox Campaign has yielded awkward moments where I had to communicate the agency's inability to do things that were against policy or regulation. While I am representing the Park in a "pay to play endeavor," I am bound by rules and regulations about how I participate and the fact that I cannot show favoritism to one group over another. My approach has been one of openness and honesty about what the Park can and cannot do, while always taking the time to clearly explain the reasons why that is the case. Fortunately, the deliberative dialogue process allowed me to start these conversations in an open and honest way, so saying no to something has been easier with that foundation. One way I have tried to address this is by researching a question from a partner group first before I flatly say no, we cannot do that. People often just want to know that their ideas are being considered. The bottom line is most of our partners understand that I want to do what I can to help build tourism in the region, even when I cannot do exactly what they want.

Another challenge is finding the common ground or issue to address. While our partnerships include people who want to accomplish good things—human nature often intercedes. The group dynamics that can fall apart quickly when one person in the mix has a separate goal than the rest of the group. Unless there is clearly defined goal and procedure to accomplish it—the partnership will not be sustained. This is evident with the Appomattox Tourism Committee members becoming frustrated with the lack of support from the Town and County governments. This is a regular topic of conversation among some of the partners, but I try to address this by simply steering the conversation and work to what we can accomplish to build momentum with

the hope that we will see greater support in the future.

9. When reflecting on using the issue book, what went well and what was more challenging? What changes would you suggest for the future?

The issue book was a helpful guide during this process, though I feel that I could have provided stronger options for examining how community organizations leverage resources to be relevant to community members they serve and to increase economic development of the region. Perhaps this was two questions that I attempted to answer instead of one, but I was trying to address the group of people in the community who do not see the value in tourism.

As mentioned previously, the change I would suggest for the future would be to engage in deliberative dialogue with community members at large to identify their thoughts about living in this region and things that concern them and their family members. My approach of just engaging with partners yielded often similar results from tourism groups who needed to see increased visitation and visitor spending as their livelihoods depends on that. Overall, I was pleased with the discussion among the partner groups who identified different perspectives on how to promote this region for economic development opportunities. Their ideas helped me create the issue guidebook. However, I want to engage this entire research process again to see how individual community members' concerns align with what the partners and tourism entities think is important.

10. Overall, was the time and talent devoted to this project worth it? Here we are looking for your candid overall impression, more than specifics, please.

The time and talent devoted to this project was certainly worth it. As I answered these questions and reviewed my notebook for this project, I read my answers to questions posed throughout the process. A few thoughts and impressions are recorded below.

My past experiences illustrated that the agency decides what the issue is and how to solve it. Clearly, working for the NPS – we readily identify a number of issues that we want to tackle. Lots of conversations I have engaged with community groups and partner organizations stemmed from a call for action in the agency such as a lack of diversity in the workforce, a need to provide opportunities to underserved youth, a gap in the stories that parks are telling that need to be more inclusive of all Americans, or a special program or event that the agency wants to promote. While these are all good causes, I entered into conversations with partners to figure out how I could accomplish the agency's goals while not necessarily even considering the partner's goals.

My perception of the role of my organization has changed as a result of this project. For the first time in my twenty year NPS career, I work in a park that is regarded as a big deal in a small town – particularly among the partner groups that I chose to interview for this project. While I thought I had been a good partner and a good listener with park partners in the past, the deliberation process for this project taught me to really listen hard to the meaning behind what others are saying. Sometimes you have to dig deeper to get to the bottom line, but it helped me learn how to look at multiple groups and their feedback and find areas of alignment. This makes for a much more honest and engaging process and from what I have experienced yields stronger partnerships and sustainable outcomes. Beyond the issues themselves, the outcome of deliberative experiences builds trust, respect, and understanding between groups. It helps to

remove assumptions about another person's motives because the conversation is so honest that it breaks down those barriers. It put me in a position to listen, learn, and leverage opportunities with others that can be beneficial for everyone. This has made me a better partner.

I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in this project to engage communities in deliberative dialogue. I value the time that I spent working on the aspects of this research project, and I will employ this process in the future. It is one of the most democratic processes I have experienced in allowing groups to name and frame an issue and discuss and debate options to find alignment. I intend to use the lessons of this experience in my future work with communities, partners, and even staff members. Thank you for allowing me to participate.

Groundwork Hudson Valley – Nathan Hunter

Reflective Questions

1. What challenges are you facing in trying to shift toward a more deliberative politics in your community? How are community networks changing, if at all?

Many of the challenges we are facing today in shifting toward more deliberative politics lie in the roles “professional experts” play in the community involving problem solving. This becomes a challenge when they discredit the concerns of the community by holding the belief that community members do not know what is best for themselves. I recognize parts of this belief system as I analyze my own relationships and work. Myself and other professional experts are quick to identify a problem and quickly find a seemingly fit solution. More times than not, we do not hit the nail on the head and either misread the issue or wrongly ascribe a solution. Shifting to a model of deliberative dialogue where community concerns can surface and options can be laid for them will help us ensure needs are being addressed.

Networks have made minor changes on the small scale, as I host meetings and continue to model the work outlined throughout our workshops at Kettering, specifically with the concern gatherings. There has been more listening on the side of myself and my community partners who have engaged in this work as we stand in the background and begin to hear and distill the real concerns of the community. Being able to hear the concerns, frame them, and then test the framework has been productive and feels more accountable to the community.

2. Did you do any research, either internal or external, that actually changed your efforts to align toward some shared purpose? Do you think your community looks at its abilities any differently?

I did not do any intentional research internally or externally that have prompted specific alignment toward some shared purpose. I believe we have become more aware of where our organizational strengths and weaknesses are and have begun to seek out partnerships for filling in these gaps. For example, through our partnership with the LYFE Coalition we have been working alongside 30 organizations from Yonkers on the Move a walking group to Lower Hudson Perinatal Network, allowing us to be aware of in reach resources, individuals may be in search of. I believe that the community has been recognizing that they do have agency and can voice their opinions as concerns arise. I believe there is still a general sentiment that change is hard to make, however, this seems to be coming from the general U.S. political climate that we are in right now.

3. Has your community been able to translate their needs way into the language of any potential partners? If so, please explain the needs and the process you used.

Through the concern gatherings and naming and framing of issues, the community has translated their needs to potential partners, specifically the team working on this assignment. We have heard that affordable food options are limited and are working to address the needs in several ways, so recently we have partnered with the local food bank to offer free food resources to the community several times a month as an option for those with limited income. Other ways of meeting these varied needs is through the expansion of extremely low cost Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) program that is provided through a community organization called Eat Local NY that does food reclamation at Farmers Markets across the county.

Other needs including employment and job training have been heard and other community partners unrelated to this work have started unrolling various training programs at a low cost to help grow the community's knowledge and skillsets.

4. How did you capture and share the outcomes of the forums? Who did you share those outcomes with?

During the forum we used pen and paper to capture the notes from the concern gatherings. We used recordings during one interview, but the sound was lost due to the death of the phone used to capture the recording. Myself and my partners then pieced through these outcomes to surface the real concerns. Upon request some respondents were informed of what was distilled from the forums. In general the information was only shared between the partners with thought that the final product would be shared with the community participants.

5. Do you think your community now sees some organizations and government partners as receptive to their needs and working to address said needs? Please give as many specific examples as possible.

I do believe that the community has recognized Groundwork as well as the partnering organizations as groups receptive to their needs and working to address these said needs. This belief comes anecdotally from general community conversations that have ended in questions such as "could Groundwork help with that?" More community members have begun to ask what our limitations are in effort to see how we may better support them. I have also received more invitations from other leading organization in the community to participate or help organize more general yearly community events including National Night Out as well as other events outside the context of sustainability.

I say this, but also don't believe the community has not made a dramatic shift from its first impression of which organizations are receptive to hearing and working on community concerns. The partners that were brought together for this work consists of groups that have had a long presence in the community (15+ years) and are more or less credible and trusted NGOs. For example the Yonkers YMCA has been around since the 1950s and has been an anchor in providing resources and opportunities to the community. As a responsive organization in Yonkers, the community has always known that the YMCA as an organization here to support and address community needs. Similarly, many in the community are familiar with Groundwork and understand that our mission focuses on incorporating community voices into decision making and community development plans. Up until now, many believed that Groundwork focused solely on community concerns relating to the natural environment, not knowing that we can actually serve to address or support other concerns. For example through our network of partners, coalitions, and others we have the ability to be more comprehensive in addressing community concerns.

6. What new partnerships have been formed because of alignment? Have there been significant benefits from these new partnerships? Please list each new partnership and the benefits derived, whether short or long-term.

Most recently Groundwork has partnered with Yonkers on the Move an organization focused on getting folks in Yonkers to exercise by attending short walks of as short as half a mile. Together

we have created Yonkers' first Food Walk, a 1-mile walk around the downtown focused on making participants aware of all the great eats and places to grow food in Yonkers! The event takes place in conjunction with our weekly farmers market and encourages individuals to start a Friday morning routine of exercising together before shopping for healthy food together. This was a partnership that was formed during our last Kettering exchange and been quite a success.

7. Have you found that other organizations and governments are responding to your community work so that your community's goals can be achieved?

I have found in the past year that more organizations are looking to collaborate and form functioning partnerships to support the work we are doing, but also to have a larger collective impact. Some of the largest concerns held by the community come down to much larger issues that Groundwork is not able to address alone. Through these channels of support I am able to find ways for our organization to leverage the resources or opportunities of other organizations who may be able to achieve those community goals outside Groundwork's realm.

8. What significant challenges do you still face in describing your work in creating meaningful partnerships with other organizations? What made this difficult? Tell us what you tried, what is working and what is not working, please.

Some of the largest barriers I have found while trying to create meaningful partnerships with other organizations to lie among active participation among internal staff. I often found myself needing to justify the time necessary to build these strong relationships. Usually it's framed around the issue of program specific funding for the time spent or issues of competition come up. Many of the partnership relationships exist between myself and the organization and never successfully branch out to the office administration (Executive Directors or Communications Dept) at Groundwork. I have found without the dedication from others the partnership is really between myself and the organization.

9. When reflecting on using the issue book, what went well and what was more challenging? What changes would you suggest for the future?

To be upfront, I did not use the guide nearly as much as I had hoped since our last learning exchange. I was able to share the document with one community group who received the document well and made mention of its accuracy with definition of the issue and framing of options and the ease of understanding. Finding tension between each of the options was a challenging task as the team naturally wanted to offer solutions rather than simply options. There is intention to implement use of this guide going forward through our work.

10. Overall, was the time and talent devoted to this project worth it? Here we are looking for your candid overall impression, more than specifics, please.

I found it to be an enjoyable process from meeting and working with the partners in the work group in Dayton to introducing the work to the community and putting the principles into action. I most enjoyed the initial stages of meeting with community groups and individuals to hear what their concerns are and then raking through our notes to define the real issues. Many of which were new or irrelevant from my work, but high priority items for the community. This was very insightful for our organizations.

I did find the initial workshops challenging with many of the initial sessions, in hind-site, coming

off overcomplicated. I struggled to understand if there was a real difference between the Kettering's model and general community engagement practices. It wasn't until the final couple of sessions that I began to understand that this work is very similar to community engagement strategies I am used to. However, this model had more tangible pieces that could then allow for easy follow up with the community. I think I would have benefitted from a very candid conversation outlining this.

I also found the process eye opening as the other organizations expressed the barriers to making the various assignments for Kettering work. This was especially insightful when the partners from the DOI spoke and expressed their struggles to do even simpler forms of community engagement that are very easy for small nonprofits such as Groundwork to achieve.

Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument – Jackie Leyba
Reflective Questions

11. What challenges are you facing in trying to shift toward a more deliberative politics in your community? How are community networks changing, if at all?

Some of the challenges we are facing is that there seems to be a recent shift in the willingness of some groups (not all) to want to enter into a deliberative dialogue. Since recent electoral outcomes, there has been a reluctance to work together. I often feel there is a sense of them vs. us attitude. Previously, we came together to identify, name, and frame issues that affected both the community and the agency. Recently, at least one of our previously reliable partners (tribal) is unwilling to cooperate with us and other interested parties, even to the extent that these actions or inactions, may pose a threat to human safety.

Another challenge we face is that internal politics within the agency. This is especially noticeable as it relates to advancing the community structure overall through alignment with partner agencies, organizations and state and local governments. There appears to be a sense of short sidedness that has the potential to impact future long term relationships and previous mutual goals and objectives. I am unsure if it is the same recent electoral outcome(s) or the fact that there is uncertainty with the agency of possible reduction of force or some other mission changes that are driving these formal and informal policy changes.

12. Did you do any research, either internal or external, that actually changed your efforts to align toward some shared purpose? Do you think your community looks at its abilities any differently?

I have conducted research externally on various state, non-profit, and tribal partners to attempt to get a better sense of what their perspective is and to gain a better understanding of their goals and missions. This research was primarily via the internet and what I was able to research really opened my eyes to the perception that some of these entities view themselves. It definitely has changed my efforts to align toward a shared purpose and has both helped improve relations by allowing me to reevaluate and realign our mutual goals and objectives. It has also showed informed me that alignment with certain partners may not be optimal at this particular period.

I think that our community as a whole still has a shared interest that overall strives to maintain is current abilities. There does appear to be heightened tensions with our NGO's and willingness to trust us to continue to partner to the extent that we once and presently (for how long is unknown) do/did. As agencies are directed by the new administration, we are being forced to realign our focus in ways that may not foster these once tried and true partnerships. This realignment of federal resources to other less communal endeavors, may inhibit the ability of our community and force them to reevaluate their abilities due to less agency support.

13. Has your community been able to translate their needs into the language of any potential partners? If so, please explain the needs and the process you used.

Yes, our community has been able to transform their needs in the language of potential partners. I have used the experience that this project has afforded me to begin talks with one of our amazing research study partners Ground Work (Curt Collier). Together, Ground Work and I will

begin this August, the process of examining if the Albuquerque area has the willingness to support a Ground Work Trust. The process I used was communicating with them while at the Kettering Foundation and realizing our mutual goals and objectives. Soon, I will put together a team of current partners that I have had the privilege to collaborate with over the past five years and begin the process of alignment by holding additional concerned gatherings that will be based on helping promote and accomplish goals and objectives of their organizations, Ground Work and myself. I don't plan to use my agency affiliation during this endeavor as I don't want to have this current political climate limit, restrain our efforts unjustly.

14. How did you capture and share the outcomes of the forums? Who did you share those outcomes with?

I captured the outcomes of the forums with the issue guide and through discussions with family, peers, friends, and interested individuals and organizations. I have had many conversations with state, federal, tribal, and organizations about finding common ground by naming and framing issues within a community. Recently I spoke with the Chief Planner for the Municipality of Grants New Mexico on the realignment of the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail. This conversation was based on ways that a concerned gathering with hikers, business owners, agencies, and other affected and potentially affected parties can increase the financial, educational, and recreational opportunities for all involved. The hope is to hold a gathering to help align the interests of these individuals and groups to better serve the community as a whole while promoting responsible partnerships that aren't affected by the current political turmoil.

15. Do you think your community now sees some organizations and government partners as receptive to their needs and working to address said needs? Please give as many specific examples as possible.

Through our past actions and concerned gatherings, I do believe that the community does have a better understanding of who is or is willing to become vested in their plight. I think that by convening these gatherings, we were able to express directly and informally our willingness to partner. Having the right individual represent the agency and expresses a willingness to align both the agency and the partner, will continue to be successful. Since holding these gatherings, we have been able to identify partners who we didn't know existed, didn't recognize their need for support, and didn't value as a resource due to lack of communication.

We were able to align with Ground Work to begin the development of a GW Trust here in the Albuquerque community, we now have a partnership with Wings for Life who will provide educational/recreational opportunities for families of the incarcerated as well as a new endeavor with Outdoor Afro who will help us identify and target individuals within the African American community and provide them with mentorship opportunities on Public Lands.

We were also able to work closely and forge a new partnership with Rio Rancho Public Schools to provide educational and recreational opportunities to students at no cost to the District and to the Agency. This was in part thanks to other organizations who granted us funding such as the National Environmental Education Foundation and the National Park Foundation. Together, we forged partnerships that enabled us to accomplish mutual goals and objectives while listening to the needs of the community.

16. What new partnerships have been formed because of alignment? Have there been significant benefits from these new partnerships? Please list each new partnership and the benefits derived, whether short or long-term.

Please see above statement

17. Have you found that other organizations and governments are responding to your community work so that your community's goals can be achieved?

I do see how partner agencies and NGOs are responding to our community efforts. I see a willingness for agencies to continue (for the time being) to support projects put forth from concerned gatherings, and the NGOs willingness to help promote and sponsor these projects. I feel that the community structure has increased significantly since we have been focusing on naming and framing issues that are brought forth from our grass-roots partners who have a higher level of community participation that the federal agencies foster. Less regulation and restraints coupled with the willingness and mission to help the community succeed as a whole helps our NGOs continue to provide opportunities for individuals and groups when the agencies experience staff turnover and/or policy/ directive changes.

18. What significant challenges do you still face in describing your work in creating meaningful partnerships with other organizations? What made this difficult? Tell us what you tried, what is working and what is not working, please.

Significant challenges that I face is the lack of support from middle management. Often, support from this level depends on what they can be given credit for and how it affects them professionally. Far too often, I propose projects/initiatives that are outside traditional norms. This unfamiliarity combined with the unwillingness to lead with innovation, makes middle management uncomfortable and reluctant to support untraditional/unique programs and projects. I also see a challenge when management is unwilling to delegate authority to those who manage partnerships. Often, delegation of authority is retained by management and they either don't have the time, energy, or desire to forge a relationship with partners who we on the ground spend and dedicate our efforts. This is especially difficult when partners approach management and the lack of understanding, and or knowledge about a specific or general partnership/program hinders our ability to retain these partners. I feel partners are looking for a constant reliable agency representative who does not put self over mission and has the ability to enter into agreements and retain partnerships. Having the ability to dedicate a representative who can forge bonds between stakeholders by building consistent trust is crucial to a successful partnership.

19. When reflecting on using the issue book, what went well and what was more challenging? What changes would you suggest for the future?

The issue guide is a great tool to help drive conversations when conducting a concerned gathering. It allows for the intro. Into a subject that has been identified by the primary interested (lead) party. This acts as the crux into the conversation of the issue guide. I would have liked to use the guide to help with follow-up gatherings and reflect on the possible outcomes of options that were identified during deliberative dialogue.

I would suggest that those conducting concerned gatherings generally identify a subject(s) to address during the gathering and initiate conversation. Upon completing the gathering and compiling data, create an issue guide used progressively to elevate the issues to the next step.

This next step would be to analyze possible solutions or reevaluate suggested remediation. The issue guide is a great tool to introduce new and update continued partners on the progress of alignment to achieve the desired goal. The question is, what comes after the guide, what is the next tool that is used to help further the process that can articulate the broad and specific objectives of those concerned?

20. Overall, was the time and talent devoted to this project worth it? Here we are looking for your candid overall impression, more than specifics, please.

The time I spent on this project was well worth the effort. I have developed an understanding on how deliberative dialogue should be managed to help ensure success. Having the ability to bring people together who have a general shared interest in the community is difficult, and having and using the tools to keep them engaged is even more difficult. By utilizing techniques I learned throughout this process, has provided me insight to engage groups and individuals through deliberative dialogue. Being able to productively converse around a shared goal and or objective brings people together. This enables a sense of ownership that inspires cohesiveness amongst stakeholders and allows for unity to accomplish assigned tasks.

I came into this process like a bull in a china shop and would push my agendas until they were accepted and or denied. This experience has provided me with the tools I feel are the cornerstone to engaging partners and retaining interest and participation. My partners our given the opportunities to address what is most important and or needed to them and allows others in the gathering to relate and help find/offer solutions. This technique allows groups and individuals the opportunity to align and stay aligned. Not all parties may participate in framing every solution, but they have an opportunity to reengage when the time is right.

**San Antonio Historical Missions National Park - Anna Martinez-Amos, Melea Taylor,
and Kristian Browning**

San Antonio Historical Missions National Park has withdrawn from the project and has not been responsive since July 20, 2017

Western Slope Conservation Center - Alex Johnson
Reflective Questions

1. What challenges are you facing in trying to shift toward a more deliberative politics in your community? How are community networks changing, if at all?

The largest challenge we faced, and continue to face, was dealing with external entities that were naming and framing for us, making it nearly impossible to use the Kettering framework to move toward a more deliberative politics in our community. The process is rich in potential, driven by a structured, academic philosophical base and tested by any manner of large community organizations and social services contexts. WSCC has been challenged to implement deliberative processes, however, as much of our work requires quick, knee jerk reactions to the decision processes presented to us by governing bodies like federal agencies, the state, and the county.

We have ongoing questions as to *which type of organizations and decision-making bodies* would find the Kettering naming and framing models most effective. WSCC has limited human capacity and urgent, changing needs, as determined by the larger processes that historically have determined how public lands and waters are managed. To be honest, it's been very difficult to justify the time and expense to apply the Kettering naming and framing activities to our organization, our partners, and the community at large. At the end of the day, WSCC had no choice but to address what we originally thought was our "wicked problem," the future of energy development in our region, through the decision-making and deliberative framework given to us by the BLM.

Our breakthrough during the Kettering Research Exchange was realizing that a truly "wicked problem" which we could address was the decision-making processes themselves and the choices our community can make in engaging with them in productive ways.

For many decades, the North Fork Valley has engaged in less formal deliberative dialogue between diverse groups of people who live in close proximity to one another, with people who share a wide range of different politics, identities, and values. This has led to the creation of a colorful and vibrant rural community. Unfortunately, we have not been particularly successful during the Research Exchange at producing new deliberative dialogue practices to engage segments of the community in fresh or newly productive ways, largely due to the challenges of timing with federal land management planning processes. It's our hope that the work we have done through this process will allow us to better articulate the choices our community has in engaging in the process: actively oppose processes, engage and support processes, or develop parallel and supplemental processes based on shared values.

In our earliest concern gathering on the future of the local economy, we saw recently laid off coal miners engage in a discussion on the economic future of solar energy. This was encouraging, as it was a rich discussion of people with different backgrounds and interests, talking about their shared values and futures here in the North Fork Valley. We had trouble, however, translating that larger, more general economic discussion into specific issue framing around the overlap of future economic *and* environmental concerns. Our community's engagement in the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Resource Management Plan, which

asked residents to weigh in on the future of oil and gas development in the area, likely produced greater division between the community rather than less. However, we believe this was directly related to the challenge presented by the design of the federal decision-making process in the first place. We had thousands of local and extended community members engaged in the deliberative conversation about local public lands, energy development, and the economic future of the Western Slope, but the decision-making framework was determined by the BLM.

All this said, we see the potential to connect what we've gleaned from our Kettering work to future and recently completed community projects that are attempting to frame the values held by community members as a means to creating solutions to challenges the community faces. Examples include an Orton Family Foundation Heart & Soul project, a Creative Space-making project, and a community symposium planned for 2018, funded by an Arts in Society Grant by the Redline Foundation, which will invite three artists to come to our community to engage us in discussing our community's shared values and options for shaping our shared future.

2. Did you do any research, either internal or external, that actually changed your efforts to align toward some shared purpose? Do you think your community looks at its abilities any differently?

The Western Slope Conservation Center's participation in the Kettering Foundation Research Exchange has certainly provided a broad suite of new information, data, and perspectives on community decision-making, however, we do not believe that the process has significantly changed our understanding of the role of our organization in solving problems. For the last 40 years, we have actively sought to engage in community problem solving in order to preserve the land, water, and wildlife of the North Fork Valley.

The perception that has changed for us, however, is *how* we go about carrying out our role. In particular, the Kettering Foundation Research Exchange has underlined the necessity for framing the conflicts in which we engage through values rather than outcomes. As a conservation and stewardship organization, we have developed solutions through community deliberation. Most of that deliberation over the years has included a discussion of values, but only as context, not necessarily as the primary tool for conflict resolution and decision-making. We hope to apply our final version of the issue guide in a way that makes it clear our community members have options in how they want to engage in collective decision-making processes over which we may or may not have control.

3. Has your community been able to translate their needs into the language of any potential partners? If so, please explain the needs and the process you used.

Yes, over the course of the Kettering Foundation Research Exchange, our organization and larger community has been able to translate our needs into the language of several new partners. Some of the greatest needs have included financial resources to support local organizing and facilitation of public discussion, support for outreach efforts that connect local community members with federal decision-making processes, and communication tools for raising the profile of our community's concerns to various levels of decision-making.

We used several different processes to address each of those needs. In regard to financial resources to support organizing, WSCC has taken the community efforts around the North Fork Citizen Alternative to build new partnerships with granting foundations and partnering state and national organizations. In regard to the outreach efforts for land planning decision-making, we've created a strong new partnership with the US Forest Service through a state-funded GOCO Inspire Initiative planning grant to create a Youth Outdoor Network. The YON gets kids outside, but also connects them with agency staff to build career pathways and engage them in decision-making processes. In regard to communication, we've been translating our local message, with local voices, to the regional and national level with the help of partnering NGOs, including the Center for American Progress. The center is looking at using the story of the North Fork Valley to highlight public land use and economic development lessons that can be applied across much of rural America.

4. How did you capture and share the outcomes of the forums? Who did you share those outcomes with?

Our organization has used deliberation to engage in local decision-making for the last 40 years. The Kettering Foundation Research Exchange, however, has clarified the power in carefully designed and developed deliberative strategies that focus on values and options rather than problems and solutions. We expect that an organizational outcome of our deliberative experiences associated with this program will be a renewed commitment to deliberation as a tool for distributing power and ownership of collective outcomes, rather than merely a necessary means to some pre-determined or independent solution that specific players, like the Western Slope Conservation Center or the Bureau of Land Management, would then implement.

For our initial concern gathering, we focused on the economic future of the North Fork Valley. Those notes were shared between the first and second Research Exchange workshop. All follow-up deliberative conversations were done through organizing for the BLM RMP, focusing on how local public lands should be used, how energy extraction could and should be managed to protect the natural resources that we are tasked to protect, and how the local economy can be supported through responsible and sustainable public land management.

This issue was chosen for us, since the BLM announced the release of a draft RMP in May 2016. With limited capacity and urgent needs, we knew we needed to focus on the issues addressed in the RMP that were most immediate in our communities.

We spoke with over 200 community members over the course of a number of community meetings. We also spoke with a diverse number community and political leaders, business owners, non- and for profit groups, and more. We took the results of all of these meetings to name and frame our issue.

We have shared the outcomes of our forums and other community engagement over the last two years in the form of web posts, press releases, and fact sheets which we have distributed on our website, in local media, to our members, and to other organizations at the local, regional, state, and national levels.

5. Do you think your community now sees some organizations and government partners as receptive to their needs and working to address said needs? Please give as many specific examples as possible.

Since we work in a diverse and dynamic broad geographic area, it's hard to judge the community's perception of various organizations' and government partners' receptiveness to their needs. That said, our membership is aware we have forged partnerships to address perceived needs:

- BLM - as a result of our draft RMP organizing, a group of local citizens created the North Fork Trail Advocacy Group (NFTAG), which now has a Memo of Understanding related to trail maintenance in proposed Special Management Area adjacent to the town of Paonia.
- Conservation Lands Foundation (CLF) - has increased funding to support WSCC's operational efficiency and advocacy for the North Fork Alternative in the BLM RMP, which increases the capacity for our organization to advocate and steward for local National Conservation Lands.
- US Senator Michael Bennet is sponsoring the Gunnison Public Lands Initiative (GPLI), recommending areas for protection that have strong community consensus around their importance. Mt. Lamborn is a central feature in our watershed and the Muddy Creek and Anthracite drainages in the Lower Gunnison Watershed are the sources of our agricultural water.
- Methane gas recapture, a process supported by WSCC and partner groups which would support the local economy and significantly reduce greenhouse gasses being emitted by the local coal mines, is a part of legislation also proposed by Senator Bennet
- The Board of County Commissioners is fully funding a boat ramp at the county fairgrounds. Public access to the river is limited and its recreational value long recognized by stakeholders.
- Center for American Progress (CAP) visited the North Fork Valley to heighten the profile of the region as a place worth protecting, and where national policies may be able to have significant local impacts replicable elsewhere.
- The Wilderness Society (TWS) will be including the North Fork Valley in their "Too Wild to Drill" campaign which seeks to minimize oil and gas activity in our upper watershed due to its impacts on our local economies and way of life.
- A coalition of organizations now looks to WSCC as a leader in organizing and engaging local conversation and regional and national language in how we frame our local challenges in the North Fork Valley.

6. What new partnerships have been formed because of alignment? Have there been significant benefits from these new partnerships? Please list each new partnership and the benefits derived, whether short or long-term.

CU Boulder conducted research on the connectedness between non-profits, businesses, and governing bodies in Delta County. The survey of over 40 entities who serve Delta County indicated that we were at the very center of the partnership network: on a scale of 0-100% on relative connectivity, we scored a 100%! On all four measures of centrality, WSCC was at the

top, which means we have the most robust partnership network of any group.

Local groups who were objectively identified as our partners include:

- Valley Organic Growers Association
- Nature Connection Association
- Farm and Food Alliance
- The Learning Council
- Delta County Administrator
- Delta County Schools
- Solar Energy International, and more.

We have strengthened many of these partnerships through our work around the North Fork Alternative and BLM Resource Management Plan.

We also expect long-term benefits from our alignment work related to the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forest Revision, which will be an ongoing process over the next four years. In the last year, we worked with the USFS to create a Youth Outdoor Network which gets youth from all local high schools into the outdoors, while also providing new career pathways for students who want to engage in the natural resource sector, and most significantly - engage the youth in federal land management decision-making.

New partnerships have also formed beyond the local area because of organizational understanding of the value of the citizen's based North Fork Alternative to the final RMP:

- The Wilderness Society - The national group is in the process of listing the North Fork Valley as one of the 12 most threatened areas by oil and gas development. We expect to have a long-term relationship with the statewide group, growing our ability to network and advocate for our public lands, water, and educational efforts around them
- Colorado Canyons Association - We have built a strong new partnership with CCA in supporting advocacy and stewardship of our National Conservation Lands
- Center for American Progress - We visited with this progressive public policy think tank while in DC twice in the past year. They were in the valley last week making site visits to interview key conservation, farming, business, and economic leaders and community members for an article highlighting our public land use and economic development lessons we've learned that can be applied across much of rural America. We expect to maintain a long-term relationship with their Public Lands, Energy and Environmental team, learning what that we can apply to local, deliberative dialogue as the political winds change in the country.

7. Have you found that other organizations and governments are responding to your community work so that your community's goals can be achieved?

Please see the previous two questions.

Additional organizations and governments who have responded in new ways to our community work include:

- Bureau of Land Management - Field Office, District Office, and national offices

- USFS - District Office
- Regional conservation organizations including Conservation Colorado, Wilderness Workshop, High Country Conservation Advocates, and Western Colorado Congress
- Delta County - Master Planning Staff
- Delta County Administrator
- Foundations including Western Conservation Foundation and Conservation Lands Foundation

8. What significant challenges do you still face in describing your work in creating meaningful partnerships with other organizations? What made this difficult? Tell us what you tried, what is working and what is not working, please.

Perhaps the most significant, persistent challenge we've faced in describing our work is distinguishing ourselves from Citizens for a Healthy Community (CHC), a citizen's action group that was mobilized in 2009 around a single issue: stopping any and all fracking and leasing for oil and gas development in the watersheds above the valley. As they gained momentum, WSCC decided to let CHC work on oil and gas issues while we focused on other public lands and watershed objectives. Community consensus around the North Fork Alternative was achieved in 2013 through collaborative efforts of CHC and WSCC who engaged other stakeholder groups.

CHC backed out of the North Fork Alternative after it was included in the draft RMP and withdrew its support for the county commissioners during the now defunct Thompson Divide Lease exchange. These actions required backtracking with the BLM, County Commissioners, Senator Bennet and others in an effort to distinguish our organization as one of compromise around all public lands issues, not just on the radical end of the oil and gas spectrum.

We tried partnering with CHC during community workshops to generate substantive comments in response to the draft RMP. We expended much staff energy in organizing the meetings, thinking we had an agreement about the global, multiple surface and below ground resource management issues that must be addressed in comments. Their leadership turned its back on that agreement, framing the process around oil and gas, confusing many participants about the nature and breadth of the plan.

We worked with other regional groups to frame a supplemental comment letter advocating for the North Fork Alternative at the very least and adding a No Leasing alternative to the RMP. We walked away from that process as we couldn't come to consensus.

We need to carefully distance ourselves from CHC to advance the North Fork Alternative as their credibility with decision-makers is in question. That said, many in our community struggle to understand why we just can't publically get along. Board Chairs and Executive Leadership of both groups met to discuss ways to bridge the gap and find common ground.

This fall we hope to co-host a community meeting in an attempt to clarify our roles in the valley and the value of leveraging a good cop, bad cop strategy to shape the parameters of oil and gas development. A streamlined naming, framing and deliberative dialogue may help us as we plan

for this important event.

1. When reflecting on using the issue book, what went well and what was more challenging? What changes would you suggest for the future?

It's difficult to summarize the insights gained from these various conversations. Generally speaking, we have been surprised how local conflicts are directly tied to regional and national conflicts, including political, cultural, and socio-economic. We have also realized just how little trust exists between different segments of the community, and how difficult it is to facilitate unbiased naming and framing when we are, in fact, biased known actors here in the community. Simultaneously, any group or agency that comes into the community from elsewhere has access to even less trust from certain segments of the community.

9. Overall, was the time and talent devoted to this project worth it? Here we are looking for your candid overall impression, more than specifics, please.

This Research Exchange has seemed particularly challenging to those of us who are located in the most rural settings. The travel alone has proven to be a major commitment of time and energy, with multiple days on each end of the workshops themselves. Meanwhile, our rural setting has only exacerbated the challenges in implementation of the Kettering naming and framing models as described above.

In regard to future Research Exchanges on framing environmental issues, which we do hope Kettering will conduct, we would suggest being more deliberative in regard to the participating organizations. While our group has certainly benefited richly from the extremely different roles, identities, and locations of participants, we do believe it has created barriers for us in collectively developing a clear sense of how Kettering's models can be most effectively implemented in "the field."

We believe we have thoroughly reviewed the struggles in the previous questions. Small victories for the Kettering framework include renewed commitment within our organization for deliberative dialogue about values, and the reminder that there are others in the community who have been and are currently engaged in those types of discussions. We hope to partner with these kinds of individuals and organizations more collaboratively in the future to utilize what we have learned in the Kettering process.

United General Hospital District 304 - Marjie Bell

Reflective Questions

1. What challenges are you facing in trying to shift toward a more deliberative politics in your community? How are community networks changing, if at all?

Shifting toward a more deliberative approach requires a tremendous amount of time and effort. The primary challenge is that there is no entity with a dedicated staff position whose job it is to ensure a consistent, deliberative politics approach to community meetings and processes. This project provided that impetus and United General District 304 has been very generous in covering my hours spent on it.

A second challenge that I identified is that while a wide cross-section of community members happily provided input during the Concern Gatherings, the Forum was attended primarily by like-minded people. They didn't understand my desire for "tension" between Options in the Issue Guide, or during the dialogue at the Forum. The participants really wanted to reach consensus on what was important, feasible, and shovel-ready. I would like to repeat this process with a modified Issue Guide that incorporates more tension, and to convene a more diverse group (politically) at a future Forum.

A third challenge is the reality that our community dynamics are a microcosm of the polarized national political climate. Certain people just don't like other people (or their politics/beliefs) and the divide is vast. I think that the Learning Exchange outcome of choosing to focus on building a healthier community for youth will help overcome this challenge; for it is one universally accepted value that we have found everyone can get behind.

Are community networks changing? Well, changes in general are afoot in the community, mostly through the school system. The new superintendent seems ready and willing to shake things up (last week I heard him say, "When your high school principal doesn't return your email for two weeks you know there's work to be done." A number of old-school staff has retired or moved on. One of the more conservative school board members is moving, and community members are mobilizing to identify promising candidates who are willing and able to take her place.

2. Did you do any research, either internal or external, that actually changed your efforts to align toward some shared purpose? Do you think your community looks at its abilities any differently?

When the project's advisory team was focusing on Economic Development as the primary issue facing the community, I researched examples of other small rural communities that had successfully resurrected themselves. I printed some copies of the two I found most inspiring and relevant and brought them to a meeting for everyone to read: 1) Asset-Based Economic Development: Building Sustainable Small and Rural Communities; and 2) Putting Smart Growth to Work in Rural Communities.

This was the point where the Mayor spoke up and kindly said something to the effect of: "The Town's Economic Development Task Force has been meeting for two years and is soon to release a 10-year Economic Development Plan. We've got this covered. Please don't muddy the

water!” His feedback was actually a relief to me because I felt completely out of my element talking about how to bring broadband internet to the upper Skagit Valley, and being politely told to back off gave me permission to beat a graceful retreat.

The community appears to be gaining ground and seeing themselves as the Little Engine that Could. Compared to 10 years ago much has changed. Visible infrastructure is being built, people are choosing to live here (not people with school-aged kids yet, but older folks), more folks are showing up at community meetings, the school is co-hosting well-attended monthly community dinners with Farm to School, and the place is hopping with summer visitors. I do believe that the community is beginning to focus more on its assets and less on its former prosperity. One of our goals with the Concrete Summer Learning Adventure is to take the students out into the wider community so they can experience and develop an appreciation for what we do have. Clean air and water, interesting natural and man-made features, relatively affordable land and housing, and a variety of employment opportunities ranging from working on a hydroelectric dam to building world-class musical instruments (a local business, Pacific Rim Tonewoods, is an unusual asset in such a small community. Their general manager started as a janitor in 2004 and worked his way up. This is the kind of Cinderella story we impart to the kids!)

<http://pacificrimtonewoods.com/>

3. Has your community been able to translate their needs into the language of any potential partners? If so, please explain the needs and the process you used.

The need to keep youth engaged to stop the hemorrhage of dropouts beginning in 9th grade: back in November we collaborated with the school district to apply for a USDA Community Food Projects grant, for a four-year “Growing Farm to School” project. This would provide a continuum of food systems-based learning, vocational credits, etc. in partnership with local farmers and restaurateurs. The grant was based on kids’ requests for Farm to School experiences beyond elementary school.

The need for safe, structured after-school activities to counteract the unstimulating and often unhealthy after-school home environments, and families’ needs for additional supports: based on Concern Gatherings and interest through the school district, United General convened a meeting with Boys and Girls Clubs of Skagit County. Their manager was aware of the upcoming 21st Century Community Learning Center funding, and quickly conducted an assessment of feasibility for the Concrete schools. Based on “desperate need” in a number of measures he agreed that a partnership was in order and we have been working with him for two months to prepare for and complete the proposal, which will be submitted by July 24.

The need for youth mentoring, job skills and work experience: Through our partnership with the Town of Concrete and North Cascades National Park during the RTCA project, a Friends of Concrete Trail System group formed and a Trail Concept Plan was developed. Since then we have been more or less dormant, but recently found out that a National Parks Service Active Trails grant was coming our way. This grant will pay our 3rd Year VISTA after her year of service, to coordinate a hiking club for students and families, with quarterly community hikes and outdoor education skill sessions. Also recently we re-discovered the PSE settlement through which they’re contributing \$200,000 to establish recreational trails in the vicinity of the Town. Combined with the connections we made during the VISTA site visit, during which we heard

about Northwest Youth Corps, the settlement has the potential to employ local youth. The concept so far is to explore a project in which the experienced trail building group take on the project but engages local youth in employment opportunities.

4. How did you capture and share the outcomes of the forums? Who did you share those outcomes with?

Toward the beginning of the Learning Exchange a reporter at the Skagit Valley Herald somehow heard about it and contacted me to find out more. She requested that I share the Issue Guide and other materials with her and also keep her informed so she could publicize the forum(s) when they took place. This media connection made it easy to share forum outcomes and she graciously printed a small story about the project and the forums.

I have held one forum with another planned for this fall. To work within the limitations of the physical space, we had three groups of eight participants, each at their own big round table. Each group was assigned one Option from the issue guide, and was asked to discuss and debate the examples and potential tradeoffs named in each Option. They were asked:

- What seemed important to all of us (a common value)?
- What are we willing and unwilling to do as individuals or as a community to solve our problems?
- What trade-offs are we unwilling to accept?
- How can we come to some common ground to support certain actions? What are those actions?
- Where do we want this process to take us?

Each group had a moderator to guide the dialogue and a note-taker to capture the outcomes. After 20 minutes of discussion (not nearly enough time), each group reported out to the large group and an overall discussion took place.

The table notes went home with me, and I sent them to all forum participants along with information about the current 21st Century Community Learning Center grant application that United General is working on with the Boys and Girls Clubs of Skagit County. The Clubs director is very optimistic about our chances of receiving an award, and I look forward to sharing this outcome with the Skagit Valley Herald and the forum participants later this summer.

At the end of the first forum, one of the participants asked, “Can we do this again?” This I interpreted as a sign that they found great value in the process.

5. Do you think your community now sees some organizations and government partners as receptive to their needs and working to address said needs? Please give as many specific examples as possible.

Definitely. During the Concern Gatherings I felt that people really appreciated being asked their opinions about things that concerned them. It seems that folks give a lot of thought to what’s not going well, and many of them have witnessed the generational slide. The Town of Concrete in particular (with leadership by a good mayor) has worked tirelessly the past few years to address

the community's needs. They have a new Fire and Life Safety Building, replacing the one that was falling off a bank into the Baker River. A new Park and Ride, bus stop and public restroom have been completed at Silo Park. The Town received funding to build a Spray Park at Silo Park. United General continues to leverage partners and resources to meet community needs. Public input helped the school district attract the best possible candidate for superintendent. Community Action now offers meals every day at the Concrete Center, and also recruits guest speakers and community educators to teach workshops. The list goes on.

6. What new partnerships have been formed because of alignment? Have there been significant benefits from these new partnerships? Please list each new partnership and the benefits derived, whether short or long-term.

By holding a Concern Gathering with the school board shortly before the superintendent search began, I think the tremendous needs for youth mentoring/vocational programs/experiential learning (anything to keep vulnerable kids from disengaging) were brought to the forefront. In holding community meetings to gather input for the search, the Farm to School program was the most often-mentioned asset that folks wanted the candidates to honor and sustain. The successful candidate (new superintendent) has a strong background in developing high quality vocational programs in similar small communities, which offers considerable possibilities for alignment. This partnership with the school board and administration is long-term and will eventually benefit the students, families and community. We are working with the school district to track student attendance, suspensions, expulsions, and graduation rates.

An important new partnership that has been formed is with Boys and Girls Clubs of Skagit County. In less than a week they will be submitting a 5-year grant proposal to establish a 21st Century Community Learning Center to serve Concrete students K-12 and their families. The center will offer after-school programming including homework help, mentoring, counseling, family supports, field trips, career exploration, and eventually a child care center for working families. United General has supported this effort by providing introductions, developing and conducting surveys of students, families, and teachers, and writing the "Community Needs" section of the grant.

7. Have you found that other organizations and governments are responding to your community work so that your community's goals can be achieved?

Definitely. We have noted several recent examples within the community.

- Last winter the Concrete Food Bank discovered that Skagit County, owner of the building housing the food bank, was preparing to auction off their surplus property. After a flurry of community organizing, local residents raised private donations and showed up prepared to bid on the building. At the same time, word had gotten out to former Defense Secretary Robert Gates, who lives in Skagit County. Mr. Gates bought the building at auction and gave it to the food bank, along with an extra \$5K for repairs. <http://komonews.com/news/local/a-big-name-donor-former-defense-secretary-robert-gates-steps-in-to-save-little-concretes-food-bank>
- The Town of Concrete recently held a Community Branding workshop and is soliciting entries for a Town flag contest. Residents are beginning to be more

engaged in forging a new identity, which may focus on its location as a gateway to countless recreation opportunities.

- For the second year in a row Concrete was the starting point for the Mount Baker Ultra Marathon, a 50 mile out and back foot race from the town of Concrete, at 276 feet, to Mount Baker's Sherman peak at 10,160 feet. The race starts at midnight and has an 18 hour soft cutoff. While we can't claim this race is a result of our community work, it aligns with our VISTA focus on community trails, recreation on public lands, and increasing opportunities for physical activity.
- We were offered a chance to apply for a 4th Year VISTA through Conservation Legacy and our application was approved. The 4th year will allow us to participate in a trail building project with the Town of Concrete, to take advantage of settlement dollars from the Baker River Dam project with Puget Sound Energy. An excerpt from the Lower Baker Trail Construction Plan reads: "During 2015 to 2019, PSE will work with the Town of Concrete to determine potential trail segment locations and design/construction criteria, in relation to the town planning department's comprehensive plan update process. By October 17, 2020 PSE will make available \$200,000 for the design and construction of a new trail in the vicinity of the Town of Concrete."
- Conservation Legacy Stewards Site Director and Director of Partnerships came from West Virginia and Idaho respectively, to conduct a site visit and see our projects in action. We took them on a tour of the upper Skagit: visited the school garden and learning kitchen, stopped at the community garden, walked through town, had lunch at 5b's, stopped in at Town Hall to look at the trail concept plan and maps, and met a few of our community champions. At the end of the visit they informed us that we were included as a success story in their big grant proposal. They also hooked us up with a trail building organization that we might work with next summer to employ local youth in the aforementioned trail project.
- The new Concrete School District superintendent came on board July 1, and participated in a meeting about the 21st Century Community Learning Center grant (to get a Boys and Girls Club at Concrete schools). He has already learned a lot about United General and the work we have done and continue to do with the school district, and was very open to our involvement. He appears to be an agent of change with a clear understanding of the inertia he faces within the schools.
- The Forum was attended by Concrete's Mayor, a Town Council member, a Skagit County Commissioner, several local business owners, a middle school teacher, social service agency staff, and many citizens. The level of engagement was inspiring and the Issue Guide brought attention to the very specific needs and opportunities the community faces. Commissioner Janicki is a member of the local manufacturing/precision machining industry family, and was leading her table in identifying the potential for mentoring/STEM enrichment opportunities through Janicki Industries.
- The regional USDA lead reached out after reading my USDA Farm to School Implementation grant quarterly reports, and invited us to co-present our Farm to School program planning process and program highlights during a National Farm

to School webinar.

- Congresswoman Suzan DelBene visited the Concrete School Garden and Kitchen and Blue Heron Farm, learning about the important partnerships supporting student engagement and the local farm economy.

8. What significant challenges do you still face in describing your work in creating meaningful partnerships with other organizations? What made this difficult? Tell us what you tried, what is working and what is not working, please.

Other than the time it takes to create and sustain meaningful partnerships, we are not facing many challenges. With a name like Community Health Outreach (I still think we should change it to Engagement) we are pretty focused on creating and sustaining those meaningful working relationships. We spend quite a bit of time thinking, planning and writing about and meeting with partners to make things happen in a way that ensures all partners' organizational needs are met. It's actually simple to find common ground with health, recreation, education, municipal, nonprofit, and community partners.

What works is to get out of the office, out into the community, and to be a visible and helpful partner. If you say you're going to do something, then do it. Cc everyone so they know you did it. Talk to real people in the community, not just the other middle class white people who work for the agencies. Ask people what they think and what they want to see happen. Show up at PTA, Town Council and Chamber of Commerce meetings. Attend the community forums. Go to events at the schools. Read the local paper and write letters or press releases. Try to figure out a way to make things happen, and then work it!

9. When reflecting on using the issue book, what went well and what was more challenging? What changes would you suggest for the future?

Are you referring to "Developing Materials for Deliberative Forums" by Brad Rourke, other Kettering documents, or our own Issue Guides? Brad's document was extremely helpful, providing philosophy, context, examples, and inspiration.

My own Issue Guide went through several revisions and was tailored to serve as a supplemental document in our Community Food Projects grant proposal. I also re-focused from Economic Development to Supporting Youth, after Mayor Miller asked us to leave ED to him. I think the fundamental challenge was in compiling and categorizing all the stated concerns, because there were so many repetitive concerns, many of which could be categorized or framed in a number of ways. It was also challenging to communicate the project expectations (rules!) to my advisory group, who to the end didn't seem to understand the part about tension. They're a great group of people and one in particular was really engaged, helping me revise the Issue Guide and providing some very insightful comments about behind the scenes community dynamics.

Changes in the future that I would suggest are: 1) go through this entire process with middle school or high school students; 2) hold concern gatherings with a wider cross-section of community members who are not affiliated with a club or organization; and 3) make sure to develop an Issue Guide with genuine tension inherent in the three options for action.

10. Overall, was the time and talent devoted to this project worth it? Here we are looking for your candid overall impression, more than specifics, please.

This project was icing on the cake for me. Totally worth the time and talent devoted to it and a real professional feather in my cap that I probably will not have the opportunity to repeat. I complete this report with a bit of sadness knowing that I will not see this fine group of people in the same place at the same time ever again! In my daily work I generally don't put myself out there to the degree that this project entailed, so it presented a nudge and a reason for me to go beyond my comfort level. During the Forum I amazed myself at how articulate I sounded when describing the project and what I wanted participants to do. It seems that I, and by extension my organization, have developed a significant measure of credibility in the community. This project is not entirely responsible, but it helped us be more visible and engaged in new and exciting ways. Thank you to the Kettering Foundation, and especially to Allan and Kirsten, for guiding us through the project. If you're ever traveling to Concrete be sure to look me up!

Themes

Impact of Internal Support for the Engaging Communities for Success Projects

The Engaging Communities for Success project required a significant amount of time from each of the participants. The researchers picked sites that already had strong community engagement efforts through the OSMRE/DOI VISTA programs. Originally, all of the sites committed to the level of work necessary to make this project successful. They had to give their time and resources, which diverted from their immediate missions. During this process, the researchers noted there was a difference in the level of engagement in the project between those who had consistent internal support from their organizations and those that did not. Those that had internal support were more easily able to give their time and energies to the project and that showed throughout the project. The participants who did not have the internal support had more difficulties achieving the successes that they desired. This project proved how important buy-in for engagement is when working with communities using the naming, framing, and alignment process – and how important clear understanding by supervisors is to the ultimate success of any effort.

One of the participants who had internal support was Nathan Hunter, who works at Groundwork Hudson Valley in Yonkers, New York. When the researchers were selecting participants, they selected Nathan's supervisor, Curt Collier as the lead participant. After agreeing to this project, Curt chose to bring on Nathan to this project. Curt's position in the Groundwork Hudson Valley changed to a national leadership position within the Groundwork Trusts and thus he was unable to lead the project. From the first learning exchange on, Nathan was the lead for Groundwork Hudson Valley. Curt supported Nathan in this project by still participating in the learning exchanges when possible and giving his valuable insight, but leaving Nathan to lead the discussions about the work he was doing with the community. When researchers asked Nathan if he was receiving internal support, he always emphatically responded yes. Many of his coworkers were familiar with similar processes of engagement and supported his efforts in gathering concerns from his community, so he never had to justify his time in the naming and framing process. However, he struggled with the challenge of building his partnerships with organizations outside just himself and the organization. He had to justify his time and resources to build these partnerships and did not always have his office administration support. Nathan's strongest successes came from the naming and framing processes, which was also where he had the most internal support. His insights into engagement vs outreach and his dedication to listening to the community's concerns have helped Groundwork earn more trust within the places they work.

Similar to the situation with Curt and Nathan, Marjie Bell's supervisor was originally selected to participate in the Engaging Communities for Success project and Marjie was going to be the second person for the project. Other duties pulled Marjie's supervisor from the project and Marjie became the lead from United General District 304. Unlike Curt and Nathan, whom both attended the learning exchanges, Marjie ended up being the sole participant from United General. But support for the project by Marjie's supervisor did not change. Marjie was given reign to lead the project on her own and to follow wherever the community's concerns took her. United General supported Marjie's economic development issue guide, even though the topic does not directly fall under United General's purview. One of the biggest examples of United General's support of Marjie and her participation in the Engaging Communities for Success

project was the use of the issue guide as documentation for an important grant that United General was applying for. It was used as an example of how United General engages with their community. Through this process, Marjie was able to more fully integrate herself and United General into the community – increasing the level of trust and opening more doors for alignment. As a participant, Marjie had the most examples of new alignments in the entire project, which a few of those alignment opportunities coming from within the town. Marjie noted that deliberative dialogue and real community engagement takes ample time and resources but that United General seemed to be committed to Marjie continuing to use the naming, framing, and alignment process in the community. The naming, framing and alignment process can be done once in a community, but having the support from an organization to make it how they go about engagement moving forward shows the potential for long lasting change and success.

Those participants who did not have adequate internal support had more difficulties in working through the naming, framing, and alignment process. Some participants who did not have internal support powered through the difficulties and ended up being able to engage with the community, utilize deliberative dialogue, and find some alignment. Jackie Lebya from Tent Rocks National Monument was one of those participants who was able to still have success with the Engaging Communities for Success project. While there was initial allowance by management for Jackie participating in the project, he seemed to be engaging with the community without management caring or noticing his actions. Jackie was able to have conversations with some community partners and had finished his first deliberative dialogue when he was detailed against his will to a new monument. While the reasons for his forced detail were outside of his actions for the Engaging Communities for Success project, it created a significant hindrance to the naming, framing, and alignment process. Jackie was now in a completely new community and he did not have a successor to continue the work he was doing at Tent Rocks. Nevertheless, Jackie decided to not stop doing the project, but to use his issue guide that he had created with his Tent Rock partners to jumpstart engagement in his new location. While this does not follow the naming, framing, and alignment process, Jackie did not have the time to restart the entire project. The new community he is now working in had the similar concerns around public engagement on public lands as his old community, so Jackie was able to create some alignment opportunities by the end of the project. The researchers note that the Kettering Foundation seems to prefer a linear process, which may not always translate to on the ground. Jackie plans to recreate the process from beginning to end again if he is still with this new community after the project is over. While this is not the ideal community engagement nor internal support situation, Jackie decided that this process was important enough to continue at his new position. In the end, his actions still created change in his new community – and in Jackie himself as a manager as well

Other participants who had internal support issues during the project wilted under the lack of support. Anna Martinez-Amos, Melea Taylor, and Kristian Browning from San Antonio Historical Missions National Parks were an example of this. During the first few months of the project, Anna Martinez-Amos, Melea Taylor, and Kristian Browning, who shall be referred to as “the group” struggled with explaining the purpose of the Engaging Communities for Success project to their coworkers and supervisors. Several employees thought it was a waste of time for the park and did not think that the park needed to be engaging with the community outside of the efforts that were already being put forth. The supervisor of the group originally supported the group participating, but seemed to fall back on their support as the project moved forward. The

group did some concern gathering in the beginning of the project, but it seems that as opposition mounted against the project, the less the group did for the project. After one of the employees who had been the most adamant against the project left, the researchers thought that this would turn around the project at San Antonio. However, during the learning exchanges, the group did not seem to be engaging with the community outside of one meeting that was set up by an outside partner. Additionally, the group seemed to find haven within rules or the standards of their park that hindered engagement with the community. The researchers found out that there were more employees who were trying to hinder the project, but it did not seem like the group was actively trying to make a case for the importance of the Engaging Communities for Success project. The group brought project ideas for the alignment discussion to a learning exchange and the researchers were hopeful that the group would be able to find some real alignment afterwards. When the participants got together for the last time, the group had not made much progress with their projects. San Antonio Historical Missions National Park was unable to create any change and the researchers believe that the lack of support from the beginning allowed inaction to spiral into the community not becoming engaged from this process.

Support for the Engaging Communities for Success project by those outside the participant group was important for the success of the project. Those participants who had significant support for the project were able to give their time and resources to fully developing the naming, framing, and alignment process within their communities. These participants ended up with real change in their communities and their organizations appreciated the processes enough to integrate it into how they will engage with their communities moving forward. Other participants who did not have adequate internal support had a more difficult time of achieving success. Some were able to overcome that lack of internal support, create their own version of the processes and still made change happen in their community. For others in the face of poor support from their organization did not follow through on any of the processes and did not engage with their communities. Overall, the researchers note how critical consistent internal support from organizations, especially the leadership, can be when engaging in communities.

Unexpected Outcomes of the Engaging Communities for Success Project

The Engaging Communities for Success researchers and the Kettering Foundation researchers had a goal of learning from the successes and failures of the project. These successes and failures can inform further research around naming, framing, and alignment in organizations and agencies focused on environmental issues. The project has revealed more than the participant's successes and failures in community engagement. Many of the participants had unexpected outcomes from the project that surprised the researchers. These unexpected outcomes also can further inform researchers about how naming, framing, and alignment can bring about change in communities.

Some unexpected outcomes happened outside of the direct naming, framing, and aligning process. In Concrete, Washington, where Marjie Bell from United General District 304 works, the school system began a search for a new superintendent during the Engaging Communities for Success project. The previous administrator was a community member who did not actively prevent the high rate of high school dropouts or push for vocational training to keep youth in schools and in jobs in Concrete. The old administration had a lack of accountability and participated in the "good old boys" system. Marjie's work in asking the community what concerns they had, brought up issues with youth and related concerns in the community right around the time of the new superintendent search. When the candidates were questioned by the community, the farm-to-school project, led by United General, was one of the projects the community demanded that the candidates promise to continue. When it came down to the final choice, it was between a member of the community who did not want to implement any change and an outsider who had a background in vocational trainings and wanted to bring change to Concrete. The community chose the latter candidate. It shows that the community was ready for a change and that the Engaging Communities for Success project had brought change to the forefront of the community's mind at an opportune moment. The new superintendent and United General are aligned on bringing up graduation rates and provide opportunities for youth and will have a strong partnership moving forward.

For Jackie Lebya in Tent Rocks National Monument, his work in collaborating with the community was unexpected, but whom he decided to collaborate with was. One of the hopes of the researchers was that all of the participants, who had common attributes such as an environmentally-focused organization, VISTA participation, and wanting to make changes in their communities, would stay in contact after the end of the Engaging Communities for Success project. The researchers did not expect that a partnership would come so quickly out of the project. Jackie Lebya, outside of his government role, is collaborating with Curt Collier, who was the Director of Groundwork Hudson Valley and is now the national Director of the Groundworks organization, to try to bring a Groundworks site to Albuquerque. Jackie and Curt will begin the process of examining Albuquerque area for the ability and willingness to support a Groundwork Trust soon. Jackie is going to host some concern gatherings with his trusted partners on this issue to gather ideas and concerns on bringing a Groundwork Trust to Albuquerque. By following the Kettering process during this alignment, the partnership is more likely to succeed and be sustainable.

Nathan Hunter's experience in the Engaging Communities for Success project prompted

more internal unexpected outcomes than external. During the project, he had spoken with a community member who had talked about the difference between engagement and outreach. Engagement was going beyond the surface level and takes hard work to implement properly. This conversation helped to guide Nathan throughout this process because he constantly re-centered himself to that idea when he was working with his community. He now takes a step back in any interaction with a community member to listen to what they are saying. Researchers had expected changes in how participants work with their community, but Nathan has taken the process and the idea of engagement vs outreach as a mantra that he is now spreading to others in his organization. This has led to an increase of trust in their organization by the community. An additional unexpected outcome of Nathan's work during this project is that the community has now begun asking what Groundwork's limitations are instead of asking 'Well, could Groundwork help with that?' While this may seem opposite of what the researchers wanted, it helps Groundwork engage effectively. Community members now understand how Groundwork can support their concerns and alignment can occur more quickly. They also have begun to realize that Groundwork does not have to just focus solely on environmental issues and that Groundwork's partnerships can allow them to help in broader areas of concern. The community has started to shift how they view Groundwork Hudson Valley to a more positive but realistic manner. Instead of Groundwork "saving" certain parts of the Yonkers community, the community is taking the lead on the conversation.

Robin Snyder from Appomattox Court House National Historical Park in Appomattox, Virginia, was similar in having more of an internal unexpected outcome rather than external. She is, by nature and by position, an agent of change, so her successes in aligning partnerships were expected by the researchers. But one of the unexpected outcomes of Robin's participation in the project was her internal realization. For the first time in her career, she realized that the park that she works for is actually a Very Big Deal, a leading agent in her small community and that with her position she can make a great number of changes in her community. The realization of her position in Appomattox has shaped how she views her job and how she engages with the community. Prior to this project, she had always walked into a conversation ready to solve the problem and figure out how she can accomplish her agency's goals, without considering the partner or communities goals. By stepping back and listening to the concerns, she was able to look at the bigger picture and create opportunities for alignment. She now does not walk into the room with the solution in hand but ready to listen first. Like Nathan, she has taken in the democratic processes in a serious and deep way that has fundamentally changed her engagement practices. The researchers strongly believe that both of them will take what they learned, continue to improve, and to take this project with them in their career.

Alex Johnson and Karen Ortiz from Western Slope Conservation Center in Paonia Colorado were more skeptical of the naming, framing, and alignment processes and how that would translate to their community. During the last learning exchange, Karen noted that this process works for organizations that are not responding to each crisis and running their organization from crisis to crisis. Alex and Karen continue to question which types of organizations would find the naming, framing, and alignment processes the most effective. It does not seem that Western Slope Conservation Center is that organization at this time. This is due to the short-term, immediate decisions that must be made and how much of their engagement on issues is driven by the actions of the Bureau of Land Management, who dictates how the

community must engage in some of the most sensitive topics in their community.

Linked to these hindrances on engagement is the possibility that Paonia may be over-engaged. There are many nonprofits in the area that are trying to figure out community concerns and most efforts are replicated over and over again. Western Slope Conservation Center recently had to separate itself from another similar organization that had a more combative approach. The community had trouble distinguishing the two organizations from each other and this negatively affected Western Slope's trust in the community. This leaves the researchers with the question of can communities engage around the strict guidelines of larger organizations beyond their control? What happens when a community is over-engaged? How do those communities move forward with change?

These unexpected outcomes of the Engaging Communities for Success project helped to further inform the researchers on naming, framing, and alignment beyond the typical successes and failures. Some of these unexpected outcomes were internally focused. Some participants took the tools and philosophy of this project to deeper place than the researchers had expected. They took this project as in internal reflection of their work and have instituted changes within themselves and their organization beyond the surface level. Other unexpected outcomes were external. In some communities, the process had unconsciously infiltrated other aspects of the community and lead to communities demanding change in and by their leaders. These unexpected outcomes provide a greater understanding of how the naming, framing, and alignment processes can change a person, organization, or community.

Successes of the Engaging Communities for Success Project

The researchers hoped that the Engaging Communities for Success project would move communities towards change. Change is difficult in any community, especially in the communities where the participants work. Many of these communities have experienced organizations that try to enact change from outside a community rather than support change coming from inside of the community. Each of the participants had a success story from this project. Some had internal successes in their organizations, which will change their approach moving forward with their communities. Other participants had successes with external partners and have started on projects that will enact obvious change in their communities. Both types of successes are critical to engaging in a meaningful, sustainable way with communities.

Marjie Bell from United General District 304 lives in Concrete, Washington, a small town with high levels of youth flight and a town that has tried to focus on revitalizing itself for several years now. The early concern gatherings had focused on economic redevelopment, but all of the successes of the project ended up focused on the issues with youth in the community instead. The mayor of Concrete told Marjie to leave the economic redevelopment to the appointed committee, which allowed Marjie to focus on the second biggest issue in the community, youth, without betraying the concerns of the community. Building a healthier community for youth is something that her town universally supports and transcends political lines. Changing the issue guide to focus on youth allowed for a significant amount of alignment success with both new and old partners. In November, 2016, United General and the school district, which are old partners, decided to expand their partnership beyond their elementary school farm to school project. Using the issue guide as material for a USDA grant, the school, local farmers, and United General will create a four-year long food systems training and vocational credit program for high school students. This project will provide alternative careers for youth in Concrete

One of the biggest concerns in the Concrete community was the unhealthy after-school home environments that youth were being exposed to. During the issue guide discussions with community members, the community wanted to create an after school program of sorts. During the fourth learning exchange, Marjie and the group discussed how to go about implementing the idea of an after school program. Instead of United General going beyond their mission area into a high risk project, they were able to align with the Boys and Girls Club of Skagit County to create a new partnership. The Boys and Girls Club saw that Concrete had a desperate need for an after school program and the two organizations partnered for a five year grant proposal to bring the Boys and Girls Club to Concrete Washington.

One of the greatest successes for Marjie and United General is that the community wants to do the naming, framing, and aligning all over again. The community enjoys being asked “What concerns you?” and having a direct impact in the issues that the community leaders address. Community members have gone up to Marjie and stated their desire to repeat the process. Marjie has utilized her Community Health Outreach partners to write the issue guide and the group has plans to go even broader in their next issue guide.

Robin is another participant who had great success in aligning the interests of her organization, Appomattox Court House National Park, with new partners. While still being in line with the mission and regulations of the National Park Service, she was able to align with new partners and help revitalize the tourism industry in Appomattox Virginia. She worked with partners to find that one of the biggest concerns was tourism and wanting to bring in people who visit the National Park to visit other parks and businesses within the Appomattox area. Robin created the Appomattox Tourism Committee with six other state parks to start a healthy people healthy parks campaign. The group aligned their resources to create a passport for people who go to all of the parks. Additionally, they have created a website and have plans for trail building events in each of the parks. The committee decided to create an Experience Appomattox campaign, with a website, passports to state parks, and advertisement aimed at showcasing the Appomattox area. From this campaign, the original partners were able to add the Chamber of Commerce, nonprofit foundations, hotels, museums and other local entities. After the establishment of these partnerships, the committee decided to formalize. Robin's leadership role will diminish because of the regulations that dictate what she is allowed to participate in as a federal employee and the community will take ownership of the tourism committee. The committee has written a charter, established a budget and goals moving forward. The Appomattox Tourism Committee will soon be self-sustaining and is an example of Appomattox coming together with a strong sense of vision and a greater sense of community.

Robin also created a unique partnership between Appomattox Court House NHP and Wolfbane productions. The two created a youth camp at the park, with youth learning about how to become a park interpreter and acting skills at the same time, creating a "feeder" for park jobs as in-costume interpreters in the summer. The production company also put on a Romeo and Juliet in the American Civil War production over the summer, which nearly 2000 people attended. The park and the production company are planning for a similar event next summer. Both of these partnerships have brought tourism and a sense of pride to the community, something that Robin had been striving for since the beginning of the project.

During the period in which Engaging Communities for Success project was going on, Jackie Lebya from Tent Rocks National Monument was detailed from his Tent Rocks site to El Malpais National Monument in New Mexico (a more remote site) as a kind of retaliation for his activism. Instead of giving up on the project, he began to restart the naming, framing, and alignment process in his new work location. He will be using his current issue guide on bringing youth to public lands as a jumpstart to bring change. Jackie also plans to hold concern gatherings to discover other issues in his new community. He built a new partnership with the local school district and connected some of his old partners with his new partners from his new location. This way he is able to maintain relationships with all of his partners in case he is able to return to Tent Rocks. The new school district partnered with El Malpais to bring students to the monument. The willingness and determination of Jackie to try this process again in a new location shows the universality of the naming, framing, and aligning process. This experience will stay with Jackie wherever he goes and he will be an agent of community driven change in any community he serves.

Being an agent of community driven change is an important distinction in Jackie's successes. When he began this process, he described himself as a bull in a china shop. He wanted

to push his agendas in the community until they were accepted or denied, to be the agent of change in his organization. While he still is an agent of change, he now approaches his partnerships and the communities differently. Because of his experience with the project, he has the tools and the experience to ask the community what they want. His partnerships are now stronger because they are able to discuss what issues are important to them and how they can partner together to achieve mutual goals. Jackie understands that not all of his partners will engage on an issue, but that bringing them into the conversation can facilitate creative alignment and encourage participation down the road.

Ann Oliver from Animas Watershed Partnership in Durango Colorado had success with the alignment process. She struggled during the naming and framing processes because her mission deals only with water issues in the entire Animas Watershed, not solving wicked problems. While the community members are concerned about the river, there are not any truly wicked problems around the river and its health. Ann will take the tools that this project has given them and start holding concern gatherings with their board members. Ann feels that this will bring to surface any issues that might be within the organization and will help ensure that the organization is going in a direction that all members agree with. Ann has taken the ideas that were discussed during the fourth learning exchange about alignment and is going to pursue new partners outside of the normal suspects. The Animas Watershed Partnership is going to be building a new “report card” for the health of the Animas River and, based on the ideas of aligning with the art community, they are going to collaborate on the report card. Ann is hoping to take this partnership further and incorporate the art community in other major projects. Hopefully this is the first step in many other types of new alignments for the Animas Watershed Partnership.

There were successes beyond just the alignment of new partners. Some of the successes were internal realizations or reaffirmations of the work that the participants do. At Western Slope Conservation Center in Paonia Colorado, Alex Johnson and Karen Ortiz had a very different experience than other participants. Right when the Engaging Communities for Success project started, the Bureau of Land Management released their conservation plan and the community had a limited time to respond. All of the efforts of Western Slope Conservation Center were thrown into this response. Therefore, traditional naming and framing efforts were not undertaken during the project. However, that does not mean that Karen and Alex did not have any successes. They hope that moving forward, they will use the tools that this process has given them to better articulate the choices the community has when debating concerns. While Alex and Karen do not believe that participating in the Engaging Communities for Success project has changed their understanding of the role of their organization in community concerns and engagement, but how they go about problem solving has changed. They plan to use the issue guide techniques, such as framing conflicts and engaging through values rather than outcomes in their community engagement moving forward. The researchers did not expect huge changes from every participant– that would be unrealistic. However, any small measures that change how communities engage and solve problems in a step in the right direction.

For Nathan Hunter from Groundwork Hudson Valley in Yonkers New York, the Engaging Communities for Success project reaffirmed the importance of his work and the importance of his organization in his community. Like many communities, Yonkers has been

subjected to professional experts that “play in the community” when they attempt to solve problems. These professional experts are more likely than not to discredit the community and their concerns due to their assumption that the experts themselves are the only ones who know how to solve the community’s problems and Nathan found similarities in some of the approaches Groundwork Hudson Valley had taken when communicating with the Yonkers community. While Nathan had gone through similar engagement training in the past, learning about the process again reaffirmed his commitment to community engagement and helped him think about the role of his organization in the community. The process gave him a chance to re-center Groundwork Hudson Valley’s engagement by encouraging his organization to take a back seat in community discussions and just listen. His coworkers were willing to learn about the naming, framing, and alignment process and gave Nathan a lot of support. During this project, Nathan felt that he received tangible tools to take back to Groundwork Hudson Valley and implement the listening. For a community that has been victim to outside help that ended in nothing over the years, having an organization willing to just listen is a success and a huge step forward in community driven change.

The researcher’s goal of the Engaging Communities for Success was twofold. The first was to see what happened when communities went further than the naming and framing process, which is what the Kettering Foundation has focused on, adding alignment as part of the complete process of community change. The second was that if there were new alignments, would there be some change in the communities. The researchers were happy to see that while not every participant had huge, game changing levels of success, each participant was able to institute some type of change – whether it is internally in their organizations or with their new partnerships. Short term successes are always welcome, but sustainable success is difficult to achieve. The challenge of the project will be for the participants continue to use the tools that they have learned during this project in their communities down the line.

Federal and Non-Profit Challenges

When the researchers were selecting the participants for the Engaging Communities for Success project, they were purposeful in choosing a diverse group to participate. Half of the participants were from a nonprofit organization, while the other half were employed by a federal agency. The researchers noted that these two categories of participants went about the naming, framing, and alignment process differently. The participants in the nonprofit sector had more flexibility in their work in their communities. For those participants in the public sector, they were limited by their roles and the regulations that guide their mission in addition to attempting to overcome the chronic mistrust of the government within their communities. The unique challenges that the nonprofit and public sectors had during this project will inform researchers on if and how to approach these two sectors differently during the naming, framing, and alignment process.

One of the biggest hurdles that the participants from the public sector had to overcome when gathering concerns, naming, and framing from their community was trust. For Jackie Leyba, he works with Native American sovereign nations and the tribal government-to-US-government relationship has been fraught with difficulties, misunderstandings, and distrust. He successfully engaged in deliberative dialogue with local tribes at the beginning of the Engaging Communities for Success project. But with a new senior Administration, that door was closed until further notice by detailing Jackie to a more remote site. The local tribes, including those that were previously reliable partners, now refuse to sit down with Jackie to discuss anything, much less a deliberative dialogue about their community concerns. Jackie believes that at this point in time, building these partnerships might not be optimal or even possible. The researchers wonder if some communities are simply not accessible to federal agencies at this time and that the agencies should wait for the communities to approach them first. The challenge of trust goes beyond attempting to gather concerns from a community, they also can make aligning difficult. Both Jackie and Robin Snyder from Appomattox Courthouse National Park noted that during major changes in political Administration, the agencies are told to refocus their priorities, which may hinder the continued development of old partnerships and wariness of possible new partners to aligning with federal agencies. Both types of mistrust create hurdles for deliberative dialogue and community engagement.

The nonprofit sector also has to build trust within the communities that they work in. In Yonkers, the community has been subjected to multitude of outside organizations who come in and decide what problems are in the community and how the organizations themselves will fix the community's problems. Most of the organizations fail to actually implement change in Yonkers. After repeated disappointments, the community is wary of any organizations that promise change. For Nathan Hunter who works in Yonkers with the Groundwork Hudson Valley organization, he has to build trust within the community to engage in deliberative dialogue. Groundwork Hudson Valley has been in the community for decades and is a trusted organization within the community. But even so, the community has fatigued of failed promises of change. Nathan had to create safe spaces prior to holding concern gatherings to engage with the community and in doing so he was able to get insightful concerns from the gatherings. In addition to gaining trust within the community for them to voice their concerns, Nathan worked to repair partnerships that had fallen by the wayside over the years. In spite of the time and

funding shortages that plague any nonprofit organization, Nathan was able to follow the partnerships and build up the trust of the partners and community to higher levels than before. Nonprofits have much more control in changing their reputations in communities than government entities. If the nonprofit senses some distrust, nonprofits have the flexibility to change perceptions. While Nathan was building alignment, he discovered that there has been a lack of accountability in Groundwork's partnerships, leading to distrust of Groundworks in some community circles. Nathan was able to quickly shift gears and get to work repairing these relationships without any roadblocks. Nathan has been listening to what the partners have been saying and attempting to implement accountability through the naming, framing, and alignment processes. It will take a long time to change the perception of Groundworks in community circles that do not easily forgive. Trust is difficult to build in any community, but nonprofits may have more flexibility in changing their reputations and correcting how they interact with the community than their counterparts in the public sector.

The participants from the federal agencies had to operate within the rules and regulations of their organizations. Robin Snyder, at Appomattox Courthouse National Park, had to discover how she is allowed to align with partners. When she was beginning to partner with a theatre production company, Robin had to research if that type of partnership was even allowed by the National Park Service. It was, but Robin had to justify the partnership as a way to tell the story of Appomattox Court House. If she had been unsuccessful, then the alignment would have been unable to continue even though a partnership with the production company would have been good for the community. Robin also had to build a legal framework to allow the partnership to happen in addition to justifying it. By building a legal framework, she opened the door for more artistic endeavors inside the park and provided sustainability for alignment. Robin was able to push the regulations to work in her favor to allow the partnership, but during its execution, there were many times where she was restricted in what she and the park could do within the partnership. This forced Robin to think outside the box and have her other state and local partners shoulder most of the responsibility.

Many of the participants in the federal agencies have to think outside the box when creating projects just to ensure they also follow regulations. It can become a fine line between following regulations and following what the community wants the agency to do. Robin noted these opposing pulls and her difficulties with it. As the "big kid in the playground", the Park seems like the answer to any funding or partnership issues in Appomattox. But this is not the case and Robin had to consistently tell her partners that the park was bound by regulations that prevented them from assisting or funding certain activities. This prevents the Park from being able to fully address the communities concerns even if the leaders of the individual office inside the federal agency wants to, but it also spreads the engagement more widely, in spite of the difficulties and frustrations. While non-profits may enjoy greater flexibility, the determination to see community benefit from the presence of a federal organization in the case of both Robin and Jackie is a remarkable and useful lesson.

Sometimes the way federal agencies outreach to communities affects how nonprofits are able to engage with their community. Alex Johnson of Western Slope Conservation Center, which is a nonprofit in Paonia Colorado, was directly affected by federal heavy-handed outreach techniques. During the Engaging Communities for Success project, the Bureau of Land

Management handed down their Resource Management Plan for the Paonia region. This plan has a set amount of time in which the BLM would engage with the local communities. Western Slope Conservation Center was therefore forced to throw all of their resources into responding to the call for engagement in Paonia. In addition to resource reallocation, the plan focused on oil and gas development issues in the area, so WSCC was also forced to focus on this concern, one that the community finds volatile. Alex noted the BLM process produced deeper divisions within the community. Even though the naming and framing process was taken out of the community's hands, WSCC was still able to draw some conclusions about the community's concerns on oil and gas development. From those conversations, WSCC did align with new partners within and from outside of Paonia. But at the end of the project, WSCC admits that they went through this process on the BLM's framework, not Kettering's. The BLM has a narrow definition of what it considers community outreach and is an example of an organization deciding what a community's concerns are and how they will be addressed, rather than the community approaching the federal government with their concerns. This is opposite of what the naming, framing, and alignment process should be.

The public sector provides unique challenges in the naming, framing and alignment process. The participants from the public sector that were selected for the Engaging Communities in Success project were people who were drivers of change and who care about their community. This quality makes the participants stand out amongst stereotypical bureaucrats and is an important caveat in understanding the struggle federal agencies have in engaging with communities. The participants faced difficulties in building trust in their communities and partnerships in the face of changing leadership. The nonprofit sector also has difficulties in creating trust with the work they do, but as demonstrated by Groundwork Hudson Valley, they are more easily able address changes in the community. The public sector is limited by the regulations and ethics of their agencies as well as administrative changes and that shapes how and when they are able to engage and drive change. Nonprofits can also be driven by the work of federal agencies, like in the case of Western Slope Conservation Center and the Bureau of Land Management. This federal-agency-driven engagement is commonplace and is the opposite of the community-driven concerns that the Engaging Communities for Success project was trying to encourage. Additional research on the special challenges the public sector – and the local leadership of those agencies -- face in community engagement and deliberative dialogue and how to overcome those challenges would be beneficial

Biographies

Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Park

When the researchers began the Engaging Communities for Success project, we wanted to select participants who were already active members in their communities, participants who had the drive to make change in their community. Robin Snyder, the new Superintendent of Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Park, was a participant who from the beginning had a strong desire to engage and see change occur in her community of Appomattox, Virginia. During the Engaging Communities for Success project, Robin grew in her professional career and in her relationships with members of the community. She was able to maneuver the naming, framing, and alignment process to work within the many constraints of the National Park Service and she was successful in using the naming, framing, and alignment process to pull together projects that will change her community. Robin Snyder is an example of a participant who listened, grew, and worked diligently to make this project work for herself, her park and her community.

At the beginning of the project, the researchers asked each participant to reflect on how their community makes decisions and how their organization engages with the community. Many of Robin's reflections were intertwined with her personal experiences of community engagement and the fact that she actually grew up in Appomattox and was known by many in the community. For Robin, there were positive interactions within the community when she attempted to engage with them around collective issues. She acknowledged that earlier in her career, she often assumed leadership and walked into a situation where the community members did not react positively to her and questioned what made her an expert on the issue. Robin realized that she liked to come into a situation and begin to work immediately toward a solution, essentially the opposite of what the naming, framing, and alignment process wanted participants to think about decision making. Over the course of the project, Robin realized that there was value in hearing from different perspectives in making decisions and that her go-getter attitude often kept her from hearing the voices of the community she was trying to help.

From her perspective in the National Park Service, Robin also noted that there is a mistaken belief that the federal government can help fix any problem that the community has, a real lack of understanding of the limits of the National Park Service. That perception by the community is not completely unfounded, as Robin noted. When the Park Service does identify and then decide to tackle an issue, change does happen and that change can benefit the community. In Appomattox, community members were frustrated when they tried to deal with community issues, sometimes expecting the Park to address the issue, yet nothing seemed to actually change. Finally, Robin noted that the community often repeats approaches even though those approaches did not yield results in the past. This can result in the community believing that nothing will be able to change, a common reaction.

Many of the participants started the naming process by holding concern gatherings on issues that they picked, rather than listening directly to what the community's concerns were. Robin's initial attempt at the naming, framing, and alignment process did exactly that -- and it did not produce the results she wanted. She chose to hold a concern gathering with the Friends of Carver Price Legacy Museum, which is a small museum in Appomattox focused on the story of the African-American experience in the community. When Robin went to Carver Price Legacy Museum, she already had her Park Service idea of what she wanted to focus on - which was the

150th Anniversary of the end of the Civil War and the Park's collaboration with other organizations. But many of the concerns Robin gathered were only about the Museum's concerns about outreach and their partnership with Appomattox Courthouse, not what she was after. From these concerns, Robin created an issue guide around engagement in the community but when the participants gathered for the third learning exchange, Robin had a chance to see what the other participants were doing. She realized that she had not let the naming process really take its own course and that she had pushed a certain conversation to occur rather than allowing for concerns to come up organically. She realized she needed to take a step back and ask bigger questions, such as "What concerns you about the Park, about our community?" and that by asking bigger questions, she would be better able to see what the real concerns are. Additionally, her issue guide was one that was action-based rather than value-based: there were not any values at stake in Robin's issue guide, just different courses of action that the Museum could take. The moderators from the Kettering Foundation reminded the participants that the public needs to decide on values that they deem appropriate to attempt to solve wicked problems before they decide on a plan of action and encouraged Robin to get out of her "expert" mindset. Robin realized that she had not really spoken to the community. She decided to go back and find more partners to hold concern gatherings and really try to find out what concerns them.

Robin's decision to go back to the beginning of the naming, framing, and alignment process allowed her to step back and rethink how she approached the project. She gathered a diverse group of community leaders, each essentially a representative of a particular sector or interest in Appomattox, and asked them about their concerns and the community. They had a wide array of concerns, from mental health to tourism. Robin was able to narrow the issue guide down to connecting people of the community to their parks – not just her park but all parks in the region. The leaders that Robin brought together for the concern gathering created their own tourism committee, where they would work towards the mutual goal of making Appomattox a better tourist destination. This Experience Appomattox Committee utilized the issue guide that Robin created as a base for all decisions. As a first step, the committee aligned for a park passport project, which encourages community members and visitors to visit all of the parks in the region and to get physically active. This small passport idea has since grown into a social media campaign supported by Experience Appomattox and started other projects such as special youth and handicapped trail building. Over the brief course of this project the committee has become self-sustaining, allowing Robin can take a step back, become a participant, not the leader, and allow the community to guide the decision-making. That the community took ownership and saw that they have the ability to make change happen is critical for continued success.

While working with the Experience Appomattox Committee, Robin realized how much of a challenge to the status quo the naming, framing, and aligning process could be. These processes were not how the Appomattox Courthouse and the community had done business in the past. During her second attempt, Robin took the time to really listen to what her partners were saying, hear the real concerns and then figure out how to look at multiple groups and align their common interests. She was put in a position where she could listen, learn, and leverage opportunities that were beneficial for everyone. The deliberative process built trust, respect, and understanding between groups and their alignment brought success. Robin's view of her role in the community and the organization also changed. She was working in a small town where The

Park was actually a Big Deal (her term) and she had never realized the power of her Superintendent position before. She was becoming a major player in any decision regarding the community, but she also realized the power of being able to step back, like with the Experience Appomattox committee, and let the community become the leaders.

One of Robin's challenges during this project was working for a federal agency, a common challenge among all the federal agencies in this project. Robin stated in the beginning of the project that many from the community considered the Park Service as the solution to many community problems, and that just is not possible. The federal government, including the National Park Service is governed by regulations and ethics rules that can seem to create barriers for many on-the-ground federal employees wanting to make a difference in the communities in which they serve. The deliberative dialogue process gave Robin the space to be open and honest about what the Park could, and could not, do. It also allowed her partners to understand that while Robin wants to do what she can to help, she can't do everything that they want. It is also interesting to note that during the project, Robin realized she could sometimes use those regulations to her advantage. When she was trying to align with Wolfbane productions, a local respected theater company, to present a play set at Appomattox Courthouse, she had to research and provide a legal framework for a theatre company to perform in the Park. This research and legal framework changed how Robin originally thought the alignment with Wolfbane Productions would look like but also contributed to a more creative project. Instead of just a Romeo and Juliet production suggested by Wolfbane, the backdrop of Romeo and Juliet was set against the end of the Civil War in Appomattox making it an appropriate presentation inside the Appomattox Courthouse National Park. She was also able to fold in an internship/training program with Wolfbane that can lead to jobs for local residents as summer interpreters in the park.

In the future, Robin is hoping for a more formal alignment that will allow for the expansion of the project and others like it. Robin's research set precedent and allowed the Park to establish criteria for further alignments with other artistic organizations. If Robin were to leave, she has set up the guidelines to allow those types of alignments to continue. Robin hopes that the community saw how the Park was an able and willing partner, but had to work within the constraints of regulations. The Wolfbane project alignment was a success for both the community's relationship with the Park and how the community viewed themselves. Many community members who had never been the Park attended the play and have a newfound sense of pride in their community and in the park as well.

While Robin has had many successes with the Engaging Communities for Success project, she feels that her work is not done. During her second attempt at the naming, framing, and alignment processes, she worked with representative community interests to name and frame concerns regarding tourism. The next time she holds a concern gathering, she would like to do it with community members who are not affiliated with any entities. When the moderators revealed that they were researching how organizations create barriers to actually talking to the community, Robin felt that the situation described what happened in Appomattox perfectly. She stayed within her comfort level by speaking to entities on a larger-scaled level rather than going out into the community and asking what concerns them about living in the region. Robin would also like to ask community members about tourism, to see if the work that Experience

Appomattox Committee has done is really what the community wants done. Those types of questions can be difficult to navigate under a federal agency and Robin expressed concern over her ability to help with larger societal problems without overstepping the mission of the National Park Service. There is also the concern that going directly to community members may appear to be end-running the very agencies represented by Experience Appomattox and actually weaken cooperation. These are challenges that will face all of her attempts at community engagement, but it will not deter her from trying to enact change in her community. Again, the researchers note that Robin is a native of Appomattox and uniquely positioned to be both a Park Service Representative and a community activist – no small challenge amidst the strictures of the National Park Service.

Due to the Engaging Communities for Success project, Robin experienced stronger partnerships and sustainable outcomes in Appomattox. While she had some challenges in adjusting her early approach in the naming, framing, and alignment process, her subsequent determination to follow those processes resulted in strong alignments and projects that are bringing change to Appomattox. Robin's role in her own organization also changed, realizing her position in her community as a Big Deal with responsibilities and also learning how to take a step back. She was able to navigate the regulations of the federal government and used her constraints to build sustainability. The alignments and projects that she worked on are not a "one and done" in this community, Robin and her partners are going to continue to follow the naming, framing, and alignment process and see what else they can do in Appomattox.

Western Slope Conservation Center

The hope for the Engaging Communities for Success project was to create some degree of change within the participants' communities. Some participants enacted change in ways that the researchers expected, creating projects and building alignment. Other participants created change in smaller ways, because they had institutional hurdles that made making conventional change difficult to implement. Alex Johnson and Karen Ortiz, Executive Director and Board Chair, who run Western Slope Conservation Center in Paonia, Colorado, were in the latter category of participants. Throughout the project, Alex and Karen were engaged in learning and understanding the deliberative dialogue framework, the struggles of engaging in a framework already decided by outside organizations, the over-engagement of the community, and the difficulties adapting what they saw as an "academic" process to real life. Karen and Alex succeeded in deepening their understanding and broadening their views on real community engagement, shifting their focus from outcomes to values. This change in perspective from within WSCC's leadership will filter into Paonia through the organization's work. While Alex and Karen did not implement the naming, framing, and alignment process as proposed, researchers felt that their struggles with the project brought up compelling perspectives on the process and the real nature of community engagement, especially in a rural, small-town environment.

Prior to the start of the project, the researchers asked each participant to answer a few questions about what engagement looked like for their organization and within their community. Alex and Karen noted the sheer number of organizations engaging in their community. They listed a wide range of entities -- federal and state agency managers, scientists, and researchers; federal Congressional delegations and political staff; local county commissioners and administration; academic researchers from state and local universities; non-profit advocacy organizations; and local citizen experts. Each of these entities were met with varying degrees of acceptance (or hostility) by the community. Of this list, only the final two, other local non-profits and local citizen experts, were viewed as being from the community by Alex and Karen. They also noted the challenges of partnering and engaging with those outside organizations to get work done in Paonia as well as the challenges of maintaining a balance between being supportive while also being critical and challenging their partners when WSCC disagrees with a position. They also expressed concern over the over-engagement of Paonia throughout the project because there are several nonprofits already doing similar work in the region. Civic life is alive and well in Paonia and when Alex and Karen were thinking about how to move forward with the project with WSCC's limited capacity, they realized that several non-profit organizations who had already come in and "engaged" Paonia in various deliberative dialogue efforts in recent years. During the last learning exchange, Karen commented that the Kettering process is excellent for a community that's never been asked what their concerns are, but Paonia had been asked about their concerns from a multitude of organizations. How can Western Slope Conservation Center distinguish the naming, framing, and alignment process from other types of engagement and get the community to engage with them?

Karen and Alex observed that in Paonia, there are many outside organizations and nonprofits that make the community decisions and dictate engagement processes. In many cases, these outside organizations decide what the concerns are and how they will be deliberated, if at

all. This scenario occurred during the Engaging Communities for Success project. At the beginning of the project, Alex held a concern gathering around economic redevelopment in the region, which transformed into a conversation about energy options for Paonia. The area has historic coal mining, as well as active oil, gas, and clean energy development. Citizens of Paonia had many concerns about impacts of energy development on the future of Paonia and this would have been an excellent issue guide topic. Unfortunately, right after the first concern gathering, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) released their draft land management plan for the region which had been five years in the making. Since land management plays a huge role in the economic and energy future of Paonia, the BLM draft plan became the biggest concern in Paonia.

Land management would have been an excellent concern to use with the naming, framing, and alignment processes, but unfortunately, Western Slope Conservation Center and every other organization in the region had to engage on the BLM's timeline and rules and their process was to discuss the draft plan with some stakeholders in the region and then release the draft plan for a defined public comment period. The Bureau of Land Management does not engage directly with each citizen. These federal engagement processes often become a "checkbox" for agencies to state that they have received community input on a solution they have already decided to move forward with. WSCC was forced to spend most of their energy filing comments and following the Bureau of Land Management's engagement processes and Alex and Karen noted how strained relations were becoming in the community due to the nature of the federal engagement process. The process is not deliberative and does not allow for the development of a truly deliberative process, such as an issue guide, to give citizens agency to decide what happens in their community. The researchers must question whether any small nonprofit organization like WSCC could work within or overcome a dictated engagement framework.

Forced engagement or decisions by outside organizations can require a quick reaction on the part of organizations like Western Slope Conservation Center. A quick reaction to a concern can make utilizing the naming, framing, and alignment process simply too slow to be effective. Forced decisions from the federal government and other organizations can also (and understandably) invoke a fear-based reaction from the community. For example, there was another non-profit in Paonia that decided that a fear-based, reactive form of engagement was best in response to the BLM draft plan. The nonprofit took a hardline opposing the plan, which ultimately discredited their work, and because WSCC was perceived to have the same values, WSCC was being discredited as well. This created a situation where Alex and Karen had to pause in their own attempts at deliberative engagement and ensure that their organization was separately perceived and still trusted in their community. Alex also noted that it was hard to devote resources to take the time to step back and find out what the real values and challenges were in the first place because every issue in the community became contextualized within the BLM's draft plan. If an organization is unable to decipher what the real concerns are under citizen's statements, then it becomes difficult to have a constructive deliberative dialogue. For Alex and Karen, dealing with both the engagement framework dictated by the BLM and the fear-based opposition to any engagement created hurdles for deliberative processes in Paonia. Throughout this project, Western Slope Conservation Center struggled to engage beyond their

first concern gathering to figure out how WSCC could productively engage in a deliberative process in the midst of the turmoil and deadlines created by BLM.

Despite these challenges in engaging the community, Alex and Karen broadened their definition of engagement and both stated that the Engaging Communities for Success project gave them a renewed sense of place and purpose in their community. In the beginning, they considered themselves an integral part of Paonia. When the Kettering Foundation discussed their goals at the last learning exchange, the moderators stated that they were looking at the difference between organizations that saw themselves as a part of the community as opposed to serving it. The moderators revealed that during other research, the Foundation had found that there is resistance by organizations to actually talk to the community. Karen was taken aback by this revelation. She had always considered WSCC to be part of the community, end of discussion. But when she really thought about the project, she realized that their issue guide came from a place of serving and not from a place of being from the community. During the project, Alex and Karen had one big concern gathering and did not talk to the community after that point. They realized that they had unconsciously created barriers between themselves and their community. For Alex and Karen, this revelation deeply changed how they now think about their organization and its role in Paonia.

Alex and Karen repeatedly stated that the Engaging Communities for Success project changed how they see their roles. This project underlined for them the necessity of framing conflicts through values rather than outcomes. They had done work with values prior to this project, but only utilized values as a context rather than as a tool for decision-making. Alex and Karen hope that moving forward, they will be better able to articulate the choices Paonia has in engagement. During the span of this project, Alex and Karen were relatively new to their respective roles in the Western Slope Conservation Center. Having this project under their belt has connected them and ensured that both are in agreement in their views of WSCC's role in their community. For Western Slope Conservation Center, that change will come from the top, as Karen and Alex decided that deliberative dialogue is how the board will henceforth make decisions. They want to renew the commitment to using deliberation as a tool rather than a checkbox when decisions are made in the community. The researchers see this as a significant success.

Because Alex and Karen saw the naming, framing, and alignment processes as tools created in what they thought of as an "academic" setting, they consistently questioned whether these processes were able to translate to their reality. Both perfectionists by their own admission, it was difficult for them to take a theoretical and academic tool and use it on the ground with the complicated relationships and conversations that exist in Paonia. Alex and Karen had difficulty grounding what they learned at each learning exchange to the work that they do every day in Paonia. For example, a Kettering Foundation moderator suggested to them that they go out and just have conversations with people in their community. Alex and Karen brought up questions such as, where would the resources come from for WSCC to do that? In a rural community like Paonia, how would they be able to have those conversations without small-town politics getting in the way of those conversations? They questioned whether the tools provided would result in a valuable exercise that justified the resources required of Western Slope Conservation Center and the moderators were unable to answer those questions.

The small-town rural setting also exacerbated the challenges of implementing the naming and framing, especially when Alex wanted to have a third-party come in and help gather concerns. Alex was legitimately worried that if he were to take a stance or get directly involved, the concerns from the community would be based on their feelings for WSCC and not what the community was actually concerned about. Unfortunately, the remote setting proved too difficult and resource intensive for a third-party to come in to Paonia. At the end of the project, Alex still was questioning whether Western Slope Conservation Center was the right type of organization to engage in the naming, framing, and alignment process. While he saw the benefits of how the naming, framing, and alignment process could work, he did not see how following those processes the way the Kettering Foundation recommended would work for his small and deeply engaged community.

Western Slope Conservation Center is limited by their capacity and changing needs that are often dictated by larger engagement processes outside of their control. How is the naming, framing, and alignment model able to fit in to a scenario like that? These types of questions and concerns surfaced from the challenges Western Slope Conservation Center faced. Alex and Karen's struggles with community over engagement, being forced to follow community engagement dictated by outside organizations, and the difficulties of using academically created tools in a real life setting prevented them from following the naming, framing, and alignment processes as directed by the researchers and moderators. In spite of these difficulties, Karen and Alex were able to create change in how they viewed themselves and their organization within Paonia and their new commitment to engaging in real deliberative dialogue with the entire board will quite likely bring ripples of change to the organization and ultimately to their community.

United General Hospital District 304

For many participants in the Engaging Communities for Success project, how well they followed the naming, framing, and alignment process dictated the success of the project in their community. One participant, Marjie Bell from United General Hospital District 304 took each homework assignment and the naming, framing and alignment process to heart. In the beginning of the project, Marjie was unsure of her role in this project but was dedicated to making a change in her community. She is the example of really going through each stage of the naming, framing, and alignment process – to her personal and community success. At the end of the project, Marjie and her organization have a renewed sense of engagement in the community and that engagement is attracting many alignment opportunities that will bring change to the town of Concrete, Washington. From the beginning, Marjie was determined to implement the information from the learning exchanges and was one of the participants who had a project that followed the naming, framing, and alignment process most closely.

When the researchers began this project, they discussed communities that had seen many organizations come and go through a town without any measurable amount of improvement in the community. Concrete, Washington, where United General District 304 works, was one of those communities. The population of Concrete has fallen from 790 in 2000 to 705 in 2010 and the household median income has dropped from \$34,464 to \$31,000 in the same amount of time. The percentage of families in poverty has grown from 8.4% in 2000 to 22.5% in 2010. Years of failed promises made the town distrust outsiders and develop a “leave us alone” attitude towards any “outside” organization.

At the beginning of the project, researchers asked participants to write how they thought their organization engaged with their community. Marjie noted that United General has had to understand the local norms, be consistently present, and celebrate the strengths of the community to develop trust from the citizens for them to carry out their organizational goals. She also realized that their engagement worked better by showing up in person and taking action rather than relying on phone calls to engage the community. Despite knowing these things about the community, Marjie noted that building partnerships was difficult due to the persistent, cyclical nature of poverty in the region and that addressing those root causes would be a challenge. Prior to the first learning exchange, Marjie had noticed that the citizens of Concrete did not want experts to come in with a plan - they wanted their own opinions and ideas appreciated and taken into consideration when discussing the community. Perhaps because she lived there -- Marjie was one of the few participants who realized from the very beginning – that her community wanted their concerns heard and their experience and perspectives taken into consideration in the decision-making processes of the town. She had a deep understanding of what her community wanted and she understood what the Engaging Communities for Success project was attempting to do, but her local knowledge also made her cautious.

As the Engaging Communities for Success project went on, Marjie grew in confidence and began to realize how much work United General could do in engaging with their community. As noted above, Marjie and United General had a good idea of how they worked and fit in their community prior to this project. But both Marjie and United General also realized that what they were doing at that time was not quite enough. When the researchers originally were selecting participants, Marjie was brought along by the director of United General. By the end of the first

learning exchange however, Marjie was given leadership over the project. She had reservations about this - while she was a member of the community and understood engagement, she had never engaged with the community in a way like the naming process. Marjie enjoyed the concern gathering process as she spoke to community members that she had never spoken with before and those conversations helped Marjie grow in confidence in her role in the community during this process while also giving her more visibility in Concrete. By the end of the project, Marjie felt that she had developed a great deal professionally in ways that she would never have had the chance to do otherwise. She put herself out there and went beyond her comfort level. At the last forum she had for this project, she was amazed at her ability to articulate the project and proud of the level of direction she had been able to give to this project. Marjie believes that through this project, largely because of the success of the project, she was able to develop significant credibility for both herself and United General in Concrete.

After the original participant shifted leadership over to Marjie, United General still saw the benefit of remaining in the project and gave Marjie relatively free reign to follow the naming, framing, and alignment process. This free reign and support allowed for Marjie to follow the processes as recommended by researchers – much to the success of the project in Concrete. While United General was already going beyond surface community outreach and really engaging the community, Marjie noted that during this experience United General was deepening its capacity as a leader in the community. The deliberative dialogue process allowed United General to hear all kinds of distinct community voices beyond just the usual complaining. The process gave the community a chance to discuss what could be done about the issues discussed and the community recognized that United General was giving them a space in which to deliberate. Marjie noted the difference in community response between United General’s approach and the local school board’s approach, which was to resist what community members were saying and blame all of Concrete’s issues on one type of population, essentially the poor.

The importance of the community and how the community felt about the project was a strength of the United General Hospital 304 site. Marjie held several concern gatherings over the course of the project – well above the amount required by the researchers. She met with several different members of the community, some whom she already had relationships with, and others whom she did not, to ask what concerns them in Concrete. The community was interested in the project and flattered that the research is being done in their own community. When Marjie asked what concerned them, she was surprised at how prepared the citizens were to talk about what they perceived as community concerns. There was a wide array of concerns from drug abuse to a failing school system, but once Marjie unpacked the concerns, she realized that most concerns centered on the economic development and the youth in the community.

Some citizens linked the two together, realizing that the lack of economic development was hurting the youth the most. In Concrete, the school system has a high dropout rate and a high rate of youth unemployment has created an array of problems that are complicated or “wicked”. These concerns were not new to Marjie, she had mentioned them in the questions the researchers had asked prior to beginning the project. But to have so many community members show their concern about these two problems pushed Marjie to work with an advisory group to create her issue guide, as the researchers had recommended. Unlike the concern gatherings, Marjie ended up with the like-minded, civically engaged members on her advisory board. But that is to be expected - in a new idea or project, a community member that had not been involved before is

not likely to jump into being member of an advisory group. It should be noted that Marjie spent the far more time on her issue guide than any other project participant. Following every learning exchange, she went back and adjusted the issue guide with her advisory group. The advisory group became very invested in the process and at the end of the project, wanted to continue to keep creating issue guides for every major concern in the community – and that interest even includes some whom did not attend the learning exchanges -- a real engagement success.

Outside of economic redevelopment and youth issue guides, the community began to bring the naming, framing, and alignment processes into other aspects of community life. During the project, the Concrete's school superintendent decided to retire and the school board began the search for a new superintendent. During the interview process, the community demanded more from their candidates. They wanted a candidate who would actively work to fix the issues in the school system and whom would bring about change in their community. The final two candidates for the position were one of the "good old boys" who would bring more of the same to the position and the other candidate was an outsider who had experience in vocational schooling and wanted to bring his background into the school district to help the youth of Concrete. Marjie noted that because of the work around naming, framing, and alignment, the community was really looking at what they wanted to change in their community. She believes that the Engaging Communities for Success project influenced the community and the school board to pick the better "outside" candidate. Although this was not an expected success of the project, it demonstrates how community members can take the naming, framing, and alignment concepts and bring them into other areas of community life.

As noted earlier, poverty is one of the biggest concerns and the community had voiced on many occasions that education was the best strategy to help alleviate the community's poverty. The idea of education was something Marjie had noticed and then drifted away from in the middle of project, and then came back to - in the end what the community had voiced was where her attempts at alignment found the most success. The first issue guide that Marjie created was around economic redevelopment of Concrete, a concern that her advisory group wanted to address. When the mayor of Concrete told her that other members of the community were working on the same issue, she happily backed away, in part because it was becoming too much of a stretch for United General to justify funds and resources.

When Marjie turned towards the concerns around youth, she and her advisory group were able to create a second issue guide. After having conversations with the community around the youth issue guide, the community decided their biggest need was a childcare/after school program. At the fourth learning exchange, Marjie brought this idea forward during an alignment exercise. She had major reservations about the feasibility of finding partners and for United General to shoulder this project. During the workshop, she was given a few ideas for alignments that would help in creating and sustaining this idea. She went back to her community with a renewed sense of purpose for making the childcare/after school program work. Marjie and United General convened a meeting with the Boys and Girls Club of Skagit County to discuss possibilities in Concrete for youth. The meeting proved to be a successful alignment - the two organizations are now partnered to bring a Boys and Girls Club to Concrete that will help alleviate the need for a child care and create a positive place for youth. Not stopping at this alignment, Marjie also took the momentum on youth issues forward and has strengthened former partnerships with the National Park Service to create a youth trails program. She also has aligned

with the regional Department of Agriculture office to showcase the efforts United General has done with youth and what they plan to do moving forward. These alignments seem like only the beginning for United General and that they plan on building new partnerships and strengthening old ones to address community concerns.

When reflecting upon the results of the Engaging Communities for Success project, Marjie reiterated the importance of getting out there and being present in the community, which was an important aspect of United General's beginning levels of engagement. In addition to being there for the community, United General has now become a leader and is actively working to participate in addressing the concerns of the community. This shift from just being present and having obvious alignment within their mission to real engagement – helping to lead the conversation and think about unconventional alignments has brought and will continue to bring change to the community.

While United General had great success on engaging the community, the process was not without problems. The community struggled with not having quick fixes to these concerns once they were asked about them. One of the problems Marjie had throughout the project was convincing her advisory group that they should not create a band aid issue guide. The advisory group kept coming up with immediate solutions that did not address the long-term problem. United General could not go in and bring thousands of jobs in the area, nor could they dictate to the school what to do about the high dropout rate. But what they could do is help create a few options and be a part of the conversation on what to do about youth and economic redevelopment within their mission. Marjie noted that one of the biggest difficulties facing the project at the end, was that while United General wants to continue this type of deliberative engagement, they do not have a dedicated staff member and United General does not seem to have the capacity at this time for a dedicated staff member. While it seems certain that Marjie will continue to do the work on her own, what might happen if Marjie were to ever leave United General remains a concern. But these are problems that face all of the participants, not just United General.

United General and Marjie Bell had tremendous success with the Engaging the Communities for Success project. Marjie and United General gained more credibility in their community, which paved the way for them to become leaders of deliberative dialogue in Concrete. Of all the sites, the community of Concrete seemed to embrace the naming, framing, and alignment process the most and even brought the principles of engagement to other aspects of community life. Alignment is an integral part of this project, adding real accomplishments, and Marjie had great success in helping to create new alignments that will bring real change to Concrete. Marjie and United General are examples of not just performing the naming, framing, and alignment processes, but integrating them into their community and organization for great successes all around.