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"In this and like communities, public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it nothing can succeed. Consequently he who molds public sentiment, goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He (the citizen) makes statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed."

Abraham Lincoln, from a debate with Stephen Douglas in 1857.
DEVELOPMENT MODELS

Traditional Approach

• Design
• Propose
• Defend

Social Ecology Approach

• Learn
• Engage
• Benefit
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OLD MODEL--Ineffective
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NEW MODEL--Effective

Social Ecology Approach

• Learn
• Engage
• Benefit

Informal Absorption Model

Community boundary

Community Culture

“Our Project”
Three Concepts That Position a Company for Citizen-Oriented Management and Policy

1. Informal Networks and Local Routines
2. Citizen Issues—Emerging, Existing and Disruptive
3. Human Geography
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TWO FORMS OF CITIZEN ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HORIZONTAL / INFORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRUCTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Horizontal Structure" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNCTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal recognition of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering places and natural routines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to tell a gathering place...

- Can you change a menu item?
- Is there a bulletin board?
- Is the site accessible, convenient?
- Is the cost reasonable?
- Are the signs friendly?
- Are there certain “types” at certain hours?
- Are there newspaper boxes out front?
- Do people know each other? Is there cross-table talk?
- Is there a “character”?
Eight Informal Network Archetypes

**Caretaker**
- Trusted by others
- Utilized in time of stress
- “Let us talk over the idea.”

**Communicator**
- “Did you know...?”
- “I heard that...”

**Gatekeeper**
- Narrows entry
- “I can hook you up.”

**Bridger**
- Two cultures
- Two languages
- “I know somebody from...”
- “This is what they’re saying...”

**Authenticator**
- Knowledge and wisdom from the culture
- Provides cultural interpretations to technical data and information
- “This is how we do it here.”

**Storyteller**
- “In the past...”
- “We used to do it this way...”

**Opportunists**
- Use of public setting for personal gain
- “We in the community...”
- “My people...”

**Historian**
- History of their geographic place, carriers of the events that have happened over the lifetime of the community. They know critical information.
The Process of Issue Management to Reduce Social Risk

A. Gather & Sort Information

B. Evaluate Solutions & Make Decisions

C. Implement, Practice and Evaluate

TYPICAL PLANNING PROCESS IN AGENCY OR COMPANY

Company Government

Public Interests

Courts or Legislature

STAGE 3 Disruptive Issue

STAGE 2 Existing Issue

STAGE 1 Emerging Issue
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BYPASSES PLANNING CIRCLE AND GOES TO COURTS OR LEGISLATURE

IMPACT

INCORPORATED INTO ORGANIZATIONAL ACTION
Themes versus Issues

“The company is greedy. You just can’t trust them.”

“They never got back to me like they said they would.”

"You can't trust government."

"They never sent us the results of the soil testing on our property."

"The County is trying to upgrade this road into a freeway."

“That heavy machinery is breaking up my drain tiles out in my fields.”

“This grass reclamation never worked. The erosion is getting worse. They don’t know what they’re doing.”

“This land is part of my family.”

“In 15 years what will the turbines look like? What happens when its life is finished?”

“They put the transmission tower in the middle of my field instead of the edge. Now I can’t even use it.”

“Yes, farmers are paid but what about the neighbors? They are the ones with the visual impacts but no benefits.”

“The roads are better than before. They kept their word.”
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Human Geographic Units of Colorado
Lessons Learned
1. Contact and engage with citizens early to avoid surprises.

Community engagement must be at parity with technical disciplines in tactical and strategic project decision making. For example, extensive technical work during FEED (Front-End Engineering and Design) should be accompanied by extensive community engagement.
2. The objective of early engagement with the community should be learning.

- Learn the informal networks of a community and their communication patterns as the basis for engagement.
- Learn the language that people use to communicate on a routine basis and use that in project development language.
- Learn the actionable citizen issues.
3. Engage the affected people directly.

- Do not rely on formal groups or stakeholders in understanding community interests.
- Do not use public meetings as a means of initial citizen contact.
- Use the gathering places of a community to foster effective project communication and as a means to become an insider to the culture.
4. Understand the human geography that reflects cultural boundaries.

These boundaries define the ways that people actually identify and relate with their landscape. They are used to foster responsive siting of facility and corridor projects and they make citizen engagement more effective.
5. Deal with citizen issues at the emerging stage of development.

- The costs of time and resources are lowest.
- Prevent emerging issues from reaching the disruptive stage.
- Close the loop with informal networks to maintain predictability and control of project resources.
Taking It Home
The Discovery Process: A Graduated Approach to Citizen Engagement
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Informal/Formal Systems of Organizations--The Function of Governments, Companies and Citizens

Informal Systems
- Citizen-centered
  - Cultural
  - Communities of Place

Function
- Caretaking
- Survival
- Cultural Maintenance
  - Interest Based

Gathering Places
- Networks
- Word-of-mouth
- Cultural language
- Community time

System Resilience
- Citizen Ownership

Collaborative Stewardship

Systems Integration and Issue Resolution

Formal Systems
- Organization-centered
  - Technical
  - Publics of Interest

Function
- Political
- Economic
- Ideological
  - Position Based

Meetings
- Focus Groups
- Technical language
- Newsletters
- Institutional time

System Resilience
- Cultural Alignment
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## Social Risk Scoring
### Save Money, Save Time, Save the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Social Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY A: Information that can be assembled from off-site—information that is publicly available from government agencies or from private on-line sources (Items 1 – 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Check to see if the corridor or drilling site comes within 500 feet of the boundaries of playgrounds, schools, senior centers, and other vulnerable areas.
   - **a. Beyond 1500 feet:** Low
   - **b. From 500 to 1500 feet:** Medium
   - **c. Within 500 feet or less:** High

*√*
2. Check the location of minority populations and their proximity to the project. If the project has been placed in a minority area deliberately to avoid battles elsewhere, the potential for an environmental justice issue is high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Social Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>L M H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. There are no minority populations or the impacts on minority populations have been mitigated:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Environmental Justice requirements are met:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Location is near minority populations:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

√
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Social Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</strong></td>
<td>L M H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public lands—local, regional and national—are highly prized by the citizens. Make sure that you avoid public lands if at all possible, especially federal lands, because national interest groups will attach their formal anti-development positions to your project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Avoid the public lands:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No entry for “b” – use just “a” or “c”</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Attempt to go through public lands:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Social Risk Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category B:</strong> Information that can be assembled best on site, in the local communities (Items 4-8).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Talk to people about past or existing project conflicts. If there have been conflicts, are they still ongoing? If resolved, how were they resolved and when? One source is utility managers who are historically responsible for gas and electric infrastructure in the geography where the corridor is located. Existing or past conflicts are a reliable indicator of trouble for a new project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. There have been no conflicts:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Past conflicts that are resolved:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Recent conflict still ongoing of any kind:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</th>
<th>Social Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Visit the gathering places in the project area. Coffee shops are ideal. What is the talk about in these places?

a. If there is no talk about your project and no talk about other current negative events: **Low**

b. If the talk is of victimization—“They” did this, “There’s nothing we could do,”—even if not related to your project: **Medium**

c. Active negative talk about your project: **High**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Social Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</strong></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Check bulletin boards in the communities to see what is posted. These are generally good sources of information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If there is nothing on the bulletin board about your project:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If your project is posted on a bulletin board, regardless of the message:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If messages about the project are hostile:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Social Risk Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</strong></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Review the local newspapers and social media sites to see how controversy is reported. What kinds of controversies have been covered and have they been covered impartially? Is there a bias?

a. News articles contain few disruptive conflicts, and nothing about your project: **Low**

b. A few articles about other project conflicts but nothing disruptive: **Medium**

c. The media are reporting on your project: **High**
8. Be conscious of the view plane from the corridor location—the lines of sight from homes and communities. People value their view planes and an early indication of this is important. Real estate agents are a good source for this information. For instance, do realtors market view planes as a part of property sales? If so, is there an economic value as well as a social value?

<p>| a. View planes are not a part of the conversation: | Low |
| b. View planes are recognized but not given much emotional weight: | Medium | ✓ |
| c. View planes have intense social attachment: | High |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Social Risk Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</strong></td>
<td>L M H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C: Information about the usual practices of your client/company in generally managing corridor definition and land acquisition (Items 9 – 12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Approach to land owners in the project area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Involving the owner in resolving an issue:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Engaging in conversation about the project:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Threatening eminent domain as a first choice:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Social Risk Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</strong></td>
<td>L     M     H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. When you are staging a public meeting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If your team has been doing ongoing citizen engagement with direct contact for a few months before the first public meeting:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If you preface a public meeting with a few weeks of effort in creating fact sheets and press releases:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If a public meeting is your first point of contact in dealing with citizens, your project is at:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Social Risk Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Risk: Low, Medium, High</strong></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Engaging individuals in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Being able to discuss the project at the early stages with informal/formal leaders through their gathering places:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Providing project information to service organizations and other community groups such as Rotary, Lions and Chamber of Commerce:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Relying only on information from government bodies or public affairs for your project:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Communicating with individuals in the community

a. Involving project personnel directly with the citizens in discussions about local issues and how to address their issues as part of project operations: Low

b. Meeting with formal organizations to discuss the project: Medium

c. Using only formal means of communication or public relation firms to get the word out: High
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>12 or Less</td>
<td>Many opportunities to position the project for community benefits. The project has a social license to operate, but management has to be diligent about maintaining that license.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
<td>13-24</td>
<td>Reduced opportunities but options available with company flexibility. This category is the most dynamic with some ability to go down the scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>25 -48</td>
<td>Few opportunities; without management changes, disruption will occur. A mid-range score means there is no chance to earn a social license. The project will have to manage in a disruptive environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCORING

Totals for the 3 columns of estimated risk:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>x 1</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 14</td>
<td>x 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A note on the weighting assumptions

- **High Risk** is 2 X more risky than **Medium Risk**. Medium Risk is also 2 X more risky than **Low Risk**.
- A **Low Risk** Project would be equal to 12 (1x12=12) or less.
- A **Medium Risk** Project would be equal to 13-24.
- A **High Risk** Project would be equal to 25-48.

### TOTAL

The Estimated Total Risk Index for this example is 28 (2+14+12) toward the lower end of the High-Risk Range.