Notes on Place and Decision Making

Wednesday Sept. 24, 2008

Goals/Approach to the Book

Bill’s thoughts on book

1. Not journal format for papers.
2. Organizing structure for publisher
3. Tone and Style is describing lines of research you are engaged in and how you envision it relating to practice (decision making, policy, mgt etc) and having an impact.
4. Note letter from OSU Press – guide to authors. Discuss the review process and schedule ms due end of Nov. when do we write front and back pieces
5. How do we capture connections issues, themes? Authors should be responsible for that. Herb brings up station review issues and what has to happen for that. He needs to get his review done before it goes to OSU Press.
6. Intro should be what we are (this book) and what it is not what its going to do. The intro becomes very important to selling the book. Should we come back with revised abstracts after meeting? Let’s come back to this on Friday.
7. Should we keep notes to individual papers if notes.
8. Missing people?

Barkley – Making sense of place according to lived experience

Starts off talking about the importance of emotion. People get worked up about Carl Park. Public parks as key expressions of values of nature, landscape etc. held by a community. Emotional knowledge is driving political and sense of place/place meanings (interchangeably). I’m thinking about literature emerging on importance of emotion (e.g., George Lakoff’s, new political book on emotion and managers’ lacking ways to validate this kind of knowledge in decision making literature (also see Joanne Vining’s work). This type of knowledge is at the center. How do we validate/legitimate in some way that is productive?

Lived Experience – photo elicitation work. What is this? James defines it: existentialist definition pre-cognition. Conceptual framework. Always remembering lived experience and how they choose to retell it, which grounds meaning in memory and representation. Collective/public memory (from anthropology) as conceptual framework to contain or make sense of social influence on memory. Remembering lived experience and external representation of it (e.g., Denzen) internal reflection and external representation (private and public) memory. Useful for building collective (memory?) among engaged group (narrowing scope of who, i.e., vocal representatives). Leading edge of public conflict. Shared stories of lived experience builds public memory as possibility of disarming competing viewpoints? Enter empathetic realm? Linking to public forum. Structuring
public forum to share lived experience. I’m wondering about political science theories here e.g., Iris Young.

End with photo elicitation. Historical review of photo elicitation (e.g., Douglas Harper). Should we include this?

**Damon Hall (Review).** He wants to “re-member” your paper. You could go one of three ways: Inward turn toward memory (pre-cognitive); Creation of public memory as of expression of culture; Actual practice of sharing these memories. Goes back to literature on public memory (e.g., Edward Casey remembering 9/11). Damon thinks the public memory (#2) would be strong for this book. Constructing public memory in a public forum. Something groups do and it becomes a basis for protecting a place. It has rhetorical dimensions that will politically position the group. And talk about how that might be applied or inform public decision making. How much focus on emotion? Emotional force can contribute to decision space in a positive way. Need to anticipate rationalist arguments against emotionality. Building politically active groups off emotional force is important as cathartic may not release these in certain points, productively. If you’re on the other side you want catharsis take place to move the process forward.

**Discussion** – literature of public memory not as integrated into resource planning as it could be. What is the role of emotion in public memory? Is emotion collective? Emotion leads to caring leads to sharing, leads to civic action. Liked the way you told the story rather than the writing. Became nostalgic – does sharing lead to civic action? How emotion-civic action plays out? How do you get from individual action to larger scale? Do you deal with nostalgia versus multiple public memories? But Iris Young doesn’t think we need to “share” the memory but learn to appreciate social difference – appreciate that others have memories. Political emotions. We have lost the recognition of emotional aspects of decision making. Difference between collective memories (shared) public. Be specific about whose collective we are mapping. Big debate among anthropologists on “stakeholders” – with the term implying that we not having done homework about who cares about this issue. What is success in process? Ties to Linda’s paper with Dale.

**Kari Gunderson: Relational marketing**

Project focus is on relationships to a buffer zone of a Tribal wilderness (both members and non). Challenges of mapping meanings: Increase the number of people involved, retain good scale representation, capture intensity of meanings, and understand threats to meaning. Very much a technique for representing meanings and their intensity. While there are a lot of methods, the focus here is giving power back to participants to define and describe meanings. The knowledge delivery is to ID threats that tribe can use to make decision making. Decisions for buffer zone should protect wilderness but not so much for nonmembers. Buffer was unavailable for timber but now considering harvest for various “forest health” issues in this zone. Used computer based mapping routines (spray can). Some members used spray can and some couldn’t, but still felt increased opportunity for
people to participate. Phase III took mapping data and applied to focus groups on fuel treatments and their impacts on meaning in the buffer zone and understand issue of trust and conflict. In applying this place meanings to decision making, hope to address which meanings are threatened. Threats related to mechanical manipulation. Trade-offs between fire mgt and meanings/decisions in a spatially explicit place. My question: How best to put this in a larger context for book?

Herb Schroeder (Review) – Emphasizes relational marketing (versus transactional – business -- marketing). Distinction between customer and community members may be a good way to tie into place issue. Also the whole notion of marketing implies developing relations with a very an agency or organizations (come out private sector – with a kind of directedness). Second is methodological approach getting people to attach meanings or value to specific land areas. Specify how this ties into conception of place? Does having a meaning and then tying it to place make it a “place meaning”? Emphasis on trust (coming out of relational marketing) but how it ties into decision making or practice and hasn’t been done yet? Set of scale related issues. What is the relationship between landscape and place? Or is the buffer zone a place or a composite of place? Or the hot spots defining “place”? Fuzzy mapping of narrow versus broad meaning?

Comments. Bill mentioned the tribal issues being addressed. Some interest in process and building relationship with group. And how going about understanding place meanings? How is it that you built trust? (Patrick) drew on participatory mapping literature contrasting Cartesian mapping and moving away from this to “place-based” systems of mapping. “Re-mapping” as agencies taking ecology into mapping. This paper is between “Counter-mapping” and re-mapping. Experience of tribal members in dealing with this. Privileging elders etc. Composite maps from 250 individuals versus (Michael’s) scale, meanings, locus of decision making. Tyra asked questions about mapping and geography and can everyone really deal with maps – goes back to Patrick’s re-mapping and counter-mapping. Questions of empowerment with maps versus some not being Cartesian thinkers (brings to my mind Douglas Torgerson’s chapter (chapter 10 in Fisher and Haer, 1999 Living with Nature) on making native senses of place public changes the SOP). Mapping lived experience and tensions. Dynamics of meaning management. Place names rather than map view. Including the localize features and names. Tension between how to work with tribes versus the status of “mapping” techniques.

Neal Christensen – Measuring place bonds

Describes a tool via a couple of case studies. Methodology to inform land mgt decisions. Conceived as informing planners before planning process. Focused on segmentation of relationships to place, expressed through cognitions, emotions and behaviors. Bonds versus attachment (the latter too focused on emotion). Measure this through a series of indicators, particularly assigned values, attachment, & activities. Stakeholder groups are narrowly focused on an issue whereas mgt is often focused on a more wicked realm. Stakeholder groups naturally divisive whereas the constituency/segments you can break up the hard-line positions. Pointed out opportunities to educate stakeholders, not so much
target marketing but way to do constituency analysis for organizing and facilitating collaboration seeing ways to get people to work together. Scale at watershed level.

**Linda Kruger (Discussant).** Likes the link to place and wicked problems. 1980s greater difference within than between groups and this paper gets at this idea of constituency analysis. Title seems without scale. Is it about measuring? Segmentation? Not just organizing but access, assess and represent place relationships. Balance individual and population, should it also include other situational factors e.g., economic, ecological features? Tool for a tool-box. Wonder about other “off-site” behaviors and not just recreation as a form of behavioral measure? Where do “non-local” people fit into this? Important to understand it is not just the activity but doing it in this place. Q2 intense bonds link to allies of managers and have networks into the community.

Pat S. Something for discussion on Friday: issue of direct line from research to agency action or civic action. Rich – is decision making aimed to please one group or another – diversity between or within? Bill -- By getting to the practice as the starting point, what the application, practice? Here is where it fits into some process of mgt. (or fitting practice into place). To what extent is it a method piece or an outcomes paper and more there than methods? (Herb) Issue of held versus assigned need to be more explicit. (Michael) using planning, decision making, policy? What is the application or practice? What are the temporal, spatial, social scales and (deliberative, accidental) intentionality dimensions of practice/application? Suggested title *Practicing Place. Or Placing Practice*

**Damon Hall – Place Representation**

Write an expose on for stakeholder and management. Mgt of symbolic resources. Mgt requires some kind of vocabulary. Find some common language. How do groups come to represent place? Representation connects meaning/language to refer to real word things. Representational process is important to politics of place. E.g., framing for thinking, screens for not thinking. Representation becomes a tool for thought and action. To explain complexity we name and bind site in order for people to conceive think about place. Ground this in the Yellowstone work. Place meanings (dynamic, semiotic) how meaning is made. How is meaning made through representation but go past looking at this to the idea of discourse; to include more historical context (practice). Discourse is about production of knowledge through language, all practices have discursive aspect. Involves the link to power – what is “relevant” information give a sense of power. Other aspect of discourse is an event (dynamic). Through language, story telling or postcards, events can construct the meaning. How to move from semiotic to effects of representations? One example is 1978 a proposed dam on a fly fishing Mecca (FF defines MT – e.g., A River Runs Through it). Lead to a discourse of “lets make Yellowstone as a tourist spot” to protect it from dam. And got the Ted Turners and the Hollywood-ization of Yellowstone. It worked well, but too well that it turned the place into the Aspen-ization of Yellowstone, with significant ecological consequences. The experience has focused on affect, but representations have material impacts. Another element of practice would be the two dominant discourses: wild and free versus as lifeblood of the valley.
Tend to clash unnecessarily and agencies get set up as third party (neutral) arbiter among them. What happens is it becomes partisan. Instead of looking at stakeholders and their positions – by focusing on constructions rather than the people and positions. What is the power of representation?

**Dan Williams (Discussant)** *I didn’t really capture my discussion comments (perhaps someone else did?).* Everyone gets to try to control the meaning of the place. Everyone is trying to manipulate the discourse and steer the meaning of place. Practice lesson is you can’t control it so play the game better. Political ecology, discourses congeal around specific discursive alliances. We are now getting into Foucault and the issues of power and discourse. We buy into governmentality. Do you hedge it? Also the power you have as author? Seems like there is the disciplinary challenge here: are you speaking to the scholar or the manager? Your own authorship of representation. Dualism as straw-man argument. We can (re)construct and deconstruct representation. Comment on where it starts. As a tool, how this is done in looking at the texts, problem of you know how this discourse was created as opposed to some of other. Need to add some discussion of how “they” do this. Show by way of example. But the whole book becomes a set of representations of the ideas related to place. Use Laure Yung’s paper (Rocky MT Front – Forest Science) as another example. Is this a critical study that says the framing is wrong and there is another more “authentic” representation? Include more example of quotes.

**Patrick Hurley – Which rural amenity?**

Trained as geographer & political ecologist. Interested in the processes through which space becomes place, econ history, environ. Political Ecology is environment history; anthropology tries to understand socio-political with ecology, political economy and power. Assumptions: All landscapes are cultural landscapes produced through material and symbolic transformations. Study of place meanings in PE is mostly third world peasants and colonial power. How can these ideas contribute to private landscape processes? Ways in which developers incorporate place meanings into their plans. How the local is response to region/global processes. How developers have adopted notions of “Conservation subdivisions.” All projects developed by amenity migrants.


Rich - Do you buy statement about living in development? Do developers care about place? Or the land? Political ecology is focused on social justice, democratic. There seems to be a tension between amenity rich and ecologically sustainable. What different array of carrots and sticks to get developers to adopt conservation subdivisions? Urban geog. talks about restless suburban landscape and quest for authentic place, which relates to this conservation subdivision design: historical, natural, environmental resources. Which of these are getting preserved? Also the whole issue of constructing the rules of
the subdivision/covenants? Looking at how private forest landowners approach this: Lot of this begins at home in terms of management. Representation of amenity migration. Community supported agriculture. Tension between how developer represents the place versus owner purchaser’s representation. These are about creation of conservation communities, built around commodification, processes of creating new kinds of decision making. Place making – whatever is amenity for this place.

**Linda Kruger – Place-based planning Case Studies**

Focus on public land planning. NW Forest Plan was effort to democratize planning process. Paper flows out of democratization theme. Get people to uncover, disclose, discover meanings. Started process with design workshop but a lot of people wanted to participate. Six different cases. Very few were successful in incorporating the information into planning. What can we learn from these examples? Challenge involves the muddling of participation, assessment and planning together, which deviates from many of the legal/administrative requirements. Go back to literature in each of these areas and identify what is appropriate where and what fits into place-based planning process. Show how these can and cannot be combined. *I also like the “case-based” learning aspect of this cases study collection.* There wasn’t a lot of clarity of these different features. Look at changing literature in all three areas and the evolution in participation levels, strategies and how much things have changed.

**Kari Gunderson (Reviewer):** What about people who have never been to the sites (locals and non locals)? Place-based approaches take more longitudinal approach. Future condition relevance to say “climate change” upsetting the whole assumptions about what is and is not possible. Tension between public participation and social assessment. To what extent is national versus local (social assessment is in fact the local issues and impacts)? How you deal with meanings that pertain to types of place? Very good dealing with limitations and has important place within the volume. Elaborate on the use of case studies. *I would underscore this last point.* Would it be an introductory piece?

**Discussion:** Some have raised the question of whether “place-based” is new idea within mgt. as opposed to activity, commodity based and relative to traditional forest planning. We may need to make some statement clarifying the history of planning (maybe in the intro). This paper documents a shift to contextually explicit processes where people identify their issues/values in place; addressing questions of symbolic landscapes (e.g., working forest landscapes). Also a matter of scale. Shows how decision making is implicit. Addresses questions of empowerment and inclusiveness. These values don’t come across in the summary table enough. Symbolic and scale. But it might be an individual orientation versus a place. There might be two different ideas going on: Planning is place-making but who is making places? Negotiation between community and agency going both ways (Norm). Lay out this challenge (Rich S). Develop the ownership into the planning process.

**Norm McIntyre – Mapping Forest Values (PPGIS)**
There are several ways to do this kind of mapping. We haven’t gone down this road: are they collecting the same or different kinds of data despite some similarity? Spectrum from unique to common things – situate this project between some of the other efforts to map meanings (e.g., Brown; Gunderson). Four questions: How are place values conceptualized? (values vs. meanings?). Ways these are elicited? How spatially representative? How incorporated into planning? In this approach going with assigned values. And used focus groups, participants, and map biographies. Then surveyed and then came up with 7 value domains, factor analyzed these data. Does the location of “areas” say something about the spatial structure? Illustrated the results of both the geography (density map) and value maps. In this case the locations are very dynamic in interaction with logging. Interactive to derive values surveys to get distribution. Also reference groups in the communities.

**Bill Stewart (Discussant).** Maps seem to have a face value to managers (and public?). It ties to management well. Grounded in Tom Brown’s conception of assigned values. What is distinct about the “Canadian-ness” of the application? Are there some differences about forest values? We could use more regionalism in the book comparing to US NPS etc. (e.g., policy framework). Tension between generalizable approach to more place specific (but they would also be dynamic as people and forests change). Kari’s paper needs more tribal-ness and Norm’s more Canadian-ness. Issue of generalizability. Michael’s will bring up the issue of nestedness. Is there a good practical scale for this kind of work?. Norm’s is about recreational use, values and behavior, being able to map behavior as well as values/meanings. Is this a methods paper on point versus polygon?

**Discussion** – (Patrick) Mapping process and mapping how meaning/attachment follows utilization/forest managing. Isn’t static? Can use map in relationship to past and future patterns, problems. Rich – overlay with mgt. In Canada different “ought” question. What is the job of forest mgt. after they have opened up or continue? Are there size effects? Can this be scaled at various levels? How does context matter (e.g., fire and fuels, or buffer zone or road closures, development)? How this can be used? The web-based approach, how participants using the on-line medium? I see two things going on here: Where are the “places” and what (meaning) are the places? Also a value in using the community’s language. Bringing out more of the community context.

**Tyra Olstad – Red Desert**

We have variously talked about scale – temporal, geographic, social, and intentional. So looking here at the social and temporal (what, where) but also the how and the why. The focus is on individual experience, place creation and its importance to land management, using a phenomenological approach based on personal experience. Project centers on Wyo. Red Desert, empty expanse ranch lands, BLM lands – a place not really on people’s radar screen. Looks at both personal experience and material characteristics. More philosophical than place based (how much is case based). Ideas are experienced more informally. Not as appreciated as much from an aesthetic perspective: but individual
sensation, perception, cognitions (to the wild heart of the West). Expressed via photo, sharing stories and starts to become public. Going from personal experience, and expression of values and professional/public participation. A good case study of “place-creation” (but in this case is more local). A citizen group formed as the BLM started working on land management planning. (What about the oil/gas development?). The place is now being marketed and this produces some visibility. The importance of story – “my red desert” and “our public lands.” Interesting question of how to bridge from “my to our”.

**James Barkley (Discussant).** Example of how to involve personal experience into decision process. Connects with place and place research at a core (Relph and Tuan). At end of abstract addresses emotional transformation of space. Do a reversal in abstract of space coming out of place. In context of other presentations, diagram is ambitious in relation to what is written here – personal experience loses focus when embedded in the larger diagram. So how much should be focused on here? Or is it “place creation” through personal experience? Is it personal place creation of public? At this scale of Red Desert seems more like getting to public place. Focus more on stories as starting point and the values social culture. What is the difference between personal meaning and public/professional meaning? Perhaps not as necessary to deal with the socio-cultural part.

**Discussion** Rich – questions were different, who created it? When are the stories about the Red Desert and when do they invoke the Red Desert in their stories and when just their personal relation? Dan – importance of the place creation story. Herb and James see paper as most closely tied to theirs. Importance of personal level. Looking at the sensory contact with the place. Connection of personal experience and the environment at the core. Aspects of experience but what is missing is the “feeling” part (is that in here?). Sense of place with sensation (including inward). Relationship between space and place – the formulation that has trouble space + meaning = place. Meaningless space is fundamental – phenomenology – we experience place first, and abstract meaning and left with space. Like the way you use the quotes. (Tyra) Red Desert was a space and bandied about without meaning attached to it. Space without first hand experience (place minus sensation). (Pat) One way to deal with individual stories and become bigger (public), mythic place. Track stories though myths and then operated on by political process. (Linda) what about agencies / institutional forces interacting with this place? (Kari) How do we make the leap to application? (Patrick) Disagreeing with Herb, need to get to higher abstract understanding – can’t divorce the two. Need to keep both lived and political construction. (Bill) Frustrations being lost in planning process, don’t need diagram. The way to move forward at the end is how personal experiences can be part of planning process. Procedure for incorporation of SOP is not working in BLM (e.g., letters etc). (Pat) Discourse includes kinds and levels of discourse. (Damon) How does this get incorporated into planning and make it resonate within the planning structures and processes? Think about new way of incorporating into institutions and practices. (Pat) The link is not strong and Pat will explain how to do it. Remember Foucault – resistance and mobilization: the book won’t do it alone. There are also marginalized voices inside the agency. The planning process itself is a barrier to bringing about change.
Rich Stedman – Volunteers and SOP

Did a somewhat different Paper (Seward Alaska – Ben Amsden, photo elicitation). Is this book methodological (photo elicitation)? Ben’s interest in volunteers. Turn lens of SOP on volunteers. Didn’t speak to questions of book. Why volunteers? Participation, decision making (practice). How do we make sense of them (who are they, i.e., not residents)? If sense of place is interaction based, neither call them residents or tourists, or landscape consumer. Place producers (restoration ecology). Production of landscape. Another form of place making is through communication (interpreters – e.g., Project Stream Watch). So they are making place as they interpret to others. Interested in the spatial trajectory of volunteering – as in a list of places (attachment and mobility) along dimensions place attachment versus activity specialist. Volunteer based Identity. Do people internalize objectives of agency/organization mission? And also community of volunteers. Practical considerations for mgt – NGOs and agencies to stretch budgets. Demand side and supply side, creating a generation of people with human capital of volunteers. Need to keep them happy. But is this really attachment to place or consumption of place? How is volunteering similar or different from public participation? Direct change to landscape rather than advocacy (point of spear for mgt). Could also look at church based, tourist based volunteering. To what degree are meanings handed to volunteer or volunteers selected based on identification with mission? Intersection between agency (volunteer) and structure?

Neal – (Discussant). Complements what is going on in our book. Volunteering raises issue of citizenship. Planning to look beyond self-interest to interests of society. Volunteers who are local (weekend) versus career volunteer who moves to a place for a while. Citizens (local) = citizen, versus career volunteers -- What are their motives? They may be more ideological or agency values in what they do. In some cases its just free camping. Want to see pulling out different types of volunteers and how it relates to place.

(Discussion) (Tyra) Good of society may not the norm but looking for the experience of going to NP rather than the mission. To learn about the place/landscape/history/ and then develop sense of the mission. (Linda) Biggest comment wanting to give back and contribute to society, again depending on the context. What they are looking for and where does place fit in? Is it consumer image? Seems like volunteers could be lifestyle/career, but also an identity thing for people to volunteer with a specific place. (Rich) Opportunity to be seen as expert. (Kari) seniors come with rich collection of experiences recognize developmental differences. (Bill) tie to Patrick – in a physical sense (practice) creating place. So they are place practitioners – “othering” volunteers. There is a variety of roles and whys of volunteers -- age, stage, affluence and motivation. (Dan) In contrast to Bill’s emphasis on the way volunteers create place, I would also suggest an alternative frame is for them is as a form of identity affirmation/place identity. (Patrick) Are they place producers and consumers? What makes it possible for some and not others? But also locals who have a citizen perspective. So we have symbolic and material productions and life experiences and knowledge that they bring to these. (Herb)
Similar to context of ecological restoration – e.g. Chicago, grass roots community level groups. Formed network coordinated by Nature Conservancy strong sense of purpose and attachment to these “forests”. Erupted into a controversy because volunteers had different vision of how this should be managed (described in book by Gobster/Hull. (Michaela) Public participation as informing planning process and volunteers about labor to execute plan. Volunteers doing monitoring and removing/restoration – no glory. Fine line between intern/volunteers and rangers (seasonal) want to be in “cool” places.

**Bill Stewart- Sharing stories**

Long time interest in using visual media in research. Grown jaded with hierarchical expert based planning. Place meanings being core to what people take to be essential about environmental issues. Crisis of representation about place meanings (borrowing from Denzen), a crisis about the way we as researcher are representing meaning. How do we adapt? Place meanings as narratives about places that connect with people. Not just a story about I like X place …. Emotions are a major part of who we are, but not well recognized in planning processes, which don’t do justice to the meanings. Agencies and organizations are not monolithic – populated with people holding varying identities. Notions of empowerment and social justice. But how we go about it and nurture it.

Another issue of place history as being central to our meanings. How do we represent our “history”? In contrast to the “trade-off” mentality of resource planning, toss it out and create value in place (share). Thesis to connect place meanings and practice involves social learning through sharing stories. Commit to sustained dialogue, sharing also emotions, get beyond simplistic. Examined the practice of learning circles. Diffuses the personalization of meaning and look at their relationship to place rather than themselves? It becomes about the place. Builds context, teach place history, to understand differences (not competitive). So this is the balance between “unity” and “difference.” A pre-planning phase helps to get us to where we both value the place.

**Patrick (discussant)** – First case study looking at a local level decision and urban context and decision making of local level of government. Great model for our chapters and thinking about how they fit into the framework. Issues, given local, so community context is missing (tell more about park district). See three ways it could go: (1) social learning – your expressed approach. Broader so what (crisis of representation). More reference to social learning literature (e.g., link to sustainability). Claim of paper certain processes are appropriate: are there inappropriate process? (2) Second way to see the paper as methods: how can managers use this “how to” is important and links to photo elicitation and GIS papers? (3) Focus on the empirical, evaluative question: does it really lead to more effective better interactions (do you have data for this)? Comments used lived experience but don’t define it and different from James ... daily activities and less about cognition. Tension between lived experience and place history (what is the demographic history)? In So. Carolina it would be radically different I suspect. This process might make the tension diminish. Are you talking about the characteristics of process?
**Discussion** (James) Who is involved? Question is it linked subheading of contextualization at outset? Is there a way to use process to say the Red Desert to help get stories into planning? Strategies that you need some process of sharing stories in a way that helps with management. And are managers participants in the learning circles? (Rich) can stories be wrong, or just evil (i.e., stories that negate existence of slavery, holocaust)? (Dan) I go back to Iris Young (see S. Benhabib 1996 *Democracy and Difference*, who makes a similar argument as Mouffe cited below). Are stories strategic? I don’t agree that participants necessarily reconcile among their differences, but it may legitimate difference. Differences are to be understood, and that is a good thing. (Damon) Building off issue of strategic, what is value of pre-planning in the learning circle, situational context? Doesn’t have to be-pre decisional? Discursive event. Transcend our interests, we have to learn about …. Conflict has a function in a collaborative (e.g. Tarla Peterson and democratic process). Chantel Mouffe’s (2000) book *The democratic paradox* (London: Verso (Dan notes it is part of the Phronesis series!!!) and this idea of agonistic pluralism in democracy. Democratizing types of knowledge that are “allowable” aren’t sure-fired is OK, born of a different type of knowledge. Abler, Adams, and Gould -- scientific mode, emotional, personal aesthetic. Place involves trying to integrate these into more formal modes of order. The importance of emotion in helping others come to understand the “other”. There are a variety of barriers that prevent: this kind of planning input into the decision process – rules and procedures, agency culture, practice, excuse. But also outside these processes there are also forces of resistance.

**Pat Stokowski – Rhetorical dimensions**

Started as a critique of issues in planning/decision making. Ask Q: What it is we need to know (that is different) and how it is that we need to mange differently? This will be a more theoretical presentation. Three stage setting items: (1) Natural resource decision making always takes account of place, in the way that is objectified and quantified but not taking account of things that are meaningful to people. (2) How organizations actually work day to day. What adm tasks are regularized, leadership? What actually happens when they do what they do? Focus on legal, structural, and operational aspects rather than organization. (3) Don’t know the cultural practices, and what gets routinized in discourses of the organization. This gets us into some troubles, how to intersect, we talk past each other. How this matters? People are raising questions about capacity to do their work. Complaining about how that work doesn’t take account of other ways of understanding. You see this in studies of place, claims among us that agencies are too top-down, mobilized understanding. Not a structural issue. Agencies should be more deliberative. But is this really the case? What is it about decision making that needs to accommodate place? After critique, I look at particular analysis of planning as what makes a good society. Philosophical basis for tangible planning practices. Looked at John Freidman’s “two centuries of planning theory.” He looks at post Enlightenment positions toward the good society: Four re-forms: *Standard planning model* -- gov. inspired model, benevolent – basic model, and progressive scientific rational); *Policy analysis* – NASA, highly expert driven system w/o public input’ *Social learning* -- the model many are talking about here at least in part, the model of dialogue which is more of a flat social organization; and *Social mobilization*, grass roots uprising both in the
positive and negative way. And these lead to different methods of doing planning practice. We need to add two others: the fifth, like Bill Stewart’s learning circles (a hybrid of social reform and social learning), you don’t challenge the structure but you work within the structure; A sixth “community action” model (or new models of governance). Decision making is shared but not at lowest levels of social circles – mid range community (extended networks, but not necessarily locale). Re-craft policy to work to create new organizing forms they may or may not persist; e.g., town hall. Where I end up is with some sort of bureaucratic form or change that is necessary to do or make happen. Is it tweaking social reform model?

**Shawn & Paul (Discussants)** – Discussion of managers with an ethnography of “managers”. More literature review that might help build this in. The idea of nostalgic democracy speaks to the broader questions we are talking about -- there are approaches to place-based collaboration but need this head-on critique of the “flawed” processes. Desire for more reference to case studies. If you were to map all the things where this would occur. Other threatened of resources. A big question may be to tie all this together. What is our position as researchers in constructing this place? (we were all studying “rootless professors”). More reflexive approach to studying place, what is our own professional culpability in not studying place. Who are we actually talking about? Sixth model, environmental sociology, the conservative collective consciousness; should we be saying it’s not just about getting data to a flawed system but do something in a more radical way?

**Discussion** (Patrick) – Ethnography of managers? How it might articulate with others for example; where does scientist-manager fit it. Mentions Latour’s *the politics of nature*. AAG ethnography of NGOs. (Bill) Link with practice. Most of us looking at consumers, creators. Pat studies the producers of place. But from a different way which may need to be more contextualized. “Othering” management? (Dan) I’ll bring up scale and the study of managers. The sixth model reminds me of the new models governance (as Tony Cheng contrasted the top-down dominance of progressive theories of planning/governance versus collaborative governance (with NGOs, stakeholders); really a question of who does the management (agencies or local networks of actors/institutions)? An emerging literature on governance institutions. Someone mentioned Maureen Reed (Univ. of Saskatchewan?) doing work on governance. New institutional forms. Governance by networks is central to where I end up in my presentation to come later. (Damon) Is this paradigmatic change at the managers’ level? What other practices and processes might be involved. EPA place-based management? (James) – book suggestions from corporate world. (Bill) what reform is necessary to accommodate place? Link is to ethnography and ought.

**Michael – Connecting Place to fire planning.** How do we change the bureaucraty versus accommodating the mapping rhetoric (GIS) that is already there? It is both very expert driven but also participatory GIS. Getting people’s stories told with maps. Two fundamental issues: spatiality of meaning and special places as non-substitutable or non-fungible. In the past its been about future biophysical conditions. Rarely linked to land mgt action. Difficult to translate results, just saying SOP of particular place isn’t getting
us there. Explicitly address connections. Need to address assumption that place research might be the answer to everything. Make it more accessible for social science to inform planning frameworks. Case Study: Kootenai NF and Fire mitigation for catastrophic fire. Nestedness of meanings yet would switch between continuum from particular locations and landscape scale. Fire and fuels was not very place (site specific); deemed inappropriate except in wilderness (landscape level). Special places were not closely linked to fire and fuels. Perhaps a case of scalar mismatch? What about something like oil/gas wells?

(Gene, Discussant) Draw parallel to community scale. So What? Place attachment has been a dependent variable. Component of place as an independent variable. Map so-called communities with demographic data? More than just the GIS components. What are we mapping? Sociologists used the word “social” what do you mean by social data? Cognitive mapping? Psychological mapping? Seems we have some discipline differences in terminology. “Social” data as distinct from biophysical data meant to cover a lot of less disciplined ground.

Discussion (Linda) Fire seems very much analogous to oil and gas. Sometimes whole landscapes are being affected. Managers would be interested in knowing that there are broader scale issues; that is sometimes useful. (Patrick) is it participatory GIS, ethnographic GIS, or grounded visualization (distinctions being made in geography). Seems like a lumping versus splitting question. Participatory, community, ethnographic, etc. … mapping (but it is participatory relative to the planning based on technical authority (drawing on sources such as texts, narratives, stories, photos). Nomenclature – what constitutes narrative analysis? This may be a question for the group. Photo-based work, but how to record this. (Dan) I think what all these GIS studies do particularly well is get at the “where” of meaning but tends to have to categorize the what of meaning in into some basic categories either based on local input (Norm’s and Kari’s) or some kind of external analytical scheme (e.g., Greg Brown). (Bill) what are the ways to distinguish the GIS papers. Spray tool versus narrative. We need maybe a paper that deals with these differences. Are you being descriptive or explanatory? Divorced special place from narrative. Again we see a tension between GIS as accepting the institutional structure versus challenging the structure. Perhaps a broader topic for the book is a series of “betweens” or tensions. Methods that can be generalized versus case-based process, dynamics, social difference, democracy. These offer planning process for community knowledge inclusion, but there are also barriers for inclusion inside these planning institutions. Example of the For Service NRIS; it can’t accommodate “synthetic” data (e.g., ROS classifications), only primary data (distance from roads). Conclusion: GIS is more of an elicitation tool.

Paul/Shawn – Rural Property. Land managers face challenges related to increased use/visitation, particularly of amenity rich places and end up losing the big picture by the incremental loss due to development. Used a photo elicitation. Locals worried about some of the background areas around development. Case study comparing Northern Wisconsin (Washburn) with Norway (Frøya and Hitra). New development hasn’t really taken off in Norway. Rules about 100 meter shoreline development. Process of collective
decision making in rural areas. Wilkinson interaction theory of community (ITC). How contentions was participatory decision making? Planning in Washburn: Smart growth, development got fired up. Does participation represent community building? Or serving some specific interest? What we are arguing is that competing interest in domestic property – defense of domestic property gets people going. Contested Ground (Davis). Accommodation and accumulation. Six relational advantages. How to marry Wilkinson with Davis. They have a place interest to defend. Place, community, domestic property, security, amenity, commodity tensioned between accommodation and accumulation. There is no “interest free” zone. Community interest and place interest (common ground potential).

(Pat Stokowski, Discussant). You have multiple stories going on. Liked focus on community, civil society, and explanation of domestic property issues. Two towns, theories, issues. Is it a sense of place study or something else? So is public lands that are important or is it sense of place? Lots of private land owners and governments. Which create special / complex situation to look at collective action? Physical landscapes and communities change. Civil society miss opportunity what do you think that is? We need more “Norwegian-ness,” Canadian-ness, etc. Use of Davis (property) is interesting but how it comes into study an explanation for what you saw in Washburn? Molotch (Urban Fortunes) relations of community by negotiating property. Summary of discussion p. 99 summarizes some of our discussion yesterday.

Discussion (Bill) step back a bit from this data set. How does this line of research connect to place and decision making? Like the collective action part of this. Focus on community, but a bit lost in the details. Tie to Patrick’s developers’of SOP. (Patrick) Nevada County – place based pendulum politics. Maneuvering to control place/landscape we must control the political machine. Not just property interests, but competing rural capitalism and the way to mobilize some capitalism over others. (Dan) yes I see a theme here in Patrick’s and this paper about capital and producers of place. I have seen some other stuff along these lines here and there (see my chapter (p.41) in Multiple Dwelling, Mitchell, 2001; Crump 1999).

Gene Theodori – Place, community and decision.

Start from the perspective of sociology: Place is where the search for community begins. Begin with assumption that place (or is it propinquity?) is necessary but not sufficient condition for community. Theoretical background draws on interactional field theory: Locality, local society, and locality-oriented collectives. The process involves mapping local society; Social fields; actions, actors (education, gov, faith, econ, env, rec) when these overlap we have community. The point of decision making is working toward community (there is more or less of it in a locality). So this paper starts with place and discusses how/why/if they become “community”. Wilkinson’s perspective: Why does this community field arise? Communities have tended to be the recipients of rational experts. So this process is aimed at enhancing local decisions. Decision making from a use-value perspective. Guides for county extension agents. And outline this process through about six steps. What is going on with the boom? (eg., Red Desert, coal-bed
methane – industry coming and disrupting community life (get run over). How can the resource developers gain community trust?

(Rich, Discussant) – Important but dangerous chapter. Having section in book addressing relationship between community and place is important – separate but equal approach to place/community. Interactional model is helpful. Some revealing aspects though – what happens if we don’t find community? Should we be necessarily looking for community? In rural sociology place = locality, which is a bit different than what other chapters mean by place. If community is predicated with social interaction, hermit might have SOP etc. but doesn’t engage in social interaction. How do we deal with the emergence of symbolic community (those that transcend without direct interaction)? How do we engage stakeholders in these process? Primer on community theory helpful to study of place. As for how it is dangerous? Are we looking at the contributions to the study of place? How do we use community to understand place? Or does community “trump” place? Community development versus place development. Wondering whether the target audience is up to the task. In what ways are these approaches going to be helpful? Are there multiple community fields in a single place? Sometimes place is mentioned but not. Rich and Linda published on place and community (overlapping the three elements) in Leisure and society.

Discussion (Pat) So much happening in fire literature engaging community. Might give it specific access to the decision making paper. (Norm) what to make of non-territorial based communities? We are going to have to deal with this idea of community at some point? (Patrick) Can we have community without place? How do you build in the dynamics underlying these community processes? (Dan) place producing community versus community can produce place. (James) Wilkinson (fields) versus Granovetter (networks – strength of weak ties). Place, locality, or space. Is community fundamentally a normative concept? Same as place? (See Agnew and Duncan 1989 book, The power of place: Bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations). Questions related to norm/definitional questions. Do we need interaction to have community but not place?

Michaela Stickney – Lake Champlain

(Michael, Discussant) – Looks at a long term place based initiative. Has lessons to offer other place-based initiatives. Main focus on incremental nonbinding agreements and consensus as a model for other watersheds. Perhaps put in section with Linda in place-based case studies. How might you frame this with the concepts and theory? Potential ties to main argument. How place is represented? Whose place is it? Who is empowered?

Discussion (Bill) – Place based versus normal routine decision making. Issue of scale -- places within the basin. Interplay between place and initiatives with management. What is distinctive about various locales that. Good example as a practice story. Don’t want to clutter it up with other references a story about the emergence of political and social institutions. Can you bring out the trans-boundary story a bit more? We need to figure out how to connect it to the theory. (James) Suggesting how this could fit. “Place as decision making: a managerial auto-ethnography.”

Herb – Sensing value

We have these two topics (place, decision-decision making). Here I use the concept of value as the way to bridge these. Depends a lot on how we understand the concept of value and is implicit in the two areas. I distinguish between different meanings of value, present Tom Brown’s framework and fill out part that is incomplete. All preference based notions of value: Conceptual realm (held); Relational realm (?) and Object realm (Assigned – expressed relative importance of worth, expressed in specific situations). According to Brown, relational is interaction and not observable and gives priority to object realm thus, a utility model of value for objects as a bundle of attributes. In contrast, place is somehow more than the sum of the parts. So relational realm should be called felt value (from Bertrand Jessup) as the immediate subjective feeling of worth, importance that something has to an individual. We can use experiential and phenomenological psych to get at it. But rather than causality linear, we can think in terms of both held and assigned arising from felt value and that these reflect back on felt values. At same time we have capacities to make deductions from held to assigned. But there can be some dissonance between my assigned value and the felt level not reflected in rational thought process. Explicit and implicit levels of process. Felt is at implicit level (pre-cognitive) and embodies a lot more going on. SOP to a large extent takes place at implicit level of felt value. Eugene Gendlin (1981) deals with the experiential practices to bring into awareness these felt values. When people attend to felt sense can bring new awareness. Psychological / experience practices – felt sense of place. His ideas are now applied in business, ecosystem management and decision making practices at both individual and institutional/group processes. Structured in a way to tap into implicit level of awareness. Look at more detail at these practices – legitimation of individual experience, empowerment to base on their own sense of situation (rather than expert) and social interactional aspects (story, learning circles, town meeting).

Discussion (Tyra) Book is predicated on the idea that managers are looking at value but the status quo is to base a lot of value consideration on economic rather than emotional or felt. Much focus on the “what” rather than at why or how. Looking at the practice of
place management. The idea was well set up. The heart of this argument is to move felt from implicit into the explicit realm. Would people be willing to commit to a process of “focusing”. What is focusing? How to explicate felt value? Phenomenological reflection is another (more formal?) version of focusing. Interrupt some of the usual terms and try to pay attention what is our feeling or sense of the whole thing. I get a strong sense of place in wilderness and backpacking because I get this focusing – putting other things out of my mind and start getting words that react to those labels. Noticing how in different landscapes or environments. Felt value is the basis of place attachment.

Discussion (James) A moment of pseudo clarity about how we are working, could frame James and Herb’s perspectives. James is a pragmatic approach lived experience -- is to make things explicit. Being more explicit about how we are framing things. Herb – how focusing as been turned into decision making practices – illustrate that there are applications. Herb is (cerebral), James is more affective/emotional (limbic). At times place got lost in it. (Bill) making public our felt values and legitimation and empowering. But the challenge I see is the issues may legitimate for the individual and empower them but it may not empower for the community. (i.e., in plain language). Is it verbal and linguistic and there may be non-verbal ways of becoming explicit. (Rich) how to situate in the book? Who has authority? What do they do how do they make sense of place. (Damon) interactions with place come at some implicit level and have brought many to the field of resource/environmental management. The paradox – how do we surface and not steal its value and appropriated and stolen by power structures (Dan adds -- this is the subject of Douglas Torgerson’s 1999 book chapter in Fisher and Majer, Living with nature), like it as a deconstruction critique of place valuation, attribute model.

Dan Williams – Place Scale and Decision Making

Didn’t take notes on my presentation.

(Norm, Discussant) What I recall is that Norm liked my abstract (focused more on the complexity theme) than my presentation which emphasized the topic of pluralism of place knowledge, place research, and decision making approaches.

Discussion (Pat) focus on the decentering of authority. Bill and several others tended to interpret me as saying that pluralism was a “problem” to be “overcome”. I’m saying pluralism/difference is inevitable (in meaning, in research, and in valuation) and cannot be wished away by some theory, method or practice. So how do we develop concepts, methods and practices to “live with” pluralism.

Discussion of Overall themes

Bill – Park City first broached the discussion about place and decision making. Ties to practice aren’t as strong as they should be.

Book Sections
Introduction Chapter

What words do we need to address: Place & Practice, locale, space, scale, landscape, planning, community, decision making, practice, meaning, and value. Need to avoid having five chapters defining Tuan’s definition of place for example. Identify key concepts that need to be elaborated, contextualize these concepts, but also the ways individual authors take these and think about its use in each case. Need to address, purposes, audiences, is it planning or something else? Democratizing decision making. Normative tone of the whole text. List of guiding theme (see flip chart).

Conceptual issues, Models, Place-based Planning (Framings for the book) Dan, Pat, Linda, Courtney, Gene

Our scope: institutional issues covering context (Area planning). Nested dolls. Macro scales of organizational and community behavior. IF we do a good job explicating the problems/issues we will be able to offer reference points for other points, for example: Overlapping spatial levels, Power, Representation.

Give some definitions/commentaries on community, networks, organizations, bureaucracy as point of departure as well as key processes.

How each of us fit into that kind of model. And linkages to other sections/papers. Linda talked about formal organization but Rich talked about less formal (voluntary) organization.

Individual Relationships to Place (Felt Value) (Herb, Tyra, James)

Spirited discussion that didn’t address the questions. Potential title: Framing the flame: understanding the passion for place. The way it relates if you don’t understand the passion for place then it is hard to be in a position to address in planning/practice. Trya’s vivid evocative account of the Red Desert, her own sense of place auto-ethnographic account (theoretically backed but humanizes it). Invites people to reflect on their own experience of place as a way to draw readers into the book. Herb’s is structured/theoretical and James is more ??? The gap (of place meaning) is a weakness and strength can’t structure the relationship. But can you invite them to make the inference between Tyra and Herb/James

Spatial Cognition, mapping, segmenting place values & bonds (Norm, Kari, Michael, Greg/Pat, Neal)

Sticking to the charge, but crisis of identity we are trying to operationalize notions of SOP to decision making. Similarities/differences – trying to get the same language and spatial representation. Adding a “different” layer (frame), putting social science concepts into GIS/planning (are managers leading or researchers leading this?). Advocating for more citizen input into the planning processes. The metaphor of a common language (in this case spatial). Applied toolbox. How different? Contextual (Canadian, first nations),
conceptual (place and values), methods (map bio, spray can, point) management implications (recreation, fire, what else). Some sense that Neal’s fits producing meanings better (or individual experiences)? All are applied tools. Whose meanings you are representing (random sample, selective groups)?

**Representation/framing/power/empowerment (is this the reformist group?) (Damon, Bill, Paul, Po-Hsin)**

Crisis of representation and place within planning contexts, how of representation (process), strategic/political, material effects of framing, possible of shared stories, empowering, characteristics of forums that allow sharing, safe venues for such sharing, what it can/can’t do for planning process. Seeing planning as a collective, creation of a working discourse, construction of place. What about other forms of practice. Paul was dealing with place centered development, in self-conscious framing/representation of what locals think outsiders want. Gap, representation via policy and law (fixing for a time). Po-Hsin, identity being represented in common pool management. Troy talking about media and policy (is it place based). Linda sees links to Bill’s. Stories of community self assessment versus formal community assessment.

**Producers, Place Makers (Rich, Patrick, Michaela, Kirsten, Courtney? Neal?)**

What is this section trying to do applied practices and on-the-ground exemplars, place production getting to real life practices, restoration, communication, interpretation, Kirsten, Rich Patrick, Michaela. Kirsten, is classic example in familiar institutions, Rich, volunteers not usually discussed, point of spear for management, understand do material and symbolic production of place, overlap with Patrick. Patrick, in quest of authentic place, new development is creating new place, noted issue of exclusion and how to address inclusion, neo-liberalism (ties to Courtney?). What is happening in private land is different than public. Michaela, Place-based decision complex story, people id closely with watershed, perceive complacency and initiate own decision making, pressure state agencies. How it is a case about power, social representation, a careful reader would pick up the links without making them too explicit. Could next book be all case studies? Could we find another case or two.

**Concluding Chapter?**