Notes from Ashland Workshop

Suggestions for Individual Chapters:

Barkley et al.

- Link to kruger with role of collaboration
- Damon suggests focusing on creation of (emotional) public memory and its role in decisions
- When/why does sharing lead to civic action and how does including emotion inform the practice of decision making?
- What scope? (which stakeholders?)

Watson et al.

- Focus on how do land managers build trust with tribes (the process, not the outcomes)
- Questioned the utility/appropriateness of “marketing” with the implications of selling.
- What is link between mapping methods and how ‘place’ is conceptualized?
- Trust and threats – how do these factors link explicitly to decisions?
- Could comment on how (well) people think mapping “captures” meanings (compare to Michael)
- Emphasize tribal perspectives and insights (eg, what are the cultural meanings?)
- Situate selves within the ‘politics of mapping’, counter mapping, and spatial cognition.
- How do tribal members perceive the process?
- Connection to James – mapping lived experiences?
- More use of place names might be helpful.
- Contextualize the line of research with a broader perspective (vs focusing on a narrow study)
- Broader template for using the approach with tribes and justification and explanation of why the tools are good.

Neal:

- Link to Herb (values) and James (emotions)
- Review literature showing within and between group differences (situate self in literature)
• How to use place data in conjunction with other data (econ, ecological)
• Create a more formal “tool”?
• What’s missing from Low and Altman’s model? (other experiences of place?)
• Give examples of how data were used in decision making (or why they weren’t used). How does this help practice?
• Is focus on measures or outcomes?

**Damon:**
• Focus on representations draws attention away from actors themselves (link to Stewart)
• Use cases to illustrate theoretical concepts
• Unintended consequences of framing
• Where does the paper end up? What can/should managers do? Do you subscribe to a habermasian ideal?
• Role of other data (postcards, local talk, etc) in creating meanings?
• What are the discursive alliances?
• Reconsider how YR meanings are represented (by Damon) to the reader (false dualism?) be sure it’s clear what’s damon’s voice vs. what’s indigenous
• Explain HOW actors constructed representations and use data more
• Link to Yung’s work on RM front
• Does categorization of stakeholders work?

**Hurley:**
• Link to Damon – representation/labels (“subdivisions” vs. “preservation ranches”). And active creation of “sense of place” by developers.
• Intentional and unintentional consequences
• “amenity” – how defined or assigned?
• How was CSD incorporated? (deliberate?) Focus more on processes. Implications for a new framework for planning? What strategy of political negotiation?
• Explore issues of trust and conflict? Nexus with governance?
• Link to neal’s paper? (segmentation and clustering)

• Amenity rich (note: changing nature of what qualifies as amenity over time) is not the same as ecological value – what governance structures apply to human amenity values vs. ecological values?

• Positioning of development within dominant cultural discourses (place, sustainability, others?)

• Clarify narrative thread and focus of the chapter (esp wrt place). Is there a social justice tie?

• Practices (eg. Covenants) create place meanings. Commodification

• Could look at how developers marketed “places’ and how residents got there

• Links to decision making? Looking at how place drives decision making processes? Needs to be more explicit.

• How much should this chapter focus on developers’ motives/strategies vs. purchasers’ objectives/meanings? If people move there because it’s trendy, do SOP ideas still apply?

Kruger:

• Appropriate role for non-users in these processes?

• Asymmetric relationship between public involvement and Social Assessment

• Which publics to involve, especially when livelihoods are at stake?

• Meanings for “types’ of places? Symbolic meanings and attachments (link to Michael’s paper and other mapping chapters)

• Book needs to address limitations of prior planning (which this chapter could do, or the intro chapter could do)

• What is Place based planning? Does it require SOP ideas?

• Link to Norm – place based, values planning

• Explore ways to sort other chapters according to Linda’s matrix?

• How does empowerment and inclusiveness fit with Public involvement, social assessment, and PB P? (expand the table and clarify where PBP fits in it)

• Link with Dan – where does knowledge reside?

• Link to others on planning as place making by actors

McIntyre
• Relations to other mapping chapters? How are they distinct? What’s unique about Canada?
• Link between assigned values and dominant cultural discourses. Emphasize Canadian policy framework?
• Behavioral aspects emphasis (link to Neal)
• Highlight proactive uses of tool (vs. description)
• Dynamics – place values “follow” forest uses – map forest use overlay with HUAs (etc) (see Stedman & Beckley)
• Do attachment/meanings to points differ from polygons? (implications for management)
• Issue of whether values should emerge from each context, vs begin with a general list – implications for a tool (see Neal’s chapter)
• Guidance for readers regarding utility and limitations of the tool
• Did values differ for different communities? (describe the communities)

Olstad
• Unique aspects – BLM; desert; Place meanings not formally negotiate4d
• Link to barkley with focus on personal experience
• Consider concluding with a reflection on and extension of Tuan?
• Trying to do too much with addressing all aspects of process (see Venn diagram). Maybe focus in on personal experience?
• Clarify definitions of “experience”; link to stories
• What’s different between “personal” and “public” opinion (link to stewart).
• Politics of place approach: who created RD, when, and why? (focus on actors and agendas – could link to Damon). Link to material transformation (oil/gas).
• When is “RD” invoked in stories, vs stories about a specific place?
• Links to barkley and Herb – individual personal experiences; sensation; focus on materiality of environment.
• Add “feeling” to sensation, perception, cognition?
• Space = place minus meaning (privileges priority of experiencing place. Alternatively, the process is intrinsically iterative.
• Another suggestion – track how stories amplify and change and aggregate via cultural and political processes. Would allow bridging analytic scales. Creation of myths.

• How do agency actions and actions of others affect this process?

• Practical implications for BLM managers? Show how the stories are being deployed and used.

Stedman:

• Citizenship as a way to get people beyond their own interests (a recurrent theme with some other papers)

• Role of behavior in creation of meaning (link to neal)

• Different types of volunteers play different roles (eg. Locals) and different dimensions of attachment (to place vs. activity, vs. ??)

• Create a typology? (go beyond Ben’s data?)

• Promoting place in recruiting volunteers may play a key role in getting mission buy in. Does this depend on the place and/or the backgrounds of the volunteers?

• How are opportunities advertised? Incentives? Places?

• Status and identify motives may be important (affirming or creating personal identity)

• Implications of types of volunteers for training?

• Link to Patrick re: physical production of place (landscaping) and as communication instruments or actors. Interplay between rules/organizations and individual agency (cf Damon). How do life knowledges mediate symbolic or material production of place?

• Volunteers are both place consumers and producers

• Volunteer grassroots efforts for restoration (eg Chicago) – strong purpose, attachment, ownership led to controversy (hull & gobster)

• Look to literature on farm tourism

Stewart:

• Links: local and urban focus are unique contribution.

• May need more case context.

• Clarify linkages to social learning literature and links to management practice. Eg when to use learning circles or not.
• Consider emphasis on methods and how important are techniques to success?
• Is this a form of “mapping” (links to mapping chapters)?
• Claims of effectiveness need basis.
• Lived experience – different from James/tyra?
• Tension between lived experience and “objective’ place history?
• Clarify purpose of chapter
• How can this process be used in settings of conflict (eg red desert)
• Link to literature on narrative cognition?
• Can some stories be wrong, or better? Eg. Stories that deny aspects of history. How does this process deal with strategic deployment of stories? All stories are told with a purpose – a story is a discursive event (damon)
• Why would a learning circle necessarily lead to reconciliation? Even if it does not, are democratic goals furthered?
• What happens after the learning circle?
• Highlight the importance of legitimizing different types of knowledge.
• Highlight why this process evolved from photo elicitation
• Link to literature on empathy?
• Link to legal requirements in planning (linda)

Pat S:
• Need ethnography of management practice (cf clare ginger? TEK research; actor-network theory studies; “practice stories” in planning lit?)
• Consider including more cases to illustrate
• Use this chapter to frame the book?
• Clarify “managers”
• Paper looks at producers of place (managers)
• Concern about homogenizing “managers” especially as management is evolving.
• Nested processes (vertical scale). Eg, how processes are driven by agendas of political leaders

• See cheng – post-progressive model; co-management. Focus on how governance is changing, eg in Colorado (addressing insect infestations) or EPA place-based approach in OR/WA.

• Participatory action research?

Michael C:

• Shift focus from SOP as dependent variable to independent variable.

• Link to parallel conclusions from community literature

• What is the novel contribution to method or literature?

• Be clear about connotations and terminology

• How do map data fit with other types of data in the other chapters? (eg photo based)

• “grounded visualization” vs. PPGIS

• Clarify use of “place” and ‘narrative’

• Niche of paper: scale matters. Disconnect between special places and management preferences.

• Link to Flint’s paper

• Maybe give examples in which one person describes a special place as well as their management preferences to illustrate the paper’s points.

• How did people think and reason about the issue of fire when it was presented to them? Did they think (per dan) in terms of the number and extent of fires? Ie did they think of fire spatially, or did they think of it conceptually?

• How much of “special place” is based on personal lived experience (cf Tyra)?

• GIS as an elicitation tool (cf photos in Stewart and Barkley)

• How likely is it that results are due to a focus on fire?

Paul:

• Multiple stories, broad scope – need to narrow. Various angles are possible:
  o Collective action
  o Maneuvering/manipulation of political process in order to control place meanings
  o Alignments/common ground
• Provide context for the project
• Concept of change may link to Norm
• What is “civil society” for this paper?
• Cases need more – why are they comparable? Why these two? Need to know more about Norway? Are both cases needed?
• Consider organization and flow with respect to the goals of the chapter.
• Why focus on Davis (vs. Molitch)?
• Articulate links between place and decision making
• Link to Patrick regarding rural development
• Profiling place can increase conflicts
• Important role of historical legacy

Gene:
• Link to papers – pat’s community action models; private lands planning (eg paul)
• Bridging place and community is key
• Clarify normative commitments (is community always desirable and better than “just” place?)
• Clarify role of interactions (with whom? With locales?)
• How use “community” to understand place? Problematize place more to fit with book’s goals. Highlight management implications, eg. Formal vs. informal processes.
• Point of departure from papers in which place is not community.
• Disagreement within group about sequence and causal linkages between place and community
• Clarify use of “place” (vs space, locale...)

Michaela:
• Longitudinal aspect is valuable
• Interesting lessons (processes; successes; unintended consequences; multiple knowledges)
• Link to linda’s paper?
• Strengthen ties to place literature
• Find a main argument/point (incremental processes? Non-binding agreements?)
• Tension between ‘place based’ outcomes/processes and universal principles
• Is there one “place” or multiple places? Link to discussion of scale in other papers
• To what extent are citizen place meanings and values incorporated into planning & management vs used to challenge managers? Could trace this process longitudinally.
• What about the place(s) leads to certain processes/outcomes? Highlight the places more
• Link to pat – example of a management-focused study. New forums for managing complex problems

Herb

• Links to James, Bill, & tyra (legitimation of individuality; practices of awareness). Shored goals of these processes – making personal experiences explicit and shared)
• How central is Focusing to this chapter? Clarify and expand the decision making aspects
• “place” gets lost sometimes (eg where is it in the model?)
• Within the book need to place these types of processes within the larger socio-political context
• Potential for skeptical reaction toward phenomenology

Dan:

• Characterization of types of natural resource problems (increasing uncertainty, etc)
• Arguing for institutional reform? (link to linda and Courtney). What institutional structures should change?
• Further develop the KEY concepts (more depth vs. theoretical breadth) and develop the arguments
• Practical suggestions for managers? (how theoretical should you be?) Eg, Why is there a demand for more science when it doesn’t help?
• Start with ideas about place?
• Clarify the purpose of the chapter (e.g., to raise awareness?)
• Maybe cut back on scale issues (leave that to Courtney)
• Public – practice gap as opposed to science – practice gap?

• Is the key aspect of place a matter of “overcoming” pluralism?

• Start with “the problem isn't within the agency”?

• The flow between the global and the micro isn’t clear.

• Who should intervene in the “gap”?

• Consider using this chapter to frame the problem and using the conclusion chapter to work on solutions.

General Themes:

• The question of “success”. Does sharing/collaboration necessarily lead to positive outcomes and unity? Does the book want to highlight positives, or is there a role for “failures” and fragmentation as well? This raises the issue of how “success” is defined – is the process of sharing a success in itself? Do participants create and/or identify shared meanings (or at east come to accept other points of view)? Do processes create ownership in outcomes? Does collaboration give air to moderate (vs. extreme) positions. Should success be viewed as “legitimation” of differences vs. arriving at agreement or acquiescence? It was pointed out that the linkages between place research and decision making outcomes is complicated and not necessarily direct, because it depends in part on agency capacity and commitment.

• Whose sense of place? How do the chapters differ in their bracketing of stakeholders? Are there “types” of stakeholders (some chapters seem to develop typologies; others don’t). Among the distinctions are: users vs. non users; those with attachment to ‘symbolic’ landscapes (indirect experience) vs. first hand knowledge; locals vs. non-residents; volunteers. Another issue is how managers/decision makers can gain access to the different “types” of stakeholders and how to legitimately represent others’ views. Some chapters focus on the process of representation, e.g., how are lived experiences appropriated in political contexts? How are actors intentionally strategic in construction of place meanings? How can processes be used to get past the simplicity of dominant cultural discourses to the deeper (and more genuine?) individual meanings and attachments?

• Power. How do legal mandates of land managers affect the delegation of authority? How does SOP or processes for understanding SOP empower (or not) stakeholders? How are discursive alliances created and deployed? What is the role of researchers? What should decision makers do with the knowledge (from the book) about how representation occurs?
• Focus on process vs. outcomes. Some chapters seem at present to be focused on outcomes of different types of processes (e.g., what meanings were mapped where by whom). Bill made a strong case for chapters to focus more on process – developing more general tools for decision makers.

• For mapping chapters – how can/do mapping techniques inform management decisions? Are there limitations to mapping, such as protecting (vs. appropriating) meanings; issues of non-spatial cognitions being lost to spatially explicit meanings; the dynamics of countermapping. Are the different mapping chapters capturing the same types of meanings (e.g., are some focused on individual meanings, while others focus on shared meanings)?

• Change. Do chapters portray place meanings as constant or changing? What are the drivers of change? How can management/decision tools acknowledge the fluidity of meanings over time?

• Scope of utility of “place” in decision making – what types of issues/problems are served well with place concepts? (e.g., wicked problems). Are there types of decisions/problems where it isn’t necessary or useful to invoke place? What distinguishes Place-based planning from planning for a “place” (which all land management plans do)?

• Scale. What are the appropriate scales for “place” analysis (both temporal and spatial)? How can managers engage both with local personal meanings as well as broader attachments to symbolic landscapes?