

TRAINING DOE STAFF TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE PUBLIC

James L. Creighton
Creighton & Creighton, Inc.

ABSTRACT

For the past decade, DOE has been engaged both in a massive environmental cleanup and a dramatic shift in organizational culture. DOE has been moving from closed decision making towards open decision making involving stakeholders both at the sites and nationally. Making such a dramatic shift requires training for DOE staff and contractors both in the skills and attitudes appropriate to the new style of decision making.

In 1993-94, DOE sponsored a first round of public participation training courses nationally. This training focused on the basic philosophy of public participation, coupled with an analytic approach to designing public participation programs. In 1997, DOE's Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability recognized the need for additional training, but also realized that the training needs at the sites could have changed considerably. The contractor selected to conduct the training, Creighton & Creighton, Inc., (Creighton), conducted an assessment of the training needs. From this assessment it became clear that the greatest training need was communication skills for technical professionals working with the public. While, there was some continuing need for training in designing public participation programs, the target audience for this training was considerably smaller.

Working under the direction of the DOE's Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability, Creighton developed a two-day training program titled "Communicating with the Public." This course has been conducted at several DOE sites including Savannah River (twice), Sandia, Rocky Flats, Morgantown, Oak Ridge, and Idaho Falls. Additional courses are being scheduled during 1999-2000. This course provides training in writing materials in clear, understandable English; risk communication; making effective presentations; working with minority communities (environmental justice); and listening and sending skills for meeting leader. The course has been well received, receiving ratings of 4-5 (on a scale of 5) from 93% of the participants.

Creighton also modified the 1993 course to produce a course called "Managing Public Participation." This course has been offered at DOE headquarters, at Brookhaven, and at Morgantown. This course has received ratings of 4-5 (on a scale of 5) from 94% of participants. Materials from this course are now being adapted into a "How to Design a Public Participation Program" guide to be published by the DOE's Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability during 1999.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has pursued an active program of environmental cleanup at existing and former sites involved in the production of nuclear

weapons. This program is generally known as the “EM” program because it is administered by DOE’s Office of Environmental Management.

Since the inception of the EM program, DOE senior management has stressed the importance of involving interested individuals and groups (“stakeholders”), as well as affected local, state and federal agencies, and Indian nations, in DOE decision making. This approach -- known variously as public participation, public involvement and stakeholder involvement -- was advocated by the program’s first Assistant Secretary, Leo Duffy. The commitment to public participation was greatly strengthened by Secretary Hazel O’Leary, who became Secretary in 1993, and has been supported by all subsequent Secretaries. In fact, DOE has extended its policies regarding public participation to cover all DOE activities, not just the EM program.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AS A CULTURE CHANGE

Including the public in open, visible decision making processes is not just a matter of new procedures for DOE, but a fundamental shift in organizational culture. As a product of its nuclear weapons past, DOE’s past culture emphasized tight control of information and emphasis on hierarchical decision making based primarily on technical and scientific expertise and judgment. Any interest expressed by the public was more likely to be viewed as a security threat than an opportunity for the agency to learn. Before public participation could be effective, there needed to be a change in how DOE did business.

Other large agencies have gone through this transformation before, with varying degrees of success.¹ In these agencies, management increasingly recognized that public participation involved not just a change in procedures, but a fundamental shift in attitudes, perspectives and values. It required “winning the hearts and minds” of the staff, not just issuing new guidance and requirements.

Those agencies that have achieved some measure of success with public participation have recognized that bringing about this change requires taking a number of simultaneous initiatives including:

- development of new public participation policies
- preparation of manuals and guides
- establishing procedural requirements and organizational responsibility for public participation
- building public participation performance into performance requirements and criteria for promotion
- training

This paper discusses how DOE has used public participation training as part of its overall strategy to transform DOE culture.

THE FIRST ROUND OF TRAINING

Beginning in 1993, the Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability sponsored the development of a nationwide series of public participation training courses through a contract with Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory (PNL). Project managers were Kristi Branch, of Battelle's Human Affairs Center, and Judith Bradbury, of PNL's Washington DC office. PNL, in turn, subcontracted with Creighton & Creighton, Inc. (C&C) whose principals, Jim and Maggie Creighton, had conducted public participation training programs for numerous federal agencies. Jim Creighton served as the principal course instructor.

The two-day training course the PNL/C&C team developed was *called Public Participation Planning for Managers*. The intended audience for the training was program and project managers who were likely to be called upon to conduct public participation programs as part of their program or project responsibilities. The main focus of the course was to teach a systematic approach to designing and managing public participation programs. Over 500 employees from DOE headquarters and DOE field offices attended the training course.² The training was conducted at DOE sites nationally, as well as at DOE headquarters.

The Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability recognized that senior management attitudes could significantly affect whether training participants would ever be empowered to implement the principles taught in the course. DOE hired Creighton to also conduct half-day executive briefings at most of the sites either prior to the two-day course, or in conjunction with it.

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST ROUND OF TRAINING

In 1996, PNL conducted an evaluation of the long term results of the training.³ The primary evaluation methodology was a series of 65 in-depth interviews. The interviews were designed to distinguish the reactions of DOE Headquarters staff, field program and project managers, and public participation specialists.

This evaluation concluded that:

- The training had a positive effective on participants' understanding of the meaning and purpose of public participation, and strengthened their understanding of the importance of doing public involvement
- The training had a positive, if modest, effect on the use of public participation at DOE
- Participants were largely positive about the training course -- a majority of the field managers and public participation specialists had actually recommended the training to others

However, a significant design problem was noted. The course was designed primarily for managers with public participation responsibilities or for public participation specialists.

But many who attended the training -- particularly those at DOE headquarters -- were not in these roles and were more likely to question the usefulness of the training. Branch and Bradbury concluded that the training course should continue to be offered, but the recruitment process needed to be modified to obtain greater attendance by managers and manager-led teams. They also recommended that headquarters and field staff be brought together in training sessions.

THE CURRENT ROUND OF TRAINING

In August 1997, after a competitive bidding process, DOE awarded a contract to Creighton to conduct a new round of public participation training. The initial scope of work in the contract called for Creighton to develop a new DOE-wide public participation training course and conduct four regional workshops during the first year of the contract. The contract also provided for two option years, during which Creighton could be called upon to conduct up to six training courses each year.

In the time between the first and second rounds of training, public participation had become a much more significant part of the culture of DOE. Most of the major sites had established site-specific advisory boards that were now a major vehicle for public participation.

Don Beck, the outgoing Director of the Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability, concluded that it was wise to conduct a needs assessment to ensure that the training course would be targeted at the right people and their needs. He believed that it was probable that training needs had changed considerably since 1993.

The contract with Creighton & Creighton was modified to include the needs assessment and permit Creighton to provide assistance in the planning, participation, and implementation of special forums on an as-needed basis. The needs assessment consisted of 51 phone interviews at DOE sites nationally. Interviews averaged 20 minutes in length. The interviews were informal, i.e. they did not follow a rigid sequence of questions, since the desire was for qualitative rather than quantitative responses.

Based on these interviews Creighton concluded that:

- At those sites with the most experience using public participation over the past 4-5 years, the highest priority was training for technical managers on how to communicate effectively with the public. This training would include such topics as communicating in the public's language, listening skills, handling difficult questions or dealing with hostile audiences, risk communication, explaining difficult technical topics in ways the public can understand.
- There continued to be a need for a course on fundamental principles of public participation. The priority for this course was lower at the most experienced sites, but extremely high at some of the laboratory sites.

- Most Assistant Managers and many Directors at the sites had not had any explicit training in public participation, and there had been very high turnover in these positions.

Creighton recommended the development of a *Communicating with the Public* course as the primary offering, but also recommended revising the original *Public Participation Planning for Managers* into a new course to be titled *Managing Public Participation*. Martha Crosland, the newly appointed Director of the Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability, approved these recommendations.

As specified in the original Request for Proposals, DOE wished to have an environmental justice component in the training, and indicated that it would provide an environmental justice consultant who would develop this component and participate in the training. DOE selected John Rosenthal as its environmental justice consultant. Rosenthal is an environmental attorney who developed a nationwide environmental justice program for the National Office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and serves as Director of the Urban Environmental Institute at Howard University. Rosenthal developed a presentation on “Cultural Sensitivities and Communication Styles” for the *Communicating with the Public* course, and a “Techniques for Involving Minority Communities” presentation for the *Managing Public Participation* course.

In order to generate interest and enthusiasm for the training, Crosland asked Creighton to conduct a two-hour executive briefing for deputy assistant secretaries at DOE headquarters. This briefing was held June 1, 1998.

The first *Communicating with the Public* training course was conducted at the Savannah River site in June 1998. Among the attendees was the Assistant Manager for Environmental Management at the Savannah River site, who was so pleased with the course that he scheduled a second offering of the course at Savannah River Operations expense.

Subsequently, the *Communicating with the Public* course has been conducted at Sandia, Rocky Flats, Oak Ridge, and Idaho Falls. Additional offerings of this course are currently scheduled for Las Vegas and DOE-HQ. The *Managing Public Participation* training course has been conducted at DOE headquarters and Brookhaven National Laboratory. Both the *Communicating* and *Managing* courses were conducted for a small group at the Federal Energy Technology Center (FETC) in Morgantown, VA, with funding from FETC.

CONTENTS OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMS

The agenda for the *Communicating With the Public* training program is provided in Appendix 1. The agenda for the *Managing Public Participation* Training program is in Appendix 2.

The *Communicating With the Public* training courses concentrates on five basic subjects:

- Making effective verbal presentations
- Writing in clear, understandable English
- Communicating with the public about risk
- Communicating with people from minority cultures
- Handling hostile audiences (including Active Listening skills and skills for intervening as a meeting leader in ways that reduce the risk of defensiveness)

The *Managing Public Participation* course begins with a summary of “lessons learned” about effective public participation programs. Participants are then presented a “thought process” for designing public participation programs. This thought process includes three levels of planning:

DECISION ANALYSIS: Clarifying the decision being made; specifying the planning/decision-making steps and schedule; deciding whether you need public involvement, and for what purpose.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLANNING: Specifying what you need to accomplish with the public at each step of the planning/decision-making process; identifying the stakeholders; linking the techniques in an integrated plan.

IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING: Planning the implementation of individual public participation activities, such as developing a workshop agenda, deciding where meetings will be held, or deciding who will make presentations.

Participants develop a public participation plan for a case, using the thought process.

TEACHING METHODOLOGY

The teaching methodology used in the courses rests on the premise that behavioral change requires not just intellectual understanding, but the ability to exhibit the desired behavior under circumstances comparable to the actual work environment. For this reason, most material is taught using a progression beginning with a brief presentation, followed by a class or team exercise in which participants apply the concepts to a case or situation similar to work conditions, followed by a class discussion.

Here is a brief description of how this methodology is used in each of the courses:

Communicating With the Public

After brief introductory remarks and an overview of the course, participants view a video of six short presentations. The class is broken into teams, and each team is asked to rank the presentations and describe the characteristics that make some presentations more effective than others. In most cases, participants conclude that the key characteristic of effective presentations is not eloquence, but human interest. Technically trained people can increase interest in their presentations by use of effective analogies, anecdotes, and concrete examples.

There is then a brief discussion of the problem of technical jargon. Participants are broken into teams of 2-3 people and asked to rewrite examples of DOE jargon. Each team presents its “re-write” to the full class, and gets an immediate “thumbs-up” or “thumbs-down.” Those receiving “thumbs-down” are given feedback on why they received this reaction. Participants are then asked to demonstrate their grasp of the difference between plain language and bureaucratic language by re-writing the nursery rhyme “Jack and Jill” in “DOEse” The nursery rhyme is re-written to describe the relative risk of occurrence or the steps that should be taken to prevent the future occurrence of “crown-breaking” behavior.

Participants then view a video in which actions by public officials lead to controversy and eventual abandonment of an important project. Working in small groups, participants identify those behaviors of officials that increased perception of risk. The entire class then discusses these conclusions.

Participants are presented with a summary of findings about how the public perceives risk from the field of risk communication. In many cases, agencies respond to public concern with technical information when the real issues have to do with whether the decision is voluntary or imposed on the public, whether the public sees the action being taken as in their interest, whether the risk is natural or human-made (or a number of other factors described in the risk communication literature). Often it is not possible to reduce the exposure, but it is possible to address the context in which the risk occurs.

The risk communication findings are then applied to the preparation of comparisons of risk, e.g. “the risk of x is approximately the same as the risk of y.” Working in small groups, participants prepare a set of risk comparisons they then share with the full class. As each team presents its risk comparisons, it receives a “thumbs-up/thumbs-down” evaluation from fellow participants, as well as feedback.

The instructor then summarizes the behaviors that agencies can engage in that are effective in reducing public outrage. Small teams are given the assignment of coming up with an approach to addressing concerns being expressed by an African-American community about the health effects of possible toxic releases from a national laboratory located just upstream. Each team shares its plan and receives feedback from the entire class.

The second day begins with each participant giving a 5-10 minute presentation. These presentations are given in teams, with team members providing critique following each presentation. Each presentation, and the critique that follows, is recorded on video tape, and the tape is given to the individual presenter.

John Rosenthal, the environmental justice instructor, presents information about cultural sensitivities and communication styles. The emphasis is on knowing the audience before making presentations, avoiding behaviors that emphasize differences, and communicating the feeling that the audience has the right to be there. The presentation is followed by a class discussion.

The final afternoon focuses on skills needed for effective meeting leadership, particularly with hostile audiences. Participants view a video showing how a particularly hostile audience was handled, and discuss the problems with how it was handled. Participants are then taught skills of meeting facilitation needed to handle a hostile audience.

This training begins with a “Not Listening” exercise in which participants engage in an exaggeration of behaviors that communicate resistance and non-acceptance. This is followed by a discussion of behaviors that communicate resistance. The principle is that when people believe their feelings are being resisted, they tend to repeat their feelings, often at a higher level of intensity and in more confrontational language. Many behaviors usually thought of as benign, such as giving facts or suggesting solutions, fail to acknowledge feelings and instead communicate “here are some facts (or some solutions) so you won’t feel that way.” In all relationships, but in public meetings especially, it is essential to ensure the people believe their feelings and concerns are acknowledged.

Participants are taught a skill called “Active Listening,” which is designed to acknowledge people’s comments without either agreeing or disagreeing. Using Active Listening, a meeting facilitator will summarize his/her own understanding of what was said and check it out with the person who said it. The skill is taught by having the instructor role-play as if he were a speaker at a public meeting, making a number of different comments. Participants write their Active Listening responses, share them, and discuss them. Later they practice the skill in an interviewing situation.

This is followed by a discussion about meeting facilitation. The fundamental principle of effective meeting facilitation is to ensure that participants see the structure of the meeting as serving their own interests. Participants then have a stake in making the meeting effective, and will help enforce meeting groundrules.

But problems such as too many people speaking at once, or people being interrupted, are inevitable, and then the facilitator must intervene. One of the skills of a facilitator is to intervene in such a way that the intervention is seen as being on behalf of the best interests of the entire audience, rather than a “power trip” on behalf of the agency. Participants practice the way they would intervene to a variety of meeting situations by writing out the actual words they would use during common meeting occurrences. They discuss their written responses with a partner, to get feedback on how their messages would be received.

Typically there is remaining time for an open discussion about meeting leadership, or questions and answers with the instructor.

Managing Public Participation

After brief opening remarks and an overview of the class, participants view a video in which actions by public officials lead to controversy and eventual abandonment of an important project. Working in small groups, participants identify those behaviors by officials that led to the crisis, and present their observations to the full group. They also identify any behaviors by DOE that are comparable. The entire class discusses these conclusions.

The instructor makes a presentation regarding the characteristics of highly effective public participation programs. This presentation stresses that in effective programs, public participation is an integrated part of the decision making process, with participation opportunities provided as early as the problem identification stage of decision making. Participation programs are targeted at those audiences most likely to be concerned with an issue, with different levels of participation available to people with different levels of interest.

Another principle taught in the course is that “technical” decisions often mask important values assumptions. It is precisely these values choices that need to be discussed with the public. Participants are asked to identify the underlying values of various stakeholder groups for an actual DOE case.

Participants are then shown a “thought process,” a systematic method for analyzing a situation and developing an appropriate public participation plan. During the course, participants actually work through two of the three phases of the thought process, the decision analysis and public participation planning phases. Among the key planning steps in decision analysis are defining the decision being made, framing the decision appropriately for public participation, and identifying assumptions and constraints that could impact subsequent public participation activities. The public participation planning phases consists of identifying the probable issues, expected stakeholders, level of interest, and public participation objectives for each stage in decision making. This information is all gathered prior to selecting specific public participation techniques.

The class is broken into teams, and each team develops a public participation plan for a pre-developed or class-created case using the thought process. The instructor presents the basic principles for each successive stage of the thought process, and the teams perform the analysis required for that stage. Teams present brief reports on their work, and receive feedback from their fellow participants and the instructors.

The course concludes with a discussion or exercise on establishing site-wide priorities for which issues justify public participation programs. Typically this is followed by an open discussion of issues raised in the course, or a question and answer period with the instructor.

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF THE SECOND ROUND OF TRAINING

Participants in the courses are asked to complete an evaluation form at the end of the course. This evaluation form asks which parts of the course were most helpful and will be most valuable in participants’ jobs, and invites suggestions for improving the course content and format. Participants are also asked to provide an overall evaluation of the course on a five-point scale ranging from Poor (1) to Excellent (5).

93% of the participants in the *Communicating* course have given a rating of Very Good (4) or Excellent (5). 94% of the participants in the *Managing* course gave ratings of Very Good (4) or Excellent (5).

Participants were asked to state which elements of the course they found most helpful, the lectures/videos, class exercises, or small group exercises, on a scale ranging from Not Helpful (1) to Very Helpful (5). Although individual evaluations showed considerable variation, class averages showed that all elements of the course proved to be of nearly equal value. In the *Communicating with the Public* Course, the mean averages were Lectures/videos (4.02), Class Exercises and Discussion (4.16), Small Group Exercises (4.01). In the *Managing Public Participation* course, the mean averages were

Lectures/videos (3.81), Class Exercises and Discussion (3.92), Small Group Exercises (3.91).

In the *Communicating* course the sections on Active Listening and on Facilitation/ Handling a Hostile Audience were by far the most frequently mentioned topics in the course. In the *Managing* course, participants reported that having a clearly defined set of steps for planning public participation was the most helpful part of the course.

There were relatively few suggestions for improving the course, and those that were received had mostly to do with logistics at the particular site. In the *Communicating* course, for example, some participants reported that they were not informed prior to the course that they would be expected to make a presentation during the course. To reduce these problems, Creighton is now communicating directly with each site about logistics, in addition to the coordination occurring between the site and DOE - HQ. In the *Managing* course there were comments at one site that using cases from the site made learning more difficult, because people got too wrapped up in details of cases with which they were familiar.

NEXT STEPS

To date DOE field sites have expressed the strongest interest in *the Communicating with the Public* training course and it is probable that the large majority of training offerings during 1999 and 2000 will be the *Communicating* course. However, the thought process presented in the *Managing* course has proven to be valuable for program planners. As a result, Martha Crosland (Acting Director of the Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability) has directed Creighton to prepare a "How to Design a Public Participation Program" guide using materials from the *Managing* course. This guide should be available early in 1999.

Appendix 1
COMMUNICATING WITH THE PUBLIC
COURSE AGENDA

<u>Time</u>	<u>Activity</u>
FIRST DAY	
8:00 - 8:45	Opening Comments; Around-the-room introductions
8:45 - 9:00	Presentation: Overview of Course
9:00 - 10:00	Class Discussion and Exercise: What Makes a Presentation Effective?
10:00 - 10:20	Break
10:20 - 10:40	Presentation: The Problem of Technical Jargon
10:40 - 11:20	Team Exercise: Re-Writing Technical Jargon in English
11:20 - 11:40	Team Reports: Discussing Rewritten Materials
11:40 - 12:00	Class Activity: Using DOEse
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 1:20	Video: How Agencies Increase Perception of Risk
1:20 - 2:00	Class Exercise: Identifying Behaviors that Increase Perception of Risk
2:00 - 2:30	Presentation: How the Public Views Risk
2:30 - 3:00	Class Exercise: Writing Effective Risk Comparisons
3:00 - 3:20	Break
3:20 - 3:30	Presentation: Reducing Public Outrage About Risk
3:30 - 4:10	Team Exercise: Analyzing a Case of Outrage
4:10 - 4:35	Team Reports: Actions to Reduce Outrage
4:35 - 4:45	Homework Assignment: Developing a Presentation
4:45 - 5:00	Presentation: Principles of Preparing an Effective Presentation
SECOND DAY	
8:00 - 10:00	Team Activity: Giving Presentations/Receiving Critique
10:00 - 10:20	Break
10:20 - 11:15	Presentation and Class Discussion: Cultural Sensitivities and Communication Styles
11:15 - 11:35	Class Exercise: A “Not Listening” Exercise
11:35 - 12:00	Class Discussion: The Impacts of Resistance
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 1:30	Video: Handling a Hostile Audience
1:30 - 3:00	Presentation and Class Activity: Active Listening
3:00 - 3:20	Break
3:20 - 4:00	Presentation and Class Activity: Communicating Concerns and Getting Agreements
4:00 - 4:45	Class Discussion: Facilitating a Meeting with Hostile Audience
4:45 - 5:00	Class Wrap-up and Evaluation

Appendix 2
MANAGING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
COURSE AGENDA

<u>Time</u>	<u>Activity</u>
-------------	-----------------

FIRST DAY

8:00-8:30	Introductions and Opening Comments – Course Objectives
8:30 - 9:15	Class Exercise: Identifying Attitudes that Block Communication
9:15-10:15	Presentation: 7 Characteristics of Highly Effective Public Participation Programs
10:15-10:35	Break
10:35 - 10:50	Presentation: Identifying Values
10:50 - 11:30	Class Exercise: Identifying Values
11:30 - 12:00	Team Reports
12:00 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00-1:30	Presentation: Decision Analysis
1:30 - 2:30	Team Exercise: Conducting a Decision Analysis
2:30 - 3:00	Small Group Reports and Discussion
3:00 - 3:20	BREAK
3:20 - 4:00	Presentation: Developing a Public Participation Plan
4:00 - 5:00	Team Exercise: Assessing Issues, Stakeholders & Level of Controversy

SECOND DAY

8:00 - 8:45	Team Reports
8:45 - 9:30	Presentation: Selecting Public Participation Techniques
9:30 - 10:30	Team Exercise: Selecting Public Participation Techniques
10:30 - 10:50	BREAK
10:50 - 12:00	Presentation: Techniques for Involving Minority Communities
12:00 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:00	Team Exercise: Developing a Plan to Increase Minority Involvement: The Jefferson Township Case
2:00 - 2:30	Team Reports
2:30 - 3:00	Presentation: Key Elements in a Site-Wide Public Participation Program
3:00 - 3:20	BREAK
3:00 - 3:45	Class Exercise: Framing Decisions
3:45 - 4:00	Wrap-up/Final Comments

¹ For information regarding other agencies' efforts at developing agency-wide public participation programs, see:

Bonneville Power Administration

Creighton, James L. August 1984. *Report on the Bonneville Power Administration Public Involvement Program*, Bonneville Power Administration, DOE/BP-304.

Creighton, James L. March 1991. *Report on the Bonneville Power Administration Public Involvement Program*, a report to the Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR.

Johnson, Peter T., *How I Turned a Critical Public into Useful Consultants*, *Harvard Business Review*, January/February 1993.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:

Langton, Stuart. September 1996. *An Organizational Assessment of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Regard to Public Involvement Practices and Challenges*. U.S. Army Institute for Water Resources, Fort Belvoir, VA, IWR Working Paper 96-ADR-WP-9.

Also see:

Creighton, James L., Jerome Delli Priscoli and C. Mark Dunning (editors). September 1998 (reprinted edition). *Public Involvement and Dispute Resolution - Volume 1: A Reader of Ten Years Experience at the Institute for Water Resources*. U.S. Army Institute for Water Resources, Fort Belvoir, VA, IWR Research Report 82-R1.

Creighton, James L., Jerome Delli Priscoli, C. Mark Dunning, and Donna B. Ayres (editors). September 1998. *Public Involvement and Dispute Resolution - Volume 2: A Reader on the Second Decade of Experience at the Institute for Water Resources*. U.S. Army Institute for Water Resources, Fort Belvoir, VA, IWR Research Report 98-R-5.

² APEX Technology, October 1994. *Public Participation Training Attendance Statistics*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management. Washington D.C. [When the course developed by the Battelle/C&C team was no longer considered in the "prototype" phase, responsibility for the training was transferred to DOE's Training and Education Division. The Training and Education Division contracted for the training through APEX Technology, which in turn subcontracted with C&C to conduct all but the last two training courses.]

³ Branch, K, J. A. Bradbury and M. Silbernagel. September 1995. *A Longer View: Evaluation of the Public Participation Planning for Managers Training Course*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Administrative Management Training and Education Division (EM-122) and the Office of Public Accountability (EM-5).