

Manuscript submitted to *Applied Spatial Analysis and Policy*

Values Compatibility Analysis: Using Public Participation Geographic Information Systems (PPGIS) for Decision Support in National Forest Management

Greg Brown¹

and

Pat Reed²

¹ Greg Brown is Associate Professor of Environmental Planning, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4101
greg.brown@uq.edu.au

² Pat Reed is National Human Dimensions Program Social Scientist, USDA Forest Service, Anchorage, AK 99503
preed01@fs.fed.us

1
2
3
4 **Values Compatibility Analysis: Using Public Participation Geographic Information**
5 **Systems (PPGIS) for Decision Support in National Forest Management**
6
7
8
9

10 **Abstract**
11

12
13
14
15 Human values are embedded in forest management decisions but are rarely systematically and
16 explicitly included in the decision process. National legislation for public lands often provides
17 conflicting goals but little guidance for agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service to operationalize
18 public value preferences. The historical difficulty of integrating public values into forest
19 management decisions includes the problems of measurement, aggregation, and tradeoff
20 analysis. In this paper, we present a method for measuring and integrating spatially-explicit
21 public values collected using public participation geographic information systems (PPGIS) into a
22 decision support framework we call values compatibility analysis (VCA). We provide a case
23 study to demonstrate how spatially-explicit public values can be used to determine the
24 compatibility of designating ATV/OHV routes on national forest land. The applications and
25 limitations of VCA for decision support are elaborated and we conclude that an effective
26 decision support framework should provide some degree of standardization, be broadly
27 inclusive, and provide the opportunity to engage in systematic place-based value trade-off
28 analyses.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Keywords:** public participation GIS; PPGIS; forest management; decision support
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Introduction**
5

6 Planning decisions for public lands in general, and forest lands in particular, are
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

inextricably linked to geographic areas that humans identify with, depend on, and often associate multiple values and meanings. Lurking behind each governmental land use decision are important questions about the *people* that were included in the decision, the *process* that was followed, the *information* that was collected, the *decision criteria* that were applied, and the specific *rules* for using the decision criteria such as ranking or weighting. Optimistically, some of the answers to these questions may be disclosed in a formal agency record-of-decision. However, public forest decisions often involve deeper, unspoken questions about social and political values. For example, what values should be considered in the decision? Whose values should count? Whose should not? How should different individual and collective values be ranked, weighted, and integrated in the decision? What is the process to adjudicate irreconcilable value differences? Are the preferences of local residents inherently more important than more distant residents or visitors? What are the government’s obligations to seek out public values in the decision? Is expert judgment about the forest more important than local or lay experiences with the forest?

Legal statutes regarding forest planning seldom provide responsible decision makers with specific guidance regarding these important questions. In the case of public forest management in the United States, national legislation provide broad, sometimes conflicting goals resulting from political compromise that invariably push down controversial decisions about forest management for administrative agencies to resolve. National legislation imposes some constraints on the decision process such as requiring the development of long-range plans for national forests, providing adequate public notice, and disclosing the potential human and

1
2
3
4 environmental impacts of various forest plan alternatives. But mandating public access,
5
6 disclosure, and even consideration of the potential impacts of a planning decision by itself
7
8 provides little guidance on how agencies can or should operationalize that direction to consider
9
10 the multiple and often competing visions for public forests that are grounded in value hierarchies
11
12 and preferences. The requirement that administrative agencies use rational-comprehensive or
13
14 synoptic decision processes to guide decision-making does not avoid the inevitable conflict over
15
16 decisions that are linked to specific places that people value for variety of reasons. Agency
17
18 efforts to integrate public values into the forest management process have not been widely
19
20 successful, and systematic approaches nearly nonexistent. Alternative dispute resolution (ADR)
21
22 processes may be successful in some forest planning outcomes, but unfortunately, these
23
24 interventions usually occur later, rather than earlier in the planning process.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Ideally, what is needed to augment current forest planning efforts is a decision support
32
33 framework that is grounded in the rational-comprehensive model, is broadly inclusive of
34
35 individuals and groups, and provides guidance regarding the breadth and intensity of public
36
37 forest values. The historic difficulty for integrating public values into forest management
38
39 decisions has involved the problems of measurement, aggregation, and tradeoff analysis.
40
41
42

43 *Measurement.* The measurement of public values for managing national forests has
44
45 seldom been systematic and is best characterized as ad hoc. Although academic researchers have
46
47 shown interest in developing and applying forest value typologies and scales (e.g., Rolston and
48
49 Couful 1991; Bengston and Xu 1995; Manning et al. 1999; Brown and Reed 2000; Tarrant et al.
50
51 2003), there is no widely accepted or adopted forest values scale used by public forest
52
53 management agencies worldwide.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 *Aggregation.* Aggregating forest values through stakeholder groups or other organized
5
6 interests in a forest planning process can mask important public forest value hierarchies. The
7
8 rules and rationale for individual aggregation from within or between stakeholder groups in a
9
10 forest planning process are seldom well-defined or explicit. The problem of aggregation is
11
12 further compounded with the knowledge that stakeholder groups, attendees at public meetings,
13
14 and individuals that comment on forest plan decisions in the scoping or impact review planning
15
16 phases may not be broadly representative of larger populations. While many consider members
17
18 of the general public to be *de facto* stakeholders in public forest decisions, there are relatively
19
20 few examples where public values have been systematically measured in representative samples
21
22 of regional and national populations. As a result, the natural tendency is to give greater weight
23
24 to known and vocal interest groups in a decision process rather than the values of the unknown,
25
26 silent majority of the public.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 *Trade-off analysis.* Although individual preferences for forest management decisions
34
35 might be logically inferred from forest values, these inferences are seldom made explicit, nor are
36
37 the rules for weighting or ranking different public forest values in the decision process. For
38
39 example, an individual that strongly values the diverse native flora and fauna of an area might
40
41 logically oppose the designation or conversion of the area to plantation forestry. Similarly, an
42
43 individual that values forest products for their economic contribution could reach the opposite
44
45 conclusion. Even if the different types of forest values could be measured and aggregated, it is
46
47 not self-evident that one set of forest values should necessarily trump the other set based on a
48
49 simple majority principle. Nonetheless, even a majority values approach would be an
50
51 improvement over existing forest management decisions where decision makers can only
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 speculate about silent majority preferences. The key point is that value tradeoffs should be
5
6 transparent in the decision process.
7

8
9 The essential qualities of a decision support framework for forest planning should
10 therefore include valid measures of public forest values, an expansive and inclusive public
11 involvement process, the use of spatial technology to geo-reference forest values, and a set of
12 decision heuristics that explicitly link public forest values to prospective forest plan decisions.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 20 **The Forest Management Context—National Forest Planning in the U.S.** 21

22 The National Forest System (NFS) in the United States comprises about 193 million
23 acres (approximately 78 million hectares) divided into 155 national forests and 20 national
24 grasslands. These public lands hold multiple values and meanings for American society and the
25 uses of these lands have been contested historically since their inception as forest reserves.
26
27 Multiple generations of Native Americans and immigrants have forged special, deep, and often
28 conflicting values for these national forests. As a result, national forest management has been a
29 process marked by conflicting values and ambiguous or contested goals at multiple scales of
30 analysis, from the individual national forest to the NFS as a whole.
31

32 The traditional rational-comprehensive forest planning model that locates primary
33 planning and management activity at the national forest unit has not often performed well under
34 these conditions, and particularly when multiple forest values have no ready means of
35 quantification and aggregation. For a variety of reasons, many related to value differences, every
36 one of the 96 national forest plans completed through 1996 had been appealed (Kaiser 2006).
37
38 The U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service), the administrative agency responsible for developing
39 and implementing national forest plans, currently lacks formal protocols to cope with these
40 “wicked” value-related management issues. Since inception of the requirement to develop forest
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 management plans under the 1976 National Forest Management Act (NFMA), there has been
5
6 little, if any, practical advancement in (1) systematic inventory and mapping of place-specific
7
8 forest values the public attaches to national forests, or (2) rigorous and replicable analysis of
9
10 place-specific forest value data to assess forest plan decisions for consistency with public
11
12 values—much less in a manner that is helpful to forest planners and capable of withstanding
13
14 legal challenges in the 1970 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. All national
15
16 forest plans are subject to the disclosure of environmental impacts under NEPA.
17
18
19
20

21 *Place-based values and special places.* With national forest conflict centered on
22
23 conflicting forest values from individuals and groups, national forest planning provides an
24
25 important but challenging opportunity to develop a decision framework for integrating place-
26
27 based forest values to help diffuse conflict. Substantial funds are spent on forest planning, but
28
29 the primary source of information about public values and preferences for land management
30
31 planning outcomes comes from the NEPA public review process that is not scientifically
32
33 rigorous nor statistically representative of public values. A preponderance of comments to forest
34
35 planners and managers may come from a vocal few who represent their own interests, or the
36
37 interests of a specific user group, to the exclusion of the interests of other, potentially conflicting
38
39 uses. In lieu of reliable, scientific data about public values, forest managers will sometimes
40
41 make erroneous assumptions about public values leading to suboptimal forest plan decisions.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Forest values operationalization.* An important premise of a place-based, forest plan
49
50 decision support system is that the concept of value provides a natural connection between place
51
52 and decision-making. The human valuing process is complex with multiple meanings of the
53
54 “value” concept. Brown (1984) classified the realm of values into three categories: held values,
55
56 assigned values, and relationship values, with preference relationships providing the linkage
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 between held and assigned values. Brown (1984) defines value as the feeling or experience that
5
6 emerges from a person's preference for an object in a given context.
7
8

9 In the earliest national forest planning application that explicitly examined forest values,
10
11 Brown and Reed (2000) asked individuals to identify the spatial location of forest values in the
12
13 Chugach National Forest (Alaska). The starting point for the selection of a forest value typology
14
15 was based on conceptual work by Rolston and Coufal (1991), who identified 10 basic forest
16
17 values: life support, economic, scientific, recreation, aesthetic, wildlife, biotic diversity, natural
18
19 history, spiritual, and intrinsic. This values typology was modified and expanded from 10 values
20
21 to 13 values by including subsistence, cultural, and therapeutic values, the latter 2 based upon
22
23 earlier “taxonomies” described by Rolston (1988). The forest values and their definitions used
24
25 are broad enough to cover a wide range of geographic settings and spatial scales, and to date, all
26
27 have been used by at least some respondents in survey research. In subsequent national forest
28
29 applications of the values mapping method, a category of “special places” was added to identify
30
31 place-based values that individuals did not feel were expressed in the pre-defined values
32
33 typology or alternatively, to emphasize multiple values in a given location. An additional benefit
34
35 of mapping special place locations separately is that it provides a means to examine inter-rater
36
37 reliability in the placement of predefined forest values.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 To operationalize the measurement of forest values, individuals are provided with
46
47 electronic or paper sticker dots (points) representing the different values and a map of the
48
49 national forest. In the cognitive process of selecting one of the values and spatially locating the
50
51 value on the forest map, individuals are expressing preference relationships that link their held
52
53 values with the place-based context in the national forest. This operationalization appears
54
55 consistent with Brown’s (1984) conception of the human valuing process that links held values
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 to object values through relationship or felt values in the process of mapping the values. This
5
6 method also appears consistent with the transactional concept of human-landscape relationships
7
8 (Zube 1987) where humans are active participants in the landscape—thinking, feeling and
9
10 acting—leading to the attribution of meaning and the valuing of specific landscapes and places.
11
12
13 When an individual places a value marker on a place location, the relationship between the
14
15 individual and place becomes explicit. In the measurement of forest values, we have not
16
17 attempted to parse the influence of held values (based on life experiences) from assigned values
18
19 (based on object attributes) as the process of mapping landscape values and special places is best
20
21 viewed as relational and holistic. Further, the difference between held and object values is likely
22
23 indistinguishable to the public for the purposes of forest planning.
24
25
26
27

28
29 *Public Participation Geographic Information Systems.* The linking of geographic
30
31 information systems (GIS) technology with public participation processes for national forest
32
33 management is a type of public participation geographic information system (PPGIS). In the late
34
35 1990's, social researchers developed PPGIS methods to capture place-based information for land
36
37 use planning (see Sieber 2006; Sawicki and Peterman 2002; and Brown 2005 for a review of
38
39 PPGIS applications). For example, landscape values were mapped in marine and coastal areas
40
41 in Prince William Sound (Alaska) to assist nongovernmental organizations in developing a
42
43 conservation strategy for protection of the Sound by identifying conservation “hotspots.”
44
45 Subsequent analysis of the values data provided opportunities to compare “expert” with “lay” or
46
47 public conservation priorities (Brown et al. 2004).
48
49
50
51
52

53 Additional applications of the PPGIS methods identified the location of highway corridor
54
55 values in Alaska to assist in the designation, planning, and management of national scenic
56
57 byways (Brown 2003); the measurement of landscape values and special places in Kenai
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Peninsula coastal areas in Alaska to identify “coupled social-ecological” hotspots where human
5 and biophysical systems are closely linked (Alessa et al. 2008); the measurement of preferences
6 for tourism and residential development on Kangaroo Island, a popular tourism destination in
7 South Australia (Brown 2006); the identification of priority areas for conservation in the Otways
8 Region of Victoria, Australia (Raymond and Brown 2007) and the Murray River corridor in
9 Australia (Zhu et al. 2010); the measurement of park and open space values in Anchorage,
10 Alaska for the purposes of park and open space planning (Brown 2008); and to inform national
11 park planning in Australia (Brown and Weber 2011). Additional PPGIS studies that mapped
12 forest values in the U.S. based were completed by Nielsen-Pincus (2011) and Clement and
13 Chang (2011).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Using the Brown (2005) landscape value spatial mapping method as a model, researchers with the Canadian Forest Service designed and developed the first internet-based participatory mapping application to collect data on the locations of forest values across a 2.4 million ha study area in the province of Alberta, Canada (Beverly et al. 2008). Three additional internet-based PPGIS landscape value and special place mapping studies were completed for the Coconino, Deschutes, and Mt. Hood National Forests in the western United States in 2006 and 2007 (Brown and Reed 2009).

While PPGIS methods that map values and special places are best characterized as applied research, the method has also contributed to theory development and validation. For example, the method has been used to validate the presence of spatial discounting of environmental resources (Brown et al. 2002), the development of a theory of urban park geography (Brown 2008), the development of proxy measures and indices for place attachment

1
2
3
4 (Brown and Raymond 2007), and the assessment of risk associated with climate change
5
6
7 (Raymond and Brown 2010).
8
9

10 11 **From PPGIS Data Collection to a Decision Framework** 12

13
14 The value maps from aggregated public responses exhibit some degree of collective,
15
16 spatial consistency despite a high degree of spatial variation and error on an individual basis.
17
18 The analogy of Surowiecki’s (2004) “wisdom of crowds” may be appropriate here in observing
19
20 that that a diverse collection of independently-deciding individuals in the PPGIS process can
21
22 produce collective spatial information that is better than individuals or even experts for certain
23
24 types of values.
25
26
27

28
29 The sampling design used in the forest planning public involvement process establishes
30
31 the limits for population inference in the decision support system. If the process is broadly
32
33 inclusive and utilizes scientific random samples of regional populations, these representative
34
35 results can be compared with non-representative stakeholder, interest group, and convenience
36
37 samples. A scientific random sample of the regional population, while not required for decision
38
39 support by regulation, is arguably essential to provide baseline public value data for comparison.
40
41 In addition to the regional sample, the values data collection process may include individuals on
42
43 a national forest’s mailing list, individuals that attend forest planning meetings, and those that
44
45 learn of the forest planning process through the Federal Register notice.
46
47
48
49

50
51 The termination of the values data collection process is followed by the generation of
52
53 forest value maps in GIS for use in decision support. The normative, guiding principle behind
54
55 national forest decisions is that in lieu of specific legislative direction to the contrary, forest
56
57 management should be consistent or compatible with public values for the forests. The degree to
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 which decisions reflect actual public values and preferences will depend on the sampling design
5
6 (whose values are included?) and the validity of interpreting the relationships between values
7
8 and prescriptive national forest decisions.
9

10
11 *The values compatibility analysis (VCA) process.* The overarching goal of the VCA
12 methodology is to explicitly integrate place-based forest values in forest planning decisions. The
13
14 simplified VCA process for providing decision support in national forest planning consists of: 1)
15
16 identifying a typology of place-based values relevant to the planning purpose, 2) querying the
17
18 general public and optional subgroups about the distributions (i.e., location and relative
19
20 importance) of the identified values through an inclusive and representative participatory
21
22 process, 3) compiling and preparing the value data for analysis, 4) modeling the compatibility of
23
24 proposed management activities or decisions with the values, and 5) using the modeled results to
25
26 promote collaborative learning opportunities through discourse with those affected by the plan
27
28 outcomes.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 The validity of the methodology rests upon the following set of assumptions:

- 37
38 • the general public and various stakeholder groups hold multiple, diverse, and
39
40 discoverable values for national forests;
- 41
42 • individuals can and will express place-based forest values in a public involvement
43
44 process;
- 45
46 • forest values have identifiable spatial (place-based) locations, although the scale and
47
48 resolution of the values will vary by individual and method of collection;
- 49
50
51 • reasoned judgments can be made about the compatibility of potential forest
52
53 management actions with forest values based on both logical inference and experience.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The analysis of forest values can be schematically mapped into at least five domains: 1)
5
6 the relationship between different forest values; 2) the relationship between values and individual
7
8 forest management activities and/or policies; 3) the relationship between values and existing or
9
10 prospective forest plans (i.e., plans represent multiple management activities and/or policies); 4)
11
12 the relationship between values and biophysical forest attributes and conditions, and 5) the
13
14 relationship between forest values and public uses/activities. While a comprehensive decision
15
16 support system for forest management should ultimately engage each of these analytical
17
18 domains, the VCA decision system described in this paper is concerned with the second
19
20 domain—assessing the compatibility of forest values with prospective forest plan policies.
21
22
23
24

25
26 *Aggregation and trade-off analyses.* Forest plan decisions represent a series of choices
27
28 about forest allocation for particular uses (or non-uses). The complexity of forest planning,
29
30 especially with public lands, requires a multi-criteria decision approach that we argue should
31
32 include place-based values as a key criterion. One of the traditional weaknesses of forest
33
34 planning is the lack of commensurate measures that allow meaningful comparisons of the
35
36 relative merits of plan alternatives. Because value data is collected systematically for a region or
37
38 population using the same value definitions, the data is commensurate across the planning area.
39
40 Forest plan alternatives can be compared for their relative compatibility with forest values (e.g.,
41
42 whether or not to designate ATV/OHV use in a particular area, as described below).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Case Study—Travel Management Planning on the Mt. Hood National Forest**

51
52
53 All-terrain-vehicle and off-highway-vehicle (ATV/OHV) use on NFS lands is one of the
54
55 most contentious issues facing forest managers. In 2005, the Forest Service published a rule in
56
57 the Federal Register requiring the designation of roads, trails, and areas that are open to motor
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 vehicle use. Motor vehicles will be prohibited off the designated system of routes. To implement
5
6 the rule, each NFS unit or Ranger District will need to designate roads, trails, and areas open to
7
8 motor vehicle use. Thus, the travel management planning process in national forest planning
9
10 consists of identifying areas where ATV/OHV use may occur on national forest land and the
11
12 policies that regulate or otherwise enable or restrict off-highway vehicle use. With the
13
14 increasing popularity of ATV/OHV use on public lands and the potential for conflict with other
15
16 national forest uses, decisions regarding travel management can be controversial. For some
17
18 individuals, the use of ATV/OHVs enhances their forest values through easier access while for
19
20 others, the presence of ATV/OHVs may negatively impact forest values.
21
22
23
24

25
26 In 2007, we completed an internet-based PPGIS project that mapped forest values and
27
28 special places for the Mt. Hood National Forest (Oregon, U.S.). Approximately 180 individuals
29
30 from a general public random sample and individuals from the Mt. Hood National Forest mailing
31
32 list participated in the project and identified 4,614 value locations and special places on the
33
34 national forest. Individuals were asked to map the values and special places identified in Table
35
36 1 resulting in the distribution of values appearing in Figure 1.
37
38
39
40

41 Independent of the PPGIS data collection process, the Mt. Hood National Forest planning
42
43 staff had tentatively identified 6 proposed areas for ATV/OHV use on the forest (see Figure 1).
44
45 They inquired whether the PPGIS values data could be used to validate the designations and to
46
47 identify potential problems with the designations. We indicated the VCA process could provide
48
49 decision support by answering the following questions: 1) What are the public values that
50
51 characterize these proposed ATV/OHV areas? 2) Are the designated areas unique or similar in
52
53 their value distributions? 3) Is the designation of ATV/OHV use in these areas consistent with
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 these public values? and 4) Are there other areas on the national forest where ATV/OHV use
5
6 designation would be more compatible with public values?
7
8

9 Some observations were made about the distribution of mapped values in the proposed
10
11 ATV/OHV areas on the Mt. Hood National Forest. For example, the Rock Creek area had the
12
13 highest number of mapped value points, and contained about 43 percent of all value points
14
15 mapped in the six proposed ATV/OHV areas, with approximately 2.5 times more value points
16
17 than the average number of mapped values per area. The Rock Creek area also had the highest
18
19 density of mapped value points per acre on average, dominated by primitive recreation value.
20
21 The Peavine proposed ATV/OHV area had the highest diversity of values suggesting the greatest
22
23 potential for value conflict within the area. Developed recreation value was the dominant
24
25 mapped value in 3 out of the 6 proposed units.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Some logical suppositions can be made from the spatial distribution of values within the
32
33 proposed ATV/OHV areas. Areas where *primitive* (non-motorized) recreation values dominate
34
35 (Gibson and Rock Creek) could present a problem for ATV/OHV designation as primitive
36
37 recreation values appear *prima fascia* incompatible with ATV/OHV recreation. However, this
38
39 conclusion must be considered tentative, at least for the Gibson area because primitive recreation
40
41 value is not highly dominant among other values expressed in the area. A closer look reveals
42
43 that the second most frequently mapped value in the Gibson area is *developed* (motorized access
44
45 okay) recreation value which may be considered *prima fascia* compatible with ATV/OHV use.
46
47
48
49
50 It is also possible for apparently incompatible forest uses to harmoniously coexist within an area.
51
52 In the case of ATV/OHV use, natural corridors, topography, and vegetation can provide natural
53
54 separation or zoning to minimize value conflict.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 To model ATV/OHV compatibility for the Mt. Hood National Forest, we assigned forest
5 value/activity scores based on survey responses from a convenience sample of 28 Forest Service
6 employees (primarily District Rangers) attending Forest Service workshops in 2007. Forest
7 Service employees were asked to assign a compatibility score for each value/activity relationship
8 on a scale that ranged from -5 (the forest value and ATV/OHV use are highly incompatible) to
9 +5 (the forest value and ATV/OHV activity are highly compatible) based on the definition of the
10 forest value and the likely effects of the activity. An assigned score of 0 would indicate no
11 apparent or obvious relationship between the forest value and ATV/OHV activity. Each of the
12 value/activity relationship scores represents a subjective judgment on the part of the rater but
13 consistent relationships emerge with increased polling of individuals. Figure 2 shows the
14 frequency distribution of responses for each forest value and ATV/OHV combination as well as
15 the mean score on the 10 point scale.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The value/activity frequency distributions can be used as input to compatibility modeling
34 in a number of different ways. One simple method, illustrated here, used the mean scale score of
35 the respondents. This method has the advantage of capturing the direction and magnitude of the
36 perceived compatibility relationship. Alternative methods could include collapsing the
37 compatibility scale to dichotomous variables or using the modal value of the scale. In this
38 illustration, we used the mean value/activity scores as shown in Figure 2 which ranged from -
39 2.18 (Wilderness value) to +3.32 (Developed recreation value).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The next step is to translate the compatibility judgments to the value locations on the
51 forests. Each value was mapped on the Mt. Hood National Forest as a point location. These
52 point locations are converted to raster data (cells) through a point density function. In this
53 example, the density of points that fall within each cell (500 m) and within a search radius
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 around the grid cell (2000 m) were calculated using GIS software. The output of this process
5
6 was a set of 12 raster data layers representing each forest value with each grid cell containing the
7
8 point density for the value. The raster data can be visualized as data layers draped on the forest
9
10 landscape.
11
12

13
14 The final step in the compatibility modeling process is to associate the activity/value
15
16 compatibility scores with the spatial distribution of values represented by the raster layers. A
17
18 composite compatibility score or index is calculated for each grid cell through the selection of a
19
20 mathematical function. There are multiple ways to combine the compatibility scores with the
21
22 density values from the grid cells, but a simple method described here is to assume each forest
23
24 value is equally important (no weighting). Each activity/value compatibility score is multiplied
25
26 by the density of the value for each grid cell and then summed into a single composite
27
28 compatibility score for each grid cell. The composite compatibility score will be negative if a
29
30 particular grid cell contains more forest values that are perceived to be incompatible with
31
32 ATV/OHV use while the score will be positive where a grid cell contains values that are
33
34 perceived compatible with ATV/OHV use. In the Mt. Hood National Forest, this method yielded
35
36 composite compatibility scores ranging from -5.8 to $+9.3$. The composite scores indicate both
37
38 the direction of the relationship (positive or negative compatibility) and the magnitude of the
39
40 compatibility relationship (stronger or weaker compatibility). The compatibility scores were
41
42 color-coded (reds-incompatible, greens compatible) and displayed for the forest in Figure 3.
43
44 Color ramping is useful as a visual guide to show the direction and magnitude of the
45
46 compatibility relationship.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 *Using the Model for Decision Support.* Each of the 6 proposed ATV/OHV areas was
56
57 examined in detail to determine individual value compatibility. If compatibility scores are
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 positive (green) in the proposed area, the public value data would appear to support ATV/OHV
5 activity. Where compatibility scores are negative (reds), the data suggest incompatibility with
6
7 ATV/OHV activity. Figure 4 provides enlarged map images for two of the proposed ATV/OHV
8
9 areas, Rock Creek and McCubbins. The model indicates general value compatibility with
10
11 ATV/OHV designation for the McCubbins area (the area is dominated by positive, green-shaded
12
13 grid cells), but potential problems with designation of the entire Rock Creek area. Within the
14
15 Rock Creek area, there are significant incompatible areas (red grid cells) in the western half of
16
17 the unit, while the eastern half appears compatible (green cells). This finding should prompt the
18
19 forest planning team to more closely examine the specific quantity and mix of public values in
20
21 the western reach of the unit that resulted in the negative composite compatibility scores.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 The compatibility model described here is intended to provide decision support, not
30
31 actual decisions. The compatibility maps generated by the process should not mechanistically
32
33 determine a decision, but rather provide the foundation for further public involvement or
34
35 stakeholder processes to explore more specific value conflicts, to present value tradeoffs with
36
37 proposed actions, and to discuss ways to ameliorate value conflicts. It is important to caution
38
39 that the value/activity scores, in effect, treat every area as if they were homogeneous across the
40
41 entire forest. Compatibility modeling at the scale of the entire forest may mask place-specific
42
43 attributes areas and should not substitute for detailed, site level project analysis.
44
45
46
47

48
49 Assumptions about the forest value/forest activity relationships used in the decision
50
51 support system can be easily changed to perform sensitivity analysis to show how widely the
52
53 model results may—or may not—vary by value/activity assumptions, by geographic area,
54
55 community, population demographic, or management unit of analysis. The VCA decision
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 framework can operate at multiple spatial scales provided there is sufficient value point data at
5
6 smaller scales.
7
8
9

10 11 **Applications and limitations of VCA as a decision framework** 12

13
14 Compatibility modeling based on the systematic, spatial mapping of forest values provide
15
16 forest planners, local communities, first nations, special interest groups, and other stakeholders
17
18 with a useful starting point for a participatory planning process to develop and revise forest
19
20 plans. Because the VCA decision framework includes data that is place-specific, includes both
21
22 tangible and intangible forest values, and accounts for local and regional values, it offers
23
24 significant advantages over the historic system of soliciting values indirectly through a scoping
25
26 or impact review process that is non-systematic, non-spatial, voluntary, and consequently likely
27
28 to be non-representative of the multiple publics that have an interest in national forest
29
30 management outcomes.
31
32
33
34

35
36 But the development and implementation of a NFS-wide protocol for mapping forest
37
38 values faces some formidable constraints that appear more administrative and political than
39
40 technical. The list of constraints includes the lack of specific agency directives, the cost of
41
42 developing and implementing the VCA protocol, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
43
44 review process for collecting public data, the lack of significant agency experience working with
45
46 value and special place data, the public acceptability of using this type of data for forest planning
47
48 decisions, and the uncertain legal implications of planning decisions that explicitly reference
49
50 public value data (Brown and Reed 2009). In addition, a general fear by government officials to
51
52 engage the public in planning and the discounting of lay knowledge relative to expert knowledge
53
54 has hampered the uptake of PPGIS applications in regional and environmental applications
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 (Brown, in process). There does not appear to be a single, simple solution to increased agency
5 adoption of the methods described herein. Brown (in process) has suggested that NGOs can
6 assist agencies in overcoming some of the structural barriers (e.g., OMB review) through
7 partnerships, but ultimately, the greatest need is a change in agency culture toward more sincere,
8 rather than token engagement of the general public in planning processes irrespective of the
9 technology involved.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Conclusion**

21
22 Beierle (1999) presents five goals to evaluate the quality of public participation in
23 environmental decision-making. Does the process educate and inform the public? Incorporate
24 public values into decision making? Improve the substantive quality of decisions? Increase trust
25 in institutions? Reduce conflict? Although not perfect, we argue that the values compatibility
26 analysis process increases the likelihood of achieving these goals by explicitly integrating public
27 values to improve the substantive quality of forest management decisions.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Even the best conceived participatory process for measuring and integrating public values
38 into decisions must consider institutional priorities, existing planning practices, organizational
39 norms, and public comprehension. Unless a decision framework can be translated into a
40 standard operating procedure (SOP) for the agency leading the planning effort, the method is
41 unlikely to be widely used or adopted. Qualitative research on forest values, while providing
42 contextually rich data, has yet to be systematically included into a decision support system. For
43 better or worse, qualitative research on forest values has not achieved the same “science-based”
44 status of other quantitative research within public management agencies.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 There is a clear need to meaningfully translate public values into agency decision support
57 systems. But how to best achieve this outcome remains a work-in-progress. We believe that
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

analyzing forest values identified through PPGIS offers considerable promise. To be effective, values must be attached to the geography of place, provide some degree of standardization, and provide the opportunity to engage in systematic trade-off analysis. Values compatibility analysis, while offering complex options for decision support, is intuitively simple at the highest and most important level for public and agency acceptance: forests should be planned and managed for activities and allocations that are consistent with public values.

1
2
3
4 **References**
5

6
7 Alessa, N., Kliskey, A., & Brown, G. (2008). Social-ecological hotspots mapping: a spatial
8 approach for identifying coupled social-ecological space. *Landscape and Urban Planning*,
9 85(1), 27-39.
10

11
12
13
14 Beierle, T. (1999). Using social goals to evaluate public participation in environmental decisions.
15 *Policy Studies Review*, 16, 75-103.
16

17
18
19 Beverly, J., Uto, K., Wilkes, J. & Bothwell, P. (2008). Assessing spatial attributes of forest
20 landscape values: an internet-based participatory mapping approach. *Canadian Journal of*
21 *Forest Research*, doi:10.1139/X07-149
22

23
24
25
26 Brown, G., & Reed, P. (2000). Validation of a forest values typology for use in national forest
27 planning. *Forest Science*, 46(2), 240–247.
28

29
30
31
32 Brown, G., Reed, P., & Harris, C.C. 2002. Testing a place-based theory for environmental
33 evaluation: an Alaska case study. *Applied Geography*, 22, 49–76.
34

35
36
37
38 Brown, G. (2003). A Method for Assessing Highway Qualities to Integrate Values in Highway
39 Planning. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 11(4), 271-283.
40

41
42
43 Brown, G., Smith, C., Alessa, L., & Kliskey, A. (2004). A comparison of perceptions of
44 biological value with scientific assessment of biological importance, *Applied Geography*, 24(2),
45 161–180.
46

47
48
49
50 Brown, G. (2005). Mapping spatial attributes in survey research for natural resource
51 management: Methods and applications. *Society & Natural Resources*, 18(1), 17–39.
52

53
54
55
56 Brown, G. (2006). Mapping landscape values and development preferences: a method for
57 tourism and residential development planning, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 8,
58 101–113.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Brown, G., & Raymond, C. (2007). The relationship between place attachment and landscape
7 values: towards mapping place attachment, *Applied Geography*, 27, 89–111.
8
9

10
11 Brown, G. (2008). A theory of urban park geography. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 40(4), 589-
12 607.
13
14

15
16
17 Brown, G., & Reed, P. (2009). Public Participation GIS: A method for national forest planning.
18 *Forest Science*, 55(2), 166-182.
19
20

21
22 Brown, G. and D. Weber, 2011, Public Participation GIS: A new method for use in national park
23 planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 102(1), 1-15.
24
25

26
27
28 Brown, G. (in process). Public Participation GIS (PPGIS) for regional and environmental
29 planning: Reflections on a decade of empirical research. *URISA Journal*.
30
31

32
33 Brown, T.C. (1984). The concept of value in resource allocation. *Land Economics*, 60(3), 231–
34 246.
35
36

37
38
39 Clement, J. M. & Cheng, A.S. (2011). Using analyses of public value orientations, attitudes and
40 preferences to inform national forest planning in Colorado and Wyoming. *Applied Geography*,
41 31, 393-400.
42
43

44
45
46 Kaiser, B. (2006). The national environmental policy act's influence on USDA forest service
47 decision-making, 1974–1996. *Journal of Forest Economics*, 12(2), 109-130.
48
49

50
51
52 Manning, R., Valliere, W., & Minter, B. (1999). Values, ethics, and attitudes toward
53 national forest management: An empirical study. *Society & Natural Resources*, 12(5), 421-436.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 Nielsen-Pincus, M., 2011. Mapping a values typology in three counties of the Interior Northwest,
5 USA: scale, geographic associations among values, and the use of intensity weights. *Society &*
6 *Natural Resources*, 24(6), 535-552.
7
8
9

10
11 Raymond, C., & Brown, G. (2006). A method for assessing protected area allocations using a
12 typology of landscape values. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 49(6), 797-
13 812.
14
15
16
17

18
19 Raymond, C., & Brown, G. (2007). A spatial method for assessing resident and visitor attitudes
20 toward tourism growth and development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 520-540.
21
22
23

24 Raymond, C., & Brown, G. (2010). Assessing spatial associations between perceptions of
25 landscape value and climate change risk for use in climate change planning. *Climatic Change*.
26 Online First. Available from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/100247> [Accessed 25 July
27 2010]
28
29
30
31

32
33 Reed, P. & Brown, G. (2003). Values suitability analysis: A methodology for identifying and
34 integrating public perceptions of forest ecosystem values in national forest planning. *Journal of*
35 *Environmental Planning and Management*, 46(5), 643-658.
36
37
38
39

40
41 Rolston, H. (1988). *Environmental ethics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
42
43

44
45 Rolston, H. & Coufal, J. (1991). A forest ethic and multivalue forest management. *Journal of*
46 *Forestry*, 89(4), 35-40.
47
48
49

50
51 Sawicki, D., & Peterman, D. (2002). Surveying the extent of PPGIS practice in the United States.
52 In W.J. Craig, T.M. Harris, & D.M. Weiner (Eds), *Community participation and geographic*
53 *information systems* (pp. 17-36). London: Taylor & Francis.
54
55
56

57
58 Sieber, R. (2006). Public participation geographic information systems: A literature review and
59 framework. *Annals Association American Geographers*, 96(3), 491-507.
60
61
62

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The wisdom of crowds*. New York: Doubleday.

Tarrant, M.A., Cordell, H.K., & Green, G.T. (2003). PVF: a scale to measure public values of forests. *Journal of Forestry*, 101, 24–30.

Zhu, X., Pfueller, S., & Whitelaw, P. (2010). Spatial differentiation of landscape values in the Murray River Region of Victoria, Australia. *Environmental Management*, 45(5), 896-911.

Zube, E. (1987). Perceived land use patterns and landscape values. *Landscape Ecology*, 1(1), 37–45.


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 1. Value typology used in the Mt. Hood PPGIS project.

Aesthetic	— I value these areas for their scenic qualities.
Economic	— I value these areas because they provide income and employment opportunities through industries like tourism, forest products, mining or other commercial activity.
Developed Recreation	— I value these areas because they provide for recreation activities such as hiking, camping, fishing, skiing, or wildlife viewing with motorized access and some facilities.
Primitive Recreation	— I value these areas because they provide for primitive recreation activities such as backpacking and horsepacking without motorized access and facilities.
Life Sustaining	— I value these areas because they help produce, preserve, and renew air, soil, and water.
Learning/Scientific	— I value these areas because they provide opportunities to learn about the natural environment through activities like nature interpretation and scientific study.
Biological diversity	— I value these areas because they provide places that support a variety of plants, wildlife, or other living organisms.
Spiritual	— I value these areas because they are sacred, religious, or spiritually special places.
Intrinsic/Existence	— These areas are valuable for their own sake, even if I or others don't use or benefit from them.
Historic or Cultural	— I value these areas because they have features that represent history, or provide places where people can continue to pass down wisdom, traditions, and a way of life.
Therapeutic/Health	— I value these areas because they make me or others feel better, physically and/or mentally.
Wilderness	— I value these areas because they are wild, uninhabited, or relatively untouched by human activity.
Special Places	— I value these places because they are special to me. Please double click on the Special Place marker to indicate the reason why the place is special to you.


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Figure 1. Distribution of mapped forest values (n=4,614) on the Mt. Hood National Forest (Oregon). The six proposed ATV/OHV areas appear in blue.




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Figure 2. Frequency distribution of compatibility scores for 12 forest values with ATV/OHV use (n=28 Forest Service employees). Scale scores ranged from -5 (highly incompatible) to +5 (highly compatible). Negative scale values appear on the left and positive values on the right. The mean scale score appears in parentheses.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Figure 3. Model of ATV use compatibility with mapped forest values on Mt. Hood National Forest (Oregon). Compatibility scores range from compatible (dark green) to incompatible (dark red).



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Figure 4. Model of ATV use compatibility with mapped forest values on Mt. Hood National Forest (Oregon). Overlay of compatibility scores on two proposed ATV/OHV management areas—McCubbins and Rock Creek. Compatibility scores range from compatible (dark green) to incompatible (dark red).

