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Relevance, Diversity, & Inclusion

Crucial to parks & rec mgmt, community interactions, & justice considerations
Racial/ethnic minorities & beyond

Relevance

Relevance is an elusive, ideal state
• Importance is striving, if not achieving
• Process not a destination

Relevance for whom? For what intent?
• Audience definition & goal alignment
• Conservation agencies’ imperative to cultivate stewardship

Diagram:
- Agent 1 (relevant) → Goal
- Goal → Agent 2 (has)
- Plan (member of) Agent 1
- Plan achieves Goal
Collaboration
I’ve been told to collaborate. 
_How do I even begin?_

I know our org wants to reach more diverse user groups. 
*Who can I tap internally and externally to help?*

I want to do more outreach, but my plate is already so full. 
*How can I be more efficient at relationship-building?*

I’m eager to partner for relevance! 
*Who’s in with me?*
Democratic Ideals & Urban National Parks

Conserve and provide for current and future generations

Urban = unique opportunity to enhance relevance, strive toward this ideal

Large, proximate, & diverse populations

Long-recognized ability – “Parks for the people”

A Call to Action – vision for the NPS’ second century
Urban National Parks in the U.S.
The NPS Urban Agenda

Emphasize urban presence in meaningful ways to local audiences

Enhance stewardship reach through community connections

Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be relevant for all Americans</th>
<th>Broad connections with potential stewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurture a culture of collaboration</td>
<td>Deep connections with key community contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activate OneNPS</td>
<td>Integrated connections throughout the agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study Areas

- **Park(s) within city**: Boston (MA)
- **Park(s) adjacent to city**: Tucson (AZ)
- **Park(s) distant to city**: Detroit (MI)
Resilient Networks for Relevance

Relevance transcends organizations
Collaborative networks positioned for new, diverse, widespread relevance

NPS opportunity to
• Share info & audiences
• Diversify & amplify engagement messages

Brokers facilitate
• Bonds & bridges
• Identity & heterogeneity
• Innovation & connection

What characterizes NPS urban present & potential collaborations?
Where are areas of efficiency and opportunity?
Methods

Roster list: NPS Urban Fellows (spring 2016)

*Who have you been in contact with about the NPS Urban Agenda with the intention of enhancing relevance?*

Interactive data collection format – phone & online (May – Sept 2016)

Response Rate: 93%

Detroit 90% (71/79)  
Tucson 94% (75/80)  
Boston 97% (37/38)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Contacts</th>
<th>Conversation (1)</th>
<th>Cooperation (2)</th>
<th>Relationship Level</th>
<th>Coordination (3)</th>
<th>Coalition (4)</th>
<th>Collaboration (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Receiving (+1)</td>
<td>More Giving (-1)</td>
<td>Balanced / Equal (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **No Current Relationship, and...**
  - **Do Consider a Potential Partner**
  - **Do Not Consider a Potential Partner**
  - **Not Familiar Enough to Place in Any Other Box**
G&F Brokerage Roles

- **Coordinator**
  All nodes belong to the same group

- **Gatekeeper**
  Source belongs to a different group

- **Representative**
  Recipient belongs to a different group

- **Consultant**
  Broker belongs to a different group

- **Liaison**
  All nodes belong to different groups

**Group Percent Capacity:** 
\[
\text{(\# present role-specific triads)} / \text{(\# potential role-specific triads)}
\]
### Group Membership (% Network)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Detroit (N=79)</th>
<th>Tucson (N=80)</th>
<th>Boston (N=39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic vitality</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resources</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity inclusion</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No group members

### Network Density (% Network)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
<th>Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute density</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective maximum density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent Capacity

**Group brokerage highlight**
Econ vitality, Cultural res, Outdoor rec, & Sustainability = most spread across roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G&amp;F brokerage role</th>
<th>Economic vitality</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Cultural resources</th>
<th>Outdoor recreation</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Urban design</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Diversity inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detroit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tucson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boston</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No group members; **Group of ≤2 cannot be Coordinators; ***Group of 1 cannot be Gatekeepers or Representatives

**Low % = high growth potential**

25-50% 50-75% >75% High % = low growth potential
Discussion

Relevance – Opportunity to capitalize on present & target potential connections

- Tailor communications & outreach efforts → common relevance goals
- NPS & Cult Res orgs → preserve past stories & contribute to strong identity of place
- Lower % capacity → engage as value-added contribution of NPS
- Cultural parks/themes/progs focused on or inclusive of multiple audiences

- Cultural resources
- Diversity inclusion

Resilience indicators (5) – Network inclusion & sustainability

1. Diversity of orgs & multiples of each category
2. Effective maximum density: realistic, proactive, & contextualized
3-5. Illustrated using model city data

Urban Agenda Category

- Economic vitality
- Education
- Health
- Cultural resources
- Outdoor recreation
- Sustainability
- Urban design
- Youth
- Diversity inclusion
3. Resilience Indicator: G&F Brokerage Role Variety

"Creative Agents"

Urban Agenda Category

- Economic vitality
- Cultural resources
- Outdoor recreation
- Urban design
- Education
- Sustainability
- Youth
- Diversity inclusion
- Health

Percent (%) Capacity

- <25
- 25-50
- 50-75
- >75

Tucson
4. Resilience Indicator: Low Percent Capacities

"Entrepreneurs"

Detroit

Urban Agenda Category

- Economic vitality
- Education
- Health
- Cultural resources
- Outdoor recreation
- Urban design
- Sustainability
- Youth
- Diversity inclusion

Percent (%):<br> <25  25-50  50-75  >75
5. Resilience Indicator: Diverse, Underutilized Brokers

“Sustainable Facilitators”

Urban Agenda Category
- Economic vitality
- Education
- Outdoor recreation
- Cultural resources
- Sustainability
- Urban design
- Youth
- Diversity inclusion

Percent (%) Capacity
- <25
- 25-50
- 50-75
- >75

Boston
Interpretive planning for local visitors

Enhancing community relevance through interpretive planning at Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site

Step into the world of one of America’s greatest artists

Integrating “the commons” into PBEE

Growth assessment & network analysis among schools & place-based ecology education resources in the Upper Valley
Park ecotourism in the Sultanate of Oman

Relevance & implementation of Tanfeedh’s tourism objectives for protected areas

Destination tourists? Local communities? Public-private partnerships?
Thank You

Questions?
bess@peerassociates.net
@parksphile