

## **Portsmouth, New Hampshire**

### Introduction

Portsmouth, New Hampshire, a small, cosmopolitan city on the southern New Hampshire border with Maine, has used Study Circles to engage citizens on a range of issues since 1999. Despite the fact that the city lacks a specific institutional sponsor of its dialogue programs, Portsmouth has been the home to several dynamic rounds of deliberation. Whereas many communities with sustained Study Circles initiatives have organized deliberations through a specific public agency, coalition or community group, Study Circles have flowered in Portsmouth outside of any one coordinated program. The achievements of each successive deliberation have produced a series of interested community leaders who have fostered their further growth.

In a sense, deliberation seems to be slowly embedding itself in Portsmouth through the development of a nascent culture of participation. Rather than relying upon a formal organization to promote greater community participation, Study Circles in Portsmouth have depended on a loose network of local leaders who see their value and seek out opportunities to apply them. As more leaders are exposed to successful rounds of circles, the number of people committed to the idea widens and new opportunities arise.

Over the past five years, five full rounds of deliberation have been completed in Portsmouth. Study Circles were first introduced to the community with a program that engaged the city's children. In 1999, the Portsmouth Middle School involved the entire sixth grade class in a round of circles on school violence. The success of this program led the school board to adopt Study Circles as a vehicle for resolving conflict around how to redistrict the city's elementary schools. These circles were followed by two rounds of dialogue on the city's master plan sponsored by a group of civic leaders and a round on racism sponsored by the police department, NAACP and school district. The publisher of the community's daily newspaper is now initiating a round of dialogue on the role of the newspaper in the community.

Organizers of several of the Study Circle rounds in Portsmouth seem to have been particularly adept at mobilizing resources and the interest of community leaders to produce highly successful efforts. Study Circles have proven themselves in Portsmouth to be a powerful tool for resolving community conflict and producing meaningful change. Nevertheless, the degree to which deliberation will become truly embedded in the community remains to be seen. Indeed, it is unclear whether it will be possible to sustain the program over the long term without a permanent institutional home.

The city's current initiative to involve the public in developing Portsmouth's master plan has been an elaborate affair. It has attracted a substantial portion of the community and a broad coalition of local leaders. The future use of Study Circles in Portsmouth will likely depend on the extent to which the master plan is eventually viewed as a success by community leaders and citizens themselves.

This case study will provide a brief profile of Portsmouth and a history of Study Circles in the community. It will focus specifically on two rounds of Study Circles, one in which they were

used to redistrict the city's elementary schools and the other to develop the city's master plan. Finally, this study will assess Portsmouth's experience with Study Circles in terms of four critical areas:

- **Participation:** How, if at all, have Study Circles changed the range of actors that form opinions upon public issues or influence community decision making on those issues?
- **Deliberation:** How, if at all, has deliberation introduced new considerations, or shifted the balance of existing considerations, in decision making processes?
- **Embeddedness:** How, if at all, are participation and deliberation incorporated into the practical and moral reasoning processes of individuals, institutions and organizations in the community?
- **Outcomes:** Have shifts to greater participation and deliberation resulted in any differences in the actions of local government, civic associations or other stakeholder organizations? Have they resulted in changes in important areas of public concern?

Research for this study was conducted through two rounds of phone interviews, a two-day site visit, and a review of relevant documents related to the Study Circles program and newspaper articles written about the events related to the program. A list of the twenty people interviewed for this case study is available in the appendix.

### Community Profile

Portsmouth is a small city in southeastern New Hampshire off the Atlantic coast. The community is a short trip from three regional centers – about 50 miles from Manchester, Boston, and Portland – but is far enough away to have retained an independent character all its own. While only 20,000 people live in Portsmouth, the community tends to view itself more as a small city than as a large town. According to several residents, Portsmouth is a “community that acts bigger than we are.”

Robert Putnam and Lewis Feldman provide an apt description of Portsmouth in their book on restoring the American community, *Better Together*:

“Portsmouth, New Hampshire, is a picturesque port city ... on the southern bank of the Piscataqua River. Historic mansions and eighteenth- and nineteenth-century brick warehouses (now housing restaurants and shops) line its downtown streets. The spires of old New England churches rise above the two- and-three story buildings. Portsmouth is a destination for tourists, who visit the Strawberry Banke Museum, which preserves homes, taverns, and shops dating back to the first half of the seventeenth century. It is an artists' town, with galleries and theaters and annual festivals of music and drama. Though no longer the thriving port it was in

past centuries, Portsmouth remains fairly prosperous, attracting retirees and young high-tech workers with its unusual combination of small size and sophistication.”<sup>1</sup>

Historically, Portsmouth’s growth depended on its relationship to the sea. It is home to the oldest naval shipyard in the country, which built the first naval warship in North America in 1690. More than 200 years later, Portsmouth constructed and launched the nation’s first submarine in 1917. Until recently, Portsmouth was home to two military bases, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyards and Pease Air Force Base. In 1988, Pease was one of 86 military bases across the country to be ordered closed by Congress. The base ceased operations in 1991, taking more than 4,000 military and civilian jobs with it.

The base closing had a great impact on the life of the community. From 1990 to 2000, Portsmouth’s population dropped by almost 20 percent to 20,784. In a matter of a few years, Pease was reduced from a busy post into an abandoned ghost town. The subsequent redevelopment of the closed base, however, produced the Pease International Tradeport, which has transformed the local economy. It is now the center of 175 firms that employ an estimated 5,575 people and produce a combined payroll estimated at more than twice that of the former base.

Like Kuna, Portsmouth’s population is largely white with persons of color making up only 6.5 percent of the population. Almost 42 percent of Portsmouth residents have earned a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared to 28.7 percent in the rest of New Hampshire. A significant number of people come to Portsmouth to retire, giving it the largest proportion of seniors in the state and the smallest proportion of households with residents under the age of 18 years old. Twenty-three percent of households have an individual who is 65 or older, while 21 percent include children under 18.

In a state with the fiery, independent slogan, “live free or die,” Portsmouth is noticeably progressive. Portsmouth’s five precincts vote consistently Democratic. In 2000, when George W. Bush won the state by less than 10,000 votes, Al Gore won Portsmouth overwhelmingly by more than 25 percent.

Portsmouth is a relatively well off community with a median income of almost \$60,000. The largest employer in the city in 2003 was Liberty Mutual Insurance with 1,873 employees, followed by Columbia HCA Hospital with 990, Lonza Biologies with 466, and Erie Scientici/Sybron Lab Products with 337 – a far cry from the blue collar city dependant on its port that Portsmouth once was. According to a 2003 statistical ranking of US cities with populations over 10,000, Portsmouth has one of the higher percentages of people employed in “professional” occupations (85<sup>th</sup> percentile).

Several people interviewed for this study described Portsmouth as a “fractured” community that is divided along class lines. Over the past two decades, the community has experienced a high influx of new residents who are more highly educated and earn higher incomes than older

---

<sup>1</sup> Putnam, R. and Feldstein, L. (2003) *Better Together: Restoring the American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

residents. More than a quarter of residents moved to Portsmouth from outside of the county over the past five years. The community has an extremely high percentage of renters at about 50 percent (13<sup>th</sup> percentile nationally for home ownership). Median home values are relatively high at \$168,600 (73<sup>rd</sup> percentile nationally).

### **Days of Dialogue: Safe and Respectful Schools**

In the summer of 1998, the Portsmouth school district asked an association of concerned parents, called the Greater Portsmouth Educational Partnership Council (GPEPC – *pronounced g-pepsi*) to “develop a dialogue framework that could be used to facilitate interaction between the school and community on issues concerning excellence in education.” GPEPC’s research led it to the Public Conversations Project at the nearby University of New Hampshire. The Project was run by a Dean at UNH, who was a Portsmouth resident and had spent the past several years organizing Study Circles programs across the state. After evaluating the Study Circles approach, GPEPC concluded that Study Circles provided the type of support for which the Portsmouth schools were looking.

At about the same time, a group of parents of sixth graders in the Portsmouth Middle School began meeting to discuss their concerns about school safety following a highly publicized fight between two students outside of the school. This group of parents formed the Portsmouth Middle School Violence Prevention Committee and by mid-Fall had approached school officials about initiating a program to address violence in the school. According to one person involved with the group, school officials were initially offended by the notion that an exceptional amount of violence took place in the schools. GPEPC intervened by suggesting that the sixth-grade class be convened in a Study Circles program to solicit input from students as to what the critical issues facing the school were. The Violence Prevention Committee, school officials and the sixth-grade student government agreed to the idea.

The round of Study Circles initiated in the Portsmouth Middle School, called Days of Dialogue: Safe and Respectful Schools, brought together all 175 sixth graders along with 75 parents, teachers and community members. The Public Conversations Project served as a resource to the effort, helping to design the program and train facilitators. Seventeen dialogue groups were formed, each with about 10-12 students, a teacher or member of the school staff, and two to three members of the community who had no current or personal connection to the school. According to a report prepared after the completion of the program, the composition of each group was designed to “broaden the students’ environment” and connect students to greater Portsmouth with the goal of making them “realize they are valued members of the community.”

Each dialogue group met for five forty-five minute sessions across five weeks in March and April of 1999. The process began with a discussion of what a safe and respectful school looked like and was followed by an exercise in which students identified their greatest concerns. Participants in the dialogue then focused on three issues: respect for the emotional environment, respect for the physical environment, and concerns about drugs and weapons. The round of dialogue concluded with participants identifying personal and community solutions to the problems.

Many adults participating in the dialogue were struck by the maturity of the children who took part in the circles. Said one organizer of the program, “The adults were impressed. They couldn’t believe these 6<sup>th</sup> grade kids could articulate this stuff. The kids were equally impressed that these adults were willing to listen to them.”

A volunteer facilitator for one of the circles said the students in her group “grew through the process.” She said, “They definitely learned how other people felt, that people cared what they had to say. They became more empathetic.” She described the most surprising outcome of the discussion as the realization by the sixth graders “that they liked adult supervision.” In almost all of the groups, students said that the absence of adult supervision was the common element in situations of bullying and other forms of intimidation. Counter to what one might expect, students said they wanted adults to have a greater presence in places like hallways, stairways, bus stops, bathrooms and in the cafeteria.

The greatest concern of parents – drugs and weapons – turned out not to be a concern for students. According to the final report from the program: “None of the students had serious concerns about drugs and weapons in their schools, including cigarette use. . . . Almost without exception, it was a greater concern for adults than for students. It is not that students are uninformed about the topic; they demonstrated a clear understanding of the dangers of drugs and weapons and how they can seriously ‘mess up’ one’s life.”

Several people involved with the process commented on the remarkable similarity of recommendations that were produced from the different groups. The top concerns registered by students were rumor spreading, note passing, and verbal and physical bullying. These views would prove prescient, expressed just weeks before the Columbine shootings in Littleton, Colorado that brought bullying and peer pressure to the front pages of the nation’s newspapers.

Students presented their recommendations to an unprecedented joint meeting of the school board and city council, exposing a wide range of leaders to the process. Among the recommendations to the community made out of “Dialogue Days” were that the middle school:

- Install and use cameras in all buses
- Make sure that adults are outside at the beginning and end of the school day
- Develop a student mentoring program
- Continue “Days of Dialogue”
- Increase the presence of adults in all aspects of school life, including in hallways, bathrooms, the cafeteria and at bus stops.

The principal of the middle school said he wasn’t surprised by the recommendations that emerged from the process. Nevertheless, he said it was good for the community to hear that these were the concerns of the students. He said that prior to the dialogue, many parents’ views were skewed by overblown newspaper headlines. As such, Days of Dialogue was a way to improve the image of the school. He also said it was good to get so many members of the community involved in the school. “We’re lucky to have five or six parents to show up to most parent advisory council meetings.”

Several of the recommendations made out of the Study Circles have been acted upon by the school administration. Cameras have been put on the buses, which has led to a decline in the number of student referrals from bus drivers by 80 percent. The school has instituted a peer mediation program and has increased adult supervision in several areas that previously had been unsupervised.

While the program seems to have been well received, it has not been repeated. The principal explained that no crisis has emerged to prompt another dialogue. Some teachers opposed running the program again because it took too much time away from classes.

Following the Columbine shootings several weeks after the 6<sup>th</sup>-graders discussions, the city convened a task force, called Take Back Our Children, to address youth violence. In the fall, several of the organizers of “Days of Dialogue” worked with the task force to convene a 300-person forum for teens and adults to talk about issues facing teenagers and what the community could do to support the needs of youth.

### **Elementary School Redistricting**

While the sixth grade dialogues were taking place, the Portsmouth school district was dealing with a difficult set of issues concerning the city’s three elementary schools. For several years the distribution of students among the three schools had grown increasingly unmanageable and it was widely accepted that something had to be done. One school, the Dondero School, was severely overcrowded with 480 students – 50 students over its maximum capacity. The school had resorted to using closets and portable classrooms – essentially double-wide trailers – to support its growing student population. The two other elementary schools, New Franklin (198 students with a capacity of 264) and Little Harbour (373 students with a capacity of 476), had room to spare.

Redistricting is widely understood to be one of the most difficult issues that must be faced by a school district. Over time, elementary schools develop personalities and reputations. Families and neighborhoods tend to grow emotionally attached to their respective schools and often assign negative attributes to others. “Redistricting causes more grief than anything else a school system has to do,” said the Superintendent of Portsmouth’s schools. “You’re right up against people’s expectations in terms of where they go to school. ... It’s a sure way to upset the culture of a neighborhood.” The principal of the Portsmouth Middle School elaborated on the point. “Everyone wonders: Why me? Why is it that my kid has to leave?” he said. “It is one of the most difficult things for a superintendent to pull off.”

Over the past decade, the Portsmouth community had experienced an “unpleasant” history with redistricting. Until the early ’90s, Portsmouth had been a city of neighborhood schools with nine schools across the community. The closing of Pease Air Force base, however, reduced the number of students in the city by close to 1,000 – a majority of them from the elementary schools. The decline in the student population forced Portsmouth to close several schools, redistrict the neighborhoods, and fire about 100 teachers based on seniority.

The initial redistricting was conducted by the school administration with limited external consultation. The controversial plan that was produced created ill will among many segments of the community. The period was widely remembered as being highly unpleasant and contentious. One school official characterized the time as “being in crisis mode.” He said, “Decisions were made by the city fathers. ... on the size of schools without a lot of input. ... People were writing letters to the editor. People were very vocal in the community. They didn’t feel they were being listened to.”

“It became an extraordinary political football,” explained a former member of the school board. “Many, many parents felt disenfranchised. They didn’t like the school their kids were being sent to. All the right reasons for doing it were misunderstood. Everyone felt whoever had the most pull got what they wanted. It was a very unhappy experience.”

Several years later in the mid-90s, the school district began considering another redistricting plan after it became clear that Dondero was becoming overcrowded. Characterizing the earlier redistricting process as “unpleasant,” one person involved with the process said that “even though it was on a smaller scale ... people were not looking forward to redistricting this time.” The process began as it had before as a centralized process by the school administration. Soon tensions in the community rose. One community member recalled that some parents were up in arms about the process. “You’re not going to send my f---ing kid to that f---ing school,” he reported hearing one parent say at a meeting on the issue.

Another community member said, “I watched in horror at a public meeting where parents stood up and said essentially: ‘Not in my back yard – I’m not sending my kids to those schools and they aren’t coming here’.”

Several months into the process, the school board tabled the redistricting effort. “It never got off the ground,” said the middle school principal. “People knew it was going to be controversial and it never went anywhere.” Instead of shifting the student population, Dondero began using mobile classrooms and other internal measures to deal with its overcrowding.

At the heart of much of the redistricting controversy were the socio-economic differences between the respective schools. According to a group of parents who later studied the matter, only 15 percent of the students at Dondero were eligible for free or reduced-price meals. Forty-five percent of students at Little Harbour were eligible for one of the programs and 50 percent of New Franklin students were eligible. An editorial in the Portsmouth Herald characterized the “preferences” of parents this way:

“Human nature being what it is, there seems to be a certain preference among some for sending their children to Dondero and Little Harbour (they are newer buildings and are located in the city's quietest and most affluent neighborhoods). However, location is not everything as we witness that children at the New Franklin School, located near a busy blue-collar neighborhood, have achieved impressive scores on state tests in recent years even as the more affluent Little Harbour School has faltered a bit.”

New Franklin, which is literally on the other side of the railroad tracks in town, had become stigmatized within parts of the community as being a low income school. One New Franklin parent said that many parents were very explicit in saying they did not want their kids to go to the school. She said people got “very nasty.” “There was this socio-economic divide,” she said. “They set up one school to have all the poor kids: ‘Let’s just put them all there and we don’t have to worry about it’.”

Another parent explained that while some Dondero parents may have denigrated New Franklin and Little Harbour, many parents from those school thought the “Dondero kids were rich and spoiled.”

In 1999, several new representatives were elected to the school board and a new superintendent was hired. The new board was determined to deal with the issue of redistricting and to bring greater transparency to the process. One board member who had served as a facilitator during “Days of Dialogue” proposed that the board use Study Circles to engage the community in determining how to redistrict the elementary schools. According to another member of the board, the proposal was not initially well received. However, with the help of the Public Conversations Project and GPEPC, she was able to convince the board and superintendent that by convening Study Circles, it would be possible to find common ground on the redistricting that the community could accept.

The school board appointed a redistricting committee made up of four board members, a representative from the city council, a representative from the neighborhoods association, the superintendent of schools, and parent representatives from each of the three elementary schools. The committee partnered with GPEPC and the UNH Public Conversations Project to design the program.

Board members credited the eventual success of the program to how the dialogue was framed. “We were unafraid to lay down generic guidelines of why we were there and what we were trying to achieve,” said one board member. At a meeting announcing the dialogue, the redistricting committee explained why redistricting was necessary and that it had to be done. Having established that redistricting was going to happen, the committee told the public that it needed guidance as to how redistricting should occur. The chair of the committee told those who attended the kick-off event, “Nothing is preconceived and the new board will make a fair districting of the elementary school with the public’s input.”

"We're not just going to draw lines," the superintendent of schools told the Portsmouth Herald. "We're going to consider the hearts, minds and souls of the parents and kids." Among the options on the table were building additions to Dondero, New Franklin or Little Harbour, the relocation of some Dondero students to the other schools, or a combination of both new construction and relocation.

More than one hundred people participated in the deliberations. Most participants were parents, but a small number of interested members of the community participated in the open meetings as well. Organizers of the Study Circles made a strong effort to ensure that each of the schools were

well represented in the discussions. They also recruited city leaders, like members of the city council, to participate, which increased the community's exposure to the program.

The groups were tasked with answering the following question: "What issues and criteria should the Portsmouth School's Redistricting Committee consider in balancing enrollments in our three elementary schools?" At the end of the round, each Study Circle prepared a written report of their findings and recommendations, which was then presented at a public meeting of the school board in November.

Participants were divided into eight groups of 12 to 15 people. Each circle met once a week over a four-week period, beginning in September of 2000. A critical design choice made by the redistricting committee was to conduct the Study Circles in each of the three elementary schools and rotate groups through each of the schools. At the beginning of each session, participants would meet with the principal of the respective school and take a tour of the facility. In so doing, many of the parents who held preconceived notions about the "other" schools were physically exposed to the facilities. Organizers of the program explained that many parents had never set foot in the schools to which their children didn't attend. "It put into perspective the culture and programs in those schools and ended up creating a very positive profile of each elementary school," said the superintendent.

People involved with the program widely agreed that the discussions were largely civil and constructive. They reported learning from other participants and witnessing parents coming to new understandings of each other. The discussions revolved around an array of issues, ranging from the growth projections for the school district to the stereotypes of the schools to the logistics of redistricting. Some groups did research into the socio-economic differences between the schools, while others conducted needs assessments of each of the facilities.

One facilitator said that the dialogue had the powerful effect of focusing parents on the common good of the community. "They walked in saying, 'I'm here for my kids'," he said, but after talking with parents from other schools a sense of "our kids, our system, our city" developed. "It wasn't so much about 'that school,' it was about 'our kids getting a better education'."

A New Franklin parent said the discussion was very useful, but difficult and emotional for her. "It's hard to hear people say crappy things about where your kids go to school. That's hard to listen to," she said. "I don't know whether it changed anyone's mind. It made them aware of the issues at the different schools. It put a face on them. It's one thing to make judgments. It's a lot harder to talk one on one to someone and say something nasty."

In the final report produced by GPEPC and the UNH Public Conversations Project, ten "common recommendations" were offered that had been shared by the different circles. Among the recommendations were:

- The school district should create more space for the elementary school population through additions and improvements to existing structures or by re-opening an existing school.
- The facilities at all three schools should be comparable and of high quality.

- The current formula for calculating capacity should be revised or abandoned. Future determinations regarding capacity should be based on how space is utilized, not simply total square feet.
- Enrollment at each school should be established in the range of 75 to 90 percent of defined capacity.
- Class sizes should be maintained in the range of 15-18 students.
- The School Board should strive for the greatest possible socio-economic balance among children.
- Fifth graders should not be moved under any circumstances in the first year of redistricting (except on a voluntary basis).
- No student should be on a bus more than 30 minutes.

After the presentation of each of the Study Circle reports at a school board meeting in November, the *Portsmouth Herald* reported, “The majority of participants agreed that taking no action at all to alleviate the overcrowding at all three schools would be the worst solution.”

In the spring, the redistricting committee voted unanimously to approve a new plan and presented it to the school board. The new plan moved two “sectors” of the city into the New Franklin School District, shifting about sixty students from Dondero to New Franklin. According to the Herald, the plan called for the city to spend \$1.7 million to renovate the New Franklin School, creating four new regulation-sized classrooms and adding a large multipurpose room. The committee also moved one sub-division into the Little Harbour school district. Finally, the plan gave fifth-graders the option to remain in their current schools during the first year of the redistricting in order to reduce the disruption.

Only a single parent showed up to voice opposition to the redistricting plan at the redistricting committee’s public hearing on its final recommendation in March. Board members reported that the parent seemed to talk herself out of her position as her testimony progressed. They said that she accepted the process as fair, but disliked the plan that had been developed by the committee. One month later, “several” residents attended the school board meeting to oppose the plan. The parents were from the Sherburne neighborhood – a small area of the city separated from the community by a highway, which had previously had its own neighborhood school. For years, the neighborhood had lobbied for the city to reopen their neighborhood school. According to the *Portsmouth Herald*, one of the parents told the board: “If the kids had a say, I don't think there would be any single one of them who would want to change their lives.”

In the end, the school board approved the redistricting plan with little opposition. Most of the criteria that had been set out by the Study Circles seem to have been incorporated into the plan. Since the redistricting, class sizes at the three schools have largely been kept to below 18 students per class, according to the superintendent. The New Franklin facilities were expanded and improved to address concerns of equitability between the schools. No students ride on the buses for more than 30 minutes. Fifth graders were allowed to finish out their terms at their respective schools during the first year of the redistricting.

Board members and school officials expressed extreme satisfaction with the outcomes of the process. Compared to the strident response to previous redistricting efforts, the minimal protest

that was voiced is striking. While some members of the community clearly may have been unhappy with the final plan, their seemed to have been a general acceptance of the results. The superintendent elaborated on this point:

“It was definitely a different reaction. When lines are redrawn the normal reaction is very emotional. . . . Large numbers will come to school board meetings and protest. We had very little of that. We had maybe a few, a handful of families that objected. Really, there was no basis for objection except for personal preference. It had already been established that it was right thing to do and everyone’s voice had been included. They had agreed to the process.”

While the Study Circles program did not necessarily shift participants’ opinions, it clearly seems to have made many feel part of the process and more accepting of how decisions were made. In some instances, dramatic changes in opinion did take place. For example, one of the program’s organizers said that on the first night of the dialogues, a parent from the Sherburne neighborhood introduced himself, saying, “I’m here to convince these people that it’s the right thing to reopen [the Sherburne] school.” At the end of the Study Circles, the same parent came up to the organizer and told him he had a change of heart “That really wasn’t a very good idea,” he said. “We need to rebalance enrollment among these three schools.”

Board members said that when the plan is reviewed in the coming year, it is unlikely that significant changes will have to be made. As such, they said it is unlikely that Study Circles will be needed to revisit the issue.

The only significant area in which the school board did not seem to take into account the recommendations of Study Circles participants was on the issue of socio-economic diversity. The redistricting committee decided that income would not be a factor considered in the process. Significantly, a higher-income neighborhood situated near New Franklin was not redistricted to New Franklin in the plan, according to the parent who had represented the school on the committee. She said that the committee was unwilling to confront the neighborhood by making such a shift.

“When the neighborhoods were divided, the affluent neighborhoods didn’t get put into that school,” she said. “Overall [the redistricting] was better than the first time, but there were some people who weren’t surprised by the way the dividing lines were made.” Nevertheless, she said she was glad that Study Circles were used and would participate in them again if they were used.

Since the completion of the redistricting process, the school board has not chosen to use Study Circles again. When asked why, if the program was so widely viewed as a success, they had not chosen to repeat it, school board members and school officials cited the significant amount of time and resources that organizing a round of circles takes. Many said that the program had influenced how they do their jobs, prompting greater participation in school decision making and more public forums. Nevertheless, several said that the redistricting situation was unique and that another issue of a similar nature had not arisen that warranted the same kind of approach to addressing it.

## **Dialogue on Racism**

In 2001, the local chapter of the NAACP contacted the U.S. Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division in regards to allegations of racial profiling and harassment of young black males in downtown Portsmouth. A representative from DOJ attended an NAACP meeting on the issue and suggested that the organization open a dialogue with the leadership of the police department. In the past, the NAACP had only interacted with the department's internal affairs division to register complaints. No formal relationship existed between the department's leadership and the leadership of the civil rights group.

According to the representative from the DOJ, the Portsmouth Police Department did have a strong internal affairs process for dealing with complaints. The challenge, he said, was that there was very little communication with the community. "The problem was that from the community's perspective, they weren't getting feedback they needed on issues," he said.

Representatives from the NAACP and DOJ soon began meeting with the chief of police to talk about police procedures and issues of race in the community. Over the course of a year, regular discussions between the leadership group expanded in scope to include issues of discrimination involving the schools and local businesses. Soon the group's size increased to include the superintendent of schools, the director of the chamber of commerce and local religious leaders.

At some point during the discussions, the representative from the DOJ suggested that the group consider sponsoring a round of Study Circles on the issues about which the group had been talking. During the mid-90s, the DOJ had adopted the Study Circles model in response to the rash of church burnings that occurred across the South. The superintendent of schools was able to help convince the group to take on the idea based on his experience with the redistricting program in the elementary schools.

About 40 people took part in a five-meeting round as part of the Dialogue on Racism in the Spring of 2002. Participants were largely recruited through the organizational networks and mailing lists of the groups that had organized the dialogue. The DOJ representative facilitated kick-off and wrap-up forums at the beginning and end of the discussions, and trained volunteer facilitators. The discussions included police officers, school leaders, members of the community and students in the high school.

One of the participants in the Study Circles said the dialogue was emotional, but productive. He said some of the police officers had been nervous that they would be verbally attacked, but that that did not happen. Some of those who participated in the dialogue said they felt that the Study Circles did not engage a broad enough segment of the community in the discussion – that they were singing to the choir.

The only significant outcome of the process seems to be that leaders of the organizations involved have formed stronger ties and informal relationships. The deputy chief of the police department commented that now when an issue or question comes up, it is easier for someone from the NAACP to simply call him or another officer, rather than having to go through formal

procedures. The dialogues do not seem to have made any significant impact on the policies or procedures of the police department or schools. The deputy police chief said that the department would be interested in participating in another round of circles if there was strong interest from the community.

### **Portsmouth Listens**

Portsmouth's most elaborate Study Circles effort to date began with a small, informal discussion over coffee in mid-2002 about how to improve the quality of life of the community. The small group that initially started talking, which included the chair of GPEPC as well as the director of the chamber of commerce, soon decided to convene a larger meeting of concerned local leaders to further explore the topic. Soon afterwards, a larger group, including local business leaders, developers, the publisher of the Portsmouth Herald, city officials, the police chief, and other civic activists, began meeting on a regular basis to consider the issue.

Over the course of several meetings, the GPEPC chair talked with the group about his experience with Study Circles and the value of engaging the community in the process. Many members of the group were familiar with the redistricting effort and agreed that involving the public in setting a vision for the future of the community would support their goal. Portsmouth's city manager shared with the group that the city was about to revise its ten-year master plan and proposed that the planning process might serve as an ideal vehicle for convening the public around issues of quality of life.

The group decided to create an informal organization, called Portsmouth Listens, that would be responsible for engaging the public in developing the master plan and would be led by the GPEPC chair and the publisher of the Portsmouth Herald. The city manager brought the planning director and the chair of the planning board into the conversation and convinced them to support the effort. The city agreed to donate \$10,000 to the process and an additional \$10,000 was raised "from 4 phone calls" made by the organizing committee.

New Hampshire state law mandates that all communities develop a master plan every ten years. The plan serves as a guide for municipal decision making by setting an overall framework for future planning. Typically, a master plan includes a vision for the future, a description of important trends, and strategies for reaching the vision. Topics addressed by a master plan may include a wide range of issue areas, including land use, housing, transportation, natural resources, recreation, historic preservation and the arts. By state law, planning boards are required to involve the public in the development of the master plan. Typically, this takes place through public hearings, surveys and stakeholder interviews.

Initially, the city's planners were leery of working with Portsmouth Listens to involve the public in the process of developing the master plan. The chair of the planning board was concerned that the civic group would try to take over the process. He wanted to make sure that all parties understood that the planning board had the legal mandate to create the plan and that, in the end, it would be their responsibility to authorize it. The city manager elaborated on the concern: "You have to be careful that you don't create a shadow planning board. You don't want people feeling

they are going to be the ones who are going to create the policy.” Planners were also concerned that the public would call for unrealistic, “pie in the sky” programs. In multiple interviews, people involved with the process cited the “mono-rail to Boston” as the epitome of the planners’ concerns.

Several years earlier, a civic group had created a “Vision 2025 Plan” that called for a mono-rail, which planners saw as highly unrealistic and counterproductive to this process. The Study Circles organizers told the planners that with adequate information about the process and feasibility of alternatives, the public would make reasonable recommendations. One of the organizers explained: “It really took an effort on our part to say, ‘No this is not going to happen – people won’t talk about monorails.’ They said, ‘You gotta tell people there isn’t money for everything.’ We said, ‘Don’t worry these are reasonable people.’”

A three-phase process was developed that would engage citizens in three rounds of circles. The first round would produce a vision for the future. The second round would develop more detailed strategies and plans that addressed the most important priorities identified in the vision. Input from these two rounds of circles would be reported to the planning board and staff as input into the process of developing the plan. After a draft plan was completed, Study Circles would be reconvened for a third time to review the plan and provide a final round of input to the city.

The planning board made a point to stress that Study Circles were only one part of the planning process. In addition to the circles, the board convened a series of community meetings around the city, interviewed various stakeholder groups, and conducted a survey of residents. Notably, very few people ended up participating in the community meetings sponsored by the planning board. It seems that most of those members of the public who wanted to be heard chose to participate through the Study Circles process.

From the start, Portsmouth Listens made a substantial effort to engage a large, representative portion of the community in the process. As part of the effort, 36 volunteers hand delivered more than 5,000 brochures to residents in a citywide canvas to recruit participants in November of 2002. Portsmouth Listens also ran advertisements in the local newspaper and asked local businesses to place displays in their windows to reach out to the community. Initially, 415 residents signed up to participate in the Study Circles (2.7 percent of the city’s adult population over the age of 25) and close to 300 people participated in the first round of the process.

The first round of Portsmouth Listens consisted of four two-hour sessions over the course of four weeks. Participants were divided into groups of 10 to 12 people. Each group was asked to address the question: “How can we make Portsmouth the best place to live and work for everyone?” The groups began with discussions about what they liked and didn’t like about Portsmouth, and then explored what they wanted Portsmouth to become. Each group created a list of issues related to its vision and prioritized the top three to five issues.

Organizers were relatively successful at recruiting a diverse segment of the community to participate. For example, 20 percent of participants had children in the schools, matching the proportion of the city’s households. The average income of participants was \$63,000, compared to the city’s family median of \$59,630. However, the effort came up short in several areas.

Eighty-nine percent of the participants were college graduates compared to 42 percent of the community. More importantly, 76 percent were homeowners in a city that was evenly split 50-50 between renters and homeowners. After the completion of the first round, Portsmouth Listens conducted an additional series of forums for renters to ensure that their voices were heard through the process. Notably, the ideas generated from the renters were significantly different than from the larger group.

Several people involved with the first round of circles commented on the diversity of the groups and the different perspectives brought to the table by participants. A Portsmouth Herald reporter who attended several of the circles wrote that participants in the first round of circles were “very knowledgeable about the issues they spoke of and they were very passionate.” By and large, the character of the deliberations in this first round seems to have been heavily focused on idea generation.

The reports of each of the groups were presented to the planning board, as was a summary of the reports prepared by Portsmouth Listens, at the end of March of 2003. According to the report, there was substantial convergence among the findings of the groups. It summarized the community’s vision in the following paragraph:

“Portsmouth should be a livable, walkable city that preserves its history, lives in balance with its natural resources, protects its waterfront and views, provides a good climate for entrepreneurial opportunity, acts on its belief in socio-economic diversity through affordable housing and connects neighborhoods through multiple and innovative modes of transportation. Portsmouth should consciously support its local arts and culture, take steps to build community through citywide events, enhanced and beautified common living and recreating spaces and neighborhood connectedness. In these ways, Portsmouth will remain the most historic and most passionate city in New Hampshire.”

The report identified seven themes from the dialogues, which would later become the overarching topic areas for the second round of the process.

- Natural resources/open space/environmental balance
- Housing and socioeconomic diversity of our community
- Building Community
- Transportation
- Economic development
- Arts, culture and history.
- Downtown

A member of the city council and planning board who listened to each of the Study Circles groups present their plans reported to the Study Circles Resource Center that he had been moved by the presentations. “They were passionate about what they felt is best for Portsmouth,” he said. The city councilor said he kept two lists as the presentations were being made, one of “vision” items and one of “practical” items that could be implemented more quickly without needing to wait for the completed master plan. Among the “practical” items were suggestions like using the

city's cable access channel more effectively; replacing historical town signs; planting trees and shrubs along the median strip of a four-lane thoroughfare; expanding recycling to the downtown area; and burying some power lines. The list of "practical" items was then sent by the city councilor to the city manager with the suggestions that they be added to the capital improvements plan.

In April, the second round of circles was launched with a kick-off attended by about 40 people. One of the co-chairs of Portsmouth Listens explained that the purpose of the new round was to translate vision into action. "How are we going to make it happen?" he said. About 100 people returned to participate in the second round, divided into groups according to the major themes from the previous dialogue. The round consisted of four to five meetings over the course of six weeks.

One organizer of the program said that participation was lower during the second round, in part, "because people felt they had given a lot and said their piece [during the first round]." He went on to say, "There was also more work. Phase one was more general and phase two was topic oriented. The task was to get into the nitty gritty, which involved more research. It tended to attract people with specific interests and expertise." According to several people, the diversity of participation did drop somewhat in the second round, attracting those people with more time and a greater interest in a specific topic area. The facilitator for the Study Circle tasked with developing a natural resource plan said several members of his group were environmentalists and environmental lawyers – which "kind of skewed what came out" – but that it also included people who just had a general interest in the issue.

Multiple people involved with the program described the participants in the second round of circles as highly energized and committed to the process. Participants met with representatives from city agencies and did substantial research for each plan. In some cases, their work on an issue stimulated additional activity outside of Study Circles. The facilitator for the arts and culture circle said that his group's work prompted the mayor's commission on the arts, which had been "on hiatus," to start working again.

The round produced six action plans that were presented to the planning board in July. Each plan consisted of a highly detailed set of recommendations as to what the city and greater community could do address the topic area. A first draft of the master plan is currently being completed and will be made available for the third round of Study Circles in the coming months.

A consultant hired by the Portsmouth Planning Department to develop the master plan said that he was impressed by the level of detail generated through the Study Circles program. "There's a lot more input than most planning processes," he said. "Having that many people involved over a long period of time has provided more ideas and more in-depth thinking about options for planning. ... It has also given people more of a chance to think about things, so they have had a more fine grained set of recommendations than you would normally have out of a public meeting – certainly more than out of a survey process."

He said that the ideas generated from the community are influencing the development of the plan itself. While many of the ideas that were developed would likely have been considered without

the deliberation, he said, it effected how priorities were set in the plan. “One thing that came up fairly early was the importance of keeping a lively downtown and preserving ground floor retail, which is something the city has decided to go forward with,” he said. “That might have come up anyway, but it really became a sense of urgency because of the Study Circles process.”

Other areas that have been influenced by the public, according to the planning consultant, included prioritizing access to the water front, preserving it as a working waterfront, improving pedestrian and bicycle access and connections, and improving the quality of development and land use along the outlying corridors of the city to make the “rest of the city as special as downtown.” An example he cited of an idea that was not incorporated into the plan was developing housing on the Pease Tradeport area. He said Federal rules, fiscal concerns and health concerns make it very difficult to create housing in that part of the community.

Several members of the community expressed considerable skepticism that input from Portsmouth Listens would have a significant impact on the plan. Some compared the straight forward nature of the elementary school redistricting with the complexity of creating a master plan, arguing that the former was a far more suitable issue for Study Circles because there was a closer link to action. A resident who had been involved with the previous effort to develop a vision for Portsmouth said that the impact of his group’s work suggested that Portsmouth Listens’ likelihood of success was not good. “The Vision Report is on the shelf as far as I can tell,” he told the Portsmouth Herald. “The people on the Vision Committee, we all kind of shook our heads when we heard about [Portsmouth Listens].” However, it seems that the earlier visioning process was too different in terms of its scope and relation to a formal decision making process to draw any conclusions about the future of Portsmouth Listens.

Organizers of the Study Circles program said they are hopeful that input will shape the eventual plan. One of the co-chairs of Portsmouth Listens said he had been told that the plan had been greatly influenced by their participation and that a version of the draft plan may be developed that shows how the elements of the plan were influenced by the public. At any rate, he said, the third round of Study Circles will provide the public with the opportunity to react to the plan if it does not seem consistent with their priorities.

Portsmouth Listens has begun to think about how it wants to remain involved with the planning process over the long term. Proposals have begun to be discussed about the creation of permanent public task forces that would work with city agencies to implement various elements of the plan. The city manager has tentatively agreed to produce an annual report of progress towards implementing the plan that may provide an opportunity for public input as well.

### **The Future of Study Circles in Portsmouth**

With each successive round of Study Circles in Portsmouth, more community leaders have been exposed to the approach. The sixth-grade dialogue’s results were presented to a joint session of the city council and school board. The elementary school redistricting organizers went out of their way to recruit community leaders and public officials to participate. The superintendent of schools was able to talk about past deliberations to influence the police department and NAACP.

Portsmouth Listens engaged a large, diverse segment of community leaders, ranging from the chamber of commerce to the city council to city planners. Thus far, the success of each Study Circles program has produced new opportunities for further deliberation. It remains to be seen how much this pattern will continue into the future.

In another example of one Study Circles program seeding another, the publisher of the Portsmouth Herald, who was a co-chair of Portsmouth Listens, has decided to launch a round of circles on the role of the newspaper in the community. As a community institution, he said the newspaper has a responsibility to the city's residents. The program will be launched in the coming months.

The third round of the Portsmouth Listens process is currently being planned to review the results of the draft master plan. The future of Study Circles in Portsmouth will likely depend, in part, on the extent to which the master plan is eventually viewed as a success by city leaders and the larger community. Preliminary discussions have begun about how the program may sustain public involvement in the implementation of the plan and whether Portsmouth Listens should be institutionalized into a permanent organization.

It is unclear whether the involvement of city officials in Portsmouth Listens will lead the city to expand public involvement in planning in other arenas. Several people interviewed, including the city manager, mentioned the redevelopment of a large federal building in downtown Portsmouth as a possible opportunity for engaging the public in deliberation about what to do with the land. If the city were to use Study Circles or a similar deliberative process, it would set a strong precedent for future use in the community.

While the school board has not launched another Study Circles program since the completion of the elementary school redistricting, several people mentioned a controversy that is currently brewing as an issue that could lead to another round of deliberation with the school board. For the past several months, tension around the schools has been "hot" around the issue of how the district has responded to drugs in the schools and how it has enforced its policies with students. A group of parents who are angry about how the schools have dealt with the issue have called for the resignation of the superintendent. Thus far, the school board has taken a defensive position and given a strong public endorsement to the superintendent. At least one school board member has privately suggested the idea that Study Circles may be appropriate to address the issue. Some who were interviewed suggested that the fact that the schools have not gone to Study Circles already on the issue is illustrative of the fact that at least some have not been able to translate in their mind the value of public deliberation from redistricting to other issues.

### **Assessing Study Circles in Portsmouth**

An evaluation of Study Circles in Portsmouth should address at least four key questions:

- **Participation:** How, if at all, have Study Circles changed the range of actors that form opinions upon public issues or influence community decision making on those issues?

- **Deliberation:** How, if at all, has deliberation introduced new considerations, or shifted the balance of existing considerations, in decision making processes?
- **Embeddedness:** How, if at all, are participation and deliberation incorporated into the practical and moral reasoning processes of individuals, institutions and organizations in the community?
- **Outcomes:** Have shifts to greater participation and deliberation resulted in any differences in the actions of local government, civic associations or other stakeholder organizations? Have they resulted in changes in important areas of public concern?

## Participation

Across all of the Study Circles in Portsmouth, it seems quite clear that the programs brought new voices to the table. The first round of Portsmouth Listens represents the best example of a concerted effort to represent the diversity of the community in the process (and also the round with the best available data about who participated). The sheer number of people that were engaged by the program – almost 300 in the first round – suggests that a wide array of individuals were brought into the process that would not otherwise have been involved. The extra effort to engage renters by Portsmouth Listens organizers through a separate forum at the end of the first round is illustrative of the degree to which organizers were committed to involve new voices in the process. However, it is worth noting that by convening this group later in the round, the renters’ voices were not able to influence the deliberations of the main group.

While “Days of Dialogue” did not concern itself with a formal policy making process, it certainly brought many voices into the decision making of a school that often tend to be unheard on such issues – the students. By convening all of the 6<sup>th</sup> graders during the school day, the program was able to avoid selection biases that exclude those who don’t have time to participate. By recruiting a dozen or so community leaders and interested community members who didn’t have an explicit connection to the school, the initiative also widened the circle of influence on school policy, while exposing these influential individuals to the concerns of students.

Limited data is available as to the diversity of participation in the elementary school redistricting process. Most of those interviewed said that the three school communities were well represented in the process. One parent from New Franklin complained that since fewer students went to New Franklin, they were a minority in the discussions and it was easier for their voices to be lost in the process. It is unclear what constituencies were represented in the discussions by the community members, who were not parents of students in the schools. It seems likely that these individuals tended to be active citizens who were involved in most public processes in the community.

The Study Circles on racism and the second round of Portsmouth Listens seem to be the least diverse forums that took place in the community. Nevertheless, both processes engaged voices who would not have been otherwise heard.

## **Deliberation**

There is significant data to suggest that deliberation did bring new considerations into the process and shift the views of people involved with Study Circles in Portsmouth. The elementary school redistricting process seems to be the best example of this phenomenon. An organizer of the program cited the example of an individual who came to the process advocating for the reopening of a neighborhood school and left the program in the end, saying that “that really wasn’t a very good idea.” The elementary school process confronted parents with their own stereotypes and views by exposing them to the schools themselves and engaging them in dialogue with parents from other schools. As one facilitator said, the process helped participants in his circle to move from a parochial view protective of their own children to one that emphasized the needs of the community’s children as a whole. The best evidence that participating in deliberation influenced how parents viewed the redistricting process is the fact that protests of the final decision were largely muted.

In the case of the 6<sup>th</sup>-grade discussions, “Days of Dialogue” seems to have shifted the emphasis of concerned parents from being afraid that guns and drugs were a prevalent problem to seeing that verbal bullying and the like were the core concern of students in the middle school. While school officials said that this was not a surprise to the schools, it seems to have influenced concerned parents.

It is less clear how opinions shifted during the Portsmouth Listens deliberations, but it does seem that new perspectives and views were brought into the process. Many of those interviewed characterized the dialogue itself as creative. Planners cited several ideas that had been added to the planning process that had not been the case. The consultant preparing the master plan commented that the input he received was far more “rich” than would normally be the case through public hearings or surveys.

## **Embeddedness**

The ongoing use of Study Circles in Portsmouth has depended on community leaders taking it upon themselves to convene the public and support the deliberative process. Without an institutional home for Study Circles, each instance of their use has relied on individuals recognizing a need and mobilizing resources and political capital to meet the need. On one hand, this status of Study Circles in Portsmouth has made their on-going use highly vulnerable to the individual whims and circumstances of a given decision making process. On the other hand, the fact that Study Circles have continued to grow despite this vulnerability does suggest that they have, at least to some degree, begun to become part of how the community does its public business.

Four factors seem to have made an important contribution to the on-going success of Study Circles in the community. First, the presence of the University of New Hampshire’s Public Conversations Project has served as an invaluable resource to the community. Bruce Mallory, the UNH Dean and Portsmouth resident who has worked with the community, has helped to bring legitimacy to proposals to conduct Study Circles and trained community members with the skills

needed to implement the programs. Second, several local leaders have become extremely dedicated to the idea of Study Circles. In most of the successful instances of deliberation in Portsmouth, the chair of GPEPC, a local attorney named Jim Noucas, has been a driving force in their success. One Study Circles facilitator described Noucas as the institution that had kept Study Circles alive in the community. It seems to be true that the programs would not have existed without Noucas. It also seems to be true that Noucas' efforts depended on a progressive leadership culture in the community that is unusually open to participation and collaboration. Third, the strong success of early rounds of Study Circles and the exposure of local leaders to that success have been instrumental in their ongoing use.

The strongest evidence that deliberation has become embedded into decision making in Portsmouth is the simple fact that their use has continued to grow over the years. As each successive Study Circle program has engaged more community leaders in the process, they have created new opportunities for programs. The growing recognition of the value of Study Circles and support from a diverse group of local leaders suggests the development of a nascent culture of participation in the community. Nevertheless, there is some reason to believe that deliberative processes will not become a sustainable part of the community until some institutional home for the process is developed inside or outside of government.

The most important piece of data supporting this concern is the fact that decision making bodies have not chosen to repeat the use of Study Circles. The Portsmouth Middle School has not chosen to reconvene "Days of Dialogue" and the Portsmouth school board has not reconvened Study Circles on other issues since the redistricting effort – though in both cases, claims have been made that the schools have incorporated lessons from Study Circles into how they involve the public on other issues. There seem to be three factors that contribute to decision making bodies not continuing to conduct Study Circles.

- First, a significant amount of time, resources and energy are required to conduct a round of circles. Even those decision makers who see the value of public deliberation conclude that it must be used only in highly unique circumstances because of limited available resources.
- Second, at least some local leaders seem to have difficulty generalizing the value of public deliberation from the specific instance in which it was used to broader use on other issue and under other circumstances. Similarly, while many leaders praise the outcomes of the Study Circles programs, some do not seem to fully appreciate the value that on-going deliberation brings to a process over public forums and other participatory processes that do not feature small-group deliberation.
- Third, while many local leaders have appreciated the value of Study Circles, it is not clear that there is a strong demand for their use on the part of the larger community. If a culture of deliberation is to take hold in a community, it requires that opportunities for participation be demanded by the public in those instance in which deliberative processes are unpleasant for decision makers.

It may be the case that the creation of an independent civic organization that advocates for and houses a Study Circles program, like Kuna ACT, would address these three factors. Such an organization could take the burden of organizing circles off of decision makers, it could foster an external demand for participation, and it could educate leaders on the value of the programs.

## **Outcomes**

That Study Circles have produced at least some meaningful outcomes in Portsmouth seems to be clear. The resolution of the elementary school redistricting process is most striking in this respect. Despite a history of highly contentious experiences with similar efforts, Portsmouth developed a plan that seems to have been widely supported from members of the community. The attention with which organizers of the program paid to exposing parents to the other schools seems to have played an important role in the process. The redistricting committee, by and large, adopted the recommendations of the community and created a plan that imposed the least burden on the greatest number of families. One must wonder, however, whether the reaction to the plan would have been as muted had the circumstances surrounding the redistricting been more dire and had the plan required that the committee produce a plan that forced more families to switch schools.

Limited outcomes have been produced by Portsmouth Listens thus far (the “practical items” identified by the city councilor that were recommended to be added to the city’s capital improvements plan), but there is reason to be optimistic that public priorities will influence the eventual plan. First, planners involved with the process have identified several areas of the plan that have been influenced by public input. Second, the third round of Portsmouth Listens will expose the plan to additional public scrutiny. Third, the heavy involvement of community leaders behind Portsmouth Listens, like the publisher of the local newspaper, suggests that planners will have to address more than just public pressure if their plans to do not address priorities identified through the process.

Days of Dialogue did lead to several new policies at the Portsmouth Middle School, including cameras on school busses. The dialogue on racism did not produce any tangible policy outcomes in how the police department or schools dealt with the issue.

*<<no conclusion written because this case will be integrated with others>>*

## Appendix A

Research for this study was conducted through two rounds of phone calls, a two-day site visit, and a review of relevant documents related to the Study Circles program and newspaper articles written about the events related to the program. The following individuals were interviewed at least once (and some two or three times) for this study.

1. Frank Amorosso
2. John Bohenko
3. Raymond Bowles
4. Dave Cohen
5. Nansi Craig
6. Ellen Fineberg
7. Cindy Hayden
8. Dave Holden
9. Todd Horn
10. Kate Leith
11. Bob Lister
12. Bruce Mallory
13. Jim Noucas
14. Paige Roberts
15. John Stokle
16. John Tabor
17. Rick Tainter
18. Carvall Teft
19. Lionel Tracy
20. Dave Young