**Results of Community Deliberation About Social Impacts of Ecological Restoration: Comparing Public Input of Self-Selected Versus Actively Engaged Community Members**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study ID** | **indicators** | **methods** | **scale** | **practices** |
| 76 | * community’s social make-up (People), * its jobs and wealth (Economy), * its character (Place), * and its organizational and leadership capacity (Vision and Vitality) | A 5-step composite method is used:   1. Participants provided numeric ratings (from 1 to 10) of their community’s current (baseline) situation across each of the four dimensions 2. A formal presentation provided participants with the latest scientific information about each salmon recovery alternative, followed by a question-and-answer dialogue 3. Participants considered the scientific information and provided a preliminary judgment of community impacts relative to their baseline assessment, rating impacts with a scale ranging from -5 to 5 4. Researchers facilitated discussions within each group to pool information from group members and clarify one another’s presumptions about likely changes across the delineated community dimensions 5. Participants provided a final individual numeric rating of the magnitude of anticipated impacts, followed by participants’ listing of three qualitative justifications for those ratings   Los datos recogidos se procesan con técnica de análisis de contenidos. | Numerical (1..10 or -5..5) | Small group techniques using nominal and focus groups or the Delphi method offer smaller groups of stakeholders the opportunity to discuss impacts collectively and develop mutual understanding |

Data collection: citizens' views on the environmental impact of proposed alternatives for recovering wild salmon in the Pacific Northwest US: no action, fish bypass improvements, and dam removal. The results affirm that deliberative methods for community-based impact assessment involving both AE and SS residents can provide a more complete picture of perceived impacts of proposed restoration activities. A 5-step composite method is used. It is then analysed using content analysis (scores are categorised) and the results of the different groups are statistically compared.