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Summary
This task examines current post-evaluation techniques and procedures undertaken in the field of EIA and SEA. Using the information derived from an extensive literature search it outlines procedures and practices that can be applied to the context of this project. Suggested parameters for monitoring have been drawn from work undertaken in the earlier stages of the SUIT project and which were developed and refined throughout the project. The role of public participation in the procedure is examined and suggestions made as to the nature and timing of this participation. However, it must be recognised that the public participation outlined in this report represents an ideal and that in practice the levels of participation will be influenced by existing common practice within each Member State.
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1. Introduction

Task 3.5 ‘Post-evaluation procedures’ is the penultimate stage in the work undertaken for this work package, the final step being the amalgamation of the methodologies developed for each element of the EIA process into the first ‘stand-alone’ prototype (task 3.6). The procedures suggested in this task have been derived from an examination of the literature relating to current international practice and are constrained by the procedures developed, for the earlier stages of the EIA process, in this work package.

This report will, firstly, discuss the methodologies used whilst undertaking this work package. The current position in relation to post-evaluation procedures will then be discussed in Section 3. Section 4 will suggest procedures that are specific to the monitoring of cultural heritage, using the parameters and assessment techniques developed in the earlier tasks in this work package. The role and potential of public participation in this stage of the EIA process will also be analysed and participation methodologies developed, in Section 5. The final part of this report, Section 6, will provide general conclusions relating to the methodologies and procedures developed in this task.

2. Methodology

The main method of research used for this task was that of review of existing literature. General searches of the main on-line databases, such as, BIDS, Web of Science and OCLC were conducted along with more detailed searches of Journals relevant to the subject, both electronic and paper copy. Searches of specific EIA related databases, such as, that of The EIA Centre, University of Manchester (http://quercus.art.man.ac.uk/eia/) were also undertaken. The searches revealed a relatively small body of available literature for this subject area and examination of the citations showed little variation in the sources used from article to article, suggesting that this is not an area that has been widely written about. This is consistent with the findings of an International Study of the Effectiveness of Environmental Assessment (Sadler, 1996) which highlighted “monitoring and follow-up” to be one of four priorities for improvement of EIA (the others being “scoping”, “evaluation of significance”, and “review of EIS”). The possible reasons for this are discussed in the literature review in Section 3.

Information derived from a questionnaire survey undertaken for Task 1.5b (Report on the EU application of EIA / SEA procedures within urban areas) and from government websites was used in this report to provide details of current legislation and insight into actual practice relating to public participation in the post-evaluation stage of EIA.

The SUIT project aims to develop methodologies that enable better consideration of cultural heritage issues within the EIA process than currently occur. In order to achieve this goal it is inevitable that the ‘ideal’ procedure in the view of the research team will be defined, encompassing wide ranging and detailed assessment of all aspects and issues. However, as the result of the SUIT project is intended to be a working methodology for use in the practical situation it was necessary to ensure that the procedures developed for this task did not go beyond what would be feasible. Therefore, actual practice within the Member States must be recognised as a potential constraint to the adoption of the ‘ideal’.

3. Current position relating to post-evaluation procedures

3.1 Introduction

This section examines, via review of existing literature, the current state-of-the-art relating to post project evaluation and monitoring. General techniques in use internationally and examples of practice are given and
whenever possible direct references to the assessment of cultural heritage issues at this stage of the EIA / SEA process have been cited.

The legal position relating to the application of post project evaluation is discussed briefly below. Greater depth relating to both the EU and individual Member States’ legislation can be found in Task 1.5b “Report on the EU application of EIA / SEA procedures within urban areas”.

Under Council Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment as amended by Directive 97/11/EC of 3 March 1997 and Directive 2003/35/EC of 26 May 2003, hereafter referred to as the EIA Directive, post project evaluation and monitoring is considered to be part of ‘good practice’ but is not mandatory. Provision for post project monitoring and evaluation within the individual Member States is uncommon and even where provisions formally exist, such as, in Portugal, the findings of the research undertaken for Task 1.5b suggest that cultural heritage issues were unlikely to be assessed at this stage. Both Spain and Greece also have specific legislation for monitoring however no information has been obtained for this project to assess how effective these procedures are in relation to cultural heritage issues.


**Article 10, Monitoring**

- Member States shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans and programmes in order, inter alia, to identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action

However, the SEA Directive only entered into force on July 21st 2001 and Member States have three years to implement its requirements. Currently only a few Member States have specific SEA legislation in place and information relating to this area, and more specifically to the consideration of cultural heritage at this stage, was not available at the time of writing.

### 3.2 State-of-the-art

Review of existing literature reveals what appears to be a longstanding consensus, amongst EIA professionals, regarding the benefits of post-evaluation within the EIA process (Sadler 1988; UNECE 1990; Canter 1993; Arts 1998; Dipper et al. 1998; Arts, Caldwell et al. 2000). The prime objectives commonly cited, to extol the benefits of post-decision monitoring and evaluation programmes, are:

- to check the accuracy of predictions with a view to improving prediction techniques
- to monitor compliance with agreed conditions and regulations
- to ensure mitigation measures are implemented and to provide learning opportunities for improving mitigation measures on future projects
- to provide feedback to decision makers about the effectiveness of their actions
- to identify unforeseen impacts before irreversible damage occurs

Despite the generally acknowledged benefits of post-evaluation and the view that it should form an integral part of the EIA process (Culhane 1993; Gilpin 1995; Barrow 1997), in practice procedures are rarely conducted.
An examination of case studies for four projects in Australia (Morrison-Saunders 1996) concluded that the implementation of ongoing monitoring and management programmes was instrumental to the successful achievement of the project and environmental performance objectives. Wood considers that the absence of any requirement, within the EIA Directive, for post-decision monitoring and evaluation has resulted in a failure to maximise the potential for learning from experience within the EIA process in Europe (Wood 1999a; Wood 2000). Even in the few countries where post-evaluation is mandatory there seems to be little incentive for undertaking it (Arts 1998) or often it only takes place for impacts that fall under the remit of specific legislation (Bird and Therivel 1996). In a recent study on EIA follow-up undertaken in South Africa (Hulett and Diab 2002) interviews were conducted with EIA practitioners and a small selection of environmental officers, and regional and conservation authority representatives. Surprisingly, relatively few of those interviewed (4 out of the 28 interviewees) considered that a legally-based approach was necessary in order for follow-up to be successful. The most popular model suggested was that of a partnership approach to follow-up, involving interested and affected parties in the monitoring and auditing. Issues relating to public participation in the post-evaluation phase of EIA and SEA are discussed in depth in section 5.

Research has also shown that in the cases where post-evaluation does occur, its effectiveness is often questionable. A study by Wood et al (2000) found that in the 28 projects examined 377 of the 865 predictions were not auditable, primarily due to a lack of data and only 150 of the predictions made had monitoring proposals attached. More reassuringly, the majority of the impacts that were auditable were found to be ‘accurate’ or ‘nearly accurate’ (79%) and only six unpredicted impacts were found. Another study by Bisset and Tomlinson found similar results, in that, in the cases they studied 82% of the auditable predictions were deemed to be accurate however, only 12% of the total predictions were auditable (Bisset and Tomlinson 1988). Numerous other studies have reached similar conclusions, with low levels of auditable predictions but a generally high level of accuracy for those impact predictions that can be assessed (Bailey et al. 1992; Bird and Therivel 1996; Dipper et al. 1998; Morrison-Saunders and Bailey 2000).

Research relating to post-evaluation of cultural heritage impacts is sparse. Two recent studies undertaken in Scotland (Baxter 2002) and Sweden (Bond et al. 2002), examined the consideration of cultural heritage within Environmental Impact Statements, concluding in both cases that coverage was poor. Each study had inherent flaws in that the sample sizes were small, 25 in the Scottish study and 7 in the Swedish study and the environmental impact statements analysed were in many ways self-selecting. The Scottish study only examined environmental impact statements that contained information on cultural heritage impacts whilst the Swedish study looked solely at cases where cultural heritage impacts were of immediate importance. However, this specific selection of environmental impact statements that contained direct reference to cultural heritage in fact serves to overstate, rather than underplay, the importance and coverage given to these issues, which leads to the conclusion that in reality the situation is even less positive than reported. Although individually each study provides limited evidence, when considered together and in conjunction with the research undertaken for Task 1.5b of this project they provide more compelling evidence that cultural heritage is poorly served within the EIA process in general and is primarily limited to the assessment of built culture (Bond et al. 2002). Although both the Scottish and Swedish studies only examined the coverage of cultural heritage issues within the environmental impact statements themselves, it would follow that if cultural heritage is a field that has limited coverage within existing environmental impact statements then post-evaluation of cultural heritage issues will also be limited.

Post-evaluation procedures need to be developed throughout, and be integral to, the EIA process (Gilpin 1995; Barrow 1997) in order that by the time development consent is granted, the programme for post-development monitoring and evaluation has been defined. This view is shared by Petts who identifies four types
of monitoring and auditing; baseline monitoring, compliance monitoring, environmental management auditing, and cause-effect surveillance, each of which fulfills specific functions at different stages of project implementation but the overlap and common objectives between them are necessary to attain more effective prediction and evaluation of impacts (Petts and Eduljee 1994).

As with the perceived benefits of post-evaluation, there appears to be general consensus regarding the necessary components of a successful procedure (UNECE 1990; Spellerberg 1991; Clark 1996; Dipper et al. 1998; Shepherd 1998; Bond 2000). Factors, such as, the purpose of the monitoring programme, who it is being done for, why it is being done, for example, to check compliance with legislation or development consent conditions, need to be considered at the beginning of the process. In addition to the objectives of the monitoring programme, the impacts to be studied, the monitoring sites, the data to be collected (when and what) and how these data will be analysed all need to be clearly defined prior to the inception of the monitoring programme. Studies to assess feasibility in relation to costs, data collection, storage and the suitability of the proposed programme to meet the objectives, along with the collection of pre-development baseline data, are all required prior to the main monitoring programme.

It can be seen therefore, that although specific literature relating to post-evaluation of cultural heritage impacts is sparse, there is general consensus upon the procedures and components necessary for the implementation of an effective post-evaluation programme. In addition common problems that prevent successful monitoring of impacts have also been highlighted in numerous studies that will hopefully prevent the same errors being made in the procedure developed for the SUIT project.

4. Post-project evaluation and monitoring procedures for cultural heritage

4.1 Introduction

The apparent lack of post-evaluation procedures specific to the field of cultural heritage, and indeed, the paucity of post-evaluation of projects in general has implications for the SUIT project.

Firstly, the procedures developed will not be constrained by current practice and preconceived ideas relating to what cultural heritage encompasses. Consequently, the tool developed will be able to address cultural heritage in its broadest form rather than being confined to narrow aspects, such as, listed buildings and designated sites.

The tools developed in the course of the SUIT project, therefore, have the potential to influence the consideration of cultural heritage in the post-evaluation stage of both EIA and SEA practice. This is of particular importance in the case of SEA procedures where, as Directive 2001/42/EC is transposed into Member States legislation, post-evaluation procedures will become a mandatory stage of the SEA process. However, because of the current lack of post-evaluation of projects, due to its non-mandatory status within the EIA Directive and the EIA legislation of most Member States, initial uptake of the procedures developed for this project could be limited. No matter how well defined, relevant and easy to apply the tool developed is, if no post-project monitoring and evaluation is taking place at all then it is unlikely that post-evaluation of impacts on cultural heritage will occur.

The value of this project to this stage of the EIA /SEA process is in being at the forefront in the development of the procedures that will be required with adoption of the SEA Directive. The work also has the potential to bring cultural heritage issues to the fore and by providing a defined procedure for properly taking these issues into account. This will hopefully ensure that where the post-evaluation of projects is occurring, either as a
requirement of individual Member States legislation or as an example of best practice, that cultural heritage issues are considered more fully than at present.

The development of post-evaluation procedures within the SUIT project is an opportunity to develop tools compatible with those developed for predicting impacts. Research on post-evaluation makes it clear that most impacts cannot be audited at a later date because the predictions were not presented in an auditable form. SUIT recognises this and uses post-evaluation to influence the prediction techniques developed to ensure that, where best practice prevails in spite of lack of legal requirement, post-evaluation will be possible.

The parameters selected for monitoring and the subsequent follow-up are necessarily constrained and defined by the assessment techniques developed for the earlier phases of this project.

4.2 The EIA and SEA processes

The figures given below outline both the EIA and SEA processes and highlight the steps at which the SUIT project can provide useful input, into the process, in relation to the assessment of cultural heritage. These figures are intended as a quick reference of the EIA and SEA processes for use in conjunction with the draft monitoring procedure given in section 4.3.

Figure 1 was adapted from the EU Guidance for Screening in the EIA process (ERM, 2001) for Task 1.5b (Report on the EU application of EIA / SEA procedures within urban areas) and is also used in Task 3.1 (Draft EA procedure applicable to historical areas active conservation) of the SUIT project. The second figure, relating to the SEA process, whilst using the same basic format as the first, was developed solely for use within this project. Both figures, in addition to outlining the basic steps of the processes, provide specific information from the Directives and also highlight the stages where the methodologies and guidance produced by the SUIT project can enhance the procedures in relation to the assessment of cultural heritage.

The shaded areas in both figures indicate the stages that are mandatory under the EU EIA and SEA Directives. The stages which are not shaded may be also be mandatory under individual Member States legislation but the situation is very variable (see Task 1.5b). As can be seen in Figure 2 monitoring is mandatory under the SEA Directive (Article 10 (1)) however, Member States have until 2004 to transpose the Directive into their national legislation and therefore, monitoring is not necessarily part of current SEA practice in all Member States.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY STAGES</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Preparation</td>
<td>The developer prepares the proposals for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification to Competent Authority</td>
<td>In some MS there is a requirement for the developer to notify the CA in advance of the application for development consent. The developer may also do this voluntarily and informally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>The CA makes a decision on whether EIA is required. The Screening decision must be recorded and made public. Cultural heritage issues are considered at this stage in many Member States (in theory) and should be one of the determinants in reaching a decision; our guidance should help authorities identifying the determinants for cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Our guidance for this stage can only be based on voluntary desired practice as, in the majority of Member States, the competent authority has the opportunity to comment at this stage but this is often at the discretion of the developer. Consultation with stakeholders is desirable at this stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>Cultural heritage assessment procedures would enable the development of best practice and ensure that the information submitted meets the requirements of the EIS review. Material assets and cultural heritage have to be covered in the study and our guidance needs to advise how to do this in a resource-effective way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Environmental</td>
<td>In most MS the environmental information is presented in the form of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS should ideally contain the information detailed in Annex IV, but only has to contain the information set out in Article 5(3). Our guidance, in the context of the SUIT project, needs to use the information requirements of Annex IV, paragraph 3 meaning we need to advise how to carry out studies which will provide information for the EIS to detail impacts on material assets, including the architectural and archaeological heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Adequacy of the</td>
<td>In some MS there is a formal requirement for independent review of the adequacy of the environmental information before it is considered by the CA. In other MS the CA is responsible for determining whether the information is adequate. A cultural heritage checklist for this stage would enable the cultural heritage assessment to be made in a systematic fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Information</td>
<td>We need to provide guidance on procedures for identifying the stakeholders to be consulted on cultural heritage issues, and techniques for consulting effectively on cultural heritage issues. The time available for comment and consultation varies greatly between MS, as does the means of consultation. Currently the Directive only requires consultation at the decision stage, but this will change due to the Aarhus Convention and we need to guide authorities on consultation at the scoping stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Statutory</td>
<td>The environmental information and the results of consultations must be considered by the CA in reaching its decision on the application for development consent (Article 8). We can help in this step by being clear about how to define a significant impact in our guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Authorities, Other</td>
<td>The decision must be made available to the public including the reasons for it and a description of the measures that will be required to mitigate adverse environmental effects (Article 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested Parties and the Public</td>
<td>This is not mandatory in most MS and when it does occur cultural heritage issues are rarely taken into account. The production of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assessment procedures for this stage could greatly enhance current practice.

Abbreviations: CA = Competent Authority; MS = Member State.

Figure 1 The Environmental Impact Assessment Process (Adapted from 'EU Guidance on EIA Screening' June 2001) Environmental Resources Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY STAGES</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan or Programme Preparation</strong></td>
<td>Draft plan or programme prepared by an authority at national, regional or local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening</strong></td>
<td>The Member State makes the decision on whether an SEA of the plan or programme is required, the screening decision, including reasons for not requiring an environmental assessment, must be made available to the public (Article 3). Cultural heritage is specifically mentioned in Annex II. Criteria for determining the likely significance of effects referred to in Article 3(5). We need indicators here which will examine potential impacts on cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation of assessment framework</strong> (scoping)</td>
<td>The authorities referred to in Article 6(3) shall be consulted when deciding the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the Environmental Report (Article 5(4)). In determining the scope of the assessment, the relevant policies, plans and programmes to the plan/programme to be assessed need to be identified (both international and national policies). The key issues and options which need to be resolved by the plan need to be identified, as do the cultural heritage indicators which will be used in the environmental/sustainability assessment process. The public should be involved in this stage and we need to devise appropriate consultation mechanisms. Note that these two stages are likely to be repeated in a cyclical way. The Environmental Report should lead to changes in the Plan/Programme, requiring further assessment. This loop will be exited in practice once the assessment has improved the Plan/Programme to an acceptable level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Report</strong></td>
<td>The information required is referred to in Annex I of the Directive and specifically includes cultural heritage (Annex I (f)). We could produce a model entry for such a report here to illustrate what should be covered. The Report will detail the results of applying the assessment framework to the plan/programme and will consider the significant effects of implementing it in its current form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation with Designated Authorities and the Public</strong></td>
<td>Article 6 lays down the provisions for consultation with designated authorities (paragraph 3) and members of the public (paragraph 4). Opportunity to express opinion on both the draft plan or programme and the environmental report are required. Article 7 refers to consultations with other member states affected. Our role here is to indicate how best to carry out consultations related to cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Adequacy of the Environmental Information</strong></td>
<td>Article 12(2) of the Directive requires that Member States report back to the European Commission on measures taken to ensure the Environmental Reports are of sufficient quality. We therefore need to develop an Environmental Report review framework with respect to cultural heritage. This may be combined with the previous step?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Making</strong></td>
<td>The Environmental Report (Article 5), opinions expressed in consultations (Article 6) and the results of transboundary consultations (Article 7) shall all be taken into account during the preparation of the plan or programme and prior to its adoption or submission to the legislative process (Article 8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Article 9 of the Directive states that, Member States shall ensure that, when a plan or programme is adopted the authorities consulted under Article 6(3), the public and any Member States consulted under Article 7 are informed. The items to be made available are: the plan or programme as adopted; a statement summarising the rationale behind the decision including consultations, alternatives and environmental considerations; and the measures concerning monitoring.

Member States shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans and programmes in order, *inter alia* to identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action (Article 10 (1)). We need to be able to suggest monitoring frameworks which will allow effects on cultural heritage to be checked and referenced against the predictions made in the Environmental Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The highlighted steps must be followed in all Member States under Directive 2001/42/EC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2 The Strategic Environmental Assessment Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Procedure

The procedure outlined in Figure 3 below and described overleaf is an adaptation of formats that are commonly cited within the literature (see section 3.2 above). The italic text in the figure indicates the actions required at each stage of the EIA / SEA procedure in order to implement successful post-evaluation procedures. Stages in the procedure where public participation (in relation to the monitoring programme only) is appropriate are marked with (PP), a full discussion of public participation within the monitoring and post-evaluation stage of EIA / SEA can be found in section 5. The suggested levels of public participation are an ideal to be aimed for, and as such, it will not necessarily be achieved in all Member States or in each individual plan, programme or project. However, individual cases may also allow for greater levels of participation than those suggested here, for example, active public participation in data collection may at times be appropriate or in some cases even necessary. Specific methodologies that have been developed during the course of the SUIT project and indicators appropriate for use in the assessment of cultural heritage that could be applied to stages in the monitoring procedure are given in Figure 4. The two figures have to be used in combination with each other, indicators suitable for each specific project or plan need selecting from Figure 4 to meet the requirements of each step of the monitoring procedure specified in Figure 3. The specific combination of indicators will vary from case to case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring procedure</th>
<th>Stage in EIA process</th>
<th>Stage in SEA process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Define the objectives for monitoring e.g. Prediction accuracy, compliance, management</td>
<td>Scoping stage</td>
<td>Preparation of assessment framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Define the scope of the monitoring</td>
<td>Scoping stage</td>
<td>Preparation of assessment framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legislation</td>
<td>In order to ensure that a viable monitoring programme is designed these issues require consideration at the scoping phase.</td>
<td>The key issues and options which need to be resolved by the plan need identifying as do cultural heritage indicators for use in the assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevance to objectives</td>
<td>Monitoring is not mandatory under the EIA Directive but is included in the legislation of some Member States.</td>
<td>Monitoring is mandatory under Directive 2001/42/EC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine monitoring sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impacts predicted that need consideration in the environmental assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Success of mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residual impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational issues</td>
<td>These have to be considered at the scoping stage but require finalising when development consent is granted</td>
<td>These have to be considered during the preparation of the assessment framework but require finalising before the plan or programme is adopted. The monitoring provisions have to be announced as part of the announcement of decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Methodologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measurements – how, who, where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currently available data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility – constraints, objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Environmental assessment and</td>
<td>Environmental assessment and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Baseline data, new and existing.** | environmental report  
*Baseline data requires collection prior to development consent and project implementation* | environmental report  
*Baseline data requires collection prior to implementation of plan or programme.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(PP) Finalisation of the monitoring programme and attachment of conditions to the permission of consent.</strong></td>
<td>Development consent</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Data collection**  
- Ongoing data collection for analysis | Monitoring programme | Monitoring programme |
| **(PP) Evaluation**  
- Determine trends  
- Relationships between activities and impacts | Monitoring programme  
*Post-evaluation* | Monitoring programme  
*Post-evaluation* |
| **(PP) Reporting and action**  
- Actions to mitigate adverse impacts  
- Documentation  
- Alterations to future monitoring programmes. | Monitoring programme  
*Post-evaluation, consultations and remedial action.* | Monitoring programme  
*Post-evaluation, consultations and remedial action. Plan or programme amendment if required.* |

Figure 3 Monitoring Procedure for EIA and SEA

4.3.1 Definition of the objectives of the monitoring programme.

The objectives of the monitoring programme need defining during the scoping and preparation of assessment framework stages of the EIA and SEA processes. This early consideration of the purpose and requirements of the monitoring programme will increase the likelihood that an effective programme that serves the specific needs of the project, plan or programme can be designed. Monitoring may be required for a variety of reasons, for example, to check compliance with legislation or development conditions; to check the accuracy of impact predictions; to identify unforeseen impacts before irreversible damage occurs; to ensure mitigation measures are implemented; and, to provide feedback to decision makers about the effectiveness of their actions.

4.3.2 Defining the scope of the monitoring programme.

Once the objectives of the monitoring programme have been decided the scope of the programme has to be defined. This definition will enable the key issues and options that require consideration to be included in the environmental assessment. Areas such as, legislation covering the existence of listed buildings and protected areas, or potential impacts, for example, alterations in the social structure of an area or enhanced / diminished access to cultural facilities or social spaces, will need to be identified during the scoping / preparation of assessment framework to ensure their inclusion in the environmental assessment and hence allow inclusion in consequent post-evaluation. The specific sites at which monitoring will take place will also require identification at this stage.
4.3.3 Operational issues

As with the objectives and scope of the monitoring programme, operational issues such as, the variables to be monitored, methodologies, the frequency and location of data collection, who will collect the data, where will it be stored and what data are already available, all need to be considered early in the EIA / SEA processes. The feasibility of collecting the data in order to monitor the desired impacts will also require consideration, for example, any constraints arising from financial, time or available expertise conditions or the absence of methodologies to realistically monitor the predicted impacts. These issues are of particular importance for the assessment of cultural heritage issues. Whilst it may be feasible to monitor factors like physical damage to existing buildings from, for example, increased traffic flows, or changes in social structure or employment within an area, other issues such as, public perception, attitudes and use of an area or building may be more difficult, time consuming and costly to measure and analyse. These issues all require early consideration in order that they can be finalised when development consent is granted or before a plan or programme is adopted.

4.3.4 Data collection.

The collection of data necessary for an effective monitoring programme can be divided into two distinct phases. Firstly, baseline data needs to be obtained during the environmental assessment stage of the EIA / SEA processes. Existing data will need to be identified and any extra data required in order to assess the potential impacts will require collection at this stage. A commonly cited reason for the failure of monitoring programmes (see section 3.2) is that of insufficient or unavailable baseline data with which to make subsequent comparisons.

The second phase of data collection, is the collection within the monitoring programme itself. This data will be part of an ongoing process of data collection, analysis, evaluation and action.

The actual data to be collected and the frequency, location and method of collection will have been defined in the monitoring programme at the time of development consent or plan / programme implementation.

4.3.5 Evaluation

Successful evaluation will be dependent upon the objectives and scope of the monitoring programme, and the quality and appropriateness of the data collected. Data collected to evaluate impacts may be used to determine the severity or existence of predicted impacts, to analyse trends and to determine relationships between activities and impacts.

4.3.6 Reporting and action

After the analysis and evaluation of the data collected the final stages of the post-evaluation process involve taking necessary action, documentation and reporting. Remedial actions and mitigation programmes may be required to offset or reduce adverse impacts. The monitoring programme may require adjustment to incorporate provisions for unexpected impacts or to remove or reduce monitoring for predicted impacts that did not arise. The findings of the monitoring programme, the evaluation of the data collected, the accuracy of the impact predictions, actions taken as a result of the findings and changes made to the subsequent monitoring programme all need to be documented and reported in a manner appropriate to its target audience.
4.4 Assessment methodologies and indicators

Throughout the course of the SUIT project indicators and specific methodologies have been selected and developed to meet the needs of EIA and SEA in relation to the assessment and proper consideration of cultural heritage. The following table shows the indicators and assessment techniques that can be applied to meet the needs of the different stages of the monitoring procedure within the EIA / SEA framework. The work package reports which provide the details of how these indicators can be measured are indicated in brackets. The indicators selected and assessment methodologies used will vary on a case by case basis dependent upon the nature of the project, plan or programme and the specific conditions of the location in which the action is taking place. The specific cultural heritage impacts that require monitoring will be identified in the scoping / preparation of assessment framework stages of the EIA / SEA process and should reflect the cultural heritage issues that exist within the area and are of concern to the local population and heritage experts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in EIA / SEA process &amp; Indicator / assessment methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although indicators have been developed to aid the screening process (see for example, Task 2.1- Identifying the relations between historical areas and perceived values: Introduction to issues and indicators) in identifying significant cultural heritage issues, they are not applicable for use in the monitoring programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoping / Preparation of assessment framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the indicators suggested to help decide whether a public perception study (see Task 2.1) is required could be used to provide useful baseline data and form part of the long term monitoring programme. (data source / measurement method)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existence of designated building / area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Buildings / areas affected by the development Statutory records to identify presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible impacts on socio-economic factors / social structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic flows (private, public, commercial Physical survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedestrian flows Physical survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of residential units Statutory records / field survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of business units Statutory records / field survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- History of public comment Previous public responses to developments within the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Image of area Press articles, random survey of public, historical sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visibility of site Lines of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other elements that may be considered at the scoping stage include:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existence of cultural facilities e.g. places of worship, community centres, schools etc. Physical survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental assessment and environmental report / Monitoring programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators selected from the following can be used to provide baseline information, to predict impacts and to form a basis for the monitoring programme. The indicators given in the section above can be developed in relation to the proposed plan or project to provide data for monitoring actual or potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existence of designated building / area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Buildings / areas affected by the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Direct physical threats e.g. demolition / alteration/ change of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential indirect impacts via, for example, change in traffic flows, pedestrian flows, level of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible impacts on socio-economic factors / social structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic flows (private, public, commercial Physical survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intended changes e.g. from alterations to infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unforeseen alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedestrian flows Physical survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decrease in pedestrian use e.g. Through increased road traffic, physical safety concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase in pedestrian use, e.g. through decreased road traffic, pedestrian areas, open spaces, improved night time lighting / security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of residential units Statutory records / field survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changes in number / type of residential units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Public participation in the post-evaluation procedure

5.1 Introduction

This section will examine the role of public participation in the post-evaluation procedure. The methodologies used and levels of participation for both the monitoring and follow-up stages will vary greatly between Member States and also from case to case depending upon the individual needs of each project, plan or programme and the nature and level of public participation in the earlier stages of the EIA / SEA process. The methods and participation practices discussed in this section are, therefore, an overview of the types of participation that could be employed in post-evaluation rather than a definitive list of the practices which should be used. The most appropriate methods of public participation for each EA will be defined by the specific needs of the individual case. Suggestions of best practice for levels of public participation during the post-evaluation procedure are outlined in Figure 3 in Section 4.3 and will be discussed in greater depth below. As can be seen in Figure 3 data collection has not been highlighted as an area where public participation is feasible. However, there may be exceptional circumstances where public involvement in this stage of the process is appropriate, for example, in the UK the Common Birds Census by the British Trust for Ornithology has been in operation since 1962 using volunteers to collect the data and this, along with other volunteer-based surveys, has
provided a wealth of data about the state of British bird populations and trends. Therefore, it is possible that in individual projects, plans and programmes there may be areas of concern where there is scope for active public participation in data collection, for example, to monitor changes in use of cultural facilities.

5.2 Current practice

The literature relating to public participation in the monitoring and post-evaluation phase of the EIA / SEA process is sparse and the little that there is predominantly relates to suggestions of good practice (Morrison-Saunders et al, 2001; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003; Arts et al, 2001) and analysis of examples of current practice (Austin, 2000; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2001; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003; Arts et al, 2001; Hulett and Diab, 2002). There is general consensus that active public participation in the post-decision phase of the EIA process is beneficial for all the stakeholders involved and at the very least stakeholders should be informed of follow-up outcomes but ideally direct involvement is desirable (Austin, 2000; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2001; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003; Arts et al, 2001; Hulett and Diab, 2002) and that it is often the public that drives the motivation for follow-up to occur (Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003). Morrison-Saunders identifies three types of stakeholder, proponents, regulators and the community (which encompasses a range from individuals up to international pressure groups) and considers that the community is a resource in its own right.

Public pressure for the implementation of a post-evaluation process can occur for a variety of reasons. The developer may wish to appear to be seen as ‘green’ or to meet community interests and expectations (Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003). Alternatively, unsolicited public interest or scrutiny may be the driving force required by regulators or proponents to instigate follow-up programmes (Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003; Arts et al, 2000; Arts et al, 2001) especially in cases where the development obviously infringes upon the local population, for example, upon their health (Ross et al, 2001) or quality of life (Arts, 1998). A general desire for greater transparency, public accountability and increased information has also provided the impetus for the introduction of follow-up procedures, both at individual project level and in the cases of Hong Kong and Portugal within procedural arrangements (Arts et al, 2001; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003).

There is general consensus that public participation in the EIA process as a whole is beneficial for the preparation of valid and reliable impact assessments (Conner, 2000; Palerm, 2000; Manchester EIA Centre, 1995) and there has been a general move in recent years towards a more participatory approach in the process (Monnikhof & Edelenbos, 2001; Enserink & Monnikhof, 2000). The Manchester University EIA Leaflet Series (Leaflet 10: Consultation and Public Participation within EIA) cites the benefits of public participation as being; an increase in the quality of the decision; reduction in costs and delays; achievement of transparency of decisions and commitment to decisions; and, avoidance of public controversy and confrontations (Manchester EIA Centre, 1995). The enhancement of democracy is a further reason given for increased participation, both as a benefit and as a basic right of those affected by projects (Enserink & Monnikhof, 2000; Del Furia and Wallace-Jones, 2000; Monnikhof & Edelenbos, 2001). Palerm (2000) provides a detailed ‘best practice’ guideline for participation throughout the EIA process, however, this guideline ends at EIS review and contains no provisions for the post-decision phase of the process. However, various components, such as, notification procedures, the identification of stakeholders and the equality of all participants at meetings will be of equal validity to participation in the post-evaluation stage (Palerm, 2000).

More specifically, within the post-evaluation phase of the EIA process the cited benefits include: local capacity building; enabling cumulative health and local community impacts to be successfully addressed; the sharing of traditional and local knowledge; enhancement and recognition of socio-cultural values; and, improved
communication between all stakeholders, public, scientists, regulators and proponents (Arts et al, 2001; Austin, 2000; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003).

Arts et al (2001) and Morrison-Saunders et al (2003) have examined the procedural arrangements implemented in Hong Kong and Portugal, which make provisions for independent follow-up studies which include an element of public accountability. In Portugal individual citizens and NGOs may raise concerns and make complaints about environmental impacts (Arts et al, 2001) whilst in Hong Kong a user-friendly web based complaints system has been introduced (Arts et al, 2001; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003). The Hong Kong system grew from public demand for transparency, growing popularity with the internet and the wish to increase efficiency and the e-government policy. The new system has increased public participation as it no longer requires visits to offices and paper based resources. Information from major projects is placed on the unlimited access website which allows for real-time monitoring and availability of data. Two-way communication is also permitted as the public can make their comments / complaints via the website. An additional advantage is an improvement to the knowledge base as all the information is easily retrievable (Arts et al, 2001; Morrison-Saunders et al, 2003).

Austin examined two case studies in America, in which post-evaluation procedures were implemented decades after the original developments occurred (Austin, 2000) and illustrated the benefits that public participation can provide for individuals, institutions and communities. In the case of the Glen canyon dam and its impacts upon the Colorado River, cultural resources were of particular importance and warranted a specific long-term adaptive monitoring programme with American-Indian tribes playing a key role, including one tribe participating in the training of river guides to change their practices so that they preserve the spiritual as well as physical well-being of sites. The tribes identify areas of concern and suggest mitigation measures (one ceremonial site has been placed off-limits to non- American Indian visitors). The participation by the tribes has resulted in numerous benefits including improved communication between the tribes, agencies and scientists and increased local capacity with the responsibility for the monitoring programme shifted to tribes with the tribes monitoring their resources with help from consultants as required. Another benefit has been a reconnection with the region with elders, young adults and youth getting together in culturally significant places and ways visiting places about which traditional and modern stories are shared, the tribes interpretations are also shared with others increasing the general level of knowledge and understanding.

Ross (2000) provides a further example of a monitoring and management programme that includes active public participation. An independent environmental monitoring agency was established as a watchdog for a major diamond mining project in Canada. It is responsible to seven organisations, including the Canadian government and four aboriginal tribes, who are all involved in the selection and appointment of its members. Its aims include bringing the traditional knowledge and concerns of aboriginal people and the public to the attention of the government and the diamond mine operators and keeping them informed about the agencies activities and findings.

As mentioned in Section 3.2 of this report post-evaluation of projects is rarely conducted and although there is general consensus about both the benefits of post–evaluation and of public participation in this process practice is very variable. Huleet and Diab conducted a survey of environmental consultants in South Africa about EIA follow-up practices, and found that only 17% identified regarded following through with interested and affected parties as part of the process (Huleet and Diab, 2002). They also examined four follow-up models and concluded that the partnership approach, which uses local forums and panels, satisfies more sustainability criteria than other methods.
5.3 Methods of public participation

Methods for public participation and the issues surrounding participation, for example, conflict resolution and uncertainty management, in the EIA / SEA process are discussed in greater depth in the Task 3.2 - Screening and scoping procedures. Further information is also contained in Task 1.3 - Description of historical area active conservation scenarios. An in-depth evaluation of public participation in the follow-up stage of the St-Léonard revitalisation plan (Belgium), which involved the organisation of five focus groups comprising inhabitants of the quarter, is contained within the annex to this report.

There are problems inherent in many methods of public participation, the most common being the selection (or self-selection) of the participants. Even methods designed to elicit the views of a wide cross section, for example, questionnaire surveys and citizens juries, can result in the views expressed being unrepresentative as there is no obligation to respond / attend. People who feel strongly about an issue are more likely to participate, as are those who have spare time or who are confident and articulate. Other issues that may create barriers to public participation are: physical access and general accessibility; lack of tradition of involvement; cultural and social barriers; the committee culture of local authorities and, past track record of raised and then dropped expectations.

The types of public participation that may be appropriate in the post-evaluation procedure are outlined briefly below. The method(s) selected for use in each individual case will vary depending upon the nature of the project, plan or programme and not all methods will be appropriate for use in each situation. The method(s) chosen will be influenced not just by the nature of the proposal but also by common practice in the locality, expertise and by financial and time constraints.

Questionnaire surveys

Questionnaire surveys can be used to canvas the opinions of a large number of people relatively cheaply, however, they require careful design in order to avoid bias and misinterpretation of the questions. The selection of people to target for the survey can be undertaken in numerous ways: blanket coverage of all households within the area affected by the plan, project or programme; random selection of households from the electoral role; structured random selection, for example, to ensure that the people selected match the demographic make-up of the area but the individuals approached are selected at random and, targeted selection, for example, of experts or of members of the public who use a facility or area affected by the proposal. In addition to problems of bias and misinterpretation that can arise from badly designed questionnaires other problems include: low response rates (in relation to postal surveys); self-selection, only people that have the time or feel strongly about the issue respond and, the depth of information that can be obtained is limited.

However, the use of questionnaire surveys may be appropriate at various stages of the post-evaluation process, for example, during the scoping phase of the EA procedure to identify public concerns and monitoring issues, prior to development consent / plan or programme approval to check the issues identified in the monitoring programme cover those that the public are concerned about and during the monitoring programme to check that the public are satisfied with the process and that no additional concerns have arisen.

Public meetings

Public meetings can be used to identify concerns of the public in the early stages of the EA process and to discuss the details of proposed monitoring programmes. The advantages of public meetings are that they can reach a varied audience and are relatively cheap to organise and run. However, they can be intimidating resulting in only those who are confident and articulate expressing opinions and, if there are strongly opposing views, they may become confrontational and be dominated by polarised outlooks.
Consultation drafts

The production of consultation drafts is a good way of providing detailed information to the public and interested parties. However, they can be limited in their application as only people who are literate, articulate and confident tend to respond. The circulation and availability of the drafts can also raise problems. Widespread circulation can be expensive but limiting circulation to those who request copies results in the risk that only those who understand the system and actively monitor for news on developments become aware of the availability of the drafts and therefore the results can be unrepresentative. Making drafts available via electronic means reduces the cost of circulation but excludes those who do not have access to computer facilities and the internet. Consultation drafts can be used to canvass public opinion in the early stages of the development of the post-evaluation and monitoring programme and prior to the development consent / plan or programme approval to check that the proposals reflect the concerns of the public.

Leaflets

Leaflets can be used to provide information to large numbers of people. They can be used to heighten awareness and to advertise opportunities for public participation, such as, public meetings, workshops and focus groups. Their use is, however, limited to the provision of information only and there is the risk that issues are oversimplified in order to make them readable.

Travelling / staffed exhibitions

Travelling and staffed exhibitions reduce the effort required by the public to get involved. They can involve the use of caravans or buses allowing for greater coverage of the area, reduced set up time and means they can be sited in very visible places, for example, shopping centre car parks. Alternatively, static exhibitions can be set up in village halls or community centres. The availability of staff on hand enables explanation and discussion of the issues and comment forms can be used to get feedback and canvass the opinions of the public. Their use is probably most appropriate in the early stages of the EA process to raise awareness and inform the public of what is proposed and they could also be used at this stage to inform the public of other measures that will be adopted for community participation. As with other methods there is the problem that the people who attend are not representative of the community as a whole.

Focus groups

Focus groups are organised and facilitated by specialists who then provide a qualitative report. They allow the opportunity for open discussion and can be useful in providing deep consideration of issues. However, they are not statistically representative and, if the facilitator is inexperienced, strong individuals can dominate the group. Focus groups could be used at all stages of the monitoring and post-evaluation process.

Topic / working groups

Topic and working groups focus upon individual issues or areas of concern, they are a commonly used method of developing LA21 strategies or action plans. In the post-evaluation and monitoring procedure they could be used to design monitoring programmes once the areas of concern have been identified and also post-development / plan or programme implementation period to evaluate the effectiveness of the monitoring programme and to suggest alterations to the monitoring programme if required.

Panels

Panels are a standing body of volunteers who reflect the composition of the local community, they serve for a fixed period of time with the remit to comment on local authority decisions or proposals. Once they have been
created they can then be used to discuss and comment upon any decisions or proposals. Panels allow for attitudes and views to be monitored over time and ideally once set up should enable a working relationship to develop between the participants. They could be used throughout the development and implementation of the monitoring and post-evaluation procedure and to evaluate the effectiveness of the monitoring programme and suggest alterations to it if required. In common with other methods of public participation panels will not necessarily be representative as they will be self-selecting (volunteers) even if the general make-up reflects the local community in terms of age, gender, employment etc.

**Citizens’ Juries**

Citizens’ juries consist of randomly selected individuals who are asked to take the time to consider a specific issue or problem with the intention of ascertaining what the ‘ordinary person’ would think if they had enough time to consider an issue fully. They could be used at any stage in the design and implementation of the monitoring and post-evaluation procedure. As with other methods of participation there is no guarantee that the jury will be representative of the public as a whole, as, although the invitation to participate is done by random selection there is no obligation to attend therefore, the final make-up of the citizens’ jury will contain an element of self-selection.

**Key informant interviews**

This approach involves discussions, often via a semi-structured interview, with key persons in the local community, for example, members of local interest groups, community leaders and local ‘experts’. Key informant interviews could be used at any stage in the design and implementation of the monitoring and post-evaluation procedure. However, it raises issues, such as, who selects the key informants?, and, are their views representative of the community as a whole?

### 5.4 Levels of public participation

The levels of public participation and consultation employed in EIA / SEA are very variable not just between Member States but also from case to case and between regions within Member States. Task 1.5b – Report on the EU application of EIA / SEA procedures in urban areas, provides detail of both the current legislation and common practice relating to public participation throughout the whole EIA / SEA process in the Member States. The information contained in this report was obtained by a combination of questionnaire survey, literature review and legislation from government websites.

Unfortunately as monitoring and post-evaluation is a voluntary step under the EIA Directive and provision for it in Member States legislation is rare, for example, in Spain and Greece, no information relating to public participation at this stage was obtained from the questionnaire survey. The SEA Directive does contain mandatory post-evaluation but as yet has not been transposed into Member States legislation.

Figure 3 in Section 4.3 outlines the stages in the monitoring and post-evaluation process at which public participation is, or could be appropriate. In order to design an effective monitoring and post-evaluation procedure it is vital that it is considered from the earliest stages of the EIA / SEA process, with the objectives and scope of the monitoring programme being defined at the scoping / preparation of assessment framework stage.

### 6. Conclusions

The procedure given in this report is intended as a practical aid to the of assessment cultural heritage within the monitoring and post-evaluation stage of the EIA and SEA processes. More detailed information relating to the
specific methodologies used in this procedure can be found in the reports accompanying the earlier stages of work package 3 (Tasks 3.2, 3.3 & 3.4) and also from the reports produced for work package 2.

In the case of EIA monitoring and post-evaluation, the procedure outlined above can only be considered as a suggestion of ‘best practice’ as this is not a mandatory step within the EIA Directive. Some Member States do have mandatory provisions for monitoring and post-evaluation but the current literature and responses to a questionnaire undertaken for this study suggest that these are often poorly conducted.

However, within the SEA Directive this stage is mandatory and the procedure developed here will enable the assessment of a vital, but previously often neglected, component of impact monitoring and post-evaluation.
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Appendix I

An in-depth evaluation of public participation in the follow-up stage of the St-Léonard revitalisation plan (Belgium)