

## SUMMARY

### Testing and evaluating methods for working with social impacts in EIA

By: Sanne Vammen Larsen, Aalborg University; Helle Nielsen, Aalborg University; Ivar Lyhne, Aalborg University; Anne Merrild Hansen, Aalborg University

Below is a summary of VVMplus work package 5 and 6. In 2016 and 2017, three RE projects were used as pilot projects to test and evaluate initiatives and methods for working with social impacts in EIA. For each of the pilot projects the initiatives and methods are described in the table below. After the initiatives were carried out, they were evaluated based on interviews with key actors in the RE-projects.

Pilot project	Biogasplant at Lemming, Silkeborg Municipality	Wind turbines at Blåhøj, Ikast-Brande Municipality	Wind turbines at Lundsmark, Esbjerg Municipality
<b>Initiative</b>	Assessment of impacts on property value	Establishing a social baseline focussed on mapping the citizens' perception of the local community and its potentials and challenges	Mapping of extent and types of concerns and wishes in the local community
<b>Method</b>	Statistical analysis, interviews with realtors, interviews with citizens (which were not useful), and literature studies	Statistical analysis (which was not useful), and interviews with local citizens	Questionnaire among local citizens supplemented with a workshop (planned but not held as the project was abandoned)

All three pilot projects support a development in EIA, where social or socio-economic impacts play a stronger role. In two out of three pilot projects it is pointed out by the municipalities that they see benefits in reaching out to the citizens earlier than what is normal practice, in order to identify social issues and act on concerns. The table below gives an overview of benefits and disadvantages of the tested initiatives and methods in each pilot project.

Pilot project	Benefits	Disadvantages
<b>Biogasplant at Lemming, Silkeborg Municipality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can create focus on local values and mitigation measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data in rural areas is too limited for a statistical analysis of property value</li> <li>• There is a lack of anchoring through dialogue with the local community</li> </ul>
<b>Wind turbines at Blåhøj, Ikast-Brande Municipality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews give a detailed insight into the local community and its potentials and challenges</li> <li>• Makes the municipality reflect on their role in the process</li> <li>• Can contribute knowledge to the political level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource intensive if all citizens are to be reached</li> <li>• Creates expectations from citizens for follow-up on the process</li> <li>• "Only" gathering information, where attitudes do not get to clash in dialogue between citizens</li> </ul>
<b>Wind turbines at Lundsmark, Esbjerg Municipality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consulting a large part of the local citizens concerning social impacts</li> <li>• Potential for ownership of the assessment and suggestions for improvements</li> <li>• Uncovers perceptions and stakes in the community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The survey creates expectations for follow-up actions from proponent and municipality</li> <li>• The methods has potential bias' in relation to coordinated and "political answers"</li> </ul>

Based on the pilot projects, the experience of the project group is that the most useful approaches are those that involve the citizens directly. Analyses of social consequences cannot stand alone but are primarily valuable, when they are coupled with participatory methods and collaboration with citizens.

The pilot projects all focus on mitigating social impacts through uncovering and strengthening the values of the local community. Here lies a challenge relating to who should and could implement the mitigation measures, e.g. supporting the local association activities or making new bicycle paths. What possibilities do proponents and municipalities have? The experiences point towards the importance of dealing with this question early, so the citizens can see which of their input and wishes will be implemented and how.

The last experience based on the pilot projects is that the concerns and attitudes of the citizens are not static, but are created and changed in the dynamic processes in the local community. This means that a stakeholder analysis or a social baseline study should not be considered static, but rather as something that should be continuously worked on during the planning and EIA process. There is a need for improved understanding of how issues arise in the debate, and a need to shed light on certain issues depending on the current concerns of the citizens.