



# Association for Conflict Resolution Environment and Public Policy Section

## WINTER NEWSLETTER 2009

### In This Issue:

Annual EPP Conference.....	Page 1
Reader Participation.....	Page 1
EPP Section Opportunities.....	Page 1
Ad Hoc Working Group on the Future of Collaboration and Consensus on Public Issues.....	Page 2
Partnering to Preserve Wildlife Habitat: Case Studies and Best Practices.....	Page 4
University Network for Collaborative Governance.....	Page 7
Calendar of Upcoming Events.....	Page 10

### Mark your Calendars for the June 2009 EPP Conference!

#### Managing Climate Change through Collaborative Governance: The Use and Practice of Environmental Conflict Resolution in Addressing Policy Challenges Globally and Locally

The annual EPP Section Conference in Denver on June 11-13 promises to be an exciting event! Co-hosted by the University of Denver's Conflict Resolution Institute, this will be the premier opportunity of the year for our members to come together to learn from each other, network, debate, deliberate, and celebrate. But that's not all. Along with a wide range of environmental issues, we will focus on a topic of particular concern: climate change - the most visible, and arguably, most pressing environmental and public policy issue of our generation. Come join us as we examine our practice as it applies to this important issue and explore its implications for our work.

In addition to presentations and workshops, we will be offering a pre-conference training on mentoring, and are exploring other conference events, such as a state or national multi-stakeholder roundtable on ways to introduce collaborative methods into climate change decision-making, a free open public lecture, and a demonstration-project workshop/charrette for Denver region stakeholders.

See [CONFERENCE](#) on Page 8

#### A New Feature of the EPP Newsletter – Smashing the Reader-Writer Interface

By Jeff Edelstein, Newsletter Editor

We're pleased to present a new newsletter feature. Each issue will offer a topic related to the field of EPP Conflict Resolution for readers to write about: from a few sentences to a novella. In the subsequent newsletter, we will present the best submittals – those that are most thought-provoking, insightful, funny, or heart-warming, you name it! Also, all submittals will be posted on a new page of the website (unless you ask us not to include yours.) The first topic is **"change"**: what are the implications for the field of EPP resulting from the changing national and global landscapes? Read on for a description of this topic and some thought-provoking questions to respond to.

See [CHANGE](#) on Page 9

#### Get involved in the EPP Section!

Looking to make a difference and help the field of EPP Conflict Resolution? The EPP Section Leadership Council is seeking people for the following opportunities:

**Blog or bulletin board moderator:** The Website Development Committee is in the process of developing a new EPP website with interactive features such as blogs and bulletin boards. This is a great opportunity to help us create something brand new for our section. Contact Jeff Edelstein at [edelstein@south.net](mailto:edelstein@south.net).

**E-Conference planners:** The June EPP conference planners want to provide "virtual" opportunities for people to participate in the conference from afar. Virtual communications methods are a growing part of our field, for a variety of reasons, including economics and minimizing carbon emissions. Volunteers are

See [OPPORTUNITIES](#) on Page 8

## Improving Clarity on Collaboration and Consensus Building Processes: The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Future of Collaboration and Consensus on Public Issues

By Suzanne Orenstein, originally published in CBI Reports.

In 2006, CBI's founder, Larry Susskind, and CBI partner-consultant, Suzanne Orenstein, recognized the need for professionals working to apply various methods of consensus and collaboration on public issues to come together to discuss commonalities among their various approaches and future directions for collaborative approaches. Following a very successful Association for Conflict Resolution conference on deliberative democracy and its links to public policy consensus building, Susskind and Orenstein convened a group of leaders of organizations working to improve dialogue, deliberation, collaboration, and consensus building to explore common approaches and principles. The group met in person and by conference call several times over two years, and produced a consensus vision for collaboration and agreement on principles and prerequisites for effective collaborative work.

**Vision:** The vision of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Future of Collaboration and Consensus is for **inclusive, effective, and fair collaboration to become a routine part of governance and civic life**. Increasing the use of collaborative practices can help achieve a fairer and more inclusive society, which will strengthen democracy and result in better decisions being made and implemented.

**Working Group Members and Mission:** The Ad Hoc Working Group is a group of leaders of professional groups who represent diverse approaches to collaboration in public policy debates, but share a distinctive professional mission: helping people work together in the face of serious differences on issues of public importance. The Working Group has come together to advance the understanding and use of collaboration in the public sphere. The list of members is included above.

**Principles:** Bringing people together for constructive conversation about public issues is not new; indeed it is probably one of the oldest of human activities. There is a wide range of existing tools and processes for collaboration work in the public arena. The Working Group has identified several hallmarks of good collaborative process that reflect the notion that creating forums for genuine communication, study and collaborative work produces significant benefits.

**Direct interaction and communication.** Opportunities for constructive interaction are at the core of collaboration and dispute resolution. While communications and internet technologies help reach large numbers of people, they are usually best used to augment face-to-face dialogue and problem solving.

**Diversity of views.** Inclusive approaches to participation make sure all points of view among those affected are welcome and encouraged. Extra effort is frequently needed to ensure that sufficiently diverse views are represented, giving everyone the confidence that the major perspectives will be thoroughly discussed.

**“Done with, not done to.”** Collaboration creates forums where parties can work together voluntarily and have a voice in shaping the process itself. Suspicion and conflict are reduced if the structure and goals are transparent and not open to manipulation by one interest.

### List of Members

Peter Adler, Keystone Center  
 Gail Bingham, RESOLVE  
 Chris Carlson, Policy Consensus Institute  
 Susan Carpenter, Independent Facilitator  
 Cindy Cook, Adamant Accord and Association for Conflict Resolution  
 Frank Dukes, Institute for Environmental Negotiation, UVA  
 Don Edwards, Justice & Sustainability Associates  
 Michael Elliott, Environmental and Public Policy Section, Association for Conflict Resolution  
 Pat Field, Consensus Building Institute  
 Cameron Fraser, International Association of Facilitators  
 John Godec, International Association for Public Participation (IAP2)  
 Phil Harter, American Bar Association Administrative Law Section, and Center for Dispute Resolution, University of Missouri Law School  
 Sandy Heierbacher, National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation  
 Maggie Herzig, Public Conversations Project  
 Matt Leighninger, Deliberative Democracy Consortium  
 Michael Lewis, JAMS  
 Carolyn Lukensmeyer, America Speaks  
 Raphael Montalvo, Florida CR Consortium  
 Lucy Moore, Independent Facilitator  
 Suzanne Orenstein, Independent Facilitator, Co-Chair of Working Group  
 Bill Potapchuk, Community Building Institute  
 Susan Sherry, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento  
 Larry Susskind, Consensus Building Institute/Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School, MIT Dept. of Urban Studies and Planning, Co-Chair of Working Group  
 Elissa Tonkin, ADR Coordinator, U.S. EPA, New England

### ***Ad Hoc Working Group (continued)***

**Timely information.** Timely information that is accessible, both in terms of availability and understanding, helps ensure that all parties are empowered to be full participants and that factual issues are resolved in ways that are expeditious and clear to all.

**Mutually beneficial results.** Participants in any effort ask the basic question: does this outcome help achieve my goals? Collaborative efforts consciously work to ensure that the results are beneficial for all.

**Focus on results and action.** A good collaborative process keeps participants focused on achieving sustainable results – whether that result is improved relationships or actions that resolve problems. Clarity about the purpose of the effort is critical to matching the process to the desired results.

**Approaches to Collaboration:** The Working Group recognized that the diversity and multiplicity of approaches and practices for building consensus and collaboration on public issues can be confusing to those who seek to sponsor or structure collaborative efforts for specific situations. Working Group members developed an overview spectrum of the purposes, outcomes and prerequisites for success for various approaches to collaboration. The spectrum is being used in education and discussion forums with the members of the Working Group organizations and professional groups and can be seen at <http://www.mediate.com/acrepp/pg8.cfm>.

**Collaboration on Public Issues in the Future:** There is a growing recognition that the roles for dialogue and collaboration about public concerns are going to increase in coming years. Politically involved action groups, for example AARP, are using dialogue to build public consensus on economic and health policy in the US. Collaborative structures are being set up to focus the energy of corporations or NGOs on addressing climate change. Expertise in structuring collaborative forums and conversations is needed, whether through the use of impartial collaborative specialists, or through the skills of those working in the collaborative forums to self guide the collaboration.

The variety of opportunities for collaboration points to the need for increasing the knowledge, skills, and abilities for collaboration among those seeking to make progress through collaboration and dialogue on difficult public issues.

---

### ***Concluding Meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group By Suzanne Orenstein and Jeff Edelstein***

The final meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group took place in November of 2008 with the goal of checking in and comparing notes about prospects for collaboration and consensus building in the new administration. The following describes the highlights and outcomes of the group's discussions.

#### **Impacts of the recent election and economic crisis on the collaboration and consensus building field:**

There are opportunities, as funding constraints may make the administration and many sectors receptive to approaches that avoid long, costly legal disputes. The increased comfort of corporations and NGO's with collaborative approaches, combined with the distaste for the rancor of the last eight years, may be a force for more constructive approaches. Many of the previous administration's ideas for collaborative conservation have not been implemented; picking up on some of those might be an efficient way to move forward.

Society is shifting in major ways, and calls for collaboration will be part of the shift. International collaborative work will increase, as will the use of technology in collaborative processes. Energy for collaboration will come from the younger end of the political spectrum. We could be at a tipping point for collaboration and consensus.

But there are challenges. The Obama administration's concept of public engagement may not be the same as ours. The focus on reviving the economy may take precedence over collaborative initiatives. What's more, shortages of funds may push government sponsors away from large expansive projects and more towards providing support to convenors through coaching and advising. Lastly, some NGOs will be closing their doors as funding becomes scarce.

## ***Concluding Meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group (continued)***

### **Communicating about Our Work**

A further challenge lies in how we communicate about our work. Our words are too academic, and are ill-suited for talking to those outside the profession. Mediation sounds painful, like going to the dentist, as do other words we use in our spectrums. For young political activists, peacemaking approaches may not resonate, but leadership strategies will.

### **The Path Ahead**

So, how do we move ahead? Our messages should focus on better decisions, sustainable decisions, and winning through collaboration, and should be supported by examples illustrating the value and impact of collaboration. A recent report, *Strengthening Democracy*, developed by a bi-partisan, full-spectrum group of entities working on dialogue and political engagement, advocates a number of new civic engagement efforts, including a new White House Office for Civic Engagement. While there was some concern about whether this degree of institutionalization is desirable or effective, overall the working group members were supportive of this proposal.

It was noted that various White House initiatives, such as proposals for an Office for Urban and Metropolitan Affairs and an Office for Children and Youth, have civic engagement and collaboration embedded in them. The *Strengthening Democracy* report proposes a Public Engagement Act to analyze barriers to good public engagement in the federal government, and develop model legislation for state and local governments to use to promote civic engagement. Working Group members agreed to seek their organizations' support for the *Strengthening Democracy* report. An on-line coalition in support of the report will be developed by AmericaSpeaks and the International Association for Public Participation.

The Ad Hoc Working Group will probably discontinue meeting at this time. Several organizations and associations in the Working Group will establish a regular communication process, and Working Group members will continue to attend each others' conferences to promote the full range of collaboration tools. Lastly, questions to be explored at a later date include:

- What would a society that has fully embraced collaboration for public issues look like in 20 years? What skills will this society require of citizens and government?
- How can we promote and encourage dialogue between various generations of collaboration professionals?
- Can we develop a list of the ten most successful and understandable examples of collaborative work on public issues?

## **Partnering to Preserve Wildlife Habitat: Case Studies and Best Practices**

***By Cyndi Szymanski, Jamie Varner, and Maggie Ryan National Parks Conservation Association***

Wildlife protection and habitat preservation efforts often cross physical boundaries of natural areas spanning local, state, federal, and private lands. As a result, partnerships between different government agencies and nonprofit groups are often required to address these broad-reaching needs. But what defines a successful partnership? And how can those collaborative efforts protect wildlife habitat?

These questions were posed by the Restoring Healthy Parks committee at the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA). NPCA's mission is to protect National Parks for future generations, including protecting park land, water, air and wildlife. In working to protect wildlife, NPCA recognizes that wildlife adaptation will be amplified in coming years due to climate change. To address this emerging issue, National Park Service (NPS) superintendents recognize that they must successfully partner with organizations outside park boundaries. To help them achieve this task, NPCA set out to provide advice that would help superintendents enter into successful cross-border and inter-agency partnerships.

Consultants within NPCA's Center for Park Management (CPM) were approached to address these questions, drawing on their expertise on environmental issues and organizational efficiency. CPM uses fact-based analysis to improve management capacity and organizational effectiveness to promote positive change within the Park Service. The project goal was to provide clear examples and recommend practical steps for superintendents and others.

CPM began the work by studying three successful wildlife habitat preservation partnerships. The case studies selected represent diverse attributes of partnerships such as geography, focal species, goals, date of establishment, and number and diversity of partners. The Greater Uwharries Conservation Partnership, focused on the Piedmont area in central North Carolina, was created to provide a forum for collaboration and information exchange among a variety of federal, state, and local agencies to protect this natural resource-rich area. The Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee, located in the Northern Rockies region, was created from a federal mandate and is primarily focused on one species in Montana, Wyoming, Washington and Idaho. The South Coast Wildlands' Missing Linkage Project, covering 8% of the state of California, worked collaboratively to produce habitat linkage maps for over 400 threatened and endangered species in the region, including mountain lions, badgers, bobcats, desert tortoises and bighorn sheep.

Each case study is explained in detail to provide the reader with concrete examples of successful partnerships and what they can achieve. The case studies highlight: the organization, its partners, its mission, when and how the partnership was founded, general habitat protection issues, partnership structure, funding, communication methods, and approaches to habitat protection. Each case study concludes with a discussion of challenges and key lessons learned. The Executive Summaries are included here, and the full case studies and report are available at:

[www.npca.org/cpm/reports.html](http://www.npca.org/cpm/reports.html)

CPM's challenge was to take these disparate case studies, each uniquely successful, and highlight the commonalities and best practices, creating a useful resource for wildlife practitioners. After a review of current partnership literature, the Fieldstone Alliance's publication: *Collaboration: What Makes it Work* was selected to provide a framework for the discussion. CPM staff then compared the case studies with the 20 factors evidenced in successful partnerships and cited examples from each partnership to illustrate each of these attributes to the reader.

The Fieldstone Alliance's resource, *Collaboration: What Makes It Work*, identifies six broad categories for creating successful partnerships. They are: 1) Environment, 2) Membership Characteristics, 3) Purpose, 4) Process and Structure, 5) Communication, and 6) Resources. In addition to these categories, CPM created two more: 7) Sharing Rewards and Celebrating Success and 8) Specific Considerations for Wildlife Habitat Partnerships. Many of the examples and recommended steps focus on activities common to any partnership. Special considerations for addressing wildlife issues include: 1) using neutral, objective scientific data, 2) employing GIS as a tool and a process, and 3) ultimately pursuing a variety of complementary habitat-protection strategies.

Finally, at the conclusion of each category, a list of suggested steps is included for the reader to consider before engaging in a partnership. The list of steps is not meant to be prescriptive but to provide a way to be thoughtful about moving forward. After reviewing these conclusions, wildlife practitioners hoping to protect species that cross man-made boundaries should be encouraged by the potential for collaboration and should be able to create successful partnerships.

#### Executive Summaries of Case Studies and Partner Lists

##### **Greater Uwharries Conservation Partnership, North Carolina**

<b>Federal Agencies</b>	<b>State Wildlife Agencies</b>	<b>Nonprofit Organizations</b>
US Fish and Wildlife Service	North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources- North Carolina	Environmental Defense Fund
U.S. Forest Service	Natural Heritage Program	The Land Trust for Central North Carolina
U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service	North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission	Piedmont Land Conservancy
	North Carolina Zoological Park	The Nature Conservancy
	North Carolina Plant Conservation Program	Central Park North Carolina (formerly Yadkin/Pee Dee Lakes Project)

The Greater Uwharries Conservation Partnership (GUCP) is focused on a geographic region, the Greater Uwharries region of the North Carolina Piedmont, rather than a particular flora or fauna. GUCP's mission is the long-term conservation and enhancement of biological diversity and ecosystem sustainability throughout the Greater Uwharries landscape. GUCP is made up of 12 partners from federal agencies, state agencies, and nonprofit organizations. GUCP does not have the authority to carry out any specific projects. Instead, it provides a structured, communicative forum for collaborative action among partners. As GUCP receives no funding, it relies on the time and resources contributed by the individual partners.

Key elements of GUCP's methodology include a collaborative decision-making process in which no partner is forced to take any action, utilization of GIS mapping to identify areas of overlapping interests, engagement with nontraditional participants, and agreement on a set of habitat-protection strategies. Specific results of the GUCP include: 1) inclusion of conservation of natural resources in county planning processes, 2) increased landowner participation in conservation and land management through farm-bill programs, and 3) the acquisition of the King Mountain property that links several noncontiguous parcels of the Uwharries National Forest.

#### **Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee, Montana**

<b>Federal Agencies</b>	<b>State Wildlife Agencies</b>	<b>Other Representation</b>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	State of Wyoming	Native American Tribes
U.S. Forest Service	State of Montana	Canadian Wildlife Service
U.S. Bureau of Land Management	State of Washington	Parks Canada
U.S. National Park Service	State of Idaho	British Columbia Wildlife Branch
U.S. Geological Survey		Alberta Wildlife Branch

The mission of the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) is to help ensure recovery of viable grizzly bear populations and their habitat through interagency coordination of policy, planning, management, and research. IGBC grew from a strong base of political support and is often considered one of the long-term success stories of interagency partnerships. Its organizational structure and communication methods have contributed to its success and improved the quality of its decision making. However, many of its success could not have been accomplished without a strong base of objective, neutral, and consistent scientific data to inform their decision-making. Since the IGBC began its work, grizzly bear populations have remained in all five of the ecosystems in which it works. In fact, some ecosystems have seen a measured increase in the number of bears, and the Fish & Wildlife Service has de-listed the grizzly in the Yellowstone ecosystem. Clearly, the group has seen success, but there is still work to be done.

#### **South Coast Wildlands, California**

<b>Federal Agencies</b>	<b>State Wildlife Agencies</b>	<b>International Nongovernmental Organizations</b>
U.S. National Park Service	State of California Resources Agency	Pronatura
U.S. Forest Service	California State Parks	Conabio
U.S. Bureau of Land Management		
U.S. Geological Survey		
<b>Nonprofit Organizations:</b> Anza Borrego Foundation and Institute, California State Parks Foundation, Conservation Biology Institute, Environment Now, Mountain Lion Foundation, The Nature Conservancy, Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, San Diego State University, Santa Monica Mountains Conservation, Wetlands Recovery Project, The Wildlands Conservancy, Zoological Society of San Diego		

The South Coast Wildlands (SCW) is a nonprofit organization whose mission is "to protect and restore systems of connected wildlands that support native wildlife and the ecosystems upon which they rely." To this end, it serves as

the lead partner for the South Coast Missing Linkages project. The Missing Linkages project goal is to conserve ecosystem processes and functions for all plants and animals native to the eco-region (spanning from Bakersfield, California over the Mexican border), including more than 400 endangered and sensitive species. SCW worked with federal, state, local and nonprofit organizations to achieve their mutual goals through a transparent, collaborative, science-based process. They successfully mapped key linkages and wildlife corridors to sustain ecosystems for a wide variety of species. Linkage projects cover a wide area of species habitat needs, including large mega fauna such as puma and peninsular bighorn sheep, as well as small mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish, invertebrate species, and plants. SCW gathered and shared data from partners and engaged stakeholders, serving as a catalyst for directing funds and attention toward the protection of ecological connectivity for the South Coast eco-region. One tangible example of SCW's success is the conservation of 240,000 acres by a private ranch company now making a physical link to Los Padres National Forest.

*Cyndi Szymanski is a Director of the Center for Park Management at the National Parks Conservation Association and can be contacted for more information at (202) 454-3316 or [cszymanski@npca.org](mailto:cszymanski@npca.org)*

## **University Network for Collaborative Governance**

***By Bob Jones, Director, Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, FSU and John Stephens, Director, Public Dispute Resolution Program, UNC-Chapel Hill***

The University Network for Collaborative Governance was launched in March, 2008 at an organizational meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, hosted by Georgia State University, Georgia Tech and University of Georgia. With the assistance of the Policy Consensus Initiative, which is serving as the Network's secretariat, the Network adopted a charter and met again in November, 2008 in Austin at the University of Texas to exchange information on initiatives and best practices.

The Network is made up of college and university centers, institutes and programs that engage in service and scholarship in order to build the capacity for collaborative governance in their communities, regions and states. The roles played by these programs include:

- Providing neutral forums where citizens and leaders can engage in dialogue, discussion and collaboration in finding lasting and informed solutions for public issues; offering expertise and a spectrum of services aiding more effective deliberation and lasting solutions.
- Engaging in public service and community engagement, teaching and scholarship on effective collaborative governance practices.
- Providing support for university and policy maker leaders in serving as convenors.

The Network's purpose is to promote and champion the role universities and their centers play as neutral forums and resources for collaborative governance. The Network's objectives include:

- Advancing teaching, research and outreach in public deliberation, collaborative problem solving and multi-party conflict resolution;
- Sharing knowledge, information and best practices among members;
- Assisting universities in shaping and adapting their research, teaching, and community engagement to enhance their effectiveness;
- Acquainting university leaders, policymakers, and the public with the role universities can play in carrying out collaborative governance practices;
- Providing linkages between university centers and programs and leaders interested in using collaborative governance practices; and
- Promoting policies that support the use of best practices and systems for collaborative governance.

The Network is reaching out to related organizations interested in collaborative governance and welcomes University programs to join this growing network. (See <http://www.policyconsensus.org/uncg/index.html>). In light of the economy and resulting budget shortfalls, in the coming year the Network will be focusing especially on developing and exchanging strategies for surviving and thriving and further refining its committee and meeting structure.

*Bob Jones is the chair of the UNCG Steering Committee and John Stephens is the vice-chair of the UNCG Steering Committee.*

## CONFERENCE (continued from Page 1)

In a spirit of collaboration, we are reaching beyond the confines of our membership to make the conference a dialogue among practitioners, academics, scientists, policymakers, program managers, and government officials involved in, or interested in, addressing the challenges of climate change. Our goal is not just to talk about these issues, but to create a springboard for future action. Questions we hope to explore are:

- What are some of the exciting initiatives taking place to address climate change through the use of collaboration and conflict resolution? What can we learn from these efforts to help us grow in our individual practices and as a field?
- How does climate change impact on other collaborative work – land use, transportation, water resources, coastal management – and what do we need to know about climate change to be effective in these situations?
- What have we learned about successful approaches to a wide variety of environmental issues that could be appropriately and effectively transferred to addressing climate change?
- How do we integrate science into these issues and how do we help communities, states, and the federal government address a central challenge of climate change: managing risk in the face of uncertainty?
- Does climate change provide an opportunity for the EPP field or does it present an obligation? Or both?
- How can we communicate to climate change program managers and policymakers - struggling to overcome societal and political resistance to action - that those of us in this field of “dialogue” are not “all talk and no action”? *How do we show them the concrete results of collaboration?*

Information on conference logistics and registration will be posted on the EPP website by April 1.

---

## OPPORTUNITIES (Continued from Page 1)

needed to help plan and execute these types of activities. Contact Jeff Edelstein at [edelstein@psouth.net](mailto:edelstein@psouth.net).

**Newsletter graphic designer:** The communications committee is seeking someone with good graphic design skills to help produce the newsletter and other communications and outreach tools. Contact Jeff Edelstein at [edelstein@psouth.net](mailto:edelstein@psouth.net).

**EPP Representative to the ACR Public Education Committee:** This committee will be developing a plan to promote conflict resolution services, including services to market, segments of the public to target, and the marketing methods to be used by ACR. An EPP Section representative is sought with one or more of the following capabilities: public education, public relations or marketing experience; creative out-of-the-box thinking; good connections within other ADR organizations, academic institutions, government agencies, etc.; experience using the Internet to advertise or to deliver web-based services. Contact Carolyn Penny at [clpenny@ucdavis.edu](mailto:clpenny@ucdavis.edu).

---

**About the ACR Environment and Public Policy Section Quarterly:** The quarterly newsletter of the EPP Section, ACR Environment and Public Policy Section Quarterly, is a publication of the Association for Conflict Resolution, a professional organization dedicated to enhancing the practice and public understanding of conflict resolution.

**Editorial policy:** The views expressed in this newsletter are those of the various authors for the purpose of encouraging discussion. Unless expressly noted, they do not reflect the formal policy, nor necessarily the views, of the Association for Conflict Resolution.

**Legal disclaimer:** This publication (or website) is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matters covered. It is provided with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional service. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the service of a competent professional person should be sought.

**Copyright line:** © 2009 Association for Conflict Resolution. All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced in whole or in part without written permission.

**CHANGE (Continued from Page 1)**

**CHANGE:** The nation and the world are in a time of change, with the election of a U.S. President who brings a new perspective on the roles of consensus-building and conflict resolution in governance, and a growing interrelatedness among environmental, economic, and national security challenges, as evidenced by issues such as climate change and access to water and energy supplies.

- What does this time of change mean for our field?
- What opportunities does it offer and what obligations does it impose?
- How can we - as a field and as individuals - support the new Administration in addressing pressing environmental and public policy challenges?
- What sorts of “radical transformations” does our field need to make to rise to the challenges ahead?
- Is our field ahead of its time, past its prime, or right where we ought to be?
- What one or two things will you do differently in the future, as a result of these changes?

Sometime soon, please set aside a little time and commit to sending us *at least* a few sentences on this topic. Your contributions will help create a vibrant dialogue! Send submittals to Jeff Edelstein at [edelstein@psouth.net](mailto:edelstein@psouth.net).

Articles and story ideas are being accepted for the Spring newsletter. Contact the Communications Committee Chair, Jeff Edelstein at [edelstein@psouth.net](mailto:edelstein@psouth.net) or (207) 247-8024.

### 2009 Environment and Public Policy Leadership Council Members

Carolyn Penny, Co-Chair, Leadership Council, 07-09  
[clpenny@ucdavis.edu](mailto:clpenny@ucdavis.edu)

Harry Manasewich, Co-Chair Leadership Council, 08-10; Chair, Website Development Committee  
[hfactor@aol.com](mailto:hfactor@aol.com)

Michael Elliott, Immediate Past Co-Chair; Co-Chair, 2009 Section Conference Committee  
[michael.elliott@coa.gatech.edu](mailto:michael.elliott@coa.gatech.edu)

Dan Adams, Elected Member, 07-09  
[dadams@langdongroupinc.com](mailto:dadams@langdongroupinc.com)

Juliana Birkhoff, Co-Chair, Professional Development Committee  
[jbirkhoff@cbuilding.com](mailto:jbirkhoff@cbuilding.com)

Ramona Buck, Co-Chair, Diversity and Leadership Committee; ACR Section Relations Taskforce Liaison - Governance  
[ramona.buck@mdcourts.gov](mailto:ramona.buck@mdcourts.gov)

Cindy Cook, Co-Chair, Professional Development Committee  
[ccook@adamantaccord.com](mailto:ccook@adamantaccord.com)

Marci DuPraw, Elected Member, 07-09  
[marci\\_dupraw@sra.com](mailto:marci_dupraw@sra.com)

Jeff Edelstein, Chair, Communications and Outreach Committee  
[edelstein@psouth.net](mailto:edelstein@psouth.net)

Janice Fleischer, Chair, Ethics Committee

[janice@flashresolutions.com](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)

Steve Lee, Elected Member, 08-10  
[wstevelee@mediate.com](mailto:wstevelee@mediate.com)

Carolyna Smiley-Marquez, Elected Member, 08-10  
[carolyna@smileyandcompany.com](mailto:carolyna@smileyandcompany.com)

Rob Williams, Co-Chair, Diversity and Leadership Committee  
[robert.williams@pdx.edu](mailto:robert.williams@pdx.edu)

Nicholas Dewar, ACR Section Relations Taskforce Liaison - Finance  
[ndewar@jsanet.com](mailto:ndewar@jsanet.com)

Vacant, Chair, Membership

## CONFERENCES AND DATES OF INTEREST by Catherine McCracken

*Note: Information correct as of January 31, 2009. Be sure to confirm via organization websites*

### March 27, 2009 – Deadline for Call for Presentation Proposals

International Association for Public Participation 17<sup>th</sup> International Conference “Making Sustainable Decisions: The Price and Promise of Public Participation” (for September 21-23, 2009 conference in San Diego, California)

For more information: [www.iap2.org](http://www.iap2.org)

### The Environmental Council of the States and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2009 Toxics Release Inventory (TRI)

**National Training Conference “TRI: Expanding Partnerships/ Expanding Knowledge”**

March 30-April 2, 2009

Bethesda, Maryland

For more information: [www.ecos.org/section/events](http://www.ecos.org/section/events)

### American Bar Association 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Section of Dispute Resolution Spring Conference

April 15-18, 2009

New York, New York

For more information:

[www.abanet.org/dispute](http://www.abanet.org/dispute)

### National League of Cities 2009 Green Cities Conference & Expo

April 18-21, 2009

Portland, Oregon

For more information: [www.nlc.org](http://www.nlc.org)

### International Association of Facilitators North America Conference

April 20-25, 2009

Vancouver, British Columbia

For more information: [www.iaf-world.org](http://www.iaf-world.org)

### Earth Day

April 22, 2009

For more information:

[www.earthday.org](http://www.earthday.org)

### American Planning Association’s National Planning Conference

April 25-29, 2009

Minneapolis, Minnesota

For more information:

[www.planning.org/nationalconference](http://www.planning.org/nationalconference)

### National Tribal Environmental Council Conference

May 10-15, 2009

Bar Harbor, Maine

For more information: [www.ntec.org](http://www.ntec.org)

### 4<sup>th</sup> National Conference of Minority Professionals in Alternative Dispute Resolution

“Broadening Opportunities for Minority ADR Professionals: In Search of New Horizons”

May 18-20, 2009

Columbus, Ohio

For more information:

[www.law.capital.edu/adr](http://www.law.capital.edu/adr)

### Canadian Association of Municipal Administrators Annual Conference

June 1-3, 2009

Whistler, British Columbia

For more information:

[www.camacam.ca](http://www.camacam.ca)

### EPP Section Annual Conference

June 11-13, 2009

Denver, Colorado

For more information:

[www.mediate.com/acrepp/pg29.cfm](http://www.mediate.com/acrepp/pg29.cfm)

### United Nations Environment Programme World Environment Day

June 5, 2009

For more information:

[www.unep.org/wed](http://www.unep.org/wed)

### 2009 National Association of Counties Annual Conference

July 24-28, 2009

Nashville, Tennessee

For more information: [www.naco.org](http://www.naco.org)

### 94<sup>th</sup> Ecological Society of America Annual Meeting

August 2-7, 2009

Albuquerque, New Mexico

For more information: [www.esa.org/meetings](http://www.esa.org/meetings)

### Water Environment Federation Conference

TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) 2009: Combining Science and Management to Restore Impaired Waters August 9-12, 2009

Minneapolis, Minnesota

For more information: [www.wef.org](http://www.wef.org)

### 139<sup>th</sup> American Fisheries Society Annual Meeting

August 30-September 3, 2009

Nashville, Tennessee

For more information:

[www.fisheries.org](http://www.fisheries.org)

### 2009 International City/County Management Association Annual Conference

September 13-16, 2009

Montreal, Quebec

For more information: [www.icma.org](http://www.icma.org)

### 2009 Society of American Foresters National Convention

September 30-October 4, 2009

Orlando, Florida

For more information:

[www.safnet.org](http://www.safnet.org)

### 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Association for Conflict Resolution Conference

October 7-10, 2009

Atlanta, Georgia

For more information:

[www.acrnet.org/conferences](http://www.acrnet.org/conferences)

### Association for Conflict Resolution - Conflict Resolution Day

October 15, 2009

For more information:

[www.acrnet.org/crday](http://www.acrnet.org/crday)