



Association for Conflict Resolution Environment and Public Policy Section

SPRING NEWSLETTER 2009

In This Issue:

Readers Dialogue: EPP Members on the Subject of "Change" - Page 2

Read the contributions of EPP members about what these times of change mean for our field: what opportunities do these times offer, what obligations do they impose, what transformations does our field need to make?

Next "Readers Dialogue" Topic: Neutrality, Justice, and Advocacy - Page 6

Do you pride yourself on your neutrality (and if so, why)? Or do you pride yourself on your advocacy? Are consensus and justice at odds with each other? Have you been faced with a situation where you felt you were contributing to an unjust outcome; what did you do? When we are involved in coalition-building, are we then advocates and what responsibilities do we have? Share your thoughts with your peers! No attribution necessary.

EPP Section Signs onto the Public Engagement Principles (PEP) Project - Page 7

The PEP Project was launched in mid-February 2009 in response to discussions about how the broad dialogue, deliberation, and public engagement fields of practice could or should support Barack Obama's January 21st memorandum on transparency and open government. Read about how this project came about and the seven principles that it has articulated.

Conflict Resolution, Climate Change, and Copenhagen - Page 9

Gregg Walker writes about how conflict resolution methods should be incorporated into the climate change agreements being negotiated at the upcoming 15th Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change to be held in Copenhagen in December, 2009. Also included is an announcement of a Copenhagen Mediation Seminar with the aim of gathering 100 mediators to create a new Manifesto showing the infrastructure to peaceful conflict resolution.

Sharon Pickett Award Nominations Sought (Deadline is July 13) - Page 13

The Sharon Pickett Award honors an ACR member who has advanced the cause of environmental protection through the effective use of alternative dispute resolution. The award will be announced at the ACR Annual Conference and on the ACR website.

New EPP Website - Page 13

The Environment and Public Policy Section has a new website, featuring blogs, information about the section, upcoming events, and more. Check it out at: <http://www.acrepp.org/>

EPP Leadership Council Elections and Other Opportunities to Help the Section - Page 14

The EPP Leadership Council is actively seeking candidates for four at-large seats and for the co-chair position. There are also a number of committees in which EPP members can become engaged. This is your opportunity to make a difference in the Section and in the field of Environmental and Public Policy dispute resolution!

Calendar - Page 15

Read about upcoming events of interest to the Environment and Public Policy Conflict Resolution field.

Upcoming in the next newsletter:

The 2009 EPP Conference on *Managing Climate Change through Collaborative Governance* was a huge success! Read about it in the next newsletter.

READERS DIALOGUE: 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?

Our Readers Respond:

Reader #1:

1. What is remarkable about the last election is how the outreach means by the political campaign really exceeded our public engagement/public ADR expertise. It launched itself far ahead of all of us, partly due to pent up demand from the last 8 years, new technologies, an exciting candidate, and, dollars, dollars, dollars. This raises the question — can we really do what we wish and have real impact without two essential figures: a key figure or issue to rally around and the money to really do it well? With all the state budget cuts, states are charging ahead on policy issues with absolutely little to no public engagement. Budget is a key part of that, along with smarty pants liberals, to use a phrase, thinking they are smarter than the rest of us in enacting policy. I’d watch for the Nixonian silent majority backlash to this if we are all not careful.
2. I don’t think the field is dead or dying at all, but it is evolving and rapidly transforming through technology, costs, and need into a much more diverse, interesting, complex field that combines prevention, resolution, engagement, and democracy. I think we should embrace this change, stop worrying about it, and figure out ways to continue to innovate and respond to demand and need. I do think as “neutrals” we have to think about in what contexts and problems stakeholders want such neutrality and in what cases where this is far less important. We as professionals tend to hold our neutrality up as the holy grail, but I am not sure that our stakeholders, in many, though not all instances, think this is most important.
3. I think we have to recognize our field is advanced enough and so are our users that we have to be more substantive experts. We have to really combine substantive policy, legal, planning and science skills with straight process skills. People are just not buying process alone any more, in my view.
4. I think we have to think about what we are really offering: neutrality, improved relationships, more clear surfacing of interests? All these are fine, but I wonder about things like good project management skills, clearly articulated policies, stronger implementation, solid agreements, and other things that I think are what people really want. Though our code says we must be indifferent to outcomes, I can’t tell you how many senior mediators tout their success by saying what cases they have settled. In other words, we say settlement can’t be the criteria of our success, yet, it’s what we use and what people ask. Who wants a mediator with a 40% success rate?

Reader #2:

The Obama administration has come into office promising a more transparent and collaborative government. President Obama himself has facilitated meetings with the major health and health insurance stakeholders at the White House and has promised that the White House would more deliberately reach out and engage with citizens and stakeholders. The President recently announced the renaming and expanded duties of the White House office of public liaison, now called the White House Office of Public Engagement (see www.whitehouse.gov/ope).

These changes will significantly affect our field. There are already differences in emphasis between those who practice in the “collaborative governance” or “deliberative democracy” space from those who practice as “public and stakeholder involvement” field from those who practice as “public policy or negotiated rulemaking facilitators” from those who provide “enforcement and litigation mediation services.” All of these terms can fall under the general term of Collaborative Governance. It includes public involvement or civic engagement, collaboration with stakeholder groups, collaborative public management, and dispute resolution with citizens and stakeholders. It can occur upstream in policy-making, midstream in policy implementation, and downstream in policy enforcement. Plus there is an increasing use of technology-assisted means of reaching out to the public, obtaining public comments, and conducting dialogues.

There is tension between practitioners in each of these spaces as people and organizations jockey for opportunities to work with the Administration and put their stamp on the shape of the Administration’s approach to Collaborative Governance.

My hope is that we as a field practice what we preach. That we are open and inclusive, willing to accept suggestions from any source and are transparent about our interests and motives. And that we recognize and accept the technology-driven changes that are about to occur as concepts about public outreach and involvement are affected by technology. Already there are differences, largely based on age, regarding acceptance of technology-based methods to consult and engage with the public.

I hope to see this Administration embrace all of the various options – upstream, midstream and downstream; web-based and other technological methods of engagement and face-to-face meetings and discussions.

We live in interesting times. I hope we as a field add value to the Administration as it attempts to find effective means of public discourse, and not simply to ourselves.

Reader #3:

One of the major difficulties we face as we try to address climate change and other challenges is the sheer and growing complexity and “interrelatedness” of everything. There is so much information, so many players, so many moving parts, so many perspectives and interests. The danger is that individuals, decision-makers and entire societies will look at that dizzying array and become paralyzed, not knowing what to do first. Our task (or rather, one of our many tasks) as facilitators, mediators, public involvement specialists, project managers, strategic planners (in short, collaboration professionals) is to help reduce the array into manageable pieces and to help individuals and groups design and implement strategies to address those pieces and then reassemble them back into a coherent and successful whole.

Reader #4:**The Yoga of Change: Flexing and Learning New Tools Whilst Staying Grounded**

By Cindy Cook ccook@adamantaccord.com

How do we, as change agents, adapt our practices to a world in which *the very rate at which we are experiencing change is changing*? I've been pondering this question more than usual as the result of discussions at the USIECR sponsored strategic planning session in Tucson last month.

I don't think that the answers –and this is a situation in which we need more than one, single answer--lie so much in concentrating on the substance of the issues we work with—though understanding the substance is obviously essential-- but rather on two somewhat divergent themes that I work on daily in my yoga practice. The first involves learning new ways to stretch and to grow-- in this case Web 2.0; the second involves remembering to breathe, to stay grounded in the core values of our field.

Stretching (with Web 2.0)

OK, first of all, for all my brother and sister Luddites, let me define a term. “Web 2.0” refers to the ever-expanding array of tools that we now have available to us. Wikipedia (itself a great tool) describes Web 2.0 as “ a second generation of web development and web design. It ... facilitates communication, information sharing, interoperability, and collaboration on the World Wide. Examples include [social-networking sites](#), [video-sharing sites](#), [wikis](#), [blogs](#) and [folksonomies](#).”

Web tools are incredibly powerful, and are likely to change the way we work with stakeholders in pretty fundamental ways. And many of them are very user friendly. Really. Want to schedule a conference call or meeting for a large group of stakeholders? Meeting Wizard, Doodle and a host of other programs save you lots of time and aggravation. Want to show people what mountaintop removal looks like from the air, or how a Superfund site is positioned relative to a river or residential neighborhood...? You can do so w/ a few mouse clicks using Google Earth (downloading is free). Want to collaborate on developing an agenda or editing a document? Check out Base Camp or Google Docs.

Web 2.0 tools are particularly valuable to EPP practitioners because they can help us communicate effectively and efficiently and because they are very good at managing and analyzing large amounts of information.

EPP practitioners have an incredible opportunity –and a responsibility--to learn how to make effective use of these powerful new tools.

Grounding, or Collaboration 101

At the same time that we are stretching and developing our ability to use these new tools, I suggest that we practitioners ought to be re-grounding ourselves in the foundational principals of our field: e.g. accessibility, authenticity, transparency, equity. Web tools are sleek, powerful, and seductive. We need to be careful to use the tools as tools, rather than be seduced by their power. We need to continually remind ourselves that the tools should assist the process, rather than letting the tools drive the process.

Cindy Cook (continued):

We EPP-sters are faced with a host of interesting questions, including:

How do we design processes that acknowledge the digital divide between those who have access to these tools and those who prefer other ways of communicating?

Social networking tools (e.g. Facebook and Twitter) are already dramatically affecting current balances of power. How can we use these tools effectively, w/o succumbing to the “tyranny of the majority” (e.g. voting) that sometimes come into play when processes involve very large numbers of people?

How can we assist w/ demystifying computer modeling so that the models’ underlying assumptions are explicit and are subject to thoughtful discussion and consideration?

How do we design processes using new technologies without increasing the current bias toward scientific, analytical, left brain ways of thinking and deciding over other more traditional, holistic, creative, and/or intuitive modes?

How will our practices be transformed as our access to information and our ability to communicate continue to expand exponentially?

The above are some “quick takes” from a series of energizing conversations w/ colleagues. If you have thoughts, comments, reactions, differing points of view, please be in touch. I look forward to the discussions to come!

Reader #5:

One of the conundrums I am personally facing at this time in history is the side of me that does not want to see myself, my family, my friends, my region, our nation or our world go through the pain and suffering that is accompanying this economic downturn and would more severely accompany an economic collapse. However, another side of me wonders if such a collapse is a necessary precondition to realigning our priorities, structures, economies and societies to achieve long-term sustainability.

**“Readers Dialogue” Topic for Next Newsletter - Please Send us Your Thoughts!
Neutrality, Justice, and Advocacy**

There was much discussion at the 2009 EPP conference about the appropriateness of so-called “neutrals” being advocates. Of particular interest was the dynamic of neutrals being engaged to facilitate coalition-building processes. Please send us your thoughts on issues such as:

1. Coalitions are often consensus-based, but they are not necessarily inclusive of all parties to an issue. Is this a problem? If so, whose problem is it? What are the responsibilities and/or ethics when a neutral is hired to facilitate a coalition-building process? Is he/she still “neutral”? Does it matter?
2. Is there a tension between consensus-based processes and justice-based processes? Does consensus always result in justice? What is the responsibility of the neutral in ensuring “justice”?
3. Have you been in a situation in which you were facilitating a process that you felt would result in an unjust resolution? What did you do? What would you do differently?
4. What does it say about ourselves that many of us pride ourselves on our neutrality? As one of the conference speakers (from outside our field) said: “I don’t know why anyone would want to be neutral.” Are you proud to be neutral? Or, are you proud to be an advocate? Does it depend on the situation?

Send your thoughts, whether a paragraph or several pages, for publication (with or without attribution) to Jeff Edelstein at: edelstein@psouth.net.

New Reading

Staying With Conflict: A Strategic Approach to Ongoing Disputes - Bernard Mayer (2009)

<http://www.mediate.com/articles/rainey1.cfm>

Eye of the Storm Leadership - Peter Adler (2008)

<http://www.keystone.org/about-us/publications/eye-storm-leadership>

Built to Win: Creating a World-Class Negotiating Organization - Hal Movius and Lawrence Susskind (2009)

<http://cbuilding.org/node/612>

EPP Section Signs onto the Public Engagement Principles Project

The Public Engagement Principles (PEP) Project was launched in mid-February 2009 in response to several unrelated discussions about how the broad dialogue, deliberation, and public engagement fields of practice could or should support Barack Obama's January 21st memorandum on transparency and open government. The memo stated that the Obama administration would work to “ensure the public trust and establish a system of transparency, public participation, and collaboration” to create an “unprecedented level of openness in Government.” The memo calls for the creation of an Open Government Directive that will instruct executive departments and agencies to take specific actions in the areas of transparency, participation, and collaboration.

Our field was abuzz in meetings, on email discussion lists, and on phone calls considering how we could support this effort, and people seemed to agree on one thing in particular: our field of practice, as a whole, needs to agree on and articulate what we consider to be quality public engagement. And this clarity, whether or not it impacts the Open Government Directive, will be a great benefit to our field.

A small working group formed to consider how to move forward quickly in as collaborative and transparent a way as possible, and the group decided to encourage broad involvement among our networks in the formation of a set of principles for public engagement we can all get behind. A simple forum (bulletin board) was created on the website of the National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation (NCDD) to enable people to post and comment on existing sets of public engagement principles, values, and guidelines issued by various organizations and governing institutions, and to start developing a unified set of principles based on the work that had already been done. NCDD's Director, Sandy Heierbacher, initially posted about a dozen sets of principles, and another dozen were soon added by others.

Members of NCDD, the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2), and other networks were informed about the project, and dozens of people with different levels and types of experience in public engagement got involved. Tom Atlee of the Co-Intelligence Institute created a draft document integrating all the statements and comments that were posted to the forum, which was subsequently critiqued by dozens of professionals and revised numerous times under the guidance of the core working group.

A near-final version was distributed to leading organizations, both for feedback and to get the ball rolling for endorsements. At the same time, the text was posted to an open document review website to allow people to critique statement by statement. The final version on these pages emerged from that process, and was approved by the core group. It is currently being distributed through various public engagement, conflict resolution, and collaboration networks, inviting all who are interested to endorse the Core Principles as an organization or as an individual.

The Seven Core Principles are described on the next page...

The Seven Core Principles (Cont'd)

In practice, people emphasize or apply these principles in many different ways, and often embrace additional principles. These seven principles reflect the *common* beliefs and understandings of those working in the fields of public engagement, conflict resolution, and collaboration.

1. Careful Planning and Preparation

Through adequate and inclusive planning, ensure that the design, organization, and convening of the process serve both a clearly defined purpose and the needs of the participants.

2. Inclusion and Demographic Diversity

Equitably incorporate diverse people, voices, ideas, and information to lay the groundwork for quality outcomes and democratic legitimacy.

3. Collaboration and Shared Purpose

Support and encourage participants, government and community institutions, and others to work together to advance the common good.

4. Openness and Learning

Help all involved listen to each other, explore new ideas unconstrained by predetermined outcomes, learn and apply information in ways that generate new options, and rigorously evaluate public engagement activities for effectiveness.

5. Transparency and Trust

Be clear and open about the process, and provide a public record of the organizers, sponsors, outcomes, and range of views and ideas expressed.

6. Impact and Action

Ensure each participatory effort has real potential to make a difference, and that participants are aware of that potential.

7. Sustained Engagement and Participatory Culture

Promote a culture of participation with programs and institutions that support ongoing quality public engagement.

View the full document, background, and endorsers online at www.ncdd.org/pep/. This article was adapted from a statement issued by the Public Engagement Principles Project.

[Seeking 2011 EPP Conference Venue](#)

The EPP Section is looking for a 2011 conference venue. Ideal venue characteristics include: a robust ADR community, low-cost (ideally free) meeting space, access to a major airport, and low-cost lodging options. In return for hosting, you'll have exposure of your organization, the opportunity to help shape the conference, and the chance to work with lots of great EPP practitioners. An east coast or midwestern location is preferred. If you and your organization are interested in hosting the conference, please contact Harry Manasewich at hfactordr@aol.com

Negotiating Conflict and Climate Change in Copenhagen: Include Conflict Prevention and Resolution Methods

During eleven days in December 2009 delegates from throughout the world will meet in Copenhagen for the 15th Conference of the Parties (COP 15) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The Denmark meeting is crucial for the international climate change negotiations. In December 2007 the parties to the UNFCCC agreed at Bali, Indonesia that negotiations on a future agreement have to be concluded at COP 15. The decision reflected the increased emphasis on the need for swift action made in the latest report by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The Bali delegates also recognized that 2009 would be a critical opportunity for an agreement before the commitments set in the Kyoto Protocol expire in 2012.

A Critical Issue

The International Crisis Group, one of the world's leading independent, non-partisan conflict analysis advisory organizations, stresses that "a key challenge today is to better understand the relationship between climate change, environmental degradation and conflict and to effectively manage associated risks through appropriate conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms." Conflict preventive measures and resolution mechanisms need to be part of the climate change negotiations, both in Copenhagen and beyond.

At the December 2007 United Nations Conference on Climate Change in Bali, Indonesia, the German Advisory Council on Climate Change presented a report, *World in Transition – Climate Change as a Security Risk*. Based on research into environmental conflicts, the causes of war, and climate impacts, the report states that climate changes could "overstretch many societies' adaptive capacities within the coming decades. This could result in destabilization and violence, jeopardizing national and international security to a new degree."

Drawing on the work of international experts and organizations including the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), the report notes, though, that "climate change could also unite the international community, provided that it recognizes climate change as a threat to humankind" and adopts "a dynamic and globally coordinated climate policy." If the international community "fails to do so," the report emphasizes, "climate change will draw ever-deeper lines of division and conflict in international relations, triggering numerous conflicts between and within countries over the distribution of resources, especially water and land, over the management of migration, or over compensation payments between the countries mainly responsible for climate change and those countries most affected by its destructive effects." In its introduction to the report, the UNEP website states that "combating climate change will be a central peace policy of the 21st century." Conflict preventive measures and resolution mechanisms should be part of the climate change negotiations, both in Copenhagen and beyond.

Scientists See the Need

In addition, the scientific community recognizes that global climate change issues challenge our ability to deal with a changing environment containing huge potential for conflict. In March 2009 over 2500 delegates from nearly 80 countries participated in the International Scientific Congress on Climate Change: Global Risks, Challenges & Decisions in Copenhagen, Denmark. At the end of the conference the delegates presented a set of key messages that included cautions about

Negotiating Conflict and Climate Change in Copenhagen (Cont'd)

conflict and climate change. *Key Message 2: Social Disruption* stated that “recent observations show that societies are highly vulnerable to even modest levels of climate change, with poor nations and communities particularly at risk. Temperature rises above 2C will be very difficult for contemporary societies to cope with.” *Key Message 3: Long Term Strategy* stressed that “rapid, sustained, and effective mitigation based on coordinated global and regional action is required to avoid ‘dangerous climate change’ regardless of how it is defined. Delay in initiating effective mitigation actions increases significantly the long-term social and economic costs of both adaptation and mitigation.” *Key Message 4: Equity Dimensions* emphasized that “climate change is having, and will have, strongly differential effects on people within and between countries and regions, on this generation and future generations, and on human societies and the natural world.” The delegates recommended the use of tools and governance practices to address these fundamental concerns. Conflict preventive measures, conflict transformation and resolution are essential to meet climate change challenges. They should be addressed at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference and beyond.

Rio and Kyoto Precedents

The COP 15 Provisional Agenda, reviewed in Bonn, Germany in early June, lists a range of essential issues, from emission reduction to technology transfer. Conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms are missing from the Agenda despite the fact that Article 14 of the 1992 UNFCCC (negotiated in New York and Rio de Janeiro and reaffirmed in Article 19 of the Kyoto Protocol) states that “in the event of a dispute between any two or more Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Parties concerned shall seek a settlement of the dispute through negotiation or any other peaceful means of their own choice.” This article, though, is not sufficient to address the complex conflicts between nations and peoples likely to emerge as climate change impacts accelerate. Conflict preventive measures and resolution mechanisms should be part of the talks in Bonn, Copenhagen, and beyond.

Beyond Rio and Kyoto, there is precedent for putting conflict resolution on the Climate Change Conference agenda. A number of UN treaties and conventions that deal with environmental issues include conflict or dispute resolution mechanisms. For example, the UN Convention on the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses, adopted in 1997 by the UN General Assembly, specifies conflict resolution methods. Agenda 21, the Environment and Development Agenda administered by the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) emphasizes conflict resolution. Article 39.3 specifies the need:

- 1) To identify and prevent actual or potential conflicts, particularly between environmental and social/economic agreements or instruments, with a view to ensuring that such agreements or instruments are consistent. Where conflicts arise, they should be appropriately resolved;
- 2) To study and consider the broadening and strengthening of the capacity of mechanisms, inter alia in the United Nations system, to facilitate, where appropriate and agreed by the parties concerned, the identification, avoidance and settlement of international disputes in the field of sustainable development, duly taking into account existing bilateral and multilateral agreements for the settlement of such disputes.

Negotiating Conflict and Climate Change in Copenhagen (Cont'd)

An Important Commitment

Climate change negotiators and decision-makers should affirm the commitment that people, communities, and nations will not be in violent situations due to conflicts that arise as a consequence of climate change. Politicians, diplomats, and specialists who attend the Climate Change meetings should consider conflict prevention measures and resolution mechanisms.

The climate change crisis challenges people throughout the world to invent and implement innovative ways to mitigate and thwart climate changing causes and effects. The crisis calls for new methods for nations and people to overcome differences and work together with the objective of preventing, minimising and resolving conflict arising because of limited resources and/or the effects of climate change.

In a Manifesto from July 9, 1955, issued in London, Albert Einstein and other leading scientists urged humanity to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters based on new ways of thinking. An important new way of thinking features the use of the collaborative, participatory, and pluralistic conflict resolution processes like mediation and facilitation. Construction of a new global conflict prevention and resolution infrastructure is critical to a comprehensive international climate change policy. Such construction can start with the Copenhagen conference, with discussions of conflict prevention and resolution along side the negotiations of scientific and technical issues of climate change.

*Gregg Walker, Tina Monberg, and Kenneth Cloke of Mediators Beyond Borders
Jens Emborg, Mie Marcussen, Lone Clausen, and Vibeke Vindelov of Nordic Mediators*

Mediation Seminar in Copenhagen during COP15



Place: Glyptoteket, Copenhagen – www.glyptoteket.com

Date: The 10th and 11th December 2009

During eleven days in December 2009 delegates from throughout the world will meet in Copenhagen for the 15th Conference of the Parties - COP15 - to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC. The Denmark meeting is crucial for the international climate change negotiations. The climate change crisis challenges people throughout the world to invent and implement innovative ways to mitigate and thwart climate changing causes and effects. The crisis calls for new methods for nations and people to overcome differences and work together with the objective of preventing and resolving conflict arising because of limited resources and/or the effects of climate change.

In a Manifesto from 9th July 1955 issued in London, Albert Einstein and other leading scientists urged humanity to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters based on new ways of thinking. An important new way of thinking features the use of the collaborative, participatory, and pluralistic conflict resolution processes like mediation and facilitation. Construction of a new global conflict prevention and resolution infrastructure is critical to a comprehensive international climate change policy. Such construction will be a major part of the Copenhagen Mediation Seminar, with discussions of conflict prevention and resolution. Our aim is to gather 100 mediators to create a new Manifesto showing the infrastructure to peaceful conflict resolution.

Please already now reserve this important seminar for 100 mediators attending from all parts of the world. More information will come shortly.

Gregg Walker, Tina Monberg, and Kenneth Cloke of Mediators Beyond Borders - Jens Emborg, Mie Marcussen, Lone Clausen, and Vibeke Vindelov of Nordic Mediators



ACR EPP Section Launches New and Improved Interactive Website!

In order to meet the changing needs of its geographically diverse membership, the ACR EPP Section Leadership Council has created a new and improved “Blogsite”, which can be found at www.acrepp.org. It has been launched at the June EPP Conference in Denver Colorado and will replace the current EPP website.

The site will be ever-changing due to a panel of bloggers, ability to comment on the blogs, Tweeting, and interesting content like “Resources” including Practice Tools (ever wonder what online tools you can use to schedule a stakeholder meeting?), “Opportunities” like jobs or RFPs, current EPP Leadership Council projects (like this one!), pictures, and much much more!

The site is still under construction. As a result, you may find some areas incomplete. We encourage you to use the site and contact us with your ideas for improvement, or even better, to volunteer to make it even better. Feel free to contact EPP Section Co-Chair Harry Manasewich at hfactordr@aol.com with your ideas or questions.

Nominations being accepted For Sharon M. Pickett Award - Due by July 13

The Sharon M. Pickett Award was established in honor of Sharon Pickett who served as Editor of ACResolution from 2000 – 2007. In addition to serving as a family mediator and trainer, Sharon worked as a communication specialist for many environmental NGOs. Her clients included the Center for International Environmental Law, Sierra Club, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Union of Concerned Scientists, Ozone Action, Clean Air Task Force, Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning, Northeast Sustainable Energy Association and others.

In recognition of Sharon’s ardent advocacy of environmental issues and mediation, both professionally and personally, the Association for Conflict Resolution presents the Sharon M. Pickett Award annually. The award honors an ACR member who has advanced the cause of environmental protection through the effective use of alternative dispute resolution. The award will be announced at the ACR Annual Conference and on the ACR website. The 2008 recipient was Alice Shorett, founder of Triangle Associates.

Nominations for the Sharon M. Pickett Award are due by July 13, 2009. Visit www.acrnet.org/about/awards/pickett.htm for eligibility and submission details.

Feedback Requested About EPP Newsletter

We want to know whether you’ve read this far in the newsletter and what features are of most interest to you. Please go to the following web address and let us know:

<http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB229DW3NRF7F>

ACR / Environment and Public Policy Section
Five Leadership Positions Opening Up Fall 2009

-- Call for Nominations --

Deadline: July 31, 2009

Vacancies: The Environment and Public Policy Section (EPP) of the Association for Conflict Resolution serves its members through the efforts of dedicated individuals who comprise the Leadership Council. Four at-large seats and one co-chair position on the Leadership Council will become vacant in the fall of 2009. The Leadership Council is actively seeking candidates for these four at-large seats and for a new co-chair. This is your opportunity to make a difference in the Section and in the field of Environmental and Public Policy dispute resolution!

Responsibilities: At-large members of the Leadership Council typically serve two-year terms. There are 3 two-year at-large seats available in this election cycle. In this election cycle, 1 one-year at-large seat is also available. Duties include:

- Participating in monthly conference calls of 1.5 hours in length;
- Working on a committee (e.g., Membership and Conference Planning; Diversity and Leadership; Ethics; Communications and Outreach; or Professional Development);
- Reflecting a commitment to ACR's Diversity and Equity statement; and
- Promoting EPP Section membership needs within ACR.

Section co-chairs serve two-year terms, followed by a one-year "past co-chair" position. Co-chairs are responsible for coordinating the activities of the Section as well as taking the lead in assessing the needs of the Section and its members, and charting the future direction of Section activities. Co-chairs appoint committee chairs and are the primary liaisons to the ACR board and staff.

EPP Election Principles: The EPP Section has established some principles regarding elections. As a volunteer organization, we wish to capitalize on the interest and energy of section members. The Section's goal is to seek candidates equal to the number of open positions. If candidates exceed positions, the Nominating Committee will seek to match candidates to additional opportunities to lead and be involved in the section. If, following this consultation, more than one person desires to serve in a specific position, elections will proceed with more candidates than positions. Voting members also are free to write in the names of any EPP section member, in addition to, or instead of the names on the ballot.

For Further Information: If interested, please send the following information to Marci DuPraw, ACR/EPP Section Nominations Committee, by July 31, 2009, for inclusion on the ballot: (1) Briefly describe your background as an EPP mediator. (2) Describe your interest in leadership involvement in the EPP Section and ACR. (3) Include any other items you would like people to know about you. Please limit your response to a total of 400 words for all 3 questions combined. Send materials to marci_dupraw@sra.com. If you have any questions, please call Marci at 703-284-6920.

EPP Leadership Council

Carolyn Penny, Co-Chair, Leadership Council, 07-09
clpenny@ucdavis.edu

Harry Manasewich, Co-Chair Leadership Council, 08-10; Chair, Website Development Committee
hfactordr@aol.com

Michael Elliott, Immediate Past Co-Chair; Co-Chair, 2009 Section Conference Committee
michael.elliott@coa.gatech.edu

Dan Adams, Elected Member, 07-09
dadams@langdongroupinc.com

Juliana Birkhoff, Co-Chair, Professional Development Committee

Ramona Buck, Co-Chair, Diversity and Leadership Committee; ACR Section Relations Taskforce Liaison - Governance
ramona.buck@mdcourts.gov

Cindy Cook, Co-Chair, Professional Development Committee
ccook@adamantaccord.com

Marci DuPraw, Elected Member, 07-09
marci_dupraw@sra.com

Jeff Edelstein, Chair, Communications and Outreach Committee
edelstein@psouth.net

Janice Fleischer, Chair, Ethics Committee
janice@flashresolutions.com

Carolyna Smiley-Marquez, Elected Member, 08-10
carolyna@smileyandcompany.com

Rob Williams, Co-Chair, Diversity and Leadership Committee
rwilliams@merid.org

Nicholas Dewar, ACR Section Relations Taskforce Liaison - Finance
ndewar@jsanet.com

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

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.

CONFERENCES AND DATES OF INTEREST by Catherine McCracken

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

July 31, 2009 – Nominations – ACR/Environment and Public Policy Section

Nominations for four at-large seats and one co-chair position on the Leadership Council
For more information: contact Marci DuPraw at 703-284-6920 or at marci_dupraw@sra.com

2009 National Association of Counties Annual Conference

July 24-28, 2009
Nashville, Tennessee
For more information: www.naco.org

American Bar Association 2009 Annual Meeting

July 30-August 4, 2009
Chicago, IL
For more information: www.abanet.org/annual

94th Ecological Society of America Annual Meeting

August 2-7, 2009
Albuquerque, New Mexico
For more information: 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

2009 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Community Involvement Training Conference

"Reaching Across Boundaries: Sharing Challenges and Opportunities"
August 18-20, 2009
Seattle, Washington
For more information: www.epa.gov/ciconference

139th American Fisheries Society Annual Meeting

August 30-September 3, 2009
Nashville, Tennessee
For more information: www.fisheries.org

2009 International City/County Management Association Annual Conference

September 13-16, 2009
Montreal, Quebec
For more information: www.icma.org

2009 International Association for Public Participation International Conference

"Making Sustainable Decisions: The Price and Promise of Public Participation"
September 21-23, 2009
San Diego, California
For more information: www.iap2.org

2009 Society of American Foresters National Convention

"Opportunities in a Forested World"
September 30-October 4, 2009
Orlando, Florida
For more information: www.safnet.org

9th Annual Association for Conflict Resolution Conference

"Convening "Whole of Community": Integrating Approaches and Practices to Address Conflicts in a Chaotic World"
October 7-10, 2009
Atlanta, Georgia
For more information: www.acrnet.org/conferences

Association for Conflict Resolution - Conflict Resolution Day

October 15, 2009
For more information including details about the poetry and video competitions for students: www.acrnet.org/crday

2009 Canadian Community for Dialogue & Deliberation Conference

October 22-25, 2009
Toronto, Ontario
For more information: www.c2d2.ca

National League of Cities 2009 Congress of Cities & Exposition

November 10-14, 2009
San Antonio, Texas
For more information: www.nlc.org

137th American Public Health Association Annual Meeting & Exposition

"Water and Public Health: the 21st Century Challenge"
November 7-11, 2009
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
For more information: www.apha.org/meetings

American Water Resources Association 2009 Annual Conference

November 9-12, 2009
Seattle, Washington
For more information: www.awra.org

13th National Brownfields Conference

November 16-18, 2009
New Orleans, Louisiana
For more information: www.brownfields2009.org

6th National Environmental Conflict Resolution Conference

U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution of the Morris K. Udall Foundation
May 25-27, 2010
Tucson, Arizona
For more information: www.ecr.gov