



US Institute and EPP Section converge for Tucson conference

by Ellen Wheeler and Bryant Kuechle

The EPP Section of ACR held its annual conference on May 19 in Tucson, Arizona in conjunction with ECR2008, the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution's fifth national conference on ECR, May 20-22. More than 300 people attended, including federal agency personnel, private practitioners, and stakeholder representatives. A full day of training sessions preceded the main part of the conference, and Roster and Native Network members participated in specialized sessions and events during the training day.



All attendees had the opportunity to hear agency officials, including Deputy Secretary of the Interior and Udall Foundation Board Member Lynn Scarlett, discuss their assessment of federal ECR – how it has been used and what to expect going forward.

Members of the interagency ECR Policy Forum created by the OMB-CEQ Policy Memorandum also shared information about ECR activities at their agencies during a plenary lunch. The final plenary session featured

see **CONFERENCE** on page 2

Sharon M. Pickett Award nominations by Michael Elliott



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 family mediator and trainer, Sharon has worked as a communication specialist for many environmental NGOs. Her clients have 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 Association for Conflict Resolution (ACR) is now accepting nominations for the Sharon M. Pickett Award, due by **Aug. 15, 2008**. Visit www.acrnet.org/about/awards/pickett.htm for eligibility and submission details.

ALSO INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- **USIECR Director steps down** page 2
- **USIECR turns 10** page 3
- **Confounding Collaboration** page 5
- **Lessons from Dialogue Evaluation Research** page 6
- **Conferences and Dates of Interest** page 8
- **Leadership Postions** page 9

CONFERENCE continued from page 1

Professor Jonathan Overpeck, a coordinating author of the Nobel Prize-winning UN report on climate change, discussing the report and its implications for the field of ECR. Conference sessions used a variety of formats -- from information-sharing to highly interactive -- and were grouped into three issue area tracks. The issue tracks were:

Technology, Tools, and Innovations in ECR

– This track explored emerging and innovative uses of computer-assisted decision support and communication tools in ECR processes. The sessions highlighted the ways stakeholders and ECR practitioners can use technology to inform and facilitate controversial decision-making processes. Some examples included web-based project and information management tools, computer-assisted decision systems, GIS mapping, and content analysis. Session presenters demonstrated how these tools are used in a range of settings, including land use planning, ecosystem management, water resources, transportation, and energy.

Matching the Process to the Problem: Navigating Process Choices

— Those involved in ECR must choose among a growing number of problem-solving approaches to find one that best suits their situation. This conference track was designed to provide a basis for making more informed choices, covering two themes:

- **Understanding choices before getting into a process.** Public and private sector presenters shared insights and explored with participants the opportunities and challenges in the emerging array of process choices and approaches for engaging interested parties and the public.
- **Choices once in a process.** Presenters shared their experiences and provided new ideas for addressing process choices in specific situations, for specific issues and from different perspectives.

ECR Evaluation – For many years there has been a growing call for ECR researchers and evaluators to move beyond the traditional measures of success (such as settlement rates and satisfaction) and to provide the field with more informative actionable feedback. The ECR research and evaluation community has acted on the recommendations, and results were presented in this conference track regarding the value of ECR and the dynamics driving ECR. Presenters reported on work to assess changes in participant working relationships, give more thoughtful consideration to claims that ECR is “quicker and cheaper,” and begin linking ECR and environmental outcomes, among other things.

Conference proceedings can be found at www.ecr.gov.

Director of U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Steps down; Search Under Way for Successor

After serving for 10 years as the director of the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, Kirk Emerson is stepping down to return to an academic career and pursue other interests. Kirk has accepted an appointment starting this July as a visiting professor at the University of Arizona’s School of Public Administration and Policy, where she will focus on collaborative governance and climate change adaptation and contribute to interdisciplinary policy research and service. Kirk will serve as a senior advisor to the Institute for the rest of the year and continue to work on various projects, including ECR evaluation.

A search for Kirk’s successor is being led by Ellen Wheeler, executive director of the Morris K. Udall Foundation. The U.S. Institute is a program of the Udall Foundation; both are based in Tucson. An announcement for the position is posted at www.ecr.gov. The Institute director’s position has been redesignated, as a result of internal restructuring at the Udall Foundation, as Deputy Executive Director for Environmental Conflict Resolution.

US Institute for ECR celebrating 10 years by Ellen Wheeler

As its 10th anniversary approaches, the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution looks forward to continuing to strengthen the relationships that have characterized its start-up years, including those with the practitioner community.

Congress established the Institute in 1998 as a program of the Morris K. Udall Foundation, an independent federal agency based in Tucson, and charged it with assisting parties to resolve environmental, natural resource and public lands conflicts that involve federal agencies. The Udall Foundation was created in 1992 to honor and carry on the legacy of the late Congressman Mo Udall, who was a national leader on environmental and Native American issues, and who also was known for his ability to bring about consensus on tough public policy issues.

The Institute works to resolve environmental disputes and foster collaborative problem-solving by:

- *Providing mediation, facilitation and other services to assist federal agencies and other stakeholders to resolve current environmental conflicts.*
- *Increasing the capacity of federal agencies and other stakeholders to manage and resolve future environmental conflicts.*
- *Providing leadership to assist the Federal government to develop ECR policies and practices to promote effective use of ECR and to improve environmental decision making.*

Working with Practitioners

The Institute's enabling legislation contained two provisions that guide how the Institute relates to the practitioner community: First, the legislation provides that the Institute should work with practitioners located in geographic proximity to a dispute whenever practicable; and second, that the Institute should charge fees for its services and use those revenues to support its operating budget. Each year, Congress funds only part of the Institute's operating budget.

These provisions have created a symbiotic relationship between the Institute and private sector practitioners. The Institute typically contracts with ECR practitioners for the lion's share of its project work, with 70% to 80% of total project revenues each year flowing through



Morris King "Mo" Udall (1922–1998) served as a U.S. Representative from Arizona from 1961 to 1991. In 1992, the US Congress founded the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation.

to contracted providers from the private sector. The remaining revenues are generated by Institute staff services and are retained by the Institute to help pay annual operating expenses.

To carry out its mandate to work with the private sector, the Institute created the National Roster for Environmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building Professionals as a resource for the Institute, other federal agencies and all stakeholders to use when selecting mediators and facilitators for projects. The Roster currently has more than 280 members from 41 states, the District of Columbia and Canada. The Roster can be searched by anyone with Internet access, and the Institute is currently working on programming improvements intended to make Roster searches even more user-friendly.

The Institute also sponsors the Native Dispute Resolution Network, which is a referral and education resource of Native practitioners and others who address environmental, natural resource, and public/trust lands issues where American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and federal agencies are primary parties.

The Institute relies on the work of Roster and Native Network members to meet the federal demand for ECR services. The Institute looks forward to continuing these partnerships. Both the Roster and the Native Network are open to new members. Information can be found at www.ecr.gov under "Resources."

Working with Other Federal Agencies

Given that the Institute is authorized to work only on issues in which the federal government is involved, outreach to the federal sector to promote the effective and appropriate use of ECR continues to be a major focus of the Institute. One opportunity for outreach and education has been the ECR Policy Memorandum issued by the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Management and Budget in late 2005. The Memo encourages the use of ECR by all federal agencies and established an annual reporting process on use of ECR. The Institute, which is designated in the Memo as a resource for other agencies as they consider the use of ECR, will continue to help manage quarterly ECR Policy Forums involving Cabinet Departments and other agencies and to assist with the reporting process. More information on the ECR Policy Memo is available at <http://www.ecr.gov/Resources/FederalECRPolicy/FederalECRPolicy.aspx>.

In addition, the Institute conducts outreach and education through its training program, which is designed to provide federal managers and other stakeholders with practical information on when and how ECR can be used most effectively. The trainings also provide tools that participants can use to more effectively participate in ECR processes and better manage and prevent disputes. With these training courses, the Institute hopes not only to increase the capacity of stakeholders in ECR processes but also to promote the use of ECR by increasing awareness of its benefits.

The growing strength of the U.S. Institute's relationships could be seen last month at ECR2008, the fifth national conference hosted by the Institute in Tucson. About one-third of the 300 attendees were practitioners, another one-third federal personnel, and the last third included a variety of individuals from tribal, state, and local and governments, environmental organizations, and academia. In addition to the conference itself, there were well-attended sessions for Roster and Native Network members, a day of training provided by private practitioners and Institute staff, and meetings for EPP section members and EPA staff.

The Institute's 10th year is also a year of some transitions. Kirk Emerson is stepping down as director at the end of June and is returning to an academic career at the University of Arizona. In addition, Senior Program Manager Mike Eng is leaving this summer to manage resource protection for the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary; Senior Program Manager Dale Keyes retired in January; longtime EPP member Melinda Holland has been hired as a senior program manager, focusing primarily on issues involving energy and environmental quality; Brian J. Manwaring has joined the U.S. Institute as a program manager focusing primarily on multi-stakeholder planning and conflict resolution processes involving water resources; Philip J. Lemanski has been designated Deputy Executive Director for Finance and Education; and Jeffrey Silvyn has joined the Udall Foundation as general counsel, replacing Ellen Wheeler, who became the Udall Foundation's executive director in January.

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution is a federal program established in 1998 by the U.S. Congress to assist parties in resolving environmental, natural resource and public land conflicts. It is a program of the Tucson-based Morris K. Udall Foundation, an independent agency of the executive branch overseen by a board of trustees appointed by the President. The Morris K. Udall Foundation was established in 1992 by Congress to honor the late Morris K. Udall's thirty years of service in the House of Representatives. More information about the Udall Foundation and the U.S. Institute can be found at www.udall.gov and www.ecr.gov.

Ellen Wheeler is the Executive Director of the Morris K. Udall Foundation.

Confounding Collaboration: The Federal Advisory Committee Act's Impact on BLM Resource Advisory Councils

by Jason E. Good

Over the past several decades, agencies that govern natural resources have been gradually incorporating collaboration into their decision-making processes (Coughlin, Merrick, Hoben, Manskoff, & Quesada, 1999). One of the tools agencies use to foster collaboration is the advisory council. The Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972 governs the administration and operation of most advisory councils in the federal government (5 U.S.C. App. 1). Congress enacted FACA in 1972 to address inequities and inefficiencies in the federal advisory council system (Cardozo, 1981). Prior to FACA, advisory committees were regarded to be wasteful, excessive in number, exclusive in membership, and unaccountable to Congress and the public (Cardozo, 1981; Croley & Funk, 1997). The powerful influence of advisory councils in the executive branch was thought to result in agency capture (Croley & Funk, 1997). FACA requires a host of administrative requirements aimed at ensuring advisory committees are balanced in membership, transparent and open to the public, advisory only, uniform in operation and administration, efficient, and accountable (5 U.S.C. App. 1). Because of its numerous requirements, FACA is thought to constrain the ability of advisory councils to operate in a flexible and collaborative manner (Long & Beierle, 1999; Wondolleck & Yaffee, 2000; Daniels & Walker, 2001). The Act's procedural and

administrative requirements, its inherent ambiguity, and its prescribed dual interpretations are thought to inhibit the formation of advisory councils and frustrate their collaborative efforts.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) established the Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) in 1995. The RACs were established to help the BLM manage public lands in a collaborative manner (Shea, U.S. BLM, 1998; Babbitt as cited in Long & Beierle, 1999; Norton, U.S. BLM, 2002; Hughes, U.S. BLM, 2003; Kempthorne, U.S. BLM, 2006; Clarke, U.S. BLM, n.d.). There are 25 RACs in 13 Western states (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, and Washington), all of which are chartered under FACA. According to BLM guidance, the RACs' objectives are to advise the BLM "regarding the preparation, amendment and implementation of land use plans for public lands and resources within its area" (§ 1784.6-1). The effects of FACA's requirements on the ability of the RACs to function effectively and engage in collaborative decision-making were the focus of this study.

RAC Designated Federal Officials (DFO) and RAC Coordinators, the BLM employees who work closest with the councils, were interviewed for their perceptions of FACA's impacts on the RACs' ability to function effectively and

be collaborative. A semi-structured telephone interview protocol was used, and 16 DFOs and eight RAC Coordinators from 22 RACs were interviewed. Impacts on the RAC process were found to be much more complex than was expected or that the literature suggests. Some interviewees feel that the Act is a hindrance to their ability to manage the RACs effectively and in a way that promotes collaboration. Others feel that FACA is essential to the councils' ability to be effective. Many interviewees feel that FACA is both a hindrance and that it is essential. Additionally, the BLM's application of FACA and policies regarding the RACs are also perceived to be detrimental to effective functioning of the RACs. Nonetheless, some indicated that they are able to avoid some of FACA's hindrances. These interviewees take a more philosophical and less bureaucratic approach to managing the RACs, perceiving that common sense is the overarching rule. These interviewees tend to follow FACA's intent rather than its procedural prescriptions when a conflict between the two arises. The findings of this study raise enough concern to warrant a systematic examination of other ways that FACA's principles might be achieved in the BLM context without imposing its problematic constraints.

Jason E. Good is PhD Student in the School of Natural Resources & Environment at the University of Michigan.

The ACR EPP Section is always looking for articles and story ideas for the newsletter. Contact the Communications Committee Chair, Bryant Kuechle at (208) 739-3048 or bkuechle@langdongroupinc.com.

Lessons from Dialogue Evaluation Research by Ellen Kabcenell Wayne

What is an article about a particular dialogue evaluation research project doing in the EPP Section newsletter? Where do dialogue and environmental and public policy work overlap? What can I offer that will be interesting and helpful to Section members?

I was asked to write this article after making a presentation on dialogue evaluation at the ACR International Conference last fall. In turn, I asked myself – and people involved with the newsletter and with the EPP Section -- all these questions. I thought about the relationship between issues of difference and understanding raised in dialogues and those that arise in environmental and public policy work with communities or projects that affect different identity groups. Keeping these issues in mind, I offer a series of lessons from the evaluation of one intergroup dialogue program that may help EPP practitioners in evaluating their own work.

Background on Operation Understanding DC

Some time ago, my colleague Leila Peterson and I undertook an evaluation of Operation Understanding DC (“OUDC”). OUDC is a year-long dialogue and leadership program for black and Jewish high school students from the Washington metropolitan area. It is an extensive and intense experience, involving participants in a series of weekend workshops, many Sunday afternoon education and discussion sessions, visits to each other’s homes or places of worship for Passover and Easter, a summer journey to parts of the United States of interest to one or both of the groups, and giving speeches and leading workshops based on their program experience.

OUDC seeks to “build a future generation of community leaders who will work to eradicate racism, anti-Semitism and all forms of discrimination, and to promote respect, understanding, and cooperation within their communities” (www.oudc.org). It proposes to do so through “education and dialogue, which lead to a change in behavior, and, ultimately, a change in attitude” (www.oudc.org), encouraging participants to work toward prejudice reduction and social change.

How do you evaluate such an effort? Many of the intended results are long term and cannot reasonably be examined in the course of the program year. Others are changes in attitudes, inclinations, and other “soft” areas that are difficult to measure. Evaluating OUDC

may therefore parallel those areas of public policy practice that seek collaboration, relationship-building, and attitude change as significant outcomes.

Lessons Learned

The experience of performing the OUDC evaluation provides five lessons that could help EPP practitioners:

Lesson #1 – If you’re going to evaluate whether a program is successful, you need a specific understanding of what it is really trying to accomplish. In the case of OUDC, this process involved working with the program staff to define and clarify specific goals underlying the program’s broader mission. The same type of definition and clarification may be necessary for EPP processes and programs – even if you have designed and are facilitating the program yourself. As practitioners, we often go into our work with a general sense of what we want to accomplish and/or what the stakeholders are seeking. But you can’t measure accomplishment generally; you need to define specific goals and figure out how to measure their accomplishment.

A wonderful guide to the process of clarifying goals can be found in Michael Quinn Patton’s *Utilization-Focused Evaluation* (1997).

Lesson #2 – Don’t reinvent the wheel. It’s fine to come up with your own measures of accomplishment when a project’s goals are comparatively concrete or when you have no choice. But if a project is seeking to change attitudes, develop relationships, etc., you should not hesitate to stand on the shoulders of those who came before you. In the OUDC project, the ability to use a pre-existing dialogue evaluation instrument posted on the internet by Dr. Walter Stephan of New Mexico State University meant that we could move quickly to measure attitudes at the program’s start, giving us “before” data to compare with end-of-program results. It also meant that we had the benefit of the time and expertise Dr. Stephan devoted to designing and testing scale questions to measure particular attitudes. In your projects, you might also start by learning from other practitioners who have created, facilitated or evaluated similar projects how they have thought about or measured success. You can also consider the increasing amount of published material on evaluation of or evaluation frameworks for various EPP processes.

Other people's work won't always be a perfect fit to your situation. You may have to adapt or supplement. Still, having the benefit of others' thinking can give you a head start in your work and let you produce a better evaluation more efficiently.

Lesson #3 -- Comparison is difficult, but you should think about it anyway. It is generally not possible in real world work to use the classic experimental research model, placing randomly-selecting people in your program or process and others in a control group. However, there may be other ways to understand which effects really come from the program and which are attributable to something else. If you compare participants' attitudes coming into the program or process with their attitudes at the end, for example, you get a measurement of change, but cannot exclude the possibility that the change is the result of some other influence occurring at the same time. If, on the other hand, you can compare those involved in your process with similarly-situated people who have not been involved, you get a better measure of process-related effects.

All research has limitations, so it's important to consider how big a problem those limitations present in a particular case. In evaluating OUDC, for example, we realized that program participants were teenagers who would normally experience a great deal of growth and change over the course of a year. We considered it a significant problem that we would not be able to say whether any changes we measured were a result of normal growth, rather than of OUDC participation. We therefore took the need for a comparison group seriously and worked to find and test an appropriate (if imperfect) group of non-OUDC students. As a result, we made the important finding that the attitude changes we saw in OUDC participants were not present in their non-program peers.

This level of comparison will not always be possible and, if it is possible, may not be worthwhile in a particular evaluation. Still, you should consider both the benefits and difficulties of using a comparison group, so that you can make an intentional decision.

Lesson #4 – Don't underestimate the importance of relationships. One finding of the OUDC evaluation was that some attitudes changed more when the program participants had closer interpersonal relationships with each other than when they did not. This effect may be limited to intergroup or bias-reduction work. On the other hand, people who develop strong personal

relationships may be more open to learning and change in other areas. In considering why a program succeeds or fails, be open to the role relationships may be playing.

Lesson #5 – Be prepared for surprises. Your evaluation should provide a lot of information about whether a program or process is succeeding in some or all of its goals. It should help you learn how it or similar processes could be improved. At the same time, it is also likely to produce some results that challenge your expectations and your thinking. In the OUDC evaluation, for example, we discovered that although participants' understanding of the other group improved and they showed strong interest being actively involved in social change, they also became less optimistic about future improvements in intergroup relationships. This finding raised a lot of questions about the nature of optimism and potential reasons for the decrease – questions that could not be answered by the evaluation results themselves. This surprise did not signal a failure in evaluation, however. Instead, it opened a new door to future research that may help us better understand of the causes and effects of decreased optimism.

Conclusion

The evaluation of OUDC provided the program with information that demonstrated its successes and pointed out areas where its process could be improved. It also provided lessons to others who seek to evaluate programs and processes that strive for "soft" changes in attitude and understanding.

Those interested in more detailed information about the OUDC evaluation process and results can find further information in "Is It Just Talk? Understanding and Evaluating Intergroup Dialogue," to be published in the July 2008 edition of *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*.

Ellen Kabcenell Wayne is an Assistant Professor teaching in the Negotiations and Conflict Management program at the University of Baltimore. She began her career as a lawyer at the U.S. Department of Justice and several Washington, DC, law firms, largely as an employment discrimination litigator. She subsequently obtained an MS in Conflict Analysis and Resolution and worked as a mediator, facilitator, and organizational consultant. Her areas of specialization include organizational conflict, dialogue processes, and evaluation.

Conferences and Dates of Interest by Catherine McCracken

**Note: Information correct as of July 2008 – be sure to confirm via organization websites.*

International Association of Facilitators

July 23-24, 2008 (Africa Conference, Pilanesburg, South Africa)

August 27-28, 2008 (Asia Conference, Sarawak, Malaysia)

October 3-5, 2008 (Europe Conference, Groningen, The Netherlands)

November 26-28, 2008 (Australia/New Zealand Conference, Bathurst, New South Wales)

April 20-25, 2009 (North America Conference, Vancouver, British Columbia)

For more information: www.iaf-world.org

93rd Ecological Society of America Annual Meeting

August 3-8, 2008

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

For more information: www.esa.org/meetings

138th American Fisheries Society Annual Meeting

August 17-21, 2008

Ottawa, Ontario

For more information: www.fisheries.org

International Association for Public Participation International Conference

“Public Participation and Corporate Social Responsibility: from why to how”

August 27-29, 2008

University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland

For more information: iap2.org

128th American Water Works Association Annual Conference

Call for Papers - deadline September 15, 2008, for conference to be held

June 14-18, 2009

San Diego, CA

For more information: www.awwa.org/ace09

2008 International City/County Management Association Annual Conference

September 21-24, 2008

Richmond, Virginia

For more information: www.icma.org

A Collaborative Meeting on the Environment of the West

September 23-25, 2008

The Homestead Resort
Midway, Utah

For more information: www.collaborativesummit2008.com/index.htm

8th Annual Association for Conflict Resolution Conference

“Aspirations, Possibilities, and Realities: Expanding Principles, Practice, and Research in a Changing World”

September 24-27, 2008
Austin, Texas

For more information: www.acrnet.org/conferences

4th National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation Conference

October 3-5, 2008

Austin, Texas

For more information: www.thataway.org

Association for Conflict Resolution - Conflict Resolution Day

October 16, 2008

For more information: www.acrnet.org/crday

136th American Public Health Association Annual Meeting

“Public Health Without Borders”

October 25-29, 2008

San Diego, California

For more information: www.apha.org/meetings

National League of Cities 2008 Congress of Cities

November 11-15, 2008

Orlando, Florida

For more information: www.nlc.org



Denver will host the EPP 2009 Conference, June 11-13

Detailed information forthcoming

Four Leadership Positions Opening - Fall 2008 **Deadline: July 31, 2008**

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. Three at-large seats and one co-chair position on the Leadership Council will become vacant in the fall of 2008. The Leadership Council is actively seeking candidates for these three 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 serve two-year terms. Duties include:

- Participating in monthly conference calls of 1.5 hours in length;
- Working on a committee (e.g., Membership and Conference Planning; Diversity, Leadership, and Mentoring; Ethics; Communications and Outreach; or Professional Development / Advanced Practitioner);
- 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, 2008, 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.

Environment and Public Policy Leadership Council Members

Michael Elliott, Co-Chair 2006-2008
michael.elliott@coa.gatech.edu

Carolyn Penny, Co-Chair 2007-2009
clpenny@ucdavis.edu

Cindy Cook, Immediate Past Co-Chair
ccook@adamantaccord.com

Dan Adams, Elected Member
dadams@langdongroupinc.com

*Juliana Birkhoff, Chair, Diversity
Mentoring Project*
jbirkhoff@resolv.org

Ramona Buck, Elected Member
ramona.buck@mdcourts.gov

Nicholas Dewar, Elected Member
ndewar@igc.org

Marci Dupraw, Elected Member
marci_dupraw@sra.com

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

Steve Garon, Elected Member
Stephen_garon@sra.com

*Bryant J. Kuechle, Chair,
Communications Committee*
bkuechle@langdongroupinc.com

*Harry Manasewich, Chair, Advanced
Practitioner Committee*
hfactorldr@aol.com

*John Stephens, Conference
Committee Chair*
stephens@sog.unc.edu