



# ACR Environment and Public Policy Section *Quarterly*

SPRING 2007

## EPP Section Welcomes Proposals for EPP Conference by John Jostes

The Environment and Public Policy Section (EPP) of the Association for Conflict Resolution welcomes proposals from section members and others who would like to participate as presenters in the 2007 EPP Section Conference. We will be meeting on the campus of Florida Atlantic University's Jupiter John D. MacArthur Campus in Jupiter Florida (near North Palm Beach and four miles inland from the Atlantic coastline). The conference starts in the early afternoon on Thursday, June 7, and ends at noon on Saturday, June 9, 2007.

In order to better understand the role of neutral and collaborative leaders in creating long-term institutional change, four themes will guide our discussions. These themes allow us to explore and examine the meaning of our work and the results it achieves. The themes are:

- The role of collaborative leadership in promoting public decision making around issues of importance to communities.
- The relationship between our practice as conflict resolvers and efforts to promote deliberative democracy.
- Dynamic tensions between our professional norms and practices to resolve particular disputes and the long-term viability and development of collaborative decision making.
- Options for advancing the field of public dispute resolution to a skeptical public.

### DESCRIPTION OF THEMES

**Collaborative Leadership**  
By holding the conference in Florida, we will be able to draw on the extensive institutionalization of collaborative processes in the state, as well as the collaborative leadership



*Florida Atlantic University's Jupiter John D. MacArthur Campus, home to the Florida Public Officials Design Institute, will host the Mid Year Conference: June 6-9, 2007.*

upon which those institutions are built. As a complement and possibly a contrast to the Florida experience, we are seeking proposals that expand the geographic range on this topic and also that address the following questions.

- What is collaborative leadership and how do we recognize and encourage it in political leaders? In neutrals?

see CONFERENCE on page 2

## Co-Chair Michael Elliott: Reflecting on the Maturation of EPP and its Future by Bryant Kuechle



Michael Elliott is an Associate Professor, jointly appointed to City and Regional Planning and Public Policy at Georgia Tech., and the most recently elected ACR EPP Section Co-Chair.

He serves as co-founder (in 1986) and Principal for the Southeast Negotiation Network and co-founder (in 1987) and associate of the Consortium on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution. In these

see ELLIOTT on page 3

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- **Forest Restoration Principles** page 5
- **RedBlue Project Report** page 9
- **EPP Section's Diversity Mentoring/Coaching Pilot Project Nears Completion** page 10
- **Conferences and Dates of Interest** page 11
- **Research Corner** page 12
- **Ethics Committee Update** page 12

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

## CONFERENCE continued from page 1

- How has political and bureaucratic decision-making (both within and external to government) been altered as a result of collaborative efforts? How have these changes been institutionalized?
- Does the role of collaborative leadership change as collaborative processes become more institutionalized, and what are the implications of these changes?

### **Deliberative Democracy**

Building on the discussion started at the 2006 EPP Section conference, we will continue to explore the relationship between our work as dispute resolvers and efforts to promote deliberative democracy, both in terms of how our work fits into existing political decision making processes and in terms of how it alters those processes over time. In particular, we will explore the following questions.

- What have we learned about the relationship between dialogue processes and traditional democratic decision-making processes?
- In what ways does our work leading collaboratives and building consensus help promote deliberative democracy in the US and internationally?
- What is the role of conflict resolvers and public participation specialists in promoting deliberative democracy?
- Under what circumstances does our accountability for good col-

laborative or consensus building processes compete with our goals and leadership efforts at promoting more deliberative democratic outcomes?

### **Nature of Our Practice**

At the core of our profession lie questions about the nature of our practice and the fate of traditional definitions of mediator, facilitator, etc., as government and civic engagement processes change. We are seeking proposals for sessions that address the following questions.

- What does our practice consist of today and how is it evolving?
- What forms of collaborative intervention most effectively promote the development of long term inclusive and participatory institutions?
- What forms of political and consultative roles are consistent with our claims to neutrality and professional competence as dispute resolvers?
- How might we best organize ourselves to address communitywide and regionally scaled conflicts, which involve a broad spectrum of citizens and interest groups over long periods of time?

### **Advancing the Field to a Skeptical Public**

Finally, the future of our practice and profession depends on the widespread adoption of conflict resolution and collaborative ap-

proaches in public decision making. In advancing the field to a skeptical public, we are seeking proposals to address the following questions.

- What messages are we sending when we describe our role and profession to politicians, the public, and the media?
- What can we learn from marketing and public relations professionals in selling a complex product or service?
- How active should mediators and facilitators be in advocating for negotiations and dialogues as a preferred approach to public decision-making?

### **OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE**

We invite proposals for the concurrent, 90-minute breakout sessions that follow each keynote address or panel.

Submit proposals by email to Cindy Cook [ccook@adamantaccord.com](mailto:ccook@adamantaccord.com) or Michael Elliott [michael.elliott@gatech.edu](mailto:michael.elliott@gatech.edu) If you have questions, please e-mail Cindy or Michael or:

- Robert Fisher (for Collaborative Leadership), [rcf@fisherccs.com](mailto:rcf@fisherccs.com)
- John Stephens (for Deliberative Democracy), [stephens@sog.unc.edu](mailto:stephens@sog.unc.edu)
- Bob Jones (for Our Practice), [rmjones@mailier.fsu.edu](mailto:rmjones@mailier.fsu.edu)

Volunteer to assist with conference planning or implementation by contacting John Jostes at [john@interactiveplans.com](mailto:john@interactiveplans.com).

## ELLIOTT continued from page 1

capacities, Michael works both as a public policy mediator and in the design and evaluation of environmental dispute management systems. He has worked regionally on issues ranging from conflicts over solid and hazardous waste and the siting and managing of locally unwanted facilities to the design of policies for managing environmental risk, natural resources and the quality of growth. Nationally, he has worked with agencies such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the National Park Service, and the President's Conference on Cooperative Conservation. Internationally, he has provided consultations and training for resolving environmental and land disputes in Estonia, Israel and Palestine, Nicaragua, Kazakhstan, and Germany.

As a teacher of continuing education courses, Michael has conducted over 50 professional training workshops in the field of public policy collaboration, conflict management and negotiation. He is co-editor of *Making Sense of Environmental Conflicts*, co-author of *Paternalism, Conflict and Co-Production*, author of more than 40 journal articles, and serves on the editorial board of the *Journal of the American Planning Association* and *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*. Michael received his Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Studies from MIT. He is recipient of the International Association for Conflict Management's Outstanding Book Award, the Georgia Institute of Technology's Outstanding Interdisciplinary Activity Award and the Georgia Planning Association's Merit Award. He currently serves as co-chair of the Environment and Public Policy Section of the Association for

Conflict Resolution.

Michael's initial involvement in conflict resolution was rooted in his work as an urban planner interested in building more effective models for political, bureaucratic and community decision making. Civic engagement based on interest-based negotiations provided a mechanism for more effectively identifying public interests and concerns, as well as linking these interests to decision making and implementation. Michael's work continues to focus on building the institutional capacity for collaborative planning and policy, including the design of more effective dispute management systems and the evaluation of the long-term impacts of collaborative processes on environmental and other public systems.

*What did you experience as an urban planner that made you decide to refocus your career towards conflict resolution?*

In 1977 I was the Executive Assistant to the Deputy Mayor for Economic Development in New York City. The city was in a fiscal crisis and close to bankruptcy. During the blackout of July 13th 1977, thousands of retail shops had been looted. The Mayor's Office had a significant amount of money, \$7.5 million in federal funds, to allocate towards commercial revitalization to reinvigorate commercial strips hit by the blackout. Since the Mayor's Office had no implementation agency, we needed to forge an agreement between our office, the departments responsible for planning and economic development.

Everyone had an idea of how to spend this money—the planning department wanted to integrate the money into neighborhoods with existing community revitalization efforts, the development office wanted to integrate the money into big projects, and the deputy mayor's office had different ideas. There was no mechanism in place for trying to resolve the difference between these agencies. During this year, the city also transitioned from Mayor Beame to Koch, with three deputy mayors for economic development, and the process of making decisions essentially ground to a halt in the absence of consistent top level leadership. I decided to go back to school to do my doctorate work at MIT, because I was interested in processes of decision making that could produce better results than the ones I was experiencing.

*What brought you to Georgia?*

Upon finishing my doctorate, I had a choice of staying in Boston at the Harvard Public Health School or moving to Atlanta to work at Georgia Tech. At that time, you could draw a line from the Institute for Environmental Negotiation at the University of Virginia, through the Conflict Clinic in St. Louis and ending at Western Network in Santa Fe, and at least in 1984 there was no environment or public policy dispute resolution center of any scale southeast of that line. In Boston I would enjoy the company of a wonderful community of researchers interested in advancing dispute resolution theory, while in Atlanta I would be in a position to initiate new centers for managing conflict. Atlanta seemed to provide

more exciting possibilities. Working with Greg Bourne, we co-founded the Southeast Negotiation Network (SNN) and, with others, the Consortium on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution (CNCR). SNN was a public policy mediation center funded by projects, while CNCR focused on theory building and education, funded primarily by the Hewlett Foundation.

*How have you observed the field evolve throughout your career?*

When I co-founded SNN in 1986, there were relatively few groups that were doing this kind of work. There were big pockets of the US where you had nobody else working in this area. There are now opportunities almost everywhere.

As the field has matured, we have also gone from a focus on individual projects, a particular dispute or a particular set of processes, to a much bigger concern with how those individual projects fit into public decision making and how collaboration and consensus building gets built for the long term. Particularly in environment decision making, efforts to improve the environment have long time horizons—if you're implementing an environmental project to improve water quality in the Everglades for example, you're not going to see results for a while. In the 1980s, the EPA and Interior Department were trying to get consensus building processes started, and were more experimental and creative in how they approached process design. Now, with 20 years of experience, public agencies are more attentive to the long term effort to sustain collaborative processes over time and to integrate them into decision

making processes that are political and bureaucratic. For dispute resolvers, this provides opportunities for more significant impacts of our work, but also threats to its creativity and responsiveness in particular conflicts.

*What would you like to accomplish as co-chair of ACR-EPP?*

Historically EPP has been very active in trying to shape these processes, in expanding the range of issues that are covered, and in reaching out to public officials and practitioner to try to develop better practices. It's a young field and EPP is a significant player in that young field.

For a while we were pretty much the dominant player in the field but now there are a wide range of institutions that are doing similar work, including the American Bar Association, The International Association for Public Participation, and the deliberate democracy groups. There is now a significant overlap, so institutionally we need to be building partnerships with these other groups that are trying to support similar kinds of work and similar kinds of social change.

In addition, as a researcher interested in the connections between practice and theory, I have been impressed by the depth of reflective practice and consistent self-evaluation of EPP practitioners in light of new ideas and experience. Our conferences are a particularly important mechanism for supporting this professional reflection, and I will be working with the conference committee in this regard. At the same time, we have few other formal mechanisms for helping to keep our membership informed about

the connection between practice and theory, between reflection and research. This needs attention.

*What are your interests away from EPP?*

I have two daughters, the youngest of which just went off to college. For years, much of my free time has centered around family and their activities. To some extent that is still true. Both are very active in either environmental or social justice concerns. My younger daughter went to Tulane University this year and became very active in social change surrounding public housing issues in New Orleans. My older daughter has worked in Nicaragua and on climate issues. It is immensely satisfying to watch them engage the world so actively and with hearts of compassion, and to help them think strategically and creatively about their work.

But, as anyone who has seen children head off knows, interests change during transitions such as this one. For this year, I took on the directorship of the City and Regional Planning Program here at Georgia Tech. Also, in my youth, I was quite interested in black and white photography, working in a darkroom. I'd like to get back into photography and have begun to bridge over into computer-based color work. And, probably most significantly, I have begun a four-year course in Education for Ministry, exploring how environmental integrity, social justice and conflict resolution interact with spirituality, how each inform and challenge the other. This is proving to be quite an exciting journey.

## Forest Restoration Principles by Rosemary Romero

I met with a Public Service Company representative in June 2005 to discuss facilitation of a process to reach consensus on utilization of woody biomass for a proposed Biomass facility in New Mexico. On July 13, 2005 the first session was held with participants that included professionals representing industry, conservation organizations, land management agencies, and independent scientists.

The first meeting was dedicated to developing a working relationship between the disparate entities. We developed ground rules, confidentiality agreement and outline for future presentations. The confidentiality agreement was important to the process as relationships between the various entities had been challenged through the years because of litigation and forest restoration prescriptions that had not met expectations and diverse opinions about forest restoration. The framework for the facilitated negotiations had been utilized by many of the participants. The Collaborative Forest Restoration Program which used a successful negotiation model for reaching consensus on grants made to organizations and agencies for forest restoration projects was utilized as a model for the development of the principles.

During the nine-month process, the group heard presentations from various experts, reviewed data developed from GIS models and discussed their respective agency goals and objectives as well as their personal perspectives on forest restoration.

In February 2006, the group culmi-

nated their work with a draft set of restoration principles. This began the next phase of finalizing the principles after vetting with all of the respective agencies and other stakeholders. The final work group product was released in May 2006. At this time some concerns were raised about how inclusive the development process had been, and at the request of the Regional Forester, the New Mexico State Forester's Office solicited further comments and suggestions from approximately 190 interested New Mexico stakeholders.

In a letter to Forest Supervisors dated February 12, 2007, Regional Forester Harv Forsgren noted the importance of the principles through the following excerpt:

"It is important to acknowledge the principles are intentionally general. They are not to be applied as standards (e.g., diameter caps, prohibitions on road construction, automatic deferral of livestock grazing) nor are they fixed in time. They do not provide "black and white" prescriptions that may be universally applied. The principles must be used in a manner consistent with established policies, relevant science, existing direction in our Forest Plans and the requirements of consultation and settlement agreements. Their principle value is to provide a framework to help focus collaborative dialog on attainment of restoration objectives among stakeholders and other interest at a local level."

The principles are now final and being used by various land management agencies.

These principles were collaboratively developed by a team of dedicated professionals representing industry, conservation organizations, land management agencies, and independent scientists. These principles for restoration should be used as guidelines for project development and they represent the "zone of agreement" where controversy, delays, appeals, and litigation are significantly reduced.

Whereas, these principles may be specific to restoration projects in New Mexico, they were developed for use in designing and implementing projects with a primary objective of ecological restoration while promoting economic and social benefits.

**Collaborate.** Landscape scale assessment, and project design, analysis, implementation and monitoring should be carried out collaboratively by actively engaging a balanced and diverse group of stakeholders.

**Reduce the threat of unnatural crown fire.** A key restoration priority must be moving stands toward a more natural restored condition and the reduction of the risk of unnatural crown fires both within stands and across landscapes. Specific restoration strategies should vary based upon forest vegetation type, fire regime, local conditions, and local management objectives. Forests and woodlands characterized by infrequent and mixed-severity fire should be managed toward a stand structure consistent with their historical ranges of variation – including, in some cases, high-density, continuous stands. Discontinuous stand structure may be appropriate

to meet community protection objectives in areas such as the wildland urban interface for these forest and woodland types.

**Prioritize and strategically target treatment areas.** Key considerations for prioritizing restoration treatment areas are: Degree of unnatural crown fire risk; proximity to human developments and important watersheds; protection of old-growth forests and habitats of federally threatened, endangered, or listed sensitive species; and strategic positioning to break up landscape-scale continuity of hazardous fuels. Treatments should be conducted at a landscape scale to decrease forest vulnerability to unnatural stand-replacing fire. This priority-setting should take place during the fire management planning, land management planning, and community wildfire protection planning stages.

**Develop site-specific reference conditions.** Site-specific historical ecological data can provide information on the natural range of variability for key forest attributes, such as tree age structure and fire regimes that furnish local “reference conditions” for restoration design. A variety of constraints, however, prevent the development of historical information on every hectare of land needing restoration. General goals should be to restore ecological integrity and function.

**Use low-impact techniques.** Restoration treatments should strive to use the least disruptive techniques, and balance intensity and extensiveness of treatments. In many areas, conservative initial treatments would be the minimum necessary to adequately reduce the threat of unnatural crown fire. Wildland fire use

or management ignited fires may be sufficient to reestablish natural conditions in many locations. In the extensive areas where fire alone cannot safely reduce tree densities and hazardous ladder fuels, mechanical thinning of trees may be needed before the introduction of prescribed fire. Patient, effective treatments will provide more options for the future than aggressive attempts to restore 120 years of change at once. In certain areas, however, such as some urban-wildland interfaces, trade-offs with imminent crown fire risks require considerations of rapid, heavy thinning of mostly small-diameter trees.

**Utilize existing forest structure.** Restoration efforts should incorporate and build upon valuable existing forest structures, such as large trees, and groups of trees of any size with interlocking crowns excluding aspen. These features are important for some wildlife species, such as Abert’s squirrels and goshawks, and should not be removed completely just to recreate specific historical trees locations. Since evidence of long-term stability of precise tree locations is lacking, especially for piñon and juniper, the selection of “leave” trees and tree clusters in restoration treatments can be based on the contemporary spatial distribution of trees, rather than pre-1900 tree positions. Maximizing use of existing forest structure can restore historical forest structure conditions more quickly. Leaving some relatively dense within-stand patches of trees need not compromise efforts to reduce landscape-scale crown fire risk.

The underlying successional processes of natural tree regeneration and mortality should be incor-

porated into restoration design. Southwestern conifer regeneration occurs in episodic, often region-wide pulses, linked to wet-warm climate conditions and reduced fire occurrence. Periods with major regeneration pulses in the Southwest occurred in the 1910s-1920 and in 1978-1998. Some of this regeneration would have survived under natural conditions. Restoration efforts should retain a proportion of these cohorts.

**Restore ecosystem composition.** Missing or diminished compositional elements, such as herbaceous understories, or extirpated species also require restoration attention. The forest understory, including shrubs, grasses, and forbs, snags, and down logs, is an important ecosystem component that directly affects tree regeneration patterns, fire behavior, watershed functioning, wildlife habitat, and overall patterns of biodiversity. Similarly, soil organisms, such as mycorrhizal fungi, are vital elements that can influence community composition and dynamics. A robust understory provides a restraint on tree regeneration and is essential for carrying surface fires. The establishment and maintenance of more natural patterns of understory vegetation diversity and abundance are integral to ecological restoration.

Restoration planning should include the conservation of habitats for diminished or extirpated wildlife species. Comprehensive forest ecosystem restoration requires balancing fire risk reduction with retention of forest structures necessary for canopy dependent species. Recovery plans and conservation plans for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species should be

incorporated to the fullest extent possible in planning for comprehensive forest restoration.

**Protect and maintain watershed and soil integrity.** Low impact treatments will minimize sedimentation, disruption of surface runoff, and other detrimental ecosystem effects. Equipment and techniques should be managed according to soil and water conservation “best management practices” applicable to site-specific soil types, physiography and hydrological functions.

Reconstruction, maintenance, or the decommission of existing roads to correct for poor hydrologic alignment and drainage condition can greatly reduce soil loss and sedimentation rates. Projects should strive for no net increase in road density.

Managing forest density and fuels to avoid uncharacteristically intense wildfire events will reduce the likelihood of catastrophic post-fire soil erosion and nutrient depletion from forested landscapes. Soil productivity should be protected and maintained by avoiding soil loss and compaction, and managing for on-site nutrient retention. Avoid repeated whole tree biomass removal from the forest to maximize nutrient retention. Whenever feasible, green foliage should be recycled by scattering on site; followed by prescribed burning to release stored nutrients.

**Preserve old or large trees while maintaining structural diversity and resilience.** Large and old trees, especially those established before ecosystem disruption by Euro-American settlement, are important forest components and critical to func-

tionality of ecosystem processes. Their size and structural complexity provide critical wildlife habitat by broadly contributing crown cover, influencing understory vegetation patterns, and providing future snags. Ecological restoration should manage to ensure the continuing presence of large and old trees, both at the stand and landscape levels. This includes preserving the largest and oldest trees from cutting and crown fires, focusing treatments on excess numbers of small young trees.

Develop “desired” forest condition objectives that favor the presence of both abundant large diameter trees and an appropriate distribution of age classes on the landscape, with a wide distribution of older trees. It is generally advisable to maintain ponderosa trees larger than 41 cm (16 inches) diameter at breast height (dbh) and other trees with old-growth morphology regardless of size (e.g. yellow-barked ponderosa pine or any species with large drooping limbs, twisted trunks or flattened tops).

Treatments should also focus on achievement of spatial forest diversity by managing for variable densities. Overall, forest densities should be managed to maintain tree vigor and stand resiliency to natural disturbances. Disease conditions are managed to retain some presence of native forest pathogens on the landscape, but constrained so forest sustainability is not jeopardized. Guidelines must provide opportunities to apply differing site-specific management strategies to work towards attainment of these goals, and recognize that achievement may sometimes require more than

one entry.

Stand level even-aged management may be appropriate for some objectives, including disease management, post wildfire tree regeneration, accelerating development of old growth characteristics, or for forest types for which even-aged stands are characteristic, such as spruce or aspen. Treatments should be identified through collaboration with key stakeholders.

Some ponderosa pine forests contain extremely old trees and dead wood remnants that may be small but are important because they contain unique and rare scientific information in their growth rings. Such trees have become increasingly rare in the late 20th century, and the initial reintroduction of fire often consumes these tree-ring resources. Restoration programs should preserve them where possible.

**Manage to restore historic tree species composition.** Forest density levels and the presence of fire in the ecosystem are key regulators of tree species composition. Where fire suppression has allowed fire-sensitive trees like junipers or shade-tolerant white fir or spruce to become abundant in historical ponderosa pine forests, treatments should restore dominance of more fire-resistant ponderosa pines. However, fire intolerant species sometimes make up the only remaining large tree component in a stand. Retention of these large trees is important to canopy dependent wildlife species. In mixed conifer forests, landscapes should be managed for composition and structure that approximates the natural range of variability.

### **Integrate process and structure.**

Ecological sustainability requires the restoration of process as well as structure. Natural disturbance processes, including fire, insect outbreaks, and droughts, are irreplaceable shapers of the forest. In particular, fire regimes and stand structures interact and must be restored in an integrated way; mechanical thinning alone will not reestablish necessary natural disturbance regimes. At the same time, fire alone may be too imprecise or unsafe in many settings, so a combination of treatments may often be the safest and most certain restoration approach.

The single best indicator of whether a proposed approach should be considered as “ecological restoration” is to evaluate if the treatment would help successfully restore the fire regime that is natural for that forest type. Approaches that do not restore natural fire regimes will not achieve full ecological restoration.

**Control and avoid using exotic species.** Seeding of exotic grasses and forbs should be prohibited as ecologically incompatible with good restoration. Once established, exotic species can be extremely difficult or impossible to remove. Seeding should be conducted with certified or weed free seeds to reduce the risk of contamination by non-native species or varieties.

In general, it is ecologically desirable to allow native herbaceous vegetation to recover incrementally unless there is potential for serious soil erosion or the potential for establishment of non-native invasive plants. If enhancement of herbaceous vegetation is needed, especially for road closures and recovery, using lo-

cally sourced native seeds or transplanting individuals from nearby areas into treatments is ecologically desirable.

Restoration treatments should also routinely incorporate early actions to control the establishment and spread of aggressive exotics that can be expected from restoration-related site disturbance.

### **Foster regional heterogeneity.**

Biological communities vary at local, landscape, and regional scales, and so should restoration efforts. Ecological restoration should also incorporate the natural variability of disturbance regimes across heterogeneous landscapes. Heterogeneity should be fostered in planning and implementing ecological restoration and all spatial scales, including within and between stands, and across landscape and regional scales.

### **Protect sensitive communities.**

Certain ecological communities embedded within ponderosa pine or other types of forests and some riparian areas, could be adversely affected by on-site prescribed burning or mechanical thinning. Restoration efforts should protect these and other rare or sensitive habitats, which are often hotspots of biological diversity, particularly those that are declining in abundance and quality in the region.

**Plan for restoration using a landscape perspective that recognizes cumulative effects.** Forest restoration projects should be linked to landscape assessments that identify historical range of variation (reference condition), current condition, restoration targets, and cumulative effects of management. Ecosystems are hierarchical; changing condi-

tions at one level arise from processes occurring at lower levels, and are constrained, in turn, by higher levels. The landscape perspective captures these complex relationships by linking resources and processes to the larger forest ecosystem. Forest restoration projects should incorporate plans for long-term maintenance of ecological processes.

**Manage grazing.** Grass, forbs, and shrub understories are essential to plant and animal diversity and soil stability. Robust understories are also necessary to restore natural fire regimes and to limit excessive tree seedling establishment. Where possible, defer livestock grazing after treatment until the herbaceous layer has established its current potential structure, composition, and function.

**Establish monitoring and research programs and implement adaptive management.** Well-designed monitoring, research, and documentation are essential to evaluate and adapt ongoing restoration efforts. Monitoring programs must be in place prior to treatment, and must evaluate responses of key ecosystem components and processes at multiple scales. Use research and monitoring results from a variety of sources to adjust and develop future restoration treatments.

When possible, restoration projects should be set up as experiments with replicates and controls to test alternative hypotheses. The locations and prescriptions for all restoration treatments should be archived in a geographic information system, so that land managers and researchers have access to site-specific records of restoration treatments.

**Exercise caution and use site-specific knowledge in restoring or managing piñon-juniper ecosystems and other woodland savannas.** These systems are diverse and complex. Knowledge of local reference structure, composition, processes and disturbance regimes is lacking or uncertain for many piñon–juniper ecosystem types. Given the diversity, variability, and complexity of piñon–juniper systems, identification of local reference conditions is critical to the development of restoration objectives. Exercise caution and use best available science and site-specific knowledge in planning and implementing ecological restoration projects. Use the Grassland and Woodland Restoration and Management Framework for development and implementation of specific projects (The Framework is currently under

development).

Active management may be appropriate to mitigate soil erosion, community wildland fire hazard, or degraded hydrologic function in cases where historical ecological dynamics are insufficiently understood to justify ecological restoration. Piñon–juniper sites may be particularly susceptible to ecological damage from treatments, for example, soil erosion and invasion by non-native plants.

**About the Facilitator:**

*For the past 20 years, Rosemary Romero has designed and facilitated numerous public involvement projects, assessed the potential for neutral conflict resolution services in diverse cases, consulted with public and private organizations on the use of alternative dispute resolution tech-*

*niques, trained hundreds of persons in negotiation and mediation and public involvement skills and promoted the use of mediation and facilitation in the environmental field and other public policy arenas. She has facilitated controversial issues with various federal, state and local governments. As a native New Mexican, she brings a heightened awareness of cross-cultural issues in the resolution of disputes. She is the former President of Western Network a non-profit organization that developed an extensive practice centered on conflict resolution specific to natural resource issues, water planning and land use. Ms. Romero has been a private practitioner for the last six years. She is the Past President of the Association for Conflict Resolution (ACR), past co-chair of the Environment and Public Policy Section and served on various ACR committees.*

## RedBlue Project Report by Mary Orton

# RedBlue BETA

The Public Conversations Project, in conjunction with Internews Interactive, is in the process of completing and evaluating a two-month beta testing of RedBlueUS (<http://redblue.endpoint.com/>). This is PCP's first attempt to translate its approach to dialogue into an online setting, where "red" and "blue" Americans could begin to talk across divides. About 55 pairs of conservatives and progressives were matched up and had online dialogues about three issues: immigration, the role of religion in the public sphere, and the balance of national security and privacy concerns.

PCP and Internews considered whether an online format might allow people to have the kind of conver-

sations that rarely take place in everyday life between people whose points of view are highly divergent. The dialogues were carefully structured and utilized the kinds of communication agreements that promote civil discourse regarding polarized issues. One of the unique features was a Virtual Facilitator, which allowed participants to get automated "help" when conversations became sticky or contentious.

PCP and Internews are currently evaluating participants' responses to determine next steps for this unique, online, structured dialogue process. For more information, please contact [djoseph@publicconversations.org](mailto:djoseph@publicconversations.org).

# EPP Section's Diversity Mentoring/Coaching Pilot Project Nears Completion

by Catherine McCracken. Special thanks to Project learning partners Bruce Coleman, Robyn Moore-Johnson, and Tina Patterson for agreeing to be interviewed and to Juliana Birkhoff and Dana Mason.

Thanks to the dedication, support and active participation of a number of EPP Section members, the year-long Diversity Mentoring/Coaching Pilot Project (DMPP) is nearing completion! The DMPP matched senior environmental third party interveners Maggie Lewis, Tim Mealey, Lucy Moore and Linda Ximenes as mentors to third party interveners and learning partners Robyn Moore-Johnson, Tina Patterson, and Bruce Coleman.

Mentors and learning partners met for a two-day training on EPP in July 2006 held at RESOLVE's offices in Washington, DC, an experience called a "highlight" of the pilot project experience by one learning partner. Since then, mentors and learning partners have been working together and facilitated conference calls have focused on various areas of EPP practice such as self-assessment of interests and strengths, marketing, building a business, and developing your presence as an EPP intervener. Learning partners have observed mentors at they facilitate meetings so that they can gain exposure to real EPP case examples.

The learning partners already have experience in various dispute resolution arenas. Bruce Coleman has worked with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency in a number of positions; currently he is a Regulated Community Liaison. In

the last decade he decided to focus on his mediation skills, completing a number of courses and an internship with the local county court system serving as a child custody mediator. He sees the DMPP as an opportunity to be a forerunner and has appreciated that the DMPP "has exposed me to things I didn't know were available and access to people to provide avenues of success."

Robyn Moore-Johnson was an attorney at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Region 6 office (Dallas, TX) and a volunteer mediator with Dispute Mediation Services, mediating business, community, employment, and family disputes. Robyn is also a former mediator with the United States Postal Service Redress Program. She became a member of ACR in 2004 and attended the 2004 EPP Conference in Portland where she learned about the DMPP. She wanted to be part of the DMPP "to learn more about the field and do some observations" and she is currently seeking a job that would involve facilitation and conflict resolution.

Tina Patterson's first exposure to public policy facilitation came when she volunteered with the "Listening to the City" program held in New York City after September 11. She has been a workshop panel presenter and moderator speaking on topics such as global leadership,

human trafficking, dispute resolution and literacy. Most recently, she was a facilitator at one of the Community Congress events held for the Unified New Orleans Plan, a post-Katrina planning process focusing on neighborhood and city-wide infrastructure needs in New Orleans. The self-assessment exercises and active listening skills taught have been key parts of Patterson's DMPP experience. Since joining the DMPP, she has done some facilitation work with the Washington, DC school system and is looking forward to connecting with the local ADR community.

The DMPP Work Group in is the process of evaluating the pilot project and assessing whether the pilot should be continued as an on-going EPP section project. The Work Group will be reporting back to the EPP Section with the results of the evaluation later in 2007.

Thanks to the following individuals and firms who made or solicited donations to support the DMPP: Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP, Gail Bingham, Kathleen Conway, Marcelle DuPraw, Janice Fleischer, Suzanne Orenstein, Mary Orton, Nancy Rich, John Stephens, and Ramsay Wiesenfeld.com

## Conferences and Dates of Interest by Catherine McCracken

*\*Note: Information correct as of early March 2007 – be sure to confirm via organization websites.*

**9th Annual Section of Dispute Resolution Conference** (American Bar Association): "ADR in Bloom: Politics and Collaboration in the Nation's Capital"  
April 25-28, 2007  
Washington, District of Columbia  
For more information: [www.abanet.org/dispute](http://www.abanet.org/dispute)

**Policy Consensus Initiative Workshops for University Centers and State Programs**  
April 25-27, 2007 in Seattle, Washington  
June 6-7, 2007 in Palm Beach County, Florida (in conjunction with EPP Mid-Year Conference)  
For more information: [www.policyconsensus.org](http://www.policyconsensus.org)

**3rd National Conference of Minority Professionals in Alternative Dispute Resolution**  
May 15, 2007 (pre-conference training)  
May 16-18, 2007 (conference)  
Columbus, Ohio  
For more information: [www.law.capital.edu/adr](http://www.law.capital.edu/adr)

**Environment & Public Policy Section Mid-Year Conference**  
June 7-9, 2007  
Palm Beach County, Florida  
For more information: EPP Section members who want to volunteer on planning for the conference should contact Conference Chair John Jostes at [john@interactiveplans.com](mailto:john@interactiveplans.com)

**Why Dialogue?** (and when, and how, and where?)  
June 15-16, 2007  
New York, New York  
For more information: [www.networkforpeace.com](http://www.networkforpeace.com)

**10th Annual U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Community Involvement Conference and Training**  
June 19-22, 2007  
Jacksonville, Florida  
For more information: [www.epa.gov/superfund/action/community/cconference](http://www.epa.gov/superfund/action/community/cconference)

**International Association of Facilitators**  
July 25-27, 2007 (Asia Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia)  
October 5-7, (Europe Conference, Edinburgh, Scotland)  
November 28-30, 2007 (Australia/New Zealand Conference, Adelaide, South Australia)  
For more information: [www.iaf-world.org](http://www.iaf-world.org)

**American Bar Association Annual Meeting**  
August 9-14, 2007  
San Francisco, CA  
For more information: [www.abanet.org/mtd](http://www.abanet.org/mtd)

**Association for Conflict Resolution - Conflict Resolution Day**  
October 18, 2007  
For more information: [www.acrnet.org/crday](http://www.acrnet.org/crday)

**7th Annual Association for Conflict Resolution Conference**  
October 24-27, 2007  
Phoenix, Arizona  
For more information: [www.acrnet.org/conferences](http://www.acrnet.org/conferences)  
Also: ACR Master Calendar at [www.acrnet.org/webcal](http://www.acrnet.org/webcal)

**Annual Conference: International Association for Public Participation**  
Week of November 12, 2007 (specific dates available late March 2007)  
Phoenix, Arizona  
For more information: [www.iap2.org](http://www.iap2.org)

**Interaction 2008 - Conflict Resolution Network Canada Biennial Conference**  
May 7-9, 2008  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Suggestions for conference theme and workshop ideas can be sent to: [crnetwork@crnetwork.ca](mailto:crnetwork@crnetwork.ca)  
For more information: [www.crnetwork.ca](http://www.crnetwork.ca)

**U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution National Conference**  
Spring 2008 (specific dates available soon)  
For more information: [www.ecr.gov](http://www.ecr.gov)

**National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation Conference**  
2008 Conference (specific dates to be announced)  
For more information: [www.thataway.org](http://www.thataway.org)

## Research Corner by Nick White

Researchers have increasingly focused their attention on the EPP field and the work conducted by practitioners. It is our hope that we can assist the EPP field by providing another conduit between research and practice.

In this space, we provide an abstract of the research with a link to the full piece. We would like to have as much diversity of research as possible. If you know of research that you think other practitioners may find interesting, please email the author's name and contact information to Nick White ([whiten@umich.edu](mailto:whiten@umich.edu)).

Collaborative planning on state trust lands was identified for further research at the 2004 State Trust Lands Research and Policy Analysis Roundtable convened by the State Trust Lands Partnership project of the Sonoran Institute and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. In March 2005, under the guidance of Dr. Steven L. Yaffee, a team of eight graduate students from the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment began conducting a region-wide survey and analysis of eight case studies in which state land trust agencies

collaborated with stakeholders in trust land telephone interviews, each lasting roughly one to three hours. The team used these interviews to answer a set of research questions concerning the benefits, challenges, costs and outcomes of collaborative planning on state trust lands. The observations and best practices in this report grew out of stakeholder reflections and perceptions as well as the research team's external analysis. For the full report go to: <http://www.snre.umich.edu/ecomgt/trustlands/>

## Ethics Committee Update

The Ethics Committee of the ACR EPP Section has been working diligently to complete a second iteration of their proposed "Standards of Professional Conduct for Facilitators of Public Policy Agreement Seeking Processes." The first iteration was presented at the ACR Conference in 2005. The Standards are based on the format of the Model Standards for Mediators adopted by ACR, AAA and the ABA. The Committee meets about once a month by teleconference. The current goal is to have a second iteration to present and discuss at the EPP Section Conference this June in Florida. For further information, you may contact the Committee Chair, Janice Fleischer at [janice@flashresolutions.com](mailto:janice@flashresolutions.com)

### Environment and Public Policy Leadership Council Members

Cindy Cook, Co-Chair 2005-2007  
[ccook@adamantaccord.com](mailto:ccook@adamantaccord.com)

Michael Elliott, Co-Chair 2006-2008  
[michael.elliott@coa.gatech.edu](mailto:michael.elliott@coa.gatech.edu)

John Stephens, Immediate Past Co-Chair  
[stephens@sog.unc.edu](mailto:stephens@sog.unc.edu)

Juliana Birkhoff, Co-Chair, Diversity Mentoring Project  
[jbirkhoff@resolv.org](mailto:jbirkhoff@resolv.org)

Nicholas Dewar, Elected Member  
[ndewar@igc.org](mailto:ndewar@igc.org)

Steve Garon, Elected Member  
[Stephen\\_garon@sra.com](mailto:Stephen_garon@sra.com)

John Jostes, Acting Chair, Conference Planning Committee  
[john@interactiveplans.com](mailto:john@interactiveplans.com)

Bryant J. Kuechle, Chair, Communications Committee  
[bkuechle@langdongroupinc.com](mailto:bkuechle@langdongroupinc.com)

Mary Orton, Elected Member  
[mary@maryorton.com](mailto:mary@maryorton.com)

Harry Manasewich, Chair, Advanced Practitioner Committee  
[hfactor@aol.com](mailto:hfactor@aol.com)

Carolyn Penny, Elected Member  
[cpenny@unexmail.ucdavis.edu](mailto:cpenny@unexmail.ucdavis.edu)

ACR EPP Section Communication Committee: Bryant Kuechle (Chair), Mary Orton, Robyn Moore-Johnson, Robin Harkless, Nick White, Forsyth Kineon, Ed Moreno, Catherine McCracken.