

Managing Climate Change through Collaborative Governance: *Addressing Policy Challenges Globally and Locally*

June 11 – 13, 2009 ♦ Denver, CO

www.du.edu/con-res/center/June2009ConferenceEPP.html

Session List

Listed below are the workshops and panels that will be presented at the 2009 conference. The complete schedule of speakers, sessions, reception, banquet, and other associated events will be posted soon.

Registration includes admittance to all sessions, a reception on Thursday evening, and a banquet on Friday evening.

Click on the session title to go to a complete description, or scroll through all descriptions below.

A Collaborative Approach to Climate Change: Experience in the States

Insights from the United States Climate Action Partnership: Lessons Learned from Creating a Foundation for a Comprehensive U.S. Climate Policy

Building Coast-Smart Communities:

An Innovative Negotiation Simulation on Combating the Effects of Climate Change

National Roundtable on Climate Change

**Addressing Climate Change through Collaboration and Public Involvement
Community Planning Assistance Programs**

Water Pressure - Local, Regional and International Issues Facing Water Utilities in Adapting to Climate Change: How Can Collaborative Governance Help?

**Managing Scientific and Technical Information in Collaborative Policy Making:
Learning from Local, Regional and International Experience**

Tools for Addressing Bi-State Climate Change: The Lake Tahoe Case Study

Working Framework for Understanding Collaborative Governance and Climate Change

Climate Change and Local Government Action - Declaration without Collaboration

The Application of Behavioral Public Relations and Communications Models to Climate Change – the New Hampshire Presidential Primary Experience

Collaborative Approaches to Addressing Climate Change in Environmental Review Processes

Some Like it Hot: A Highly Interactive Session on Climate Change in ADR

A Tale of Three Parks

Authentic Public Participation: What, Why and How to Involve Others in Your Decisions

The Ethics of Collaboration: From Case Scenario to Issue to Standards of Practice

The I-70 Mountain Corridor: Ten Years and \$30 Million- What Does it Get You?

Creating Forums and Building Capacity to Manage Climate Change Conflicts

Challenges & Opportunities to Integrate Collaborative Governance into Climate Change Adaptation at the Regional Level

Can Greater Collaboration between Public Health and Environmental Experts Encourage Better Policies to Address Global Climate Change?

A Collaborative Approach to Climate Change: Experience in the States

While the national debate on climate change has been marked by acrimony and polarization, some states are adopting innovative, consensus-based strategies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, adopting renewable energy technologies, and creating sustainable economies. These experiments provide important lessons in collaborative governance and stakeholder engagement related to the development of effective climate change policies. This session will examine this topic and its implications including:

- Why has this approach worked and what are its potential pitfalls?
- How can the discussion be moved from debate based on conflicting scientific, economic, and political positions to collaboration within a framework of common goals?

- How can policy-makers, stakeholders, and conflict resolution professionals use these lessons to encourage the development of more effective greenhouse gas reduction and carbon management policies nationally?

For the most part, the discussion about climate change and approaches to collaborative governance has been focused on political, regulatory, technical, and framework concepts. While most of this dialogue has been going on in political, environmental and professional contexts, numerous organizations and individuals have been working to create practical models that can be adapted and replicated in the “real world.” This unique conversation will offer the perspective of three people who are leaders in creating and coordinating practical, collaborative state climate programs. They will explore their successes and challenges in conducting this work.

Presenters:

Tom Peterson, president and CEO of the Center for Climate Strategies in Washington, D.C., has been involved in almost all state and regional climate programs. Mr. Peterson’s work focuses on collaborative partnerships with state governments and uses a model based on effective stakeholder engagement.

Stephen Saunders is the president of the Rocky Mountain Climate Organization (RMCO). Using the Center for Climate Strategies’ collaborative model, RMCO convened a stakeholder panel that recommended actions that can be taken by the Colorado state government, local governments, and others to reduce the state’s contribution and vulnerability to climate change.

John “Jack” Pommer represents District 11 in Boulder County in the Colorado State House of Representatives. Rep. Pommer is the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and holds the prestigious position of vice-chair of the Colorado Legislature’s Joint Budget Committee. He previously chaired the House Transportation and Energy Committee where he was a leader on issues related to renewable energy and climate change. He sponsored the bill that doubled Colorado’s renewable energy portfolio standard. He also sponsored two bills that aligned Colorado’s transportation, land use, energy, and climate change policies. Although neither of these bills passed, Rep. Pommer continues to push for an integrated approach to climate change policy in Colorado and the Rocky Mountain region.

Moderator – Paul Aldretti, senior program manager at CDR Associates. Prior to joining CDR, Mr. Aldretti served as the national director of climate programs at Business for Social Responsibility for six years during which time he coordinated the U.S. DOE/U.S. EPA *Climate Wise* Program. Mr. Aldretti has more than 15 years of experience in developing and coordinating synergistic climate programs

with businesses, government agencies, communities, and non-profit organizations.

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Insights from the United States Climate Action Partnership: Lessons Learned from Creating a Foundation for a Comprehensive U.S. Climate Policy

This session will present the Meridian Institute's work with the United States Climate Action Partnership (USCAP). The USCAP is a broad-based coalition whose members include major U.S.-based multi-national corporations from a variety of sectors, several large U.S. utilities, and leading environmental organizations. USCAP has developed and publicized consensus recommendations for national climate protection legislation, including two key documents: the **Call for Action (CFA)**, which was released in January 2007, and the **Blueprint for Legislative Action (BLA)**, which was released in January 2009. The CFA includes consensus principles and high level policy recommendations that USCAP members believe should form the foundation of U.S. climate change legislation. The BLA builds upon these principles and high-level recommendations with a more specific set of interlinked policy recommendations. The consensus policy recommendations were negotiated and agreed upon by the CEOs of the participating organizations. They now serve as the focal point for USCAP members as they seek to build a broader consensus among policy makers and opinion leaders to enact climate protection as rapidly as possible consistent with USCAP's recommendations. Meridian continues to serve as facilitator of USCAP process, working collaboratively with both government affairs and communications specialists, as USCAP seeks to implement its consensus policy recommendations through enactment of legislation.

The presentation will very briefly note past efforts such as the National Commission on Superfund in the early 1990s that provided a model for design of the USCAP process. The presentation will describe the origins, approach, accomplishments, evolution and current status of the USCAP process. The remainder of the presentation and discussion will focus on three aspects of the process: the changing political context; group processes; and negotiation dynamics.

Beyond a review of the project specifics, this presentation will highlight the following key issues:

- The role of the USCAP CEOs has been invaluable in moving this process to its current level of influence on U.S. Congress and the Obama Administration;

the legislative process – whether at the local, state or federal level – often moves at an unpredictable pace.

- Collaborative processes tend to be more deliberate and methodical. We will look at the ways that the USCAP process has both influenced and responded to the rapidly changing pace of discussions and negotiations on climate protection legislation on Capitol Hill.
- A portion of this presentation will be devoted to understanding the role that science and information played in shaping the USCAP agreements. Specifically, we will discuss the impact of the evolution of scientific understanding of climate change has had on USCAP recommendations for GHG emissions reduction targets and timetables; and the critical link of target and timetables to a myriad of other issues in the USCAP negotiations. We will also review the role that economic modeling – the so-called “dismal science” – played in the USCAP process, and the challenges associated with organizing the diverse USCAP membership around a single economic modeling plan.
- Finally, the USCAP process provides an excellent case study to explore a number of questions related to the nature of collaborative practice and leveraging the “tools of the trade” to impact public policy to protect the climate. The USCAP has and continues to have a salutary impact on U.S. climate policy. The presenters intend to raise a variety of these questions as a means of opening a dialogue with session participants. Some possibilities include:
 - How has the approach that was used to convene and facilitate the USCAP to consensus agreements between major U.S.-based corporations and ENGOs deviated or not deviated from “orthodox” practice norms and standards?
 - To the extent that the approach to the USCAP process has deviated from the norms of collaborative practice, do these deviations represent a new form of practice or an evolution from past practices?
 - Whether they represent a new form of practice or not, to what extent should collaborative practitioners go toward leveraging these tools and skills to achieve significant and durable changes in climate protection public policy?

Presenters:

Tim Mealey Senior Partner, Meridian Institute

Kevin Bryan Mediator, Meridian Institute

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Building Coast-Smart Communities

An Innovative Negotiation Simulation for involving Dispute Resolution Professionals in Combating the Effects of Climate Change

This engaging, hands-on session is designed to involve multiple local stakeholders in the difficult decisions surrounding strategies for adapting to the risks of climate change. Several hundred coastal and state leaders (in conjunction with Maryland's MACRO) will participate in mediated runs of this game on April 27, 2009 in Annapolis. The event is a core component of Maryland's efforts to promote climate change adaptation in communities along the state's vulnerable coast.

In the simulation, participants must negotiate a set of policy reforms and public investments that a hypothetical Maryland coastal community can take to reduce its vulnerability to the risks of climate change. The actions are scored using a "Coast-smart community scorecard" that ranks each action's effectiveness and cost. Participants play the role of nine different stakeholders in the community and must reach a minimum total score to qualify for benefits under a hypothetical state-funded, incentive-based initiative called the Coast Smart Community Bill. A facilitator/mediator guides the group's negotiations. More on the game and the Maryland initiative can be found at maryland.coastsmart.org. There is no cost for dispute resolution professionals who want to use the game after the ACR/EPP conference and materials will be freely available online.

Presenters:

David Plumb, Senior Associate at the Consensus Building Institute,
Evan Thomas Paul, Conflict resolution practitioner and graduate student of environmental policy and planning at MIT
Nathan Lemphers, MIT Graduate Student

Click to return to [Session List](#)

National Roundtable on Climate Change

National leaders from across the spectrum of climate change, including NGO's, state Governors' offices, state climate change offices, federal agencies, local government, business groups, water utilities, public health organizations, and research institutions, are being given the opportunity to meet face-to-face at the conference for a facilitated discussion on a variety of topics and key questions, such as:

1. How can the tools of collaboration, consensus-building, and conflict resolution be best utilized to address climate change? What are these tools' strengths and what are their limitations?
2. Where do the various players' strategies overlap and where do they diverge? How could synergies be leveraged? How could divergences be respected, yet coordinated?
3. Does a need or opportunity exist for greater coordination and collaboration among the hundreds of organizations and agencies addressing climate change across the U.S. and/or internationally?
4. If so, how can this need be addressed: what structures, actions, activities are needed?

Presenters to be determined

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Addressing Climate Change Through Collaboration and Public Involvement Community Planning Assistance Programs

This session will address the benefits of collaboration and public involvement in addressing uncertainty and explore options for adaptive management. The program will provide an overview and discussion of the use of collaborative and public involvement processes in climate change decision-making. Key issues that will be addressed include:

1. Why are climate change issues uniquely well-suited to benefit from collaborative and public involvement processes?
2. How have these processes already been used to address climate change?
3. What kinds of existing collaborative models can effectively be transferred to the field of climate change?
4. How can collaborative and public involvement processes be used in future legal and policy decision-making to achieve expeditious adoption and implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures? How can these decisions incorporate adaptive management?

This session will highlight the significant benefits of using collaboration and public involvement processes to achieve greenhouse gas reductions and develop adaptation measures in a more expeditious and effective manner than traditional processes. Participants will have an opportunity to learn about existing models already being used in the climate change field and consider options for transferring processes from other public policy arenas.

Presenters:

Thomas Peterson - Mr. Peterson founded the Center for Climate Strategies to assist state and regional governments with climate change policy development and implementation. He is also an adjunct law professor at Pennsylvania State University Dickinson School of Law, where he teaches Climate Law and Policy and provides advisory research on climate and energy policy issues. Mr. Peterson has been involved in the design, facilitation, and economic assessment of 20 state climate action planning initiatives. He previously represented the White House and the U.S. Senate in U.S. climate treaty negotiations and national policy development. His past experience includes service as a representative of the White House Climate Change Task Force, as a Brookings Legislative Fellow for U.S. Senator Joe Lieberman, as an Economist with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and in other positions in state government as well as in both private and nonprofit sectors.

Edna Sussman – Edna Sussman is an ADR specialist who has been immersed in climate change work for many years. She is a principal of SussmanADR LLC with broad experience as an arbitrator and mediator and serves on the neutral panels of many of the leading dispute resolution institutions. In addition, Edna co-chairs the Alternative Dispute Resolution committees of the American Bar Association Section of Environment, Energy and Resources (ABA-SEER) and of the Energy Bar Association and Chairs the New York City Bar Association Energy Committee. She was appointed by Mayor Bloomberg to serve on the New York City Panel on Climate Change and by County Executive Andy Spano to serve as Chair of the Business Sector Committee of the Westchester County Global Warming Task Force. She is a frequent speaker on both climate change and conflict resolution and has published many works on both subjects.

Joseph Siegel – Joe Siegel is an ADR Specialist and senior attorney specializing in climate change and air pollution at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Region 2 office in New York. He is also an adjunct professor at the Center for Environmental Legal Studies at Pace Law School where he developed and teaches the Climate Change Seminar. In addition, Joe co-chairs the Climate Change, Sustainable Development and Ecosystems Committee of the American Bar Association Section of Environment, Energy and Resources (ABA-SEER) and is a vice-chair of the ABA-SEER Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee. He is a frequent speaker on both climate change and environmental conflict resolution, has published works on both subjects, and is a community mediator.

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Water Pressure: Local, Regional and International Issues Facing Water Utilities in Adapting to Climate Change. How Can Collaborative Governance Help?”

This panel will focus on local/regional water utilities or governments facing the need to adapt their operations and infrastructure planning to deal with global climate change in both the short- and long-terms. The panelists will represent the perspectives of water management practitioners from North America (including Denver, the conference host city), as well as the developing world.

Local water utilities in many parts of the world are beginning to experience and/or anticipate how climate change will affect their ability to provide safe and reliable drinking water. As they do so, they face significant challenges in integrating and resolving the technical, policy and management elements associated with developing effective approaches for adapting to climate change.

For example, they must determine whether a top-down or bottom-up approach within their organization will be most effective in assessing the climate vulnerabilities of their water systems. Looking beyond their utility, they need to reconcile international or national directives and initiatives (such as emerging carbon markets) with developing local and regional approaches for addressing climate change. The challenges are even greater in the case of most developing countries, where utilities struggle to provide adequate services today, let alone in an uncertain future.

Successfully addressing these challenges will require working across traditional “silos,” creating new partnerships across sectors (agriculture, industry, etc.) and agencies (environment, urban development, etc.), developing more integrative solutions, and fostering a more informed and engaged citizenry. All of this will be necessary to develop the political will needed to plan and operate under a longer time horizon than the next election cycle. The tools of collaborative governance (conflict resolution, consensus building, collaboration and public information/participation) will be critical to these efforts.

This panel is designed to provide interactive engagement between local water practitioners (or those who can represent their interests and challenges) and the professional community attending this conference. Utility or government representatives will present case examples of specific issues or challenges facing them, and will seek interactive input from the audience. The panel will give conference participants insight into the struggles that government entities are faced with in dealing with this complex issue.

Presenters:

Nancy Ahern/Paul Fleming, Seattle Public Utilities

Marc Waage, Denver Water

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Can Greater Collaboration between Public Health and Environmental Experts Encourage Better Policies to Address Global Climate Change?

Climate change is a multi-faceted, complex and technical issue with wide-ranging implications for environmental, ecological, climate and biological systems, and human health. Even minor rises in temperature are projected to contribute to various environmental consequences, such as extreme weather events, sea level rises, and impact on food production, with associated human health effects, including rise in and diversity of infectious diseases, poor air quality and greater respiratory disease, reduced water resources, famine and malnutrition. Impacts on the environment and human health are closely intertwined, so it seems a straightforward strategy that public health and environmental advocates would be working closely and collaboratively to advance the development of policy to address climate change. While interaction among stakeholders in public health and environmental advocacy is occurring, comprehensive and robust partnerships and other collaborative strategies that could foster the development of more comprehensive and integrated policy to address climate change are in their infancy.

Trust for America's Health (TFAH), with the support of the Pew Charitable Trusts' Global Warming Campaign, and facilitation expertise provided RESOLVE, is convening environmental and public health policy experts to develop a series of detailed policy options that will result in a public health infrastructure capable of informing, educating, and responding to global warming health issues, and based on common goals and interests. While still in its early phases, this project has revealed some very interesting insights regarding the opportunities for and challenges to developing effective public policy that draws from and integrates multi-disciplinary expertise and perspectives. This roundtable session will discuss and evaluate some of the lessons learned from this ongoing effort, as well as build and expand upon these lessons to discuss additional efforts and models for future collaboration. Questions to be examined by the round table leaders include the following:

1. What are the insights and lessons learned from the TFAH project about collaborative partnerships between environmental and public health experts and policy makers?
2. What are other examples of collaborative partnerships in the United States and internationally and what can we learn from these examples.

3. Are there particular and prioritized areas of public policy to address climate change requiring greater cooperation and collaboration? If so, how will these priorities shape collaborative tools and strategies?

Presenters:

Dr. Jeff Levi, Executive Director, Trust for America's Health

Abby Dilley, Senior Mediator, RESOLVE

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Managing Scientific and Technical Information in Collaborative Policy Making: Learning from Local, Regional and International Experience

In the coming decades, humanity and the global environment will face great challenges associated with unprecedented rates of climatic change. While the general trends and mechanisms are well understood, the precise implications for particular locations and the impacts on the biophysical and social systems are not. This panel will draw from local, regional and international policy-making initiatives to provide insight into collaborative problem solving and climate change. The panelists will provide examples drawn from organizing a local carbon neutral food shed alliance; carrying out negotiations about declining regional ground water resources; and making international comparisons about conserving threatened coastal areas. The panelists will address three key queries:

1. What do we know about the theory of technical and scientific information and public policy conflict resolution, and how does that help us solve climate change problems at the local, regional and international levels?

In the face of threats from climate change, conventional institutional governance and policymaking structures do not respond well to the uncertainties and complexities of a changing world. Resilient responses to climate change will depend not only on use of the best available information, but also on widespread support among and engagement with affected people. Some community residents rely more on contextual or observed knowledge, while others trust only science-based, peer-reviewed studies. Further, language often varies across scientific disciplines and geographic regions, and institutions have widely different traditions about engaging citizens in deliberating public policy.

2. What are ways to structure collaboration in order to address scientific complexities and differing stakeholder perspectives in ways that lead to legitimate processes and better science? What are recent efforts to

institutionalize collaborative problem solving to initiate demonstration projects and open the bureaucratic decision-making processes?

Scientific information is key to environmental policy making to address global warming issues. Unfortunately, there are significant challenges to involving citizens in technical discussions. The challenge for building the institutional capacity to ameliorate rapid and unpredictable change is to understand collaborative decision-making to foster more effective patterns of governance.

3. What lessons can we draw from local regional and international contexts and examples that show the opportunities and dilemmas about how to successfully interface scientists, local and federal officials, citizens, industry, and other stakeholders?

Public policy dispute resolution practitioners have had success in dealing with complex scientific and technical issues in a collaborative manner. Collaborative planning and joint fact-finding are processes by which stakeholders work with scientists and decision-makers to frame, review, and incorporate scientific information into policy decisions. These processes have helped diverse groups reach consensus on many environmental and natural resource policy issues.

Each panelist will give a brief overview of an experience with a local, regional or international climate change initiative. The panelists will also address the importance of establishing a problem solving framework, structuring collaboration and creating positive working relationships, and dealing with the challenges of instituting collaboration in scientific and technical issues. After the presentations, there will opportunity for discussion about the key issues, innovations and approaches to framing problems and engaging in collaborative problem solving. The panelists will also encourage a lively discussion of the applicability of joint fact finding and other collaborative processes to climate change and global warming challenges.

Presenters:

Ric Richardson is Professor of Community and Regional Planning at the University of New Mexico. Ric's expertise is in facilitating consensus about local and regional land use decisions, managing regulatory negotiations and designing ways to institute collaborative planning. He has advised citizens, business leaders and government officials in face-to-face negotiations on development initiatives, environmental decisions and regulatory changes. He is a Senior Associate with the Consensus Building Institute and the Lincoln Institute for Land Policy in Cambridge Massachusetts, as well as the Public Disputes Program at the Harvard Law School.

Michael Elliott has worked in negotiation, environmental dispute management, environmental risk management, and environmental planning and policy for 25 years. His particular expertise lies in the design and evaluation of environmental dispute resolution and public participation processes, and in the mediation of public policy disputes. He is an Associate Professor of Environmental Planning and Policy, and former co-founder and Director of Research for the Consortium on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution. In addition, Michael was a co-founder and director of the Southeast Negotiation Network.

Herman Karl is a USGS Senior Scientist and Co-director of the MIT-USGS Science Impact Collaborative (MUSIC), at MIT. Herman's expertise is in analyzing the role of scientists, particularly federal government scientists, in stakeholder-driven, collaborative processes that include joint fact-finding; exploring the integration of local knowledge with expert knowledge. Recent work of MUSIC focuses on assessing coastal infrastructure and preparing for climate driven physical change. Herman teaches an advanced seminar on science and problem solving addressing the importance of collaboration in science and natural resource issues.

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Tools for Addressing Bi-State Climate Change: The Lake Tahoe Case Study

20 years ago Tahoe was at the forefront of environmental planning. Today, the region is struggling to make its communities more sustainable and preserve Lake Tahoe's famed bluewaters, while facing an unprecedented threat from climate change. With aging and underutilized urban areas, limited transportation alternatives and increasing concern over the future of the lake, all acknowledge the need to redevelop and reconfigure the region's communities and transportation infrastructure. But how do we get there from here while dealing with climate awareness, protection and prevention and adaptation? Reducing GHG emissions is a shared responsibility involving both public land managers, local jurisdictions, transportation agencies, land use planning jurisdictions, residents and businesses working together to minimize impacts. Between 2008 and 2009 a massive collaborative effort was undertaken with over 21 parties.

This two part presentation will focus on: 1) a summary of recently passed CA legislation regarding climate change, 2) applying best practices in climate change and sustainability frameworks to the region with a focus on collaboration at four levels of government. The session will provide practical, usable information and lessons for conference participants and will explore unique types of collaborative tools and case studies.

Darin Dinsmore, owner and founder of Regional Planning Partners (RPP), works with communities and regions to create sustainable visions for the future. Based in Truckee, California, the firm was created in 2004 out of the need to develop regionally appropriate solutions for our cities and towns with a focus on community-based planning and involvement of implementation partners early in the process. Darin has 15 years of experience in planning and design focused on building better communities. Darin has been involved in the Regional Plan update process in Lake Tahoe for the last three years and is currently working with the City of South Lake Tahoe to develop a Sustainability Plan. Prior to establishing the firm, Darin was the Director of Town Planning for the Sierra Business Council.

Patrick Wright is the Executive Director of the California Tahoe Conservancy, a state agency charged with protecting and enhancing natural resources and recreational opportunities in the Lake Tahoe basin. He was previously the Director of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, where he led a consortium of agencies and stakeholders in managing one of the nation's largest collaborative water management programs. Wright also served as Deputy and Assistant Secretary for the California Resources Agency in the Davis and Schwarzenegger administrations, and on the board of the California Coastal Conservancy. Prior to these appointments, he was a Senior Policy Advisor to the Deputy Secretary of Interior and to the Regional Administrator of EPA.

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Working Framework for Understanding Collaborative Governance and Climate Change

This workshop will discuss a new working framework for understanding the connections between collaborative governance and climate change. The primary emphasis is on conceptualizing collaborative governance within the context of the climate change challenge. The framework is based on an extension of the evaluation findings from the Multi-Agency ECR Evaluation Study, sponsored by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. We are interested in exploring how ECR and public engagement articulates with collaborative governance and provides opportunities for moderating and adapting to climate change challenges. The framework is easily generalizable to other policy arenas.

This framework has the potential for communicating the abstraction of collaborative governance as an action-driving system. As a framing device, it can help practitioners think about their practice in a larger systemic context of policy change and performance outcomes. As a conceptual framework, it can be used to engage sponsors, conveners, scientists, public managers, and parties in designing, refining and evaluating progress toward stated outcomes. As a

research and evaluation tool, it can help frame any number of hypotheses about the dynamics and performance of collaboration and its contributions to determinations, actions and outcomes.

Presenters:

Kirk Emerson, University of Arizona and former Director of the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

Tina Nabatchi, Maxwell School, Syracuse University

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Climate Change and Local Government Action - Declaration without Collaboration

ECR practitioners probably lean toward collaboration as a means to making government and multi-sector decisions to respond to climate change. However, the hundreds of U.S. cities who have adopted declarations to be “cool cities” (as part of the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement) had a range of approaches to how the mayor, or council, made such a declaration. The key part of local action through their commitment is to: “Strive to meet or beat the Kyoto Protocol targets in their own communities, through actions ranging from anti-sprawl land-use policies to urban forest restoration projects to public information campaigns”

Key questions include: Do county- and city-level elected officials value collaboration leading up to a declaration of action? If not, can collaboration help make things work when there was little/no collaboration among important actors in setting the emission reduction targets in the first place? Overviews will be presented of Cool Cities – the Sierra Club program; and the Mayors Climate Protection Center.

This will be a preliminary report on selected cities’ processes for adoption of the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement. Roughly 8-10 cities drawn from California, Utah and North Carolina will provide a rough sampling so attendees can gauge:

- a) The importance of a collaborative process to help other cities adopt plans for climate change response
- b) The importance of post-agreement facilitated assistance for cities to act on their commitment.
- c) Preliminary findings – trends, reflections – does collaboration really matter at the front end?
- d) Discussion

Presenters:

John Stephens

Peter Murchie – National Policy Consensus Center

Click to return to [Session List](#)

The Application of Behavioral Public Relations and Communications Models to Climate Change – the New Hampshire Presidential Primary Experience

Using a unique case study - the 2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary – this session will explain how Clean Air–Cool Planet used the application of a behavioral public relations model, tested communications strategies and evaluative techniques to lead first to the decoupling of partisanship from the issue of climate change, and second to the placing of climate action at the top of the public agenda in advance of the 2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary (to the degree that *Time* magazine called global warming one of the eight keys to winning New Hampshire.)

Clean Air-Cool Planet focuses exclusively on climate change, delivering solutions through creative on-the-ground partnerships and pioneering policy design. Since their beginning they have worked to create regional climate leaders in order to tackle the climate crisis, and they identify their distinctiveness in the following ways: Where many groups focus on climate policy change supported by grassroots activism, CA-CP concentrates on demonstrating practical action that can be supported by effective policies; Where others work with one sector (e.g. business or municipalities), CA-CP brings players together from multiple sectors to form collaborative networks; and where some groups tend to tell people what needs to be done, CA-CP listens first and builds partnerships based on mutual interests. At the community level, CA-CP's most important innovations have been to provide a focus for climate action by catalyzing the formation of Local Energy Committees (LECs), creating a suite of tools and resources, and providing a coordinated network to allow cross-fertilization of ideas, knowledge exchange, community expression, capacity-sharing and the rapid spread of best practices.

Presenter:

Roger Stephenson has over 20 years of experience providing public relations expertise and counsel to corporate management, government agencies and non-profit executives regarding internal communications, stakeholder relations, coalition building, strategic public campaigns, grassroots organizing, branding and fundraising strategies. Roger joined CA-CP in 2006 to prepare a global warming education campaign in New Hampshire ahead of the 2008 presidential

primary. Prior to a successful 5-year stint as an independent public relations practitioner, Roger was a consultant in the public relations and management consulting firm Jackson, Jackson and Wagner. From 1995 through 1999 he served as Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior and served in the White House Council on Environmental Quality to help manage overall program and policy development for President Clinton's American Heritage River Initiative. Before serving in the Clinton administrations Roger was National Field Director for the League of Conservation Voters and later executive director of the LCV Education Fund.

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Collaborative Approaches to Addressing Climate Change in Environmental Review Processes

With the Supreme Court's decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA* in 2007, an expanded governmental role in regulating greenhouse gases now has a legal basis. With the EPA's pending actions to establish federal regulations for carbon dioxide and many states and communities also taking action, environmental review is poised as an increasingly important tool in climate change decision-making. Ensuring that these policies are implemented in a manner that leverages the opportunities associated with collaborative processes represents a very important opportunity in need of further exploration.

The presentation will focus on emerging opportunities to use collaborative decisionmaking to enhance efforts to address climate change in environmental review processes. This presentation responds to two recent trends. First is the emergence of local and state environmental review policies that require greenhouse gases to be addressed for some types of projects and plans. The second trend is an increased emphasis on public participation and collaboration in environmental review, from the federal level with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) down to state and local governments. Acknowledging these two changes in policies and practice, a key opportunity exists to explore ways to maximize collaborative approaches to environmental review, particularly related to climate change issues. The potentially larger geographic and broader temporal scales of climate change impacts and the significance of cumulative impacts, makes collaborative approaches all the more essential to effective identification and mitigation of impacts.

Drawing on knowledge of best practices for collaboration in environmental review, opportunities to integrate these approaches into the first generation of environmental review policies addressing climate change will be highlighted. Opportunities and approaches to engaging agencies, technical experts, decision-makers, non-governmental organizations, and the public will be explored. In

addition, a research agenda to advance knowledge on these issues will be introduced.

Presenter:

Carissa Schively Slotterback, PhD, AICP
Assistant Professor, Urban and Regional Planning Program
Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Some Like it Hot: A Highly Interactive Session on Climate Change in ADR

Emotional heat is part of the package of environmental and public policy dispute resolution, no less with climate change than with other issues. Working constructively with that emotional heat remains a key aspect of EPP practice and can be a challenge and opportunity for seasoned and new practitioners alike. Panelists and participants alike will offer transferable process ideas to address the global threat of emotional combustion. The following questions will be explored:

- How do we as ADR practitioners assess and generally regard the risks and opportunities posed by emotional climate change “in the room”?
- What tools do we have to consciously affect the temperature in the room?
- When is heat useful, when is it harmful, and how do we tell the difference?
- How do substance and process interplay with emotion, and how can we use

Presenters:

Cindy Cook
Carolyn Penny
Matt Schweisberg (invited)
Doug Thompson (invited)
Ellie Tonkin

Click to return to [Session List](#)

A Tale of Three Parks

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Yellowstone and Grand Canyon. The program will answer the following questions: (1) When there is conflict between a national park and the gateway community to the park, or between two agencies that serve the interests of a park, how can you get them to move from conflict to collaboration? What are specific, promising facilitation strategies? (2) Why is park regional management using facilitative services? What are their expectations of such services and what is their assessment of its value to them as managers? • The three cases offer usable lessons for those who work as practitioners on complex environmental and inter-agency issues. Rick Frost, Deputy Director of the Intermountain Region of the NPS will set the stage for why facilitative assistance was sought in each instance and Carl Moore, the practitioner for these cases, will highlight some things done that were especially helpful in reaching a collaborative outcome. The context and case stories will be outlined in a succinct way, allowing time to explore the specific strategies and the general questions raised by doing this kind of intervention in these settings.

Presenters:

Carl Moore, Panelist, moderator.

Rick Frost, Deputy Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Authentic Public Participation: What, Why and How to Involve Others in Your Decisions

With the current and welcomed White House reemphasis on the importance of collaboration, consensus, and public participation there is renewed need to maintain consistency, authenticity and effectiveness in how our practices are defined. Organizations and practitioners of conflict prevention and resolution typically speak the same language but in a variety of dialects. IAP2 has sought to find consensus, consistency and authenticity in the practice of public participation, and this session will present that message. At the conclusion of this course, attendees will have learned: -How public participation ties into decisionmaking -When and why to have the public participate or not participate in decisions -The practitioner and decision maker's unique role and commitment - Key concepts that must be considered to be effective and authentic when involving others *How:* This session will be a combination of presentation, facilitated discussion, and smallgroup working session. It will be interactive in nature and designed to be as participatory as possible within the time constraints of the workshop.

Authentic public involvement promotes widespread awareness of how conflict resolution and collaboration in public decision-making can be used as a tool to address climate change and other complex public policy issues. Public participation promotes collaborative decision-making and advocates for dialogue, but there are limitations that must be clearly understood. This kind of collaborative intervention promotes long term solutions to policy in the U.S. and democracies globally.

Presenters:

John Godec is a course developer, Board Director, and one of only nine licensed global master trainers for the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2). He is an IAF Certified Professional Facilitator ®, and has more than 30 years of experience in issue management, conflict resolution and consensus, and public participation. Godec is a roster member of the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, a native roster member and transportation (former) roster member. Godec served on a federal task force to design a nationwide risk and emergency communication protocol for the National Governors Association. He is a past Director of Issues Management for Motorola Corporation, and served as Special Assistant to the Director of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). He has designed and facilitated more than 300 complex public projects helping agencies and citizens find consensus, common ground, and sustainable solutions. He proposed and comanaged the largest public/private environmental cleanup effort in Arizona history involving more than 21,000 volunteers on 94,000 acres of public land. This year-long effort was characterized by USEPA, FEMA, BLM, BIA, Arizona State Lands and the Arizona Governor’s Office as an “innovative solution to an extraordinarily complex and multi-jurisdictional quagmire.” He has managed and taught issue management, communication and public participation throughout the United States, Canada, Europe, South Africa, Australia and Southeast Asia for corporations, tribal, state and federal governments and NGOs. He is a featured speaker at events and symposia dealing with public participation, crisis communication, conflict resolution, and issue and reputation management, and lectures at Arizona State University, the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University, and Queensland University of Technology.

Click to return to [Session List](#)

The Ethics of Collaboration: From Case Scenario to Issue to Standards of Practice

Ground rules or group charters set the expectations of behavior for collaborative groups. However, beyond those tools are key ethical questions about how stakeholders and facilitators work together. This session will present:

1. Overview of kinds of ethical issues in collaborative groups
2. Scenario of an ethical dilemma: a) Participants choose among alternatives to resolve the dilemma b) Identify key values/concerns that led them to their choice c) Open discussion – trade-offs; other options; comparison to participants' experience with similar groups
3. Three strands of ethical thinking related to collaboration: degree of “contracting in” to collaboration; the degree that ethics builds out of commonly accepted norms of collaboration, degree that the relationships in collaborations are dynamic and so, too, should be the ethical standards.
4. Standards of Practice – Is a “casebook” needed on ethical dilemmas in collaborative processes for purposes of professional education? Do other ACR ethical statements cover our needs in this area?

Presenter

Dr. John B. Stephens
Coordinator, Public Dispute Resolution Program
School of Government
University of North Carolina

Click to return to [Session List](#)

The I-70 Mountain Corridor: Ten Years and \$30 Million- What Does it Get You?

The I-70 Mountain Corridor is the gateway to the Colorado Rockies: 144 miles of mountains and valleys, towns and scenic views, places to stop and linger, destinations and activities, places to live, history to experience, a world of snow, wildlife and people. These characteristics provide the context for Colorado's most challenging and complex environmental policy project. The interstate was built in the 1960s and accommodates nearly 100,000 vehicles a day. Travel demand is projected to increase by more than 10 million trips over the next 25 years. The once remote communities have grown to support these conditions and now have urban traffic problems. With seven counties, 27 towns, two National Forests, two ski corporations, six ski resorts, and thousands of residents, business owners, truckers, commuters, and the miscellaneous lost traveler; determining how best to improve the transportation system has been a topic of discussion for 20 years.

In 2000, the Department of Transportation began a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement to increase corridor capacity, improve access and mobility, and decrease congestion. A debate ensued about how to design a solution that met everyone's needs. From the onset of planning, there was a goal of increasing capacity in the corridor and well-organized opposition to widening the highway. During the traditional process of creating the environmental document, trust between and among participants dissolved into endless data debates. The global trends of gas prices, concern about climate

change, air pollution problems, and more commuters moving into the corridor complicated the process even further. These varied interests and positions resulted in 10 years of work, \$30 million dollars spent, and over 2,000 public comments on the draft document. With agencies versus stakeholders, this stalemate stopped progress.

A change of lead agency administration opened the door to collaborative decision making. A structured, transparent, and accessible process managed by a third-party facilitator was named the Collaborative Effort. This eight-month process resulted in agreement among the agencies and corridor stakeholders on a Consensus Recommendation for a multi-modal transportation solution. With the solution in hand, the Collaborative Effort participants moved the discussion toward how best to ensure the solution accommodates unknown future conditions. Context Sensitive Solutions was employed as the foundation for collaborative decision making for all future projects. Further, included in the Consensus Recommendation are milestones or triggers that would initiate the process to reevaluate the original agreement and respond to changes in funding, the environment, and other global, regional and local trends. This moves the I-70 transportation improvements beyond a solution for today. This approach guarantees a future of collaborative decision making and innovative practices that address complex policy issues and external trends.

The I-70 Mountain Corridor has successfully institutionalized participatory decision-making and built a culture of respect and partnerships between agencies and stakeholders. This interactive session will present the techniques and tools used to reach consensus. Panelists also will seek audience ideas to enhance the guidance for future corridor decisions. Attendees will receive practical and usable information on how to conduct collaborative decision-making with large groups. provide the history of the corridor, background on 10 years of problems, how the current agreement was reached and developing the path forward. With a moderator and seven participants, we will use a point /counterpoint format of agency representatives and stakeholders to offer their differing perspectives on each of the topics. To conclude, the session participants will be asked for ideas based on their experiences that could be incorporated into the future decision making process and guidance.

Panelists:

Cynthia Neely, Executive Director, Georgetown Historic Trust.

Harry Dale, Commissioner, Clear Creek County.

Gary Frey, Transportation Coordinator, Trout Unlimited.

Monica Pavlik, Senior Operations Engineer, Federal Highway Administration.

Mary Jo Vobejda, Vice President, CH2M HILL.

Sarah Stokes Alexander, Director of Sustainability and Leadership Programs, The Keystone Center.

Brian Pinkerton, Program Engineer, Colorado Department of Transportation.

Moderator: Michelle Halstead, Local Government Liaison, Colorado Department of Transportation.

Click to return to [Session List](#)

Creating Forums and Building Capacity to Manage Climate Change Conflicts

Description to be posted shortly

Click to return to [*Session List*](#)

Challenges & Opportunities to Integrate Collaborative Governance into Climate Change Adaptation at the Regional Level

Description to be posted shortly

Click to return to [*Session List*](#)
