To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Hugh Andrew Bullock entitled "Tennessee Forest Roundtable: Analysis of a Multiple Stakeholder Dialogue on Forest Resource Policy." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science, with a major in Forestry.

David M. Ostermeier, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of The Graduate School

TENNESSEE FOREST ROUNDTABLE: ANALYSIS OF A MULTIPLE STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUE ON FOREST RESOURCE POLICY

A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Hugh Andrew Bullock
December 1996

AG-VET-MED.
Thesis
96
.B84

Copyright © Hugh Andrew Bullock, 1996

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people here at the University of Tennessee have contributed greatly to my general experience and to the completion of this thesis. First, my professors in Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries have shown genuine interest in their students and have created an environment in the department that is conducive to both learning and developing friendships. Special thanks is due to Dr. David Ostermeier, Dr. J. Mark Fly, and Dr. Dave Buehler who share my interest in the social aspects of conservation. Dr. David Feldman, Dr. Mary English, Dr. William Park and other professors from my minor concentration have earned my respect and gratitude. Special thanks is due to my committee: Dr. David Ostermeier, Dr. J. Mark Fly, and Dr. Charles Cleland.

I am also grateful for several funding sources. Some funding has come from student employment in both the University Center and Dr. Fly's Human Dimensions lab. The largest contribution came from the Tennessee Valley Authority, Land Management intern program. Through this internship, I experienced many unique opportunities for hands on learning and developed friendships with many fine professionals in the agency. I wish to extend special thanks to David Harrell, Tere McDonough, and Robert Brooks.

Lastly, this Master's degree would have been impossible without the support of my parents. Austin and Joel Bullock have supported me from birth, and just when they thought their job was done and I was on my own, I returned to school. They have given me immeasurable support of every kind, and I take this opportunity to acknowledge their contribution to my education and my life.

ABSTRACT

Like other states, Tennessee has experienced some conflict over forest resource management that has or could result in courtroom litigation, legislative action, and/or protests. Responding to this confrontational atmosphere, a diverse, national coalition of forest stakeholders developed a model for convening local roundtables to provide preliminary input to the Seventh American Forest Congress, planned for February of 1996. This process was designed to bring diverse groups of stakeholders in America's forests together to seek "common ground" on the future use and management of forests and associated resources. A committee of eleven diverse individuals organized and executed one of these meetings, the Tennessee Forest Roundtable, on November 11, 1995. To their credit, the organizing committee succeeded in planning and executing the roundtable with tight constraints on time, but time pressures prohibited all committee members from actively contributing in all decisions and may have limited the group's cohesiveness. Thirty-nine individuals representing a range of stakeholders in Tennessee's forest resources attended the program, and through the facilitated process developed some "common ground." This study examines the Tennessee Forest Roundtable as a process for developing "common ground" between diverse stakeholders and examines the content of the resulting consensus statements and unresolved issues. The process proved to be one effective way to engage this group of stakeholders in dialogue about the resources that they all value. Though the participants did not represent the 'ideal' distribution envisioned by the organizing committee, they did represent a broad range of stakeholders. The only

group identified in the 'ideal' that was not represented was that of recreation/tourism interests. Several other groups identified in the 'ideal' were under represented, and the participants did not reflect the general demographics of Tennessee regarding sex, race, or age. Overall, the process's use of small groups and facilitators worked effectively, but not all participants were equally satisfied with the quality of facilitators. Time constraints limited the program from its conception and continued to be important throughout the program. The day's planned activities were cut short which is thought to have limited the range of "common ground" which was identified. Facilitators, committee members, and participants all suggested that more time would be beneficial in developing "common ground" and understanding. Despite these constraints, participants did develop forty-three consensus statements. This "common ground" clearly demonstrated that these participants believe strongly in both using and caring for forests and their resources, i.e., using the forest to meet human wants and needs but maintaining forest health and sustainability. The remaining comments, on which participants did not deliberate or could not agree, suggest that stakeholders have great interest in forest policy, management, and use. These unresolved issues also suggest that disagreements remain about how society is to balance the needs of human and natural communities. They also display the ambivalence surrounding how society is to balance private and public rights and responsibilities. Both the process and content analysis suggest that though these forest stakeholders have taken some crucial first steps toward developing a collaborative community, more time and energy must be invested if the stakeholders in Tennessee's forest resources are to truly collaborate on the use and management of these resources which so many value.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

1. **INTRODUCTION** 1

Background 1

Problem 1

Making Forest Policy: The Traditional Process 3

Alternative Policy Process: Collaboration, Consensus, and Common Ground . . 5

Tennessee Forest Roundtable 6

Objectives 7

Limitations 8

2. **LITERATURE REVIEW** 9

Common Ground: A Unique Approach to Complex Issues 9

Basic Principles of Common Ground Processes 12

Prerequisites and Necessary Foundations 16

Unique Circumstances Necessitate Flexibility in Design and Application . .17

Process Design Considerations 19

On Using Subgroups 20

Process Steps 21

Assessing the Issue 21

Goal Setting 22

Program Sponsorship and Sponsors' Roles 24

Bounding the Scope of the Process 26

Groundrules and Initial Agreements 26

Facilitators/Mediators/Conference Managers 28

Selecting and Inviting Participants 30

Advice for Participants: Challenges and Preparation 33

Participant Roles 36

Other Important Considerations 37

Post Meeting Activities and Follow-up 40

Limitations, Disadvantages, and Obstacles 42

3. **METHODS** 45

The Birth of an Idea 45

Training 46

The Organizing Committee 47

Invitations 52

Meeting for Roundtable Organizers and Facilitators, Atlanta, GA 53

Action Learning: Georgia Roundtable, Savannah, GA 54

Partial Meeting of Tennessee Forest Roundtable Organizing Committee at UTK 55

Facilitators Training Meeting, November 10, 1995 56

Tennessee Forest Roundtable, November 11, 1995 57

Group Work 57

Unresolved Issues 58

Agenda and Overview 58

4. **PROCESS AND CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RESULTS** 69

Process Analysis 69

Training 69

Organizing Committee 70

Invitations 72

Participation 74

Potential Factors Influencing Participation 77

General Process 79

Facilitation 83

Overall Evaluation 85

Content Analysis of Results 88

Consensus Vision and Principle Statements 88

Unresolved Issues 96

Next Steps 98

5. **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS** 100

Program Sponsorship 100

Invitations and Participation 101

Process 102

Applications of Content Results 105

WORKS CITED 108

APPENDICES 115

Appendix A 116

Appendix B 125

Appendix C 131

Vita 143

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

3-1. Summary of Invitations Mailed by Stakeholder Category 53

3-2. Breakdown of Registrants at the Tennessee Forest Roundtable 60

4-1. Comparisons of Actual Number of Invitations Mailed to Planned Number of Invitations by Stakeholder Category 73

4-2. Actual Participants Compared to "Ideal" Participants by Stakeholder Category .74

4-3. Human Utility Phrases in Consensus Vision Statements 89

4-4. Human Utility Phrases in Consensus Principles 90

4-5. Forest Health and Sustainability in Consensus Vision Statements 92

4-6. Forest Health and Sustainability in Consensus Principles 93

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE PAGE

4-1. Characteristics of a Healthy Forest 94

4-2. Communication/Relationships 94

4-3. Education 94

4-4. Science, Research, and Professional Education 95

4-5. Policy Tools 95

4-6. Management Activities 96

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

America's forests provide an abundance of market and non-market goods and services to a citizenry of equal diversity. To loggers, foresters, mill workers, wood-product manufacturers, and the variety of businesses that support them, forests provide their economic lifeblood. To agencies that manage public lands, forests are equally important in an economic sense. Forests partially support a vibrant outdoor recreation industry, which enriches the lives of participants and bolsters the aesthetic and spiritual values of forests. To hunters and ecologists, forests are wildlife habitat; and to researchers, forests are laboratories. And, to all consumers in the modern world, forests contribute a variety of materials that may go unseen and forgotten, from paper and packaging to the skeletons of our home and offices. Considering the variety of people who benefit and their inherent diversity, the potential for conflict should be obvious. A forest cannot provide all things to all people. Hence, choices must be made regarding the distribution and use of forest resources, and conflicting interests must be addressed.

Problem

Popular media and professional journals tell the story of conflict over forest resources. In the fall of 1996, radio stations reported the arrest of two rock stars and others for protesting the harvest of ancient redwoods on private lands in the Pacific Northwest. On July 16, 1996, the Knoxville News Sentinel reported the protest by a regional environmental group, Save Our Cumberland Mountains, waged against an

industrial timber company, Champion International (Simmons, 1996). One associated press writer, H. Josef Herbert, blasted politicians for helping business interests "whittle away at [the national park] system" (1996). In 1994, the Journal of Forestry dedicated an entire issue to the controversial Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT); the front cover illustrated two spotted owls over the humans affected by the team's decision and a handful of 'suits' negotiating around a table over the fate of both (J. of For., 1994). The title to an article in *American Forests* referred to the growing conflict as "Forest Gridlock" (Stahl and Sampson, 1995).

Students of conflict theory will argue that conflict is not necessarily bad and is inevitable. As human populations increase and place greater demands on forest resources, this is likely to be increasingly true. Accordingly, several questions arise about forest conflicts:

- What impact does conflict have on the ability of forest owners and resource professionals to meet the needs and expectations of society?
- What impact does this conflict have on the individuals and groups with interests in forests?
- How are these conflicts addressed by the diverse stakeholders?
- Are these processes producing acceptable results?
- If not, how else could these conflicts be addressed?

Some theorists argue that forest conflict is unacceptable when it results in violence, which some forest conflicts have produced. Others argue that conflict is unacceptable if it produces gross inequities resulting from imbalances of power. Some forest stakeholders

argue that this, too, has already occurred, citing the 'capture' of public agencies by particular interests.

Making Forest Policy: The Traditional Process

Forest policies are not a neatly gathered body of codified laws and administrative policies. Forest policies originate in governments at the local, state, and national levels and differ greatly according to the forest's geographic location, size, and purpose (Lundmark, 1995). Forest policy is complicated because some lands are in public ownership but much of the nation's forests are privately owned by businesses and private citizens (Ibid.). The laws affecting forest management generally evolved from private common law actions to state regulation, which is now the predominant method of influencing forest management (Ibid.). Some federal laws affecting forest management, such as the Endangered Species Act, have been enforced on private lands which has resulted in extensive litigation. Conversely, states generally pursue non-confrontational methods to assure compliance, in spite of the codified criminal penalties embodied in most state legislation (Ibid.).

Individuals and organizations favoring environmental protection may argue that such efforts are insufficient to ensure compliance and may call for more regulation. In Tennessee's 74th Congressional District, clearcutting has been an issue of controversy. Subsequently, State Representative James L. Peach sponsored a public hearing on October 7, 1995. This hearing illustrated the adversarial nature of traditional policy processes. Peach assembled a panel of 'experts' representing both sides of the clearcutting issue. The Division of Forestry (TDF) and the State Parks opened the meeting with presentations

that generally showed opposite sides of the issue. Thus, one agency within the state bureaucracy was pitted against another.

In the ensuing comment period, most citizens voiced opposition to clearcutting, but Ken Arny, Chief of the TDF, was given opportunity to rebuke or comment on citizens' presentations, i.e., people against the agency and vice versa. In the panel discussion that followed, representatives of the larger timber companies within the district rallied behind Arny. Citizen representatives, including a retired forest practitioner, voiced fierce opposition to clearcutting, characterizing it as an evil misuse of the resource. Furthermore, citizens suggested that companies, agencies, and individuals that used the harvest technique should be guilty of some environmental crime. Peach proposed that, at minimum, clearcutting should cease on *public* land, which drew support from the citizens. The Division of Forestry and the representatives of larger timber companies opposed this proposal, again supporting clearcutting as a sound forest management practice.

This meeting illustrates the adversarial nature of forest policy. Efforts to increase public involvement can pit the citizens against an agency and vice versa. Subsequently, suggestion of regulation evokes an image of a legislative battle in which one side will win and another will lose, according to the majority preference voting mechanism of legislative bodies. Freeman and Frey (1990-91) criticize using majority preference as a natural resource decision-making tool because it suppresses minority views. Alternatively, decision making may be thrown into the civil or criminal court system, constitutionally designed as an adversarial environment, pitting lawyers and clients against each other. Romm (1995), criticizing the us/them orientation of natural resource decision making,

calls for a balanced response and institutions designed to foster the balance. As Banzaf (1995) explains, "we need to establish a new way of doing business, a new way of communicating."

Alternative Policy Process: Collaboration, Consensus, and Common Ground

A different idea, or philosophical orientation, emerging from the growing dissatisfaction with the adversarial, traditional processes, might be called collaborative forestry. The roots of collaborative forestry are firmly planted in democratic theory and interest-based negotiation, from which springs the belief that "all interested citizens and stakeholder[s]" should be involved in decisions that could potentially affect them (Ostermeier, 1996a). As McKinney (1990) and Selin and Chavez (1995) note, collaboration and consensus based decision making processes are uncommon in natural resource management. However, since 1990, journals have documented the incorporation of this alternative policy process in water policy (McKinney; 1990, 1991), recreational trail development (Selin and Chavez; 1995), deer management (Nelson; 1992), national forest management (Cawrse, Johns, and Jones; 1994), national conservation planning (Russo, Hanrahan, and Valencia; 1992), energy development (Cohen and Townsley, 1990), and riparian management (Johnson, 1991). McKinney (1990), Selin and Chavez (1995), Kellert (1982), Hustedde (1994), Cormick (1982), Johnson (1991), Romm (1995), and Freeman and Frey (1990-91) suggest that decisions should be based on consensus, unanimity, mutuality, and/or common ground in natural resource and other public policy areas.

Tennessee Forest Roundtable

In light of Tennessee's natural resource conflicts and the presumable dissatisfaction of the 'losers', stakeholders in Tennessee's forest resources may be ready to investigate collaborative forestry. After all, as Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider (1996) suggest, if the stakeholders are to reach more acceptable decisions, to do so with less confrontation, and to reduce the adversarial nature of their relationships, they must try something different.

In the spring of 1995, Tennessee and the nation were presented with a unique opportunity to attempt a modest exercise in collaborative forestry. Sponsors of the Seventh American Forest Congress encouraged local or state organizers to convene local roundtables. Following a design promoted by the national sponsors, these local roundtables sought to bring the diverse stakeholders in forest resources together in search of a shared vision for America's forests (Banzaf, 1995). Therefore, the focus of the roundtables was to increase understanding and work toward common ground -- not to resolve existing and/or specific conflicts. Since the roundtables would provide preliminary information for the Seventh American Forest Congress in Washington, D.C., February 19-24, 1996 (Ibid.), this presented a brief window of opportunity for Tennessee's stakeholders to experience collaborative forestry directly.

The sponsors of the Seventh American Forest Congress developed a process similar to the policy dialogues developed in the 1970's for mediating environmental disputes. Cormick (1982), an experienced professional in the field of environmental dispute resolution, defined a policy dialogue as a "problem-solving and negotiation approach developed on a pragmatic, ad hoc basis . . . [and] intended to identify joint

positions which can be advocated in the public policy arena by interest groups that are normally opposed to one another." Thus, the local roundtables were essentially multiple stakeholder dialogues on forest resource policy.

Because of its implications on forest policy, Dr. David Ostermeier, a professor of forest policy at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville, believed that this rare opportunity could not be allowed to pass. Ostermeier initiated efforts to organize a roundtable in Tennessee and attracted help from interested individuals and stakeholders representing eight other entities. Planning for what would become the Tennessee Forest Roundtable began in July 1995. On November 11, 1995, these efforts culminated in a meeting of 39 diverse stakeholders in Tennessee's forest resources.

Objectives

The specific objectives of this study are:

- Through a review of the literature, to explore, examine, and investigate processes that seek common ground on issues important to diverse parties, with a particular focus on natural resource management.
- To evaluate the experience of the Tennessee Forest Roundtable from two broad perspectives: process/implementation, and content.

The research will document two important processes, the design and planning of the Roundtable, as a process seeking common ground, and the Roundtable itself. Documentation and analysis of pre-meeting processes will investigate activities from conception of the idea to pre-meeting setup, including selection, interaction, and responsibilities of the organizers and how and by whom decisions were made. The

analysis of meeting processes will describe and evaluate the Roundtable activities from registration to dismissal. Formal evaluations by participants and informal evaluations with organizers and facilitators will be important data sources for this step, beyond the author's interpretation of the experience. Both areas will be compared with relevant material from the literature review.

The content analysis will focus on stakeholder responses, the consensus and disagreement on answers to the trigger questions. For forest managers and policy makers, this analysis will recommend process considerations and will highlight important themes from discussions between the stakeholders, including their vision for the future of our forest resources.

Limitations

As described, this, as any, project is subject to certain limitations. First, as Ostermeier (1995a) notes in his analysis, collaborative processes are neither static nor homogeneous. Therefore, this research will not present a recipe for collaborative forestry. Each issue, event, or conflict is unique, and effective collaborative problem solving demands a sensitivity to even subtle differences. Second, this process addresses only one step in collaborative problem solving, that of finding common ground and identifying areas of disagreement. Third, this project does not focus on a discrete or specific conflict but solicits involvement from Tennessee's forest community *at large* and on forest resources *in general*. As such, any processes or analysis may not be appropriately applied to particular events or conflicts or other geopolitical areas.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews processes of seeking common ground on issues of importance to diverse parties, with a particular focus on natural resource management. Literature investigated includes natural resource policy, environmental dispute resolution, and future search conferences (see below). This review's specific objective is to present a guide for designing a process to seek common ground. The guide will describe the important characteristics and steps of such processes and specific helpful hints from authors in related fields.

Common Ground: A Unique Approach to Complex Issues

Consider the following:

"Imagine devising that agenda so that as members of the group work through it, they are led to reach an agreement everyone can subscribe to. It is obvious that this preparation work requires a lot of attention and a fair amount of skill. But the payoff is enormous: those parts of your agenda and your priorities that survive in the crucible of a joint process may become the agenda and priorities of your group, your community and even your nation." -- Phillips (1994)

and

"I quickly discovered numerous obstacles . . . [and] decided:
1). I would probably not get it perfect the first time,
2). Real world constraints, things like limited time and money, must be honored, and,
3). I was really lucky to be in a situation to try something like participative strategic planning at all." -- Fambrough (1992)

These two authors together demonstrate the ideal and the practical realities of designing processes to seek common ground among diverse interests. The task is challenging, but

the potential rewards have motivated many to pursue such aims before us, and they have chosen to share their knowledge with others.

This review defines common ground processes as those that bring diverse individuals and/or groups together to try to identify common ground with which all parties can agree. Variations of these process evolved concurrently in different fields and have been broadly applied. Future search conferences developed from the application of behavioral and educational psychology to strategic business planning (Weisbord, 1992c). Search conferences apply ideas of "whole systems learning" and common ground to an area traditionally dominated by managers and experts (Ibid.). This novel approach to natural resource planning seemed to warrant specific attention and, therefore, Appendix A describes a general model for search conferences. The field of environmental dispute resolution, emerging in the 1960's and 1970's, applied consensus based negotiation first to discrete, specific environmental conflicts among a broad range of affected parties and has since applied the concepts of environmental mediation to more diffuse environmental issues such as policy dialogues between representatives of business, environmental, and governmental interests (Cormick, 1982). Cormick (1982) defines policy dialogues as "a problem-solving and negotiation approach developed on a pragmatic, ad hoc basis . . . and intended to identify joint positions which can be advocated in the public policy arena by interest groups that are normally opposed to one another." Other authors have used the phrases collaborative problem solving or collaborative decision making to describe similar processes (McKinney, 1990 and 1991; Selin and Chavez, 1995), which Hustedde (1995) calls "interest based problem solving." In each of these fields, common ground processes

have been applied to effect change, which suggests a presumption that some issue is perceived as a problem or a potential problem by one or more individuals.

Whatever the basis of the problem, common ground processes are fundamentally different from traditional approaches to complex problems. Phillips (1994) contends that traditional adversarial proceedings have produced "no exchange of ideas, no reasoning with demands." Processes characterized by controversy, polarization, and "using information as a tool of combat" are not dealing "satisfactorily with the real issues in dispute" (Bingham, 1986). The judicial system, and much public involvement, is characterized by the transcendent pressure of judgment, which Wheatley (1992b) and Baburoglu and Garr (1992) stress should be suspended in seeking common ground. Failure to suspend judgment undermines the ability to build trust (Ibid.). An alternative approach must seek to break the paradigm of conflict as a battle, with winners and losers, and reframe it to one of group problem solving (Phillips, 1994); "this is the first step in dissolving the impasse." Perhaps all common ground processes are essentially tools for indirect, group problem solving, in contrast to the traditional "head-on approach" (M. Emery 1992), also known as a *frontal assault*. The challenge is to look beyond the entrenched positions and to seek the underlying interests that the parties may share, to find those interests for which parties will put differences aside in "pursuit of that common purpose" (Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider, 1996). Accordingly, common ground processes are founded on principles of democratic dialogue, mutuality/interdependence, integration/cooperation, voluntary participation, and consensus-based decisions.

Basic Principles of Common Ground Processes

Common ground processes require that diverse stakeholders, acting as equals, be given the opportunity to freely exchange opinions, ideas, and points of view. "Collaboration . . . celebrates the beauty of diversity" (Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, 1992) because participants become a team of experts with "specialized understanding of different facets of a conflict" (Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider, 1996). Through dialogue "without attacking or defending," participants are more likely to discover, learn, support, and assume responsibility for "a reordered world view," and to make "changes in personal and institutional priorities" (Emery and Weisbord, 1992).

Dialogue allows for exploration and validation of differences and for the acknowledgment of each other's realities (Weisbord, 1992b). "If people listen to and acknowledge differences," then "They discover and move toward common ground" (Emery and Weisbord, 1992). "The perceptual shift comes when we realize that our diverse mental maps integrate into a larger shared whole that worries/excites us" (Ibid.). One recalls the story of the blind men and the elephant: to one with the tail, an elephant was like a rope; to one at the side, an elephant was like a wall; to one touching the elephant's leg, an elephant was like a tree. Though each blind man thought that the elephant was like something different, they were all right. As participants integrate these differing views, they can come to share "joint snapshots," (Weisbord, 1992d) enabling them to go beyond short-term action steps and approach a long-term future.

Weisbord (editorial comments in Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, 1992) contends that there are very few opportunities to engage in such dialogue in modern society, and,

perhaps consequently, dialogue can be difficult. Phillips (1994) gives three practical suggestions to participants:

> 1) "Speak From the Heart. Express your thoughts and feelings honestly, intentionally, and authentically."
>
> 2) "Be respectful of others. . . . To show respect, we find ways of trying to put ourselves in the other's position."
>
> 3) ". . . keep the dialogue going." Even the poorest communication conveys some useful information. Stop and listen.

This last strategy could be difficult for participants and facilitators, but M. Emery (1992) echoes the same idea: aggressive communication may convey strong feelings and is definitely better than no communication at all.

A second critical objective of designing a common ground process is to facilitate participants' discovery of mutuality/interdependence, a very important issue in natural resource conservation (Kellert, 1982). Phillips (1994) stresses that process design should focus on "mutuality - making common cause with the other side, looking for mutual gain . . .," or as Romm (1995) says, to "accomplish mutually desired ends." The intention is to avoid adversarial confrontation, me-you and/or we-they communication and psychology (F. Emery, 1992), and to encourage cooperation (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). Thus, irreconcilable differences must be skirted, though they should be acknowledged (Weisbord, 1992b). Although "some parties must, by definition, play adversarial roles . . . they will cooperate on significant areas of common interest" (M. Emery, 1992).

The inclusion of diverse interests and reframing of the issue (Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider, 1996) produce integration and cooperation. Mushak (1993) stresses the

complexity of environmental problems, and Bohm (1992) cautions that succumbing to the human tendencies to fragment or break up problems ignores their interrelatedness. As Weisbord (1992b) suggests, the solution lies in "scanning the whole system, not problem solving in bits and pieces." By having the '"whole system" (Ibid.) involved, the potential for cooperation increases, especially toward mutual goals, as previously discussed.

Voluntary participation is also critical to the design of processes seeking common ground. Bingham (1986) and Cormick (1982) stress that these processes should always be voluntary and should never be mandated/required, which could indicate a power imbalance and signal the potential for manipulation. It is essential that sponsors recognize and acknowledge "the inevitable role of power in the design" (Franklin and Morley, 1992). Power can only be appropriately managed though truly democratic dialogue where all participants interact as equals and where no one's interests are more important than another's (Emery and Weisbord, 1992).

And finally, common ground processes require that decisions be based on unanimity. McKinney (1990) notes that "the most valuable role" that an agency "can play is not to determine what decision or outcome is reached, but how decisions are made." The various authors from diverse fields use different phrases, but 'unanimously agree' that decisions must be acceptable to all participants. In environmental dispute resolution, "agreement . . . almost always means unanimous agreement. If . . . just one party did not agree, the parties themselves described that as a failure to reach agreement" (Bingham, 1986). Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990), Phillips (1994), McKinney (1990), and Selin and Chavez (1995) also refer to consensus decision making processes. Crowfoot and

Wondolleck (1990) also describe these decisions as mutual agreements. Selin and Chavez (1995) go on to suggest that consensus decision making is an essential part of collaboration. Johnson (1991) contends that win/win decisions must be unanimous and based on consensus, else someone loses. Echoing this belief, Freeman and Frey (1990-91) criticize the use of majority rule as a decision making tool and maintain that suppression of minority views is inevitable. Thus described, consensus techniques are essential to common ground processes.

The unique focus of a policy dialogue on common ground can be a powerful force. This "agreement model . . . draws people out, helps lower defenses, banishes unrealistic optimism and pessimism and lowers frustration. People are restored to their own good judgement and regain a sense of balance and proportion" (Phillips, 1994). Participants can discover their "power to affect or change . . . [and can] act in our own best interests" (Ibid.). Once discovered, a common ground vision of the future can "be a powerful guidance mechanism for making far reaching course corrections" and can generate "energy, enthusiasm, optimism, and high commitment" (Weisbord, 1992d). In all processes, "there will be pressure to go along with an agreement, but there should also be room to say, "No - we need some changes" (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). Process designers, facilitators, and "participants must ensure that this latitude exists and feel confident using it. After all, no negotiation is successful if *your* interests are not addressed" (Ibid.). For example, in the Common Ground Consensus Project in Illinois, Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) note that one of the fifteen groups could not accept an

agreement that satisfied the other parties. Presumably not wanting to interrupt the process, this group agreed to stand aside and not oppose the agreement (Ibid.).

Prerequisites and Necessary Foundations

Weisbord and the contributing authors to *Discovering Common Ground* (1992) describe several prerequisites for an effective search conference, and these are equally appropriate for a consensus-based policy dialogue. Since these are excerpts from one book, many ideas are very similar but expressed differently by the diverse contributing authors:

> 1) All participants agree that they live in the same world (are discussing the same thing), that they all are equally human (and, accordingly, have similar needs, concerns, and desires), and that they can perceive the reality of that world and can discuss possible futures for it (Emery and Weisbord, 1992; M. Emery, 1992; and Weisbord, 1992c).
>
> 2) The "whole system" must be involved in the planning community and must participate in the search conference as equals, i.e., maximize diversity and equality (Emery and Weisbord, 1992; and Weisbord, 1992b; Smith, 1992).
>
> 3) ". . . allow participants their own interpretation of results, accepting that the whole is too huge and complex to be analyzed, categorized, by any one person" (Smith, 1992).
>
> 4) Establish the broadest possible planning context, i.e., a global context inclusive of the past, present, and future (Emery and Weisbord, 1992).
>
> 5) Encourage participants to self-manage themselves and remain task-focused, reducing dependence on experts and managers/facilitators (Ibid.).

Franklin and Morley (1992) suggest eight of their own "basic assumptions and minimum requirements":

> 1) the initiating agency(ies) take a broad-based, integrated approach to problem framing;

2) awareness of the rate of change and uncertainty related to problem setting;

3) the search conference is viewed as only one part of a wider action learning process (pre-conference and post-conference stages are also a critical concern);

4) initiators involve the full array of stakeholders in exploring the issue - the problem domain;

5) a locally-based group representing the key interests carries out the conference design and participant selection;

6) the conference aims to establish joint directions for continuing collective action;

7) the conference designers agree that the ideological and power structures inherent in the problem will be made explicit in search conference activities;

8) the parties commit to maintaining the domain process - an ongoing dialogue between existing organizations and emerging interests, networks, and groups.

These foundations suggest that common ground processes require some minimum commitments from both sponsors and participants. Sponsors are charged with satisfying certain considerations in their design of the process, particularly with respect to choosing/inviting participants, defining the topic, and sponsoring equality. Participants are called upon to accept the participation of other interests, to demonstrate a commitment to equality, to actively participate in and manage the exercises, and to continue the process beyond the event.

Unique Circumstances Necessitate Flexibility in Design and Application

A variety of authors stress that no single program design is appropriate for the vast diversity of potential applications. Emery and Weisbord (1992) suggest that sponsors and facilitators should not 'can' a design to run every time, nor should every search be identical; instead they support managers applying "personal wrinkles" and adapting

"designs based on local situations." Haugen (1992) goes on to say, "Each conference is unique, tailored to specific requirements." (Also advocated by Franklin and Morley, 1992; Selin and Chavez, 1995). In environmental dispute resolution, participant representation and roles may differ from case to case (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). Bingham (1986) notes the difficulty in defining and identifying environmental dispute resolution processes resulting from the ambiguous nature of the field. In summary, these authors stress that, for any given situation the process chosen should best reflect the parties to, and nature of, the dispute/issue rather than following an exact formula. In other words, unique circumstances require unique processes to produce unique policy results or outcomes.

This emphasis on flexibility in process design carries over into the conference as well. Ducsik (1986) cautions against an overly restrictive agenda, particularly if designed to skirt controversial issues. Participants may have needs that emerge during the process, and failure to address emergent needs can undermine the process (Ibid.). To facilitate development of options that meet the broadest possible array of interests, Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider (1996) stress that participants should remain flexible in the options that they propose, advice that seems equally valuable to the sponsors. Nelson (1992) stresses that any such processes should be subject to continuous improvement. Alston and Freeman (1975) note that goals in natural resource management "are fluid, multiple, inconsistent, multidimensional, and incommensurable, and that no fixed solutions are possible." As if of the same mind set, Cohen and Townsley (1990) recommend that sponsors and participants remain flexible to the outcome of their deliberations. Johnson

(1991), characterizing human planning as imperfect and necessitating repeated tests and improvements, offers salient theoretical advice to both sponsors and participants: "Change is good. Change is the only way that humans progress."

Process Design Considerations

Several *Discovering Common Ground* authors stress the importance of informal interaction. Fambrough (1992) began her conference with an icebreaker that provided "safety for interaction, risk-taking, and successfully equalized the group. The exercise also initiated the development of "A sense of team-ness . . . as a result of the shared pleasurable experience" (Ibid.). Weisbord (1992b) notes the use of informal/nonworking sessions (here a trip to the pub) "in establishing egalitarian relations." Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) note that informal interaction allows the process and ideas to "soak" or sink in, allowing participants' unconscious minds to work on the problems. Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) also indicate that evenings are more conducive to reflection and suggest scheduling dialogue on world trends to take advantage of this.

Finally, several authors offer tips or ideas to keep in mind while designing a process. Morley and Trist (1992) suggest involving the facilitators in planning the process. Angus (1992), noting that participants may be skeptical of the "airy-fairy" nature of future searching, suggests more concrete transitions into the process. He used video clips from John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King to help make the participants comfortable with the visionary approach (Ibid.). M. Emery (1992) strongly cautions against anything that might interrupt the momentum of the process, "reducing instead of increasing participants' control of the outcome," such as questionnaires. Burgess (1992)

describes the infusion of creative arts (drama, drawing, etc.) into the search process and theorizes that these techniques could unlock power, energy, creativity, and vision. He suggests that these could have "a more lasting effect," particularly on nonparticipants (Ibid.). Bingham (1986) suggests three questions by which a process can be evaluated, which seem as pertinent to the design stage as after the event: 1) how fair is the process?, 2) how efficient is it?, and 3) how much are participants able to influence a decision?

On Using Subgroups

In many circumstances, attracting the full range of stakeholder viewpoints to the dialogue may result in a group that is too large to manage effectively without breaking it into subgroups. Several authors have used subgroups effectively, but the participant cross section of these groups may be critical to both output and to the perception of transparency. Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) stress that subgroups should be used to reduce the number of participants regarding an issue and not to avoid conflict. Accordingly, these subgroups may need a facilitator to function effectively (Ibid.). Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) suggest that using smaller, facilitated work groups from the start can be efficient and can result in a strong agreement on an integrated product. Baburoglu and Garr (1992) describe a process that alternated small group activities with whole system activities, where all of the participants met and performed the activities together. They enabled small groups to play ideas off each other by exchanging work (Ibid.). Bingham (1986) suggests that subgroups can be effective for providing concrete ideas or talking points for the larger group and to make rapid progress on important

issues. Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) and Bingham (1986) agree that subgroup actions should be subject to approval or ratification by the whole group of participants.

As Haugen explains, since the dialogue is dependent upon the input from participants, "small group composition . . . determines the scope and content of these discussions." Bingham (1986) describes a case (Patuxent River, Maryland, in 1981) that successfully used small workgroups of diverse interests. Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) state that these groups "should be a microcosm of the large process with balanced representation from the different parties." Haugen (1992) and Brokhaug (1992), two search conference practitioners from Norway, use both heterogeneous (cross-sectional) and homogeneous (peer, functional) groups, dependent upon the task at hand. Haugen (1992) and Brokhaug (1992) both use homogeneous groups to describe environmental trends, but Brokhaug continues to use homogeneous groups to describe probable and desirable futures. Haugen (1992) uses heterogeneous groups to emphasize convergence, consensus, and future action planning. Brokhaug (1992) also begins using the mixed groups to set priorities and in planning. Homogeneous groups can present stakeholder perspectives in a facilitated session to ensure that *all* perspectives were heard by *all* participants (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992). [Note, these practitioners followed this activity with extensive community building in mixed sessions (Ibid.).]

Process Steps

Assessing the Issue

One initial task in convening a common ground process is to assess the situation surrounding the focal issue. A thorough assessment should seek, at least:

- to define the problem, to determine why it exists, and to identify the key issues related to it (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990); and
- to identify the stakeholders (Bingham, 1986; Franklin and Morley, 1992)

Dubras and Brokhaug (1992) go on to suggest five more questions: 1) Is the timing right?, 2) Are the right people prepared to sponsor the process?, 3) Are the involved political leaders committed and prepared to take ownership of the event?, 4) Are the people most involved appropriately motivated, in reason and intensity?, and 5) Can the sponsors work effectively together? Dubras and Brokhaug (1992) seem to imply that sponsors should assess whether to proceed based upon potential benefits/costs, subject to their own judgments (common sense).

Bingham (1986) contends that a thorough assessment of an issue can greatly enhance the potential for success of common ground processes and favors a formal "dispute assessment" that includes facilitated discussions. Bingham (1986) documents cases in which assessments were conducted by various actors and at different junctures in the planning stage. Potential resources to help in the assessment include interviews with stakeholders (Hustedde, 1994; Schwass, 1992), library research (Hustedde, 1994), and consultation with experts (Hustedde, 1994).

Goal Setting

Following the assessment of the issue, sponsors need to consider the potential benefits of a common ground process and set reasonable goals accordingly. A list of nine areas of potential benefits or 'goal areas' for common ground processes follows. Concise statements of these goals are noted in all capital letters, and for additional clarity,

descriptions follow in lowercase letters. The goal areas are listed from most to least commonly cited in the literature with citations in parenthesis:

- TO IMPROVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN AND, THEREBY, FACILITATE EDUCATION OF PARTICIPANTS. To help participants understand each other, each others' interests, broader influences on the issue, and the tradeoffs related to the policy choices (Bingham 1986; Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider, 1996; M. Emery, 1992; Weisbord, 1992b; Emery and Weisbord, 1992; Fambrough, 1992; McKinney, 1990; McMullin and Nielsen, 1991; MacDonnell, 1988; Nelson, 1992; Mushak, 1993; Cohen and Townsley, 1990; and Hustedde, 1994, 1995).

- TO REFRAME THE ISSUE AND/OR CONFLICT: changing people's relationships to each other, distributing power more democratically (equally), and changing people's relationships to the issue (Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider, 1996; Weisbord, 1992a , 1992b; Fambrough, 1992; Emery and Weisbord, 1992; Franklin and Morley, 1992; Phillips, 1994; MacDonnell, 1988; Alston and Freeman, 1975; Romm, 1995; Freeman and Frey, 1990-91).

- TO IDENTIFY AND EXPAND THE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES OR CHOICES (Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider, 1996; Emery and Weisbord, 1992; Hustedde, 1994; Alston and Freeman, 1975; Selin and Chavez, 1995; Freeman and Frey, 1990-91).

- TO DEVELOP THE CAPACITIES/ABILITIES OF PARTICIPANTS, including communication and negotiation skills, informal communication channels, trust, and open-mindedness (Bingham 1986; Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider, 1996; McKinney, 1990; Hustedde, 1995; Cohen and Townsley, 1990; Emery and Weisbord, 1992; Russo, Hanrahan, and Valencia, 1992).

- TO INCREASE COOPERATION, COORDINATION, AND/OR INTEGRATION of policies, programs, and/or activities (McKinney, 1990; Cawrse, Johns, and Jones, 1994; Kellert, 1982; Nelson, 1992; Romm, 1995; Cohen and Townsley, 1990).

- TO INCREASE ACCEPTANCE/OWNERSHIP of policies/programs (McKinney, 1991; Fambrough, 1992; Hustedde, 1995; Russo, Hanrahan, and Valencia, 1992).

- TO HELP RESOLVE CONFLICTS AND/OR DIFFUSE CONTROVERSY (McMullin and Nielsen, 1991; Mushak, 1993; Cohen and Townsley, 1990).

- TO DEVELOP A BROADER CONSTITUENCY base for natural resource agencies and/or conservation activities (Nelson, 1992; Cohen and Townsley, 1990).

- TO HARNESS THE POWER OF CONTROVERSY "to fuel solutions to natural resource problems" (Nelson, undated).

Some of these goals should be considered with caution, including honest evaluation of sponsors' motivations and expectations. Increasing acceptance/ownership and 'constituency building goals' could be interpreted as attempts to co-opt participants to support the goals of the sponsors, which evokes questions of power and motive. Additionally, Cormick (1982) cautions that mediation cannot resolve basic differences or avoid conflict. Nelson's (undated) goal, unique in the literature, reminds sponsors of the benefits of conflict and the potential for improving the atmosphere surrounding an issue.

In summary, these goals all relate to three interrelated themes: process, relationships, and skills. At first glance, some goals seem to apply to one category more than the others, but categorization proves frustrating, illustrating the relationships. The ultimate goal of common ground process seems to be to change the relationship among stakeholders and between the stakeholders and the issue; process and skills are both necessary tools to make this change.

Program Sponsorship and Sponsors' Roles

The collaborative processes described in the literature were sponsored by a variety of entities. Natural resource management organizations have sponsored many of these processes (McKinney, 1990; McMullin and Nielsen, 1991; Nelson, 1992; Cawrse, Johns, and Jones, 1994; Russo, Hanrahan, and Valencia, 1992; Johnson, 1991; and Freeman and Frey, 1990-91). In contrast, Bingham (1986) notes that the policy dialogues included in her study sample "were conducted largely outside of government." Nelson (undated) describes two programs led by a citizen group with the state agency serving an advisory role.

Other sources advocate broader participation of stakeholders in the organizing stage. Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1992) suggest that "In most communities where one organization sponsored the first event, a second, if held, was always sponsored by a collaborative committee." "Sponsors learned that the broader the planning team the greater the participation in the event" (Ibid.), an idea echoed by Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992). Mushak (1993), Hustedde (1994), Haugen (1992), and Emery and Weisbord (1992) describe several processes involving committees representing a broad cross-section of stakeholders. The committee approach can help reduce the hostility and distrust by avoiding single group sponsorship and can invest many groups in the program's success (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992). Committees can also provide "expert knowledge" about the issues, framing the problem, and how stakeholders might behave (Ibid.). Learning from his own mistake, Cumming (1992) recommends that others involve key decision makers throughout a process, such as including the implementing entities and other decision makers in the sponsorship. Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) recommend establishing groundrules before continuing with agendas at planning meetings involving a heterogeneous organizing committee. Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990), in a case study on environmental and agricultural issues in Illinois, present some additional ideas on committees: the total group should 1) number about 14, 2) represent the philosophical spectrum, 3) share some common ground, and 4) be capable of communicating with a larger constituency.

The responsibilities of program sponsors might include issue assessment (Bingham, 1986), goal development (Dubras and Brokhaug, 1992), deciding how inclusive the

committee should be, and other pre-event planning. Schindler-Rainman, reflecting in Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1992), describes the benefit of a diverse committee; since members have unequal access to all resources, individuals can contribute different efforts, time commitments, funding, etc." according to their ability and the programmatic needs."

Bounding the Scope of the Process

Bounding the process scope is closely linked with dispute assessment. Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) warn that the complexity of environmental problems can easily render a process unmanageable. Accordingly, sponsors should determine the boundaries of the issues regarding authority, negotiable and nonnegotiable issues, and time and information constraints on problem-solving (Ibid.). Ducsik (1981) and Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) suggest modest expectations for initial efforts focusing on projects of less controversy and later moving on to more controversial topics. The initial goals should be on overcoming distrust and beginning "to develop a cooperative working relationship" (Ibid.). Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider (1996) note that managing an issue begins with framing it properly.

Groundrules and Initial Agreements

Establishing groundrules at the beginning of the program is essential to facilitate the 'flow' through the process. Groundrules should "help participants to jell as a group and" help them to accomplish the process's goals (Phillips, 1994). Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) note that establishing groundrules plays a key role in shaping the process and may be essential to facilitating effective participation and fostering effective dialogue. The groundrules should include clarification about how the group will reach a

final decision, i.e., majority-vote, 90% consensus, full consensus, et cetera (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). Groundrules may be crafted entirely by participants or prepared by a neutral third-party, in which case participants are allowed to modify them as necessary (Ibid.; Phillips, 1994). By thus ensuring control for participants, sponsors may increase their willingness to continue despite pitfalls and obstacles (Ibid.).

A few authors shared some specific groundrules that they have found useful.

1) "Members of horizontal [homogeneous] groups do not need to agree among themselves. The purpose is to generate as many ideas as possible (brainstorming)."
2) "Heterogeneous groups are asked to find agreement, the common ground on which all can stand."
3) "A general rule for all groups is that members have equal chance to express their views" (Haugen, 1992).

4) "All perceptions are valid" (M. Emery, 1992).

5) Moderators guide the discussion, but like the scribes, they remain neutral.
6) Everyone should participate, but no one should dominate.
7) "Our discussion should focus on the issue and the choices that brought us here."
8) "We agree to disagree with ideas, not each other."
9) "We listen to each other and respect each other" (Hustedde, 1995).

Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) suggest including a strong statement about common ground as the main objective.

Participants must reach some initial agreements on the process's goals and scope. This can be difficult and may require extensive dialogue (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). As Bingham (1986) notes, participants must agree on the problem before they can agree upon a solution. Baburoglu and Garr (1992) stress that these initial agreements become essential "should the group regress into dysfunctional fight/flight or dependency." Any "absolutely nonnegotiable" topics should be identified at the outset (Crowfoot and

Wondolleck, 1990) and are not appropriate for inclusion in common ground processes (Bingham, 1986). Out-of-scope issues may also be met with intolerance and may interrupt the process (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992). If participants cannot agree on the problem area ". . . one might as well close down the conference (or let it drift into an information exchange session . . .)" (Emery and Weisbord, 1992).

Facilitators/Mediators/Conference Managers

Several authors seem to agree that neutrality should be the primary consideration when choosing an individual or team to manage the process. Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990), noting the potential for bias, indicate that third parties typically fulfill this role. Though stakeholders themselves can and have facilitated effectively (Ibid.), Bingham (1986) suggest that this will occur less frequently in the future since "the number of experienced neutral interveners has grown considerably." Phillips (1994) notes that the facilitator(s) must "*be* neutral and *be seen* as neutral," thus, the facilitator must earn the trust of the participants (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). Government or private officials may serve as facilitators "if they are not perceived as having a political stake in the outcome" (Phillips, 1994). Phillips (Ibid.) clearly favors "outsiders" who are "capable of understanding the issues under discussion." Presumably to maintain balance, Richardson (1992) suggests choosing an assistant manager from each "serious division of interests." He notes that this lends credibility to the search manager and helps him/her learn the system and its language (Ibid.).

The primary role of facilitators/mediators/managers, regardless of title, is to help move participants toward the specific goals of the meeting, i.e., to manage the process

(Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990; Phillips, 1994). Thus, a facilitator's performance is pivotal to success (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). Fambrough (1992) notes that this responsibility is both powerful and necessary but risks "creating dependency," which some processes specifically intend to reduce (Emery and Weisbord, 1992; Baburoglu and Garr, 1992). "Thus, the facilitators take no positions on the conference content, and they invite people to take . . . initiative . . ." (Emery and Weisbord, 1992). Facilitators encourage "maximum dialogue, learning, and creative ideas" (Ibid.). Phillips (1994) goes on to suggest that this role includes helping "each side to see the other's point of view and . . . [helping] develop options for resolution." Facilitators should observe "group dynamics, help diagnose the current emotional state and intervene in ways that continue to empower the group" (Baburoglu and Garr, 1992).

Weisbord (1992c) notes that a facilitator should keep "the group at its task," but, Richardson (1992) cautions that, as a facilitator, "I must help people do what *they* intend, and not what I wish they would do." Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) agree, noting the importance of allowing groups to move forward on their own energy and knowing when to "stay out of the way." M. Emery (1992) refers to a "Creative Working Mode," when a group "takes full responsibility for the control and coordination of its work toward the agreed purposes. . . . once a group establishes this mode it is very difficult to stop them. Managers who feel the need to decelerate or reverse the momentum can find themselves in a great deal of trouble." Thus, an effective facilitator must know when to intervene and when to stand back.

Besides managing the process, the facilitators may also be called upon to fulfill other roles in the program. Facilitators usually explain the exercises and may manage time (Smith, 1992). Bingham (1986) notes that other roles include: dispute assessment and issue identification; process design and planning; establishing ground rules; identifying, selecting, inviting, and briefing the potential participants; initiating dialogue; troubleshooting; and providing linkage between parties and nonparticipants. Facilitators can mediate discussions both between parties and/or experts and in private caucuses with the parties or coalitions (Phillips, 1994). They may also be called upon as content experts (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990; Emery and Weisbord, 1992). Emery and Weisbord (1992) seem cautious of this role but recommend that facilitators prepare for it regardless. Phillips (1994) indicates that facilitators can provide logistical assistance, arranging times and locations of meetings, and taking and distributing minutes.

Selecting and Inviting Participants

Selection of participants is another crucial factor of success in common ground processes (M. Emery, 1992). As Phillips (1994) states, "Having the right people present is key to mediation's success." Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) suggest that all "key" or "major" stakeholders should be "appropriately represented," since any who are not present are likely to try to "block or demand changes in any agreement reached." Bingham (1986) notes that inclusion of all parties influencing the decision and its implementation, particularly public agencies, is very important to the success of the process. Baburoglu and Garr (1992) also stress the need to include implementors. McKinney (1990; 1991), Nelson (1992), and Hustedde (1994) seem to favor the 'all affected parties' approach.

Furthermore, Haugen (1992) says that participants should reflect both the variety of stakeholders, their relative proportions to each other, and typical demographics including age, gender, etc.

Franklin and Morley (1992) note that some processes that begin, by design or oversight, without representation of all stakeholder groups and can continually add participants as necessary to develop a more inclusive representation. If some stakeholders simply cannot be present, Wooten and Libby (1992) recommend that their interests and claims still be represented. Pre-conference brainstorms, "special reports, speeches, bulletins, and news clippings" can be used during the conference or supplied as background material for participants before the conference (Ibid.). Bingham (1986) notes that government agencies may stand as surrogates for the public interest.

Having all stakeholders present may be difficult to impossible, or simply unmanageable. Weisbord (1992b) recommends choosing "at least 30 to 40 [up to 65] diverse stakeholders to get a solid cross section of knowledge and experience" and "to present the full range of views and perspectives to capture the whole picture." M. Emery (1992) favors smaller groups, 15 to 30 participants, and recommends multiple searches if numbers exceed 35, though Bingham's (1986) study of 161 cases of environmental dispute resolution found no evidence that a large number of participants made it more difficult to reach agreement.

When selecting participants, sponsors should be aware that individual personalities can affect success. Participants must be both willing and able to get beyond their 'positions' and to create new alternatives that might meet their underlying interests

(Bingham, 1986). Thus, some personality traits may precipitate actions/behaviors that preclude agreement and others may make agreement more likely (Ibid.). Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider (1996) identify three important characteristics for participants: persuasiveness, "an ability to revise our thinking in the light of fresh insights, . . . [and, thirdly,] our ability to put ourselves in other people's shoes and to see the world from their point of view." Authors recommend inviting individuals with "creative minds" (Emery and Weisbord, 1992); a people orientation, excellent communication skills, patience, and good humor (Cohen and Townsley, 1990); and who can work with diverse groups "without regard for rank and status" (Baburoglu and Garr, 1992).

Once stakeholders are identified, their participation hinges upon their perceptions of incentives and disincentives (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990; Bingham, 1986). Individuals or groups must see that they have something to gain by participating. Bingham (1986) notes that interest may be low in the early stages of the issue's development and may rise as the problem becomes more prominent.

Inviting participants is more complex than it may first appear. Written invitations may appear to save time, but personal contacts may be more effective (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992). Personal invitations allow sponsors to convince stakeholders that their presence is important and to help them become more comfortable with the process (Ibid.). Morley and Trist (1992) include information on the search process and the preliminary program in their invitations, which may increase the comfort levels of potential participants. In situations with historically adversarial relationships, sponsors should remember that the invitation's goal is to get people to the meeting, not to secure

any additional commitments (Phillips, 1994). "A third-party invitation sidesteps impasses which have already developed between the parties" (Ibid.). Effective use of popular media and speaking engagements can also boost participation (Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, 1992).

Attracting volunteers to a meeting is more difficult "than relying on compulsory attendance by rule or order of court. It is also more beneficial. In writing the letters and making the telephone calls to convene the parties, you open participants to more creative approaches. They become more hopeful about reaching resolution, an advantage when the going gets tough later on" (Ibid.). Accordingly, sponsors should be flexible and willing to adjust the process to reflect the concerns of possible parties (Bingham, 1986). Scholarships may be appropriate to support participation of individuals or groups with fewer economic resources (Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, 1992).

A party may be influenced to participate by fear of the result of their absence (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990), sanctions for nonparticipation (Ibid.), or modest pressure. These suggest coercion and may not encourage constructive participation (Ibid.; Bingham, 1986). Phillips (1994) stresses that "participation must be voluntary if mediation is to deliver even a fraction of what it has to offer." Bingham (1986) and Cormick (1982) also support this idea.

Advice for Participants: Challenges and Preparation

Individuals and groups should not take an invitation to a common ground process lightly but should give great thought to their participation. Public agencies, though common participants, may express some of the following misgivings: discomfort with

expressing opinions too soon, perception of the process as a threat to their authority, uncertainty over responsibilities and roles concerning the agency's mission, and the political nature of the issue (Bingham, 1986). McMullin and Nielsen (1991) note that agency personnel may perceive these processes as a threat to their roles and stature as 'professional' managers. Selin and Chavez (1995) note that legal precedence, agency culture, historical conflict, and traditionally adversarial public involvement programs may inhibit agency participation in collaboration. The basic principles of open participation, cooperation, and shared responsibility may be uncomfortable for the traditional power structure (Dubras and Brokhaug, 1992), including agencies and organized interest groups. Bingham (1986) notes that various parties may have differing abilities to gather the necessary data and analyze it to negotiate effectively. Cohen and Townsley (1990) advocate a "level . . . playing field." Accordingly, participants with greater access to financial resources provide funding for technical expertise and information gathering to participants with fewer resources (Ibid.). Bingham (1986) notes that the parties must be informed enough to produce a technically sound decision. However, "formal education, or specialized backgrounds need not be the 'entrance requirements' for participation . . ." (Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, 1992).

"The quality of the discussion depends on laying a firm foundation. And the more people invest in the process, the more they get out of it" (Phillips, 1994). This analysis suggests that participants should invest in preparation for the event, and two authors approach this by posing questions for parties to explore themselves. Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) suggest four questions:

1) What are your concerns and objectives regarding the issue?,
2) What, specifically, are your goals for *this* process?,
3) How will you ensure that the momentum of the process does not cause you to loose sight of your interests?, and
4) What are the alternatives and how can you improve the alternatives to strengthen your position in the process?

Phillips (1994) suggests five questions to help participants prepare:

1) What are the main issues that need to be negotiated?,
2) What are the secondary issues within each issue that need to be negotiated?,
3) What side agreements (not among all parties) might be needed to make overall negotiated agreement among all stakeholders more likely?,
4) Are there procedural agreements that need to be reached, to keep the group discussion progressing?, and
5) What procedural agreements must be reached first?

Note, answering these questions requires participants to conduct their own assessment of the problem before they agree to participate (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990).

In corollary, Cormick (1977) notes that parties need to understand the processes and understand what they want and are likely to achieve. For future searches, Brokhaug (1992) recommends providing participants with an orientation guide. The guide defines future search conferences, describes the process, explains the main phase and follow-up ideas, and ends with a postscript supporting the overall philosophy (Ibid.). As preparation for the conference, the guide also recommends that participants think about the present and future and talk with other interested people. However, he cautions participants not to "work out solutions to problems in advance" (Ibid.). Brokhaug (1992) encourages participants to bring relevant material to his search conference. If sponsors wish to encourage participants to bring such data, the process should be designed to allow its constructive use.

Additionally, Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) seem to support Susskind and Cruikshank's (1987) observation that coalition building is beneficial "to build a mutual understanding of the objectives and issues to be pursued and their relative importance." However, these coalitions should be built on shared goals rather than shared opposition (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990).

Participant Roles

Since not all processes are alike, participants may fulfill various roles dependent upon unique processes. Bingham (1986) notes that there is no rule for how interests should be represented in environmental dispute resolution processes; in some, leaders represent organizations, in others, government agencies may stand as surrogates for the public interest, and in other cases groups may hire representatives such as attorneys and/or lobbyists. In site-specific disputes common in the environmental dispute resolution literature, participants may formally represent their organizations and any agreement may be binding on the associated organizations (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). In policy dialogues, participants may speak toward the interests of an organized group but are not official representatives of those groups (Ibid.; Bingham, 1986). Weisbord (1992c) cautions against nonparticipant observers and suggests that those who wish to observe should fulfill a role of discussion leader, documenter, recorder, or timekeeper, which are all important roles. Since the phases of a search conference are so interrelated, Baburoglu and Garr (1992) discourage participants from partial participation, even to receive phone calls, meet with people, or to go home. Finally, perhaps the most important role for participants is that of interpreting the results of the process. Smith (1992) contends that

each participant should interpret the results on an individual basis, "accepting that the whole is too huge and complex to be analyzed, categorized, by any one person."

Other Important Considerations

Sponsors must also address other issues including: funding and material needs; time, deadlines, and locational decisions; and the involvement of media, nonparticipants, and experts. Though the literature did not reveal significant financial information nor even a supplies list for this type of program, some expenses will clearly be incurred. Bingham (1986) notes that some uncertainty surrounds how these processes should be funded. Schindler-Rainman (1992) indicates that sponsors may have different abilities to contribute financially. Cormick (1982) suggests that state or federal governments, acting in the public interest, should fund these efforts, as they have in labor disputes. The only specific material needs described in the literature are flip charts or butcher paper. Emery and Weisbord (1992), M. Emery (1992), and Haugen (1992) suggest recording data during the conference on these papers for all to see. Nelson (1992) offers a generic annual cost of managing a citizen task force, but does not break these expenses down. McKinney (1990) and Russo and Valencia (1992) do suggest that consensus processes can have significant expenses related to them, but logic suggests that these expenses cannot be generalized across many unique events.

Time and timing can be very important as sponsors consider the scheduling, deadlines (Bingham, 1986), and the actual time/length of a conference event (M. Emery, 1992; Haugen, 1992; and Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992). Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) suggest preparing a time line to help pace the workload and to deter

premature withdrawal by participants. This time line should depend upon reasonable deadlines, i.e., those that afford sufficient "time to deal with the issues effectively and to create pressure for closure" (Bingham, 1986). The presence of a reasonable deadline appears to promote successful resolution of a dispute (Ibid.). Critical issues should be placed on the agenda early to ensure that sufficient time can be devoted to them (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). This avoids rushing participants, which might result in a less than optimal product and leave participants dissatisfied with the whole process (Ibid.). Time lines should also consider the stress stemming from the high demands of personal involvement and intellectual integrity of these processes, which, therefore, should not be prolonged (Weisbord, 1992c). Conversely, "People and perspectives change, but this takes time" (Phillips, 1994). So, perhaps the best answer is to construct time lines based on a best guess and to adjust them as necessary: adding more time when tasks obviously cannot be completed, and cutting activities off if the stress to participants becomes unreasonable.

On search conferences, M. Emery (1992) cautions against trying to accomplish too much in too brief a time, "One and a half days is possible but really only suitable for very simple situations." M. Emery (1992) instead favors forty-eight 48 hours, lunch to lunch. Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1992) agree with two days, and Haugen (1992) says, "two or two-and-a-half days."

Location can also be an important decision for sponsors. Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) identify location as a key to success. M. Emery (1992), Haugen (1992), and Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) stress the importance of the "social island"

concept, calling for a location away from telephones and daily routines (Haugen, 1992). Haugen (1993) recommends sites suitable and comfortable for informal gatherings. M. Emery (1992) favors locations with residential and food service facilities on site and with plenty of open wall space (for posting the newsprint or butcher paper).

Several authors discuss the roles of nonparticipants in the dialogue processes. Bingham (1986) and Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) stress the importance of establishing beforehand how to handle the media, particularly if sensitive issues could be discussed. If the agenda includes presentations to nonparticipants, Morley and Trist (1992) stress that participants need opportunity to share their ideas/presentations with each other first, excluding the outsiders. This can ensure comfort and trust between the participants and can help integrate ideas (Ibid.).

One nonparticipant group, the technical expert, is viewed with noted caution by several *Discovering Common Ground* authors. M. Emery (1992) and Emery and Weisbord (1992) strongly caution against the use of expert speakers in the search process. Experts can create impediments to the search process by encouraging dependency and discouraging participants from self-managing their problem-solving, "democratic dialogue" (Emery and Weisbord, 1992), and even their own destinies (M. Emery, 1992). Avoiding the "expert lecture," Schwass (1992) used pre-conference papers prepared by experts to help frame the range of the situation and recommended the following format: 1) detail of current condition and likely results of no action, 2) identify desirable goals of alternative actions, 3) "principal constraints and obstacles and possible ways of dealing with them," 4) authors' views on "the most desirable lines of action." Schwass (1992) indicates that these

papers were to be distributed to participants three weeks before the conference, but instead were presented at the conference (in a most lecture-like manner), which limited the depth of the discussions. Franklin and Morley (1992) suggest that expert comments or presentations can be effective within the search process if the experts "link their expertise to the issues" and to the process through which the issues emerge in the dialogue. In her conference, Fambrough (1992) also chose to include an expert, who interacted as an equal with the participants, allowing him to provide his knowledge without subverting the egalitarian, participative process.

Post Meeting Activities and Follow-up

Upon completion of a policy dialogue, one question that is likely to arise is "was the program a success?" According to Bingham (1986), evaluating the environmental dispute resolution (EDR) processes requires knowing what the underlying issues are and knowing to what extent they are resolved. Fortunately, the voluntary nature of EDR processes leaves these in the hands of the participants who "are themselves good judges of what the real issues are and whether they are resolved adequately" (Ibid.). Smith (1992) also suggests that individuals might perceive this differently and should be allowed their own interpretation. For cases in which the stated goal was to reach an agreement, the success or failure in reaching agreement is itself a measure of the success of the program; and because of its voluntary nature, the support that the agreement draws from participants can gauge the degree to which it addresses the underlying interest (Bingham, 1986). Furthermore, participants will judge the success of a program against more traditional approaches and their perception of how these other processes might have met

their interests (Ibid.). In any agreement, some parties are likely to feel that their interests have been better satisfied than other participants and the converse is also true (Ibid.). *Some* agreement shows that *some* interests have been satisfied, but *any* agreement does not indicate that *all* interests have been satisfied (Ibid.). Bingham (1986) also notes that the value that participants attribute to a policy dialogue can be an indication of a program's success, regardless of whether or not an agreement was reached. In these cases, benefits may include improved communication, clarification of issues, and contributing to the understanding of the dispute's dynamics (Ibid.). M. Emery (1992) suggests that the level of excitement that participants show as they work toward their goals is also a clue to a program's success.

By definition, a policy dialogue implies that participants hope to see some form of implementation of its products. Bingham (1986) notes that agreements reached in policy dialogues are more difficult to carry out than the specific agreements produced in discrete environmental dispute resolution processes. Successful implementation of agreements produced in policy dialogues generally depend upon "the ability of the participants to gain the broad support of those who share similar interests and on their willingness and ability to bring new policy options to the attention of those making policy decisions" (Ibid.). These agreements may be blocked by unrepresented groups, may fail to meet public expectations, may be technically unsound, or may fail to deal sufficiently with post-conference challenges (Ibid.). Schwass (1992) stresses that support from those in traditional decision making positions is crucial to the implementation of these agreements. Weisbord (1992c) suggests that "rarely are strategies carried out exactly as fantasized in a

conference" but that the experience tends "to influence a broad spectrum of future actions by participants. Because slight course corrections make a big difference the further out we go in time, these conferences probably have more impact than can be measured with typical evaluations." Haugen (1992) echoes this belief but suggests that "the potential influence may, however, be consistent with other forces and strengthen developments that were already going on. Changes in organizations and in large social systems take time. . . . [Evaluation within] a two-five year period is realistic for substantial change."

Schwass (1992) suggest that a one-time event, like a search conference or a policy dialogue, is insufficient to produce substantive results. Ideally, the event should produce one or more action teams of committed individuals working with supportive decision makers who can provide the necessary resources (Ibid.). Baburoglu and Garr (1992) and Haugen (1992) ideally aim for a follow-up meeting to review progress, and revise action plans or develop new ones. Haugen (1992) suggests that this second meeting should fall about six months after the first.

Limitations, Disadvantages, and Obstacles

Like any other, common ground processes are subject to certain limitations, disadvantages, and obstacles. These processes can present a challenge to individuals or groups lacking access to specialized resources and negotiation skills (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). Some groups may also feel compelled to support an established position to ensure their continued, and essential, membership support (Ibid.; Selin and Chavez, 1995), in which case the group might be wise to pursue different strategies (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990). Additionally, collaborative processes require

extensive time (McKinney, 1990; Nelson, 1992; Cawrse, Johns, and Jones, 1994; Hustedde 1995; Russo, Hanrahan, and Valencia, 1992; Cohen and Townsley, 1990; Johnson, 1991), staff commitment (McKinney, 1990; Nelson, 1992; Hustedde 1995), and financing (McKinney, 1990; Russo, Hanrahan, and Valencia, 1992), all of which may be in scarce supply for individuals and citizen groups.

Participants may face other obstacles as well. When engaging in collaborative processes, natural resource agencies can be frustrated by centralized decision making norms or structures, bureaucratic inertia, traditions of adversarial public involvement, and legal precedence (Selin and Chavez, 1995). Bitterness, historical conflict, and ideological differences can also inhibit collaboration (Ibid.).

Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) note that unresolved trust and communication problems from previous experiences or relating to other issues can create potential obstacles. They contend that these must "be dealt with before new common ground" can be found (Ibid.). Weisbord and the other authors in *Discovering Common Ground* (1992), might contend that this is analogous to confronting conflict, which Emery and Weisbord (1992) argue ". . . fence[s] off the access to common ground."

Sometimes, participants themselves can be the obstacles; as Pogo said, "We have met the enemy and he is us" (Quoted without citation in Emery and Weisbord, 1992). For instance, "Parties mired in their one-sided view of the matter continue to see it in the same old way . . . [and] are often emotionally stuck as well" (Phillips, 1994). ". . . we often see things exclusively from our own partisan perceptions. We fail to explore other points of view that would offer enlightening perspectives" (Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider 1996).

"Most people . . . will move out of their well-worn and predetermined corners" and into areas of common ground, but ". . . everyone has some level of difficulty giving up being a "corner person," . . . [using] guile to gain power . . . " (Richardson, 1992). Additionally, individuals' creative thinking may be restrained by their presumption that current resource constraints will continue (Baburoglu and Garr, 1992). M. Emery (1992), noting that some constraints must be addressed, recommends that when one arises, facilitators should *immediately* focus the participants on identifying possible solutions. The only solutions to these obstacles must come from individuals making a personal commitment to the process, the other participants, and the common ground. "Ultimately, trust is essential. But it must be earned. We earn trust ourselves by being reliable and by giving our attention to the other side's concerns" (Phillips, 1994).

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The Birth of an Idea

The Tennessee Forest Roundtable began indirectly as an idea spinning off from discussions between "a small group of individuals from Weyerhauser Company, the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, American Forests, the Pinchot Institute for Conservation, and the Society of American Foresters (Banzaf, 1995)." Concerned about the long-term management of America's forests, these individuals included other forest stakeholders in the discussions (Ibid.). This larger group proposed a seventh American Forest Congress that would seek "to establish a new way of doing business, a new way of communicating" between the various stakeholders in forest resources (Ibid.). This idea solidified into planning for "the Seventh American Forest Congress in Washington, D.C., February 19-24, 1996" (Ibid.). In planning the Seventh American Forest Congress, the idea emerged to hold preparatory conferences ahead of the national program (Ibid.). In the spring of 1995, William Banzaf, then Executive Vice President of the Society of American Foresters, published an editorial in the March 1995 Journal of Forestry, from which this information was taken. This editorial birthed the idea of convening a local roundtable in Tennessee.

Hugh Bullock (a graduate student of Forest Policy at the University of Tennessee) and David Ostermeier, Ph.D. (a professor of Forest Economics and Policy at the University of Tennessee), and perhaps others, read this editorial and began thinking independently about the possibility of convening a roundtable in Tennessee. Ostermeier

discussed the idea with other professionals in the state (Ostermeier, 1995b). Ostermeier was convinced that, for Tennessee to have a roundtable, its planning should begin immediately, while the "window of opportunity" was present (Ibid.). At this point, Ostermeier and Bullock talked at length about the possibility of holding a roundtable representing the diversity of forest stakeholders in Tennessee. This is the direct beginning of the Tennessee Forest Roundtable.

Training

Ostermeier spoke with the coordinators of the Seventh American Forest Congress, hereafter called the Office of the Congress, and was invited to a training workshop for those who were considering organizing or facilitating a local roundtable. Ostermeier discussed this with Bullock and asked him to attend the meeting, and Bullock agreed. The facilitator's training program was held on July 30-31, 1995, at the Society of American Foresters Complex in Bethesda, MD.

The meeting began with a brief history of the six previous Forest Congresses, followed by a brief workshop on facilitation. Much of the program focused on extensive education about the process developed for local roundtables, including a variety of hands-on learning experiences (role-plays) to accelerate understanding. Attendees also heard lessons from the three pilot roundtables. The meeting's closure encouraged attendees to make personal commitments to help convene local roundtables in their area. Informal activities allowed the participants to discuss the circumstances that each faced at home with respect to convening local roundtables, allowing opportunities both for encouragement and co-miseration. Bullock left this meeting with a commitment to push

the Tennessee Forest Roundtable forward and with some questions about how it was going to happen. Upon returning home, Bullock and Ostermeier discussed the training meeting and Bullock shared with Ostermeier the literature and information from the meeting.

The most important pieces of literature distributed at the meeting were the Organizer's Manual for Local Roundtables and the Facilitator's Manual for Local Roundtables; both of which included a Sample Roundtable Script. These three documents provided the agenda, description, and explanation of the process that the Office of the Congress was recommending to roundtable organizers. Developed by organizational development professionals, this model included modifications following the three pilot roundtables: Haddam, CT; Minnesota; and Portland, OR. Representatives of these roundtables had been present and provided personal insight and advice at the meeting.

The Organizing Committee

In the summer of 1995, Ostermeier began sharing the idea of holding the Tennessee Forest Roundtable with key stakeholders representing the diversity of interests in Tennessee's forest resources. To these individuals, Ostermeier extended an invitation to serve on a committee to organize a roundtable for the state of Tennessee. Representatives of the Tennessee Division of Forestry noted that the Division was involved in the Governor's Commission on Agriculture and Forestry and, expressing concern about potential conflicts, choose not to serve on this committee (Ostermeier, 1995b). Others may also have been asked to serve but declined. Representatives of several nongovernmental organizations, two University of Tennessee employees, and one

employee of a timber company agreed to serve on this committee. The names and affiliations of this committee follow:

Linda Caldwell	Tennessee Overhill Heritage Tourism Association
Dennis Curtin	Tennessee Valley Authority
Candace Dinwiddie	Tennessee Forestry Association
Jenny Freeman	Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning
Alan Jones	Tennessee Environmental Council
Bob Ford	Tennessee Conservation League
Tony Parks	Anderson-Tully Company
George Smith	Agricultural Extension Service
David Ostermeier	Department of Forestry, Wildlife, and Fisheries, UTK
J. Mark Fly	Department of Forestry, Wildlife, and Fisheries, UTK
Hugh Bullock	graduate student in Forest Policy, UTK

As this list shows, the organizing committee represented a diversity of stakeholders in Tennessee's forest resources: tourism, federal land management agencies, timber industry, citizen environmental groups, citizen conservation groups (hunters and fishers), university professionals, and rural development interests.

Ostermeier discussed the Tennessee Forest Roundtable with each individual personally when recruiting their participation, and the Organizing committee met together to discuss the necessary planning in Nashville, Tennessee on August 28, 1995. As the meeting began, some uncertainties surfaced over why such a program was being proposed and whether it was even feasible (Organizing Committee, 1995a). After some discussion,

most present were more comfortable with the concept. Tony Parks was particularly influential in helping persuade other committee members and soothing their concerns since he had attended the Nebraska Meeting from which the proposal for the Seventh American Forest Congress emerged. Still, anxiety remained about the short time table, two to two-and-a-half months, in which to plan and execute the local roundtable to provide input into the national program. Five questions emerged:

- "What are we about (goals);
- Are such goals worth the time and effort, especially in light of limited time;
- Can we do it (can we muster time and resources, and do we have backing by major stakeholders);
- What are our duties to make it happen and
- Who will do what" (Ibid.).

Members discussed what the benefits of a roundtable might be and whether we should convene such a program. The members at this meeting ratified two goals associated with all roundtables nationwide that linked to the Seventh American Forest Congress: "to facilitate discussion, and organize the results of such discussion, among a wide variety of forest stakeholders and interests" (Ibid.). A secondary goal also emerged, "to foster continuing dialogue between all stakeholders" (Ibid.). Additional discussion confirmed that the roundtable was a worthwhile effort and possible (Ibid.). However, executing it would require "considerable work, coordination, and focus" with the "support from members present (& the groups they represent)" (Ibid.).

The meeting also focused on the tasks necessary to execute a Tennessee roundtable and sought to identify corresponding volunteers. The eight main tasks and volunteers are listed below:

- Identify participants — all committee members
- Identify, secure, and train facilitators — Bullock
- Communication and coordination — Bullock, Curtin, Fly, and Ostermeier
- Budget and finance — Curtin, Ford, and Ostermeier
- Publicity — Parks, Ford, and Smith
- Setting date — All
- Securing facilities — Smith, Fly, and Ostermeier
- Materials — Bullock, Curtin, Fly, and Ostermeier
- Participant table assignment — based on committee's 'ideal table' (Ibid.)

Additional discussion centered on the process of the roundtable, its organization, the inclusion of observers, and selection of participants (Ibid.).

Settling upon a date for the Tennessee Forest Roundtable was fraught with difficulty. The original date proposed by Ostermeier was November 18, 1995, but this date was the opening day of the firearm deer hunting season in much of the state. The organizing committee dismissed this date because of this perceived conflict for one stakeholder group.

The deadline for compiling results and submitting them to the Office of the Congress created a tight window of opportunity for the roundtable. Accordingly, some debate followed on whether a weekday or another Saturday would be most appropriate.

Some members felt that a weekday might be fine for employees of organizations for which the roundtable would be a priority. Conversely, a weekday might require that other participants take time off from work to attend, which might restrict attendance by these interested stakeholders. Addressing concern about the participation of smaller logging operations, members noted that weather conditions would likely be of more influence than days of the week.

In the end, the group reached a consensus that no day was perfect, but a Saturday was better than any other day. November 11, 1995 was proposed, and Alan Jones noted that some members of Tennessee Environmental Council and Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness planning would be attending an annual meeting. After some discussion, Jones said that this did not preclude adequate participation from the environmental community. After additional discussion all committee members admitted that no ideal date could be found within the limited window of opportunity. Accordingly, the committee agreed that November 11, 1995, imperfect as it was, would be the date for the Tennessee Forest Roundtable.

Late in the day, after losing some members to other commitments, the remaining organizers addressed the task of selecting participants. The remaining members proposed that an ideal table 'team' consist of the following representation:

1 forest landowner

2 participants with economic interests in forest land

2 members of environmental or conservation groups

1 professional in a forest related field

1 educator, student, or communication person (like media/journalists)

1 local government official, community leader, or rural development practitioner

1 recreational or tourist interest (Ibid.)

The minutes of the meeting, later sent to each committee member, asked for feedback from any member who had any problems with this 'ideal' (Ibid.). Organizers hoped to have ten of these 'ideal' tables, or a total of 90 participants (Ibid.). The minutes, revealing the committee's practical side, note "we will not always get it [10 ideal tables] but we can hopefully come as close as possible" (Ibid.).

This selection process for participants, a critical step in the process, consumed much of the time in the meeting. In hopes of attracting sufficient participation, the method of identifying potential participants relied on the members of the organizing committee. Each member was asked to submit three times as many individuals as there were slots in the above ideal, for each category in which they had contacts (Ibid.). This would allow for a rate of at least 66% decline of the invitations. In some cases, more than one committee member could submit names for the same category of participants (Ibid.).

Invitations

As discussed at the organizing meeting, committee members compiled names and addresses of potential participants. A special effort to include minorities was made by inviting representatives of the African-American community from a conservation organization based in the Nashville area. As the names and addresses trickled in to Ostermeier, invitation letters were mailed to each potential participant when locational arrangements were complete. As represented in Table 3-1, 243 invitations were mailed to

representatives of the seven original stakeholder groups and the additional minority group. Some invitations were mailed to individuals representing more than one stakeholder group. For instance, one professor of forestry also served on a conservation organization's board of directors and might be classified as an educator, professional, or member of a conservation group. The committee did not conduct any further investigation of the demographics of these participants before the meeting.

Table 3-1. Summary of Invitations Mailed by Stakeholder Category

Stakeholder Categories	Total # of Invitations
Forest landowners	26
Economic interests in forest land	52
Members of environmental or conservation groups	41
Professionals in a forest related field	13
Educators, students, or communication professionals	7
Local government officials, community leaders, or rural development practitioners	16
Recreation or tourism interest	17
Minority interests	54
Representatives of multiple stakeholder groups	17
Total	243

Meeting for Roundtable Organizers and Facilitators, Atlanta, GA

Hoping to stimulate and encourage roundtables in the southern United States, the Office of the Seventh American Forest Congress planned a meeting for September 22-23 in Atlanta, GA. One goal of this meeting was to help put the local roundtables in a

"Southern Context" (Office of the Congress, 1995). Similar to the July training program in Bethesda, this program allowed Bullock the opportunity to interact informally with individuals directly involved in the Haddam, CT and the Arkansas Roundtables. Between the additional exposure to the training material and informal discussions, Bullock came home with a few new ideas.

Action Learning: Georgia Roundtable, Savannah, GA

Upon invitation from David Newman, Ph.D., the lead facilitator, Bullock also attended the Georgia Roundtable, in Savannah, GA on September 29, 1995. At the conference, Newman invited Bullock to contribute as an active participant rather than as an observer. This enabled Bullock to experience the process from the perspective of a participant. This alerted Bullock to a few logistic considerations that he had not yet considered concerning the use of audiovisual equipment.

The Georgia Roundtable elected to complete the Vision and Principles portion of the process but omit the Next Steps portion. Newman felt that this was sufficient to satisfy the Office of the Congress and that the final activities did not justify the time or dedication from participants. At the end of the Principles exercise, Newman asked the participants if they wished to go on and most seemed content to stop. In the final comments, one participant expressed concern that participants would not have opportunity to review the results, as compiled by the organizing committee, before it was mailed to the national program. The concern did not appear widespread, and Newman tried to sooth the concerns of this participant.

Bullock conducted informal interviews after the meeting with Newman and two small group facilitators. Newman felt that the process had gone very well and was pleased. One facilitator had no formal training or experience with facilitation and expressed that he felt that better training would have been very valuable. The other facilitator, who was an experienced, professional consultant, indicated that everything had gone well at her table. Overall, the Georgia Roundtable produced a set of Vision and Principle statements on which all participants could agree, signifying that the participants had discovered common ground. This helped relieve some anxiety that Bullock had about the approaching Tennessee Forest Roundtable.

Partial Meeting of Tennessee Forest Roundtable Organizing Committee at UTK

As the date of the Tennessee Forest Roundtable neared, four members of the organizing committee (Fly, Ostermeier, Smith, and Bullock) met to discuss final arrangements and preparations for the meeting. The meeting began with discussion on final arrangements, facilitators, and the facilitator training session. The remainder of the meeting focused on developing balanced tables of the stakeholders who had confirmed their attendance. Forty-two people had confirmed and they represented the following stakeholder groups:

5 forest landowners

12 participants with economic interests in forest land

8 members of environmental groups

7 representatives of conservation interests

5 professionals in a forest related field

3 local government officials, community leaders, or rural development practitioners

2 recreational or tourist interests (Ibid.)

Less than half of the 90 participants originally envisioned, but the forty-two participants represented a broad range of stakeholders. By this date, no educators, students, or communication people had confirmed invitations.

Facilitators Training Meeting, November 10, 1995

The six facilitators for the Tennessee Forest Roundtable were volunteers from three agencies: Cherokee National Forest (2), Tennessee Valley Authority [T.V.A.] (2), and Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation - Recreation Services Division [R.S.D.] (2). None of these facilitators had been involved in planning the Roundtable, and, therefore, all had minimal familiarity with the process developed by the Office of the Congress. The Facilitator's Manual for Local Roundtables was mailed to each facilitator upon confirmation of his or her assistance. For additional information, the organizers planned a meeting on the evening of November 10, 1995, at a hotel in Nashville. Both facilitators from the Cherokee National Forest elected to drive up on the morning of November 11, and did not attend the meeting. One facilitator from the R.S.D. also missed the meeting due to other commitments. The remaining facilitators, two from the T.V.A. and one from the R.S.D., met briefly in the hotel. This meeting provided opportunity to go through the script for the Tennessee Forest Roundtable and to identify and explain the divergences from the script in the Facilitator's Manual.

The TVA facilitators had extensive experience, whereas the R.S.D. facilitator had no formal training but had attended facilitated meetings. Therefore, some of this meeting

was dedicated to reminding the R.S.D. facilitator of her role. Fly, who also had experience in the area, agreed to make himself available if any facilitator was overwhelmed, particularly for the less experienced facilitator. This was not a formal training program and was very brief, but the facilitators expressed comfort with the process and confidence with their ability to manage the meeting.

Tennessee Forest Roundtable, November 11, 1995

The Tennessee Forest Roundtable generally followed a format similar to those used at three pilot roundtables (Portland, OR; Haddam, CT; and Minnesota) and two other roundtables (Arkansas and Georgia). No two of these roundtables were identical, nor did the Tennessee Roundtable duplicate any previous format though it resembled them all. At the most basic level, the Tennessee Roundtable brought together representatives of diverse groups who were interested in the forests of Tennessee and America.

Group Work

At the meeting, the individuals were divided into small groups that represented the diversity of the Roundtable participants as a whole. These smaller working groups varied in size and were matched with facilitators to help guide them through the process of developing Vision statements, Principles, and, perhaps, Next Steps. The facilitator acted as an impartial guide for the process but did not contribute to the group's work. These small working groups were the basis of the roundtable's activities. Their resulting work became the material that the whole Roundtable synthesized into the common ground and unresolved issues. Group work was recorded on flip charts, from the roughest brainstorming through refinements to clear and concise statements. Four graduate

students from the University of Tennessee served as recorders, as did Curtin from the organizing committee and one graduate student from Minnesota.

Unresolved Issues

The groups were encouraged to stake out the greatest range of common ground, on which all could stand. However, it was expected that issues would arise upon which the small group or whole roundtable would not reach agreement. These issues were very important for two reasons. First, in order for the process to continue, individuals who proposed an idea on which there was no general agreement must still feel that they were being treated fairly. An individual may feel very strongly about a subject. If the rest of the group squelches that point, the individual may become, at best, dissatisfied. At worst he/she could have attempted to disrupt the process or questioned its merits. Also, issues on which we could not reach agreement were important for representing the range of views on a particular subject. This range could be a better representation of the people of Tennessee than any set of common ideas. For these reasons, all issues warranted being recorded. Ideas that were not incorporated into common statements were "parked" as Unresolved Issues.

Agenda and Overview

The basic agenda for the Tennessee Forest Roundtable, as it was sent to participants, is outlined and discussed on the following pages. Much of the discussion follows the format used to explain the tasks to committee members prior to the event. Except for minor issues of timing, any deviations from the original agenda are set off with

three asterisks (*** . . . ***). Brackets [. . .] are used to set off introductory information that was not included in the description for participants or organizers.

Agenda in Brief

8:30-9:00am	Registration
9:00-9:10am	Welcome
9:10-9:25am	Table Introductions
9:25-9:35am	Ground Rules and Contracting at Tables
9:35-9:45am	Explanation of Vision Statement
9:45-10:30am	Table Work on Vision Statements
10:30-11:30am	Roundtable Synthesis of Common Vision
11:30-12:00 noon	Working Lunch
12:00-12:15pm	Video
12:15-12:25pm	Report/Update on Common Vision
12:25-12:35pm	Explanation of Principles
12:35-1:20pm	Table Work on Principle Statements
1:20-2:20pm	Roundtable Synthesis of Common Principles
2:20-2:40pm	Break
2:40-2:50pm	Explanation of Next Steps
2:50-3:35pm	Table Work on Next Steps
3:35-4:35pm	Roundtable Synthesis of Common Next Steps
4:35-4:50pm	Presentation of Common Vision, Principles, and Next Steps
4:50-5:00pm	Evaluation
5:00pm	Reception begins

8:30-9:00am Registration

[conducted by UTK graduate students]

1. Identified who came from the confirmation list.
2. Identified each participant as a representative of an interest.
3. Registered any add-ons, those who were invited but did not confirm or even some who may wish to be included and who heard of it from a friend, etc.
4. Gave each participant a name tag.
5. Assigned participants to a table.

[Table 3-2, which follows, illustrates the breakdown of registered participants at the Tennessee Forest Roundtable according to the categories identified by the organizing

committee in designing the 'ideal' table. This table includes only active participants, excluding nonparticipant observers.

Table 3-2. Breakdown of Registrants at the Tennessee Forest Roundtable

Stakeholder Categories	No. of Participants
Forest landowners	5
Economic interests in forest land	8
Members of environmental or conservation groups	11
Professionals in a forest related field	9
Educators, students, or communication professionals	2
Local government officials, community leaders, or rural development practitioners	4
Recreation or tourism interest	0
Total	39

As Table 3-2 displays, more than one quarter of all participants were members of environmental and conservation groups, and 'professionals' and 'economic interests' were also well represented in number. Conversely, no participants represented 'recreation or tourism interests', and 'educators, students, and communication professionals' were only modestly represented.]

9:00-9:10am *Welcome*

[given by Dr. David Ostermeier, Chair of Organizing Committee]

1. Welcomed participants.
2. Identified exits, restrooms, and other important areas.
3. Briefly summarized the process to participants.
4. Briefly explained the reason/purpose for the roundtable.
5. "Charged" the roundtable to:
   a. respect and try to understand the views of others.
   b. to earnestly work together in pursuit of common ground.

6. Introduced Organizing Committee.
7. Introduced Hugh Bullock, Lead Facilitator, who introduced facilitators.

9:10-9:25am Table Introductions

[led by facilitators at each table]

1. Each participant gave his/her name, home, affiliation, and a brief personal interest in the Roundtable.

9:25-9:35am Ground Rules and Contracting at Tables

1. Facilitators went over the following ground rules with each table.
2. Participants verified acceptance of the ground rules and/or suggested changes.

Ground Rules: I will . . .

1. Treat all participants as fellow team members working for common ground; remember, it is always us against the challenge, never against each other.
2. Listen actively. In fact, I commit to try to understand different views and ideas than mine.
3. Not engage in one-on-one side conversations.
4. Not engage in debate, name calling, or other adversarial activities and will not stereotype any participants.
5. Encourage all other team members to participate.
6. Treat all discussions as confidential.
7. Work within anti-trust policy guidelines.
8. Support my fellow team members in today's activities searching for common ground.

9:35-9:45am Explanation of Vision Statement

1. Done from podium/microphone so that all tables got the same explanation.
2. Any additional questions were fielded by facilitators at each table.

[The rest of the day's activities were built on the foundations of the Vision statements. The following description (written in present tense) was supplied to the organizers before the meeting and is used here to help the reader understand this important area. This is also the text from which the description was drawn that explained

visions to the participants. This was the most important activity and set the tone and 'work ethic' for the day.]

The direct goal of a Vision statement is to express a desired state of being for America's forests in a generation or two. In USFS terms, these are *Desired Future Conditions*. Some relevant questions include: what will it look like? What will it be used for? Another way of understanding a Vision statement is to think of it as the completion of a phrase beginning, "In a generation or two, America's forests will be . . ." Some endings may be adjectives, i.e., healthy, strong, vigorous, valuable. Other answers may be more lengthy, for example, ". . . used for a variety of purposes (multiple-use) by a variety of users." An important distinction is made between Vision statements and Principles; Visions are what we want in the future whereas Principles are essentially the "how to get from where we are to the where we want to be." Many exercises and other roundtables have revealed that these are often difficult to separate and that Principles are often proposed during the Vision process.

Non-forest Example: "A steady supply of golden eggs into the future and a healthy, glossy goose which kids like to look upon" (Harte, 1995).

-or-

What kind of cake you want for your birthday, and what wants/needs do you want it to satisfy?

9:45-10:30am Table Work on Vision Statements

1. Began by generating a diversity of ideas. Two techniques were proposed to facilitators to get this first activity started, and facilitators were given flexibility to

use either or any other technique that they were comfortable with. One option was to use one technique for the Vision exercise and the other for the Principle exercise.

a. Brainstorming

b. Silent, individual idea-generation on Post-It Notes

2. Once a list of possibilities was generated, the group began to work together to generate clear, concise Vision statements around these initial ideas. Efforts focused on the ideas about which the group could reach common ground.
3. Ideas about which the group could not reach common ground were written up as clear, concise statements and noted as unresolved issues.

10:30-11:30am Roundtable Synthesis of Common Vision

1. Directions from the central podium explained the process as follows:

"At this point we need to move from Visions common to each table and work toward a Vision for the Tennessee Forest Roundtable as a whole. The facilitation support team is distributing three colors of adhesive dots (approximately 1/2 inch in diameter). These dots represent the colors of a traffic signal and have similar meanings. Green indicates that you like a Vision statement and wish for it to go forward. Yellow indicates that you are a bit cautious of a statement. Red means that you feel that a statement should be stopped now. Each participant will get his/her own supply of dots and will be able to place them independently of all other participants. You will have approximately 60 minutes to place your dots. Based on feedback from the other roundtables, we encourage people who choose to place red dots to try and briefly explain why on a post-it note. This

allows for some revision of the original statements by the authors and/or facilitators and may help move a statement forward with only a minor change."

2. Dotting procedure.

3. Synthesis of results by organizing committee - spills over into working lunch.

11:30-12:00 noon Working Lunch

12:00-12:15pm Video

1. Art Smith video, prepared by the Office of the Congress

12:15-12:25pm Report/Update on Common Vision

12:25-12:35pm Explanation of Principles

1. Done from podium/microphone so that all tables got the same explanation.

2. Any additional questions were fielded by facilitators at each table.

[The following description of Principles (written in present tense) was supplied to the organizers before the meeting and used here to help the reader understand this important area. This is also the text from which the description was drawn that explained this to the participants.]

Principles are general "how to's" that provide some ideological structure on which to base "Next Steps," a more specific expression of how. These will form the framework within which Next Steps will fall. One appropriate analogy may liken the Principles to Aldo Leopold's *Land Ethics*, only these will be essentially *Forest Ethics* developed by the group. The questions pertinent to the Principles must reflect the group's Vision, and, therefore, some degree of agreement on the Vision statements is necessary before the Roundtable can proceed to the Principles. Ideally, this might mean a complete synthesis of

the small groups' Vision statements into a collective Vision statement on which all of the Tennessee Roundtable participants can agree. Due to time and logistical constraints, it may be more appropriate simply to sum up some of the portions of the Vision statements upon which there seems to be the most agreement.

Following some presentation of a common Vision, the small groups begin to discuss how to move toward the conditions expressed in the Vision statement. Remember, these are still general statements and should not focus on details. Examples might include a broad definition of ecosystem management, tax incentives, education programs, and/or other ideas.

Non-forest Example: "The goose must be given all its basic requirements, including love and attention, and the kids must be given opportunities to view the goose that they may learn its value and derive pleasure" (Harte, 1995).

-or-

A list of the ingredients necessary to meet your wants and desires in a birthday cake, but not a recipe (perhaps, more appropriate for Next Steps).

If a roundtable can complete these two portions of the exercises, then the roundtable is a success. These are the most important parts to the Seventh American Forest Congress, and the Office of the Congress will be very pleased even if our Roundtable chooses to stop here. Anything beyond these and the unresolved issues related to the Vision and Principles is "icing on the cake!"

12:35-1:20pm Table Work on Principle Statements

1. Began by generating a diversity of ideas.
    a. Brainstorming, or
    b. Silent, individual idea-generation on Post-It Notes
2. Once a list of possibilities was generated, the group began to work together to generate clear, concise Principle statements around these initial ideas. Efforts focused on the ideas about which the group could reach common ground.
3. Ideas about which the group could not reach common ground were written up as clear, concise statements and noted as unresolved issues.

1:20-2:20pm Roundtable Synthesis of Common Principles

1. Directions from the central podium. Same procedure as above in Vision synthesis.
2. Dotting procedure.
3. Synthesis of results.

2:20-2:40pm Break

2:40-2:50pm Explanation of Next Steps

1. Done from podium/microphone so that all tables got the same explanation.
2. Any additional questions were fielded by facilitators at each table.

[The following description of Next Steps (written in present tense) was supplied to the organizers before the meeting and used here to help the reader understand this important area. This is also the text from which the description was drawn that explained this to the participants.]

"These are the discrete actions, ideas, or policies that follow the structure provided by the Principles and will move us toward" the collective Vision of the Tennessee Forest Roundtable for America's forests (Harte, 1995).

Next Steps are clearly action oriented and probably more concrete that the Visions and Principles. Many participants may come to the Roundtable with specific Next Steps in mind, and these may be representative of traditional positions. For instance, "All public land management agencies will stop clearcutting on public lands," or "Agencies should encourage compliance with voluntary Best Management Practices in timber harvest." This is the point in the process on which there may be the greatest tensions and least agreement. Some previous roundtables did not get to the "Next Steps" portion at all, and others simply brainstormed on Next Steps and did not develop a collective set of steps. Metaphors for the Next Steps might include, "writing the recipe," "dividing the pie," or even "where the rubber meets the road." It is extremely important that at this point, participants be reminded of the ground rules for the process and the agreed upon set of Vision statements and Principles.

Non-forest Example: "We will set up a food committee responsible for feeding the goose, a shelter committee to insure that the goose is warm and dry, and create a visitation system for the children" (Harte, 1995).

*** At this point, the Organizing Committee, taking note of the taxing nature of the process on participants, suggested a change in the schedule. Speculating that some participants might have came to the meeting with some specific Next Steps in mind, the

organizers did no wish to forgo this exercise completely. In respect of the considerable commitment by participants so far and the needs of those who might be traveling several hours home that evening, the organizing committee proposed the following abbreviated exercise, which was accepted by the participants. ***

2:50-3:35pm ******Table Work on Next Steps******

1. Began by brainstorming a diversity of ideas, expressed as concise statements generated by individuals.
2. Modified dotting procedure; participants were given ten green dots and ten red dots. Participants were asked to place green dots on their ten favorite Next Steps, and to use the red dots to identify any Next Steps which they could not live with.

3:35pm ******Reception and Evaluations******

The reception began concurrently with this activity and participants were encouraged to take the time to complete evaluations before they left.

CHAPTER 4

PROCESS AND CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The goals of this chapter are: to critically investigate the Tennessee Forest Roundtable as a process, from initiation through execution, and to analyze the content of the resulting outcome, both consensus results and unresolved issues.

Process Analysis

Training

Bullock attended three programs that served as training for organizing and executing the Tennessee Forest Roundtable. The July 1995 facilitators' program (Bethesda, MD) and the September 1995 meeting for organizers and facilitators (Atlanta, GA) were sponsored by the Office of the [Seventh American Forest] Congress. Much of the time at these meetings was dedicated to presenting and explaining the process being recommended by the Office. These meetings also provided opportunities to discuss this process with individuals who had used the process, or variations of it, in four roundtables. The Georgia Roundtable in Savannah, GA, provided Bullock the opportunity to experience the process first hand as a participant, experiencing both the frustrations and the elations of seeking common ground. Bullock also gleaned from the facilitators a few important suggestions applied to the Tennessee Forest Roundtable. These three experiences were essential to Bullock's understanding of the process sponsored by the Office of the Congress. Thus, he was able to condense it into an eight-hour program and, then, to explain the necessary changes to the organizing committee.

Organizing Committee

The organizing committee was relatively diverse and worked hard to plan and execute the Tennessee Forest Roundtable. These eleven individuals represented nine organizations with interests in forest resources, with the ability to communicate with a larger constituency, and with limited, perhaps fragile, common ground.

The committee lacked general representation of the public agencies most responsible for public forest management in Tennessee: the Tennessee Division of Forestry, Bureau of State Parks, and Wildlife Resources Agency; the United States Forest Service, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Corps of Engineers. The Division of Forestry chose not to serve on the committee due to obligations with a concurrent program on agriculture and forestry. Fortunately, the Division contributed in other ways and sent representatives to participate in and observe the program. Since the Tennessee Division of Forestry is broadly recognized as the state agency most directly interested in forest management and policy, the committee, respectfully, chose not to invite the other public agencies to serve on the committee. Though Tennessee Valley Authority was included, the literature review suggests that the absence of some representation of these other public land management agencies was a shortcoming of the process that may have influenced the implementation of the products.

The only 'full' meeting of the committee was August 28, 1995, and was not attended by Caldwell (Tennessee Overhill Heritage Tourism Association) or Freeman (Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning). None-the-less, this meeting displayed the ability of those who were present to work together effectively. The meeting began with

some uncertainty over whether a Tennessee roundtable was worthwhile and/or possible given the small window of opportunity (concern over the deadline to provide input to the Seventh American Forest Congress probably served an important role in motivating committee members). The resulting dialogue proved valuable, helping members to understand each other's perspectives, soothing anxiety, and generating a tenuous consensus that the roundtable was a worthy goal. At this meeting, the committee developed some common goals; identified seven important stakeholder groups; discussed timing, deadlines, and locations; and set a date, after extensive discussion in which the willingness and abilities of members to negotiate were most evident. As noted in the previous chapter, Smith, Fly, and Ostermeier later arranged the location and catering, both of which seemed to work well as a "social island" (M. Emery, 1992; Haugen, 1992; Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992).

Some activities of the organizing committee were less successful or are subject to some question. Since some members were absent and others had to leave early, attempts to assess the situation surrounding the issue may have been incomplete and may not represent a consensus. Similarly, the design of the "ideal table" may have lacked a consensus. The minutes of the meeting were mailed to all members who could then have expressed dissatisfaction and/or alternatives. The committee did not thoroughly determine the boundaries of three areas that Crowfoot and Wondolleck (1990) consider important: who has and does not have authority to make or carry out decisions?; what issues are negotiable and what are nonnegotiable?; and what other constraints may be faced? Nor did the entire committee address the question of nonparticipant observers and media

representatives, something suggested by the Office of the Congress. Ostermeier discussed the Office's suggestions with some committee members and then, by memo, suggested to the committee that nonparticipant observers and media be included in the program. Perhaps, this suggests that one meeting was insufficient to sort out these details and that members did not budget sufficient time in their personal schedules to cover all of the important issues. Both of which reflect and reinforce the assertion that collaboration requires extensive time commitments.

Invitations

The organizing committee fell far short of their goal to invite three times the necessary participants to fill the ninety-participant 'ideal' roundtable. All names and addresses recommended by the organizing committee members were mailed an invitation, thus, the members did not generate enough addresses to meet their goal of three times the number of participants. Table 4-1 illustrates the shortcomings of this effort. None of the original seven stakeholder groups received more invitations than were planned, and economic interests were the only group that approached its goal. As percentages, only landowners and economic interests were invited in proportion to the 'ideal' model. The invite-goal for environmental and conservation groups may have been exceeded since the addresses for minority interests were generated from a conservation organization. Invitations to representatives of multiple stakeholder groups may suggest a better relative distribution of invitations.

Table 4-1. Comparisons of Actual Number of Invitations Mailed to Planned Number of Invitations by Stakeholder Category

Stakeholder Categories	Planned # of Invitations to be Mailed	Planned Percentage of Invitations	Actual # of Invitations Mailed	Actual Percentage of Invitations Mailed
Forest landowners	30	11.1%	26	10.7%
Economic interests in forest land	60	22.2%	52	21.4%
Members of environmental or conservation groups	60	22.2%	41	16.9%
Professionals in a forest related field	30	11.1%	13	5.3%
Educators, students, or communication professionals	30	11.1%	7	2.9%
Local government officials, community leaders, or rural development practitioners	30	11.1%	16	6.6%
Recreation or tourism interest	30	11.1%	17	7.0%
Minority interests	N/A	N/A	54	22.2%
Representatives of multiple stakeholder groups	N/A	N/A	17	7.0%
Total	270		243	

Reflecting on the invitations to the roundtable, Ostermeier (1996b) notes that though the committee did describe an 'ideal' table and number of participants, the more important issue was the perception of balance of participants, particularly between economic and environmental interests. Given the scheduling conflicts noted, the committee anticipated some difficulty eliciting 'ideal' representation from the environmental community, distinct from the conservation community (Ibid.). Due to the potential perception of substantial imbalances of participants, the committee was cautious about mailing too many invitations (Ibid.). The tight timetable might prevent the committee from remedying the imbalance by recruiting additional participants from under

represented groups (Ibid.). Thus, balance was considered more critical than numbers, and, due to time constraints, the committee opted to simply invite fewer participants rather than risk the perception of gross imbalances (Ibid.).

Participation

As one might expect given the distribution of invitations, participation also deviated from the 'ideal.' Only thirty-nine individuals attended the Tennessee Forest Roundtable, but this number proved to be manageable, whereas a full ninety participants might not (Weisbord, 1992b; M. Emery, 1992). Table 4-2 compares the actual participants in the roundtable with the 'ideal' as described in the minutes from the organizing committee meeting (Organizing Committee, 1995a). As Table 4-2 illustrates, the proportion of participants in several categories approximated the 'ideal' proportion;

Table 4-2. Actual Participants Compared to "Ideal" Participants by Stakeholder Category

Stakeholder Categories	'Ideal' # of Participants	%-age of Total	Actual # of Participants	%-age of Total
Forest landowners	10	11.1%	5	12.8%
Economic interests in forest land	20	22.2%	8	20.5%
Members of environmental or conservation groups	20	22.2%	11	28.2%
Professionals in a forest related field	10	11.1%	9	23.1%
Educators, students, or communication professionals	10	11.1%	2	5.1%
Local government officials, community leaders, or rural development practitioners	10	11.1%	4	10.3%
Recreation or tourism interest	10	11.1%	0	0.0%
Minority interests	N/A	N/A	0	0.0%
Representatives of multiple stakeholder groups	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	90		39	

for instance, landowners, economic interest, and local government/community/rural development. Educators, students, communication professionals and recreation or tourism interests were under represented, but environmental/conservation groups and professionals exceeded their 'ideal' proportions. Personnel from the U. S. Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife Service and the Tennessee Division of Forestry (TDF) and Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA) attended, suggesting that implementors were well represented. Additionally, key decision makers from the TDF the TWRA attended as observers, as did two state legislators. Two participants suggested in evaluations that more state legislators should be encouraged to participate. In spite of the 54 invitations mailed to African-American members of the Nashville-area conservation organization, no ethnic minorities participated.

As the organizing committee expected, they did not meet their goal of 'ideal' participation in the roundtable. However, the participants did represent a broad range of stakeholders, and as evident in the evaluations, they recognized this diversity. As a category, only recreation and tourism interests were entirely absent, though the participants did not include any students or media representatives either.

The participants were not representative of more broadly defined demographics of the region, a point that one participant criticized in the evaluation. The absence of any minority representatives, not a distinct group in the original 'ideal', is notable since invitations were sent to African-Americans with addresses in the Nashville area to facilitate participation. The young generation was also absent, as no participants appeared to be less than twenty years old. Considering that the vision statements were focused "in a

generation or two" (Harte, 1995), these individuals may have greater 'stakes' in forest resources than older participants. Women were also under represented, with only three, or 7.7%, attending.

With this distribution of participants, the subgroups at the roundtable also deviated from the 'ideal' tables. Table assignments were made before registration based on the 42 participants who had confirmed their attendance when Smith, Fly, Ostermeier and Bullock met to complete final arrangements. Some empty seats were left open at tables to accommodate any last minute confirmations or any new registrants at the meeting. Final arrangements developed six tables, accommodating up to fifty-four participants, hence distributing the thirty-nine participants at these tables implies some deviation from the 'ideal.' Only one table closely approximated the full 'ideal', the remaining tables had empty seats. One table initially had only four participants; but two state legislators, invited as nonparticipant observers, joined the table and actively participated in discussions. Responding to suggestions from the organizing committee, participants and their facilitators chose not to switch tables to more closely approximate any 'ideal' distribution.

Perhaps some difficulty in developing diverse subgroups could have been avoided by making table assignments at registration. One method of doing this would require a list of confirmed participants at the registration table, alphabetized and identifying the stakeholder group of each participant. The first landowner, or any other interest with one representative per table, would be assigned to table one, the second to table two, the third to table three, etc. Economic interests and members of conservation or environmental organizations would also be assigned to tables one at a time; when all tables had one

representative, the process would return to table one and assignments continue around the tables again. This method would likely ensure that the first table, or few tables, had diverse representation, but the last table, or tables, could be scant on numbers if some stakeholder groups had fewer representatives. A variation of this process would try to balance tables similarly but would stagger stakeholder assignments around the tables, i.e., the first economic interest, environmentalist/conservationist, and landowner could be assigned to table one, the first professional to table two, the first educator to table three, etc.

Both methods would demand that individuals be identified as a representative of a stakeholder interest at the meeting. The identification could be limited to the registration staff, but astute individuals are likely to ascertain the process and may raise concern that the process is not straightforward or make accusations of conspiracy. Or, each individual's stakeholder affiliation could be made transparent, even noted on their name tags. It is uncertain what effect, if any, this might have on discovering common ground, but the effect may be minimal, since table introductions likely identify affiliations as well.

Potential Factors Influencing Participation

Other than the distribution of invitations, no empirical evidence explains the choices of invitees, but several factors may have had varying influences on their participation in the roundtable. Though the invitation from the diverse organizing committee likely avoided the perception of co-optation, some sources suggest that the reliance on written invitations might have produced fewer results than personal contact (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992), speaking engagements, and popular media

announcements (Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, 1992). The political nature of the program may have influenced participation by some invitees since the Governor's Council on Agriculture and Forestry was looking at forest resources concurrently. Members of the environmental community may have been unable to participate due to previous commitments relating to other meetings scheduled for the same weekend, as discussed in Chapter 3 - The Organizing Committee. Some invitees may have been unwilling to incur the expenses relating to their participation that would have included travel expenses and the fifteen-dollar registration fee. Scholarships for these individuals might have overcome their difficulties. Some stakeholders may simply have been unable to see any benefit in their participation, which might have been illuminated through the dialogue of a personal invitation.

Expert knowledge of forest resources was not an important consideration to the organizing committee in choosing invitees, but perhaps some chose not to participate because they did not feel well enough informed. Upon acceptance of invitation, participants were mailed a packet that included a publication from the Office of the Congress, *Information for Local Roundtable Participants* (1995). This provided some potentially relevant information on forest resources and more information about the process than was included in the invitation. This information might have helped any invitees who felt insufficiently informed if it had been available to them and any anxious participants who confirmed their acceptance.

Finally, the method chosen to identify invitees may have been insufficient to meet the goals for participation. Some sources in the literature support organizing committees

representing diverse interests because of their presumed connections to stakeholders with similar interests (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992; Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, 1992), but this may not be an accurate assumption. Perhaps the committee members had difficulty generating names and addresses of potential participants. Or, perhaps, there was insufficient communication between Ostermeier, who was coordinating the invitations, and committee members who could have provided more names but were unaware that the numbers of mailed invitations fell below the committee's goals. It is not known whether other mailing lists were available that might have resulted in better participation. Also, the importance of the perception of balance, and its influence on invitations, were definitely influential in determining the eventual participation in the event.

General Process

From a general analysis, the Tennessee Forest Roundtable's process flowed rather effectively, in fact, smoothly. The organizing committee's goals were rather modest, including the hope to develop modest cooperation between participants, which Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) support. The process was founded in the concepts of mutuality, voluntary participation, democratic dialogue, and integration and focused on common ground, remaining neutral regarding conflict. Consensus based decisions, both in subgroups and roundtable-wide syntheses, supported this orientation (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990; Bingham, 1986; Johnson, 1991; Freeman and Frey, 1990-91). The fact that participants acted as individuals, not representatives of organized interests, follows that of similar processes (Crowfoot and Wondolleck, 1990; Bingham, 1986).

Evaluations reflect that, with a few exceptions, the process did encourage a free exchange of ideas, opinions, and points of view without attacking or defending. It is uncertain how effective the process was at building trust or actually getting participants to begin thinking from another's perspective. The roundtable did not include any exercises focusing explicitly on understanding the various viewpoints or other perspectives. To develop empathy, one specific exercise would have encouraged participants to 'tell their story.' Individuals could have explained why they chose to participate and related their personal experiences, potentially revealing some underlying interests.

The program's future focus likely contributed to the discovery of common ground among diverse individuals, i.e., some consensus on a possible future (Weisbord, 1992c). However, the process did not encourage participants to: consider the future most probable if no efforts were made to alter current paths/trends, to compare their perception of present conditions to their consensus future, nor to describe any changes necessary to work toward the consensus future. This might have helped drive home the point that a future is something that people create; it does not just happen (one theme in *Discovering Common Ground*, 1992).

The program's beginning successfully set the tone for the day but did so on an assumption that might not always hold. Ostermeier's welcome to the roundtable seemed to convey to participants that this was their program and they would be responsible for its outcome, but it is unsure to what extent it helped them feel that they could work *together* to effect change. Fortunately, the initial subgroup work on Vision statements and the subsequent roundtable synthesis revealed that the participants did share some common

ground. Without this, the process would have been unlikely to continue with other tasks. Still, some participants noted in evaluations that too little time had been spent in team building before beginning the exercises. Facilitators agreed that most participants were open to reach common ground, but a few were notably closed. Perhaps some icebreaker or some activity focusing on something other than the issue at hand might have proved useful.

Several other parts of the agenda also appear to have been important contributors to the program's success. The groundrules were prepared before the meeting and reviewed by the facilitators before group work began. They were designed to avoid disturbances to the process arising from destructive communication and to encourage team work and mutual support. As one facilitator reported, some participants were offended by the groundrules which they perceived to imply that some participants might not cooperate. The facilitator reported that some of these same participants had to be reminded of the groundrules.

The activities began in subgroups and then alternated with whole-group (roundtable) activities. These processes seemed to make effective use of subgroups and the whole-group synthesis of subgroup work, though facilitators noted that it is very difficult for a group to write a sentence. In fact, participants, recorders, and facilitators were surprised with how well it worked. Perhaps the most complex of the day's activities, the synthesis, accomplished with the dotting procedure, worked rather smoothly, suggesting that the instructions for this activity must have been complete and, perhaps, suggesting the simplicity of this type of synthesis. However, this type of synthesis does

not allow deliberation among all roundtable participants and does not hold participants accountable for preventing statements from being carried forward, since they were not *required* to explain the red dots. As Weisbord (1992c) suggested, efforts were made to process the day as we went, reminding participants of what they had accomplished by updating them on the group synthesis of the previous activity before moving on to the next. This required a more rapid turn around than was possible, so these updates were generally abbreviated and did not present the full array of consensus statements.

Throughout the day, participants had opportunities for informal interaction, before the program began, at breaks, at lunch, and even in roundtable synthesis exercises. Some participants were observed interacting with other participants from very different interest groups. For instance, one group that gathered outside repeatedly for a bit of fresh air or a cigarette included an environmentalist, a landowner, a TDF employee, and others and had to be ushered to return when the meeting began. These opportunities can build commonality (Fambrough, 1992), reinforce equality (Weisbord, 1992b), and help the process sink into the unconscious mind (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992). The video, shown after the Vision exercises and lunch, may also have imprinted on the participants' unconscious mind, recharging participants and inspiring them for the work ahead, as both participants and organizers observed.

Considering past conflicts over Tennessee's forest resources, the organizing committee judged that some stakeholder relationships had been confrontational or adversarial. Implying dissatisfaction with the traditional processes that had precipitated these conflicts, the committee hoped to change these relationships. As Fisher, Kopelman,

and Schneider (1996) state, achieving different results requires doing something different. Therefore, upon recommendation from the national sponsors, the committee initiated the Tennessee Forest Roundtable with a specific agenda, to develop understanding and common ground, and with a specific process. The invitation packet and the information sent upon its acceptance explained the process that *would be used.* Thus, the committee indicated that participants would be given little opportunity to modify the process, which seems to differ from the literature's recommendation that participants should have opportunity to influence the process task, goals, and/or scope. Though this suggests that the committee would not modify the process to meet the concerns of potential participants, the confirmations and subsequent attendance of thirty-nine participants suggests that some invitees agreed that the "new way of doing business" (Banzaf, 1995) was at least worth a try. Post-roundtable evaluations suggest that participants did find the process to be worthwhile.

The actual process used is likely not the *only* process through which participants could have developed common ground and understanding. Perhaps by involving potential participants in process design, a roundtable could achieve similar results and meet the interests of more people. However, the process promoted by the national sponsors had several benefits. It was a proven process, did not require hiring experienced specialists, and would produce an output that the Office of the Congress agreed to use at the Seventh American Forest Congress. In combination with the time constraints, it would appear a logical choice to favor the 'tried and true' over a more highly participative approach to process design.

Perhaps, the Tennessee Forest Roundtable attempted to accomplish too much with too little time. As members of the organizing committee observed, the process appeared to demand high personal involvement and appeared to be stressful to participants, who, as a result, were tired from the day's activities. Accordingly, the organizing committee suggested abbreviating the Next Step exercises. This illustrates the flexibility of the committee and their sensitivity to participant needs. One participant, apparently feeling less anxiety, wanted to complete the exercise in full and expressed his opinion in the evaluation. Failure to deliberate Next Steps in the subgroups yielded more statements on which participants could comment, but the statements in raw form may not have been received as warmly.

Facilitation

The use of trained facilitators to manage the subgroup processes proved to be an effective technique. The facilitators were not involved in the assessment and may have been less familiar with the situation than committee members, but Cormick (1982) notes that is not absolutely necessary for mediators to properly manage the process. Facilitators were provided a facilitator training manual (Office of the Congress, 1995b) and information specific to the Tennessee Forest Roundtable by mail prior to the meeting. Unfortunately, the training session on the evening of November 10, 1995, was less effective than planned. Only three of the six facilitators attended, one of whom had no previous training or experience as a facilitator. With the low participation and assurances from the facilitators, this meeting proved to be brief and informal, rather than a true training session as planned.

In general the facilitated subgroup activities went rather well. Facilitators displayed a great deal of creativity in handling the groups and noted that some leaders among participants helped them develop synergy and manage the process. Evaluations reveal that most participants were satisfied with facilitators' performances, suggesting that they were perceived as having maintained a neutral role. Two evaluations suggested that "Strong, talented," or "skilled" facilitators were necessary, and one specifically said that similar programs could be improved by having "Better trained facilitators." These comments suggest that some participants were less than satisfied with the facilitation. Since the evaluations did not identify participants or tables, it remains uncertain whether these comments refer to one or more facilitators. Committee members' observations and post-roundtable discussions with the facilitators and recorders suggest that only one facilitator experienced great difficulty in managing the group, which was the facilitator with the least training and experience. By chance, this group included some individuals who were very insistent and seemed to have some difficulty working toward common ground. It is uncertain to what extent the quality of facilitation contributed to this problem. If programs are designed to rely on small group facilitators, the potential for difficulty should be minimized by relying only on well trained, experienced individuals. Conversely, the authors of *Discovering Common Ground* (1992) suggest that small groups need not be facilitated by trained neutrals. In search conferences these groups are generally "self-managed" and participants themselves assume the responsibility for managing the process (Ibid.).

Overall Evaluation

As stated in the literature review, evaluations of common ground processes are difficult at best and highly complicated by many issues that may not be readily apparent. Since the program did produce some agreements, ten consensus Vision statements and thirty-three consensus Principle statements, the program was successful at developing some common ground. Following Bingham's (1986) and Smith's (1992) philosophy that participants can adequately judge the success of the program, evaluations also suggest that the program was a success. Several participants expressed interest in continuing the dialogue on a more regular basis.

The evaluations, administered at the program's completion, were perhaps the most important part of this program; without them, this analysis would be reduced entirely to speculation. Twenty-seven of the thirty-nine participants, or approximately 70%, returned the evaluation, which consisted of four questions. The small sample size prohibited extensive, meaningful statistical analysis, so this analysis relies primarily on more qualitative methods. When asked to rate the program from 1 (poor) to 10 (best), twenty-three participants gave numbers ranging from four to ten, and the mean was 8.3. As a raw number, the mean suggests that participants felt good about the program, but the range and written comments show that not all participants were satisfied. The remaining questions sought more open-ended responses about process and general comments. The responses to the open-ended questions are used throughout this analysis to reflect participants' views, comments, and concerns. These evaluations were compiled and

mailed to participants following the roundtable with the content results. This compilation is included in Appendix B.

Some individuals are uncomfortable with processes that intend to develop less tangible results than the traditional policy processes that produce legislation and administrative policies. As one participant in the Tennesssee Forest Roundtable said, "Doubtful much was accomplished, but I did enjoy the interaction." Though the organizing committee never suggested that the program would result in any policy changes, perhaps this individual thought that it should. However, a brief reassessment of the literature review suggests that goals for common ground processes are generally relational rather than concrete policy changes. Some individuals may not understand the connection between dialogue and policy. Or, some may be satisfied with the status quo of traditional processes and feel threatened by alterantive processes that could challenge their fragile positions.

Thus, the relationship between the Tennessee Forest Roundtable, an example of common ground processes, and traditional policy processes remains uncertain. How did the roundtable relate to the traditional policy process, and how should it? As noted, leaders from natural resource agencies both participated in the process and attended as observers, as did two state legislators. How did this process affect them as individuals or with respect to their professional responsibilities? Will these decision makers attempt to change how their agencies do business or introduce legislation? Should they do either? The results of Tennessee Forest Roundtable represent the efforts of only thirty-nine

individuals; should these decision makers institutionalize the views of these few participants within their agency?

Since the roundtable was explicitly designed as a stakeholder dialogue, its results should not be interpreted as those of the public at large. Hence, though some participants or observers might have hoped that the roundtable produce more substantive policy changes, these were above and beyond any stated objectives of the process. Efforts to institutionalize these views would be premature until after a broader constituency base is clearly supportive of these views. As Bingham (1986) notes, implementing the products of a policy dialogue requires attracting the attention of decision makers *and* developing widespread support.

Given the program's stated objectives, a more appropriate evaluation of the Tennessee Forest Roundtable depends on its impact on participants, not on decision makers. Did the roundtable: 1) "foster continuing dialogue" (Organizing Committee, 1995a), 2) "develop a greater understanding about the diversity of forest views and values held by Tennesseans" (Organizing Committee, 1995b), and/or develop "common ground on the future use and management of our forest lands" (Ibid.)? These questions relate directly to those present at the program. Clearly, the process began a dialogue and created an opportunity for participants to learn about the diversity of views. Furthermore, the consensus statements stakeout some common ground on the future of our forests. By these criteria, it appears that the Tennessee Forest Roundtable achieved a certain degree of success. Perhaps those present will chose to carry its ideas, both process and content, forward and eventually reach the public policy arena.

Several authors caution against premature evaluations of common ground processes, Haugen (1992) even suggests that substantial change may take two to five years. Weisbord (1992c) suggests that the real impact of these processes may never be known because slight course corrections can have enormous effects over longer periods of time. Still, as comments from Haugen (1992), Schwass (1992), and Baburoglu and Garr (1992) suggest, real change is most likely if the Tennessee Forest Roundtable provides continued opportunities to discover common ground through dialogue among the diverse interests in forest resources.

Content Analysis of Results

As described in the process section, facilitators and recorders attempted to capture all of the subgroup work on flip charts, and these pages serve as the written record of the event. Subgroups deliberated upon and refined rough ideas into concise Vision or Principle statements before the roundtable synthesized the subgroup activities. As noted, Next Steps were not deliberated. All of the statements were gathered following the meeting and compiled into a report for participants and for the Office of the Congress. The statements upon which all participants could reach agreement were reported as "Consensus" statements, and those with which one or more participants could not agree were reported as "Unresolved Issues." Appendix C includes the Consensus Visions, Consensus Principles, Unresolved Issues, and undeliberated Next Steps, as reported to participants and the national program.

Consensus Vision and Principle Statements

Analyzing the Vision and Principle statements on which the participants could reach common ground clearly illustrates two thematic perspectives held by stakeholders in Tennessee's forest lands. First, these participants recognize and support the continued use of forest resources to meet the wants and needs of human beings. Second, they recognize and support the innate value of forests and forest resources. Thus, participants favor the continued use of forests to meet both human and non-human needs.

Nine of the ten of the consensus Vision statements directly link forest lands with human utility values. Table 4-3, on the following page, uses ellipses to focus attention on those portions of the consensus Vision statements that refer to this theme. As illustrated, forests are to benefit humans as economic goods, recreation areas, timber sources, and educational settings. Other products will include nontimber, nontraditional, and intangible resources. Humans will also benefit from the general enjoyment of the forests. Only the ninth consensus Vision statement lacked clear linkage to this theme, but its references to ecosystems, health, and diversity relate to aesthetic values, environmental health, and human health and safety.

The consensus Principles also reflect the importance of forest resources to the *human* population of Tennessee. Table 4-4, on page 92, categorizes human utility phrases and records the frequency with which each category is represented in the consensus Principles. Phrases related to the root word 'manage' appear most frequently in the principles, which suggests that participants favor managed forests over 'natural' systems uninfluenced by humankind. To be sure, 'manage' does not mean the same to everyone,

Table 4-3. Human Utility Phrases in Consensus Vision Statements

Statement Number	Edited Vision Statement
1	A storehouse of . . . resources . . . managed for economic [and] recreational benefit of society.
2	A . . . productive, sustainable forest providing multiple uses and values.
3	The . . . American forests will be characterized by productivity for . . . timber & nontimber (traditional & nontraditional) values.
4	Our forests will . . . sustain human . . . values.
5	Our forests will be managed for long-term sustainability of the forest intended to produce a variety of products for human use . . .
6	Healthy sustainable forest lands which are managed in such a manner to provide for continued enjoyment . . . .
7	A shift from urban tourism to urban education within the forest setting. The best education experiences demonstrate the conflicts and resolves of humanity in the forest to meet all needs in a sustainable way.
8	. . . productive forests which supply both tangible and intangible resources and values for the present and future users.
10	A healthy forest provides multiple benefits for a diversity of interests including human . . . species over long periods of time.

but dictionary definitions refer to directing, controlling, arranging, guiding, or otherwise influencing *toward some end*. Incentives are a favored tool of effecting the desired management. Multiple use phrases are commonly used to include ideas of diverse human use and non-human uses, such as non-game wildlife habitat.

Thus, the consensus Vision statements and Principles suggest that a diverse range of human utility values are dependent upon Tennessee's forest lands. Though they illustrate the range of 'goods' for which humans value the forest, the consensus statements

Table 4-4. Human Utility Phrases in Consensus Principles

Phrases	Frequency
Sound management, management, managed, management practices, managers, private land managers	18
Tax incentives, private landowner incentive programs . . . (tax and cost share incentives), property tax incentives, technical assistance and financial partnerships, incentives . . . for individuals, and landowner assistance	5
Multiple uses and values, diverse interests, human and non-human interests and benefits; needs of people/plants/animals . . . etc.	5
Recognition and recognition for individuals	2
Utilization, owners who are using the land	2
Short and long-term, . . . human . . . interests and benefits	1
Forests will survive if they are valuable to the owner	1
Real market assessment of full costs and benefits	1
Respect for private property rights	1
Options to the landowner	1
Forest product consumers	1
Provide needs of people	1
Productive forests	1

do not delineate the proper mix or distribution of the myriad of goods. The participants clearly support the multiple use concept but they are unclear about how managers are to effectively and/or equitably actualize the 'idea'.

Equally evident in the consensus Vision and Principle statements, participants believe that forests should sustain healthy systems of plants and animals. All of the consensus Vision statements included references to the innate value of forests and forest

resources. To illustrate this in a clear concise form, the Table 4-5 uses ellipses to focus attention specifically on the portion of the following statements relevant to this theme. Such references to forest health and diversity, ecosystems and ecology, nonhuman species, and sustainability reflect an interest in preserving the ability of forest land to provide for more than human production, i.e., forests are more than a resource to satisfy human needs and wants.

Table 4-5. Forest Health and Sustainability in Consensus Vision Statements

Statement Number	Edited Vision Statement
1	A storehouse of genetically diverse biological resources including all members of the forest community, managed for . . . ecological benefit . . .
2	A healthy, productive, sustainable, forest providing multiple uses and values.
3	The health of the American forests will be characterized by productivity for all plant and animal species, biodiversity . . .
4	Our forests will be diverse and sustain . . . nonhuman values.
5	Our forests will be managed for long-term sustainability of the forest intended to . . . maintain and protect environmental values (watersheds, soils, air quality, aesthetics wildlife, plants, etc.).
6	Healthy sustainable forest lands which are managed in such a manner . . . to insure continuance of the diverse habitat for the protection of native species.
7	. . . the forest . . . [will] meet all needs in a sustainable way.
8	Healthy and productive forests which supply both tangible and intangible resources . . .
9	Maintain a healthy and diverse forest ecosystem.
10	A healthy forest provides multiple benefits for a diversity of interests including . . . nonhuman species over long periods of time.

The consensus Principles echo this belief. Table 4-6 illustrates the range of words and phrases that represent this theme. The consensus Principles include nine categories of references to non-human interests, and fifteen Principles contained at least one of these phrases. Together, these Consensus Visions and Principles suggest widespread appreciation, or at least acceptance, of the important role that forest lands play in providing necessary 'goods' and 'services' to non-human parts of the global community.

Table 4-6. Forest Health and Sustainability in Consensus Principles

Phrases	Frequency
Sustainability, sustainable, sustained, sustainable management practices	5
Multiple uses and values, diverse interests, human and non-human interests and benefits; needs of people/plants/animals . . . etc.	5
Ecosystem, ecology, landscape/ ecosystem, holistic management	4
Biodiversity, diverse, biological diversity, plant and animal species	4
Protection of . . . soil, protect soil, soil, erosion, siltation	4
Protect streams, protect . . . water, water quality, protection of . . . water	4
Protection of air, air . . . quality	2
Healthy	2
Non-human interests and benefits	1

To facilitate a better understanding of the thirty-three Principle statements, each statement's content was assessed and categorized into six categories: Characteristics of a Healthy Forest; Management Activities; Policy Tools; Science, Research, and Professional Education; Communication/Relationships; and Education. Figures 4-1 through 4-6 depict the statements, or portion thereof, which relate to these categories. Five statements

(16, 23, 28, 30, and 31) apply to two categories, and statement number 15 applied to three categories. Statements number 25 and 29 had two parts (A. and B.) which were categorized independently.

15.	**Expand research, utilization, biodiversity.**
16.	**Have a forest land base w/diverse interests, owners who are using the land w/sustainable management practices.**
17.	**Protect soil and water so that viable forest management can occur.**
25.	**Stewardship** **B. Sustainability should be on a landscape/ecosystem scale over long periods of time.**
33.	**Protection of air, water and soil.**

Figure 4-1. Characteristics of a Healthy Forest

5.	**Forest management practices on public and private land should promote biological diversity and multiple uses and values.**
6.	**Sound mgt. requires thorough resource inventories.**
8.	**Forest management practices must protect streams from undue siltation and slopes from erosion.**
15.	**Expand research, utilization, biodiversity.**
16.	**Have a forest land base w/diverse interests, owners who are using the land w/sustainable management practices.**
18.	**Have management practices grounded in science rather than opinions/feelings in order to provide needs of people/plants/animals . . . etc.**
20.	**Develop management strategies to fulfill long term goals which extend beyond a normal human lifespan.**
23.	**Continue our research to increase our knowledge and adapt our management as science progresses.**
25.	**Stewardship** **A. Activities within and with the forests, short and long-term, should include human and non-human interests and benefits in a responsible manner.** **B. Sustainability should be on a landscape/ ecosystem scale over long periods of time.**
28.	**Management** **Develop goals and policies that would allow long-term predictability.**
31.	**Education, planning, and management should be based on science and on a real market assessment of full costs and benefits.**

Figure 4-2. Management Activities

1.	**Tax incentives should be used to encourage sustainable forest management.**
9.	**Financial principles--private landowner incentive programs should continue to be funded at state and federal levels to provide healthy, diverse and sustained forests (tax and cost share incentives).**
14.	**Provide landowner incentives for management through taxation, recognition, and landowner assistance.**
19.	**Have respect for private property rights recognizing that private owners are also a part of the big picture, and can contribute to the vision of healthy/productive forests.**
24.	**Create incentives (IE. property tax incentives) for landowners to protect and manage forest lands in a way that is consistent with our vision goals (Forests will survive if they are valuable to the owner).**
28.	**Management** **Develop goals and policies that would allow long-term predictability.**
29.	**Education, Incentives and Regulation** **B. To provide incentives and recognition for those individuals who are practicing responsible forest management.**
31.	**Education, planning, and management should be based on science and on a real market assessment of full costs and benefits.**
32.	**Federal and State govts. Should provide tech. assistance and financial partnerships which encourage a range of desired forest management practices.**

Figure 4-3. Policy Tools

2.	**Forests should be managed in accordance with research based scientific understanding including study of Native American forest ecosystems.**
3.	**Professional resource management training should be continually updated and reviewed toward accreditation.**
10.	**Education principles--To educate resource managers to approach the management of forests from a holistic standpoint. (Biodiversity, air & water quality, soil, plant & animal species, etc.)**
12.	**Research principle--Continue basic research on forests to provide information for management and education.**
15.	**Expand research, utilization, biodiversity.**
23.	**Continue our research to increase our knowledge and adapt our management as science progresses.**
26.	**Research and Science** **Actions should be predicted on good science and peer review, and willingness to incorporate and respond to new information.**
31.	**Education, planning, and management should be based on science and on a real market assessment of full costs and benefits.**

Figure 4-4. Science, Research, and Professional Education

11.	**Communication principle--Continue the dialogue among citizens, and public and private land managers & forest policy makers.**
21.	**Have people work toward being respectful to each other, not base actions on selfish desires.**
27.	**Communication** **A. Open and honest dialogue.** **B. Provide a means for interest groups to come together and discuss concerns.** **C. Willingness to listen.** **D. A means of disseminating and receiving information to the general public.**
30.	**Decisions should be made by a well informed and educated public.**

Figure 4-5. Communication/Relationships

4.	**The general public should be educated about what forest sustainability and multiple use involves.**
7.	**All forest landowners should be educated in recommended forest mgt. practices, guidelines and ecology.**
13.	**Develop education programs for forest product consumers, landowners, the general public, managers, and workers. Develop a K-12 curriculum and teach respect for diverse views. Communicate the Vision.**
22.	**Educate society so that we all realize our decisions about the future of our forests impact not only our country but the world, we are all interconnected and must work together to fulfill our vision.**
29.	**Education, Incentives and Regulation** **A. Establish avenues of educational opportunities for a better understanding of options to the landowner.**
30.	**Decisions should be made by a well informed and educated public.**
31.	**Education, planning, and management should be based on science and on a real market assessment of full costs and benefits.**

Figure 4-6. Education

Unresolved Issues

Besides the consensus Vision and Principle statements, the results of the roundtable include a list of thirty-two statements about which the participants could not reach agreement. These Unresolved Issues illustrate the difficulty in reaching a consensus with less than 40 individuals, a minor task compared developing public policy on the

management of Tennessee's forest lands. Ten Vision statements and twenty-two Principles were opposed by one or more participants, i.e., the statements had one or more red dots placed on them in the synthesis process. Therefore, this list may (and does) include issues that only one participant could not accept. Furthermore, the participants were encouraged but *not* required to provide more information about their disagreement, and one word, such as "all," could be enough to elicit strong disagreement. Accordingly, the difference between some statements that reached a consensus and others that did not appears slight. As such, complete analysis of why these issues did not reach a consensus is beyond the scope of this study and would demand further discussion with the participants.

Inability to reach a consensus on these issues suggests that the stakeholders in Tennessee's forest resources remain divided on some issues. Remaining differences can range from mild disagreement to great controversy; thus, the development of *some* common ground does not imply unanimity on forest policy and management. Like-minded individuals are expected to remain bound together in organized interest groups and to continue to use these organizations to affect forest policy. Thus, environmental groups and forest industry organizations are expected to continue to be important actors in forest policy. One theme concerning the Unresolved Issues suggests that, though the participants could reach agreement on a great deal, disagreements still surround questions of how to reach the Vision. Specifically:

Where do rights and responsibilities begin and end?

Should forest policy rely on incentives or regulations?

Should decisions be made by consensus, with widespread public participation, or by individual property owners?

Stated differently, participants do not seem to agree on the extent to which private property rights should allow landowners to act in private interests that run counter to general public welfare. Concurrently, participants seem to disagree over to what extent the general public welfare should be compromised to preserve the rights of private property owners to meet their own interests with their own private property. The ideas of private property rights and general public welfare are both important to participants, but these seem to speak of the potential for conflict. Participants did not develop a consensus on where the boundaries should be drawn between the two or what polices or decision making techniques are best for holding both public and private interests within these boundaries. Perhaps, the controversy can be summed up as ambivalence over how to hold private interests accountable to public welfare and how to hold public interests accountable for private welfare. The controversy seems analogous to the debate about the role of governmental economic policy. Are our institutions forced to serve two masters: to ease the concentration of benefits in private interests (to build private capital) and to protect the citizens from the costs of such concentration of benefits (to protect the public from the darker side of capitalism)? How should economic policy be integrated with environmental or conservation policy?

Next Steps

In addition to the Vision and Principle exercises, participants were also asked to consider "What concrete Next Steps can individuals and organizations take to move us

toward the agreed-upon Vision, based on the identified principles?" Participants developed one-hundred thirty-six (136) Next Steps but did not deliberate on them, as noted in the methods section. The vast majority (119) did not have any red dots that indicated the opposition of one or more participants, but seventeen (17) were opposed by at least one participant. Disagreement on these Next Steps reiterates the themes of Unresolved Issues, but the large number of statements generated indicates that participants have some specific ideas about how Tennessee's forests should be managed. The one-hundred nineteen (119) statements that were not highly opposed suggest that participants can develop some common ground on Next Steps with additional dialogue and deliberation.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This analysis of the Tennessee Forest Roundtable has revealed both successes and shortcomings. As Weisbord (1992f) explains in his "first paradox of quality . . . Learning to do it right the first time probably means doing it wrong at least once." Thus, the Tennessee Forest Roundtable was a learning opportunity for both sponsors, participants, and, hopefully, forest managers and policy makers. This summary of the lessons from this experience is intended to be of use to these and other individuals or groups who may consider becoming involved in future common ground processes. The summary focuses on four areas: program sponsorship, invitations and participation, meeting processes, and applications of the results to forest management and forest stakeholders.

Program Sponsorship

Tennessee Forest Roundtable was sponsored by a diverse organizing committee that worked together to design and execute the meeting. The various members of the organizing committee could contribute differently to the project and may not have contributed equally. This reflects both the different resources to which each had access and the different needs/tasks that arose in design and execution. Thus, diversity was important to the success of this committee, both for constituency contact and in access to resources. Had circumstances allowed the Tennessee Division of Forestry to serve on the organizing committee, the program might have established more direct linkages with traditional decision making processes regarding forest policy. As revealed in the literature review, support by such an agency throughout the program can be a substantial influence

on both the success of the program itself and the subsequent application of its results. However, no written sources indicated that the roundtable's ultimate goal was to develop new policies, which might have exceeded the modest expectations recommended in the literature. Overall, the diverse organizing committee was an effective way to sponsor the program.

From a process standpoint, though, several lessons are to be learned from the shortcomings of the committee's actions. At some points in the process, the common ground between the members of the committee appeared fragile or tenuous. Accordingly, it is recommended that additional time and effort be invested in developing the relationships between committee members and reinforcing the common ground which they share before progressing in the planning process. Additionally, collaborative planning requires extensive time, and in this case, the organizing committee did not invest enough time in meeting together. Accordingly, sponsors should be flexible to spend more time in meetings and/or to meet more frequently to accomplish the necessary tasks. This also helps insure that all sponsors are aware of what is happening with all parts of the process. Superior communication is essential throughout the process, i.e., not just more letters, memos, and phone calls, but open dialogue between sponsors making sure that they are both aware of *and* support the process.

Invitations and Participation

The organizing committee sought to convene a program representative of a diverse community of stakeholders in Tennessee's forests, and, accordingly, invited a diverse group of individuals. Unfortunately, their invitations yielded a different composition of

stakeholders than envisioned. The committee mailed fewer invitations than planned and received fewer confirmations than planned, and the response rate differed for the various stakeholder groups. Thus, sponsors should be cautious when relying solely on written invitations. Achieving a desired number and balance of participants, requires continuous monitoring of confirmations and can require repeated mailings to under represented groups. A recommended method of soliciting participation would rely on a multifaceted approach, including written invitations, group presentations, personal communication, and, perhaps even, media releases. This process would also require constant monitoring and evaluation, but could boost participation by key stakeholders.

The participants in the Tennessee Forest Roundtable did represent a broad range of stakeholders, but some groups were poorly represented and warranted additional attention. The absence of recreation/tourism representatives, students, and communication professionals, and the scant representation of educators was a substantial shortcoming, given that these groups were specifically identified in the 'ideal' model developed by the organizing committee. Additionally, the representation of women, minorities, and youth suggests that their interest may not have been sufficiently considered, particularly in the interest including affected parties in decision making. Solving these issues of representation would have simplified the maintenance of diversity at the subgroup level, as would the alternate registration process discussed in Chapter 4.

Process

Though the analysis suggests that the general process of the Tennessee Forest Roundtable worked rather effectively, some areas warranted additional attention. Some

participants were critical of the lack of time invested in subgroup development before beginning the group work. The literature review supports the importance of initial activities to build group cohesiveness, yet the Tennessee Forest Roundtable did not attempt any icebreakers or informal activities to develop these relationships. Nor did the roundtable involve the participants in developing process goals or tasks. In effect, participants seemed to have little control of the process. Some potential participants who declined invitations might have attended if they were given the opportunity to provide feedback to the sponsors on the process design based on their interests. Perhaps, given their lack of control and lack of team building, sponsors should be surprised at the tremendous contribution that participants made to the success of the program. As they plan and design common ground processes, sponsors should devote ample time and attention to: 1)communicating with potential participants, 2) including them in process development, and 3) team building between participants.

Though the decision to use small group facilitators proved to be generally effective, participant evaluations and discussions with sponsors and facilitators reveal that not all facilitators were equally successful at managing the process. The authors of *Discovering Common Ground* (1992) note that subgroup facilitation is not necessary, but if it is used, only strong, skilled facilitators with sufficient training and experience to manage difficult groups and/or individuals are recommended.

The Tennessee Forest Roundtable did not provide direct linkage to traditional decision making processes, which suggests that the program did not strictly adhere to Cormick's (1982) definition of a policy dialogue. Though, the program's sponsors did not

identify this linkage as an objective of the dialogue, some decision makers were invited to participate or observe. The Tennessee Division of Forestry and the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency sent both participants and observers to the program, and two state legislators also attended. However, the invitations to potential participants did not clearly explain or describe the extent to which the program was to link with traditional policy processes and may, therefore, have been ineffective in persuading some invitees to participate. Though the roundtable's established objectives related to communication and education, at least one individual who did participate seemed to expect some direct linkage to policy and at the program's completion voiced his/her disillusion with the program's ability to produce real change. Perhaps some misunderstanding could have been prevented had potential participants and the organizing committee engaged in two-way discussion (dialogue) regarding the programs actual objectives and the reasoning behind these.

As the literature review illustrates, a one-time event may be unlikely to produce substantive results, and the evaluations show that participants enjoyed the roundtable and would like future opportunities for dialogue. These suggest that sponsors should continue to communicate with participants and to involve them in the process following the program. The above discussion on linkages implies that participants want to know what results from their participation in a common ground process. The participants volunteered their time and money and developed Principle statements and Next Steps, *only at the request of the organizing committee*. Does the committee, therefore, have a responsibility to continue meaningful opportunities for dialogue between forest stakeholders and to

serve a role in communicating with the public at large? Clearly, the consensus Principles illustrated in Figure 4-2 state that these should be future goals.

In summary, these suggestions support the fact that collaboration does take extensive time, of which, perhaps, the Tennessee Forest Roundtable did not have enough. The Office of the Congress needed to have the written results by mid-November to provide support for the Seventh American Forest Congress. However, the intangible results of the roundtable were not necessities for the national program and could be of timeless value in Tennessee. At every turn, it seems that the Tennessee Forest Roundtable was plagued by the tight deadlines and timetables of sponsors and participants. Committee meetings, scheduling, contacts and invitations, communication, balancing representation, process design, team-building, facilitator training, and many other steps seemed to need more time than was available. This suggests that collaboration requires extensive time commitments in the planning and design stages and that these demands can easily be underestimated. The Tennessee Forest Roundtable may not have been bound to the deadlines of the national program, but perhaps the national program and these very deadlines provided necessary catalysts for the event. It is uncertain whether the organizers and participants would have supported and labored for the idea without these incentives. Perhaps Weisbord would agree, the sponsors did not do it perfectly, but they gave an honest effort to seek common ground and to overcome the inherent obstacles and constraints.

Applications of Content Results

The consensus building processes of the Tennessee Forest Roundtable produced some clear areas of agreement in the Vision and Principle statements. Two themes define much of the common ground on which all participants could stand: Tennessee's and America's forests should continue to be managed to produce a variety of goods and services for human beings, timber and non-timber, market and non-market, and tangible and intangible; and these forests should also be managed to the meet the needs of the non-human 'stakeholders' in forest management, maintaining the more natural functions and values of forest lands. Thus, the consensus statements show great support for the multiple-use concept by its broadest definition, including human and non-human uses. However, these same statements do not present a consensus on how managers are to accomplish these Visions. Since forests cannot provide all things to all organisms simultaneously, policy makers, resource managers, and stakeholders must continue to wrestle with the use and distribution of our forests' benefits. Thus, controversy is likely to occur over specific disputes in the future, but the Vision statements provide a mark toward which they can focus their intentions. The Principles, illustrated in Figures 4-1 through 4-6, may provide a helpful guide for decision makers in relation to: Characteristics of a Healthy Forest; Management Activities; Policy Tools; Science, Research, and Professional Education; Communication/Relationships; and Education.

However, the consensus statements do not illustrate the whole story, they must be considered with the Unresolved Issues if managers and decision makers are to understand the participants. Only by looking at the two together can we even begin to understand the

range of views that Tennesseans hold toward the state's forest resources. These Unresolved Issues illustrate the remaining division over some issues and suggest that the stakeholders differ in the approaches that they favor in achieving the Vision. The uncertainty seems to surround three questions for society at large and, more specifically, for those with interests in forest resources: 1) What should our (inclusively defined) rights and responsibilities be to each other and to the forest resources? 2) When should we use incentives to encourage stewardship and when are regulations appropriate?, and 3) How are we, the stakeholders in forest resource management, to interact with each other and to reach decisions on these and the related questions that we face? Can some common ground be developed in these areas? The facilitators seemed to think that additional dialogue could expand the common ground. Or perhaps, deliberation on Next Steps might produce some answers; the number of ideas generated certainly attest to the interest that these participants have in opportunities to be involved in the decision making process.

As the literature review suggests, the Tennessee Forest Roundtable is not the last word in forest resource management and policy, and any analysis of the results will reveal that such belief is clearly misled. The roundtable did produce some substantive agreement and revealed some areas of continued disagreement, but the process marks only the first steps, and crucial steps, in establishing the "new way of doing business, . . . of communicating" that Banzaf (1995) envisioned. As detailed in Chapters 1 and 2, collaboration is an unfamiliar experience for many in natural resource management and can be subject to some substantial challenges and obstacles. Therefore, some leadership will be necessary to build upon this modest exercise and bring the stakeholders in Tennessee's

forest resources together for more ambitious goals. At this point it is uncertain who, if anyone, will assume or continue the leadership of these stakeholders toward a more collaborative future. Nor is it certain how the leaders should be nurtured and encouraged or what resources they will need to continue down this path. Ultimately, the continued evolution of this process is in the hands of the stakeholders themselves, as many and as diverse as they are.

WORKS CITED

WORKS CITED

Alston, R. M., and D. M. Freeman. 1975. The natural resources decision-maker as political and economic man: Toward a synthesis. J. Environ. Manag. 3(3):167-183.

Angus, D. W. 1992. Presbyterian/St. Luke's Medical Center develops a new vision. Pages 149-156 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Baburoglu, O. N., and M. A. Garr, III. 1992. Search conference methodology for practitioners: An introduction. Pages 73-81 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Banzaf, W. H. 1995. The Forest Congress: A new way of doing business? J. of For. 93(3): 3.

Bingham, G. 1986. Resolving environmental disputes: A decade of experience. The Conservation Foundation. 284 pgs.

Bohm, D. 1992. Dialogue as a path toward wholeness (Interview by J. Briggs). Pages 111-124 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Brokhaug, I. K. 1992. Informing participants of what to expect. Pages 95-100 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Burgess, M. S. 1992. The creative search gathering: A story of creative action-learning from the arts. Pages 403-418 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Cawrse, D. C., R. M. Johns II, and D.H. Jones. 1994. Ecosystem management in the Upper Chattooga. J. of For. 92(8):25-27.

Cohen, A. and M. W. Townsley. 1990. Perspectives on collaboration as replacement for confrontation. Public Util. Fortn. 125(5):9-13.

Cormick, G. W. 1982. The myth, the reality, and the future of environmental mediation. Urban Land 14(Nov.):9-13.

Cormick, G. 1977. The ethics of mediation: Some unexplored territory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution.

Crowfoot, J. E., and J. M. Wondolleck. 1990. Environmental disputes: Community involvement in conflict resolution. Island Press, Washington, D.C.

Cumming, J. A. 1992. The Center for International Education: Pitfall - Missing the "power people." Pages 375-379 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Dubras, M., and I. K. Brokhaug. 1992. The Isle of Jersey future search: Pitfall - Whose idea is this anyway? Pages 363-373 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Ducsik, D. W. 1981. Citizen participation in power plant siting: Aladdins's Lamp or Pandora's Box? J. of the A. P. A. 47(2): 154-166.

Ducsik, D. W. 1986. Chairman's report on the 1982 Edison Electric Institute Workshop on Public Participation. In D.W. Ducsik, ed. Public Involvemnt in Energy Facility Planning: The Electric Utility Experience. Westview Press, Boulder.

Emery, F. E. 1992. Effective dialogue and the new technology: Can closed-circuit TV enhance democracy? Pages 389-401 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Emery, F., and M. R. Weisbord. 1992. Conditions for success: An exchange between Fred Emery and Marvin R. Weisbord. Pages 55-70 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Emery, M. 1992. Training search conference managers. Pages 326-343 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Fambrough, M. 1992. Doing by learning, learning by doing: A practitioner's experience with theory and practice. Pages 345-360 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Fisher, R., E. Kopelman, and A. K. Schneider. 1996. Beyond Machiavelli: Tools for coping with conflict. Penguin Books, New York. 151 pgs.

Franklin, B., and D. Morley. 1992. Contextural searching: Cases from waste management, nature tourism, and personal support. Pages 229-246 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Freeman, D. M., and R. S. Frey. 1990-91. A modest proposal for assessing social impacts of natural resource policies. J. Environ. Sys. 20(4): 375-404.

Harte, A. 1995. Organizer's manual for local roundtables. Second edition, Office of the Congress, New Haven, CT. August 25.

Haugen, R. 1992. Adapting to rapid change using search conferences: Lessons from Norway. Pages 83-94 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Herbert, H. J. 1996. Parks under siege. Knoxville News Sentinel. July 7. A8.

Hustedde, R. 1995. Interest based problem solving: The key to addressing public disputes. University of Kentucky - Cooperative Extension Service, Rural and Economic Development Programs. No. 5.

Hustedde, R. 1994. Community issues gathering: A tool for resolving controversy. CD Practice. No.1. Community Development Society, Milwaukee, WI.

Johnson, M. L. 1991. Striving for unanimity and consensus: Finding the common ground in conflict over riparian management. Natural Resources and Environmental News: College of Natural Resources, Utah State University, Logan, UT. Apr. 18-19:71-76.

Journal of Forestry. 1994. Developing forest policy: The FEMAT model. Issue 92(4).

Kellert, S. R. 1982. Striving for common ground: Humane and scientific considerations in contemporary wildlife management. Int. J. Stud. Anim. Prob. 3(2):137-40.

Kloth, C. 1992. Ohio childhood development conference: Pitfall - starting in Ohio, not globally. Pages 381-386 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Lundmark, T. 1995. Methods of forest law-making. Boston Coll. Environ. Aff. Law Rev. 22(4):783-805.

MacDonnell, L. J. 1988. Natural resources dispute resolution: An overview. Nat. Resour. J. 28(1):5-19.

McKinney, M. J. 1991. Water for wildlife: Integrating science and politics in wildlife conservation. Policy Stud. J. 19(3-4): 534-541.

McKinney, M. J. 1990. State water planning: a forum for resolving water policy disputes. Water Resour. Bull. 26(2):323.

McMullin, S. L., and L. A. Nielsen. 1991. Resolution of natural resource allocation conflicts through effective public involvement. Policy Stud. J. 19(3-4):553.

Morley, D., and E. Trist. 1992. Planning, designing and managing large-scale searches: Day care in Saskatchewan. Pages 187-213 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Mushak, B. 1993. Setting environmental agendas: The search for common ground. Environ. Health Perspec. 101(1):26-29.

Nelson, D. H. 1992. Citizen Task Forces on Deer Management: A Case Study. Northeast Wildlife. 49:92-6.

Nelson, L. R. No date. Leading from behind to solve natural resource controversies. Draft manuscript. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. New Ulm, MN.

Organizing Committee. 1995a. Unpublished minutes distributed to committee members from August 28 meeting.

Organizing Committee. 1995b. Invitation letter mailed to potential Tennessee Forest Roundtable participants.

Office of the Congress. 1995. Agenda: Meeting for roundtable organizers and facilitators. Unpublished.

Ostermeier, D. 1996a. Collaborative forestry: A vision for a new century. Unpublished manuscript.

Ostermeier, D. 1996b. Pesonal communication with the author. 4 November.

Ostermeier, D. 1995a. Managing Conflicting interests in landscape-level forest ecosystems: Potential institutional arrangements. Paper presented to Division 6 -- Social, Economic Information and Policy Sciences at the IUFRO XX World Congress held in Tampere, Finland on August 6-12, 1995.

Ostermeier, D. 1995b. Personal communications with the author in summer.

Phillips, B. A. 1994. Finding common ground: A field guide to mediation. Hells Canyon Publishing, Austin, TX. 222 pgs.

Rehm, B., R. Schweitz, and E. Granata. 1992. Water quality in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Pages 215-227 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Richardson, T. 1992. Leading search conferences: Reflections on managing the process. Pages 317-234 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Romm, J. 1995. Reclaiming the commons of public trust. Utah State University, College of Natural Resources, Conflicts in Natural Resource Management: Integrating Social and Ecological Concerns. 3:45-49.

Russo, S. L., M. Hanrahan, and I. Valencia. 1992. Strategic Long-range planning for environmental and natural resources management: Results from applied experience in Central America and the Caribbean. J. Environ. Manag. 36:215-223.

Schindler-Rainman, E., and R. Lippitt. 1992. Building collaborative communities. Pages 35-44 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Schwass, R. 1992. A conservation strategy for Pakistan. Pages 159-169 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Selin, S., and D. Chavez. 1995. Developing a collaborative model for environmental planning and management. Environ. Manag. -- Springer-Verlag. 19(2):189-195.

Simmons, M. 1996. SOCM protests Champion chip mill. Knoxville News Sentinel. July 16.

Smith, W. E. 1992. Planning for the electricity sector in Colombia. Pages 171-186 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Stahl, A., and N. Sampson. 1995. Why forest gridlock? American Forests. March/April: 26-27+.

Susskind, L. and J. Cruikshank. 1987. Breaking the impasse: Consensual approaches to resolving public disputes. Basic Books, Inc., New York, NY. 276 pages.

Weisbord, M. R. 1992a. Preface. Pages *xi-xvi* in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Weisbord, M. R. 1992b. Applied common sense. Pages 3-17 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Weisbord, M. R. 1992c. Inventing the search conference: Bristol Siddeley Aircraft Engines, 1960. Pages 19-33 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Weisbord, M. R. 1992d. Parallel paths to community: Equifinality in Action. Pages 45-53 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Weisbord, M. R. 1992e. Touring 'the four room apartment': A dynamic view of future searches. Pages 101-103 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Weisbord, M. R. 1992f. Introduction to part 8: Pifalls in organizing search conferences. Page 361 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Wheatley, M. 1992a. Future search conferences and the new science: What process should we trust? Pages 105-110 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Wheatley, M. 1992b. Revising Brigham Young University's business school curriculum. Pages 137-140 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Wooten, J. T., and K. M. Libby. 1992. Strategic planning in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Pages 125-135 in M. R. Weisbord, ed. Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

GENERAL MODEL OF SEARCH CONFERENCES

The literature is scant on the specific descriptions of policy dialogues, but one model used in natural resource planning is the search conference. *Discovering Common Ground*, edited by Marvin Weisbord and published in 1992, provides a very thorough look at the search conference, its design, and the specifics of its use in a variety of circumstances. Weisbord offers a generic format of a search conference in the initial chapter. Thirty-five coauthors contributing to this work describe the modifications, nuances, and personal wrinkles that they have used to apply the general model to unique circumstances.

Weisbord's generic description follows:

> Typically, 30 to 65 or so people meet for up to two-and-a-half days. We do five tasks of about three hours each. We explore in turn the past, present, and future - of the world, ourselves, our institution. Everybody puts in information, discusses it, and decides what to do. The "technique" is a series of semi-structured dialogues. They take place in mixed, voluntary, and/or stakeholder groups, usually of eight people. Small groups report their conclusions to the whole. They post everything on flip charts in plain sight. (1992b)

He goes on to stress that search conferences differ significantly from traditional processes:

> . . . the most radical aspect of these conferences is our stance toward . . . conflicts and disagreements. . . . we discourage conferees from "working" their differences. Instead, we . . . put the dysfunctional shadow dynamics in the background. People . . . tune in on different aspects of themselves - the more constructive and cooperative impulses. . . . we put our energy into staking out the widest *common ground* all can stand on without forcing or compromise. . . . We seek to validate polarities, not reduce the distance between them. We learn, innovate and act from a mutual base of discovered ideals, world views, and future goals. (1992b)

This difference parallels another difference. Traditional meeting processes could be characterized as left-brain oriented, driven by strictly organized agendas, time limits, and

hierarchical participation. Conversely, search conferences tend toward right-brain processes, stressing idea generation, creativity, a fast pace and play-like activities to interpret data. As Fambrough (1992) suggests, the results are not decided by the manager but are created or discovered by the participants.

In addition to the attributes of other common ground processes, the authors of *Discovering Common Ground* stress two other ideas that make search conferences unique: the future focus and self-managed teams. "By putting the ideals [for which a group is searching] as far into the future as the group can tolerate, we break the mindset of present constraints on time, money, and knowhow" (Weisbord, 1992c). This mindset can inhibit problem-solving to 'what is' rather than 'what could be' (Ibid.). Weisbord (1992b), quoting a coauthor, stresses the need to affirm "the notion that people can change the present and the future, if they become pro-active" and can transform "their desires into doable actions." Self-managed work teams affirm this belief in the common citizen. "The essence of the method is that participants supply all the content for discussion and regulate their own small groups" (Baburoglu and Garr, 1992). Haugen (1992) encourages groups to develop their own organization. This self management, Weisbord (1992b) contends, is one factor that makes future search conferences unlike most traditional meeting formats.

The structure of activities is designed to focus first on the global, or generic, environment and then narrows to the local, or specific, environment (Emery and Weisbord 1992). Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) describe this as a funneling process, moving from the broad global context to the implications on the issue or topic. Baburoglu and

Garr (1992) describe five phases of a SC: 1) world trends, 2) trends that affect the issue/organization, 3) the evolution of the issue/organization, 4) the future design of the issue/organization, and 5) strategies. Haugen (1992) condenses this into three phases: "1) Mapping the context (trends in past and future); 2) Identification of key problem areas; and 3) Making a plan for future action." Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992), Haugen (1992), and Franklin and Morley (1992) note that the process includes a mixture of both small and whole group activities. Small groups present reports to the whole group (Haugen, 1992), which M. Emery (1992) suggests can help build continuity and commonality through the conference.

'Charging' the Conference

As Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) note, ". . . the opening moments of a conference are critical." In starting a conference, a speaker should set the tone for the conference, charging the participants to take responsibility for and ownership of the conference (Ibid.). Also, the speaker should briefly explain the conference (Franklin and Morley, 1992). Richardson (1992) describes the goals of an introduction as twofold: "to have people feel within themselves their potential to explore and share ideals" and "to see from their own experience that planning without this focus on ideals may lead to frustration around details." Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) note that the beginning of a conference should also instruct participants that old wounds and previous conflicts are not the focus. The invocation can be given by a sponsor (Fambrough, 1992), a conference manager (Richardson, 1992), or a speaker invited to display support for the process (Franklin and Morley, 1992). A second, and equally important, goal of the introduction is

to establish the sense of inclusion (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992). The opening should make people feel included and help them begin to open up to others (Ibid.).

Following this vein, Wheatley (1992b) suggests beginning with an icebreaker or similar activity that stresses teamwork and creative problem solving and that challenges "preconceived patterns of organizing." Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) add that personal experiences/histories can be valuable aids to establishing common ground. Personal experiences humanize the participants and reveal their shared values or experiences outside the policy arena (Ibid.). As Weisbord added in an editorial comment, "'irrelevant' personal data may sometimes be central" (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992). Wheatley (1992b) suggests that sharing real experiences and feelings on a personal level "opens people up very quickly both to one another and to the process."

Phase One: Building a Shared World View

The opening activities engage either the whole system or smaller subgroups that represent the whole system. M. Emery (1992) prefers opening activities "done in the total group for the good reason that we are building communities; not in small 'in' or 'out' groups but in big 'many hat wearing' groups who have to collaborate and can diffuse through many networks." As Weisbord describes in his reply to Kloth (1992), "the opening activity needs to help people establish a common base for further exploration (or discover they have none)." "If people can't see that they share a world of their collective making, you've failed right at the start" (Weisbord, 1992b). Kloth (1992), having explored other opening activities and found them wanting, expresses a strong inclination to begin with an activity that focuses on the shared history. Weisbord (in his response to Kloth,

1992) and Baburoglu and Garr (1992) both support using the history exercise to develop a shared appreciation of the global environment. "The first phase therefore accomplishes: (1) The creation of shared context, (2) the expression of values on the context, and (3) the realization of collective action and decision making as a group" (Baburoglu and Garr, 1992).

Phase Two: Examining the Trends Influencing the Issue

As Baburoglu and Garr (1992) state, "Once they have a shared appreciation of the global environment, participants are now ready to appraise the trends." Haugen (1992) explains that the environment is ever changing and that as it changes, old behaviors are less likely to produce the desired result; thus, functioning effectively within a changing environment requires that humans recognize these environmental changes and change with them. The trends exercises are designed to identify the changes and to enable participants to explore ways to change that continue to produce desirable results.

The trends phase begins by focusing on the global context and looking at the 'present and future' of this context (Emery and Weisbord, 1992). Baburoglu and Garr (1992) describe world trends as those that "originate somewhere else and continue onwards past the point where we encounter them." "The probable trends are those they [participants] consider likely to extend into the future whether they are desired or not" (Ibid.).

The second half of the trends exercise concentrates on the focal system surrounding the issue or problem at hand. "This phase is characterized by more detailed knowledge and would correspond to defining the operating environment of the

system" (Ibid.). This phase is likely to generate enormous amounts of data, initially without order, which creates great anxiety for participants (Wheatley, 1992a). According to Weisbord (1992e), this is where participants are deepest in confusion. Wheatley (1992a) contends that, perhaps unconsciously, the human mind can, and will under the right circumstances, use this anxiety as a motivational factor leading to organization, assimilation, and creativity. As the participants begin to wrestle with this confusion and begin to talk with each other about what they are doing and what they want to do, they begin to move out of confusion and into renewal (Weisbord, 1992e).

Phase Three: Predicting Probable Futures and Imagining Desirable Futures

During this phase participants must rely heavily on both logic and creativity, two sometimes incongruent skills. First, participants focus on the realistic judgments about where the identified trends are most likely to lead (Haugen, 1992), i.e., what will the future most likely be if we change nothing. The next step demands more creativity because it seeks to envision the *possible* futures of the system; "curative, unconventional and surprising conceptions of what the system ought to be" (Baburoglu and Garr, 1992). This sets "the tension between what we have and what we really want" (Emery and Weisbord, 1992). Thus, the power of juxtaposition is invoked to unlock creativity by comparing an *ideal* future with either the "current reality" or the "probable future" (Ibid.). Emery and Weisbord (1992) stress that the more thorough the descriptions of the two are developed in preceding exercises, "the greater the impetus for action," i.e., the greater the motivation to investigate creative ways to move toward the ideal. Thus derived, an

"umbrella" vision or mission statement, supported by the consensus of all participants, serves as the focus for the following phase (Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata, 1992).

Phase Four: Action Planning

Once the participants develop a clear image of their commonly desired future, the focus returns to more practical matters that require great creativity. Baburoglu and Garr (1992) and Schwass (1992) recommend that this phase's activities occur in mixed subgroups. Baburoglu and Garr (1992) suggest that each group have before them a copy of the idealized future before them to insure that all groups are pursuing the congruent aims. Richardson (1992) suggests letting small groups bounce ideas off each other and even set tasks for each other. The groups' first step is to identify the constraints and obstacles that must be overcome to reach the desired future (Schwass, 1992). However, do not list the constraints, but approach them one-by-one immediately linking each with several possible strategies for overcoming (M. Emery, 1992).

The next step is to develop action plans. M. Emery (1992) notes that facilitators play a key role here by framing the activity, noting that group work and individual voting systems produce different results. Emery (Ibid.) prefers to stress that participants make personal commitments to those action items to which they are prepared to invest their time and efforts but suggests that these be discussed with the group. Baburoglu and Garr (1992) also ask participants to design personal action plans but do so after the groups develop strategies as part of a larger action plan and discuss their feasibility. Richardson (1992), also a proponent of group planning, agrees that plans from subgroups should be reported and discussed with the whole conference. Haugen's (1992) searches generally

produce action plans that specify "*what* can be done after the conference by *whom*, *how*, and *when*. . . . [but] The conference does not make formal decisions." Rehm, Schweitz, and Granata (1992) and Richardson (1992) both recommend that participants set up one or more action teams or caretaker groups. Additional attention must be devoted to defining how these groups should carry the process forward. Smith (1992) recommends that time be dedicated at the end of a conference to reflect upon the activities, an opportunity to debrief, catch breath, and congratulate each other.

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Tennessee Forest Roundtable - November 11, 1995

At the conclusion of the Roundtable, participants were asked to complete an evaluation form which asked five questions. Twenty seven participants completed the form and their answers are recorded as follows:

QUESTION I: THE GROUP PROCESSES THAT WORKED WELL FOR ME TODAY ARE:

1. Emphasizing positive aspects.

2. Diverse group was certainly assembled.

3. Periodic willingness to share was expressed. Some listened, some would not.

4. Establishing visions, principles and steps with varied interests/interest groups.

5. The facilitator kept us moving - those in conflict handled it through teasing.

6. Free exchange of ideas - considerate participation

7. The visioning process and the principles.

8. Brainstorm; visioning; principle; voting; I.D.

9. Open candid comments.

10. Facilitator was very helpful in keeping discussions in tact; also, unbiased - All parties at our roundtable were cordial.

11. Small groups with diverse representation.
The atmosphere of cooperation - I discovered I had more in common with those with diverse views from mine. I was pleasantly surprised to discover the ideas presented that I concur and agree.

12. Discussion within the group focusing on the primary vision.

13. Bringing out good ideas.

14. The roundtable was very informative.

15. Interesting dialogue.

16. Listening to others express ideas - some very familiar - some different than expected. Rating those thoughts and consolidations.

17. The process was good.

18-21. All (same exact answer)

22. Open brainstorming session with explanation.

23. Sitting at the table with diverse group of interest.

24. Exchanging ideas with this diverse group.

25. The nominal group technique was good. Like the small group approach to the discussion.

26. Listening to others and being listened to.

27. Both roundtable and the participation in voting on other decisions at other tables. Excellent method to obtain consensus of opinion from all present.

QUESTION II. IDEAS I HAVE FOR IMPROVING THIS PROCESS FOR SIMILAR PROGRAMS IN THE FUTURE:

1. None - worked surprisingly well

2. Take proper amount of time to develop group before calling it a "team". Skilled facilitators necessary.

3. Encourage more legislators to participate.

4. Need time to really dig into the things that separate us. They don't disappear by focusing on what we agree on.

5. Put principles out as separates so that they can be reviewed by all.

6. Break up the process with whole group sessions - more of programs like the video would be good to keep us inspired and on track.

7. We had time left - would have liked to continue discussions, perhaps prioritize vision/principles/next step.

8. Move up-front preparation on selected issue.

9. Seem to take a little while to get into process. May need to extend the time allotted for a warm-up session.

10. I think this was a well planned meeting.

11. Do this on a systematic basis, format is good, workable.

12. More DOTS. Bit more explanation on defining visions and principles.

13. During the week.

14. Better trained facilitators.

15. Limit members of "green" dots to 3 or 5.

16. Strong, talented facilitators. More diverse participants, i.e. education profession Accts, Engs, medical field. Also, females and other ethnic backgrounds.

17. More time for and methods for constructive dialogue. Maybe a retreat and other opportunities for exchange.

18. Need more time.

19. Thought it was well organized and time was adequate.

20. None, Congratulations on a splendid, well run day!!!

QUESTION III. ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 10, THIS IS HOW I FELT ABOUT TODAY AND WHY:

Average number (23 who gave numbers): 8.3 Range 4-10

WHY?

1. Positive feeling - a job well done.

2. Frustrated with process and biased/overwhelmed facilitator. We went where she wanted. Some people's ideas got lost.

3. Despite varied interests/groups did not feel intimidated by environmental groups.

4. I learned a lot. Just needed more time to consider some points.

5. Good process and helpful. Would be good to carry it further.

6. Genuine exchange among all spectrums of opinion.

7. Very worthwhile but not enough up-front preparation - at least on my part.

8. More agreement than expected.

9. Feel that the local issue will over-shadow a national mission.

10. This type of meeting has been long needed.

11. Good ability to have input on a national level.

12. Some people in group has too off-wall ideas.

13. Doubtful much was accomplished, but I did enjoy the interaction.

14. OK mostly, but I'm confident that some concepts were lost by facilitator and/or recorder.

15. Good representation of constituent groups. Well facilitated. A good process. Very good, diverse group of participants.

16. Brought such diverse groups/ideas to the same table.

17. It's needed for all interested publics with concerns with N. R. Mgt. Particularly, I feel more of our legislators should participate or their employed representatives.

18. Facilitators did an excellent job in keeping our group focused - kept momentum going.

19. Very important dialogue that needs to happen.

20. A great start.

21. I felt this could accomplish a wonderful opportunity for input from all interests groups.

QUESTION IV. OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT THIS ROUNDTABLE ARE:

1. Well planned and executed.

2. I hope some benefit comes out of this when finally synthesized in D.C. Take pains to listen to the quiet people, not just the loud.

3. Good.

4. It was very beneficial to meet someone under this agenda. Thanks.

5. We need to keep on.

6. Very worthwhile. I hope something comes out of it.

7. Do it again.

8. I would attend again.

9. Facilitators were very good. Group interaction was good-new acquaintances made.

10. Who called/authorized an American Forest Congress? Who decided "it's time"?

11. Many participants didn't seem to focus on the specific level of scoping asked for, i.e., "visions and principles"

12. I look forward to the results from Tennessee and the Nation.

13. Suggestion: Have a roundtable discussion like this once a year with same groups. It creates good dialogue.

14. We need to keep the communication going.

15. Same group should meet again after DC Congress.

16. Good program.

17. Method could be used to solve many similar problems provided there is a diverse number of persons present with different approaches to the problems to be solved.

18. I am absolutely amazed at the high level of interest and participation. Thanks for a great workshop. Everything was just great!! Let's have a Tennessee Congress annually. Best thing I've seen since the First National Forestry Stewardship Conference at the Arbor Day Farm.

Appendix C

CONSENSUS VISION STATEMENTS

1. A storehouse of genetically diverse biological resources including all members of the forest community, managed for economic, recreational, spiritual, ecological benefit of society.
2. A healthy, productive, sustainable, forest providing multiple uses and values.
3. The health of the American forests will be characterized by productivity for all plant and animal species, biodiversity, timber & nontimber (traditional & nontraditional) values.
4. Our forests will be diverse and sustain human and nonhuman values.
5. Our forests will be managed for long-term sustainability of the forest intended to produce a variety of products for human use and at the same time maintain and protect environmental values (watersheds, soils, air quality, aesthetics wildlife, plants, etc).
6. Healthy sustainable forest lands which are managed in such a manner to provide for continued enjoyment and to insure continuance of the diverse habitat for the protection of native species.
7. A shift from urban tourism to urban education within the forest setting. The best education experiences demonstrate the conflicts and resolves of humanity in the forest to meet all needs in a sustainable way.
8. Healthy and productive forests which supply both tangible and intangible resources and values for the present and future users.
9. Maintain a healthy and diverse forest ecosystem.
10. A healthy forest provides multiple benefits for a diversity of interests including human and nonhuman species over long periods of time.

CONSENSUS PRINCIPLES

1. Tax incentives should be used to encourage sustainable forest management.
2. Forests should be managed in accordance with research based scientific understanding including study of Native American forest ecosystems.
3. Professional resource management training should be continually updated and reviewed toward accreditation.
4. The general public should be educated about what forest sustainability and multiple use involves.
5. Forest management practices on public and private land should promote biological diversity and multiple uses and values.
6. Sound mgt. requires thorough resource inventories.
7. All forest landowners should be educated in recommended forest mgt. practices, guidelines and ecology.
8. Forest management practices must protect streams from undue siltation and slopes from erosion.
9. Financial principles--private landowner incentive programs should continue to be funded at state and federal levels to provide healthy, diverse and sustained forests (tax and cost share incentives).
10. Education principles--To educate resource managers to approach the management of forests from a holistic standpoint. (Biodiversity, air & water quality, soil, plant & animal species, etc.)
11. Communication principle--Continue the dialogue among citizens, and public and private land managers & forest policy makers.
12. Research principle--Continue basic research on forests to provide information for management and education.
13. Develop education programs for forest product consumers, landowners, the general public, managers, and workers. Develop a K-12 curriculum and teach respect for diverse views. Communicate the Vision.
14. Provide landowner incentives for management through taxation, recognition, and landowner assistance.
15. Expand research, utilization, biodiversity.
16. Have a forest land base w/diverse interests, owners who are using the land w/sustainable management practices.
17. Protect soil and water so that viable forest management can occur.
18. Have management practices grounded in science rather than opinions/feelings in order to provide needs of people/plants/animals...etc.
19. Have respect for private property rights recognizing that private owners are also a part of the big picture, and can contribute to the vision of healthy/productive forests.
20. Develop management strategies to fulfill long term goals which extend beyond a normal human lifespan.

21. Have people work toward being respectful to each other, not base actions on selfish desires.
22. Educate society so that we all realize our decisions about the future of our forests impact not only our country but the world, we are all interconnected and must work together to fulfill our vision.
23. Continue our research to increase our knowledge and adapt our management as science progresses.
24. Create incentives (IE. property tax incentives) for landowners to protect and manage forest lands in a way that is consistent with our vision goals (Forests will survive if they are valuable to the owner).
25. **Stewardship**
    A. Activities within and with the forests, short and long-term, should include human and non-human interests and benefits in a responsible manner.
    B. Sustainability should be on a landscape/ ecosystem scale over long periods of time.
26. **Research and Science**
    Actions should be predicted on good science and peer review, and willingness to incorporate and respond to new information.
27. **Communication**
    A. Open and honest dialogue.
    B. Provide a means for interest groups to come together and discuss concerns.
    C. Willingness to listen.
    D. A means of disseminating and receiving information to the general public.
28. **Management**
    Develop goals and policies that would allow long-term predictability.
29. **Education, Incentives and Regulation**
    A. Establish avenues of educational opportunities for a better understanding of options to the landowner.
    B. To provide incentives and recognition for those individuals who are practicing responsible forest management.
30. Decisions should be made by a well informed and educated public.
31. Education, planning, and management should be based on science and on a real market assessment of full costs and benefits.
32. Federal and State govts. Should provide tech. assistance and financial partnerships which encourage a range of desired forest management practices.
33. Protection of air, water and soil.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES - VISIONS

1. Forests grown for multiple uses on sites unsuitable and unprofitable for other crops.
2. Increased acreage of large forested tracts not fragmented by development, connected by forested corridors extending along major water courses and ridge lines.
3. Preservation of regional representations of historical ecosystems.
4. The future forest should provide for a sustainable forest economy while maintaining age and native species diversity on all forest lands.
5. Maintain enough mature, native forests (by encouraging longer rotation cycles) so that biodiversity within ecosystems is maintained.
6. Improved community input in the management of forest land and its uses.
7. A healthy balance between the natural environment and the economy.
8. Rights of private property owner to responsibly manage forested land should be protected with incentives to be good stewards.
9. Enhance the credibility and rebuild the trust of those individuals and institutions which most directly influence our forests.
10. America's forests will be recognized as a valuable resource that is environmentally, economically, socially sustainable.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES - PRINCIPLES

1. Private forest owners should have the right to manage and harvest their timberland provided it does not degrade or harm the property of others.
2. Forest mgt. practices should encourage maintenance and enhancement of large forested tracts and their connection by forested corridors.
3. All forest mgt., whether public or private should adhere to state and federal conservation laws.
4. Forest mgt. practices should include protection and enhancement of existing representative examples of historical natural ecosystems and populations of native species in each physiographic province.
5. Federal environmental laws should be rewritten to avoid conflicts.
6. Local, state, and federal taxes and regulations should not be so oppressive as to prevent the landowner from enjoying their land.
7. All timber harvest plans that pose potential environmental risks to other properties should be subject to public review and appeal.
8. Forest management practices should NOT include application of persistent organic pollutants.
9. Management principle-- The needs of the forests should dictate the management tools, but greater emphasis must be placed of uneven-aged management techniques. Forest climate, soils, and moisture content must be protected and maintained.
10. Maintain a viable public forestry program at the federal and state levels. Develop forest policy by consensus.
11. Provide opportunities for access to public land, and encourage access to private lands where possible.
12. Practice ecosystem management on public lands.
13. Provide legislation that will protect soil and water resources.
14. Encourage secondary processing of forest products domestically and discourage export of raw materials.
15. Address world population growth problem in order to fulfill our needs and goals in the future.
16. Have government agencies responsible to the local communities they impact (not outside special interests).
17. Use full cost accounting methods and consider long term benefits in order to improve the decision making process, and have this process open and public.
18. Utilize the uniqueness of our nations heritage (IE. Constitutional rights, free enterprise system) in the decision making process.
19. IF educational and incentive programs do not produce sufficient inducement to faster responsible forest management, regulations should be used as a last resort.
20. Forest and planning should involve all affected parties, including: Property owners, corporate interests, and local communities.

21. Private property rights should be protected.
22. Land ownership involves rights and responsibilities to communities, human and nonhuman, through generations.

UNDELIBERATED NEXT STEPS - with no red dots

1. Monitor the status of soils under various applications.
2. Create tax incentives to promote best management practices.
3. Cost share thru the Natural Resource Conservation Service for reforestation.
4. Tax incentives to promote voluntary habitat conservation/ preservation.
5. Tax incentives that support growth of wood species/ qualities for value-added forest products (furniture, veneer, etc.).
6. Do more research on how exports affect the forest resource.
7. Increase forest research.
8. Improve forest research technology transfer and education.
9. Promote consumer awareness of impacts of their consumption.
10. Guidance from state level to promote more wood using industries.
11. Designate sales tax increment to fund TDF, TWRA, and Dept. of Conservation.
12. Identification, acquisition and protection of representative samples of natural forests.
13. Educate all forest--use extension service, direct mail of printed info, use Forestry Association.
14. Figure out how to motivate landowners to read/ attend educational stuff. Use incentives.
15. Set up demonstration areas to increase public awareness of forestry practices.
16. Educate landowners, educate public.
17. Pass laws that promote sustainable forestry.
18. Tax incentives for private landowner.
19. Educate the educators
    -Outreach education program through univ. extension services to citizens, landowners, public managers, everyone.
20. Develop value-added industries close to the source (e.g. furniture, palettes, kiln, etc.)
21. Monitor import and export of timber.
22. Educate public on forest products shipped out of the country and imported again at inflated prices.
23. Increase long and short range funding for stewardship incentive program, forestry incentive program, Farm Service Agency (FSA) funding for forestry.
24. Provide technical assistance for landowner.
25. Expand curriculum of master loggers program.
26. Encourage use of Best Management Practices.
27. BMP's should include more than just water quality protection.
28. Provide funding for forestry research.
29. Implement ecosystem management.
30. Provide protection for endangered species.
31. Manage for endangered species.

32. Assist urban and rural communities to maintain, restore and enhance the quality of ecosystems.
33. Establish an annual Tennessee Forest Congress.
34. Exchange forest practices that restore aesthetics, maintain surface and ground water, restore soil fertility, diversity of native species, protect archeological, cultural and historical sites.
35. Identify and preserve old growth ecosystems.
36. Increase public funding for education and tech. asst.
37. Examine resources in an area before industry is allowed to locate.
38. Educate the public that is trying to help the public land managers.
39. Promote research in all phases of forest management and development.
40. Encourage private landowners into stewardship demonstration programs.
41. Propose legislation to achieve increases in public funding for education.
42. Remove forestry from the Dept. Of Agriculture.
43. Encourage public landowners into stewardship demonstration programs.
44. Public and private funding for scientific environmental education.
45. Promote a county data base for co. executives. to use in the process of setting zoning criteria.
46. Continue and expand the Greenbelt program.
47. Promote/ encourage Master Logger programs.
48. Increase Fed. And State incentives for forestry improvements an private land.
49. Promote PLT and similar programs.
50. Strengthen the emphasis for state forestry and wildlife depts role in mgmt of natural resources.
51. Maintain protection of private property rights.
52. Encourage additional participation of private foresters in private forestry.
53. Strengthen and expand the good stewardship program.
54. Improve database by shortening the USFS inventory cycle to 5 years. (Papermill vote- Keep the public in the dark)
55. Estate tax reform/ inheritance tax for forest land owners.
56. USFS Public Education program --create
57. TDF Public Education program--create
58. Encourage membership in private forest landowner associations.
59. Hire trained foresters to be county agents.
60. Have foresters trained in alternatives to industrial forestry.
61. Increase GIS databases.
62. Document the impacts of past forest practices.
63. Promote Project Learning Tree (PLT) and Project Wild to grade schools.
64. Reform ESA-Endangered Species Act.
65. Market development for better utilization.
66. Develop secondary wood industry.
67. Reform public land policies.
68. Improve quality of eastern hardwood trees.

69. Put more emphasis on threats to forest health.
70. Address issue of controlled burning.
71. Develop forest needs assessment nationally.
72. Provide incentives for reforestation/ reestablishment of bottom land hardwoods.
73. Re-authorization of the water quality act emphasis on wetland protection.
74. Set up demonstration forests/forest cooperatives locally for exchange of management practices and ideas.
75. Encourage forest landowners to use long rotations to improve diversity.
76. Increase research in hardwood regeneration.
77. Create and maintain early successional habitat where it is limited.
78. Create stable policies that don't change with each administration.
79. Use less paper! Reduce paper consumption! Recycle!
80. Promote value-added industries within TN and the nation to affect changes we want to see.
81. Educate the public to the export of our natural resources which are sold back value-added.
82. National and State forests be used as demonstrations of wise forest management.
83. Constructively critique information put out by the forest product industry and the environmental community.
84. Put information on the table and determine what needs to be done in research.
85. Can't look at national, state, or private land individually, must be viewed in the same matrix.
86. Funding increased for forest related research.
87. More national forests managed for national interests beyond those extracting for resources.
88. Compensate private forest landowners when their properties are controlled by the federal government for the good of the public.
89. A better data base information of natural resources.
90. Larger areas available for recreational benefits.
91. Continue to fund and expand programs in place.
92. Focal point in communication--clearinghouse
93. Landowner education in forest practices.
94. Existing gov. Entities much more active in educating the public--regular basis through the media (newspaper, media, etc.) To the point of on the ground involvement.
95. Educate the stakeholders and each other on varying positions--facilitation of discussion between groups, on site visit of good and bad.
96. More funding for outdoor education for elementary through high school. Formal curriculum in ecological principle.
97. Communicate with legislators-state and federal.
98. Establishment of position ombudsman and/or ethics committee.
99. Incentives program funding or at least maintain its span.
100. Ongoing dialogue--2 of 3 times a year with this type of roundtable.

101. Educate forest landowners/ operators.
102. Educate forest community stakeholders.
103. Educate public officials.
104. Educate school teachers (curriculum)
105. Educate children... Scouts, 4-H camps, forestry camps
106. Educate consumers/ citizens
    -traveling exhibit/ program
    -community forums
    -develop partnership funding programs
107. Develop an interactive and comprehensive (computer) model to assist in Nat. Res. decision making.
108. Utilize existing interagency, interdisciplinary human resources.
109. Develop a database of case studies of forest mgmt. practices (positive and negative) to be evaluated in the context of environmental and economic sustainability.
110. Encourage public and private partnerships at the local level.
111. Establish a policy/ goal for forestry, and implement incentives to reach the policy/goals.
112. Protect and enhance competitiveness and efficiency of existing native forests.
113. Enforce mandatory BMP's.
114. Clarify wether or not silviculture is exempt from provisions of Clean Water Act.
115. I.D. and stimulate complimentary forest uses to enhance economic returns.
116. TORT reform, inheritance tax reform.
117. Encourage "Bark Belt" program.
118. More Roundtables
119. Equitable tax valuations

UNDELIBERATED NEXT STEPS - with one or more red dots

1. State sponsored review board for private forest mgmt. plans.
2. Universities and state forestry division develop press releases to educate people about forestry practices/ issues.
3. Leave us (industry, private landowners) alone.
4. Research into fiber alternatives to wood (kenaf) combat the gypsy moth.
5. Create a certified forester program w/ training component.
6. Conduct a comprehensive forest resources inventory in TN (for ALL lands).
7. Codify BMP
8. Provide incentives for endangered species management.
9. Encourage land use planning to protect forest land.
10. Expand greenbelt to manage for biodiversity.
11. Stop the export of raw materials.
12. Notification--for harvests over 5 acres-notify the state.
13. Educate teachers about forestry to reduce misinformation.
14. Federal forests--a movement away from burdening regulation to avoid stagnation.
15. Allow public input in decision making, but give resource specialists the final decision and responsibility for implementing the decision.
16. Continue Fed/ State re-forestation policies.
17. Stimulate increased value-added industries.

VITA

Hugh Andrew Bullock was born in New Orleans, Louisiana, in 1969, and was raised in Knoxville, Tennessee. He attended Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee, on an Academic Excellence scholarship from 1987 to 1991. While in school he served as Hall Council President, Theta Phi Beta Treasurer, and Student Government Association Senator. He was awarded membership in Phi Alpha Delta and Omicron Delta Kappa, honor societies for history and leadership respectively. In 1991 Hugh received his Bachelor of Arts degree in History from Memphis State University, graduating magna cum laude. He subsequently served the university as a counselor in the Office of Student Relations, working in both East and West Tennessee.

In the fall of 1993, Hugh return to East Tennessee and began preliminary course work toward a graduate degree at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. At UTK, his undergraduate work has included both the social and the natural sciences. Similarly, Hugh's graduate work included statistics, economics, sociology, and conflict management in addition to ecology, forestry, wildlife, and fisheries science.

Upon enrollment at UTK, Hugh worked in the University Center and was promoted to student manager. He has also worked as a research assistant in the Forestry, Wildlife, and Fisheries Department's Human Dimensions laboratory. Beginning in May of 1995, Hugh served as an intern with the Tennessee Valley Authority on the Shoreline Management Initiative.

In the Spring of 1996, Hugh was awarded the Chancellor's Citation for Extraordinary Professional Promise. And in December of 1996, he received his Master of Science degree in Forestry with a minor in Environmental Policy.

1903 8874 9
05/30/97 MAB