



Building Trust

Twenty Things You Can
Do To Help Environmental
Stakeholder Groups Talk
More Effectively About
Science, Culture,
Professional Knowledge,
and Community Wisdom

**When Knowledge From “Here”
Meets Knowledge From “Away”**

By:

Peter S. Adler, Ph.D.

The Keystone Center
padler@keystone.org

&

Juliana E. Birkhoff, Ph.D.

RESOLVE, Inc.
jbirkhoff@resolv.org

The National Policy Consensus Center

www.policyconsensus.org

Overview

How to use the booklet

Across the United States, hundreds of community leaders, business professionals, and government representatives are sitting around the table with each other to discuss potentially far reaching solutions to persistently stubborn natural resource, energy, and public health issues. Driven by the high costs of litigation and the need to find smarter, fairer, and more durable outcomes, consensus-seeking and collaborative problem solving are now accepted and complementary approaches to formal environmental decision-making. Unfortunately, many stakeholder processes now getting under way will fail for the wrong reasons.

This pamphlet is about the art and craft of consensus-building. Some people call it "dialogue by design." Others call it "constructive information exchange" or "mutual gains problem solving." No matter how it is framed, many stakeholder groups flounder and collapse because participants are not able to sustain a disciplined conversation that uses both heart and mind to work out differences of opinion. We hope this small publication helps change that.

Our focus is on building better bridges between scientists and native peoples, government officials and ranchers, and planners and community leaders. We believe that environmental stakeholder groups can have more meaningful, eloquent, and productive discussions. Even more pointedly, we assert that well organized discussions held between people of integrity and good will and inclusive of high quality technical and cultural information sets the stage for good solutions.

One specific use of the publication is as a design tool. We encourage agency heads, community leaders, advocates and other conveners and moderators to read this document and use it to help decide who should participate, the kind of information that needs to be brought to the table, and how to structure conversations productively.

A second use for this document is as a preparation tool. We hope organizers of collaborative groups will make the document available to all participants before meetings actually begin. It can help anticipate and avoid some of the traps that environmental problem solving groups typically fall into.

Finally, this publication can be useful after people have been brought together but at the first sign that participants may not be talking effectively across professional or cultural barriers. This document can be a course correcting device that allows conversations to get on track.



Snapshot from the States

Wyoming. Members of the Shoshone tribe are negotiating for stewardship rights in a national forest. Their starting point of reference is the historical obligation they feel to take care of the forest. Federal representatives explain their views in terms of "acres" and "management areas." The tribe does not want to talk about numbers. When pushed, they say they want hundreds of thousands of acres. The Feds offer 40. The talks break down.

Maine. State and federal agencies initiate a conservation measure to protect small vernal pools. Local environmental groups applaud the proposed measures and lobby for it. Local property owners oppose it and insist it will hurt their development rights and family businesses. Environmental scientists talk in terms of national ecological protection for wetlands. Property owners talk about their local communities.

Island of Hawaii. A consortium of science institutions led by an outstanding group of astronomers proposes to add several new telescopes to a complex of observatories on the summit of Mauna Kea. The summit is one of the best viewing spots in the world. Native Hawaiians oppose any more facilities. They argue that the mountain is sacred – the navel of the world – and the structures are offensive. A Japanese astronomer is unsympathetic until a Hawaiian asks him how he would feel if telescopes were placed on top of Mt. Fuji.

New Mexico. Under pressure from environmentalists, officials propose to withdraw long term grazing leases because of environmental damage from cattle ranching. The ranching community strenuously objects and, in a series of angry meetings with state officials and environmental organizations, argues that

their "way of life" is at stake. Over time, a series of well-designed public meetings and smaller working groups allow for a dialogue process which, for the first time, brings environmental advocates and ranchers into a productive discussion.

Washington State. Officials from the US Forest Service are worried about the forest practices of new immigrant groups from Southeast Asia. In particular, they are concerned about mushroom gathering practices at the foot of certain trees which may disrupt larger forest cycles. USFS's initial attempt to talk with Hmong, Vietnamese, and Cambodian mushroom gatherers does not go well because the Immigration and Naturalization Service is present. After a series of angry exchanges and miscommunications, the situation improves when the Southeast Asian communities are asked for their advice and native translators and cultural interpreters are brought in.

California. A large, long term State/Federal initiative aimed at protecting the remaining waterways of the San Francisco delta region begins. The effort requires the participation of environmental advocates, water districts, state, county and federal agency representatives, and various private water users. Similar attempts at comprehensive landscape-level planning discussions have not succeeded. In this new round, a Native American project director is hired to steer the collaborative project. Part of the outreach effort is aimed at creating new cross-cultural dialogues with communities, fishermen, farmers, and neighborhood representatives. As a result of hearing from these diverse groups, the focus shifts to achieving mutually advantageous outcomes that can be tracked through ongoing indicators.

The Problem

What's The Problem?

All of us are challenged to make meaning out of the vast amount of sensory data that we encounter each day. Growing up, we learn what to pay attention to, what to ignore, what to react to, and what to file away for future reference. We learn who is similar to us and who is different, who is threatening and who is friendly. We do this by developing frameworks, patterns of thinking, and distinct "ways of knowing."

Because they are intimately tied to culture, many aspects of how we "know" the truth of things are invisible to us. Metaphorically, they are the sea we swim in and the air we breathe. Behaviorally, they are the unwritten categories we use to sort data and construct coherent models of the world. Corporations, communities, and professions have these models, as do countries, tribes, and ethnic groups. We are accepted as full and functioning members of our group when we have learned them.

When people disagree over environmental issues, as they inevitably will, we forget this most fundamental principle: different people and different groups think in different ways. Some people value knowledge that is experientially or intuitively derived. Others treasure expert knowledge or knowledge revealed from spiritual sources. Some people prize stories and aphorisms passed down from grandma and grandpa. Others give priority to data and scientific principles.

How we think about things directly and powerfully affects what happens in consensus-building. Engineers, lawyers, economists, and politicians, for example, tend to formulate and solve problems from their own intellectual vantage points (Table 1).

While engineers, lawyers, economists and politicians (to name just a few) bring different perspectives to the mix, not every difference inherently leads to conflict. In many circumstances, divergent world views fit together comfortably and produce excellent results. In other circumstances, however, they don't. Sometimes people fail to create the good working relationships and thoughtful across-the-table interactions that lead to solid substantive conclusions.

Whether the different ways of knowing are disciplinary, professional, local or cultural, misunderstood and unintegrated differences can harm discussions. When discussions break down, good solutions are missed, conflict protracts, and unnecessary litigation may follow.



Acknowledgments

Many people contributed time and ideas to this document. Our thanks go to our sponsor, the Policy Consensus Center at Portland State University; our funders, The Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and the Ford Foundation; and our conveners, Concur, Inc., The California Center for Public Dispute Resolution, Environmental Mediation Services, Inc., and the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium. We are especially appreciative of the following people who contributed time, ideas, and expertise to this project:

David Aladjem
Downey Brands
Sacramento, CA

Geri Auerbach
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
Portland, OR

Robert C. Apgar
Attorney
Tallahassee, FL

Thomas Bachman
Oregon City, OR

Hal Beardall
Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium
Tallahassee, FL

Gary Bobker
Bay Institute
Novato, CA

Doug Buck
Florida Home Builders Association
Tallahassee, FL

Josh Bradt
Urban Creeks Council of California
Berkeley, CA

Paul Bratovich
Surface Water Resources, Inc.
Sacramento, CA

Leland Brown
California Center for Public Dispute Resolution
Sacramento, CA

Chris Carlson
Policy Consensus Initiative
Santa Fe, NM

Charlie Casey
Friends of the River
Sacramento, CA
(cont)

Table 1.

Indices	Engineers	Lawyers	Economists	Politicians
Cultural Values				
Believe in:	The laws of physics	Statutory laws	The laws of economics	The law of survival
Have respect for:	Technology, computations, materials, designs	Authority, precedent, the sanctity of contract; rules in general	Theories and statistical data	Patrons, parties, and partisan loyalty
Cultural Perspective				
See themselves as:	Builders and problem solvers	Defenders of justice, partisan advocates	Planners and policy advisers	Defenders of the public interest, mediators, ultimate decision-makers
Express themselves through:	Numbers and works	Technical words and documents	Money	Approvals and directives
Suspicious of:	Timely project simple-mentation and worker performance	Parties' good intentions and pledges	Socio-political variables	Rival bureaucrats and ambitious subordinates
Negotiating Style				
Team role(s):	Leader or technical specialist	Leaders, spokesperson, technical adviser, or excluded	Leader or financial adviser	Leader
Negotiating focus:	Technical specifications	Parties' rights and duties	Costs, prices, payments	Satisfying superiors, avoiding criticism
Future concern:	Project implementation	Conflict resolution	Cash-flow risks	Project completion
Communication style:	Precise and quantitative	Precise and logical, but perhaps argumentative	Technical and conservative	Cautious and self-protective

From Winifred Lang in "A Professional's View," Culture and Negotiations, Guy O. Faure and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, editors, Sage Publications, 1993.



The Process

How Does This Play out in Consensus Building?

Environmental problems inevitably precipitate difficult discussions about impacts, risks, and benefits to human health and the environment. Woven into and throughout are the sometimes profoundly different ways people think about the beauties and practicalities of landscapes. Power, justice, and the continuity of valued lifestyles may be issues. Present also are the histories of previous struggles and contrasting visions of the future, both of which have a way of popping up when the subject turns to land, water, health, and lifestyle.

In these kinds of crosscutting conversations, people with good intentions can easily talk past each other. Scientists, planners, and other technical experts usually try to bring forward their best knowledge consistent with their professional standards. Citizen groups and local people, on the other hand, bring their direct and immediate experience to the table. They invoke local insights, tribal wisdom, neighborhood intelligence, and the memories of previous generations. Sometimes the conversations work perfectly. Too often, they collide.

In the broadest sense, we think of these as confrontations of different knowledges some of which come from “away” and some of which come from “here.” The problem reveals itself in many forms (Table 2). The differences between “away” and “here” knowledge can be profound. When talk turns to forests, rivers, mountains, and coastlines, knowledge from “here” tends to be location specific. It is detailed, often cannot be generalized to other places, and much of it is nested in a web of implicit, unspoken relationships. Moreover, knowledge of this type is based on the observations and experiences of people over generations and, for some cultural groups, it is socially restricted. This makes it appear closed and mysterious because people will not readily share family, tribal, and community intimacies with strangers.¹

Professional understandings, on the other hand -- knowledge from “away” -- places value on information and insight that does not change depending on the context and that is transferable across time, space, and specific social settings. Information gathered in one place should be available for review and cross-examination and replicable elsewhere if the circumstances are the same. Knowledge of this type is based on explicit assumptions and evidence and on bodies of codified learnings built up using scientific logic.

When epistemological confrontations of these types occur, issues of aesthetics, risk, history, power, and moral behavior are also close to the surface. The challenge, then, is to anticipate these “teachable moments,” manage them so that good solutions are not defeated, and ultimately weave them together in the creation of the best environmental solutions available.

¹See Meninick, J. and Winthrop, R. (1995), “Talking With Anglos: Cultural Barriers to Communicating An Indian Perspective on Environmental Rights.” Draft chapter for Water, Culture, and Power edited by John M. Donahue and Barbara R. Johnson.

"Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted."

- Albert Einstein



Table 2.

KNOWLEDGE FROM "HERE"		KNOWLEDGE FROM "AWAY"
Slow Knowledge	↔	Fast Knowledge
Cultural Information	↔	Scientific Information
Lay People	↔	Experts
Observations of Particular Locales	↔	Broad Statistical Patterns
Holistic Thinking	↔	Disciplinary Thinking
Information That Starts With Certain Values In Mind	↔	Information That Seeks To Be Value Neutral
Oral Traditions	↔	Written Histories
Informal Insights	↔	Formal Studies
Single Situations	↔	Universal Patterns
Lore, Stories, Narratives, and Anecdotes	↔	Data, Figures, Measurements, and Statistics

Basic Principles for Managing Knowledge from "Here" and Knowledge from "Away"

- The best stakeholder processes do not privilege one way of knowing above others. They welcome all modes of inquiry and analysis to the table and integrate information that makes sense culturally, scientifically, economically, and politically.
- The best stakeholder processes ensure that both kinds of information -- technical and local, scientific and cultural, lay and expert -- are accessible to everyone involved.
- The best stakeholder processes are built on mutually framed questions by the stakeholders. The stakeholder groups, rather than scientists or "culture experts," drive the gathering of information, its analysis and meaning-making, and its application to decision-making.
- In the best stakeholder processes, all information (whether it is scientific, technical, traditional, cultural, local, or remembered) is subject to respectful questioning about validity, accuracy, authenticity, and reliability. Every type of knowledge has standards of quality that can be examined, debated or shaped.
- The best stakeholder processes improve the capacity of all participants to learn from different kinds of knowledge.

Acknowledgments (cont)

Jennifer Charles
Charles Consulting
Cambridge, MA

Douglass Dompier
Columbia River Inter-Tribal
Fish Commission
Portland, OR

Jill Drummond
North Adams, MA

Marci DuPraw
California Center for Public
Dispute Resolution
Sacramento, CA

Sallie Edmunds
Bureau of Planning
Portland, OR

Maria Fernandez-Gimenez
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

Stephanie Floyd-Johnson
CEDA, Neighborhood/
Commercial Revitalization
Oakland, CA

John Folk-Williams
San Antonio, TX

Zeke Grader
Pacific Coast Federation of
Fishermen's Association
Half Moon Bay, CA

Efren Gutierrez
Chicano Consortium
Sacramento, CA

Steven Haberfeld
Indian Dispute Resolution Services
Sacramento, CA

Elaine Hallmark
Hallmark Pacific Group, LLC
Portland, OR

Rebecca Haney
Massachusetts Coastal Zone
Management
Boston, MA

The Outcome

How Do Collaborative Processes Work?

Although all collaborative processes have beginnings, middles, and ends, no two are exactly the same. Some have short life-spans. A group meets a few times, conducts its business, comes to conclusions, and disbands. Others go on for years. Some are

high in complexity, conflict, and drama. Others are slow, easy going conversations.

Table 3.

START-UP	INFORMATION EXCHANGE	PROBLEM SOLVING AND CONSENSUS BUILDING
Appraising the situation for possibilities.	Organizing productive and respectful exchanges of different viewpoints.	Making informed choices.
Organizing leadership, sponsorship, and the capacity to convene.	Bringing the best technical, cultural, legal, and economic information to the table.	Working with parties not at the table to ensure acceptability of proposed projects or solutions.
Gaining the participation of all affected stakeholders.	Discerning the underlying interests of all stakeholders.	Ratifying, memorializing, and preparing for implementation.
Designing the forum, establishing protocols, and forging working agreement on the issues to be considered.	Discovering, clarifying, or creating the greatest joint gains possible.	Developing implementation plans and ways to insure compliance.

Some stakeholder groups are composed of parties who have established standing in a lawsuit or who are on a trajectory toward administrative rule-making, standard-setting proceedings, or contested administrative hearings. Others, like appointed or nominated advisory boards, are convened to exchange ideas or provide reactions to proposed policies, projects, or programs.

Some groups -- watershed councils, forest management groups, and re-vegetation committees for example -- work collabora-

tively over years to manage and improve a resource. Sometimes an independent facilitator or mediator is involved. More often than not, collaborative leadership must come from the group itself, often with government officials acting as conveners or moderators. Typical collaborative processes involve a variety of functions and activities organized into three broad phases (Table 3).

What Kinds of Outcomes are Produced?

Every stakeholder group aspires to what is popularly known as the "win-win" solution. This term is attractive but misleading. It suggests that collaborative processes can perfectly and comfortably integrate different ways of knowing and produce results which give everybody everything they want in terms of their values and interests. Unfortunately, it also implies that anything less than a full "win" is somehow a loss. We don't like this term very much and try not to use it because it obscures more than it reveals.

In reality, stakeholder groups come to different kinds of closure, many of which are not win-win but which are nonetheless acceptable, durable, effective, and well reasoned. They also produce powerful and graceful reconciliations and accommodations that honor different forms of knowing. Consider the following two cases, both involving Native Americans.

"Science is a way of not fooling yourself."

- Richard Feynman



In the first, the Rose Center for Earth and Sky in New York's American Museum of Natural History acquired a geologically unique 15.8-ton meteorite from the rain forests near Willamette, Oregon in 1906. In 1999, the new center was literally constructed around the meteor. Following the museum's opening, members of the Clackamas Tribe stepped forward and demanded that the meteor, called "Tomanoas" and revered by their tribe, be returned. After arduous negotiations, the tribe and the museum reached an agreement in which the meteor is retained by the museum, the scientific and cultural explanations of Tomanoas sit side-by-side, and the tribe's right to perform ceremonies in the museum is preserved in perpetuity.²

In the second case, a drumming ceremony conducted by the Spokane Tribe served as a solemn goodbye to a site where generations of the Spokane had fished. The ceremony, in honor of Coyote Rocks, was a stately close to a controversy that had arisen from a road-widening project. The Spokane had wanted the area left untouched. After negotiations, the county agreed to bypass certain boulders even though some sacred rocks had to be destroyed. "We didn't win, but we didn't lose," said Brian Flett, the tribe's cultural director. The final agreements included \$114,000 for archeological digs, monitoring by the tribe, and a closure honored by tribal protocol.³

While an infinite number of outcomes (including no outcomes) are possible, skillful and well-executed stakeholder processes can braid different ways of knowing together in unusual and creative ways (Table 4).

² "Between A Rock And A Hard Place," The Bulletin, March 28, 2000.

³ "Special Rocks Drummed Out," AP, Journal North, p. 4, December 14, 2001.

Table 4.

Types of Outcomes	Characteristic
Co-Existent Knowledges	Different strands of knowledge are acknowledged. Like the Rose Space Center, neither explanation of how the world works is privileged over the other.
Complimentary Knowledges	Different strands of knowledge stand on their own. For example, one group decides to work on developing economic options for local forest practitioners while another group forecasts lower timber yields for future forest management plans.
Integrated Knowledges	Different strands of knowledge fully complement each other. Tribal wisdom and scientific analysis come to the same conclusions.
Adaptive Knowledges	Different kinds of knowledge are treated as "tentative" and processes are set up to continually collect information that might in turn change the project itself.
Knowledge Compromises	Different kinds of knowledge are used in part. No one source of knowledge is predominant. Stakeholders agree to trade off or give up an issue, place or idea that is important to them in exchange for significant concessions, the larger good of the community or environment, or as a bargaining tactic to affect future interactions.

Acknowledgments (cont)

Elise Holland
Trust for Public Land
San Francisco, CA

Brian Holloway
Building Industry Association of
Superior California
Sacramento, CA

Charles Hudson
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish
Commission
Portland, OR

Judith Innes
Department of City and Regional
Planning
University of California
Berkeley CA

Robert Jones
Florida Conflict Resolution
Consortium
Tallahassee, FL

Herman Karl
U.S. Geological Survey
Menlo Park, CA

Mike Kashiwagi
City of Sacramento
Sacramento, CA

Kenneth Kirby
Saracino, Kirby, Snow
Sacramento, CA

Malka Kopell
San Francisco, CA

Peter Lavigne
Rivers Foundation of the Americas
Portland, OR

Kae Lewis
SCAN
Sacramento, CA

Kate Kopischke
Policy Consensus Initiative
Santa Fe, NM

Tools & Strategies

Twenty Tools, Tips and Trust Building Strategies

1 Begin With Co-Hosting. When two or more groups are potentially or actually at odds with each other over environmental matters, it is always better to co-convene, co-host, or co-manage a stakeholder process. A respected farmer working side-by-side with a respected environmentalist (or Native American, or government representative) sets a tone from the beginning that all points of view and all ways of knowing will be welcome.

2 Create a Game Plan and Group Covenants. Stakeholder processes usually have beginnings, middles, and ends but, at the start, not everyone knows the plan. Make game plans negotiable and transparent. Groups come with expectations that a collaboration will be made up of diverse interests. They also may have expectations about how long it will take to accomplish the work. Stakeholder groups require flexibility for work to go faster or slower but "time" is a key element of culture and handled differently by different people. Engage the group in some gentle discussions about how much time people can devote to meetings and how they will handle attendance, alternates, and "logistics."

3 Concentrate on Relationships First. People need to know each other as individuals, not just as scientists, community members, or representatives of organizations. Learn each other's histories. Share a meal together. If people do not know each other, they will not trust each other and will revert to fear-based interactions. As a collateral procedure, it is often useful to have stakeholders create interpersonal "contexts" by having each participant identify what the impacts of a decision or agreement might mean in their own lives versus for their community or group.

4 Be Transparent About Decision Making. Clarify the "rules of the road" before you start trying to build agreements -- who will make final decisions, how representation will be established, how the group will decide things. Craft opening moves that will help the parties manage complex technical discussions. Set the stage also for informal versus formal across-the-table discussions by asking stakeholders to identify when they are speaking officially or unofficially.

5 Pay Attention to Power. Community groups, scientists, indigenous people, government professionals and environmental advocates come to the table with different kinds of standing, control over resources, and access to decision-making. Although power relationships are rarely as fixed as people think, most groups have a "predominant" way of knowing things, a shared prism through which group members take in and give out information. This way of knowing may be institutionalized in laws, rules, and protocols or it may



"Culture is the way we do things...around here."

-Steve Haberfeld



simply be "the way we do things around here." Ask group members: "What is the dominant way of knowing in this group?" "Who has power to control what information gets considered and what information is not salient?" "How can we give opportunity, credence, and value to the ways of knowing that are not predominant?"

6 Create Rituals. Stakeholder groups often invent or discover small habits that give members a sense of identity, though as individuals they represent different organizations and interests. Small routines – starting with a traditional song or chant, bringing homemade food, celebrating birthdays, ending with a story, buying everyone a hat with the name of the group -- can become a small reference point that helps a group develop good working relationships.

7 Balance Linear Processes With Iterative Strategies. Overly structured processes and agendas with detailed times are off-putting to people who come from story telling traditions. Resist the temptation to bear down directly on "problems" and "solutions" and "getting right to work." Instead, make sure the process has enough forward momentum to satisfy some people and enough story telling and circling back to values and history to satisfy others.

8 Talk About "Values." Explicitly talk about the values participants bring to the table before you talk about problems, data, or potential solutions. As for the issues at hand, discuss what they cherish most, what "truths" they hold dearest, what they hope to leave behind as a legacy for their children, how the past informs the future, and what values they believe are "absolute and unconditional." Most people hold multiple values, few of which are actually unequivocal or categorical.

9 Acknowledge Different Kinds of Knowledge. From the beginning, explicitly legitimize that there are different ways of "knowing" and different modes of communicating important facts and ideas. No one -- scientists, Native Americans, planners, farmers, ranchers, people from the neighborhood -- wants to see their kind of knowledge trivialized and most people have specific "ways" they want to be engaged.

10 Generate Multiple Problem Definitions. Do not assume that problem solving proceeds from a single definition of the issues. No definition is wrong or "off the table." Scientists will see the problem one way. Community people will define it their way. Business professionals will bring yet another approach. All problem definitions are helpful starting points because they reveal issues and aspirations.

Acknowledgments (cont)

Peter LaBrie
Bay View Hunters Point
Community Advocates
San Francisco, CA

Michelle LeBaron
Institute for Conflict Analysis
and Resolution
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

James Lyle
Sierra Club
Tallahassee, FL

Scott McCreary
Concur, Inc.
Berkeley, CA

Carolyn McVicker
McVicker Associates
Portland, OR

Nelson Mathews
Trust for Public Land
San Francisco, CA

Carl Moore
The Community Store
Santa Fe, NM

Lucy Moore
Santa Fe, NM

Debra Nudelman
RESOLVE, Inc.
Portland, OR

William Otani
USDA Forest Service
Sandy, OR

Mark Patnode
North Adams, MA

Len Pennaud
Massachusetts Department of
Natural Resources
Boston, MA

Rachel Peterson
Urban Ecology
Oakland, CA

Tools & Strategies

11 Step Out of the Normal Conversation Mode. Do not rely solely on meetings, conversation, and negotiating sessions. Too much talk can weigh a group down and actually confuse discussions about values, identity, issues, and options. Invite hand drawn (rather than slick) diagrams, maps, and pictures. Try to create joint maps and pictures with everyone contributing to a common picture. Take field trips. Go look at the landscapes or sites under consideration and allow people to educate each other in ways other than words.

12 Create "Jointly Owned" Knowledge. If information really is power, then information that has been jointly brought to the table is especially powerful. To the greatest extent possible, create a "group inquiry" in which all stakeholders jointly frame the questions that need to be answered (who actually lived here before, what are the migratory paths of the elk, what is the interaction of ground and surface water, etc.) and actually bring it into the process. Stakeholder groups go through a "learning curve" which deepens over time and often matures into truly mutual understandings. Choreograph the learning curve so that scientific and technical information is not privileged over the information brought to the table by community groups, native peoples, and citizen advocates.

13 Explore Validity and Accuracy With Care. All information -- scientific, technical, traditional, cultural, local, or remembered -- is subject to questions about validity, accuracy, authenticity, and reliability. Create a climate in which, in the spirit of problem solving, it is acceptable to respectfully ask people to substantiate what they are saying. Every type of knowledge, cultural assertions no less than scientific models, can be reviewed. The issues of what is examined, how it is examined, who examines it, and when it is examined are all negotiable.

14 Talk Politics. . . But Do It Gracefully. The higher the level of interpersonal trust in a stakeholder group, the easier it is to speak candidly about internal and external political pressures. Environmental conflicts are inevitably embedded in political contexts where tough value choices are at play. While these value choices can be informed by cultural, professional, and scientific considerations, underlying values are the ultimate arbiters of political decision-making.

15 Be Patient Teachers to Others. When professionals present their knowledge from "away", it is important that they explicitly present and clarify the assumptions behind what they are saying. It is often useful that initial technical presentations not be done through power-point, overheads, or fancy models. Without dumbing things down, keep presentations as simple and clear as possible. Community groups, native peoples, and others also have a burden to present their knowledge from "here" in ways that make sense

to outsiders or people who do not share in local ways of doing things. Without violating matters that are sacred, and without talking down to outsiders, it is critical that context, history, and background are explained in ways that do not leave things inexplicably mysterious.

16 Organize "Sidebars". When matters of great technical or cultural complexity arise, establishing sidebar groups or working committees is usually useful. There are many different design strategies worth considering, among them a special committee of "cultural experts" or scientists. Sometimes, it is useful to create public sessions for the stakeholder group to meet other interested members of the public and to report progress, test out new ideas, or gather feedback. In all such meetings, balancing local knowledge with outside expert knowledge is important.

17 Create a "Public Learning" Culture. Build a group norm to support joint inquiry. This means that knowledge will be built slowly with contributions from each participant. It also means that ground rules and agendas should take account of constantly evolving information. Additionally, it implies that the stakeholder process should allow for small meetings and group breakouts for those who are shy or don't share the western norms of public meetings.

18 Engage in Storytelling. Stories are the single most accessible way for human beings to communicate in groups. Often local or cultural knowledge is located in stories. For scientists and technical experts, telling stories can provide important context and help people understand the assumptions and values that are embedded in models and findings.

19 Explicitly Articulate Outcomes. No matter how we try, not all collaborative processes end up with integrated solutions. If the outcome leads to ongoing relationships, try to create structures that reinforce continuing relationships and trust building. If the outcome means loss or change for some, acknowledge the transition and grief and create rituals that memorialize changes and losses.

20 Create Strong Endings. Stakeholder groups often run out of steam toward the end of the process. Resist the temptation to leave things unsaid or undocumented. Besides developing well-crafted written agreements, make sure everyone is acknowledged. With or without agreement, close the process with dignity by inviting different cultural and professional voices to help summarize what they have learned. Then, find ways to celebrate.



Acknowledgments (cont)

John Platt
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish
Commission
Portland, OR

William Potapchuk
Community Building Institute
Annandale, VA

Joseph Quetone
Governor's Council on Indian
Affairs
Tallahassee, FL

Dick Robbins
Portland Water Bureau
Portland, OR

Rosemary Romero
Western Network
Santa Fe, NM

Lynn Rosselli
Stewarts Point Rancheria
Santa Rosa, CA

James Ruff
NOAA/NMFS Northwest Region
Portland, OR

Steve Sanders
Office of the Attorney General
State of Oregon
Portland, OR

Jerry Schoen
Massachusetts Waterwatch
Partnership
Boston, MA

Steve Shaffer
Agriculture and
Environmental Policy
California Department of
Food and Agriculture
Sacramento, CA

Susan Sherry
California Center for Public
Dispute Resolution
Sacramento, CA

Talking With Native

These protocols were disseminated by the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission and were passed along to us by Joe Quetone, Executive Director of the Governor's Council on Indian Affairs, Inc.

Understand the unique relationship between American Indians and the United States government. It is a political relationship—not race based. The history of this unique relationship is relevant and important to working with a Tribe. There are more than 500 federally recognized Tribes—each with its own history, culture, and language. Being Indian and accessing services is complicated and complex.

Do not assume one Tribe or one leader speaks for all. Take the time to find the key players. Remember that American Indians may be suspicious of outsiders and outside ideas. American Indians object to being "consulted" or "studied" by people who have little intention of doing anything in response to their concerns. Be prepared to negotiate--to find ways to accommodate the Tribe's concerns. Be prepared to respond with reasons why the advice may or may not be followed.

Meetings with Tribal Council officials and Tribal program staff should, if possible, be conducted between the same levels of officials. There may be fewer or a greater number of people at a meeting than you expected. Take the initiative in introducing yourself, especially with older people. It is a sign of respect to take the initiative. You may not get what you consider an enthusiastic response but you will probably get a slight nod.

Do not speak loudly. It is not necessary and it can be offensive. Although you may expect others to look you in the eye when they speak to you, the American Indian culture does not hold this to be important. In fact, when you think about the meaning of an oral culture the American Indian person may simply be listening very carefully to what you say. Remember that the lack of eye contact is not a sign the person is not being honest or truthful.

Most Tribal governments are not wealthy and it may be difficult for Tribal officials to attend meetings or to exchange correspondence. Also, tribal governments in general do not have large support staff to assign to meetings, follow-up, etc. Formal notices or invitations should be addressed to the Tribal Chairperson and/or the appropriate Council Representative or Committee, with the respective Tribal program Director copied on the letter.

Do not rely solely on written communication. Follow-up written correspondence with tele-

e Americans



phone calls, faxes, or in-person contacts. Traditional authorities may prefer face-to-face consultation to written communication. Remember the American Indian tradition is primarily an oral tradition so the preference for face-to-face communication is deeply imbedded in history and culture.

Understand that there are different ways of communication. Seemingly extraneous data may be reviewed and re-reviewed. During negotiations, prepare to discuss all aspects of an issue at hand simultaneously rather than sequentially. Respect tribal Council representatives as elected officials of a government. Tribal Councils expect to be treated in the highest professional manner when conducting business.

Like all business relationships, honesty and integrity are highly valued. A sense of humor is appreciated but generally, serious, businesslike behavior is appropriate. Dress in a businesslike way for meetings. Always shake hands when introduced to someone or when departing. It is customary to shake hands with everyone in the room. Normally, light shaking of hands is the preferred way. Some American Indians may follow your custom and shake with a strong grip—they are accommodating your culture when they do this.

If possible, arrange meetings with refreshments and/or a meal. This is a cultural characteristic that is still strong. Those you consult with might not be able to answer questions immediately. They may need to think about it and consult with others.

Understand that 'Indian time' does not mean being late. It means that things get done when they are meant to get done, and those who should be there are present. Often, the person to whom you send written communication or of whom you have a question will want to consult with others and this takes time. Even more important, the American Indian concept of time is based in a fundamental world view that considers the "long term" instead of the short term.

Do not promise what you can't deliver. This is a key to building trust.

Acknowledgments (cont)

Craig Shinn
Mark O. Hatfield School of
Government
Portland State University
Portland, OR

Jennifer Shively
Policy Consensus Center
Portland, OR

Paul Siri
University of California
Bodega Marine Lab
Bodega Bay, CA

Greg Sobel
Environmental Mediation Services
Sudbury, MA

Rick Soehren
Department of Water Resources
Sacramento, CA

Michael Stanley-Jones
Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition
San Jose, CA

Tom Taylor
Florida Conflict Resolution
Consortium
Tallahassee, FL

Walter Tschinkel
Biological Sciences
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL

Susanna Trujillo
US EPA Region 9
San Francisco, CA

Sara Vickerman
Defenders of Wildlife
Lake Oswego, OR

Gregg Walker
Peace and Conflict Studies
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR

Stan Williams
Santa Clara Valley Water District
San Jose, CA

Produced by:

The National Policy Consensus Center
Urban & Public Affairs, Suite 728
506 SW Mill Street
Portland, Oregon 97207
tel: 503/725-9077
www.policyconsensus.org

With Support and Cooperation From:

The California Center for Public Dispute Resolution
Concur, Inc.
Environmental Mediation Services, Inc.
Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium
The Ford Foundation
The Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation



*Building
Trust*