
Planning and Conflict Management

*Aquifer Storage and Recovery and Artificial Recharge in Oregon:
Overcoming Technical, Regulatory and Social Challenges*
Oregon State University
February 28, 2008

Planning is about...

- Designing a set of actions to move from today to a preferred future, which is
- Inherently uncertain, and
- Requires actions of many interdependent individuals, organizations, institutions.

Planning is joint decision making and joint actions to move forward toward a preferred future in the face of uncertainty.

Conflict Management

- The second oldest profession
 - Bring resolution to differences among parties
 - Reap the benefits of conflict (crisis and opportunity)
-

Have you encountered much conflict around ASR? (rhetorical question)

- What are the sorts of issues get raised?
 - What sorts of demands are made?
-

ASR? Conflict arises from concerns about...

- Impact of water withdrawal
 - On wildlife
 - On natural surface water systems
 - On competing users
- Impact of water injection on water quality
- Investment of public funds
 - Economic
 - Symbolic
- The seduction of success

(THESE CONCERNS MAY NOT BE VALID, BUT FEARS NONETHELESS MOTIVATE ACTION.)

The theory behind conflict management:

Differences are expressed as *oppositional positions*, but the concerns and needs behind these positions in fact may not conflict.

The differences may be complementary.

Hence, an acceptable resolution need not be conceived as dividing a fixed pie, or “zero-sum,” or win-lose.

Moreover, communication and information are often used strategically to bolster preferred positions.

“Positional opposition”

- Water district **proposes** ASR facility to meet projected growth in water demand.
- Environmental group **opposes** because worried that investment of public funds in ASR may detract from efforts to encourage water conservation.

Example of complementary concerns:

Wanting to provide for future needs does not mean that the water provider is against water conservation, especially in a context of growing demand.



Agreement to commit to concurrent investments.

Aside: Meaning of no vocal opposition?

- Trust in water service providers and government
- Not aware of issues
- Impact on own welfare not recognized
- Lack capacity to voice concerns
 - Not organized
 - Lack technical and/or political knowledge

Today's reality is not necessarily tomorrow's reality.

History of Conflict Management

- In public policy – 1970s, Dispute over building a dam in the Snoqualmie River
- Conflict management theory builds on negotiations theory
- Variety of names: conflict management, dispute resolution, consensus building
- Variety of applications – regulatory negotiations, policy dialogues, collaborative planning

Anticipating the future together through consensus-based processes

Structure:

1. Public notification, open invitation subject to screening
2. Bring interested parties together around agreed upon agenda (e.g. water provision for specific purposes) – the more diverse the better
3. Regularly scheduled face-to-face meetings
4. Share information, identify additional information needs – the more diverse the better
5. Decisions made based on “consensus” rule
6. If necessary, hire mediator/facilitator to manage

Examples?

- Regulatory negotiations or negotiated rulemaking
- Policy dialogues
- Re-licensing applications of hydroelectric facilities
- Collaborative land use planning and resource management
- Interagency coordination for environmental reviews

CETAS



The Collaborative Environmental and Transportation Agreement for Streamlining (CETAS) was signed by Oregon's state and federal transportation and environmental agencies in 2001.

CETAS Participating Agencies

1. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA);
2. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS);
3. Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD);
4. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ);
5. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW);
6. Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL);
7. Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO);
8. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT);
9. US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE);
10. US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); and
11. US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/GEOENVIRONMENTAL/cetas.shtml

Structure of CETAS process

- Monthly meetings
- Discuss ongoing projects, projects in design phase (intellectual capital)
- Discuss expectations of various agencies (intellectual capital)
- Share information about specific projects, as well as general information specific to agencies
- Develop network and social relationships (social capital)

Pay-off from CETAS and other types of formal processes:

- Social networks and social capital enable better working relationships that last into the future
- Intellectual capital generates better proposals for discussion
- Benefits in working relationships and intellectual capital carry over into other activities (e.g. OTIA 3 biological assessment)

Right sizing' the process

- Not every situation will require a formal consensus building process
- But the principles of consensus building can be applied informally:
 - Open process
 - Share information: joint fact-finding and joint analysis
 - Listen: Seek to understand concerns of others
 - Seek to identify complementary concerns
 - Recognize interdependency: Seek to develop options that meet concerns of all
 - Be willing to change one's mind, decision and actions
 - Seek to develop and maintain good relationships

Thank you!

Connie P. Ozawa, Ph.D.
Nohad A. Toulan School of
Urban Studies and Planning
Portland State University