

MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

8/04 * ME

Identifying and Dealing with Conflict in the Transportation Arena
Dale Keyes, Susanna Liller, Ruth Rentch

Speaker: This panel's going to keep you awake for the afternoon. I promise. How's that? I'm going to introduce Don Cody, who is going to be moderating this session. He's from Federal Highway Resource Center. He's worked over 30 years in project design, project and program management and operations management, with three engineering and environmental consultant firms. He's managed NEPA documentation and compliance projects for several state transportation departments and numerous federal agencies. Mr. Cody has been with Federal Highway since 2003, as a technical service team leader [environment] in the Federal Highway Resource Center, San Francisco. Mr. Cody has a BS in civil engineering, and an MS in civil environmental engineering from Northeastern University. He's completed certification programs in strategic planning at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, and in project management at PSMJ Resources, Inc., and is a registered professional engineer in numerous states.

Please welcome Don, and he'll introduce the rest of the panel.

Moderator: Thank you, Judy. In addition, another piece of biographical information is if you have any question about the area, I'm a native. I'm not from away. I grew up here and worked here for many years, and only left in 1991.

Speakers: [inaudible / crossing]

Moderator: What've we got going here, now?

Speaker: Wait a minute; wait a minute.

Moderator: Already.

Speakers: [inaudible / crossing]

Ruth Rentch: What we wanted to show was that obviously there was a conflict going on between Susanna and Dale. I tried to step in with a solution that I thought was fair. However, Dale, are you happy with your hat?

Dale Keyes: I certainly am not.

Ruth Rentch: And Susanna?

Susanna Liller: I am not happy.

Ruth Rentch: So if you were involved in a conflict, even though I came and thought I did a very amicable solution, half-and-half, obviously we don't have happy parties. There's a main reason, because of it. The word is, "Why?" Why each of them wanted it. Dale? Why did you want the orange?

Dale Keyes: I clearly wanted it because I was making orange juice -- and I needed the whole orange, not half an orange.

Ruth Rentch: And Susanna, why did you want the orange.

Susanna Liller: I clearly wanted it because I'm going home to make a cake, and I needed the rind from the end of it to make the cake.

Ruth Rentch: So therefore, I thought we had a perfectly good solution, and everybody was happy. But in reality, my solution was bad for both of them, while there could have been a happy win-win solution for both of them if I had stepped back, not jumped in and tried to make a quick decision. If I'd stepped back and found out the underlying reason that each of them wanted it. Hopefully, through the end of your session here, you'll understand that this is a crux to collaborative problem-solving.

You may, in your job, or in your life... I'll admit I did this many times with my children, and it probably was not a good solution, because neither of them -- all three of us probably -- weren't happy. But you need to find out, to get a win-win situation, ask the real important questions "why." Hopefully, this helped a little bit.

Susanna Liller: No, I think Dale should just have the whole thing.

[laughter]

Speaker: Sorry, Don.

Moderator: I know. I've lost control, already.

Let me start by introducing our panel here, today. The person who made the bad decision with the knife is Ruth Rench, from the FHWA. She's an environmental protection specialist with FHWA's office of project development and environmental review in Washington. She is FHWA's headquarter's lead for the Alternative Dispute Resolution System, as mandated by the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century. She's worked for a number of years with the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution to develop Federal Highway's guidance on collaborative problem-solving.

Other job responsibilities that she has include collecting and disseminating transportation project time data and being the headquarters contact for states in the Southeast, and also for several priority projects as related to the Executive Order on Streamlining. Prior to her service with Federal Highways, she was employed by Maryland State Highway Administration in the Office of Real Estate. She has a Bachelor's degree in biology and education from the University of Delaware.

On her left is Susanna Liller, who is a partner at Barton and Gingold, a communications consulting firm based here in Portland. She is a facilitator and mediator, specializing in conflict-management and collaborative processes. She has served the Maine DOT for four years as a NEPA process facilitator, and coordinates public advisory committees, public scoping, informational meetings and public hearings. She's listed on the roster as a mediator for the postal service and for civil cases for the Maine Superior Court. She is president of the Maine Association of Dispute Resolution Professionals.

Finally, Dale Keyes, closest to me. Dale is a senior program manager at the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. His work focuses on multi-stakeholder collaborative problem-solving and dispute-resolution involving energy development, transportation planning and project development, and air and water quality.

His previous professional experience includes positions at the University of Wisconsin, Universities of Wisconsin at Battelle Columbus Laboratories, the Urban Institute and EPA. Dale has degrees in biochemistry, urban planning and geography.

So that's the panel. What we're going to be doing here this afternoon -- and this session is going to last the entire afternoon. We'll take a break as long as you promise to return after the break. The session is, "Identifying and Dealing with Conflict in the Transportation Arena."

The panel members have listed some desired outcomes. They include that the participants receive a basic primer on conflict management. That the participants share their main sources of conflict. That they brainstorm and discuss options for handling conflict. That the panel members share methods for dealing with conflict from their experience. And that they provide information on conflict management resources available from state and federal agencies. And that the participants -- you -- all feel engaged.

This is going to be an interactive session. What we need to do is form... We've got six flip charts, as you can see. I don't think we have enough people to form six groups. But if we could arrange ourselves so that it looks like maybe either three or four groups... if you could have...

Speakers: Four groups of five.

Moderator: Four groups of five. Okay. Can you do that without my actually orchestrating it?

Speaker: Yes. perhaps either the two -- Jimmy -- and if you could move up to this group, that would be four. I think we're pretty good. The people from the back could join the table right in front of them. I think we'd be all right, then.

Moderator: Okay.

Speaker: Does that look pretty even?

Dale Keyes: Just make sure you're compatible with the other table members.

Speaker: No knives!

Moderator: Okay. We're going to stay in these groups for this exercise. You each have an easel, a pad and markers. You need at each table to identify a timekeeper, a scribe, and somebody who will report out. We're going to be asking you to work on answering the question. Think about the challenges that you face at your job. What types of conflict arise? And where in the transportation development-and-review process? I think that can be summarized on each of the easels.

We'd like you to brainstorm the list. We're going to provide each person with three dots. Even though the notes say that there are red, blue and green dots, in fact, there are red, orange and green dots. And you will all vote on the list that you put together. A red dot will be worth three points, an orange dot two points, and a green dot one point. So you'll put those dots next to the challenges that you'll be putting up on the flipchart. As I said, a presenter will be prepared to report the top three of the list that you put together.

Dale and Susanna, do you want to add to that?

Susanna Liller: Is that clear? Anybody that doesn't really know? Should we summarize again?

Speaker: Yes.

Susanna Liller: What you're doing is brainstorming on the easel pages what you think from your own personal experience are your worst transportation challenges. And kind of where that is, in the process. Kind of go back over your experiences. What has been the hardest for you, conflict-wise, to deal with? You're just listing them.

So you need somebody who's willing to write on the easel, and the rest of you are brainstorming. You'll have a half hour for this whole exercise. Once you get your list, you'll have the dots at your table. And you individually put your dots next to your top three, "These are the worst for me."

Speaker: Red being the worst, orange the second-worst, and then the green. You can actually use other peoples'. They don't have to be your personal.

Speaker: Right. Out of the list that you brainstorm.

Speaker: Just which ones do you think are the top three, and then as a group, you'll select whichever ones get the most votes. The person who reports back to the group will say, "Okay. These are our top three." So take time to create enough of a list and talk about it. Then you can be clear with the other people. Obviously, you all have different job functions or something. Where do you get the areas of the most conflict?

Dale Keyes: The first thing to do is to pick a scribe. Somebody that's going to report for you. The second this is somebody to report out. As soon as you've done that...

Speaker: [inaudible]

Dale Keyes: Right. [inaudible] Ten start brainstorming -- answering these questions.

Speaker: We'll float around and help you with questions. Don, they have a half hour, so they need to be done by what time?

Dale Keyes: 2.30?

Speakers: 2.30.

Moderator: 2.30.

Dale Keyes: 2.30.

Speaker: So we'll give you like 5-minute warnings. So if you haven't started to vote yet, at least you'll have 5 minutes to vote. 5-10 minutes. Okay?

Dale Keyes: Orange is second and green is third.

Speaker: One more thing too, about the dots. This is really important that you get the dot thing right. You only have three dots. I know some of you are already trying to fudge the rules, but everybody gets three dots. One of each color. And you have to put them on three different things. You can't put them all on one. And no cheating.

Moderator: For the number of points, for each of the top three, based on three points for red, two for orange and one for green. I think we're just about ready to move forward. We're going to ask the presenter from each of the groups to list the top three, based on the voting. And to tell us the number of points that each one of them has. Just let me mention that the panel here really is going to do something this afternoon. When we get these, we're going to put you back into the groups to work on addressing these challenges, and that will be the time that Dale and Susanna and Ruth will be circulating among you, trying to provide some assistance in addressing those challenges. We will get some work out of them before the afternoon's over. It's not all your work.

Could we start with the table in the back on my left?

Speaker: You want the top three?

Moderator: Top three and number of points for each.

Speaker: Our number one was an overwhelming number one. It was a broad conflict or issue in disagreement on objectives or goals of a project. Overwhelmingly, that was our number one.

Dale Keyes: How many points?

Speaker: 14 points.

Dale Keyes: Number two? Second one?

Speaker: Number two as with 7 points -- conflict about the amount of information necessary to make a decision. Volumes and volumes versus a quick memo. What's the right amount?

Speaker: How many points?

Speaker: 7 points.

Moderator: 7 points for that one. And third?

Speaker: Third one is with 5 points. Conflict happening late in the process. And the huge problems that creates.

Speaker: That's 5 points?

Speaker: 5 points.

Moderator: Let's move counterclockwise to the next table. Number one, and how many points?

Speaker: Number one. The first one is poor communications. That's 8 points. Personal agendas is 4 points.

Dale Keyes: Poor communication is between people or which agency?

Speaker: Actually, everywhere.

[laughter]

Speaker: No, really, I mean that. We talked in terms of general communications not being appropriate. That causes a lot of conflict. So if you attack communications, you might resolve a lot of conflict.

Speaker: Did "personal agendas" get four points?

Speaker: Personal agendas was 4 points. Yes.

Dale Keyes: Most of the poor communications having how much?

Speaker: 8 points. And the third one was a tie. It had 5 number 3s. This is rather interesting. What it means to me is that we have a very diverse group here to start off with. Secondly, there's such a thing as a normal

distribution among these responses. That's where the meat probably is. So do you want to know what they were? The five of them?

Speakers: Yes.

Speaker: All right. One was fixation on solutions. People coming to the table knowing what to do about it without maybe even identifying what the problem was. People coming to the table with the solution. Another 3 was attitude toward state and federal regulations. Some of them think that they're something to put up with, and others understand that there's some reasoning behind them. The third one of the 3s is conflict with other agency and group missions. In other words, certain agencies are intent on dealing with this particular thing -- like environment. Another is interested in providing traffic service to the through-traffic. Others are interested in land-use development. Different missions that can be in basic conflict, as you come to the table.

Then the other two have 3 each. One was conflicting goals. Again, like individuals not wanting a project and other people wanting the project. The last one was this one, here. Means to achieve the goals.

Dale Keyes: Confusing the goals.

Speaker: Yes. Confusing the goals with the means to achieve the goals. In other words, they might agree with what the goal is, but we can't agree on methodology. Like the devils in the details. Questions?

Speaker: Thank you. Because we already have one that was disagreement on goals, we just added your three points to this. So if you already have one that's already up here, just let us know.

Speakers: [inaudible / crossing]

Speaker: Our first one is competing interests. That's everything from agencies to just the communities versus maybe the county versus individuals versus whoever is out there. Just competing interests. That was 10. Our second one is political influence. Not always knowing what the political influence is. It may have started at the MPO stage, and that influenced how they started things. Then it kind of follows it. Then the political influence may change a little, where all of a sudden, "You will do this." It bypasses the planning process altogether, and you "will" provide. The political influence in it. That was 6. Then we had a tie for third. The first one being not managing public expectations and changing decisions. Bait-and-switch. The example given was in Texas. The highways' already under construction. The public thinks or was told it was being funded with federal money, and now they're changing it to a toll highway -- during construction. So when it opens, they've basically baited-and-switched.

Speaker: [inaudible] handle the EJ issues.

Speaker: We're still working on that. I'm open to suggestions.

[laughter]

Speaker: That's 5. Then our other 5 is alternatives, development and [NIMBY]s. Basically, during that process, it's fine until you put a line on the paper. Then every [NIMBY] out there was okay 'til they saw their house was within 500 yards. Then they decided it's not okay, any more. That was 5.

Speaker: Thank you.

Moderator: Fourth group?

Speaker: Our number 1 was willingness to try things -- they seem to be stuck in a rut. Whether it's out of fear, or whether it's out of uncertainty or whatever -- or somebody came up with the idea. That was our number 1, with 10. Our number 2 was recognition of roles and responsibilities. The inherent conflict of, "I thought I was doing that, and my responsibilities were overlapping into your area, and yours into mine." It received 8. Number 3 was the lack of flexibility. I think that kind of goes along with the willingness to try new things -- to tell you the truth. It got 5. Top 3? That's it.

Moderator: Thanks. Do you want to try to get some sorting out of this, Dale and Susanna?

Susanna Liller: So if we went with the top -- you've probably guessed by now that what we're going to do is get four of these, and we're going to actually let you self-select which group or which challenge is the one you really want to work on. Then you come up with possible solutions for that challenge. The question is how to get those four challenges. We could choose the top four vote-getters. If we did that, then the biggy was disagreement on objectives and goals. That was really 17 points. Then the next-highest vote-getter was 10, competing interests and willingness to try new things. Competing interests. The next-highest vote-getter was poor communications among all participants, and recognition of roles and responsibilities.

Dale Keyes: Right.

Susanna Liller: So we really have 5 top vote-getters.

Speaker: [inaudible] competing interests [inaudible]

Ruth Rentch: So he can combine.

Susanna Liller: Willingness to try new things certainly is similar to flexibility.

Speaker: No. I have a disagreement on objectives and goals, and recognition of goals. Is that sort of the same? Is your role the same? Or is your role and somebody else's... Is that what you're thinking?

Susanna Liller: Roles is one thing. Goals is another thing.

Speaker: We're looking at conflict with other agencies and group missions, as well as competing interests. They're similarly related to disagreements on objectives and goals.

Susanna Liller: So let's see if we've got something, here. I need a new thing to write on, though.

Dale Keyes: [inaudible] that we combine this agreement on objectives and goals with competing interests?

Speaker: No. I object.

Speaker: Competing interests.

Susanna Liller: I'm hearing that one thing is goals and disagreement on goals, and one thing is disagreement on mission or interests. That's another one, wouldn't you say? That's with everybody? Then what? Poor communication in general? Could that be?

Speaker: I have willingness to try new things here, too.

Dale Keyes: Right.

Susanna Liller: Flexibility. Willingness to try new things?

Dale Keyes: Right.

Susanna Liller: I'll call that flexibility.

Speaker: Flexibility and inflexibility.

Susanna Liller: Then the last one being communications? Would that work for folks?

Speaker: So we have four?

Susanna Liller: Is there anything that's not up there that you're really wanting some answers to and you wish it were up here, and you want to advocate for your topic?

Speaker: No.

Susanna Liller: No; okay.

Dale Keyes: So we've captured roles and responsibilities and the mission and interests.

Speaker: [inaudible]

Dale Keyes: But is that proper or not? Or really should we split out interests?

Susanna Liller: We could have five groups.

Speaker: I think "mission" is more of an agency issue than interests.

Dale Keyes: Right.

Susanna Liller: It think "competing interests" could be "goals" and "competing interests" could be "mission." Right?

Dale Keyes: Yes.

Speaker: Yes.

Susanna Liller: So you could talk about interests here, too.

Speakers: [inaudible / crossing]

Susanna Liller: What isn't up there? Cathy asks is there anything that you run into on a regular basis that didn't make any of this, but you want to... Cathy has something. Yes.

Speaker: I think even before you get to goals or you understand that you're dealing with mission and so on, we were talking about what drives a goal and what drives people to want to achieve a certain thing. Really, their values. That's -- if we don't understand what the values are that are driving certain decisions or certain needs, then we could be going down to...

Susanna Liller: With that, maybe here you could say, "values and interests." Because values are kind of locked up with the interest? I'm putting "values" here and "values" here.

Dale Keyes: Yes.

Speaker: [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: That's a good question. I would say goals are things we've decided to do. We're going to build the highway or build the bypass or whatever, and "mission" is more my purpose. It's to protect the environment. My reason for being is the environment doesn't get hurt. But I know your goal is to build the highway.

Speaker: Only to protect the environment?

Speaker: Right. Yes.

Speaker: Or that's different?

Susanna Liller: Go ahead, Judy.

Speaker: My definition of a goal is when you go to the public and you ask them. If you do this before, all you've got to do is study everything. Then you'll have an understanding of some of the problems. One of the goals could be to reduce [crashes] [inaudible] or to -- it's part [what a person needs] and what you use to measure your [purpose]

Susanna Liller: Whereas mission is more reason for being, and why you exist as an agency?

Speaker: It's more of an agency [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: I'm thinking we may be getting into a smaller group discussion -- and this is good -- but of course, we have to get you into your smaller groups, so you can start brainstorming possible ways to deal with this. So maybe we could just make sure. If you were in the "goal" group, you would be talking about solutions to possible competing goals and values and interests behind those goals?

Speaker: The only suggestion I have is because the more I think about it, [inaudible] goals, missions and interests are three separate things. Could be. I think that's what we need you all to decide. Whether peoples' values and interests might be completely different than a subject on missions and responsibilities. I think what our next step is might be a mute point -- or it might not be a mute put -- depending. We're going to let you sort of break into those four groups, again.

Break into four groups, of which one of these you would like to work on, in terms of [inaudible]. The next step is...

Speakers: [counting]

Ruth Rentch: Actually, we have five. Let's just do hands, so we can have an idea. How many would like to work on goals?

Susanna Liller: Competing goals. How that's a problem. Possible solutions.

Dale Keyes: Maybe we have four, now!

Susanna Liller: We have two people. Okay?

Ruth Rentch: How many working on missions and mandates?

Dale Keyes: More of an agency focus, here. Competing missions and mandates amongst different agencies.

Speakers: Wow. Nobody.

Ruth Rentch: How about flexibility / inflexibility.

Dale Keyes: Three.

Ruth Rentch: Communication problems?

Susanna Liller: Six.

Ruth Rentch: Values and interests.

Dale Keyes: The rest of you want to leave?

Speaker: [inaudible] a group and deciding which one?

Susanna Liller: No. What you're voting on is, "What group do I want to go work with?"

Dale Keyes: Yes. We're going to split up again. Oh. You're in the same group.

Susanna Liller: You want to stay in the same group. Is that okay?

Ruth Rentch: It might be easier.

Susanna Liller: Then let's do this. Table 1 -- what do you want to work with?

Speaker: [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: So we'll assign it. Okay. Communications for you guys. Do you have a preference, or should I assign?

Speaker: Flexibility.

Susanna Liller: Flexibility. 2. That leaves you. What do you guys want to do?

Speaker: [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: We have values and interests. And I'll give you guys goals. Is everybody clear on the topic? Okay. Your conflict. Now what we want you to do is, in a group, brainstorm for ways to solve or manage your conflicts. We'll come around and sort of help you if you need it.

Moderator: We're going to do that for about 25 minutes. We're going to end that at 3.15.

Ruth Rentch: What are they going to need to do, to report on?

Moderator: Then we're going to take a break. After the break, we'll ask the presenter from each group to report out on the ideas that you've developed to help manage this conflict. We're going to be asking people -- each presenter -- to report out in about two minutes. Two minutes, each. In the reporting. You now have 25 minutes to get to that point, with a presenter from each group to talk about the options that you develop to manage the challenges that were presented to you, or that you selected.

I'd like to keep the report to three or four minutes, each. Then we're going to wrap up that session, and the three panelists are going to present some additional material. So let's start again. We have a spokesperson or presenter for -- do you want to start here, this time? Here we go.

Speaker: [inaudible]

Moderator: Oh, yes. I forgot to mention that. All the material on the flipcharts is going to be documented, and you'll be receiving a copy of that. So you don't need to copy each others' information. You should be receiving it sometime after the conference ends.

Okay. When? Christmastime. Okay.

Speaker: We had the subject of goals. We figured early on that we needed to define what "goals" meant. We had to be broad. We took a broad definition of "goals." Essentially, it said "Individual expectations on the part of individuals or groups." In other words, they wanted certain outcomes in reviewing a project. It was important to identify what they were, early on. So we suggested that that be done. Then we needed to communicate these goals to the various stakeholders, so each was aware of what the goals actually were.

Then we would try to identify common ground among the goals -- to the extent there was. Then, challenge the stakeholders to come up with proposals that would be within reasonable parameters of the goals their agency or they as individuals had prescribed.

Then we recognized the need for a technical professional, unbiased evaluation of the various alternatives. This is something that would be done by professionals and reported back to each of the stakeholders. For instance, there might be differences in air quality, for the various proposals. Then it would be a matter of trying to choose the appropriate alternative of communicating the results of the analyses. Then, try to fine-tune, if necessary, the alternatives -- to try to come up with an acceptable alternative.

In that last stage, there could be tweaking. There could be adjustments. We would move to the point where people could essentially voice the philosophy of, "Well, I can buy into that." We were not looking for total consensus or absolute concurrence. The model basically is, "I get enough of what I was looking for," and that would be acceptable. "I recognize it's the best alternative for us." If, of course, you can't get to that stage, then you need to work more at it -- or you need to develop more alternatives, or you need to abandon the project. That's the implication, here.

Did I do it reasonably well? Does anyone want to add anything? No?

Moderator: Thank you.

Speaker: Next? Who's next?

Speaker: I guess I was elected, here. We took a look at communications problems and we decided we wanted to break that down. Conflicts in communication. Whether that was 1 -- conflicts with communication to the

public, or 2 -- conflicts in communication with agencies being interagency communication problems, as well as 3 -- being intraagency communication problems that lead to conflict.

First, we took a look at public issues. We actually kind of coded our issues. Communication problems with the public -- a couple of solutions we looked at are obviously something that we've probably heard a lot about early. Coordination with the public. Getting the word out early on the project. Having a public involvement plan in place, so that you have ideas for the types of communications, and how you're going to communicate with the public when you start the project.

Maintaining visibility. It seemed like that was a way to try to head off communication problems. How would you do that? How would you keep that visibility of a project? That could be via newsletters that could continue, websites, getting it out to the media -- whether it's newspaper -- I think we had written down "newspaper," but it could be other forms of media. Yearly updates. Whether you're reporting back to an MPO or a certain legislative body. To get the word out about the project. Keep them informed. Keep people in the loop. Yearly updates with local officials and MPOs.

Then we also looked at communication problems leading to conflict with interagencies -- with other agencies. How could you solve some of those problems? Having formal agreements, or agreements on methodologies with those other agencies. Have those formal agreements in place on communication. How you're going to communicate with those other agencies ahead of time would be helpful. Timeframes. Having specified timeframes for agency interaction and commitments would be helpful.

We also looked at -- if there were some conflicts, looking at alternative dispute methods. Having facilitated workshops, maybe having some mediation if you need to -- if there are communication problems with those agencies.

Then lastly, we looked at some intraagency. If there were some communication issues leading to conflict within your agencies. Taking a look at and making sure that you clearly articulate priorities and are articulating the process that needs to go through for communication. It could be training. I don't know if it's training, or just making sure that people are aware of the policies, and how they're supposed to be communicating.

Part of it was seen as maybe a leadership philosophy -- or organizational. Often if you're in a DOT, there may be some communications gaps perhaps from a central office to a regional, district office. Or it could be within different organizations. It could be communication problems from planning to project-development to construction. Again, it probably needs to be an agency change or mandate, how you're going to communicate within the agencies.

Those were the three areas that we looked at for communications.

[tape turn]

Speaker: The first thing we did when we talked about flexibility challenges was ask the "why" question. Why? We looked at changing the decision-making process, new public involvement techniques and design standards. Timing and schedule. These things all appear to be very rigid to us. We looked one step deeper. We were drilling here, folks. We looked at what the "why" was. Why is changing the decision-making process so difficult? Why don't people want to do it?

Regulatory requirements, safeness, control... And in each case, as we asked those questions, we came up with, "risk." Whether that was a regulatory risk or whether it was that you had no support from folks up on top to take a risk. Therefore you surely didn't want to stick your neck out. Or whether it was a documentation, in

order really just to document the risk that you were taking, and the assumptions that you were making. Or the need for training and education.

It was a combination of, "If we could reduce risk in each instance, we thought we would have more flexibility." That's the bottom line it came down to.

Dale Keyes: Thank you.

Moderator: [More groups]?

Speaker: Without a doubt, we had the hardest topic to discuss. In fact, we had both Ruth and Susanna here trying to help us. Our mission was to figure out ways or talk about ways to manage conflicts in values. We can get pretty deep in "values." We tried to identify some values, and some of these may be "goals," as well. One of them that didn't get on there was the "growth versus no-growth" value, and how that inherent conflict causes all kinds of troubles.

We sort of walked through a little bit of a process. We didn't get into a lot of the specific techniques. I think underlying this is a commitment for communication on the part of DOT and Federal Highway. And of course, with the objective of building trust and confidence in the process. Especially when you're talking about values that are very dear to peoples' hearts.

But we did walk through several of the steps of the process, so as to identify the values of the stakeholders. There are many techniques for doing that, through outreach. Identifying conflicting as well as common values. We first took the easy route and said, "Let's just build upon the common values." But we recognized that wouldn't be enough. So we then talked a little bit about addressing and understanding the conflicting values. That's about as far as we got, recognizing that many of the outreach techniques everyone here has used are applicable -- to get to the point of building trust and confidence in the process, with that commitment of communication.

Moderator: Thank you. Good work! Good work!

Audience: [applause]

Moderator: Ruth, Susanna, Dale -- do you have anything that you want to comment on or add to before you go into your individual presentations?

Dale Keyes: Just an observation. I thought the discussions that I had the opportunity to listen in on were fantastic. They were rich, they were informative, and we really still want to work through some issues. It was informative for me, but hopefully it was valuable for you, too, to be able to share and struggle with these things as you folks do on a daily basis.

Moderator: Thank you. Now Ruth is going to give us some introductory comments regarding the regional workshops, and we'll show a video. Are you going to do them in that order?

Ruth Rentch: Sure. I just want to say a few words about where Federal Highway is, in terms of collaborative problem-solving and/or conflict resolution. Not that any of this in terms of having any kind of conflict resolution, dispute resolution, elevation, collaborative problem-solving -- none of this is new. This has been around forever. It's just that obviously we haven't been embracing it well enough. Or obviously things haven't been working well enough, because we're now getting heavy direction from Congress that we need to go down this road. While it's now six years ago, the passage of T21 where they actually had Section 1309, which was the first time we titled something called "Environmental Streamlining." There was a section in that section that

had to do with dispute resolution. It directed us as DOT to do several things. From that, just to quick-synopsis of where we are now, we put together what we call a dispute-resolution system. Most of this was partnering with the Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. I should know that by heart. Dale represents it, out of Tucson.

Basically, our system involves a guidance document which we wrote, which is on our website. It's very basic, but it's more key to how to do collaborative problem-solving in a transportation environmental review situation.

Another part of it was, out of a direction directly from T21, DOT needed to establish its own elevation procedure. We have done that and of course it only took us 5 years, but we did get it done. It came out as a DOT order. It is essentially an internal elevation procedure that can be used by other agencies. But it basically keyed on not meeting timeframes, as this is a big thing from Congress.

It's sort of very similar... We are aware that there are other existing elevation procedures that other agencies have. The Corps has one. The Advisory Council has one. We now have one. So that was another part of our dispute-resolution system.

A third part was, we worked with the Institute... They had a roster of qualified neutrals. We worked with them in creating a sub-roster of transportation-neutrals. These are qualified mediators and facilitators who have experience in the transportation arena. These people are available for any work on any projects that you may have, in any aspect. You need to contact either a federal highway person or the Institute to get keyed into them. The cost of these people is a project-eligible cost. Just things to keep in mind.

The fourth one was we created regional workshops on collaborative problem-solving. There are 10 standard federal regions. Federal Highway doesn't use regions any more, but we went to the 10 existing ones. In fact, the Southeast had so many states that we actually held two. We did 11 of these regional workshops, and we feel very good about them. There are several people here who attended them. Obviously, it was the very tip of the iceberg, considering these were regional, and involved anywhere from 5, 6, 7 or 8 states. We tried to really key on having equal representation. These were mostly based on the federal agencies.

We had all the major federal agencies. We had tribe representatives. There was "a" representative, at minimum, from the DOTs in each of those states in the region, and it was a completely collaborative and interactive type of workshop. For three days, we did activities similar to the type of thing we did with you, today. Any presentations were very short and very beneficial, and we worked interactively.

We created a video out of the 11. We actually taped and filmed from two of them. This is what I'm going to show you. Hopefully it will give you an idea of what these were like. We're now kicking the next from the regional. Hopefully, states are interested in holding a type of collaborative problem-solving workshop within your state. That can be on any multitude of topics. We have actually held one and have several in the planning, but some can be just exactly another collaborative type of problem-solving, where you can involve more of your state partners -- state resource agencies -- to learn a lot of the collaborative problem-solving techniques. Communication techniques, if you feel that's needed. If there's a special project of something that you feel is in an area that needs to be discussed in a collaborative problem-solving way, we can come in and do that.

There is a real push. We try to call it collaborative problem-solving -- not dispute resolution -- because we're trying to be proactive. We get up front and we don't want 'til the problems present themselves. We present these things upfront, how to get everybody together at the table. It's really the way to do business if you read stuff. In the private sector, collaborative methods are discussed all the time.

I want to show you this video. You guys have been great all afternoon, so we don't want to bore you to death. But I think you'll find the video interesting. It's only about 8 minutes long. Do you want to start if for me, please?

Dale Keyes: What Ruth did say was that the regional boards are all supported by FHWA -- including all of the travel costs and accommodations for all the agencies. There's a cost-sharing format at the state-level workshops, where the states provide some or offset the total costs. FHWA pays for the rest.

Speaker: Could you tell me [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: Elevation means when there is a conflict that can't be resolved at whatever level it is. There is a procedure that would go to a higher level to either hear about it and make suggestions on how to resolve it, or to actually [inaudible].

[music begins on video presentation]

Voice: In 1998, as the Congress was deliberating what to do about surface transportation reauthorization, they heard from folks around the country that a number of projects were being held up in the environmental review process, and couldn't get to a decision point. They responded by enacting a provision that was called "Environmental Streamlining." [That directed the] secretary of transportation to get the agencies and government to work together, to get the projects through the process more quickly.

Voice: This task force is to actually look at different aspects of the environmental review process.

Voice: We don't want to see archaeological sites disturbed.

Voice: Deterioration of the resources.

Voice: The workshops came about as part of a program we were developing to implement the congressional direction. To streamline the environmental review process.

Voice: We tried to have equal representation from the transportation agencies and the resource and permitting agencies.

Voice: As long as we can get agency involvement early -- that means before we discuss purpose and need or anything...

Voice: We wanted the people who were the ones who actually review the documents -- who are actually sitting at the tables for the scoping meetings, who go to the public hearings...

Voice: We really needed to have someone who could bring all of the other agencies together and review, as a neutral, by all of them. In establishing the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, the Congress really had that in mind.

Voice: For us, it was a marriage made in heaven.

Voice: The US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution was created by Congress back in 1998. Our mission is to help parties engaged in disputes involving natural resources and the environment and public lands, in which there's a federal interest or a federal agency involved. To resolve those disputes by alternative means. That means other than litigation.

Voice: The main thing that we wanted was to have a workshop that was a discussion workshop -- not a class. We didn't want it to be a course. It was to be a discussion. We wanted to have it relevant to topics of concern for each of the regions that we held at the workshop.

Voice: There's not a lot to understanding what the underlying need is that drives that position. What's a position that you've heard, recently?

Voice: ...but I mean the underlying concerns, hopes, fears, which they call interests.

Voice: The workshops take principals of interest-based negotiations. Collaborative problem-solving and alternative dispute-resolution. They allow the workshop participants to have some practice in using them.

Voice: Hey, listen. We need to develop this mitigation plan with you, because we have X-number of dollars. In salt marsh mitigation. It may take more than \$80,000 per acre.

Voice: I'm learning a language. [New trust] versus positions -- in hopes of changing our conversations, so they'll be more focused on interests. Then we weave into that the next day, information on communication skills. But how do you do that in the context of communicating back and forth? As well as how to communicate in a way that protects the relationships across agencies?

Voice: There's a real need for just providing the space and the place for agencies to talk. Agencies are yearning to talk about and to understand why other agencies do what they do. That's just to kind of give you a background of where we're at.

Voice: So your main concerns are...

Voice: It's like a light bulb goes off, and you can see the "aha" statement in the eyes of others. It's saying, "That's where that agency is coming from." Or, "That's what's happening in that state, right now."

Voice: Oh, there's definitely a chemistry. There's a difference from 30-some individuals. Some of whom -- lots of whom -- already know each other and have some preconceived notion to [achieve]. Over time, one thing I really look for laughter. Not just one person in on corner and another person sort of laughing in the other corner. But when all of a sudden, the whole group will give a big belly laugh, then I know they're starting to come together as a team.

Voice: [inaudible] problems, because then you will be very late in the process. It started with the Highway Administration at the local level with the planning board and the local environmental quality board.

Voice: [inaudible] so broad. We may have one part of a department that says, "A" and another part of the department that says, "No, Z." So even before we can provide a response to the DOT, we have to resolve it.

Voice: We need you to fill out your evaluations, please. We take your input very seriously.

Voice: At the end of the conference, we do an evaluation. This then gets incorporated, to improve the workshop, as we go. We've been surprised by the really positive evaluations we've gotten. It was right on target with what we wanted to accomplish. Here are some examples. In the question asking, "What did you learn to do?" Recognize that you can't rely on assumptions regarding other parties' positions.

Voice: I will implement several ideas gathered from this workshop. Pre-scoping methods to flush out issues. Enhanced listening skills. Set stronger priorities for agency reviews. And stronger direction to sponsoring agencies to set reasonable project schedules.

Voice: The comments made by the other agency people have provided insight in problems they encounter, and will influence the way I review NEPA documentations. That definitely is one of the objectives that Federal Highway Administration was interested in.

Voice: We are now talking with individual states about holding state-specific workshops. These would be modifications of the regional workshops, focused on a specific issue.

Voice: These are the kinds of skills that engineers, biologists, historians don't learn in school. Whether they learn them or not is a function of on-the-job type training. This formal workshop setting helps them to learn how to negotiate in a way that gets to new and better solutions than they would, otherwise.

Voice: To learn to hear other peoples' interests.

Voice: That was interesting to see how we viewed our role and how other agencies -- their expectations and how they view us as the lead federal agency.

Voice: What I will take back is a better appreciation of what each agency has to deal with, and better understanding your agency's issues and processes and things like that.

Voice: It really made me go back. I can look at that interest, as opposed to coming up and automatically, "This is the position."

[video ends]

Susanna Liller: That was a workshop in a nutshell. Again, anybody in any states who are interested, please feel free to contact us. Does anybody have any questions?

Speaker: [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: I would say that the answer is no -- yes and no. Are you a football fan?

Speaker: [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: People problems are discussed among all the agencies. Granted, our workshop here, we work and we don't [inaudible] we're focused on federal agencies. We couldn't focus on everybody. But we certainly understand and appreciate the fact that that is a problem. [inaudible] In terms of our dispute-resolution process, I can't speak for Federal Highway, but I'm speaking for Federal Highway. I believe that part of the process is [inaudible]

Dale Keyes: [inaudible] people problems.

Susanna Liller: Yes.

Dale Keyes: There are different personalities in different agencies, as well. So that's recognized. But we didn't for years, when the NGOs and the [inaudible]

Speaker: The reason I asked that is because [inaudible] resources [inaudible] permits [inaudible] we put the emphasis on them because they [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: Yes. This is of course another topic. We may just have gotten another topic in terms of some other [inaudible] projects may be quicker. We at Federal Highway did a really cursory survey of what holds up the process. It's not the environmental [inaudible]. It's all outside of that. [inaudible]

Moderator: Dale is going to tell us a little bit more about the Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, and I want to tell you that if you are going to refer to Dale by his full name, don't pronounce it the way I did. It's pronounced KEIZ.

Dale Keyes: This is a follow-up. I'm not going to take very long. I really wanted after today's discussion to talk about what resources were available. I really am trying to get all the agencies involved in transportation planning, project development, environmental review -- to think about the institute as, foremost, a resource. Our mission as it was defined by congress, was to help all stakeholders. Not just agencies. But all stakeholders involved in public lands, natural resources, and in environmental disputes -- to resolve those disputes. Using collaborative processes and using alternative dispute resolution processes.

We defined environmental conflict resolution very broadly, as...

Speaker: [inaudible]

Dale Keyes: No. I'm thinking of your name, Ruth. As Ruth was saying, really...

Moderator: [inaudible]

Dale Keyes: Yes. Right. That's right, Don. Thanks.

[laughter]

Dale Keyes: I blame everything on age, and I'm sure I get away with everything. But it's not just conflict resolution. It's really collaborative problem-solving to make better decisions. It's conflict prevention. It's setting up systems to resolve conflicts when they emerge. It's developing elevation procedures. It's all of that, combined together. So we get involved in work we do, and transportation energy is my area. Bu we have other program managers who want to focus on other areas.

It goes right from the planning stage all the way down to the enforcement and the hardcore well-crystallized dispute resolution stage.

The couple of things again, to emphasize -- 1 -- we have a roster of qualified environmental conflict-resolution professionals. We have a very small staff in Tucson. There are only six of us at my level. We're involved in literally hundreds of projects in a year. We depend on a roster that now number over, I believe, 250. There's a subroster called the transportation roster as Ruth mentioned, number 43. These are folks who really are well-qualified, very experienced in environmental and transportation conflicts and controversies. They are available to help you set timelines, develop processes and resolve disputes.

We also get involved in helping resolve dispute around specific cases. Cheryl knows a lot about one near Stillwater on the St. Croix river. This is one of the top 13 high-priority cases under the President's Executive Order. We're involved in another one of those in California, at Riverside County -- A [CTAP] process. We get called in to actually help resolve disputes, as well as hold workshops and try to develop these systems or frameworks for collaborative processes and reaching better decisions.

Please keep in mind that we do have this state workshop series that's just getting underway. We've had one in California. We're working with Texas, right now. We've talked at Maryland and North Carolina and a variety

of other states. These workshops vary from further developing skills, to really working on relationships among specific agencies to a substantive topic of great interest.

The one we're doing in Texas is on multijurisdictional ecosystem banking concept. It's really quite innovative. Keep that in mind. If you have an interest or you have some other agencies in your state who would like to have a workshop developed, give me a call. It's a cost-sharing relationship, and we try to make it very attractive.

I think that's really about all I want to say. Please do read through the materials in the folders. We have a lot of information on how to get access to our roster. We have a roster manager that'll help you pick somebody. If you just want to go in and pick somebody off the roster, you don't really have to involve the institute as an organization. That's fine. If you want us to help out, we can do that, too.

We often find that because we are an independent federal agency, we're not part of any other federal agency. It gives more than just symbolically the aura of independence, if a contractor contracts with us, as opposed to contracting with one of your agencies.

Let me just pause and ask quickly if there are any questions.

Speaker: [inaudible]

Dale Keyes: Yes. Back in 1998. We're in the President's Executive Budget. We're part of the Morris Udahl Foundation. We're totally independent. And we have a very strict firewall and conflict-of-interest policy set up within the foundation, so that the foundation is actually separated from us, as well.

Yes?

Speaker: [inaudible]

Dale Keyes: The FHWA, at this point, will provide 50 percent of the cost of a workshop. The other 50 percent has to come from state agencies or other organizations within the state. That formula may be changed to make it even more attractive, but right now, it's 50 percent.

Yes?

Speaker: [inaudible]

Dale Keyes: Sure. As long as there's a federal agency or a federal interest involved, it's fair game. We don't take every project that comes to us -- we have a series of criteria that we use in a decision tree. But clearly, we could be involved in helping, probably through partnering with somebody from our roster -- to help you work with communities or set up classes whereby you'd want to be inclusively collaborative with a lot of stakeholders.

Yes.

I'm going to turn this over to Susanna.

Moderator: Susanna's going to talk to us for a few minutes about some experiences regarding things that work and things that don't. Susanna?

Susanna Liller: Thank you, Don. I think I come to this with a different perspective. I'm feeling like maybe these are the elite troops that do all the strategic planning, and I'm the person in the trenches, crawling on my belly in front of a public mob. I don't know, but... I wanted to just share with you my perspective as a facilitator and a mediator. I've watched in several different studies within the state and also outside the state. I've done work on transportation projects within Maine, for the Federal Highway, but I've also worked with the FAA in airport projects, as well. So I get a chance to see what works and what doesn't work.

When I'm talking about what works, how do you define if it's working? I'm talking about people connecting. The agencies involved and the public. And again, I'm a facilitator for public processes. So when I'm thinking about this, I'm thinking about the public and how that's working.

So what works for me is people aren't afraid. They're not afraid to take risks. You can have a conversation. They're not feeling like victims. As well as the people working on the project, and the study team. They're not getting defensive. There's a connection, there.

What doesn't work is the opposite. When people are alienated, it's an "us" and "them." There are enemies and no communication. Nobody's hearing anything, because they're so afraid. They don't believe you; they don't trust you. That's what works and what doesn't work.

Also, I realize a lot of this you know. So maybe I'll be stating the obvious, in some cases. You also know that there's no silver bullet. There's no "one way fits all," and no cookie-cutter approach to this. Here are some just general observations I've made being out there in the trenches. This is something that I think all of you talked about today -- my top item. And also, I should say that I divide it into two parts -- preventions and interventions.

I believe if you look at public involvement and working with people, the first thing you have to look at is, "What are all the things I can do to prevent things getting ugly and out of control and out of hand?" Then, once you've done all those, hopefully it won't happen. But if it does, then you have to interventions that you're ready to put into place in case it does happen.

So starting with prevention -- you've all talked about getting connected early on. To me, I call this, "foundation building." Richard was talking about that -- Jeffrey was talking about this before. Going to people before you even start talking to them about purpose and need and NEPA. "What are your interests? What are your concerns? What makes sense to you in your community?" I'm not going to go into examples, because we don't have enough time, but most of these things have been practiced in the State of Maine. When I think about going to people, it's the Route 1 Gateway Project. It's the Bath Viaduct Project, where I saw people just sit around a table and say, "What's important to you?" Having a conversation. I think that really does you well if you start out that way -- participation in the process.

Here in Maine, I've seen groups, study teams invite the public to draw routes on a map. Brainstorm alternatives. Have them actually participate in coming up with ways to get through their communities. I did some work for O'Hare Airport, where they actually had 52 different towns involved. They had people come in and brainstorm screening criteria, if you can believe it. That worked! They divided the group up into four separate groups of about 20 people, each. These folks who were really angry with O'Hare and the modernization project -- brainstorming screening criteria.

Scoping. Small groups. I've seen this happen, as well. Varied meeting formats. It seems to me not always doing the big, large, public meeting with grandstanding. It's just a breeding ground for grandstanding. Small neighborhood meetings. Open houses with plans and displays, I've seen that work. Going to people instead of having them always come to you. Going to the [inaudible] County. The potato growers and the other stakeholder groups. They really appreciate it.

Education? Not assuming that everybody knows how things work, necessarily. I've been working at the Philadelphia airport. They had informational meetings on how the airport works. A lot of people learned that you have to take off into the wind. I was one of those that didn't know. So all those people that were saying, "Why are you sending the planes over our houses?" Well, they weren't. You have to take off into the wind.

I think the visioning and the looking at the big picture as a step, maybe, in the beginning goes a really long way. It gets an interest. "What do you want your community to look like? What do you want Route 1 to look like?" Of course, great communication materials. You guys already addressed that. Being a facilitator. Of course, I would say, "Well-run, structured meetings. You have an agenda. You know who's in control of the meeting. You start and end on time." People feel more secure in a situation like that.

Working relationship with the media. Not running from the media, but inviting them right up front, calling them in and educating them, as well. Meeting planning. What do you do when people walk in the second to last meeting and know nothing about anything and start asking all these questions? Do you anticipate that?

As far as what doesn't work with all those preventions, it's the opposite of all of them. Not trying to build a relationship up front. Having crummy communication materials that people can't read and don't understand. So -- preventions.

Interventions are, "Okay. It's happening. You've got the conflict. You're in trouble," in that regard. So what have I seen work? I've seen individual interviews work, where people actually call people on the phone. "I want to talk to you about what's upsetting you. Let me hear more." It gives them a chance to talk about it and to vent. I've seen just in the meeting, publicly acknowledging, "You were really upset about this. I can see that you have a lot of concern." Instead of almost all these interventions are the opposite of trying to put a lid on it. Hoping it'll go away. Just getting to the end and hoping it'll go away. But actually inviting them. All right. What is troubling you?

People are always worried that you're going to let the cat out of the bag. But if you have a good facilitated process, it can be contained. Being responsive. Answering all those e-mails. Answering. When people know you're going to get back to them, they trust you more. Somebody already mentioned you can actually have a mediated conversation, get people together, understand what the interests are and the different values.

Then again, what doesn't work for interventions is what I said -- trying to keep a lid on the whole thing, and hoping it'll go away. "Let's just get this thing over with," and hope that it'll somehow get better.

So my message to you is to consider preventions -- and I have a little handout for you. Consider preventions first -- consider interventions. But the basic truth is, it's really, really hard for an individual to have a relationship with an agency. I mean just that you have going against you. Also, people don't trust professionals, any more. Just because you're an engineer -- so what? People don't trust government officials, any more. There's so much more that we have to do to prove our credibility to people.

The other basic thing about working with the public is that it's the people who're unhappy that are going to show up. There could be a huge group that's happy, and you'll never get them out. There's so much going against us, even to begin with. But that's the nature of the beast.

I would just end with having an active public involvement process, where you do a lot of involvement at the beginning. It's costly, it takes time, it take energy. But I think it saves time and energy if you do it right up front than waiting until something bad happens and then trying to do it.

Those are my two cents' worth from the trenches. I have a quick little handout that I'll give you. Any questions? Yes?

Speaker: [inaudible] At the meetings, people stand up [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: Right. Right. Yes. Yes. Yes. [inaudible / crossing]

Speaker: It's like you're not doing a thing, here. [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: That's a key mediator technique to diffuse conflict. It's to acknowledge the person's hurt, and be able to say... They write realms on just the apology and what the apology does in diffusing a conflict. It would be great if you could get them to say that, because I think it would help.

Speaker: [inaudible] local groups or organizations [inaudible] to create opposition to what you're doing? One of the best ways to engage them -- the closer you can get to your enemy, the better off you are. In case [inaudible] and have them work with you and try to identify what the solutions are. As a post script, try not to deal with it. If you don't deal with it, it'll become a bigger problem [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: I was thinking of that, as far as responsiveness, where you get so many letters and e-mails. I think the tendency is, "Oh, I just want to put this behind me." But it pays off to just meet them and not try to push them away.

Yes.

Speaker: I hate to do this, but we've done that. We've tried to involve the opposition and they would refuse to engage in conversation. That gets [inaudible] we did everything we could. Now [inaudible] contact with everybody should know up front that it's not always fair. If you want me to get engaged in a conversation, then once I do, [inaudible]

Susanna Liller: Agreed. Absolutely. Yes.

Speaker: How to break that wall...

Susanna Liller: In some cases, you may never be able to. We were talking about this with the values group. You might just have to admit that there is no common ground in this situation.

Speaker: But after this court case we've gone through, one of the key people -- that person will be invited to sit down and work out a mitigation [inaudible] There will be a follow-up to try to go ahead and try to engage them, even though we [inaudible] court case in the past [inaudible]

Speaker: A lot of times, sometimes [inaudible] litigation [inaudible] Some of the [inaudible] are pretty successful. Litigating has been successful in the past. However, conditions change. If they lost a court case and it looks like their position isn't as strong. They may be much more agreeable to [inaudible].

Speaker: Also, if they've had some successes in cooperative processes, too, that tends to condition them for additional involvement.

Speaker: I just want to say one closing thing. None of this -- especially if you're at the starting block in terms of interpersonal relationship -- collaborative problem-solving, it all... We've both talked about it before. It comes down to trust. You're not going to get someone's trust overnight. So don't think that this is a quick fix. It's a long process. But you chip at it a little bit at a time and just keep your sights on the horizon and the

positive. It really, in terms of one thing Susanna alluded to... A lot of this getting everybody up front -- not just the public interagencies -- it is. It's a lot more work up front. But we are actually starting to document that it does, in the long-run, pay off.

Also, every time you do it and every time you follow through -- whether it's answering somebody's e-mail or providing another agency with what they asked for -- every time you do what you say you're going to do, you're building a little trust. So they won't be at you every single time and thinking that they're trying to pull the wool over their eyes. Just keep up the good work is the best thing we can say.

[tape ends]

[begin tape]

Don: Are there any other questions?

I want to thank Susanna, Ruth, Dale -- but mostly, I want to thank all of you. You really made this work. I think it was a successful exercise, and we appreciate your participation. Thank you very much.