## Supplement A. Case studies for Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Description of conflict</th>
<th>Relevance to research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Queensland, Australia:</strong> flooding of Blackfellow Creek, Mt Sylvia</td>
<td>The devastating floods in 2011 destroyed road access to the community at Mt Sylvia. The Department of Transport &amp; Main Roads was urgently tasked to rebuild the road. South-East Queensland Catchments (a prominent, government-funded catchment management group) strongly disagreed with the design of the new road, arguing that it was vulnerable to destruction in future floods. The dispute between SEQ Catchments and the Department was managed by referring the decision to the community, and with consultation from the local council.</td>
<td>An example of a <strong>constructive</strong> conflict, where conscious efforts were made to keep the criticism constructive, despite much media attention focused on the area in the aftermath of the floods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New South Wales, Australia:</strong> timber industry vs national parks</td>
<td>In the 1980s, the State and National governments increased the area of land protected as National Parks. The timber industry vigorously objected. Environmental groups joined the conflict. There was notable politicisation: government officials took sides, which discouraged cooperation because each side sought political victory, rather than consensus. Tensions are not yet resolved.</td>
<td>An example of an <strong>intractable</strong> conflict, where politicisation prevented resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria, Australia:</strong> management of Barmah Forest</td>
<td>The Barmah–Millewa system is an internationally significant wetland. Its water needs competes with agricultural water demands in the ‘food bowl’ of Australia, the Murray–Darling Basin. In the early 2000s, the Victorian State Government came to a cooperative management agreement with the Yorta Yorta (Indigenous) people, irrigators, and community and environmental groups.</td>
<td>An example of a <strong>constructive</strong> conflict, where an agency with formal power (the State gov’t) devolved power to communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Northwest, USA:</strong> Spotted Owl habitats (desktop)</td>
<td>The Northern Spotted Owl was listed as a threatened species, which resulted in a court prohibition of logging its habitats in 1991. This sparked a furious conflict between the logging industry and environmentalists.</td>
<td>An example of an <strong>intractable</strong> conflict. This case will test the applicability of results to a case beyond Australia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Supplement B.** Two examples of conflict patterns: one intractable, and the other resolvable.

**Figure B1. Intractable conflict: an example**
Intractability driven by popular politics. Further research (Sep 2013 – May 2014) will determine other drivers of intractability.

- **Starting point**
  - **High stakes** (so parties really care)
  - **No easy alternatives** (perceived incompatibility; e.g. land development and wetland preservation can’t coexist)
  - **Parity of power between parties** (so no one party can unilaterally ‘squash’ the others).

- **Initial negotiations fail**
  - Polite letters don’t work; increasingly heated communications. Parties look for allies.

- **Media attention**
  - Parties often go to media to raise public support.

- **Forcing of political solutions**
  - Since political solutions are driven by public opinion, parties go to media to increase their chances of political decision in their favor.

- **Politisation**
  - Politicians take sides; make promises to support one side or another.

- **Further negotiations fail**
  - Groups no longer negotiate because sweeping political decisions in their favor are sought. Why cooperate if you have a chance of 100% success?
Supplement B. Two examples of conflict patterns: one intractable, and the other resolvable (continued)

Figure B2. Constructive conflict: an example
Pro-active action breaks the feedback loop, leading to consensus.

Starting point
• **High stakes** (so parties really care)
• **No easy alternatives** (perceived incompatibility; e.g. land development and wetland preservation can’t coexist)
• **Parity of power between parties** (so no one party can unilaterally ‘squash’ the others).

Initial negotiations fail
Polite letters don’t work; increasingly heated communications. Parties look for allies. **BUT...**

Limited media attention
One or more of the parties make efforts *not* to seek public outrage about the conflict.

Limited politicization
Politicians don’t/ can’t capitalize on limited media attention (directly as a result of low media attention, or perhaps because one or more parties make efforts *not* to seek sweeping political decisions in their favor)

Cooperative solutions encouraged
Since sweeping political decision is no longer likely, next best alternative is to cooperate.

En route to consensus
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