Using mediation to resolve disputes in your community association while improving its bottom line

Editor’s note: This article was originally published in the March/April 2011 issue of Community Assets magazine, a publication of the Pennsylvania & Delaware Valley Chapter of Community Associations Institute (CAI). (www.cai-padelval.org).

By James A. Rosenstein and Gary A. Krimstock

Introduction

As a member of a community association or its property manager, do any of these three scenarios sound familiar?

Scenario 1: Although the declaration for your condominium authorizes establishment of a reserve fund to pay for major capital items, for years the payments into it have been quite small in order to hold down the unit owners’ annual assessments. However, the roofs have now begun to leak and your association’s board has concluded that they should all be replaced at a cost that is far in excess of the balance in the capital reserve fund. To meet this expense, the board is proposing a large capital assessment for the current year and (to preclude a similar problem in the future) substantially increasing the amount of each unit owner’s contribution to that fund on an ongoing basis.

The unit owners are up-in-arms over this proposal.

Scenario 2: After living relatively harmoniously for a dozen years in your planned community of 25 townhouses, a number of conflicts have arisen between neighbors on such contentious topics as parking on shared driveways, barking dogs and loud noises. Some of the affected homeowners have asked the community association to intervene while others are threatening litigation.

Scenario 3: The backyards of units in your community association are enclosed with fences owned by their respective unit owners but initially constructed by the developer with uniform materials and appearance. Over the years, many fences have deteriorated significantly. Several owners are now seeking approval to replace their fences using materials and colors of their own choosing. However, other owners have expressed concern that the appearance and materials of replacement fences should be consistent with the existing ones.

The association’s declaration requires that changes to fences be approved by an architectural review committee appointed by the board, but it does not specify the criteria to be used in granting this approval. The architectural review committee has historically functioned exclusively like a hearing board, and its members have no experience in resolving this type of multi-party position conflict. This issue has the potential to divide the community.

Mediation would be an excellent way to resolve any of these situations in a timely and cost-effective manner. Other examples of when mediation might be a viable alternative are issues relating to covenants and rules enforce-
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Message from the editor

By Mary Kate Coleman
Arbitration & Mediation editor

Best wishes for a beautiful spring! I hope you enjoy our committee’s second newsletter of 2011. Thank you to everyone who contributed items for the newsletter or otherwise assisted in its production.

The newsletter committee is interested in receiving items for our next newsletter. We are seeking articles, book reviews, photos, notices of upcoming events, etc., that may be of interest to your fellow committee members. Please send any newsletter items to me at MKColeman@rhwrlaw.com by July 15.
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tment, assessment collections, disputes between the board and manager, and contract disputes between the association and its vendors. For examples of other situations that lend themselves well to mediation, please see various items in the Appendix.

What is Mediation and When Should You Consider Using It?

In essence, mediation is negotiation facilitated by an impartial third party (the mediator) for the purpose of resolving a conflict or dispute or solving a problem. A conflict, per Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary, is a “competitive or opposing action of incompatibles: antagonistic state or action (as in divergent ideas, interests or persons),” while that dictionary defines a dispute as a “verbal controversy; debate; quarrel.”

Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 illustrate the two principal situations in which mediation typically can be most effective. Scenario 1 describes a conflict that could be diffused if action is taken promptly before the conflict escalates into a full-scale dispute. However, the apparent extent of polarization in the community indicates that a resolution is not likely without some impartial outside intervention. On the other hand, Scenarios 2 and 3 are examples of clearly definable disputes that the parties would like to resolve in a cost-effective, expeditious and confidential manner, but they lack the tools needed to do it on their own.

The principal difference, from a dispute resolution perspective, between the situation described in Scenario 1 and those summarized in Scenarios 2 and 3, lies in the extent to which the dispute is ripe for negotiations – whether with or without the assistance of a mediator. In Scenario 1, the principal issues have not been clearly defined, all of the parties to the conflict have not been identified, and their respective underlying interests and willingness to resolve it through negotiations have not been ascertained. Until this groundwork has been laid – which is the job of a trained and experienced conflict assessor with no stake in the outcome of the assessment – attempting to negotiate a resolution would probably be unproductive and might even be counterproductive.

On the other hand, in Scenarios 2 and 3, the issues, the parties and their interests appear clear and the only remaining procedural question is whether the parties are willing to try resolving their dispute through direct negotiations or facilitated negotiations (i.e., mediation) or whether they prefer to “duke it out” before an arbitrator or judge. This last question should be readily answerable, at which time the
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matter can proceed to negotiation, mediation, arbitration or litigation.

Viewed in this light, mediation should be considered by organizations, individuals and their lawyers whenever they are faced with a conflict or dispute that they can not resolve on their own.

How Does Your Community Association Get the Help Needed to Resolve A Conflict or Dispute?4

Once you have identified a dispute or potential dispute that would appear to lend itself to mediation, you should decide whether or not it is ready for mediation. There are several factors to consider when deciding whether a conflict assessment should be conducted or whether to proceed directly to mediation:

- Has the issue (or issues) at the heart of the conflict been adequately defined?
- Has everyone who has a stake in the conflict (or its resolution) been identified (the stakeholders), as well as their respective underlying interests that may need to be addressed in order to resolve the conflict?
- Are these stakeholders willing to attempt to resolve their conflict through negotiation rather than in an adversarial manner (through arbitration or litigation)?

If all of these questions can be answered in the affirmative, then the matter is ripe for mediation. If you are unable to answer any of the questions or if you answer “no” to either of the first two questions, you should consider scheduling a conflict assessment. Once you have all these answers, you can decide whether mediation is likely to be productive. For example, if some of the essential parties to the dispute are not willing to negotiate (i.e. you get a negative answer to the question under bullet point three), you may have no alternative but to initiate litigation.

How Can Your Community Association Find Someone with the Requisite Skills, Knowledge and Experience to Conduct a Conflict Assessment or to Mediate the Dispute?

First, it is important to understand the similarities and differences between an ideal mediator and an ideal conflict assessor. While there are differing opinions on the ideal characteristics of each, here is one expert’s list of the qualities of an ideal mediator:

- “Absolute impartiality
- Trustworthiness and ability to motivate people to disclose confidential information
- Mediation experience
- Good listening skills
- Ability to understand the law and facts
- Good people skills
- Leadership qualities
- Problem-solving skills
- Flexibility
- Strong negotiating skills
- Patience
- Good management skills
- A sense of humor
- Good business sense”5

Here’s another “expert’s” list of desired qualities for a conflict assessor:

- Impartiality
- Some knowledge of the issues at stake
- Conflict assessment experience
- Effective interviewing skills
- Ability to “connect” with the stakeholders”6

Some people may be qualified to act as both conflict assessor and mediator in the same matter, although the parties might decide against using the same person in both roles if it creates an unacceptable conflict of interest. On the flip side, sometimes you may not find one person with a sufficient combination of these qualities to serve as either a mediator or conflict assessor for your dispute – in which case you might use a team composed of individuals who together possess all of the requisite qualities.

How do you find a qualified mediator or conflict assessor? Someone in your association or its lawyer may be able to recommend such a person or organization. Also, there are quite a few professional organizations to which professional neutrals belong that could recommend people in your area to interview – for example, the Association for Conflict Resolution (of which co-author Rosenstein previously served as president), the Dispute Resolution Section of the American Bar Association, Dispute Resolution Sections and Committees of your state or local bar association, and organizations that provide mediators (for a fee), such as the American Arbitration Association and JAMS.

Contracting for conflict assessment or mediation services is pretty straightforward but is beyond the scope of this article. For this, we recommend consulting your association’s attorney and items 1 and 6 in the Appendix.

How do Mediators Help Parties Resolve Conflicts or Disputes?

Although each mediation can be tailored to meet the needs of the parties (and this is one of the principal advantages of mediation compared to other types of dispute resolution), generally speaking, the components of a mediation are preparation for the mediation, the mediation itself and documenting the outcome of the mediation.

Preparation. Preparation for mediation is every bit as important to achieving a successful outcome as is preparation for negotiations without the benefit of a third-party facilitator. Depending upon whether the parameters of the dispute and the identity of the disputants are clear, mediation preparation includes:

- clarifying the issues;
- identifying all necessary parties;
- determining the willingness of those parties to participate in mediation;
- deciding whether to mediate and...
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which issues to include in the mediation;
• identifying a mediator who is mutually acceptable to the parties; and agreeing on procedural rules for the mediation, including how any resulting agreement will be documented.

Mediation. Generally speaking, skilled mediators help parties resolve their conflicts or disputes by applying techniques that are not readily available to the parties themselves or in ways that differ from how the parties themselves could use them. Table 1 provides examples of how, in a community association setting (where the issues relate to the ownership or use of property or some aspect of the operation of the association), a skilled mediator (1) helps the parties identify the obstacles to reaching resolution, and (2) employs the tools that are likely to be most effective in overcoming these obstacles.

Documenting. After an agreement is reached, the parties and their respective lawyers should document the terms accurately and completely in the form of a legally binding written contract.

Why Consider Using Mediation Rather than Another Type of ADR or Litigation?

Unlike litigation, and sometimes arbitration, parties who elect to mediate can pick the person they both want to serve as the mediator.

Unlike arbitration and litigation, the parties themselves decide on the outcome of their mediation – including the terms of any resulting legally enforceable agreement. If, after mediation, they are still unable to agree on all terms, the unresolved ones can be raised in subsequent arbitration or litigation.

Unlike litigation, and to some extent arbitration, the parties and the mediator can tailor the “forum to fit the fuss” by deciding on the issues to be addressed, the specifics of the process to be used to address them, the outcome of the process (which is not restricted to remedies that are available in court) and even which parties will participate. This usually results in win-win resolutions in which the parties are invested, unlike arbitration or litigation, which produces a winner and a loser and often ongoing acrimony between the parties. This benefit is particularly valuable in a community association context – where the parties continue to live in the same community after the dispute has been resolved.

 Unlike litigation, and increasingly arbitration, mediation can be quite cost effective – principally because it can be used effectively early in a dispute, before a party incurs the substantial legal expenses typically encountered in preparing for and participating in either arbitration or litigation. Unlike litigation, and occasionally arbitration, mediation is confidential. This can be particularly important in disputes where public disclosure could publicize potentially embarrassing situations or negatively affect property values.

Conclusion

The timely and appropriate use of mediation almost always produces better results for the parties in less time, with reduced business disruption, and at lower cost than either arbitration or litigation.

APPENDIX

Some Useful References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Some Examples of Obstacles to Reaching Resolution</strong></th>
<th><strong>Some Tools that Mediators Use to Help Overcome these Obstacles in Joint (Face-to-Face) Sessions or Private Caucuses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties hold differing views about the central problem(s) or issue(s).</td>
<td>Mediator reframes the problem(s) or issue(s), preferably as a shared problem or issue. Mediator encourages the parties to speak directly to each other about their respective views and the reasons for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even though the parties agree on the problems or issues, they hold differing views about how to resolve them.</td>
<td>Mediator helps the parties distinguish between their positions (and those of the other party) and the interests that underlie them. Then focus first on finding mutually acceptable ways to address those interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parties are unable to decide how to address inter-related issues.</td>
<td>Mediator helps the parties (a) understand the relationships among the issues and their relative importance; and (b) use this information to develop a “roadmap” for addressing them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties are thinking in too narrow a framework about possible resolutions.</td>
<td>Mediator facilitates non-judgmental brainstorming by the parties about a wide variety of ways to address their shared or differing interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parties have difficulty communicating with each other (other than difficulties caused by cognitive impairments).</td>
<td>Mediator helps each party to engage in active listening to the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One party fears the other party, or has a sense of weakness or lack of empowerment.</td>
<td>Mediator uses a variety of confidence-building measures to start building or restoring trust between the parties, including meeting separately with the mediator (private caucuses), “shuttle diplomacy” and mediator creating a “safe setting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more of the parties feels angry, frustrated, wronged, disrespected or misunderstood.</td>
<td>Mediator provides the parties with an opportunity to “vent” their emotions directly with the other party in a setting where the mediator is present to provide safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more of the parties are unwilling to even consider the other’s proposals (reactive devaluation).</td>
<td>In private caucus, mediator communicates the other party’s proposals in the form of “trial balloons” originating with the mediator rather than the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more of the parties misunderstand their relative strength or have unrealistic expectations.</td>
<td>In private caucus, mediator engages in reality testing and playing devil’s advocate with the party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more of the parties blames the other party for creating the problem and does not acknowledge their own role.</td>
<td>In private caucus, mediator encourages the party to make educated guesses about the concerns, needs, etc. of the other party (by putting oneself in the other’s shoes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each party is unwilling to negotiate a settlement agreement on the basis of the other party’s draft (the “dueling-drafts” problem).</td>
<td>The mediator uses “single text negotiation” to help the parties and their counsel generate their agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Since the early ‘70s, James A. Rosenstein, who is Of Counsel to the Philadelphia firm of Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C., has represented parties engaged in the development and operation of condominiums and other types of planned communities. In the last dozen years, he has also mediated disputes and provided a variety of mediation-related services principally with respect to these types of properties. Gary A. Krimstock, a senior partner with Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C., practices real estate and business law, and represents many community associations in the Philadelphia area on operational, management, governance, regulatory, contractual and litigation matters.

2 For more information about difficult negotiations, see items 3 and 12, and for more information about mediation in general, see items 1 and 4 through 7 in the Appendix.

3 For more information about pre-dispute mediation, see items 2, 8 and 11 in the Appendix, and for more information about conflict assessment, see items 8 through 11 in the Appendix.

4 Although this article focuses on obtaining competent neutrals, your association will likely need to consult with its attorney to prepare for and participate in any mediation process in which it will be a party.

5 Pp. 36 and 37 of item 6 in the Appendix.

6 Adapted from pp. 106 and 107 of item 11 in the Appendix.

Calif. Supreme Court reverses controversial decision and upholds mediation confidentiality

Editor’s note: This article was originally published in the Mediation Council of Western Pennsylvania’s newsletter, Mediation Today, and is re-printed with the permission of Laura Candris and the MCWP.

By Laura A. Candris

Cassel v. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County (2011 WL 102710 (Cal.)), Supreme Court of California, No. S178914 (Jan. 13, 2011). Cassel sued the attorneys who represented him in mediation for malpractice, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud and breach of contract, contending that, “by bad advice, deception, and coercion, the attorneys, who had a conflict of interest, induced him to settle for a lower amount than he had told them he would accept, and for less than the case was worth.” The attorneys moved under the mediation confidentiality statutes to exclude all evidence of communications between them and Cassel relating to the mediation, including matters discussed at the premediation meetings and private communications among the attorneys and Cassel during the mediation. The trial court granted the motion. The Court of Appeal granted mandamus relief to Cassel and vacated the trial court’s order. The Supreme Court of California granted review, superseding the opinion of the Court of Appeal, and held that the attorneys’ mediation-related discussions with Cassel, their client, were protected against disclosure as confidential mediation communications and, therefore, were neither discoverable nor admissible for purposes of proving a claim of legal malpractice.

In reaching its conclusion, the Supreme Court noted: “In order to encourage the candor necessary to a successful mediation, the Legislature has broadly provided for the confidentiality of things spoken or written in connection with a mediation proceeding. With specified statutory exceptions, neither ‘evidence of anything said,’ nor any ‘writing,’ is discoverable or admissible in any arbitration, administrative adjudication, civil action, or other noncriminal proceeding in which ... testimony can be compelled to be given,’ if the statement was made, or the writing was prepared, ‘for the purpose of, in the course of, or pursuant to, a mediation....’ (Evid.Code, § 1119, subds.(a), (b).) [Footnote omitted.] [...]

We have repeatedly said that these confidentiality provisions are clear and absolute. Except in rare circumstances, they must be strictly applied and do not permit judicially crafted exceptions or limitations, even where competing public policies may be affected.”

Laura A. Candris is an employment lawyer and mediator with Meyer Unkovic & Scott L.L.P. in Pittsburgh.

Laura A. Candris

Attorneys James A. Rosenstein and Gary A. Krimstock are with the law firm of Fineman, Krekstein & Harris P.C., Philadelphia. Krimstock is vice president of the Pennsylvania/Delaware Valley Chapter of Community Associations Institute.
Harrisburg lawyer Herbert R. Nurick to be honored by PBA

The Pennsylvania Bar Association Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee will present its Sir Francis Bacon Award to Harrisburg lawyer Herbert R. Nurick on May 4 during the association’s Annual Meeting in Philadelphia.

The Sir Francis Bacon Award recognizes an individual who has made a significant impact in bringing mediation and other forms of dispute resolution to Pennsylvania. Sir Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was a Renaissance writer and served British monarchs in a legal capacity as knight, attorney general and solicitor. He authored the essay, “Of Negotiating,” which featured the frequently-quoted line, “It is generally better to deal by speech than by letter, and by the mediation of a third than by a man’s self.”

Nurick became the first mediation coordinator for the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission in 1996. He was responsible for revising and expanding the mediation program to significantly increase the number of utility disputes handled by means of alternative dispute resolution. Since that time, the PUC program has served as a model for mediation efforts in other state agencies.

From 1967 to 1996, Nurick was an associate and then partner in the Harrisburg law firm of McNees, Wallace & Nurick.

Nurick is a member of the American Bar Association, Pennsylvania Bar Association, Dauphin County Bar Association and Pennsylvania Council of Mediators. Nurick is a past president of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute, past chair of the Pennsylvania Bar Association’s Professionalism Committee and past chair of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Pennsylvania Bar Association Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee. Nurick was instrumental in the development of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute Alternative Dispute Resolution Institute and the Civil Dispute Resolution Program for the Dauphin County Bar Association.

Active in the community, Nurick is a former member of the Penn State Alumni Association’s Alumni Council and Executive Committee, a former member of the board of Beth El Temple, a founding member and first president of the Hershey Ronald McDonald House and a member of the first Board of Overseers for the Widener University School of Law, Harrisburg Campus.

Nurick holds an undergraduate degree from Penn State University, a juris doctor from the Dickinson School of Law and a certificate from Key Bridge Therapy and Mediation Center.

2011 Lawrence W. Kaplan Lecture in Conflict Resolution set for May 18

The topic of the 2011 Lawrence W. Kaplan Lecture in Conflict Resolution is “Developing Conflict Competence.” Conflict competence is the ability to use cognitive, emotional and behavioral skills to manage conflict more effectively. The speaker for the lecture is Craig Runde, director of the Center for Conflict Dynamics at Eckerd College in Florida. This eighth annual lecture is sponsored by the Allegheny County Bar Association’s Alternate Dispute Resolution Committee, Collaborative Law Association of Southwestern Pennsylvania, CVVC’s Dialogue and Resolution Center and Mediation Council of Western Pennsylvania.

The lecture takes place on Wednesday, May 18, in Pittsburgh at the Omni William Penn Hotel. The evening starts at 5 p.m. with an hors d’oeuvres reception and cash bar. The lecture begins at 6 p.m. The cost is $50 per person. To RSVP for the lecture, please send your completed reservation form and check made out to the ACBA to Marlene Ellis by May 10. For further information, please contact Mary Kate Coleman at mkcoleman@rhwrlaw.com or Marlene Ellis at mellis@acba.org.

To access the invitation to the lecture and the reservation form, go to http://www.acba.org/acba/pdf/KaplanLectureInvite11.pdf.
The dramatic success of arbitration in resolving commercial disputes has brought with it justified concerns that the process has increasingly mimicked litigation complete with extensive discovery, reflexive motion practice and contentious advocacy. In October 2009, the College of Commercial Arbitrators convened a Summit Conference in Washington, D.C., attended by the four groups of stakeholders in the commercial arbitration process: business users, arbitration advocates, provider institutions and commercial arbitrators.

As a result of the Summit Conference, the College developed Protocols for Expeditious, Cost-effective Commercial Arbitration. These Protocols have been well received, having been selected to receive both the American Bar Association Lawyer as Problem Solver Award and the Institute for Conflict Prevention and Resolution (CPR) Practical Achievement Award for 2011.

On June 7, our ADR Committee will present a CLE focusing on the Protocols. Titled “Control Your Process, Control Your Costs: New Protocols for Arbitration,” the webcast and live simulcast CLE from Philadelphia is scheduled for 9 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. A panel consisting of David Burt, corporate counsel for DuPont in Wilmington, together with Judy Meyer and Steve Yusem, will discuss the Protocols from both the national and international perspectives. A second panel of David Fitzsimons, Mike McDowell and Tom Wilkinson will look at the ethical implications of the Protocols as well as other arbitration issues.

All attendees, whether attending in person, by webcast or by simulcast, will receive complimentary copies of the 87-page Protocols, which include key action steps for limiting discovery to what is essential without replicating litigation discovery; setting and enforcing arbitration time limits; using fast track arbitration in appropriate cases; establishing guidelines for early identification of issues, claims and defenses and controlling motion practice.

Click here to register for this CLE or to receive more information.

For this particular CLE, the ADR Committee is reaching out to business users, including CEOs, CFOs and risk managers, as well as corporate house counsel, in order to enable them to consider the commercial arbitration process from a new perspective, economizing on time and costs expended. ADR Committee members are requested and encouraged to send to Karen Fincham at PBI the names and regular mail addresses of business community persons who could profit from attending. Fincham’s e-mail is kfincham@pbi.org. She will then mail special announcements to our business prospects.

Stephen G. Yusem, Of Counsel, Morris and Clemm, P.C., Plymouth Meeting.
Pa. Superior Court upholds mediation confidentiality

By Mary Kate Coleman  
Arbitration & Mediation editor


This case is important because it upholds Pennsylvania’s Statutory Mediation Privilege.

The parties entered into a mediation conference, which was conducted by a Court of Common Pleas Judge in his chambers. It was alleged that, on the date of the mediation conference, the parties entered into a verbal settlement agreement concerning the issues pending in their litigation, with the intent for the parties to reduce to writing the terms of the verbal agreement. Subsequently, Fedinick refused to sign the written settlement agreement.

At a later hearing on Habitat’s Petition to Enforce Settlement Agreement, the trial court accepted evidence pertaining to the mediation conference. The court heard testimony from Fedinick’s former counsel who represented her at the mediation, the judge who served as mediator, a representative of Habitat who attended the mediation, and friends of Fedinick who were present at the mediation, among others.

The Superior Court found that these witnesses testified concerning mediation communications contrary to the statute making such evidence privileged. The court also found that none of the statutory exceptions were applicable to the testimony offered by the witnesses. Therefore, the trial court should not have accepted the testimony from the witnesses at the hearing on the Petition to Enforce Settlement Agreement.

Additionally, at the hearing, the trial court accepted into evidence privileged mediation documents. Specifically, the trial court received copies of three proposed settlement agreements which had been presented to the trial court by Habitat.

The court noted that the statutory exception permitting settlement documents to be introduced in an action or proceeding to enforce a settlement agreement expressed in the document was not applicable because none of the proposed settlement agreements were signed by the parties, as required by the statute. Therefore, none of the documents should have been admitted into evidence by the trial court.

The Superior Court held that the trial court erred in determining that the parties entered into an enforceable settlement agreement. It remanded the matter to the trial court for further proceedings.

Mary Kate Coleman is an attorney, mediator and arbitrator with the law firm of Riley Hewitt Witte & Romano in Pittsburgh.

Mary Kate Coleman
Help with using your PBA listserv

To subscribe, log in on the PBA website with your PBA member username and password, select the “Committees/Sections” tab, then the “Committees” tab, then the “Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee” tab, then the “Listserv Sign-Up” tab. The subscription form can also be accessed directly at www.pabar.org/public/listservform.asp.

Once subscribed to the listserv, you will get the following confirmation message:

“File sent due to actions of administrator traci.raho@pabar.org.”

To send a message to members of the listserv, address your e-mail to adr@list.pabar.org.

To reply only to the sender, hit “Reply,” and type your personal reply to the sender. This response will only go to the sender, not to the entire listserv membership. You can manually add other recipients outside of the sender or the membership.

To reply to the entire listserv membership, hit “Reply to All,” and type your response. This response will go to the sender and to the entire listserv membership.

To unsubscribe, send a message to listserv@list.pabar.org with “unsubscribe adr” in the body.

To change your e-mail address, you must unsubscribe the old e-mail address using the old e-mail address and subscribe the new e-mail address using your new e-mail address. Sending an e-mail to the list will not change your e-mail address on the listserv.

For customer service, contact Traci Raho, PBA internet coordinator, (800) 932-0311, ext. 2255.

Mark your calendars for these 2011 PBA events

**Family Law Section Summer Meeting**
July 7-10
The Sagamore, Bolton Landing, N.Y.

**Young Lawyers Division Summer Meeting/New Admittee Conference**
July 28-30
Rocky Gap Lodge & Golf Resort, Flintstone, Md.

**PBA Committee/Section Day**
Nov. 17
Holiday Inn East, Harrisburg

**PBA House of Delegates Meeting**
Nov. 18
Sheraton Harrisburg Hershey Hotel, Harrisburg