Collaborative Planning on State Trust Lands:

A University of Michigan Study

for the State Trust Lands Partnership Project
of the Sonoran Institute and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

About the Study:

Collaborative planning on state trust lands was identified for further research at the 2004 State Trust Lands Research and Policy Analysis Roundtable convened by the State Trust Lands partnership project of the Sonoran Institute and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. In March 2005, under the guidance of Dr. Steven L. Yaffee, a team of eight graduate students from the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment began conducting a region-wide survey and analysis of eight case studies in which state trust land agencies collaborated with stakeholders in trust land planning and management. The research team conducted 117 on-site and telephone interviews, each lasting roughly one to three hours. Through these interviews, the team answered a set of research questions concerning the benefits, challenges, costs and outcomes of collaborative planning on state trust lands. The goals of this research were to:

- Capture on-the-ground experiences of collaborative planning on state trust lands
- Analyze the advantages and disadvantages of this trust land management approach
- Distill a set of best management practices
- Provide broader recommendations for overcoming barriers to collaborative planning on state trust lands

Authors:
Stephanie Bertaina, Alden Boetsch, Emily Kelly, Eirin Krane,
Jessica Mitchell, Lisa Spalding, Matt Stout, Drew Vankat, Steve Yaffee

Sponsors of this Study Include:

Sonoran Institute

The Sonoran Institute promotes community decisions that respect the land and people of Western North America. Facing rapid change, western communities recognize and value the importance of their natural and cultural assets – assets that support resilient environmental and economic systems. The Institute offers tools, training and sound information for managing growth and change, and we encourage broad participation, collaboration and big-picture thinking to create practical solutions. The decisions communities make about using land, water and other resources affect their prosperity and quality of life today and in the future. www.sonoran.org

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy is a nonprofit educational institution based in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Through courses, conferences, research, publications, demonstration projects and other outreach programs, the Institute seeks to improve the quality of debate and disseminate knowledge of critical issues in land policy by bringing together scholars, policy makers, practitioners and citizens with diverse backgrounds and experience. www.lincolninst.edu

Ecosystem Management Initiative

The Ecosystem Management Initiative promotes landscape-scale conservation and sustainable natural resource management. Through short courses, dialogues, graduate student training and action-oriented research, the Initiative works to advance the knowledge and skills necessary for collaborative, adaptive ecosystem management. Over the last ten years, EMI has evaluated the progress of a large set of collaborative efforts in order to identify best practices, policy recommendations and tools that enable individuals and organizations to become more effective at managing resources and building sustainable communities. www.snre.umich.edu/ecomgt/

Natural Resources and Environment
University of Michigan

The University of Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment is dedicated to advancing the protection of the Earth's resources and the achievement of a sustainable society. Through research, teaching and outreach, faculty, staff and students generate new knowledge and develop policies, techniques and skills to help practitioners manage and conserve natural and environmental resources to meet the full range of human needs on a sustainable basis. www.snre.umich.edu

RESEARCH METHODS

This project employed a case study based research approach. The research team determined that because of the level of in-depth research needed to understand the complex dynamics of collaborative planning on state trust land, a case study approach was the most effective mechanism to meet this need. The objectives of the research were to identify examples of collaborative planning on state trust land in the American West and to investigate the benefits, costs, challenges, facilitating factors and lessons learned from those examples of collaborative planning.

To achieve the research objectives, the research team conducted nine phases of research. Early in the planning process, the team developed a set of research questions. The team then created an analytic framework through which to interpret relevant literature on collaborative planning and state trust land issues. The team also conducted preliminary investigation to identify as many examples as possible of collaborative planning on state trust land and then used a set of case selection criteria to decide on the final eight cases and three alternates. In addition, the team developed interview questions based on the basic research questions.

At the same time, the team prepared for an initial presentation of research concepts to an audience of state trust land commissioners and managers at the Western States Land Commissioners Association Conference, where the research team solicited feedback from the conference participants on their research approach and research questions. Individual case research teams then conducted on-site interviews with participants of the eight cases and wrote in-depth case studies. Finally, the research team developed a cross-case analysis framework to guide the cross-case analysis and the development of best management practices, recommendations and additional research products.

The project incorporated the following research phases:

1. Development of research questions
2. Creation of an analysis framework and completion of background literature review
3. Preliminary case investigation and case selection
4. Development of interview questions
5. Development of Western States Land Commissioners Association Conference presentation and information gathering
6. Completion of case research and case study writing
7. Development of cross-case analysis framework
8. Cross-case analysis of case studies
9. Development of best management practices and recommendations

1) DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The first step in the research process was the development of a set of research questions to guide the project in its focus. The research team created these research questions through an initial review of the literature on collaborative processes and state trust land management in conjunction with the advice of the project advisor and client. The final set of research questions were:

1. What makes collaborative planning on state trust land unique and different from other land management collaborative efforts?

2. Why did the state trust land stakeholders in the selected case studies engage in collaborative planning? Why was collaborative planning not used in some cases?

3. What benefits were derived from engaging in collaborative planning? For example:
    - More informed decision-making
    - More effective and stable outcomes
    - Common ownership and shared understanding of the issue(s)
    - Improved conservation/environmental outcomes

4. What costs were associated with engaging in collaborative planning? For example:
    - Increased demand on resources, time and/or staff
    - Undesirable outcome(s)

5. What are the challenges associated with engaging in a collaborative planning process on these lands (recognized at the time of collaboration, as well as in hindsight)? How did participants deal with these challenges?

6. What are the measures of success for collaborative planning on state trust land?
    - How did the participants measure "success" within these collaborative efforts?
    - What are objective measures of "success" for these collaborative efforts?
    - How do the objective measures of "success" compare within the selected collaborative efforts and what common themes are illuminated in a cross-case analysis?

7. How do the collaborative efforts compare within the context of the participants' measures of success, as well as within the context of the objective measures of success? What common themes can be illuminated in cross-case analysis?

These research questions guided the literature review and formation of interview questions for the cases.

2) CREATION OF AN ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK AND COMPLETION OF BACKGROUND LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to effectively analyze the literature on collaborative planning and state trust land management, the research team created an analysis framework through which to interpret the literature. This framework was used to categorize the information gathered in the background literature review. The framework was based on the team's research questions and helped formulate the interview questions in a later phase of the research. The research team divided the relevant literature into several categories and assigned team members to research sources for each of the categories. These categories included literature on state trust lands, general collaboration and collaborative planning, collaboration on public lands, case study research methods and relevant articles from the project client's websites. From this list, the research team isolated key resources and then completed the framework for each key resource. The frameworks served as a basis for understanding and compiling the literature relevant to the project's focus.

3) PRELIMINARY CASE INVESTIGATION AND CASE SELECTION

Case selection involved three steps.

1. To identify all relevant instances of collaborative planning on state trust land from states west of the Mississippi that still held substantial amounts of state trust land.

2. To identify case selection criteria from which the total number of identified cases would be narrowed down to eight, apply those criteria to the cases and select an initial 19 possible cases.

3. To narrow down the cases to a final eight based on the case selection criteria, create research teams and assign teams to research the various cases.

STEP ONE

The first step in case selection was to research state trust land planning processes in 18 of the states west of the Mississippi, including Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, Wyoming and Utah. California was excluded since it no longer has a significant amount of state trust land. Each team member researched potential collaborative cases within two of these states. In identifying all possible cases, the researchers used the following definition of collaborative planning:

> ***A transparent process where multiple stakeholders who represent various interests have an opportunity to influence or affect decision making***.

The research team formulated this definition using the following three dimensions: (1) the breadth of stakeholders involved, (2) the degree of transparency of the decision-making process and (3) the degree of influence the stakeholders had on the decision. The team used these dimensions and the definition of collaboration to guide the identification of potential cases. Methods of investigation included internet research, examining the states' annual reports and phone calls and emails to state land departments to gather additional information.

Basic talking points for phone interviews were as follows:

1. I'm just in the beginning stages of my research and am trying to learn more about state trust land management in the west. Could you tell me a little more about how your state approaches trust land management?
2. Are there examples of state trust land planning efforts in your state that have included participants from outside the agency or where managers used a collaborative approach to decision making?
3. Do you have any suggestions for other people I should talk to or reports or websites I should research?

Forty-two possible cases were identified from this process (Table 3-1).

STEP TWO

The second phase of case selection was to develop case selection criteria. These case selection criteria included:

- Geographic representation
- Level of completion
- Range of size
- Issue range
- Level of information available
- Impetus for collaboration
- Scope of the plan

The research team determined a desired distribution for cases within these criteria (Table 3-2).

Nineteen of the 42 identified cases that fit the definition of collaboration most closely were submitted to these case selection criteria (Table 3-1).

STEP THREE

The third and final step of case selection was to assess the 19 cases and narrow the selection down to eight, develop research teams and assign research teams to cases. The goal of the final narrowing down was to compile a set of cases that exemplified the breadth of geography, land use, parcel sizes and types of collaborative planning found in Western state trust land. The research design allowed for eight total case studies, with a pair of researchers working on each case, and each team member working on a total of two cases. Thus, the research team selected eight cases that best fit the selection criteria, with the addition of three alternates to choose from if one of the original eight cases was later found to be unsuitable.

Table 3-1: Cases Identified from Step One

State	Case Name
Arizona	Altar Valley Conservation Alliance*
	Desert Hills Conceptual Planning Process
	Empire Ranch – Biological Planning Team*
	Houghton Area Master Plan Process*
	Sonoran Desert Invasive Species Council*
Colorado	Baca Ranch./Great Sand Dunes National Park*
	Emerald Mountain Planning Process*
	Kremmling*
	Lowry Air Force Base*
Idaho	Coeur d'Alene Timber Sale*
Kansas	---
Minnesota	---
Mississippi	---
Montana	Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process*
	Strategic Plan for Trust Land Management
Nebraska	---
Nevada	---
New Mexico	Mesa del Sol Planning Process*
	Southeast New Mexico Working Group*
	Vecinos del Rio*
North Dakota	Coordinated Resource Management Plan
Oklahoma	Lake Texoma Lodge and Park*
Oregon	Elliott State Forest Planning Process*
	Public Land Management Plan Working Group
South Dakota	State Trust Land Advisory Council
Texas	Padre Island National Seashore Oil Drilling
Utah	Castle Valley Planning Process*
	Coral Canyon, St. George
	Desert Tortoise, St. George
	Dwarf Bear Claw Poppy
	Eagle Mountain, Utah County
	Fort Pierce Industrial Park, St. George
	Hidden Valley and Fossil Hills, St. George
	Nine Mile Canyon
	Onion Hill, near Moab
	Orgill Distribution Site, near Hurricane
	Prairie Dogs, Wayne County
	South Block, St. George*
	Stephen's Canyon, Cedar City*
	Stream Restoration, Cache County
Washington	Conservation Assessment
	Cooperative Planning Efforts with San Juan County
	Conservation of 237 Acres of Open Space
	Lake Whatcom Landscape Management Planning Process*
	Wildfire Protection Plans
Wyoming	Policy Decision with Public Comment
	State-Wide Strategic Planning Process
*Cases that were selected as the 19 semi-finalists in Step Two.	

Table 3-2: Case Selection Criteria Requirements

Criteria Category	Desired Distribution
Geographic Representation	Represent a minimum of 6 states
Level of Completion	At least 50-75% completed
Range of Sizes	Wide range of sizes represented
Issue Range	6 land use, 2 natural resource based
Level of Information Available	Maximum amount of information available
Impetus for Collaboration	Mandated v. voluntary (both represented)
Scope of the Plan	Both short-term and long-term plans included

The final eight cases included:

- Castle Valley Planning Process (Utah)
- Elliott State Forest Planning Process (Oregon)
- Emerald Mountain Planning Process (Colorado)
- Houghton Area Master Plan Process (Arizona)
- Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process (Washington)
- Mesa del Sol Planning Process (New Mexico)
- Southeast New Mexico Working Group (New Mexico)
- Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process (Montana)

These final eight cases fit the selection criteria because (Table 3-3):

- The cases represented seven **different states** (Arizona, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah and Washington);
- Greater than 60 percent of the cases' processes were **completed**;
- The cases represented a **wide range of land parcel sizes**;
- Six cases dealt with **land use issues** while two dealt with **natural resource issues**;
- All cases had **sufficient information** available;
- The cases involved both **mandatory and voluntary** processes;
- Two cases related to **short-term** planning and six related to **long-term** planning.

In response to a request from the team, the research team advisor helped designate eight total case research teams by matching the team members' individual case preferences, schedules and skill sets. The research design matched each individual researcher with two different researchers in order to ensure adequate mixing of skills and experience. Each case research team prioritized its preferences for specific cases, and all researchers participated in assigning the teams to cases according to these preferences. Each team then assumed the responsibility for researching the background of its assigned case and conducting on-site interviews at the case location.

Table 3-3: How the Final Eight Cases Fit the Selection Criteria

Selection Criteria	
Desired Distribution	**Selected Cases' Distribution**
Represent minimum 6 states (Include UT, NM, AZ, CO)	7 States (AZ,NM,OR,WA, CO, UT, MT)
50-75% Completed, fewer current or ongoing	5/8 completed >60%
Wide range of sizes	3,000 (Mesa Del Sol) to 109,000 (Southeast New Mexico Working Group)
6 land use, 2 natural resource	6 land use, 2 natural resource
Include those with most information available for a richer analysis	Sufficient
Mandated vs. Voluntary (include both)	1 Mandated, 7 Voluntary
Short term planning verses long-term planning	2 ST, 6 LT

4) DEVELOPMENT OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The research team developed interview questions that served to address the research questions to be used in the on-site case interviews. The research team based the interview questions on additional information gathered from the background literature review, from input from the project advisor and client and from the stated objectives of the project (to assess the benefits, costs, challenges, facilitating factors and lessons learned from collaborative planning on state trust land). The research team reviewed the initial set of interview questions multiple times and made changes to the content and form of the questions throughout the first three phases of the research process (see Appendix, Exhibit 1).

5) DEVELOPMENT OF WESTERN STATES LAND COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE PRESENTATION AND INFORMATION GATHERING

During the first four phases of research, the research team worked on developing a presentation and panel discussion session for the Western States Land Commissioners Association (WSLCA) conference held in July 2005 in Breckenridge, Colorado. The purpose of presenting at this conference was twofold: (1) to propose the research concept to an audience of state trust land commissioners and other conference participants and (2) to solicit feedback on the research concept and methods in order to refine the interview questions and research approach.

The team created the following products for this Conference: (1) a color executive summary brochure of the project's goals and selected cases, (2) a presentation to WSLCA conference attendees and (3) a facilitated panel discussion about the project's research design, methods and desired products. Panel members included Mark Winkleman, Commissioner of the Arizona State Land Department; Tom Schultz, Trust Land Administrator of the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation; and Ric McBrier, Assistant Director of Planning and Development of Utah's School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration. Feedback and comments from WSLCA participants provided guidance on the specific research questions and helpful products that could be developed to communicate the results of the study.

6) COMPLETION OF CASE RESEARCH AND CASE STUDY WRITING

The eight case research teams conducted background research on their cases, identified potential participants to interview, conducted informal initial phone interviews with potential interviewees and scheduled the in-person interviews during May through July 2005. Prior to conducting the interviews, case research teams sent follow-up letters to interviewees confirming the date and time of scheduled interviews and providing additional details about the project (see Appendix, Exhibit 2). The case research teams also provided an informed consent document to each interviewee and obtained verbal consent prior to conducting all interviews (see Appendix, Exhibit 3).

The case research teams conducted on-site case research in August 2005. Each case research team conducted between 11 and 17 interviews per case, each lasting approximately one to two hours. The teams attempted to garner the broadest possible base of stakeholder representation in their interviews, in order to get as full a picture of the case details as possible. The number of interviews conducted varied from team to team based on the types and numbers of stakeholders involved in that case. When permission was granted by the interviewee, interviews were digitally recorded and then later transcribed and/or summarized by the case research teams.

Interview transcriptions and summaries; notes taken during the interviews; supplemental materials; and information from archival research, internet sources and interviewees served as the data for each case. Several case research teams conducted follow up phone interviews with participants who they had interviewed in person in order to ask follow-up questions or to obtain clarification. In addition, some of the case research teams conducted phone interviews with other case participants who could not be interviewed in person.

After the research was completed, the research teams wrote in-depth case studies during the fall 2005. Each case study had one lead author who was one of the primary researchers for that case. Each lead case study author wrote a summary of the state trust land background for the state in which the case took place; a synopsis of the events of the planning process in the case; and an analysis of the benefits, costs, challenges, facilitating factors and lessons learned about collaborative planning from the case. Each author based his or her analysis on themes that emerged from interview transcriptions and notes and other supplemental materials used in the case research. The case research partner then edited their partner's draft case study for content, interpretation and grammar. The research team then peer-reviewed cases in which they were not involved for both content and grammar. The project advisor and clients also were provided opportunity to comment on the draft case studies, which were edited accordingly.

After lead authors made all relevant changes to their case studies, they sent them to all interviewees who were directly quoted in the document to get approval to use the quotes and to check for errors in fact or representation. Case study authors then made the appropriate changes to the cases.

7) DEVELOPMENT OF CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

The research team developed a framework for cross-case analysis through a brainstorming session during which all of the case research teams shared their initial perceptions of the major benefits, costs, challenges, facilitating factors and lessons learned from their cases. The area of overlap between the cases served as the beginning of a matrix that served as the basic framework for cross-case analysis. The information in the matrix was augmented by adding in cross-case comparisons by the team advisor and individual team members.

Additionally, the research team held a cross-case analysis charrette, where all team members and the project advisor contributed ideas to creating the outline and substance for the cross-case analysis section. After the charrette, team members, the project advisor and the project clients helped continue to shape the cross-case analysis outline. After the cross-case analysis outline was completed, the research team assigned individual section writers to each section, and those section writers were responsible for researching and drawing the key lessons from all of the case studies that were relevant for their section(s).

8) CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDIES

Each cross-case analysis section writer analyzed and wrote about a specific theme of the cross-case analysis such as legal issues, motivating factors or leadership. To do so, each writer read and analyzed all eight completed case studies and looked for common themes, similarities and differences regarding the theme in question. The author also based his or her writing on the content that emerged during the cross-case analysis charrette. The cross-case analysis sections also included discussion of relevant lessons from the collaborative planning literature where relevant.

9) DEVELOPMENT OF BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After having written the case studies and cross-case analysis sections, the research team brainstormed a set of best management practices and recommendations based on the full set of lessons learned and cross-case analysis from the eight cases. To do so, the research team held a charrette to jointly develop best management practices and recommendations for overcoming the barriers to successful collaborative planning involving state trust land. During this charrette, the research team developed the basic categorization and substance for the list of best management practices and recommendations. The best management practices focused on providing on-the-ground guidance for collaborative planning processes on state trust land that are getting started or currently ongoing. The recommendations addressed the broader context of challenges that impede collaboration on state trust land, providing a bigger-picture and often longer-term recommendations to overcome those barriers.

APPENDIX

Exhibit 1: Interview Questions

Exhibit 2: Sample Follow-Up Letter

Exhibit 3: Informed Consent Form

Exhibit 1

Interview Questions

1. **Could you please tell us a bit about how you were involved with this process?**
    - **a.** How long were you involved?
    - **b.** At what point in the process did you join? Initiator? Invited?
    - **c.** What issues did you weigh before joining? Risks and benefits?
    - **d.** Did you feel like this process was collaborative?
    - **e.** Have you been involved in a collaborative planning process before?

2. **Could you please tell us about how this situation unfolded?**
    - **a.** How would similar projects normally be undertaken?

3. **Why did you / your organization participate?** *(benefits)*
    - **a.** What did you hope to accomplish?
    - **b.** What were some of the positive outcomes of the process? Anything unexpected? (ex: resource sharing, relationships, more effective and stable outcomes, common ownership and shared understanding of the issue(s), more informed decision making etc.)
    - **c.** What was the quality of the relationships that developed? (face to face? Phone or email? Friendships?)
    - **d.** How did relationships within the group evolve over time? Predictions for future?
    - **e.** How were discussions structured? (formal bargaining, open discussion, etc.) How were decisions made? (consensus, majority vote, by a facilitator, etc.)
    - **f.** How did you feel about the effectiveness of the facilitator? About the structure of the process?

4. **Was the process successful?**
    - **a.** Were your goals achieved? (SLB/school: trust revenue goals met?)
    - **b.** Were other stakeholders satisfied?
    - **c.** What made it successful (or what elements were successful)? *(facilitating factors)*
    - **d.** What made it unsuccessful (or what elements were unsuccessful)?
    - **e.** Was this a fair process? (Did it feel inclusive or exclusive? Was your voice heard?)
    - **f.** Would you collaborate again in the future? (Was this a "value-added" activity?)
    - **g.** What would the outcome have been under "normal" circumstances?
    - **h.** What did the group do well?

5. **What were the costs associated with participating?**
    - **a.** Increased demands on resources, time, staff?
    - **b.** Unsatisfactory outcomes?
    - **c.** Anything else you/your org sacrificed by participating?

Exhibit 1 **(cont.)**

Interview Questions

6. What were the challenges of collaborating?

(Note: allow the person to brainstorm their own list of challenges, but bring a back-up list in case they don't. Also, ask individuals about the critical challenges others mentioned in their interviews.)

- **a.** Challenges group encountered? *(brainstorm list)*
- **b.** Did you reach an impasse or stall? (Did anyone threaten to leave, or give ultimatums? How was this resolved?)
- **c.** Challenges you/your organization encountered? *(brainstorm list)*
- **d.** Challenges unique to state trust land?
- **e.** Did you / the group receive outside criticisms? Response?

7. How did you overcome these challenges?

- **a.** Group challenges *(pick from their list)*
- **b.** You / your organization's challenges *(pick from their list)*

8. How did you feel about your involvement? (excited, tired, silenced, frustrated?)

- **a.** Was this a productive use of your time?

9. How did your organization feel about your involvement?

- **a.** Support or encouragement? Suspicion? (colleagues, superiors) Did this fit in with the culture of your organization?
- **b.** Is your organization structured to be able to do this? Process consistent with mission and goals? How different? How reconciled?
- **c.** Any legal restrictions, or regulatory constraints?

10. What advice do you have for others considering a similar collaborative planning process on state trust lands?

- **a.** What is critical to success? Essential elements?
- **b.** Anything the group should have done differently?

11. Is collaborative planning on state trust lands different from using the approach to address other public lands issues?

- **a.** What kinds of issues is collaboration useful in resolving, and what kinds is it not?
- **b.** What challenges face STL management in the future? How to address?

12. Anything else to share? Is there something else you think I should be asking participants? Anyone else we should talk to?

Exhibit 1 (cont.)

Interview Questions

Informational Questions

Ask these to first one or two interviewees to confirm logistics of process. Possibly confirm with others, or take note of (and then probe about) responses that offer conflicting information.

1. Who was involved?
2. What happened?
3. How did this process get started?
4. Of participants, who played important roles in the process? Who were leaders? Obstructionists?
5. Who were the dominant voices?
6. Anyone you would like to have participated, but didn't? Anyone refused? Excluded?
7. Common goals identified? How?
8. Initial vision statement? How developed? (copy?)
9. How did group set agenda? Priorities?
10. What was decision-making process? (consensus, majority, etc.)
11. Ground rules established?
12. Leadership structure? How determined?
13. Professional moderator?
14. Plans for future work together?

Exhibit 2

Sample Follow-Up Letter

Dear **[Interviewee Name]**,

On behalf of our research team, I would like to thank you for agreeing to be interviewed as part of our research project on state trust land management. I am following up in order to give you more information on the project and to explain the interview process. As we discussed by **[email/phone]**, the interview is scheduled for **[date/time]** and I will **[come to your office at *address*/call you at interviewee's telephone number**].

The interview should take approximately one hour. If necessary, I may contact you a second time for further information or clarification. With your consent, the interview will be recorded to ensure the accuracy of our research. In addition, please let us know if there are other people you believe may be interested in sharing their experiences.

Our research team of eight students formed in March 2005 at the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment to investigate collaborative planning on state trust land. Under the guidance of Steven L. Yaffee, the Theodore Roosevelt Professor of Ecosystem Management and Director of the Ecosystem Management Initiative at the University of Michigan, our team will prepare a series of case studies in seven western states of recent planning processes in which state trust land departments collaborated with stakeholder groups in the planning and management of specific trust-owned land. Through in-depth interviews, our research team will seek to answer a set of research questions concerning the challenges, benefits, costs and outcomes of collaborative planning on state trust lands. The goal of the project is to identify the advantages and disadvantages of engaging in collaborative planning in state trust land management and to define a set of best management practices for these processes.

Should you have questions regarding your role as a participant in research, please contact:

Institutional Review Board
1040 Fleming Building
503 Thompson Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
734-936-0933; email: irbhsbs@umich.edu

Thank you in advance for your participation! I look forward to speaking with you about **[city/location's]** trust land planning process. If you have any questions, I can be reached at the contact information below.

Best Regards,

[Researcher's Name and Contact Information]

Exhibit 3

Informed Consent Form

Purpose of this Interview:

This interview is being conducted as part of a project exploring the use of collaboration in decision making regarding state trust land. As a participant in the interviewing process, you will help the research team learn more about the process of collaboration in a specific case regarding state trust land. The information given below is intended to clarify your role in the interview process. If you have any additional questions, please ask us, the researchers.

Voluntary Nature of Participation:

Your participation in this project is entirely voluntary. You may ask questions before, during, or after the interview. You may choose to participate or not, skip any questions you choose not to answer, or withdraw at any time, without any consequences to you. The only foreseeable risk to your participation in this interview is a breach of confidentiality, should you wish to have your comments remain confidential. However, all possible measures will be taken to ensure that confidentiality is protected. Should you have any questions regarding your participation in the interview, you may feel free to contact a member of the research team or the University of Michigan Institutional Review Board, whose contact information can be found at the end of this document. Benefits of your participation in this interview include your contribution to the body of knowledge regarding collaborative decision making on state trust land.

Content of the Interview:

Questions regarding your participation in or knowledge about the collaborative effort in question will be asked during the interview, which is expected to last approximately one (1) hour. Should we need additional clarification regarding your comments, we would like to request permission to contact you again in the future.

Confidentiality of Information Collected:

With your permission, we would like to use audio recording devices during the interview to ensure accuracy of the discussion. If, for any reason, you do not wish to be recorded, audio recording devices will not be used, and you may still participate in the interview, if you so choose. Direct quotations used for this project will be submitted to you for your review to ensure accuracy. You may refuse to be quoted by name in association with all or part of your commentary.

We will keep confidential the notes, recordings, and transcripts from your interview to the extent provided by federal, state and local law. The recordings of this interview will be erased and/or destroyed after two (2) years of the interview date.

Exhibit 3 (cont.)

Informed Consent Form

Documentation of this Consent:

One copy of this document will be kept together with our research records on this project. You will receive a second copy to keep.

Contact Information:

Researchers:
[NAME]
[ADDRESS]
[PHONE]
[EMAIL]

Should you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant in research, please contact:

Institutional Review Board
Kate Keever
540 East Liberty Street, Suite 202
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2210
734-936-0933
email: irbhsbs@umich.edu

Consent of the Participant:

I understand the meaning of this information. Ms. / Mr. _______________ and Ms. / Mr. _______________ (names of group members conducting interview) have offered to answer any questions I may have concerning the project.

I hereby consent to participate in the project.

(***Get verbal consent***)