

# **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:



**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](http://www.sonoran.org)



**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.lincolnst.edu](http://www.lincolnst.edu)



**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/](http://www.snre.umich.edu/ecomgt/)



**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](http://www.snre.umich.edu)

## **WHAT MOTIVATES AND SUSTAINS A COLLABORATIVE PLANNING PROCESS?**

Collaboration is one of many decision-making models used to address natural resource management issues. There are a number of reasons the parties involved in the eight cases of collaborative planning on state trust land discussed in this report chose collaboration over other decision-making models. These cases also provide a range of reasons why the collaborative model was sustained throughout the decision-making process. The following topics inform what motivates and sustains a collaborative process:

- Factors that motivate a collaborative decision-making model
- Reasons parties join a collaborative effort
- Barriers to collaboration
- Factors that sustain collaboration
- Reasons collaborative efforts conclude

### **FACTORS THAT MOTIVATE A COLLABORATIVE DECISION-MAKING MODEL**

Scholars of collaborative processes have identified many reasons why parties choose a collaborative model as a method of decision-making. In some cases, collaboration is chosen because parties have become frustrated with the process and outcome of traditional decision-making models, or have exhausted other options for making progress on resolving an issue.<sup>1</sup> In other cases, individuals and groups turn to collaboration because of the inclusive forum these processes create in which a range of interested parties can come together to work through issues together.<sup>2</sup> In addition, parties often choose collaboration because of a shared sense of threat or a sense of place expressed as concern for the future of an area.<sup>3</sup> Common goals, previous relationships between individuals involved in an issue and public pressure can also motivate the creation of a collaborative process.<sup>4</sup> The nature of the collaborative model also offers the potential for parties to share resources and expertise.<sup>5</sup>

The parties involved in the eight cases explored in this report chose a collaborative model of decision making for a range of reasons. These included a sense of a shared threat, a sense of place, a set of common goals and public pressure (Table 13-1).

**Table 13-1: Factors that Motivated Collaboration**

CASE	Sense of Threat	Sense of Place	Common Goals	Public Pressure
Castle Valley Planning Process	✓	✓		✓
Elliott State Forest Planning Process	✓		✓	
Emerald Mountain Planning Process	✓	✓		
Houghton Area Master Plan Process			✓	✓
Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process	✓			✓
Mesa del Sol Planning Process			✓	
Southeast New Mexico Working Group	✓		✓	
Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process	✓	✓		✓

**SENSE OF A COMMON THREAT**

The sense of a common threat can be a powerful motivating factor in collaborative processes. A common response to a perceived threat is to join together with others to address it. In six of the eight cases a collaborative planning process was convened in response to a sense of a threat. These threats included the potential of increased development in an area valued by local residents for scenic beauty, recreational opportunities or more traditional land uses like ranching; the perception that certain land management practices had the potential to negatively affect public safety; and the potential for restricted use and revenue production activities on state trust land because of the implications of potential endangered species issues.

Following a sale of trust land by Utah’s School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) at the base of Parriott Mesa, a prominent natural feature in the desert surrounding Castle Valley, Utah, residents felt threatened by the possibility that more trust land in the area might be sold. Residents were concerned about the possibility of increased development in the area as a result of this and potential future sales. In response to this perceived threat, a series of events unfolded into the creation of the collaborative Castle Valley Planning Process. The community of Castle Valley reacted in two ways: a citizen group called the Castle Rock Collaboration (CRC) formed to address concerns surrounding the land sale and the town of Castle Valley expressed interest in rezoning trust land within the boundaries of Castle Valley to much lower density which would discourage development of the land if it were sold in the

future.<sup>6</sup> SITLA expressed concern about the potential rezoning and recommended that the community and town engage with SITLA in a collaborative planning process instead of pursuing the rezoning effort. CRC members had similarly considered a collaborative planning process. Thus, the town, members of CRC and SITLA agreed to engage in the collaborative Castle Valley Planning Process that worked to explore options for further development and conservation in Castle Valley. According to John Andrews, Associate Director of Administration for SITLA, “It made more sense to talk than fight.”<sup>7</sup>

Road widening actions taken by the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) in preparation for a timber sale near Lake Whatcom in Bellingham, Washington drew the attention of local community members living around the lake. Because of a destructive landslide in 1983 that many in the community perceived to have been exacerbated by decades-old logging practices in the area, community members felt that the DNR’s intended logging would threaten both their safety and the water quality of Lake Whatcom. In response to this threat, two residents, with the support of hundreds of others in the community, decided to try to work with state legislators to change the forest policy laws in their area. Their efforts ultimately resulted in a bill mandating that the DNR create a collaborative committee for the development of a landscape management plan for the area.<sup>8</sup>

The Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) responded to increased development inquiries in Whitefish by initiating a neighborhood planning process. The purpose of the process was threefold: to develop a way to assess potential trust land uses in the area; to address the zoning, infrastructure and public services disparities between trust land and adjoining private property; and to educate local government and members of the public about state trust lands. Some community members felt that the potential development would threaten the traditional timber uses of the land and limit or destroy recreational access to this trust land area. Motivated by these perceived threats, community members persuaded the Montana State Board of Land Commissioners to charter a Whitefish School Trust Lands Advisory Committee to work collaboratively with the DNRC on a neighborhood plan for the area.

In response to rising real estate prices in Steamboat Springs, Colorado, the Colorado State Land Board (SLB) began to consider the possibility of selling a large parcel of state trust land in the area - which happened to comprise a large portion of scenic Emerald Mountain- for development purposes. The area traditionally had been used for grazing and appreciated for its open space and some residents of Steamboat Springs, concerned about increased development already occurring in the area, felt that the potential development of Emerald Mountain further threatened the community’s agricultural heritage and scenic views. Many also valued the area as open space and for the recreational opportunities it could provide, however recreation was prohibited on all Colorado state trust lands. In response to these concerns, the community and the SLB began a collaborative process to develop options for conserving the land and collecting the market value of the parcel for the trust.

Both the Elliott State Forest Planning Process and the Southeast New Mexico Working Group cases are examples of a collaborative process convened to alleviate the threats of a wildlife species being listed as federally threatened or endangered species. There would be significant negative financial repercussions for the state trust land management agencies were this listing to

occur. In the case of the Elliott State Forest Planning Process the two agencies that manage the forest, the Oregon Departments of State Lands and Forestry, decided to convene a collaborative planning process to draft a multi-species Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the area. Instead of revising the existing HCP, the agencies decided that developing a plan that included species that might become listed as endangered or threatened would provide them with more long term management certainty. In New Mexico, the State Land Office, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the Bureau of Land Management, conservationists and many in the oil and gas and ranching communities recognized that there was a threat of “tremendous economic fallout” should the prairie chicken and sand dune lizard be listed under the Endangered Species Act,<sup>9</sup> coupled with an opportunity for conservation. In response to this threat and in pursuit of this opportunity, these interests convened to address prairie chicken and sand dune lizard conservation in southeast New Mexico.

## **SENSE OF PLACE**

A sense of place can be a very important element in why collaborative efforts begin. The term is often used to refer to the connection that humans have with their natural surroundings. Places which “display three primary characteristics: a landscape setting, a set of associated activities, and a significance to people.”<sup>10</sup> In three of the eight cases community members’ sense of place played a major role in the initiation of the collaborative planning process. In each of these cases local residents appreciated the state trust land in their community for its beauty, the activities it supported and the meaning its present and future condition held for them.

The residents of Steamboat Springs, Colorado involved in the Emerald Mountain Planning Process were concerned about preserving Routt County’s agricultural heritage and open space. They valued the state trust land on Emerald Mountain for its scenic beauty, rangeland, wildlife habitat and the potential recreational opportunities it could provide. Many felt that the possible sale and development of this land would threaten these elements of the area they cherished. Residents’ mutual concern for the fate of the Emerald Mountain parcel inspired them to begin meeting together to brainstorm potential solutions that could meet the needs of grazing lessees, recreators and adjacent landowners – user groups who had at times been in conflict with one another. This mutual concern and a sense of place was one of the factors that initiated the collaborative Emerald Mountain Planning Process.

The sense of place felt by members of Whitefish, Montana for the state trust land in their area was very similar to that of the residents of Steamboat Springs, Colorado. The beauty, recreational opportunities and traditional timber uses of the land were significant for residents in the Whitefish area. Their interest in conserving the land and in preserving this connection with the landscape was one of the major reasons why the community lobbied the State Land Board for the creation of an Advisory Committee and hence a more inclusive process.

The small town of Castle Valley, Utah is surrounded by vast amounts of strikingly beautiful open space. Many of the town’s residents describe themselves as “urban runaways” or “renegades” and have a sense of place that comes from the solitude and natural beauty offered by such a landscape.<sup>11</sup> The potential for increased development in the area, highlighted by the sale of trust

land at the edge of town, motivated many residents to come together to seek a collaborative solution to deal with issues that would negatively affect their sense of place.

## **COMMON GOALS**

The presence of a shared goal or goals also can be a strong motivating factor in the initiation of collaborative processes. Just as people band together in the face of a threat, it is equally natural for people working toward a common goal to seek each other out. In four of the eight cases the recognition and pursuit of a common goal was also a major factor in the creation of the collaborative planning effort.

As part of a comprehensive growth strategy, the City of Tucson's Department of Urban Planning and Design decided to develop the Houghton Area Master Plan in order to guide the development of a large, mostly undeveloped area on the southeast edge of town. The city recognized that its goal of developing the area was shared by that of the majority landowner in the area, the Arizona State Land Department, and that many local residents also had an interest in helping define how the land could be developed. The city's creation of the Citizen's Review Committee provided a collaborative forum within which all interested parties could explore this common goal together.

The common goal pursued in the Mesa del Sol Planning Process was to develop a plan for a large tract of state trust land on the outskirts of Albuquerque, New Mexico that minimized sprawl and maximized revenue for the State Land Office (SLO). Although there was no formal collaborative process followed by the three New Mexico SLO Commissioners who were most involved in the development of the plan, they did pursue an ongoing effort to solicit and encourage input from interested parties.

The overarching reason for the initiation of both the Southeast New Mexico Working Group and the Elliott State Forest Planning Process was to create a plan to help provide long-term management and revenue generation certainty from the uses of the land. In both cases potential restrictions related to federally threatened or endangered species were creating a sense of land management uncertainty for various parties. In both cases the collaborative processes were initiated because of a shared goal to eliminate potential management restrictions by developing plans that either attempted to prevent the need for listing of a species, as with the Southeast New Mexico Working Group, or to mitigate the effects of such an occurrence, as in the Elliott State Forest Planning Process.

## **PUBLIC PRESSURE**

Collaborative processes also are often initiated as the result of public pressure to do so. In four of the eight cases the public's interest in being involved in a decision-making process concerning state trust land led to the initiation of a collaborative planning process.

In the case of the Houghton Area Master Plan Process, the City of Tucson's Department of Urban Planning and Design convened a collaborative planning process in part as a response to two sources of public pressure. One was a more general sense of pressure to use a collaborative

model because of the way the city perceived the community expected to be engaged.<sup>12</sup> The other source of pressure was residents of the southeastern part of town. Council Member Shirley Scott who represents Ward Four, of which the Houghton Road area is a part, had previously convened a citizen-based collaborative group to address planning concerns in the area. The existence of this group and the citizen interest it represented also affected the city's decision to initiate a collaborative planning process.

The Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process was a direct result of public and political pressure on the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to convene a collaborative group to address planning issues on state trust land in the Lake Whatcom watershed. Two citizens in particular worked with state legislators to have their concerns, and those of hundreds of other area residents, heard and addressed. The result of their efforts was a bill requiring the DNR to initiate a collaborative process to develop a management plan for the area.

In an effort to become more involved in a neighborhood plan for 13,000 acres of state trust lands in the Whitefish, Montana area, residents of Whitefish lobbied the State Land Board to convene a stakeholders group to work collaboratively with the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC). In response, the State Land Board chartered the Whitefish School Trust Lands Advisory Committee as a venue for interested stakeholders to participate in the decision-making process with the DNRC.

## **REASONS PARTIES JOIN A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT**

Participants in collaborative processes have an interest in the outcome of the process and are motivated to join by different reasons. An analysis of the eight cases reveals a number of reasons why participants in those collaborative planning processes got involved (Table 13-2). These reasons include having a financial stake in the outcome and a personal interest or professional interest in the outcome.



**Table 13-2: Reasons Parties Chose to Join the Collaborative Process**

<b>CASE</b>	<b>Financial Stake</b>	<b>Professional Interest</b>	<b>Personal Interest</b>
<b>Castle Valley Planning Process</b>		✓	✓
<b>Elliott State Forest Planning Process</b>	✓	✓	
<b>Emerald Mountain Planning Process</b>	✓	✓	✓
<b>Houghton Area Master Plan Process</b>		✓	✓
<b>Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process</b>		✓	✓
<b>Mesa del Sol Planning Process</b>	✓	✓	
<b>Southeast New Mexico Working Group</b>	✓	✓	
<b>Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process</b>		✓	✓

**FINANCIAL STAKE**

Although the subject of all eight of the cases examined in this report was state trust land, the state trust land agencies were not the only parties at the table with a financial stake in the outcome of the process. In four of the eight cases, interested parties joined the collaborative process because of an interest in helping shape a decision that would affect them financially.

Many of the ranchers and oil and gas industry professionals involved in the Southeast New Mexico Working group joined the effort to develop a conservation plan for the prairie chicken and sand dune lizard out of concern for how their livelihoods could be negatively affected if the two species were listed as endangered. Were the species to be listed, oil and gas drilling and grazing activities would be greatly restricted and revenues from these activities would fall. Similarly, in Steamboat Spring, Colorado, longtime state trust land grazing lessee Jim Stanko also had a financial stake in the outcome of the collaborative Emerald Mountain Planning Process. Had the area been developed, he would have lost access to a significant amount of land his family had ranched for three generations. Additionally, a trust beneficiary representative joined both the Elliott State Forest Planning Process and the Mesa del Sol Planning Process because of the direct financial effect decisions involving management of state trust land have on the revenue generated for the trust.

**PROFESSIONAL INTEREST**

The inclusive nature of the collaborative decision-making model encourages parties with an interest in the benefits of the process and the outcome to get involved. In all of the eight cases there were participants who joined the collaborative process because of a professional interest in the benefits of the process or the outcome. Many of them represented a constituency of people

involved in conservation, resource regulation, resource extraction, recreation, planning or development.

Joining the collaborative effort provided a way to give their professional interests a voice in the decision-making process and to have their concerns addressed. For example, Bill McCourt, a representative from the city of Bellingham and a water quality specialist, got involved in the Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process out of an interest in aligning Department of Natural Resources forest practices with water quality initiatives for Lake Whatcom he'd worked on in the past.<sup>13</sup>

Many participants also joined a collaborative process because being involved would give them the opportunity to further inform their professional work. For example, Linda Morales, an urban planning consultant in Tucson, Arizona had a professional interest in being involved in the Houghton Area Master Plan Process because knowing what kinds of planning were being discussed in the area helped her provide reliable information about the process to her clients.<sup>14</sup>

### **PERSONAL INTEREST**

In five of the eight cases participants joined the collaborative processes because of a personal interest in either the area that would be affected by the decision, or how the decision would affect them personally. All of the cases that were initiated because of a perceived threat to community members' sense of place – the Castle Valley Planning Process, the Emerald Mountain Planning Process and the Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process – included participants with a personal interest in how the outcome would affect the undeveloped nature of the state trust land in the future. In addition, urban planning consultant Linda Morales noted that in addition to her professional interest in being involved in the Houghton Area Master Plan Process, she also had a personal interest in being involved in how Tucson developed because of the attachment she felt to the city as her home.<sup>15</sup> In the Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process the reason Linda Marrom, one of the citizen representatives on the committee, got involved was because of the perception that state trust land management activities in the area had the potential to endanger her safety and those of her neighbors.<sup>16</sup>

### **BARRIERS TO COLLABORATION**

---

Barriers to collaboration can be either reasons parties could not join a collaborative effort, or reasons they discontinued their participation in a collaborative effort. As Yaffee notes, barriers to collaboration can fall within four main categories including attitudes about the process, particular process elements, technical factors and the institutional context in which the collaborative effort occurs.<sup>17</sup> Some participants in all eight cases examined in this report experienced different kinds of barriers to participating or continuing to participate in the collaborative planning efforts (Table 13-3). The reasons fall under this basic framework and include interpersonal differences like personality conflicts or feelings of alienation from the group, the perception of an ineffective process, limited financial resources or time, conflicting goals, restrictions of the process structure such as a limited group size and professional changes like a group member's retirement or change in job.

## INTERPERSONAL ISSUES

Interpersonal barriers to continued collaboration were mentioned in only one of the eight cases in this report. Steamboat Springs, Colorado rancher Jim Stanko decided to leave the Emerald Mountain Planning Process after losing his lease on state trust land in the area as part of a land exchange with the Bureau of Land Management. Once his connection with the land being discussed by the group was severed, he felt alienated from the group.

**Table 13-3: Barriers to Collaboration**

CASE	Interpersonal Issues	Ineffective Process	Limited Resources	Conflicting Goals	Process Structure Restrictions	Professional Changes
Castle Valley Planning Process				✓		
Elliott State Forest Planning Process					✓	✓
Emerald Mountain Planning Process	✓			✓	✓	✓
Houghton Area Master Plan Process		✓				✓
Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process					✓	✓
Mesa del Sol Planning Process			✓			✓
Southeast New Mexico Working Group		✓	✓			✓
Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process				✓	✓	✓

## INEFFECTIVE PROCESS

In two of the eight cases there was some attrition from the collaborative group because of frustrations with the process itself. One of the participants representing environmental interests on the Southeast New Mexico Working Group eventually left the group out of frustration over the length of time the process was taking and his perception of “endless talk”.<sup>18</sup> A number of

Citizens Review Committee participants left the Houghton Area Master Plan Process out of frustration over the length of time the process was taking and the perception that their input was not being valued.<sup>19</sup>

### **LIMITED RESOURCES**

Some participants in the Mesa del Sol Planning Process and the Southeast New Mexico Working Group had to leave the collaborative process because of a lack of adequate resources. For example, in the Mesa del Sol Planning Process, the length of the process made it difficult for the Sierra Club and other environmental groups to maintain a steady level of participation because of the limited staff resources the group could devote to involvement. Also, some parties interested in the Southeast New Mexico Working Group were unable to participate because meetings were held during the workweek for usually two days in a row, which was not a convenient time for those who were not professionally involved in the group and for those who had to travel great distances to the meeting locations.<sup>20</sup>

### **CONFLICTING GOALS**

Participants in three of the eight cases decided to leave the collaborative process after realizing that they had either a conflict of interest or difference of vision with the rest of the group. The representatives from the town of Castle Valley withdrew from the Castle Valley Planning Process in their formal capacity because of a perception that they had legal conflict of interest in being there. This conflict stemmed from the fact that while the town was in the process of updating its land use ordinances, it did not want to be involved in collaboratively developing a plan with School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, a landowner and potential developer.<sup>21</sup> Steamboat Springs resident Bob Enever left the Emerald Mountain Planning Process because of his realization that the group was not ready to discuss the kinds of development options he was skilled in and interested in exploring for the area and he felt that his continued participation would not be useful.<sup>22</sup> Janet Cornish, the original facilitator in the Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process, left the group after realizing that over the course of a year the project had changed significantly from the one she had originally agreed to facilitate. Not comfortable with the role of increased decision-making power that the Advisory Committee had assumed, Cornish resigned from the process.<sup>23</sup>

### **PROCESS STRUCTURE RESTRICTIONS**

Four of the eight cases exhibited barriers to collaboration related to process structure restrictions. For example, there were more people interested in participating in the Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process than allowed for under the Advisory Committee Charter. As a result, not all people originally interested in participating were able to do so.<sup>24</sup> Representatives from the forestry industry were not represented in the Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning because of a decision by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) not include them.<sup>25</sup> It was assumed that the DNR would be able to adequately represent their interests during the process, but in hindsight the DNR felt the forestry industry should have had a more formal presence at the table.<sup>26</sup> Those involved in convening the Elliott State Forest Planning Process decided to limit the representation on the Steering Committee to participants who had a financial interest in the way

the Forest was managed. However, this made some interested parties who did not have a financial stake in the outcome feel left out of the process.<sup>27</sup> Some participants in the Emerald Mountain Planning Process felt that the group's policy allowing the City and County to elect representatives, who then selected other members, inadvertently led to an under-representation of county interests and a barrier to their formal participation.<sup>28</sup>

## PROFESSIONAL CHANGES

In seven of the eight cases participants in the collaborative efforts had to leave the process because of a change in their professional capacity that no longer allowed for their continued participation. Some participants in the Elliott State Forest Planning Process, the Emerald Mountain Planning Process, the Houghton Area Master Plan Process, the Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process, the Southeast New Mexico Working Group and the Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process left the process either because they took a new job or job transfer that did not allow for or require their participation or they retired from professional life.

## FACTORS THAT SUSTAIN COLLABORATION

---

Many of the reasons parties either initiate or join a collaborative process are the same reasons they continue to participate until a conclusion is reached. There are, however, a few additional factors that can arise during a collaborative process that motivate people to continue participating (Table 13-4). These factors include the presence of a leader or a committed personality who inspired others to continue, the amount of time and effort already invested in the process, the lack of attractive alternatives if the collaboration failed and financial incentives on the part of the state trust land agency.

**Table 13-4: Factors that Sustained Collaboration**

CASE	Leadership	Investment in process	Lack of attractive alternatives	Financial Incentives
Castle Valley Planning Process	✓	✓	✓	✓
Elliott State Forest Planning Process		✓	✓	✓
Emerald Mountain Planning Process	✓	✓	✓	✓
Houghton Area Master Plan Process		✓	✓	✓
Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mesa del Sol Planning Process	✓	✓	✓	✓
Southeast New Mexico Working Group		✓	✓	✓
Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process	✓	✓	✓	✓

## **LEADERSHIP**

Leaders can be officially recognized or they may emerge informally from among collaborative process group members, as further discussed in Chapter 18. For example, the Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process had several different kinds of leaders that helped maintain the collaborative process. The combination of the committed Department of Natural Resources and Conservation officials and staff involved in the project, an effective facilitator and Advisory Committee Chairman kept the process moving toward consensus on a plan that was well-received by most involved. Commissioner Ray Powell's vision of how the Mesa del Sol area in Albuquerque, New Mexico could be developed in a comprehensive way and his commitment to obtaining community buy-in for the development kept the project alive over the many years in which it unfolded.<sup>29</sup> Bellingham, Washington resident Linda Marrom's commitment to and emotional investment in the Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process was recognized by some participants as inspiring others to stay at the table to reach consensus.<sup>30</sup> Many participants in the Emerald Mountain Planning Process noted that Emerald Mountain Partnership Chairman, Ben Beall's commitment and dedication to the process and persistence of participation helped the group achieve its goals.<sup>31</sup> In the Castle Valley Planning Process participants recognized that the leadership, dedication and stamina of the representatives from the School and Institutional Trust Land Agency and Utah Open Lands and the process facilitator sustained the collaborative process.<sup>32</sup>

## **INVESTMENT IN PROCESS**

All eight of the cases were sustained to some degree by participants' commitment to seeing the process through to some level of completion after investing personal and professional time and often significant amounts of work into the process. Shawn Knox, a participant in the Southeast New Mexico Working Group, noted that a common question among group members was "Do we want two years to go down the drain?"<sup>33</sup>

## **LACK OF ATTRACTIVE ALTERNATIVES**

Participants in all eight of the cases mentioned that another reason they persisted through the process was because of the unattractiveness of the potential alternate outcomes that could result without a collaborative process. For example, in the four cases that involved potential development on state trust land, there was concern that without the process either unchecked or unplanned development would occur. The threat of having the prairie chicken and sand dune lizard listed as threatened species, and the subsequent restrictions imposed by the Endangered Species Act, motivated many members of the Southeast New Mexico Working Group to continue participating in the collaborative process to develop a conservation plan for the species.<sup>34</sup> Similarly, participants in the Elliott State Forest Planning Process recognized that should new species in the area become listed as endangered there would be even more significant restrictions on their logging activities without a comprehensive Habitat Conservation Plan in place. The Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) recognized that if it did not continue to participate in the Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process it faced both the possibility of additional legislation requiring it to continue and lawsuits challenging its actions in the watershed. For Linda Marrom, one of the citizen participants in the process, the unattractive

alternative to collaboration was having DNR activities in the area that she felt threatened her continued safety. Also, Castle Valley residents recognized that the alternative to participating in the Castle Valley Planning Process may have been to have increased development in their community. In light of this unfavorable alternative, many residents persisted in the process. Similarly, School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) perceived that community outrage in response to agency actions was not preferable. Therefore, SITLA's engagement with the community in a collaborative planning effort served as a much-preferred alternative.

## **FINANCIAL INCENTIVES**

In all eight cases the state trust land agency had a certain amount of financial incentive to continue participating in the collaborative planning processes. For example, in the Castle Valley Planning Process, the Emerald Mountain Planning Process, the Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process and the Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process, the state trust land agency involved had to temporarily either suspend or keep static some kind of revenue generating management activity or exploration of development options while the concerns about those activities or a change in activity were addressed through the collaborative process. The state trust land agencies had an incentive to continue participating in the collaborative efforts in order to either continue or modify their management activities without continued resistance from the communities. The financial incentives for continued state trust land agency personnel in the Southeast New Mexico Working Group involved the potential for financial loss were wildlife species in the area listed under the Endangered Species Act. For state trust land agency personnel involved in the Elliott State Forest Planning Process, both the potential for financial loss were additional species in the area listed in the area without a mitigation plan in place and the opportunity to increase harvest levels through the plan provided incentive to sustain the collaborative process. In the Houghton Area Master Plan Process and the Mesa del Sol Planning Process, the financial incentive for state trust land agency personnel to stay involved in the collaborative process included the potential for an increase in revenue for the trust if the areas were planned for development in a comprehensive way.

## **REASONS COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES CONCLUDE**

There are two main reasons that the processes in the eight cases concluded (Table 13-5). The first reason was that the goals of the process were achieved and the second was the imposition of an external deadline on the process.

**Table 13-5: Factors that Bring Collaborative Processes to a Close**

<b>CASE</b>	<b>Goals of Process Achieved</b>	<b>Externally Imposed Deadline</b>
<b>Castle Valley Planning Process</b>	✓	
<b>Elliott State Forest Planning Process *</b>		
<b>Emerald Mountain Planning Process *</b>		
<b>Houghton Area Master Plan Process</b>	✓	
<b>Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process</b>	✓	
<b>Mesa del Sol Planning Process</b>	✓	
<b>Southeast New Mexico Working Group</b>		✓
<b>Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process</b>	✓	

\* Process not yet concluded

### **ACHIEVED GOAL**

In six of the eight cases, the collaborative process was concluded because the group achieved the goal they were working toward together. For the Houghton Area Master Plan Process, the Lake Whatcom Landscape Planning Process and the Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process this meant the completion of a land use plan for the area in question.

The creation of an option for an exchange of state trust land with Bureau of Land Management land will potentially satisfy the goals of the Emerald Mountain Planning Process and the Castle Valley Planning Process pending the success of the transactions. For the Mesa del Sol Planning Process the goal of the process was achieved when a private company signed a lease to develop the area consistent with guidelines developed through the collaborative process.

### **EXTERNAL DEADLINE**

With the involvement of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the processes surrounding the protection of threatened species, the Southeast New Mexico Working Group concluded because of an external BLM deadline that forced the parties to come up with a final agreement. While many feel the goals of the process were also met in the end, others felt that the external deadline sped up the decision-making process such that the final plan will not be durable.<sup>35</sup> Regardless, Rand French of the BLM was confident that meetings would still be underway had it not been for the deadline.<sup>36</sup>



## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Barb Cestero, *Beyond the Hundreth Meeting: A Field Guide to Collaborative Conservation on the West's Public Lands* (Tucson: Sonoran Institute, 1999); Julia M. Wondolleck and Steven L. Yaffee, *Making Collaboration Work: Lessons from Innovation in Natural Resource Management* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2000), 9.

<sup>2</sup> E. Franklin Dukes and Karen Firehock, *Collaboration: A Guide for Environmental Advocates*, (The University of Virginia Press, 2001), 10.

<sup>3</sup> Steven Yaffee, "Collaborative Decision Making" (2006) in Dale Goble, J. Michael Scott and Frank Davis, ed., *The Endangered Species Act at Thirty: Renewing the Conservation Promise*, Vol. I (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2006), 214-15.

<sup>4</sup> Steven Yaffee, "Regional Cooperation: A Strategy for Achieving Ecological Stewardship" (1999) in W.T. Sexton et al., eds., *Ecological Stewardship: A Common Reference for Ecosystem Management*, Vol. III (Oxford: Elsevier Science, Ltd.), 139-43.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Cris Coffey (Resident, Castle Valley), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Eirin Krane, August 18, 2005, Castle Valley, UT; John Andrews (Associate Director of Administration, SITLA), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Eirin Krane, August 16, 2005, School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration Office, Salt Lake City, UT; Wendy Fisher (Executive Director, Utah Open Lands), personal communication [email] with Stephanie Bertaina, December 16, 2005; Ric McBrier, "Memorandum to the Board of Trustees regarding Sale of Parcel E – Castle Valley," School and Institutional Trust lands Administration, May 29, 2003.

<sup>7</sup> John Andrews (Associate Director of Administration, SITLA), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Eirin Krane, August 16, 2005, School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration Office, Salt Lake City, UT

<sup>8</sup> ESSB. 6731, 2000 Leg., 56th Sess. (Wash. 2000).

<sup>9</sup> Patrick H. Lyons (State Land Commissioner, New Mexico State Land Office), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, July 26, 2005, Western States Land Commissioners Association Conference, Breckenridge, CO.

<sup>10</sup> C.H.W. Foster, *The Environmental Sense of Place: Precepts for the Environmental Practitioner*, New England Natural Resources Center, Needham, MA (1995).

<sup>11</sup> Bruce Keeler (Mayor, Town of Castle Valley), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Eirin Krane, August 18, 2005, Castle Valley Community Center, Castle Valley, UT; Cris Coffey (Resident, Castle Valley), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Eirin Krane, August 18, 2005, Castle Valley, UT.

<sup>12</sup> Albert Elias (Director, city of Tucson, Department of Urban Planning and Design), interview by Alden Boetsch and Jessica Mitchell, August 4, 2005, Tucson, AZ.

<sup>13</sup> Bill McCourt (General Manager, Lummi Tribal Water and Sewer District), interview by Alden Boetsch and Matt Stout, August 8, 2005, Lummi Tribal Water and Sewer District, Lummi Nation, WA.

<sup>14</sup> Linda Morales (Principal, The Planning Center), interview by Alden Boetsch and Jessica Mitchell, August 3, 2005, Tucson, AZ.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Linda Marrom (Citizen, city of Bellingham), interview by Alden Boetsch and Matt Stout, August 9, 2005, Tino's Pizza, Sudden Valley, WA.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> Steven Yaffee, “Regional Cooperation: A Strategy for Achieving Ecological Stewardship” in *Ecological Stewardship: A Common Reference for Ecosystem Management*, Vol. III, 143-47.
- <sup>18</sup> Roger Peterson (Ecologist, New Mexico Natural History Institute and Sierra Club) interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, August 22, 2005, Santa Fe, NM.
- <sup>19</sup> Linda Morales (Principal, The Planning Center), interview by Alden Boetsch and Jessica Mitchell, August 3, 2005, Tucson, AZ.
- <sup>20</sup> Toby Herzlich (Principal, Toby Herzlich & Company), telephone interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, October 28, 2005.
- <sup>21</sup> Catherine Howells (Water Agent, Town of Castle Valley), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Eirin Krane, August 18, 2005, Castle Valley, UT.
- <sup>22</sup> Bob Enever, interview by Lisa Spalding and Matt Stout, August 2, 2005, Steamboat Springs, CO.
- <sup>23</sup> Janet Cornish (Community Development Services of Montana), telephone interview by Jessica Mitchell and Lisa Spalding, August 8, 2005.
- <sup>24</sup> Whitefish Neighborhood Planning Process Meeting Minutes, Nov. 13-14, 2003, available at <http://www.statetrustland.com/index.cfm>; Andy Feury (Mayor, city of Whitefish), interview by Jessica Mitchell and Lisa Spalding, August 17, 2005, Montana Coffee Traders, Whitefish, MT.
- <sup>25</sup> William Wallace (Northwest Regional Manager, Washington State Department of Natural Resources), interview by Alden Boetsch and Matt Stout, August 9, 2005, DNR, Sedro-Woolley, WA.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup> Dan Shults (Southern Oregon Area Director, Southern Oregon Area, Oregon Department of Forestry), interview by Eirin Krane and Drew Vankat, August 24, 2005, ODF, Roseburg, OR.; Francis Eatherington (Forest Monitor, Umpqua Watersheds, Inc), interview by Eirin Krane and Drew Vankat, August 25, 2005, Umpqua Watersheds, Inc., Roseburg, OR.
- <sup>28</sup> Martha Drake (Chris) Young (Psychologist), interview by Lisa Spalding and Matt Stout, August 3, 2005, Steamboat Springs, CO.
- <sup>29</sup> Jacqueline Dubose Christensen (Vice President of Business Advocacy and Government, Greater Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce), interview by Emily Kelly and Drew Vankat, August 16, 2005, Albuquerque, NM.
- <sup>30</sup> Richard Rodriguez (Regional Planner, Washington State Department of Health), interview by Alden Boetsch and Matt Stout, August 11, 2005, DOH, Kent, WA.
- <sup>31</sup> Libbie Miller (District Wildlife Manger, Colorado Division of Wildlife), interview by Lisa Spalding and Matt Stout, August 3, 2005, Colorado Division of Wildlife Area 10 Office, Steamboat Springs, CO; Bob Enever, interview by Lisa Spalding and Matt Stout, August 2, 2005, Steamboat Springs, CO.
- <sup>32</sup> Dave Erley (Southeastern Field Agent, Utah Open Lands), personal communication [email] with Stephanie Bertaina, February 27, 2006; Cris Coffey (Resident, Castle Valley), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Eirin Krane, August 18, 2005, Castle Valley, UT; Laura Kamala (Director of Utah Programs, Grand Canyon Trust), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Eirin Krane, August 19, 2005, Castle Valley, UT.
- <sup>33</sup> Shawn Knox (Wildlife biologist, New Mexico State Land Office), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, August 22, 2005, SLO, Santa Fe, NM.

---

<sup>34</sup> David Coss (Director of Field Operations, New Mexico State Land Office), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, August 22, 2005, SLO, Santa Fe, NM; Jennifer Parody (Conservation Biologist, US Fish and Wildlife Service), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, August 22, 2005, RB Winnings, Albuquerque, NM.

<sup>35</sup> Bill Dunn (Predator and Gamebird Biologist, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish) interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, August 23, 2005, Frontier Restaurant, Albuquerque, NM; Rand French (Biologist, Marbob Energy), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, August 26, 2005, Mack Energy Corporation, Roswell, NM.

<sup>36</sup> Rand French (Biologist, Marbob Energy), interview by Stephanie Bertaina and Emily Kelly, August 26, 2005, Mack Energy Corporation, Roswell, NM.