Branching Out:

Engaging Forest Stakeholders through Collaborative Design

Brady Bender, Han Ding, and Michael Reiterman
Supervisor: Heather Kulp

Acknowledgments

First, we would like to thank the National Forest Foundation for initiating and supporting this project. In particular, it was our pleasure to work with Karen DiBari and Emily Olsen, who throughout the project were generous with their time and gracious with their feedback.

Second, we would like to thank the three collaboratives that permitted us to attend their meetings or talk with their leadership: the Panhandle Forest Collaborative, Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative, and the San Gabriel Mountains Community Collaborative. We also appreciate the thoughtful responses of the individual stakeholders whom we interviewed by phone.

The Harvard Negotiation and Mediation Clinical Program ("HNMCP") community has been incredibly supportive of our work. Our classmates in the HNMCP clinical seminar provided thoughtful feedback on an early presentation of our project. Rachel Viscomi and Sara del Nido Budish were willing listeners and able instructors as we began our work. Tracy Blanchard helped us in countless ways throughout the semester, big and small. We cannot thank her enough. We also want to thank Professor Robert Bordone, who provided thoughtful suggestions and abundant inspiration for our work. Finally, we are deeply grateful for the patience, insight, and guidance of our HNMCP supervisor, Heather Kulp. We could not have done this without her.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

In Fall 2016, the National Forest Foundation ("NFF") enlisted the Harvard Negotiation and Mediation Clinical Program ("HNMCP") to study stakeholder engagement in collaboratives that advise the United States Forest Service ("Forest Service") in the agency's stewardship of National Forest System lands.

Our project aims to help collaborative group conveners devise and implement structures and strategies to best promote ongoing stakeholder engagement in the collaborative processes. To accomplish this purpose, we conducted twenty-seven stakeholder interviews, hosted five focus groups, observed two collaborative meetings, and reviewed relevant academic literature. We then condensed our research into this white paper which catalogs reasons that stakeholders engage in—and disengage from—collaborative processes. To complement this white paper, we also designed a tool that conveners, facilitators, and collaborative members can use to identify collaborative design elements (e.g., caucusing) that can aid groups in achieving their work goals or overcoming barriers to stakeholder engagement.

We lay out our findings first. In that section, we first address engagement before turning to disengagement. We found that stakeholders *engage* in collaboratives because they: (1) believe that they can more effectively achieve their goals from within a collaborative than independently; (2) want to gather and share information; and (3) seek to forge relationships with other stakeholders and the Forest Service that can serve as the basis for ongoing cooperation. By contrast, we found that stakeholders tend to *disengage* from a collaborative when they perceive that the collaborative: (1) manages interpersonal conflicts poorly; (2) leaves stakeholders feeling undervalued; (3) budgets time inefficiently; (4) suffers from an unproductive working relationship with the Forest Service; and (5) does not effectively achieve goals.

In response to these findings, we formulated several recommendations, some generally applicable to all collaboratives and others specifically tailored to particular situations. We offer these recommendations in order to help collaboratives both appeal to stakeholders and to overcome challenges responsible for stakeholder disengagement.

We make four general recommendations. First, collaboratives should continue working to keep group size small and therefore manageable in order to optimize efficiency and ensure that each individual member occupies an important place in the collaborative process. Second, they should purposefully integrate new stakeholders into the collaborative, formally or otherwise. Third, collaboratives should continuously monitor their own track records in meeting stakeholders' interests, so that they can capitalize on

their procedures' strengths and learn from their flaws. Finally, they should actively cultivate a strong working relationship with the Forest Service.

We detail our recommendations for specific situations separately in the accompanying tool, which uses PowerPoint to guide users through a decision tree that identifies potential design elements they should consider based on their collaborative work goal or anticipated barriers to engagement. We use the term "elements" to broadly include group structures (e.g., subcommittees), meeting processes (e.g., public fora), and responsive tactics (e.g., facilitated negotiation of stakeholder disputes). This paper closes by introducing that tool along with some guidelines on how it can best assist collaboratives.

We propose that, in using this tool, a collaborative should first identify its work goal. Committing first to a common purpose will enable a collaborative to select design elements best suited to this goal. With its objective in mind, a collaborative can also anticipate and preempt potential barriers to engagement using various design elements. Finally, in choosing and implementing an element, the collaborative should take care to comply with applicable legal requirements, promulgate clear communication guidelines between individual stakeholders and across various collaborative groups, and allocate decision-making authority and reporting responsibility among stakeholders.

We hope that our efforts will help collaboratives design processes that promote stakeholder engagement by appealing to stakeholders' reasons for joining collaborative in the first place: to make progress toward their own goals, gather and share information, and form durable working relationships with other stakeholders. Our project is meant to prompt creativity, not constrain it: we hope that collaboratives will take what is useful from our suggestions and innovate from there. Active stakeholder engagement and a robust collaborative design will mutually reinforce each other in helping NFF, stakeholders, and government actors make decisions and implement proposals in service of fair and responsible forest stewardship.

Introduction

The NFF is a non-profit organization that partners with the Forest Service to promote community stewardship of National Forest System lands.[1] One of NFF's primary roles is to provide neutral facilitation and support to collaboratives, which comprise groups of interested citizens and stakeholders who advise the Forest Service regarding its management of forest lands, conduct community outreach, and support the Forest Service's implementation of its projects.

The HNMCP is a practical clinic wherein Harvard Law School ("HLS") students who are trained in negotiation and alternative dispute resolution work with clients on projects centered on conflict management and dispute systems design.[2] As second- and third-year law students in HNMCP, our personal and professional interests in the subject matter made us especially eager to investigate stakeholder engagement and ultimately help NFF fulfill its mission.

Questions Presented

Why do stakeholders engage in collaboratives?

In order to make recommendations about how to maintain and increase stakeholder engagement, we first investigated why stakeholders join and participate in collaboratives.

Why do stakeholders disengage from collaboratives?

We then investigated why stakeholders leave or stop participating in collaboratives. We focused especially on barriers to full participation and reasons for citizens' disenchantment with the collaborative process.

What structures and strategies can collaboratives use to promote stakeholder engagement?

Finally, at NFF's request, we elaborated on the following recommendation from HNMCP's Spring 2016 report authored by a different set of HLS students: "To meet the dual interests of ensuring broad contribution and creating an efficient process, we propose an alternative structure to collaborative groups, and encourage brainstorming other alternatives."

Methodology

Throughout this project, we sought to ground all our findings and recommendations in stakeholder feedback and research. To that end, we conducted stakeholder interviews, held focus groups, observed collaborative meetings, and undertook independent academic research. We discuss each in turn.

Stakeholder Interviews

Throughout Fall 2016, we conducted 27 phone interviews with a diverse array of stakeholders. Those interviewed included elected officials, tribal leaders, business owners, industry representatives, environmentalists and conservationists, and many others besides. They played a variety of roles in collaboratives; we interviewed conveners, facilitators, and collaborative group leaders, as well as members of subcommittees and of full collaborative groups. These stakeholders hailed from a variety of different regions across the United States, including the Pacific Northwest, the Idaho Pan Handle, the San Gabriel Mountains in California, and the Carolinas. NFF helped introduce us to some of our first interviewees. From there, we broadened our outreach to forest stakeholders to gather opinions of people from different backgrounds and playing different roles within collaboratives.

Focus Groups

We led five focus groups with members of the Panhandle Forest Collaborative ("PFC"), the San Gabriel Mountains Community Collaborative ("SGMCC"), and the Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative ("KVRI"). Across these five focus groups, we spoke with 29 distinct collaborative participants. Through these focus groups, we hoped to learn more about the motivations behind stakeholder engagement, investigate barriers to stakeholder engagement, and brainstorm possible solutions to encourage participation.

Observations

We observed two collaborative meetings this fall, including a telephonic meeting of the SGMCC steering committee and an in-person meeting of the PFC.

Academic Research

We studied academic literature and field reports on topics such as forest stewardship, stakeholder engagement, consensus building processes, and dispute systems design. We started with the materials NFF kindly shared with us: collaboratives' current membership lists, meeting minutes, communication records, work products, and historical achievements. Lastly, we had the great fortune to speak with several experts in these fields to discuss how their work can inform and assist existing collaborative groups. For that, we are indebted to William Hale Butler, Tony Cheng, Robert Pomeroy, Eric Poncelet, and Lawrence Susskind for sharing their time and insight with us.

Findings

Our findings summarize what we learned from our discussions and interactions with stakeholders, as illuminated by our academic research. This section answers two of the three key questions identified above: namely, why do some stakeholders engage in collaboratives, while others disengage?.

Why do stakeholders engage in collaboratives?

To more effectively achieve their goals

Our interviewees consistently expressed that the most basic—and yet the most important—reason why stakeholders participate in collaboratives is to advance their own goals.[3] While stakeholders appreciate supporting and interfacing with others at collaborative meetings, most deemed it far more important to make progress toward their individual goals. Put simply, stakeholders engage in a collaborative if—and because—they believe that the collaborative will enable them to achieve their substantive goals better than they would have been able to on their own.[4]

For example, one timber company representative joined a collaborative because it offered him an opportunity to protect his company's logging rights in a federal forest. In fact, he felt obligated to participate in the group, which was developing a land-use proposal for Forest Service, because he thought that abstaining from this group would have forfeited his chance to ensure their proposal adequately accounted for his company's livelihood. Similarly, an environmental representative shared that he joined his collaborative because he was interested in protecting a certain species that could be threatened by the Forest Service's work.

Several stakeholders believed that acting collectively via a collaborative works better at accomplishing their individual goals than would acting independently. For instance, two agreed that, by engaging in a collaborative, they succeeded amassing broad support for their organizations' proposals to the Forest Service. The additional weight behind their proposals led the Forest Service to pay attention to recommendations that had previously gone ignored.

By contrast, a tribal representative reported dropping out of a collaborative after one meeting in part because he saw no value added to his tribe. According to him, the tribe believed that it could more effectively achieve its ends through direct talks with the government.

To learn and share information

Stakeholders also participate in collaboratives to share and gather information.[5] This information can concern individual interests, data about forests, and ongoing discussions with the government. Because stakeholders represent a group of disparate actors in a region, they can pool their access to information that any single individual may lack. With more information on hand, the collaborative group can correct individuals' misperceptions and share information that would otherwise remain unknown to other members or to the public at large. One collaborative member shared that local citizens tend to get involved "when collaborative projects hit the ground or start

becoming present in communities." At that point, stakeholders see collaboratives as a venue for them to learn more about and in turn exert their influence on developments.

Sometimes stakeholders seek to tap into the community's informational well in order to correct previous misconceptions. Before the formation of one particularly long-standing collaborative, a government agency had provided different members of the community with divergent and often contradictory signals about its intentions. Having only incomplete information led these community members to distrust one another and predictably discouraged cooperation among them. When the members formed the collaborative, they first shared with the group what the agency had told each of them and soon constructed a more complete picture—all the pieces of the puzzle had come together.

As these examples illustrate, the steady exchange and accumulation of collective knowledge: (1) filters out misconceptions, which (2) increases the accuracy and reliability of information, which (3) builds trust among collaborative participants, which (4) empowers them to interact with one another more confidently, which (5) enables the collaborative to hold the government agency to account.

To build relationships

Stakeholders also see collaboratives as opportunities to improve their relationships with other members of the community.[6] One such stakeholder succinctly captured that the sentiment was to "turn strangers into teammates." In many cases, collaboratives begin as attempts to overcome contentious, even bitter, feuds among parties with opposing interests. A successful collaborative can establish functional relationships among a community's differing constituents and thereby lay the foundation for their continued cooperation into the future.[7] One stakeholder came to a collaborative meeting because he "wanted an opportunity to talk to the Forest Service about its program of work in a healthy way," instead of being consigned to the negative relationships with the Forest Service that others in his field had often reported. Another credited the "open and honest dialogue" that collaboration fosters with helping his organization work amicably with individuals and organizations that hold different interests.

The long-term value of building healthy working relationships within a community, whether it be local, regional, or national, extends far beyond serving any particular party's interests. Stakeholders report that they are more likely to remain engaged in a collaborative if they believe that the group will foster fruitful and meaningful relationships both within the community and between that community and the Forest Service.

Why do stakeholders disengage from collaboratives?

Although stakeholders recognize that collaborative groups can produce good outcomes for them, many nevertheless disengage. Stakeholder interviews showed that disengagement can assume a variety of forms. Some fail to participate in collaboratives at all or entirely withdraw from the collaborative process. Others attend meetings only sporadically and may not pay attention or contribute at the meetings they do attend.

Stakeholders cited a range of explanations for disengaging. Some disengage because they believe that the collaborative cannot or will no longer serve their interests. As one stakeholder noted, "If you come to a process because you had one interest in mind, and that interest has been satisfied, then you will drop off. This might not be a bad thing." Indeed, the "mission accomplished" rationale may make a great deal of sense for those who got what they came to the collaborative for and whose time commitments do not warrant their continued investment of time and effort in the collaborative.

But many more disengage and leave progress undone because they dislike select aspects of the experience of participating in a collaborative. These stakeholders suggest that, if these negative aspects were improved, they might feel more inclined to return and persist. Thus, in this section, we explore four primary barriers to stakeholder engagement: (1) poor conflict management; (2) stakeholders feeling undervalued; (3) stakeholders' inability to commit as much time as collaboratives often demand; and (4) some collaboratives' unproductive relationships with the Forest Service.

Stakeholder conflict is not well managed

Poor conflict management leads many stakeholders to disengage. Some level of conflict within the collaborative process may be unavoidable, but conflict need not be counterproductive.[8] If well managed, some disputes' resolution can be cathartic, and overcoming them can produce better working relationships. Left ignored, however, conflict can thwart a collaborative's prospects for success because once relationships sour, the participants may be reluctant to agree on even trivial issues.

Conflict can occur both during a particular collaborative session and between collaborative meetings. Several stakeholders saw long-standing, external hostility between participant organizations or individuals play out at the collaborative table.[9] One stakeholder related that he initially distrusted other members of the collaborative because of his prior relationships with them in other settings. Some stakeholders lament that other members do not behave respectfully toward those with whom they disagree. These disrespectful exchanges may result from a misunderstanding, bad

personal history, or even a calculated ploy to spoil the group's progress. Stakeholders have said that unresolved predictably resurface in later meetings, in e-mail chains, or in public exchanges.

Of course, prevention is the best cure. Absent that, however, once a conflict emerges, *actively* managing it proves more effective than ignoring it. A small business owner contrasted his experience in two different collaboratives: one that fell apart and another that grew steadily. He attributed the latter's durability to that collaborative's facilitator's active lead in managing and preventing conflict. The facilitator took preventative steps by identifying members with bad blood between them and asking them to agree to basic rules of conduct vis-à-vis each other before joining the group. The unsuccessful group, however, employed little effort ahead of time to spot and diffuse potential disagreements. In another collaborative, wherein an email chain's comments took a nasty turn, a facilitator intervened to manage the conflict: she reminded the group of its commitment to civility and spoke directly with the aggrieved members to reach a detente. This appeal to common ground and shared values reverberates throughout other collaboratives: another stakeholder spoke to the effectiveness of revisiting a collaborative group's shared goals and vision of supporting their local community in reducing tensions.

Several stakeholders suggested that group structures can either court or disarm conflict. For one thing, there's the group's membership size: a stakeholder suggested that her collaborative's large size is not at all conducive to managing conflict. To reach an agreement, she continued, you need "a small number of regularly engaged people who know each other and have the same information," which her particular collaborative lacked. Likewise, another stakeholder credited her collaborative's subcommittee structure in mediating conflict. Subcommittees make stakeholders work together in small groups that naturally encourage "people begin to trust each other," with the comfort of knowing that, "no one will go 'off the tracks' and try to slip things by each other."

Stakeholders do not feel important to the collaborative process

Stakeholders may disengage from the collaborative process when they do not feel important to the group's work. This concern appeared in many stakeholder comments.

Several collaborative members agreed that collaboratives often run too large to allow each individual stakeholder to have a meaningful role.[10] A subcommittee leader shared that the number of participants both in her subgroup and the larger collaborative did little to instill in members a feeling of ownership of their work, which deprives them of their motivation to contribute to collaborative projects.[11] One stakeholder estimated that her collaborative's membership, at greater than 40 participants, was far too large—most of

the work gets done in subcommittees, so stakeholders don't feel like they play any important role in larger collaborative meetings. Another stakeholder praised small groups of 12 to 15 members as ideal for active discussion and contribution by all involved. A smaller collective elevates the prominence of every individual within that collective. By contrast, one stakeholder observed that larger groups tend to allow majority views to "squash smaller interests."

New collaborative members may feel out of place and overwhelmed by the process.[12] One such newcomer recalls being initially intimidated by the collaborative process's complexity, and therefore hesitated to contribute because she didn't know how to word recommendations appropriately. Another concurred that, "At bottom, interest, capacity, and ability determine whether people step up to the plate," and most newcomers may take a while to come into their own. This may be true especially when the collaborative's subject matter is complex: as a stakeholder said, "the content doesn't make room for anybody else."[13] As one might imagine, "going to collaborative meetings and hearing scientists talk about complex, technical things is not interesting or accessible" to many local citizens.

Sometimes the current work of a collaborative group is simply unimportant to a given stakeholder, and so they do not feel like they have a place in the collaborative as currently configured. As one stakeholder put it, it may be a truism that "people engage when they see that the collaborative process touches on things that are very tangible and personal to them." But that means that, conversely, when a stakeholder lacks the knowledge or interest to chime in on a project, they may disengage.

Process design can help address stakeholders' sense of place and belonging. One stakeholder noted that his collaborative was often plagued with an "us" versus "them" mindset that makes it difficult to bring new members into the fold. He suggested that the collaborative host more social functions to integrate newcomers. Another collaborative's leadership hosts orientation for new members and advises them on how to engage. Articulating clear responsibilities and duties of membership helped in another collaborative. One collaborative's leader once stared at a membership roster that included hundreds of people who were nominally members, but whose active participants numbered only in the dozens. She then devised a membership agreement and requested that committed members pledge to fulfill certain responsibilities. Although it may seem paradoxical that asking more of people would attract rather than repel them, her call for dedicated members to take ownership vastly raised attendance.

Stakeholders do not have time to fully participate

Stakeholders often disengage because of time concerns.[14] Meetings are long and take place during business hours.[15] This prevents many stakeholders from attending and, "feeds the narrative that [a collaborative] is a professional and professionally staffed endeavor" open only to those who can afford to attend. Indeed, stakeholders' personal and professional commitments often get in the way of full participation.[16] One environmentalist confessed that his organization was both over-committed and under-staffed, explaining that low funding on hand forces him to participate less than he would like to.

Many stakeholders expressed concern that the collaborative meetings take too much time. When meeting time isn't used efficiently, stakeholders don't feel it important to engage. Many say, more generally, that the entire process takes too long. One stakeholder, initially "skeptical" of joining a collaborative, cited the six-month process of developing procedures as a major barrier to her engagement because "it felt like nothing was getting done." Another stakeholder said that while he did not mind the deliberative process "when it focused on substance," but he nevertheless wished for a speedier means to resolve procedural issues that had dragged on for multiple meetings over the course of several months. Even after the collaborative has moved from procedure to substance, creating a workable proposal can take years.

Stakeholders sincerely believe that facilitation and strategic decision-making can alleviate some of these time concerns. One stakeholder, for example, suggested that a primary reason her collaborative had floundered early on was that they had too much work to do at full collaborative meetings. When tasks were delegated to subcommittees, they were more quickly and efficiently accomplished. As humans, stakeholders' "appetite for work is greater than their ability to do it," and this stakeholder expressed interest in recruiting more organizations involved to take on some of this workload. Some members, she noted, contribute only nominally by showing up at meetings and approving work that happens there, while others do collaborative-related work full time.

Relationships with government agencies hinder effectiveness

Failing to build and maintain good working relationships with government agencies can also lead stakeholders to leave the group. Collaboratives' relationships with the Forest Service are particularly important, because the Forest Service has much of the ultimate decision-making authority.[17] The Forest Service, however, can be unresponsive to collaboratives' needs. Forest Service staff members are incentivized to move around from one forest to another in order to advance their careers within the agency.[18] Such turnover disrupts collaborative group's working relationships with Forest Service staff.

This disruption bleeds institutional knowledge, personal trust, and reliability. In one instance, an entire team—including a ranger and government scientists—transitioned out. The collaborative then had to build relationships with multiple new personalities all at once, while simultaneously trying to revive the plan that they had developed with the previous team.

Stakeholders perceive, more generally, that government agencies are skeptical of working with a collaborative until the collaborative can prove that it has a track record of success. For example, one stakeholder's collaborative "wants to do part of the work that was traditionally done by the Forest Service, and it's a leap of faith for them to allow this to happen." But because collaboratives' success depend in part on the Forest Service's buy-in, this puts collaboratives in a Catch-22: the Forest Service is reluctant to accept collaboratives before they establish their credibility with success and utility, but collaboratives' success and utility require the Forest Service's acceptance in the first place.

Nonetheless, process can help. One stakeholder's collaborative asks Forest Service rangers to share exit memos with both the collaborative and the new ranger. Another stressed the importance of shared leadership. Collaborative leadership can help ease the transition to new Forest Service representatives by fostering relationships with new personnel and informing them of the group's work. One collaborative earned the ability to provide input into the Forest Service hiring process: prospective rangers would come to talk to collaborative participants, who would in in turn share feedback on the ranger's candidacy with Forest Service leadership.

Perspective helps. Many stakeholders shared that collaborative participants grew frustrated when the Forest Service declined to adopt the group's recommendations. Two noted that this disappointment is caused, in part, by "unrealistic" expectations.[19] "It takes time," one said. In the short-run, it may seem that the needle is barely moving. Over three years, however, he has seen growth in his collaborative group's interactions with the Forest Service and their willingness to incorporate his collaborative's input into their agency decisions.

Stakeholders don't perceive the collaborative process to be effective

Finally, a key reason stakeholders disengage is that they perceive the collaborative process as ineffective.[20] One stakeholder put it bluntly: "People don't care about the technical planning process—they care about signs of action." When it doesn't seem like the collaborative is getting anything done, stakeholders' interest and engagement wane. This may happen, for instance, when the collaborative lacks an active, driving goal or

project from the Forest Service. In that case, they may feel as though they're twiddling their thumbs.

A collaborative's effectiveness depends in large part on how it initially formulates its task. One stakeholder contrasted his experience in two collaboratives. The small community group he was a part of succeeded because they had a discrete set of small objectives that they were able to mark "completed" once attained. A larger group, by contrast, had a much broader scope and program of work, and thus saw far less success. An expert we interviewed confirmed this stakeholder's experience: "To the extent that you can break up the collaborative work into bite-sized objectives, you can and should". Framing objectives at a micro-level enables the collaborative to consistently and steadily reach goals. With clearly defined goals in mind, the collaborative can more easily assign roles to stakeholders. In stakeholders' eyes, accomplishing goals instills "pride in the collaboration" that builds momentum, keeps people at the table, and preserves stakeholder interest.

Similarly, collaborative design can help improve effectiveness. Multiple stakeholders noted that a strong subcommittee model was crucial to their collaboratives' success, attesting that those meetings are where the work actually gets done. One facilitator believed that her group's large size hindered its effectiveness by preventing them from reaching consensus and slowing their process. Another suggested that a collaborative group's "identity should be tied to its task." For example, a collaborative formed to provide high-quality scientific information might require one composition, while a collaborative formed to conduct community outreach might require quite another.

Recommendations

In this portion, we synthesize our research and findings. Together, they suggest that, by improving collaborative design, the NFF and other group conveners can promote stronger stakeholder investment in collaborating around forest stewardship.[21] Here, we answer the final question presented by offering two sets of recommendations to improve the collaborative process and promote stakeholder engagement: one set generally applicable to collaboratives writ large and the other specific to each collaborative's goals and anticipated barriers to collaboration.

For collaboratives in general

Our stakeholder interviews and research highlighted the following best practices generally applicable collaborative groups.

Keep working groups as small as possible.

Our findings and research both supply support for the notion that keeping group size small promotes stakeholder engagement.[22] Smaller groups allow stakeholders to feel **more important** to the collaborative process by providing additional time and space for each member to shine.[23] Limiting group size also increases effectiveness by assigning a clearer role to each participant, allowing for more efficient time management in group work, and streamlining communication.[24] Keeping groups small also promotes a stronger sense of community and relationship building within the group.[25] Interviewees recommended that groups' size be capped at 15. Our research agrees: groups tend to be most effective when they involve a maximum of 20 participants.[26]

Minimizing groups' size need not detract from collaboratives' commitment to inclusivity, a value NFF prioritizes. By forming multiple smaller groups, the collaborative-at-large can accommodate however many stakeholders want to participate.[27] The key is to keep each individual group small. Multiple smaller groups can then communicate with each other or report to a designated leadership group overseeing the larger collaborative. That is, we suggest that collaboratives *pool* smaller groups, not *merge* them. Keeping smaller groups intact can create space for more stakeholders to have a meaningful role in the collaborative process, without sacrificing the benefits of small groups.[28]

To complement smaller groups' detail-oriented work, larger groups may be brought in to provide input and feedback through one-time meetings, such as public fora.[29] If ongoing collaboratives remain large, conveners and organizers can simulate some of the smaller groups' advantages by separating attendees into small working groups or one-on-one discussions followed by reporting out or large group discussion.[30]

Invest in integrating new participants into the collaborative process.

Conveners can help new and uncommitted participants stay engaged by purposefully integrating them into the collaborative. Our findings suggest that participants disengage early in their collaborative involvement because they do not yet feel comfortable with the group's social structure, process, or subject matter.[31] This barrier can be addressed both at a collaborative group's infancy and as new stakeholders join throughout.

In young collaboratives, conveners can build early investment by hosting a site visit or kick-off event. Organizing a group trip to the site can help make the collaborative group's work concrete and create a sense of shared purpose.[32] A kick-off event can also **initiate social relationships** and generate excitement about the collaborative group's work.[33] This event can be as simple as a potluck dinner or as extensive as a speaker series. Opening the event to the public may help conveners identify additional stakeholders to recruit, whether into this group, subsequent groups, or as alternates for

group members.

Even later in collaboratives' life cycle, the group should purposefully integrate new members. For example, a group may designate an experienced member to mentor a new member. The mentor can relay information on the collaborative group's project, history, and social norms. As a new member takes over for a retiring member, the new member can shadow or meet with the retiring member before participating fully in the collaborative.[34] New members can meet or work with a collaborative for a trial period before becoming official members.[35] Most simply, collaboratives can create an orientation document that summarizes the collaborative's purpose, history, and membership.[36] Each of these strategies can help the collaborative feel more inviting to new stakeholders as they become more comfortable with and invested in the collaborative process.

Engage in ongoing monitoring and adaptation of the collaborative group's process.

Participants should assess how collaborative processes are working throughout the life cycle of their work and adapt processes and structures as necessary.[37] Here we emphasize *processes* because although our findings indicate that collaboratives routinely update members on the progress of *substantive* projects, far fewer regularly evaluate process.

Regular check-ins provides stakeholders the opportunity to reflect on whether and how the collaborative is meeting their individual interests, whether the collaborative is on track to meet its goals, and whether the collaborative has been running its meetings and work efficiently.[38] Learning what is *not* working can be just as as important as learning what is.[39] Providing opportunities for feedback also underscores participants' sense of self-determination, makes more salient their important role in determining process, and thereby boosts their engagement.

Asking participants to provide brief feedback after each meeting enables collaborative groups to regularly refine their processes.[40] Our findings suggest that stakeholders disengage when they feel meetings are inefficient or ineffective.[41] By evaluating specific meetings, groups can identify which activities worked and which did not in order to prepare for planning future meetings. These check-ins should be kept brief and minimal in order to avoid over-burdening members. For instance, the collaborative can ask participants to write down one thing that worked well and one thing that should have been done differently in a meeting or circulate a short survey rating activities on a numerical scale.[42]

Mid-point check-ins provide occasions for more comprehensive feedback on the long-term collaborative process. Based on this feedback, collaborative groups can help groups make necessary big-picture changes, like modifying group structures, communication rules, or timelines.[43] While many collaboratives currently undertake *annual* process evaluations, we believe they would benefit from performing these check-ins more frequently, such as once every few months. These evaluations may take the form of participant surveys, group discussion, or interviews with participants.[44]

Performing more regular check-ins also helps collaboratives take stock of their accomplishments. Highlighting and celebrating a collaborative's successes can forestall stakeholders from disengaging by demonstrating that the collaborative *is* effective in producing tangible results.[45] Stakeholders want to be involved in successful efforts; therefore, underscoring success can inspire engagement.[46] Collaboratives may acknowledge success by hosting celebratory events, giving awards for involvement, or publicizing group accomplishments.[47]

These check-ins and associated celebrations can also mark the end of collaborative group projects. Our findings suggest that stakeholders often continue engaging in the collaborative even when periods in which they have little interest in or knowledge of the work at hand. Check-ins can provide an opportunity for members to reassess the collaborative's shifting purposes and signal an appropriate time to join or leave the process. Regular check-ins can allow disinterested stakeholders to step back gracefully and prompt interested stakeholders to step forward enthusiastically.

Establish a strong foundational relationship with the Forest Service.

Ensuring buy-in from the Forest Service is critical to collaboratives' success in strengthening forest stewardship. The Forest Service generally has final authority to decide whether collaborative group recommendations are implemented. Our findings suggest that many groups struggle with this relationship due to Forest Service rangers' turnover or lack of investment in collaboration. Regardless of where fault lies, collaboratives should nurture relationships with the Forest Service through several different strategies.

First, collaboratives can establish norms for working with the Forest Service.[48] Collaboratives can work with the Forest Service to develop norms addressing issues such as: (1) Forest Service attendance at collaborative meetings (who will attend, for how long, and how frequently); (2) communication between the Forest Service and the collaborative (method, frequency, and substance to be shared); and (3) expectations for collaborative projects (processes for identifying them, which topics and how many to be expected, and timeline for completion). The collaboratives and the Forest Service can

reset or revisit these norms as new Forest Service representatives are assigned to a group.[49] Forest Service representatives often work with multiple collaboratives simultaneously; if so, those collaboratives should consider holding a joint norm-setting meeting with the Forest Service, as doing so may encourage the Forest Service to participate by reducing the burden on them and uniting collective power across the collaborative groups who can speak with one voice.

This norms-setting process lends itself to another potentially helpful strategy: asking the Forest Service to provide regular evaluations or feedback on the collaborative's processes and work. Establishing check-ins with the Forest Service can help the collaborative group learn about barriers that may be discouraging Forest Service representatives from fully cooperating with the group or trusting them with work. Conversely, the collaborative group should also share feedback with the Forest Service about how to improve their partnership.[50]

If collaboratives establish a strong relationship with a Forest Service manager, they may request to participate in hiring of new rangers. While the Forest Service may not be wiling or able to delegate the collaborative group decision-making power in hiring, our findings indicate that some model groups participate in the hiring process by sitting in on ranger interviews or inviting an interviewee to a meeting, during which the collaborative generates input to inform the hirer's decision.[51]

Most importantly, the collaborative should strive to establish a strong social relationship with its associated ranger. The collaborative might accomplish this by assigning the Forest Service a liaison within the group. That liaison will then be responsible for connecting with the Forest Service outside of meeting contexts to provide them with information about the group's work, coordinate logistics for meetings, gather feedback and, more broadly, foster a relationship with the Forest Service.

For specific collaboratives

Our findings and research suggest that thoughtful process design can improve stakeholder engagement by considering each community's specific needs.[52] To this end, we have developed a framework of design elements that can supplement or replace current collaborative groups in order to overcome the barriers to engagement detailed earlier and better meet the stakeholder interests.

Introduction to tool

This paper accompanies a tool that summarizes our findings and recommendations and helps collaborative groups assess what elements would best suit their interests and needs. Groups may use this tool to modify, supplement, or replace current collaborative

elements that contribute to disengagement or to create new elements more disposed to promoting engagement.

Of course, this tool does not and cannot solve all of the diverse problems of collaborative groups. Thus, we recommend that conveners tailor this tool to their particular needs and encourage them to modify or combine elements as they see fit. This tool works best as a basic starting point for discussion with collaborative groups. In the process of considering the suggested elements, collaborative groups may brainstorm additional, more suitable ideas about how to design a collaborative process. Discussing it together can encourage participants to be creative but critical in identifying appropriate elements.

This tool guides conveners through the process of designing a collaborative process based on either a group's work goals or its current or potential barriers to engagement. The "Choosing a Decision-Making Factor" slide assists conveners in choosing a decision-making factor.

Designing a collaborative process based on work goal

Conveners designing or redesigning a collaborative process should begin by defining the group's work focus and goal.[53] Identifying the group's goal will in part determine who should be engaged in the process, calibrate what level of engagement is necessary, and devise ways to engage these individuals.[54] Certain collaborative elements presented in our tool may be more appropriate than others, depending on the group's goal.[55] For instance, a collaborative with the goal of public engagement may involve a broader group of stakeholders than would a collaborative intended to make recommendations around a specific technical decision.

Identifying a work goal

As discussed on the "Goal-Based Decisions: Identifying Work Goal" slide, conveners may identify work goals based on an outside request. This request may come from the Forest Service, community leaders, political leaders, or many others. A work goal may be distilled from a larger or previous collaborative's vision. Conveners may also identify work goals based on community interest by surveying community members, or by holding a public forum to gather ideas.[56]

Conveners can further define work goals by considering the following questions:

- **What would success for this collaborative group look like?** This question asks conveners to envision the outcome the group will achieve.
- **What work must be done to achieve success?** This question uncovers the basic types of work a group will perform in working toward their goal.

- **How will group members contribute to success?** This question considers what work individual stakeholders will do throughout the life of a collaborative process.

Conveners and organizers can identify an overarching work goal before stakeholders arrive at the table. Upon convening, however, the group members themselves should be involved in further developing the work goal. This sets the tone for active stakeholder engagement by letting them take ownership of the group's work and ensuring that this goal is relevant to their interests and needs.[57] In early meetings, group members should consider the questions identified above.

Many collaborative groups undertake several types of work, and groups may be more effective if they focus on work of the same type, as they can more narrowly tailor elements to serve their efforts.[58] Narrowing focus to a particular goal also helps promote engagement by addressing two of the barriers noted in our findings: reducing the time commitment required of stakeholders and helping the group demonstrate effectiveness by reaching goals more frequently.[59] Our stakeholder interviews and research suggest that most collaborative groups focus on one of three work goals: community engagement,[60] making recommendations,[61] or supporting project implementation.[62]

The tool accompanying this white paper identifies collaborative elements that conveners should consider in working toward each of these goals. Conveners should consider each of the proposed elements before deciding on one. If none of the elements put forward for a goal are appealing, conveners can view a list of all elements included in the tool or view a list of outside resources by clicking on "Other" on the "Goal-Based Decisions: What Is the Work Goal of The Group?" slide. And, as always, conveners may also create their own alternative design elements.

Designing a process based on possible barriers to collaboration

After taking into account goal, conveners may also consider certain collaborative elements that would best address anticipated or actual barriers to engagement.[63] We recommend first tailoring collaborative elements to work goals, as this can address both prongs by preventing potential obstacles from arising. If, however, groups still anticipate or encounter challenges based on their context, careful design can help avoid and resolve these.[64]

Conveners can identify barriers to engagement after check-ins, because participants or stakeholders may have identified obstacles in their feedback. If they have worked with this or similar communities before, conveners may consider the challenges confronted in that work; alternatively, they may seek help identifying potential challenges from

individuals who have more historical knowledge. Finally, simple reflection and discussion may uncover potential barriers.

Considering the following questions may help conveners identify barriers:

- **Which stakeholders are not adequately represented right now? What might prevent them from participating?** This question uncovers current reasons for disengagement and primes conveners to consider what they *can* do to promote engagement.
- **What may stop involved stakeholders from participating more effectively?** This question prompts consideration of barriers to maximal effectiveness. Most groups could benefit from optimizing engagement.

Our findings suggest five primary challenges in promoting stakeholder engagement: (1) managing conflict; (2) ensuring stakeholders feel important to the collaborative process; (3) budgeting time; (4) building robust relationships with government agencies; (5) ensuring that collaboration is both effective in moving toward stakeholders' goals and is *perceived* as such.

The tool offers several elements that may help collaborative groups overcome these obstacles. Considering all possible elements may begin with the tool, but it need not end there. Conveners should also consult the outside resources to which our tool directs. Finally, conveners should encourage stakeholders to brainstorm elements among themselves before deciding on one.

Considerations in implementing a collaborative design

As conveners and organizers design a collaborative process, they should consider issues of: (1) legal and statutory compliance, (2) communication, and (3) reporting and decision-making authority. Each of these issues, if carefully managed, can increase collaborative group effectiveness. If disregarded, however, these issues can derail collaboration altogether.

Ensure that collaborative design meets legal requirements.

In implementing a collaborative element, it is important to consider relevant legislation and regulations.[65] Groups should be aware that collaboratives associated with the Forest Service may be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act ("FACA").[66] Moreover, their recommendations may have to go through the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ("NEPA") process.[67] The Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program ("CFLRP") and groups selected for funding under this program can provide a model for forest collaboration.

Establish clear communication guidelines within and between collaborative groups.

Strong communication is crucial to maintaining stakeholder engagement. Establishing procedures and norms for communication can promote effectiveness and improve cooperation.[68] Early on, groups should consider how communication will take place among the group's individual members, with other groups involved in a larger collaborative process, and from the group to broader stakeholder organizations.[69] Strong communication can encourage groups to work together, leading to increased effectiveness that promotes stakeholder engagement. Conversely, however, communication failures can result in individuals or groups duplicating work or undertaking conflicting work, each of which reduces effectiveness and risks stakeholder disengagement.

Clarify reporting mechanisms and decision-making authority within and across collaborative groups.

Conveners should consider what decision-making authority will inhere in collaborative groups and what reporting procedures these groups will use.[70] Stakeholders may not engage in a collaborative group if they perceive that they will not be given any decision-making power.[71] While the Forest Service makes the final decision on many issues that a collaborative will confront, those groups still retain control over what recommendations they make to the Forest Service. Exercising decision-making power instills participants with a greater sense of importance to the process. Thus, as much as possible, the group most involved in making a recommendation or taking an action should be given decision-making power instead of vesting all final authority exclusively in a more distant and removed group within a broader collaborative process.

If a collaborative process involves multiple working groups, each of these groups can report to the Forest Service directly or can report to an umbrella group that will itself package together recommendations to relay to the Forest Service. To encourage strong relationships with the Forest Service and promote clarity and efficiency, we recommend a *single* reporting group. Having regular, ongoing communication from one group helps a larger collaborative group build relationships and establish procedures that will help keep the Forest Service engaged.[72] Having a single reporting group, of course, makes clear and consistent communication between various subgroups in a collaborative process all the more important.

Conclusion

We hope that this tool will help collaboratives design processes that manage conflicts productively, use time efficiently, and exchange information freely. If successful, their

efforts will promote stakeholder engagement by appealing to stakeholders' reasons for joining collaboratives in the first place: to make progress toward their policy goals, learn from others while sharing their own interests, and forming healthy relationships with other stakeholders. Once effective collaborative processes are in place, collaboratives can produce more compelling and durable proposals, better inform Forest Service projects, and engender communal support of forest stewardship.

Bibliography

1. *5B Restoration Coalition Purpose and Goals,* 5B RESTORATION COALITION, https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbnw1YnJlc3RvcmF0aW9uY29hbGl0aW9uc2l0ZXxneDo1YTJlZWVlMWU5ZTk1OTc4 (last visited Dec. 3, 2016).
2. *B-D Working Group*, https://sites.google.com/site/bdworkinggroup1/ (last visited Dec. 3, 2016).
3. *Best Practice: Community Collaborative Develops Process to Orient New Members*, CONSERVATION CONNECT (Nat'l Forest Found.) at 1, https://www.nationalforests.org/assets/pdfs/Best-Practice-Orienting-New-Members-into-a-Collaborative_NFF.pdf.
4. Joseph E. Bonnell & Tomas M. Koontz, *Stumbling Forward: The Organizational Challenges of Building and Sustaining Collaborative Watershed Management*, 20 SOC'Y & NAT. RESOURCES 153 (2007).
5. William Butler, *Collaboration at Arm's Length: Navigating Agency Engagement in Landscape-Scale Ecological Restoration Collaboratives*, 111 J. OF FORESTRY 395 (2013).
6. Susan Carpenter, *Choosing Appropriate Consensus Building Techniques and Strategies*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 61 (1999).
7. Antony S. Cheng & Katherine M. Mattor, *Why Won't They Come? Stakeholder Perspectives on Collaborative National Forest Planning by Participation Level*, 38 ENV. MGMT. 545 (2006).
8. *The Collaboration Cloverleaf: Four Stages of Development*, CONSERVATION CONNECT (Nat'l Forest Found.) at 6, https://www.nationalforests.org/assets/pdfs/Tool-Collaboration-Cloverleaf-Four-Stages-of-Development_NFF.pdf.
9. Alexander Conley & Margaret A. Moote, *Evaluating Collaborative Natural Resource Management*, 16 SOC'Y & NAT. RESOURCES 371 (2003).
10. JAMES L. CREIGHTON, THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION HANDBOOK: MAKING BETTER DECISIONS THROUGH CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT (2005).
11. Emily Jane Davis, *The Role of Leadership Committees in Forest Collaborative Capacity*, CASE STUD. BRIEFS (Or. Forest Research Lab.), June 2015.
12. E. FRANKLIN DUKES, COLLABORATION: A GUIDE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES (2001).
13. ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION INST., EXPLORING BARRIERS TO COLLABORATIVE FORESTRY: REPORT FROM A WORKSHOP HELD AT HART PRAIRIE, FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA 7 (Ann Moote & Dennis Becker, eds., 2003).
14. *Factors Influencing Successful Collaboration*, CONSERVATION CONNECT (Nat'l Forest Found.) at 1, https://www.nationalforests.org/assets/pdfs/Tool-Factors-Influencing-Successful-Collaboration-Evaluation_NFF.pdf.

15. ROGER FISHER & ALAN SHARP, GETTING IT DONE: HOW TO LEAD WHEN YOU'RE NOT IN CHARGE (1998).
16. SUZANNE GHAIS, EXTREME FACILITATION: GUIDING GROUPS THROUGH CONTROVERSY AND COMPLEXITY (2005).
17. BARBARA GRAY, COLLABORATING: FINDING COMMON GROUND FOR MULTIPARTY PROBLEMS (1989).
18. Scott D. Hardy & Tomas M. Koontz, *Rules for Collaboration: Institutional Analysis of Group Membership and Levels of Action in Watershed Partnerships*, 37 POL'Y STUD. J. 393 (2009).
19. HARVARD NEGOTIATION AND MEDIATION CLINICAL PROGRAM, http://hnmcp.law.harvard.edu/ (last visited Dec. 4, 2016).
20. Judith E. Innes, *Evaluating Consensus Building*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 631 (1999).
21. JUDITH E. INNES & DAVID E. BOOHER, PLANNING WITH COMPLEXITY: AN INTRODUCTION TO COLLABORATIVE RATIONALITY FOR PUBLIC POLICY 103 (2010).
22. Judith E. Innes & David E. Booher, *Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century*, 5 PLAN. THEORY & PRAC. 419 (2004).
23. *Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership*, NAT'L FOREST FOUND., https://www.nationalforests.org/who-we-are/regional-offices/california-program/laketahoewest (last visited Dec. 3, 2016).
24. Richard D. Margerum, *Overcoming Locally Based Collaboration Restraints*, 20 SOC'Y & NAT. RESOURCES 135 (2007).
25. Richard D. Margerum, *A Typology of Collaboration Efforts in Environmental Management*, 41 ENV. MGMT. 487 (2008).
26. Carl M. Moore, Gianni Longo, & Patsy Palmer, *Visioning*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 557 (1999).
27. Ann Moote & Andrea Bedell Loucks, *Policy Challenges for Collaborative Forestry: A Summary of Previous Findings and Suggestions*, Presentation at Policy Dialogue on Collaborative Forestry (Sept. 2003).
28. NAT'L FOREST FOUND., https://www.nationalforests.org/ (last visited Dec. 4, 2016).
29. NAT'L FOREST FOUND., COLLABORATIVE RESTORATION WORKSHOP: WORKING TOWARD RESILIENT LANDSCAPES AND COMMUNITIES SUMMARY (2016)
30. Riikka Paloniemi & Annukka Vainio, *Legitimacy and empowerment: combining two conceptual approaches for explaining forest owners' willingness to cooperate in nature conservation*, 8 J. OF INTEGRATIVE ENV. SCI. 123 (2011).
31. PANEL ON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DECISION MAKING, PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DECISION MAKING (Thomas Dietz & Paul C. Sterns eds., 2008).
32. Michael L. Poirier Elliott, *The Role of Facilitators, Mediators, and Other Consensus Building Practitioners*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 199 (1999).

33. William R. Potapchuk & Jarle Crocker, *Implementing Consensus-Based Agreements*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 527 (1999).
34. *Proposed Approach,* PANHANDLE FOREST COLLABORATIVE, https://sites.google.com/site/panhandleforestcollaborative/home (last visited Dec. 3, 2016).
35. Mark S. Reed, *Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review*, 141 BIOLOGICAL CONSERVATION 2417, 2425 (2008).
36. *San Gabriel Mountains Community Collaborative,* NAT'L FOREST FOUND., https://www.nationalforests.org/who-we-are/regional-offices/california-program/sangabrielmountains (last visited Dec. 3, 2016).
37. Michael A. Schuett et. al, *Making It Work: Keys to Successful Collaboration in Natural Resource Management*, 27 ENV. MGMT. 587, 591 (2001).
38. S. Singleton, *Collaborative Environmental Planning in the American West: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*, 11 ENVTL. POL. 54 (2002)
39. *Stakeholders Forum for the Nantahala and Pisgah Plan Revision*, NAT'L FOREST FOUND., https://www.nationalforests.org/who-we-are/regional-offices/eastern-regional-program/stakeholdersforum (last visited Dec. 3, 2016).
40. David A. Straus, *Designing A Consensus Building Process Using A Graphic Road Map*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 137 (1999).
41. LAWRENCE SUSSKIND, SARAH MCKEARNAN, & JENNIFER THOMAS-LARMER, THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK (1999).
42. JULIA M. WONDOLLECK & STEVEN L. YAFFEE, MAKING COLLABORATION WORK (2000).

Endnotes

[1] NAT'L FOREST FOUND., https://www.nationalforests.org/ (last visited Dec. 4, 2016).
[2] HARVARD NEGOTIATION AND MEDIATION CLINICAL PROGRAM, http://hnmcp.law.harvard.edu/ (last visited Dec. 4, 2016).
[3] *See also* JAMES L. CREIGHTON, THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION HANDBOOK: MAKING BETTER DECISIONS THROUGH CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT 23 (2005) (stating people participate when they have a stake in decision to be made and don't participate when their interests and values aren't affected); Antony S. Cheng & Katherine M. Mattor, *Why Won't They Come? Stakeholder Perspectives on Collaborative National Forest Planning by Participation Level*, 38 ENV. MGMT. 545, 558 (2006) (noting stakeholder nonparticipation because of perceived lack of personal benefit in doing so; stating stakeholders view collaborative process as opportunity to influence the final planning decision).
[4] *See, e.g.*, JUDITH E. INNES & DAVID E. BOOHER, PLANNING WITH COMPLEXITY: AN INTRODUCTION TO COLLABORATIVE RATIONALITY FOR PUBLIC POLICY 103 (2010) ("Stakeholders . . . do not come [to the table] out of altruism, solidarity, or community values, as some commentators assume. . . . Stakeholders come because there is potential benefit for their constituency. . . .").
[5] *See id.* (noting collaborative meetings help stakeholders learn about problems and issues).
[6] *See also id.* at 113 (stating collaboration can improve social and political relationships); Susan Carpenter, *Choosing Appropriate Consensus Building Techniques and Strategies*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 61, 85 (1999) (exploring impact of consensus process on relationships); JULIA M. WONDOLLECK & STEVEN L. YAFFEE, MAKING COLLABORATION WORK 161–62 (2000) (detailing how successful collaboratives create opportunities for relationship-building); Michael A. Schuett et. al, *Making It Work: Keys to Successful Collaboration in Natural Resource Management*, 27 ENV. MGMT. 587, 591 (2001) (noting centrality of relationship-building to achieving collaborative goals).
[7] *See* Innes & Booher, *supra* note 4 at 103 ("[Stakeholders] build relationships with others around the table that also help them professionally. For example in the collaborative San Francisco Estuary Project, a Corps of Engineers stakeholder told us he routinely began calling the Sierra Club representative when the Corps was proposing a dredging project to find out the environmentalists' perspective on it and modify if necessary.").
[8] *See id.* at 104 ("Conflict and tension among participants is essential to the practice of collaborative dialogue and at the core of collaborative rationality.").
[9] *See also* Cheng & Mattor, *supra* note 3 at 549 (highlighting that participants' judgments about other participants can lead to disengagement).
[10] *See also* ROGER FISHER & ALAN SHARP, GETTING IT DONE: HOW TO LEAD WHEN YOU'RE NOT IN CHARGE 143 (1998) (noting that the greater the group size, the greater the risk of disengagement).
[11] *See also id.* (arguing large groups lead to diminished sense of personal responsibility).
[12] *See, e.g.*, Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 64 (connecting unfamiliarity with lack of process skills to ineffectiveness); Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 84–85 (discussing how

preparation will help individuals participate productively); Cheng & Mattor, *supra* note 3 at 549 (noting participant's sense of her own incapacity can deter participation).
[13] *See also* Joseph E. Bonnell & Tomas M. Koontz, *Stumbling Forward: The Organizational Challenges of Building and Sustaining Collaborative Watershed Management*, 20 SOC'Y & NAT. RESOURCES 153, 160 (2007) (describing participants' intimidation about lack of scientific knowledge leading to sense that they had little to contribute).
[14] *See, e.g.*, Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 56–57 (describing how lack of time constrains collaborative efforts).
[15] *See also* Bonnell & Koontz, *supra* note 13 at 158 (discussing collaborative excluding citizens by holding meetings during business hours).
[16] Richard D. Margerum, *Overcoming Locally Based Collaboration Restraints*, 20 SOC'Y & NAT. RESOURCES 135, 137, 140 (2007) (attesting to frustration with time collaboration requires; recounting story of government actor who sees collaboration as "add-on" duty in addition to primary professional responsibilities); Emily Jane Davis, *The Role of Leadership Committees in Forest Collaborative Capacity*, CASE STUD. BRIEFS (Or. Forest Research Lab.), June 2015, at 1 (describing necessity of stakeholder capacity to contribute, hindered by business in primary jobs).
[17] *See* PANEL ON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DECISION MAKING, PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DECISION MAKING 99–100 (Thomas Dietz & Paul C. Sterns eds., 2008) (noting importance of agency commitment to process to ensure effectiveness and engagement).
[18] *See* Ann Moote & Andrea Bedell Loucks, *Policy Challenges for Collaborative Forestry: A Summary of Previous Findings and Suggestions*, Presentation at Policy Dialogue on Collaborative Forestry 8 (Sept. 2003) (noting problems caused by agency practice of transferring officers every few years); ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION INST., EXPLORING BARRIERS TO COLLABORATIVE FORESTRY: REPORT FROM A WORKSHOP HELD AT HART PRAIRIE, FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA 3 (Ann Moote & Dennis Becker, eds., 2003) (noting government agency policies and cultures as problematic issue for forest collaboratives);
[19] *See also* Ecological Restoration Inst., *supra* note 18 at 4 (highlighting need to address "unrealistic expectations of collaboration").
[20] *See also* Alexander Conley & Margaret A. Moote, *Evaluating Collaborative Natural Resource Management*, 16 SOC'Y & NAT. RESOURCES 371, 373 (2003) (noting participants may question investment in collaboratives that fail to achieve their desired outcomes).
[21] Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 164 (attesting that carefully designed process can create conditions in which qualities of successful collaboratives emerge).
[22] *See* Fisher & Sharp, *supra* note 10 at 143–46 (highlighting barriers to engagement caused by large group size).
[23] *See* Innes & Booher, *supra* note 4 at 97, 107 (noting authentic dialogue harder to achieve in larger groups and small groups where the most productive dialogue takes place); Creighton, *supra* note 3 at 148, 152 (suggesting high level of interaction normally not possible in large meetings).
[24] *See* Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 119–20 (highlighting studies showing less effectiveness in large groups and noting weakening of communication in

large groups); William R. Potapchuk & Jarle Crocker, *Implementing Consensus-Based Agreements*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 527, 534 (1999) (noting involving large numbers of stakeholders can make process unwieldy); Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 112–13 (suggesting that managing number of participants prevented collaboratives from getting "bogged down" or process "becoming so burdensome that groups would drop out"); Fisher & Sharp, *supra* note 10 at 144 (noting importance of sense of personal responsibility in promoting engagement).

[25] *See* Richard D. Margerum, *A Typology of Collaboration Efforts in Environmental Management*, 41 ENV. MGMT. 487, 491 (2008) (noting studies showing stronger sense of community in smaller groups).

[26] *See* David A. Straus, *Designing A Consensus Building Process Using A Graphic Road Map*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 137, 146 (1999) (suggesting seven to fifteen members is the most efficient size for a problem-solving group); Michael L. Poirier Elliott, *The Role of Facilitators, Mediators, and Other Consensus Building Practitioners*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 199, 226 (1999) (highlighting necessity of special procedures for groups of more than 20 people); Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 92 (warning against including more than 25 people in a group); BARBARA GRAY, COLLABORATING: FINDING COMMON GROUND FOR MULTIPARTY PROBLEMS 80 (1989) (recommending use of subgroups if collaborative is larger than twelve to fifteen participants).

[27] *See* Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 113 (examining collaborative capacity to organize the way all stakeholders are included).

[28] *See* Innes & Booher, *supra* note 4 at 106–07 (recommending subgroups in order to include more stakeholders and enable work on complex and technical issues); Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 86–87 (highlighting subcommittees as a way to involve more people in collaborative process); Margerum, *supra* note 16 at 142, 148 (recommending combining collaborative types to address collaborative needs and allow broader representation in decision making).

[29] *See* Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 127 (noting more intensive processes tend to be less inclusive); Judith E. Innes & David E. Booher, *Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century*, 5 PLAN. THEORY & PRAC. 419, 430 (2004) (suggesting more stakeholders can participate in one-time meetings and dialogues).

[30] *See, e.g.*, Creighton, *supra* note 3 at 152, 163 (providing example of what this might look like in the course of a meeting); Gray, *supra* note 26 at 80 (providing examples of collaborative groups breaking into subgroups).

[31] *See* Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 64–65 (suggesting need to learn process skills); Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 84–85 (noting preparation helps individuals participate in collaborative discussions).

[32] Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 86 (recommending field trips as kick off to process).

[33] *See* Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 168–69 (arguing making process "fun" through events and demonstration of success promotes investment).

[34] *Id.* at 168 (detailing strategies for easing stakeholder transition into collaboratives).

[35] *Id.*

[36] *See, e.g.*, *Best Practice: Community Collaborative Develops Process to Orient New Members*, CONSERVATION CONNECT (Nat'l Forest Found.) at 1, https://www.nationalforests.org/assets/pdfs/Best-Practice-Orienting-New-Members-into-a-Collaborative_NFF.pdf (describing one collaborative's efforts to integrate new stakeholders).
[37] Judith E. Innes, *Evaluating Consensus Building*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 631, 631 (1999) (stressing importance of evaluation of process); Ecological Restoration Inst., *supra* note 18 at 7 (noting importance of collaboratives collecting data to monitor collaborative accomplishments and processes).
[38] *See* Innes, *supra* note 37 at 655; Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 90 (recommending ongoing process evaluations); Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 106–08 (underscoring importance of evaluation to collaborative learning and effectiveness).
[39] Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 224–25 (noting importance of learning from both success *and* failure).
[40] *See* Creighton, *supra* note 3 at 219 (noting need to evaluate specific public participation activities).
[41] *See* Innes & Booher, *supra* note 4 at 103 (noting stakeholders may disengage if little accomplished in collaborative meetings).
[42] *See also* Creighton, *supra* note 3 at 219–22 (providing more examples of how collaboratives can evaluate specific activities).
[43] *See* Innes, *supra* note 37 at 655 (recommending midcourse evaluations to assess process).
[44] *See also id.* at 663–70 (describing more methods of evaluation); *Factors Influencing Successful Collaboration*, CONSERVATION CONNECT (Nat'l Forest Found.) at 1, https://www.nationalforests.org/assets/pdfs/Tool-Factors-Influencing-Successful-Collaboration-Evaluation_NFF.pdf (providing NFF tool for evaluating success of collaborative).
[45] *See* Bonnell & Koontz, *supra* note 13 at 158 ("Board members pointed to the lack of tangible accomplishments as a primary reason for low levels of participation.")
[46] Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 169, 187 (highlighting importance of celebrating success in promoting engagement); Riikka Paloniemi & Annukka Vainio, *Legitimacy and empowerment: combining two conceptual approaches for explaining forest owners' willingness to cooperate in nature conservation*, 8 J. OF INTEGRATIVE ENV. SCI. 123, 134 (2011) (suggesting positive expectations of outcomes promotes engagement).
[47] *See also* Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 171 (describing examples of how to acknowledge and reward collaborative efforts); *The Collaboration Cloverleaf: Four Stages of Development*, CONSERVATION CONNECT (Nat'l Forest Found.) at 6, https://www.nationalforests.org/assets/pdfs/Tool-Collaboration-Cloverleaf-Four-Stages-of-Development_NFF.pdf (recommending rewards for work done and goals achieved).
[48] *See* Ecological Restoration Inst., *supra* note 18 at 7 (recommending collaboratives establish rules and agreements to improve agency participation in collaborative process).

[49] *See id.* at 6 (recommending "periodically revisit[ing] and review[ing] partner expectations of each other and of the collaborative process.").
[50] *See id.* at 6 (recommending helping agencies understand community perspectives on constraints resulting from agency culture or practice).
[51] NAT'L FOREST FOUND., COLLABORATIVE RESTORATION WORKSHOP: WORKING TOWARD RESILIENT LANDSCAPES AND COMMUNITIES SUMMARY 40 (2016) (noting some groups interview Forest Service candidates).
[52] *See* Innes & Booher, *supra* note 4 at 106 (highlighting process design to address stakeholder needs); Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 230 (recommending designing process to address challenges).
[53] *See* Mark S. Reed, *Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review*, 141 BIOLOGICAL CONSERVATION 2417, 2424 (2008) ("In order to design an appropriate [collaborative] process using relevant tools, it is essential to clearly articulate the goals towards which the group will be working. . ."); Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 77 (recommending determining goal of process before selecting approach); Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 232 (recommending considering goals in designing public participation process); Creighton, *supra* note 3 at 24, 71 (suggesting knowledge of task necessary to determining appropriate public participation method).
[54] Reed, *supra* note 53 at 2424 ("Participatory methods can only be chosen once the objectives of the process have been clearly articulated, a level of engagement has been identified that is appropriate to those objectives, and relevant stakeholders have been selected for inclusion in the process.").
[55] *See* Margerum, supra note 25 at 496 ("[C]ertain types of collaboratives might be more appropriate than others for particular problems and approaches"); Nat'l Forest Found., *supra* note 51 at 40 (recommending matching collaboration structure to expectations of outcomes); Scott D. Hardy & Tomas M. Koontz, *Rules for Collaboration: Institutional Analysis of Group Membership and Levels of Action in Watershed Partnerships*, 37 POL'Y STUD. J. 393, 394 (2009) (highlighting studies suggesting "different types of groups are better suited for different results.")
[56] Carl M. Moore, Gianni Longo, & Patsy Palmer, *Visioning*, *in* THE CONSENSUS BUILDING HANDBOOK 557, 558 (1999) (discussing community visioning process as a way to develop shared goals).
[57] *See* Reed, *supra* note 53 at 2422–23 (recommending involving stakeholders early and throughout process); Fisher & Sharp, *supra* note 10 at 39, 55, 58, 144 (examining importance of sense of individual purpose to effectiveness and sustained engagement); Paloniemi & Vainio, *supra* note 46 at 128 (noting importance of common goal in promoting cooperation).
[58] S. Singleton, *Collaborative Environmental Planning in the American West: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*, 11 ENVTL. POL. 54, 69 (2002) (noting the larger the scale, the more difficult to achieve success); Gray, *supra* note 26 at 80 (recommending charging subgroups with individual tasks when large number of tasks to be accomplished in process).

[59] *See* Fisher & Sharp, *supra* note 10 at 139–40 (attesting that making commitment smaller promotes engagement); Innes & Booher, *supra* note 4 at 107 (recommending "partitioning of a large objective . . . into smaller do-able tasks"); Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 187 (noting value of starting with small goals).
[60] *Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership*, NAT'L FOREST FOUND., https://www.nationalforests.org/who-we-are/regional-offices/california-program/laketahoewest (last visited Dec. 3, 2016); *Proposed Approach,* PANHANDLE FOREST COLLABORATIVE, https://sites.google.com/site/panhandleforestcollaborative/home (last visited Dec. 3, 2016); *B-D Working Group*, https://sites.google.com/site/bdworkinggroup1/ (last visited Dec. 3, 2016); *5B Restoration Coalition Purpose and Goals,* 5B RESTORATION COALITION, https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbnw1YnJlc3RvcmF0aW9uY29hbGl0aW9uc2l0ZXxneDo1YTJlZWVlMWU5ZTk1OTc4 (last visited Dec. 3, 2016); *San Gabriel Mountains Community Collaborative,* NAT'L FOREST FOUND., https://www.nationalforests.org/who-we-are/regional-offices/california-program/sangabrielmountains (last visited Dec. 3, 2016).
[61] Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership, *supra* note 60; Panhandle Forest Collaborative, *supra* note 60; B-D Working Group, *supra* note 60; 5B Restoration Coalition Purpose and Goals, *supra* note 60; San Gabriel Mountains Community Collaborative, *supra* note 60; *Stakeholders Forum for the Nantahala and Pisgah Plan Revision*, NAT'L FOREST FOUND., https://www.nationalforests.org/who-we-are/regional-offices/eastern-regional-program/stakeholdersforum (last visited Dec. 3, 2016).
[62] Lake Tahoe West Restoration Partnership, *supra* note 60; B-D Working Group, *supra* note 60; Stakeholders Forum for the Nantahala and Pisgah Plan Revision, *supra* note 60.
[63] *See* Innes & Booher, *supra* note 4 at 106 (noting collaboratives should be design based on issue and context); Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 230 (recommending process be decided based on context-specific challenges).
[64] *See* Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 231 (noting design can minimize obstacles to engagement); Wondolleck & Yaffee, *supra* note 6 at 164 (noting that carefully designed process can create conditions in which qualities of successful collaboratives emerge).
[65] *See* Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 189 (recommending consideration of legal or regulatory mandates and constraints).
[66] *See* William Butler, *Collaboration at Arm's Length: Navigating Agency Engagement in Landscape-Scale Ecological Restoration Collaboratives*, 111 J. OF FORESTRY 395, 396 (2013) (noting applicability of FACA in some collaborative contexts).
[67] *See id.* (". . . NEPA regulations make collaboration supplemental to required public involvement procedures."); Ecological Restoration Inst., *supra* note 18 at 3 (highlighting necessity of and length of NEPA processes).
[68] *See* Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 130, 232 (highlighting importance of structuring process to promote communication); E. FRANKLIN DUKES, COLLABORATION: A GUIDE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES 64–65 (2001) (recommending setting of procedures and norms).

[69] *See* Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 232 (detailing aspects of communication necessary to commit to); *The Collaboration Cloverleaf*, *supra* note 47 at 6; Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 88 (highlighting importance of determining how representatives will communicate with groups they represent).
[70] *See* Carpenter, *supra* note 6 at 77 (suggesting stakeholders need to understand their decision-making power); *The Collaboration Cloverleaf*, *supra* note 47 at 6; Panel on Public Participation, *supra* note 17 at 187–88 (recommending consideration of decision-making authority and reporting).
[71] *See* Cheng & Mattor, *supra* note 3 at 548, 558 (attesting to stakeholder concern that decision-making power won't be shared and recommending clarification of how input will be incorporated into decisions); SUZANNE GHAIS, EXTREME FACILITATION: GUIDING GROUPS THROUGH CONTROVERSY AND COMPLEXITY 77 (2005) (noting that, to participants, having a seat at the table means having power).
[72] See Davis, *supra* note 16 at 2 (describing Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project and Blue Mountains Forest Partners).