

APPENDIX A



FLORIDA PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY INTERORGANIZATIONAL COLLABORATION SURVEY

This survey aims to identify the factors that lead to the success of collaborative natural resource management initiatives. For the purposes of this survey collaboration is defined as a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible. It includes cooperation and coordination. Furthermore, this survey is focused on only the planning/decision-making phases of collaboration. Please do not reply to the questions in terms of the plan/program implementation phase of collaboration.

BACKGROUND

The following questions are intended to get some background information on the case circumstances and the collaboration.

1. Please **record the number** of organizations and non-affiliated individuals participating in this collaboration in each category.

- ___ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY
- ___ STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCY
- ___ LOCAL OR REGIONAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY
- ___ PRIVATE CORPORATION
- ___ NATIONAL NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
- ___ STATE NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
- ___ LOCAL NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
- ___ INDIVIDUALS NOT REPRESENTING AN ORGANIZATION
- ___ UNIVERSITY STAFF OR FACULTY
- ___ OTHER - PLEASE SPECIFY: _____

2. Please indicate the extent to which the participating parties to this collaboration have a prior history of collaboration with each other by circling the appropriate choice.

- a. NONE OF THE PARTIES HAVE COLLABORATED WITH EACH OTHER BEFORE.
- b. SOME OF THE PARTIES HAVE COLLABORATED WITH EACH OTHER BEFORE.
- c. MOST OF THE PARTIES HAVE COLLABORATED WITH EACH OTHER BEFORE.
- d. ALL OF THE PARTIES HAVE COLLABORATED WITH EACH OTHER BEFORE.

3. Please circle **one** of the following that best characterizes your role in this collaboration process:

- a. AN INTERESTED PARTY BUT NOT THE CONVENER RESPONSIBLE FOR BRINGING THE PARTIES TOGETHER
- b. INTERESTED CONVENER - HAD A STAKE IN THE OUTCOME
- c. NEUTRAL CONVENER - HAD NO STAKE IN THE OUTCOME

4. Please circle the category that best describes the geographic scale of the natural resource that is the focus of this collaborative effort:

- a. MULTI-NATIONAL
- b. MULTI-STATE
- c. SINGLE-STATE (MULTI-JURISDICTION)
LOCAL (WITHIN A SINGLE COUNTY, CITY, TOWN, OR VILLAGE)

OUTCOME/ PERFORMANCE CHARACTERIZATION

The following questions deal with outcomes of the collaboration and evaluation of the collaboration process.

5. Please circle the category that best describes the objectives of this collaborative effort.

- a. INITIAL PREPARATION OF A PLAN
- b. REVISION/UPDATE OF AN EXISTING PLAN

6. Please circle the category that best describes the status of this collaborative effort.

- a. THE PLAN HAS BEEN COMPLETED AND APPROVED (GO TO QUESTION 7)
- b. THE PLAN HAS BEEN COMPLETED AND IS AWAITING APPROVAL (SKIP TO QUESTION 9)
THE PLAN IS IN PREPARATION (SKIP TO QUESTION 9)

7. Please indicate how long it has been since **completion and approval** of the plan described in Question 5 by circling the category that corresponds to the appropriate time interval.

- a. LESS THAN 3 MONTHS
- b. 3 TO 6 MONTHS
- c. 7 TO 12 MONTHS
- d. 13 MONTHS TO 18 MONTHS
- e. 19 MONTHS TO 2 YEARS
- f. 2 TO 3 YEARS
- g. MORE THAN 3 YEARS

8. Please indicate how long the plan described in Question 5 has served as an agreed upon guide for action and decision making by circling the category that corresponds to the appropriate time interval.

- a. LESS THAN 3 MONTHS
- b. 3 TO 6 MONTHS
- c. 7 TO 12 MONTHS
- d. 13 MONTHS TO 18 MONTHS
- e. 19 MONTHS TO 2 YEARS
- f. 2 TO 3 YEARS
- g. MORE THAN 3 YEARS

9. Please indicate the extent to which **your party**¹ achieved its goals in the collaboration by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 = None of our goals have been achieved; 6 = All of our goals have been achieved)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 <small>NONE</small> <small>ALL</small>
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Achievement of goals

¹ If you participated as an unaffiliated individual “your party” is you. If you represented an organization in the collaboration, “your party” is that organization.

10. Please indicate the extent to which **your party** realized the following outcomes as a result of the collaboration by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 =None acquired; 6 =Much acquired)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
NONE ACQUIRED						MUCH ACQUIRED	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Acquired new resources (technology, labor, funds, or equipment)
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Acquired knowledge, information, or expertise
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Acquired knowledge that resulted in new decision-making structures and/or processes within your organization

11. Please indicate the extent to which the collaboration has resolved the real issues of concern to **all parties** by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 =Resolved none of the real issues of concern; 6 =Resolved all of the real issues of concern)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
NONE						ALL	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Issues resolved by the collaboration

12. Please indicate the extent to which you believe the agreed upon solutions are consistent with scientifically accepted understanding of the problem by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 =Do not conform at all; 6 =Conform completely)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
DO NOT CONFORM AT ALL						CONFORM COMPLETELY	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Conformance of solutions to scientifically accepted understanding

13. Please indicate how successful you consider this collaboration effort by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 =Not successful at all; 6 =Very successful)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
NOT SUCCESSFULL						VERY SUCCESSFUL	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Success of the collaboration

14. Please explain what characteristics you use to judge the success of this collaborative planning process.

15. Please describe the factors that you think positively or negatively influenced the success of this collaboration. You can list as many as you like.

a. Factors that contributed to success

b. Factors that hindered success

16. Please indicate how the collaboration process has affected the following interactions among the majority of the collaborating parties by circling the appropriate number on the scale (-3 = Deteriorated substantially; 0 = No effect; 3 = Improved substantially)

-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
DETERIORATED SUBSTANTIALLY			NO EFFECT			IMPROVED SUBSTANTIALLY	
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	Communication
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	Working relationships
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	Trust and respect

17. Please indicate **your party's** overall satisfaction with the collaboration process by circling the appropriate number on the scale (-3 = Very dissatisfied; 0 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 3 = Very satisfied)

-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
VERY DISSATISFIED			NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED			VERY SATISFIED	
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	Your party's satisfaction

18. Please indicate the extent of **your party's** impact on the substance of the plan by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 = No impact at all; 6 = Great impact)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
NO IMPACT AT ALL						GREAT IMPACT	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Your party's impact on the plan

19. Please indicate the extent to which the plan has or will produce joint gains for the parties by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 =No party gains; 6 =All the parties gain)

<u>0</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u> <small>NO PARTY</small> <small>ALL PARTIES</small>
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Joint gains produced by the plan

20. Please indicate the extent to which the parties have shown a willingness to abide by and implement the plan developed by this collaboration by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 =Not willing at all; 6 =Very willing)

<u>0</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u> <small>NOT WILLING AT ALL</small> <small>VERY WILLING</small>
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Willingness of the participants to abide by and implement the plan

21. Please indicate the extent to which your party views the outcomes of the collaboration as equitable by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 =Not equitable at all; 6 =Very equitable)

<u>0</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u> <small>NOT EQUITABLE AT ALL</small> <small>VERY EQUITABLE</small>
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Equitability of the outcomes

22. Please indicate how efficient the decision making process has been in terms of the financial resources and time required of the parties by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 =Very inefficient; 6 =Very efficient)

<u>0</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>6</u> <small>VERY INEFFICIENT</small> <small>VERY EFFICIENT</small>
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Financial resource efficiency
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Time efficiency

PROCESS CHARACTERIZATION

The following section deals with different attributes of the collaboration process.

23. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following statements accurately describes this collaboration process by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 = Strongly disagree; 6= Strongly agree)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
STRONGLY DISAGREE						STRONGLY AGREE	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	All affected stakeholders were included.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sufficient incentives existed for the stakeholders to participate.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Parties to the collaboration process were committed to the collaboration.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	There was effective leadership of the collaboration process.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	The issues addressed by the collaboration process were sufficiently ripe to be addressed at the time.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	The decision making process was viewed as equitable by all the parties.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	All of the parties had equal power to affect the collaboration process and its outcomes.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	There was mutual agreement on ground rules and decision-making processes.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	There was proportional representation among parties.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mediators were available during crisis points in decision making.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	There was agreement on the scope of the collaboration.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Shared ideology and common ground existed among parties.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Parties negotiated in good faith.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	There was trust among the parties.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Parties maintained good interpersonal relationships with each other.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Lines of communication were open among the parties.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Parties had the necessary professional and technical capabilities.

24. Please indicate the extent to which the available political support and funding were sufficient for this collaborative planning process to succeed by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 = Insufficient; 6= Sufficient)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
<small>INSUFFICIENT</small>			<small>SUFFICIENT</small>					
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Political support	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Funding	

25. Please indicate the extent to which the collaboration process was governed by formal rules by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 = No formal rules; 6= Many formal rules)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
<small>NONE</small>			<small>MANY</small>					
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Number of formal rules	

26. Please indicate the extent to which the parties committed resources to the collaboration (money, labor, equipment, or materials) by circling the appropriate number on the scale (0 = None of the parties committed resources; 6= Most parties committed substantial resources)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
<small>NONE</small>			<small>SUBSTANTIAL</small>					
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Resource commitment	

27. Please circle the statement that best describes the positions of the participants within their respective organizations.

- a. THE PARTICIPANTS WERE PREDOMINANTLY LOWER RANKING STAFF MEMBERS
- b. THE PARTICIPANTS WERE PREDOMINANTLY SUPERVISORY STAFF OR PROFESSIONALS
- c. THE PARTICIPANTS WERE PREDOMINANTLY UPPER LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS
- d. THE PARTICIPANTS WERE PREDOMINANTLY CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS
- e. THE PARTICIPANTS INCLUDED A MIX OF POSITION LEVELS
- f. THE PARTICIPANTS WERE PREDOMINANTLY INDIVIDUALS WHO DID NOT REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF AN ORGANIZATION

28. Please circle the statement that best describes the focus of power within the collaborative planning process.

- a. POWER WAS DECENTRALIZED, INDIVIDUAL ORGANIZATIONS WERE LARGELY INDEPENDENT OF EACH OTHER AND THE COLLABORATIVE PROCESS POSED FEW THREATS TO THEIR AUTONOMY
- b. POWER WAS DECENTRALIZED, BUT INDIVIDUAL ORGANIZATIONS HAD TO DEPEND ON EACH OTHER TO ACHIEVE THEIR GOALS
- c. A NEW DECISION MAKING ENTITY WAS CREATED THROUGH COLLABORATION WHICH HAD THE POWER TO MAKE DECISIONS THAT BOUND PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

29. Please circle the statement that best describes the focus of control within the collaborative planning process.

- a. NONE OF THE DECISIONS MADE DURING THE COLLABORATION PROCESS HAD TO BE RATIFIED BY THE PARTICIPANTS' ORGANIZATIONS
- b. SOME OR ALL OF THE DECISIONS MADE DURING THE COLLABORATION PROCESS HAD TO BE RATIFIED BY THE PARTICIPANTS' ORGANIZATIONS

30. Please circle the statement that best describes the goals upon which the parties were focused during the collaborative planning process.

- a. PARTIES FOCUSED ONLY ON GOALS OF THEIR INDIVIDUAL ORGANIZATIONS.
- b. PARTIES FOCUSED BOTH ON COLLECTIVE GOALS AND ON GOALS OF THEIR INDIVIDUAL ORGANIZATIONS.
- c. PARTIES FOCUSED ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY ON COLLECTIVE GOALS.

If you would like to provide additional opinions or information, please use this space.

Thank you very much for taking time from your busy schedule to reply to our survey. Your participation is extremely important, and your responses will remain anonymous. Please fold your completed survey at the dashed line, seal, and mail within one week. Postage is prepaid.

If you would like to see the results when they become available please check the box below.

Yes, I would like to see the results.

Fold on line. Please do not staple. Tape the postpaid self-mailer on the sides and mail.

Interorganizational Collaboration Project
Florida State University
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2280

APPENDIX B

CASES THAT WERE SURVEYED

<u>Case No</u>	<u>Case Name</u>	<u>Case No</u>	<u>Case Name</u>
Remedial Action Plans		PT13 [†]	Lazy K Bar Ranch L.L.C.
PT01 [†]	Clinton River	PT16 [†]	Plum Creek
101	Ashtabula River	401	Plum Creek
102	Black River	402**	US Borax
103	Grand Calumet	403	Cedar River Watershed
104*	Kalamazoo River	404	California Department of Fish and Game Striped Bass
105	Manistique River	405	Simpson Timber NW Operations
107	River Raisin	406	Metro Bakersfield
108	Rouge River	407	Kern County Valley Fl
111	Eighteenmile Creek	408	Tacoma Water
112	Oswego River/Harbor	409	Washington DNR
115	St. Clair River	410	Multiple Species Conservation Program, San Diego
116	St. Mary's River	411	San Joaquin County
117	Niagara River	Surface Water Improvement and Management Plans	
118	Deer Lake	501	Apalachicola River and Bay
119	Muskegon Lake	502*	Choctawhatchee Bay
120	Saginaw River	503	Lake Jackson
121	White Lake	504	Pensacola Bay System
122	St. Lawrence River at Massena, NY	505	St. Marks River
123	Bay of Quinte	506	St. Andrews Bay and Watershed
124	Peninsula Harbour	507	Indian River Lagoon
127	Thunder Bay	508	Lake Okeechobee/ Kissimmee River
129	Hamilton Harbour	509	Charlotte Harbor
130	St. Lawrence River, ON	511	Lake Panasoffkee
National Estuary Program Management Plans		512	Lake Tarpon
201	Barnegat Bay	513	Lake Thonotosassa
202	Charlotte Harbor	515	Sarasota Bay
204	Maryland Coastal Bays	517	Winter Haven Chain of Lakes
206	Morro Bay	National Estuarine Research Reserves Management Plans	
207	New Hampshire Estuaries	601	ACE Basin
208	Peconic Bay	606	Grand Bay
209	Puget Sound	608*	Jacques Cousteau
210	San Juan Bay	610	Kachemak Bay
212	Tillamook Bay	611*	Narragansett Bay
National Marine Sanctuaries Management Plans		612	North Carolina
PT03 [†]	Florida Keys	615	Rookery Bay
301	Channels Islands	617*	South Slough
303	The Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale	618	Tijuana River
305*	Stellwagen Bank	619*	Weeks Bay
306	Thunder Bay		
Habitat Conservation Plans			
PT06 [†]	El Coronado Ranch		
PT09 [†]	Cinergy		

* Cases excluded from analysis due to missing values

** Cases excluded from analysis due to outlier effects.

† Cases surveyed for the pretest

APPENDIX C

SURVEY RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

The following three lists present the responses to the three open-ended questions in the survey about the measures and determinants of success. The responses are grouped into thematic categories and presented as such. The boldfaced themes are the ones identified from the collaboration literature and included in the frameworks used in the quantitative analysis of this study (Tables 4.1 and 4.2). The others are themes that emerged from analysis of the open-ended questions that should be used in future research. The number of times each factor was mentioned is indicated in parentheses when it was mentioned more than once.

Measures of Success

14. Please explain what characteristics you use to judge the success of this collaborative planning process.

- **Realization of Goals**

- ⇒ Realization of Goals: General
 - # of collaborative projects 10202
 - That will be determined by the goals achieved. 10802
 - Did the project results meet goals & objectives? 12704
 - Attainment of goals, objectives 20203
 - Results 20401
 - Establishment of the sanctuary with dedicated fiscal and staff support from federal and state agencies. 30604
 - Is there closure? 40102
 - The plan is highly likely to succeed in its objectives. 40801
 - Whether: The city of Tacoma was able to acquire the Incidental Take Permits (ITP) that it sought, 40802
 - Permits were issued 41001
 - We achieved most of our goals, which were a permit to take ESA-protected species, a comprehensive open space plan to eliminate project-by-project review 41004
 - Goals achieved 51204
 - Your success has to be linked to the outcome of the process 60104

- Program success 60601
 - The establishment of a research reserve, development of successful research & monitoring 61001
 - Accomplishment of goals & objectives in the plan 61901
 - Meeting realistic expectations, changing unrealistic expectations PT406
- ⇒ Realization of Ecological Goals
- The success of the project is only determined by the actual dredging 10103
 - The restoration of the Kalamazoo River and delisting of said river. 10404
 - The environmental degradation that was the focus of the group has been remedied. 10501
 - Achievement of clean up goals – removal/control of contaminants in sediments. 10502
 - High levels of PCB remediated 10701
 - Public health benefits (restoration of impaired beneficial uses) 10704
 - Water quality of the stream 11101
 - The success of the collaboration is measured by how well the Remedial Action Plan succeeded in identifying existing conditions in the creek, problems and defined a realistic path to deal with the problems. 11104
 - Addressing 14 use impairment indicators in detail. Remedial actions done 11201
 - Clean up of the river 11602
 - The restoration of the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Niagara River Ecosystem in a manner that reflects the community's concern for the remediation, preservation and protection of the river 11702
 - Implementation has resulted in published scientific information that documents significant reductions in measurable pollutant levels in the Niagara River. Brownfields have been or are in process of becoming ... park/open space on the Niagara River. 11704
 - Will it clean the pollution from the past to the lake, will it help restore & preserve the lake, will it help preserve the lake for the future. 12103
 - Working towards delisting of Hamilton Harbour as an Area of Concern with the Great Lakes 12903
 - Quantifiable successes, such as increased number of shellfish growing areas opened, etc. 20101
 - Non-degradation of estuaries 20201
 - Objective was to bring various agencies and individuals together to combine resources and achieve environmental objectives. Outcome will result in better and cleaner community. 20402
 - Did end result (the revised management plan) help directly abate priority threats to humpback whales in Sanctuary waters; and 30303
 - Whether: The HCP provides habitat and species protection. 40802
 - Resources protected 41001
 - Water quality improvement 50301
 - Results in restoring waterbodies that have been impaired. The plan lays the framework for work to be done 50503
 - Projects prepared within the SWIM plan that will have had positive impacts on Sarasota Bay. 51501
 - Acreage of protected land & habitat enhancement. 60101
 - Degree to which the resources are protected and managed 61202
 - The proper mgmt. & protection of the resources covered by the plan developed as a result of the process. PT303
 - Achieving conservation and management goals PT406
 - Net conservation benefit to listed species was achieved. PT409

- ⇒ Problem Identification
 - PCBs were identified as a major concern – the HOT SPOT 10701
 - The problem sources identification process found additional areas which needed remediation. 12104
 - Were problems clearly identified? 12204
 - The plan consisted of: Problems identified 12701
 - Id[entify] various “problems” 51303
- ⇒ Production of an Agreement or a Plan
 - A highly contentious situation at the start evolved to a cooperative agreement. 10501
 - Stage 2 RAP document has been produced. 11603
 - Completed the planning stage plan document called “Stage II” report in a timely manner. 12303
 - Plan preparation 12904
 - The agreements 20203
 - Development of “ready to implement” plan 20603
 - Prioritizing activities/projects/goals 20604
 - Action plan to remediate an ecologically dysfunctional system 21004
 - Successfully completing CCMP. 21204
 - Completion of a plan that is acceptable to all parties. 50501
 - Completion tasks leading to Final report 50903
 - The report has been produced. 51303
 - This collaboration between and among groups has allowed us to generate 4 general plans over this period of time. 61802
 - Process produces plan PT101
- ⇒ Approval or Adoption of a Plan
 - We have completed a Comprehensive Management Plan & EIS that is being approved by USACE HQ as we speak. 10104
 - Each of 4 parties internally has approved document. 11603
 - Progress of plan update through various layers of approval (just starting, but at least has made it in the door) 12002
 - [Plan] Approval 12904
 - New plan was approved and adopted 30304
 - Additionally, the plan approval facilitated the participation and future management activities of the Northwest Fl. Water Mgt. District. 50601
 - Approval of the plan in a timely manner 50703
 - * All that participated signed off on plan. 21204
- ⇒ Acceptance or Support of the Plan
 - Acceptance of outcome by previously skeptical parties. 12002
 - The plan was accepted by all stakeholders, the community at large and the municipalities. 12303
 - Consensus on preparing report. 12401
 - Consensus on solutions 20201
 - Degree of consensus 20601
 - Public support of outcomes 20603
 - Consensus among diverse groups – universities & fed. Agencies ↔ citizen groups from poor communities 21004
 - Community to support the final document 21202

- Development of a management plan that has support of community and good likelihood of being implemented. 21203
 - Support voiced for certain issues/ positions 30502
 - We have a plan that is widely accepted, 40504
 - A planning product that is a consensus within a regulatory framework 40701
 - Acceptance from outside sci. community 40703
 - We agreed on joint efforts, as well as complementary separate efforts, that led (or will lead) to a successful mitigation and restoration plan. 40803
 - Agreement on goals and objectives in the basin in terms of protection, restoration & preservation of ecology. 50101
 - Establishment of a consensus regarding framework and strategies for preservation and restoration efforts 50303
 - Good acceptance by community. 50701
 - Positive public comments during development 50703
 - Positive feedback from site users and advisory committee members, acceptance of the plan by federal and state agencies 61201
 - The Management authority is able to come to a working consensus that meets the Vision Statement of the management plan in the best interests of the resource. 61802
 - Plan is accepted by groups not involved in planning PT101
- ⇒ Product Quality
- Is the plan useful? 11604
 - Whether the recommendations are usable 11901
 - Did the process celebrate successes as well as identify problems, did the plan result in establishing clear restoration targets 12001
 - Specific recommendations [in the plan] 12904
 - The quality of decisions 20203
 - Results in plan with clear assignments & timelines (expectations are clear) 20901
 - Did the end result help managers to focus resources on priority resource management problems 30303
 - Ensuring all major issues are addressed 30503
 - Quality & breadth of final report 50502
 - By number of goals of local conservation organization that were incorporated in SWIM plan. 50603
 - Plan clarity – people took their own view of what was intended in the plan (which often is not in writing) 61001
 - * The SWIM plan was well written 50803
- ⇒ Implementation
- The ability to implement portions of Remedial Action Plan. 10301
 - That will be determined by the implementation actions 10802
 - Whether the recommendations get used. 11901
 - Collaborative projects have been implemented 11902
 - Did the completed plan initiate remedial actions and/or discussion about how to address identified problems 12001
 - The actual cleanup implementation has begun 12104
 - [The plan] provided the base for successfully implementing remedial actions. 12303
 - We have implemented many options while plan was developed. Much of implementation complete. 12701
 - Was the project completed? 12704

- Completed projects consistent with the goals, local implementation 13001
- The plan is one that can be implemented. 20401
- Results in the field (projects implemented per the plan) 20601
- [Plan] is being implemented 40504
- Completion of projects listed in the plan 50101
- How well the plan has been implemented 50402
- Evidence of plan implementation 50502
- We measure success as implementation of planned activities 50503
- Document is in third iteration with several projects complete or underway. 51201
- Process resulted in funding recommendations and project implementation 51701
- The fact that many of the “projects” described in the plan have been implemented or have been approved to be implemented is testimony for the success of the plan. 60104
- The completion of tasks elaborated in the approved Management Plan. 61103
- Plan is implemented PT101
- ⇒ **Implementation Safeguards**
 - Was there a commitment to ongoing monitoring in order to measure success? 12204
 - The plan consisted of: Action Plan, Implementation/monitoring 12701
 - We have defined a system that provides for a level of accountability not usually achieved. We have an advisory committee comprised of stakeholder representatives that is engaged in development and implementation of monitoring an adaptive management. 40504
 - There are provisions to monitor & evaluate success and mechanisms for adjustment if any part does not succeed. 40801
 - Follow-up by lead agency on collaborators regarding results over time 50502
 - Clearer definition of performance measures 50701
- ⇒ **Achieving Each Party’s Goals**
 - Individual members goals being met 20604
 - Objectives of “parties” (USFWS, NMFS, Plum Creek) achieved and new cooperative approach emerged. 40101
 - The extent to which each participants goals/needs were considered and incorporated/addressed. 61902
 - [The company] achieved desired regulatory assurances. Net conservation benefit to listed species was achieved. PT409
- ⇒ **Achieving Own Party’s Goals**
 - Did my party obtain most of what it needed. 40601
 - Whether my agencies issues are addressed. 51302
 - Success is achieved if the plan factors in the concerns of our jurisdiction provides leeway & consideration for governments that have already been pro-active in reducing polluted loading 51304
 - Meeting overall goals of our organization 61104
- ⇒ **Capacity-Building of Organizations**
 - ❖ **Acquisition of New Resources (Technology, Labor, Funds, or Equipment)**
 - ❖ **Acquired Knowledge, Information, or Expertise**
 - Increase in level of awareness and understanding among stakeholders regarding the process and the sanctuary. 30101
 - Resource (fish & wildlife) needs well understood 40402
 - ❖ **Acquired Knowledge That Resulted in New Decision-Making Structures and/or Processes**
 - The learning 20203
 - Systemic changes in local govt & to some extent in state agencies 20403

- ⇒ **Whether the Outcome Resolves the Real Issues in Dispute**
 - # issues identified and resolved 10202
 - Controversy basically resolved. 30603
 - Resolution of issues addressed in the plan 50101
 - Whether it lays the groundwork to fix the problem. 50803
 - Plan objectives encompass all concerns & problems. 51202
 - Priority issues of concern raised by stakeholders have been resolved through increased understanding & awareness of program goals and objectives and by establishing constructive partnerships that provide mutual benefits. 61501
 - * Issues were addressed. 51302
- ⇒ **Conformance of the Solution to Available Objective Standards**
 - Based on the major concern in our AOC (PCBs) the agencies involved in our area worked closely together, identified the options, and for the most part arrived at the most environmentally sound and practical solution. 10703
 - Ecosystem approach 10704
 - A wholistic, integrated “sustainability” approach 12302
 - Basing plans on scientific facts from recognized experts 20404
 - Adopts to new scientific evidence and thinking, incorporates and articulates consensus positions 20901
 - Conformity with major goals like the National Estuary Program, inclusion of conditions which further environmental goals, such as compliance with and progress toward Clean Water Act goals, pollution reduction, and habitat protection. 20904
 - Technical validity of desired outcome. 21002
 - Using good science to inform decisions 21004
 - The level of scientific rigor to base conclusions. 40401
 - Success is based on what the norm is when dealing with cities, towns, counties, and individual landowners in dealing with ESA compliance 40602
 - Whether: The restrictions placed on the City’s water utility by the ITPs were not overly burdensome, 40802
 - The effort also satisfied the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. 40803
 - Best science based 40904
 - Completion of a plan that meets the criteria for formal pursuant to statutory guidance 50501
 - Plan goals are realistic & can be expected to be achieved. Plan projects are practical and address objectives. 51202
 - Incorporation of [scientific] information into the SWIM Plan. Utilization of [scientific] information to create new projects and/or enhance existing projects that will benefit the resource (in this case, Lake Thonotasassa). 51301
 - Increase in public use opportunities, increase in public access, expanded recreational opportunities, emphasis on sustainable development, increase in compatible economic development 60101
 - NERR managers understand & incorporates into plan fact that state owns & manages most the land & water in the NERR 61002
 - Was the result biologically sound? PT416
 - * Included public health concerns 10404
 - * Adaptive management built into the plan 40901
- **Durability of the Agreement**
 - The fact that [the project] is alive & well does speak for itself 10103
 - Participants have continued to participate over a 12 yr process. 10204
 - The resultant work product is still the guiding document (5 years later) 10302

- Attendance at meetings over a period of 14 years 11503
- Citizen Advisory group continues to participate/support effort. 11603
- Continued participation by some members 20401
- In an ongoing sense we are all still collaborating which is a success in and of itself. 30104
- Degree of back sliding on issues previously resolved (lack thereof) 40503
- Longevity 60601
- We have done this for the past 20 years. 61802
- Continued collaboration for ongoing efforts 61901
- **Enhanced Interorganizational Relations**
 - ⇒ **Improved Communication Among Collaboration Participants**
 - Increased communication and coordination. 50701
 - ⇒ **Improved Working Relationships Among Collaboration Participants**
 - Change in mutual attitudes between sectors 11503
 - Strengthened working relationships 40301
 - A series of new working relationships with traditional opponents 41004
 - Fundamentally how well the planning process led to effective relationships with partners relative to implementation 60104
 - ⇒ **Building Trust and Respect among Collaboration Participants**
 - Mistrust replaced with guarded acceptance. 30603
 - Degree of trust developed among parties with competing ideas. 40201
 - New sense of trust 40301
- **Satisfaction of Collaboration Participants**
 - ⇒ **Overall Satisfaction of the Participants**
 - All stakeholders were satisfied with the planning document and the process used to develop it. 10302
 - The RAP revision process is judged by satisfaction with the final document. 10802
 - Were all parties reasonably satisfied with the results? 12704
 - Satisfied with signed agreements. 40303
 - How the parties “felt” at the end. 40401
 - Was there satisfaction gained by all parties 40601
 - Amount of dissatisfaction 40701
 - Mutual satisfaction/consensus among diverse interests 40703
 - Satisfaction of parties 51204
 - Satisfaction of individual stakeholders in the process & the outcome. PT303
 - ⇒ **Do the Parties Feel they Affected the Substance of the Plan?**
 - Respect and responsiveness to stakeholder concerns 30101
 - Were the views of all interest groups accounted for in both the planning process and end product; 30303
 - Lead agency truly listens to input 40904
 - The plan addresses many different concerns ranging from basic land use planning to restoration 50102
 - How well interested parties concerns were addressed in completing the plan 50402
 - Did all parties have an opportunity to be heard? PT416
 - ⇒ **Does the Agreement Produce Joint Gains for the Parties?**
 - Are all parties gaining something in the process and conclusions? 40102
 - Results reflect interests of all parties 40501
 - Design a program that effectively balances the environmental and economic goals of all parties. 40702

- And the plan was developed in a way to be inclusive of as many diverse interests as possible. 40801
- Were all parties at least somewhat better-off as a result? PT416
- ⇒ **Willingness of the Stakeholders Implement the Decision**
 - Unanimous support for trying the planned solution 11804
 - All parties remain committed to implementation even eleven years after original plan was adopted. 20903
 - Support for implementation. 21201
 - Compliance of agreement by collaborators to engage in plan implementation 50702
- ⇒ **Equity in the Outcomes**
- **Efficiency**
 - ⇒ Efficiency: General
 - Process efficiency 30101
 - ⇒ **Resource Efficiency**
 - # of parties contributing output vs. effort expended, value of output 11103
 - Efficiency of resource use (esp. \$ + labor/time) 21201
 - Cost effectiveness 40402
 - ⇒ **Time Efficiency**
 - Timely? No 11604
 - Finished under deadline requirement. 20403
 - Timelines in resolving issues and moving forward. 40503
 - Grand Bay NERR was approved and designated in record time and exists under general direction of board (partners) representing state, federal, university & private non-profit entities. 60602
- **Others**
 - Results tested 40904
 - Testing out new techniques 61104
 - Overall organization of the group was great 61004
 - Evaluates success/failure of previous activities 51303
 - Enjoyable 61104
 - The outcomes were somewhat easily defined, however not easily attained. 10203
 - National Economic Development vs. Environmental Quality 10704
 - Completion of plan update that was several years late, despite many attempts over last 3 yrs. 50701
 - Strong beginning, well formulated planning, good discussions and conclusions, weak ending 12402

Positive Determinants of Success

15. Please describe the factors that you think positively or negatively influenced the success of this collaboration. You can list as many as you like.

a. Factors that contributed to success

Member Factors:

- Inclusion/Participation of Stakeholders
 - ⇒ **Inclusion of All Affected Stakeholders (Intergovernmental Participation)**
 - Involvement of all stakeholders 20404
 - The entire community was involved. 21202
 - Representatives of all relevant interest groups were invited to participate in the process 30303
 - [Water Management District coordinator] contacted all parties that had a potential interest. 50203
 - Getting all interested parties and/or stakeholders involved in the planning process at the earliest point possible. 60104
 - We attempted to involve all stakeholders. 60802
 - Attempt to include all parties 61002
 - * All relevant regulatory agencies were involved 40303
 - * Involvement of all parties – true collaboration 40904
 - ⇒ Inclusion of Key Stakeholders
 - Having environmental groups at the ready. 10301
 - Ford Mtr. came to the table 10701
 - The people included in the process were for the most part stakeholders 11101
 - Presence of a not for profit industrial environmental organization (Lambton Industrial Society- now called Sarnia Lambton Environmental Association) with a thirty + year record. 11503
 - Also cooperative industrial entities interested in environmental remediation. 11602
 - Participation of all extreme interest groups re: resource use. 20201
 - Involving fund providers (legislators) in process 20903
 - Participation of a number of key individuals on the Bay Environmental Study Team, who have in depth knowledge and many years of experience & persistent efforts. 50601
 - ⇒ Multistakeholder Involvement
 - Large diverse group initially 10302
 - Variety of interests, variety of backgrounds, many organizations/ companies. The Rouge River Advisory Council (RRAC) is comprised of members of local governments, MDEQ and other agencies as well as interested citizens. 10801
 - Many people involved 12203
 - Multiple stakeholders 20903
 - Wide representation and participation 20904
 - Program (collaboration) fully funded by feds (EPA) & Program had authority of Clean Water Act & federal administration. These 2 factors promoted broad-based participation. Diversity of participants. 21201
 - Diverse participation 21203
 - Wide participation by not only the main participants, but the general public through the public comment process associated with conservation planning under the ESA. 40301

- Multi-party oversight of info gathering re instream flows, multi-party discussion & crafting of proposals for 1) Instream flows 2) Fish mitigation 3) Watershed mgmt. 40303
 - Participation by a diverse group of stakeholders. 50501
 - Most of the agencies that had a hand in Lake Management were involved. The group worked together to develop a fairly comprehensive Management Plan. 51202
 - Each contributing agency brought its own local and/or regional focus to the process, thus resulting in a SWIM Plan that was more comprehensive in scope than it otherwise would be. 51301
 - Input was sought by most affected parties 51304
 - Inclusion of multiple stakeholders 51501
 - Diverse group 51701
 - Involvement of stakeholders. 60101
 - Multiple parties involved 61002
 - Review and input from many parties PT406
 - * Breadth of stakeholders' sectors eg. Env. Groups through industry 11503
 - * The broad group of participants 12104
 - * Diversity of attendees and issues 30502
 - * Participation by multi agency field scientists 50901
- ⇒ Public Participation/Input
- Public participation, attendance and participation in meetings 10202
 - Citizen driven 10404
 - Public information and involvement, public interest and pressure 10504
 - Local public involvement in the RAP process has provided the few successes that have resulted from the process. 11601
 - Outside attention (IJC, Citizen Advisory Group) pushing for progress on AOC 11603
 - Good community involvement in public meetings, hearings, etc. 12103
 - Good planning mtg attendance, consultation in the communities affected by the process 12303
 - Good input from all parties involved. Actual participation of a final phase II report would constitute success. 12403
 - Citizen participation 20101
 - Citizen stakeholders very active 20401
 - Intensity of citizen interest, willingness of other groups not involved in the beginning to join in the process 20403
 - Inclusiveness for being in 20601
 - Stakeholder-based process 20603
 - Strong stakeholder interest and involvement, help from the Sanctuary Advisory Council 30101
 - Exhaustive process of public review (NEPA & SEPA) 40303
 - Community input. 50304
 - Received input from a number of stakeholders 50402
 - Public meetings 50703
 - Strong public influence 51204
 - Presence of good/supportive publics 61001
 - Advisory Committees established, numerous public meetings/open meetings 61002
 - Opportunities for input (e.g. public meetings, local advisory committees) 61201
 - The ongoing, public involvement in the process was vital. PT303
 - * Local input had a large impact on the plan. 10501
 - * The RAP revision process is judged by participation 10802

- * Does the public understand, care, ask? 11604
 - * Meetings are each month – well attended by PAC members, new membership recently; more health department participation, more community foundation involvement. 11902
 - * Public involvement – meetings, public input into document/issues/solutions 12102
 - * Involvement from w/in the local community 12302
 - * Expanded community participation 13001
 - * Open process that public can access 20201
 - * Even with no authority to enforce implementation participation has been excellent 20903
 - * # of entities represented 20904
 - * Inclusion of public in implementation of plan 21004
 - * Number of participants 21201
 - * People and organizations’ participation 21204
 - * # of attendees at public hearings, # of comments submitted to agency 30502
 - * Degree of involvement by all parties. 40201
 - * Extent and number of review comments received by formal reviewers and the general public. Most reviewers were happy with the format and content and very few substantial changes were needed. 50801
 - * Participation 60601
 - * The number of people and organizations that came to the table to negotiate the plan, continued throughout the planning process, and continue to serve on the management team. 60802
- ⇒ Education and Outreach
- Emphasis on public education 10202
 - Good press coverage 12103
 - Outstanding public outreach and education program. 20402
 - Strategies for “using” the local media – entire public outreach effort 20403
 - Educating all stakeholders 20404
 - Good public relations 20702
 - Information and education 20903
 - Outreach efforts prior to hearings (in-person, email, websites, etc.). Extent & type of media coverage 30502
 - Well publicized 61002
 - Our success is dependent on consensus/communication and education! 61802
 - * Public education/support/interest 21002
 - * Raising awareness of public to ecology, environmental issues on a broader scale than normal 21004
- **Magnitude of Stakeholder Incentives**
 - ⇒ All “parties” had needs to be met. 40101
 - Motivation of all parties to come up with a solution 40601
 - * Everyone has a stake in the outcome 40301
 - **Commitment of the Collaboration Participants to the Collaboration Process**
 - In this case the responsible parties are responsible for the success. They keep the project going & always seem willing to go the extra mile. Dedication to see a problem solved 10103
 - A committed group of partners 10203
 - Committed parties 10802
 - A group of people willing to stay committed over the long term. They didn’t give up and go away. 11602
 - Very dedicated public members 11604
 - Strong staff commitment 11901
 - Long term dedication of most parties. Willingness to seek solutions 20203

- Desire to find solutions. Commitment of the parties 20401
- Willingness of participants to be involved and stay engaged. 20402
- Willingness to take on small work steps en route to larger goals 20702
- The genuine will of everyone to see something get done. 20801
- Perseverance (20+ years in the making) 30603
- Persistence by both state and federal entities. 30604
- Desire to “make it work” 40102
- Leaders of primary convener groups were dedicated to success. Willingness of conveners to consider alternatives, willingness of participants to move beyond rhetoric. 40201
- Support /coalition approach to an agreed upon position by negotiating parties when position was challenged in the public review process. 40503
- Commitment to developing a program that meets all needs 40702
- Most parties had the will to succeed. 40801
- Desire to reach an end point by both sides of spectrum 41001
- High level of assurances 41004
- Firm determination to accomplish plan update by top management. Willingness to work through problems by staff 50701
- Determination for success 60104
- Commitment 60601
- Staff dedication – willingness to go extra mile 61001
- Willingness to go the extra mile to write up the proposal. Follow through on commitment was outstanding 61004
- An attitude that caters to the resource not to the “EGO” = commitment 61802
- Dedication of a few parties to making it work. PT406
- Commitment to fern conservation by all parties PT409
- Both parties were willing to do whatever necessary to complete. PT413
- * Strong commitment to devoting the required time and energy into the process 10302
- * Willingness to pursue remediation instead of taking legal avenues. 10504
- * Although the RAP process is slow, participants remain optimistic that they are making a difference 11902
- * Dedication of participants from start to finish 20403
- * On-going commitment to update and reprioritize 20903
- * Willingness of participants 21201
- * Had high level commitment from State/Fed agencies to make it work, including financial contributions. Local politicians that were willing to be “partners” 41003
- * Strong desire to see protection of the resource! 50304
- * A willingness to work w/ others 60102
- **Effective Leadership for the Collaboration**
 - Excellent leadership and organization of the New York State Department of Water and outstanding work by [two individuals there]. 11702
 - Excellent leadership 12303
 - Skill of the chairperson 12704
 - Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan (RAP) coordinator. This person was well respected by all parties/stakeholders and worked hard towards consensus building. 12903
 - Strong leader 20401
 - Ability of citizen chair to listen to everyone & find consensus points & ability of that chair to attend all subcommittee meetings & keep continuity plus stop duplication of effort 20403
 - Strong leadership 20404
 - Efforts by key individuals 20603

- Local leadership that bridged gap between pro/con groups 30603
- Good local leaders 40703
- Strong leadership by city of San Diego 41001
- Highly motivated “point man” 50301
- Process leadership 50304
- Leadership by the Water Mng District was very good. 51704
- Leadership 60602
- * Good direction and management 20702
- Agency Attitudes
 - ⇒ Flexibility
 - A proactive approach by corporations involved in addressing scientific and technical issues. 10501
 - High degree of initiative, creativity 60104
 - Risk-taking 60604
 - * Willingness to look at innovative solution 10504
 - ⇒ Turf
 - The lack of interagency rivalry. Willingness of agencies to work towards goals 13002
 - Non-regulatory program that did not usurp anyone else’s authority 60802
 - ⇒ Lack of Turnover and Institutional Memory
 - Length of professional careers 10204
 - Continuity of convener reprs and a few key interested parties 11103
 - Ind. representatives of agency remained constant – low/no turnover of staff 40501
 - * Lack of turnover 20403
 - * Institutional memory 40503
 - * Changing personnel + changing understanding of the process & outcomes 40901
- Representative Attitudes
 - ⇒ Enthusiasm
 - Enthusiasm in group at the beginning of process 12203
 - Excitement about our mission both w/in the community and amongst staff 61001
 - Enthusiasm 61004
 - ⇒ Personalities
 - Good people 12302
 - Tendency to leave egos at the door 21004
 - “can do” attitude of participants 21203
 - Personalities of participants 40701
 - Reasonable people representing the parties PT416
 - ⇒ Politics
 - Strict adherence not to get involved in politics – until recently- which I view as a threat to long term viability of the program. 2040
 - ⇒ Patience 20601, 40201

Process Factors:

- **Ripeness of the Issue / Timing**
 - The threat of making the river a Superfund site got all parties involved in the common goal of the environmental dredging of the river. 10102
 - Genuine caring for the quality of life 10204
 - Timing 10703
 - Urgent/visible need to address the problem 12302
 - Genuine concern among citizenry about environmental issues. 20402

- The need for action was clear. 21202
- Knowledge and interest in the problem 40601
- Need to come up with a better way to comply with ESA [saves time, knows up front ESA costs (costs are reasonable)]. Before the HCP lots of dissatisfaction, delays, costs, etc. 40602
- The subject matter under discussion – water supply and species protection – are both very important to society. Both have to happen. One can't trump the other. 40802
- Interest in issues was high, issues are critical to resource sustainability 50101
- True concern for the resource 50702
- Timeliness in meeting 60102
- Genuine interest among all parties 61201
- All had desire for environmental improvement in the watershed. PT101
- **Decision-Making Structure**
 - ⇒ **Equity in Decision Making**
 - ⇒ **Power Distribution among the Parties**
 - ⇒ **Agreement on Ground Rules / Mutually Agreed upon Decision-Making Process**
 - Able to make decisions without dispute 10801
 - Multi faceted group agreed to work together by consensus 12701
 - Use of consensus, rather than majority vote 12704
 - Meetings were essential to agree upon processes. 20604
 - Consensus decision making 20903
 - Establishing scope and deadlines 40102
 - Majority of players were not looking at process as zero sum game 41003
 - * The process used and the parties involved are compatible. 10203
 - * Effort was based on consensus building 20402
 - * Striving for and frequently reaching consensus – still doing what's right for the estuary. 20404
 - * Knowledge of agreed upon processes so everyone knows where they stand 20604
 - * Completing goals & objectives for mgmt. with consensus 30503
 - * All the reviewing agencies were on board with what was contained in the Plans as well as what was proposed. 50801
 - ⇒ **Proportional Representation**
 - Participation was reasonably balanced among the collaborators. 30102
- **Availability of Mediators during Crisis Points in Decision Making**
 - A “neutral” coordinator – actually a government (MOE) paid official 11503
 - The Muskegon Conservation District (MCD) has served as the “local RAP coordinator” for 8 years. 11902
 - Consultant – Process coordinated by a consulting firm with a lot of experience. Made the process relatively unbiased and decision making meetings were facilitated. 12001
 - Facilitated discussion format 30502
 - Articulate facilitation helped. 40801
 - A funded staff person to coordinate the process 50501
- **Organization and Centralization of the Collaboration**
 - ⇒ **Rank of the Participating Agency Representatives**
 - High-level management attention on all sides 41004
 - Key decision-maker participation 50304
 - * The right people were at the table. 40901
 - ⇒ **Degree of Formalization of the Collaboration**
 - ⇒ **Level of Resource Commitment to the Collaboration**
 - * Commitment of resources by participants 20603

- * Leveraged resources to get a project done that couldn't be done otherwise 20801
- ⇒ **Focus of Power in the Collaboration**
- ⇒ **Focus of Control in the Collaboration**
- ⇒ **Focus of Collaboration Goals**
 - * Re-aligned priorities by other collaborators to match or be complementary to “ours”, re-aligned policies to be consistent with plan objectives 50702
- **The Relationship between the Parties**
 - ⇒ **Agreement on the Scope of the Collaboration**
 - A consistent focused vision 11604
 - Clearly defined goals & objectives 20702
 - Focus 60601
 - Clear identification of roles and boundaries 60802
 - Getting every one on the same page at relatively the same time. 61901
 - ⇒ **Shared Ideology / Common Ground among Participants**
 - Common interests 10203
 - Meetings were essential to agree upon mutual goals. 20604
 - Parties' ability to convene around the issue at the center of the collaboration (i.e., Puget Sound) 20901
 - Respect & understanding that the primary purpose of a National Marine Sanctuary is to protect & enhance biodiversity/fish & wildlife first & public use is secondary 30503
 - All parties working toward a common goal (for the most part) 40803
 - Industry predominantly agrees w/ natural resource protection, economy relies on healthy natural environment 50101
 - Consensus on problems, priorities & solutions 50303
 - Same goals, same methods of operation 50602
 - Common purpose of protecting water quality 50603
 - Mostly a common vision 60104
 - Shared vision 60601
 - Mutually desired goals 61202
 - A thorough understanding of the vision statement in the management plan by all parties involved. 61802
 - Shared goals of the major contributing organizations. 61804
 - * Defined, agreed upon goals and measures. 12302
 - * Common goal to develop a management plan 20402
 - * Only had one issue couldn't find consensus points. 20403
 - * Clear goals and objectives 20702
 - * Clear explanation of guiding goals and mandates 30101
 - * All parties interested in a common goal 51704
 - * Successful collaboration occurred because we all agreed our goal 61004
 - ⇒ **Negotiating in Good Faith**
 - Willingness to listen to all sides. 10504
 - Being reasonable and realistic 11804
 - Willingness to listen to the parties ideas. 13002
 - Cheerful goodwill of committee chairpersons & staff & parties. 20203
 - Listening to all sides of an issue 20404
 - Professional (scientific) respect 40102
 - Willingness to listen and respond /revise through consensus 61501
 - Appreciation of each participant's role and field of expertise 61902
 - Each party recognized needs of others. PT 416

- * When presented the information can the group reach a decision without letting their personal bias hamper agreement 12203
- * Being realistic to others' needs & concerns 60102
- ⇒ **Existence of Trust in the Relationships**
 - Transparent /mutual trust 12303
 - Trust 12401
 - Absolute honesty and veracity of Federal lead employee. EARNED local trust. 30603
 - Development of trust between parties 40503
 - Building a basis for trust among the participants. The company took a very straightforward approach to their negotiations in being very clear as to what they wanted and could give. 40504
 - Trust developed over time 40702
 - Started with good basis of trust 61501
- ⇒ **Maintaining Good Interpersonal Relationships among Participants**
 - Friendships and previous alliances, non-threatening atmosphere 11901
 - Personal relationships 12401
 - Respect among parties 20201
 - Local participants, resulting in “more friendly” atmosphere 20603
 - Existing relationships among many parties 20901
 - Good working relationship 30304
 - Respect for individual /organization positions. 30503
 - Personal relationships 40401
 - Excellent working relationships formed & were maintained throughout process 40501
 - Development of personal relationships between parties 40503
 - Relationship developed over time 40702
 - Positive working relationships 40803
 - Personal relationships 41004
 - Good working relationships among participants. 51201
 - Respect for expertise of partner org/ individuals 60604
 - Reserve has established reputation for working with diverse interests in community 61501
 - A positive relationship between management/research/education and the general public. 61802
 - Most had history of working together PT101
 - Excellent working relationship with applicant PT409
 - * Good interpersonal relationships (trusting etc.) 12302
 - * Nobody killed anyone in the process! ☺ 20401
- ⇒ **Establishing Clear Lines of Communication**
 - Ability for groups to interact. 10301
 - Free sharing of information within the group and the community as a whole. 10501
 - Good communication & working solutions amongst the committee members. 11104
 - Openness of industry, government and others to share information and identify strategies to resolve complex environmental issues of concern on the Niagara River. 11704
 - Willingness of academics to explain their study in detail 11901
 - Good communications in the communities affected by the process 12303
 - Open dialogue & appreciation of other parties' goals and concerns, continued dialogue with all parties 13001
 - Open, transparent, public process 30101
 - Open forum for discussion 30104

- Open minded participants, are communications open and constructive? 40102
 - Extensive communication among stakeholders. 50701
 - Attitude of open-mindedness for the sake of the resource 50702
 - Open exchange of scientific information 51301
 - Communication, openness 60102
 - Open public meetings and forum for discussion 60802
 - Good networking and communications, communication was good 61004
 - Effective communication with all parties 61501
 - Our success is dependent on consensus/communication and education! 61802
 - Open communication was very important. PT413
 - * Active networking of science and manager types 12302
 - * Communication between parties regardless of “status” – even citizens had easy access to all govt staff regardless of level in agency 20403
 - * Open free discussions on points of mutual concern/interest 50602
 - * Ability of partners to open & flexible. E.g. look at the big picture and acknowledge/accept the hurdles we have to overcome 61001
- ⇒ Coordination and Cooperation between the Parties
- Cooperation of Federal and State agencies, cooperation of local industries with regulators 10102
 - Partnership with USEPA, OEPA, USACE, Political leaders, community, state of Ohio, Industry and many more 10104
 - Cooperation of local industry 10502
 - Cooperation among local affected agencies 10703
 - Good cooperation by Canadian agencies. 12204
 - Good cooperation with all levels of government initially 12701
 - Partnership agencies working together 20101
 - Collaborative approaches, better coordination with monitoring programs and efforts to modify monitoring programs to measure effectiveness of action items. 20103
 - Willing collaboration of disparate as well as congenial parties. 20203
 - Good collaboration on issues with which the collaborators had experience and expertise in their own organizations, such as community communication/ outreach, goal setting, and rational establishment of management priorities. 30102
 - Collaborative attitude of all parties 40501
 - Willingness to resolve differences, ability of people to work together to achieve consensus 40701
 - Willingness to negotiate, willingness to compromise 40901
 - Willingness to compromise 41001
 - Partnership between Water Management Districts 50703
 - Cooperation 50903
 - Participants ... were very cooperative. 51704
 - Cooperative attitudes of some parties, extent of cooperation among parties, as indicated by progress in achieving stated objectives 60604
 - * The extent of the cooperation all parties have exhibited in pursuing the goals of the revised plan. 12301
 - * Extent of collaboration and communication among a full range of agencies and participants. 20904
 - * Cooperative attitude /help in achieving an acceptable solution vs. “It’s your problem” type attitude 40503

- * Coordination of government agencies, coordination of government agencies with private & non-profit organization 50101
- * Cooperation 60102
- * All the government agencies Federal/ State/Local and the NGO and the research community are able to coordinate effectively to prioritize all activities that directly and indirectly effect the resource. 61802
- Professional and Technical Capacities
 - ⇒ **Relevant Professional and Technical Capacities: General**
 - Led by an expert; dedicated to the outcome 10404
 - Experts participating 11201
 - Intelligence and knowledge level of the participants 11804
 - Strong staff knowledgeability 11901
 - Good plan writer @ Cons. District 12102
 - Outside experts who could explain complicated processes, people involved who had time, energy and knowledge 12203
 - Well organized RAP team 12303
 - Skills of director + other staff, especially in preparing materials, skills of contractors. 20203
 - Strong direction with experience and knowledge of the system & program 20401
 - First director was local with EPA experience 20403
 - Consensus striving skills 20404
 - Well qualified staff 20702
 - Organized, diligent staff 20904
 - Strong technical support from: Academia, state and Fed. Programs – FWS, USGS, USACE, EPA, ERB, Universities. 21002
 - Attitude of Ctee Chair: Open to suggestions, free form discussions, good group, technically, from different agencies, companies, universities 21004
 - Strong staff. 21204
 - Assistance from [National Marine Sanctuary] staff 30104
 - Technical resources were made available to answer all questions. 40801
 - Good technical resources 41003
 - Scientific expertise 50304
 - Availability of GIS resources during the process, well-established planning program and guidance about plan components/format. 50501
 - Technical & professional depth of staff 50502
 - Known experts 51701
 - Preparation, properly formatted meetings 60102
 - Expert knowledge, good organization 61004
 - Technical support from national office 61104
 - A highly skilled well educated staff and management authority. 61802
 - The involvement of the species expert PT406
- Availability of Scientific/Technical Information
 - University and state level scientific input was included 10404
 - Studying/investigation, delisting criteria 11201
 - The science was extensive and useful in addressing immediate technical issues dealing with the worst problems first. 11703
 - Balanced, reasonable scientific background 11901
 - Input by Aquatic Biologist (Cons. District); University Scientist from Grand Valley St. University – Annis Water Res. Instit. EPA. Delisting guidelines/structure published 12102

- Excellent scientific input 12303
- Sound scientific information 30101
- Sustained technical effort/input by biologists 40402
- Exclusive information on biol. resources 40703
- Scientific documentation 50702
- Long term data base of water quality 51303
- Studies 51704
- Provision of information and resources to interested parties. During implementation of the management plan and ongoing research science/scientific fact is a major contribution to the solutions. 60802
- * At each meeting all members share valuable information that makes the process work. 10801
- * Generation of applicable scientific data, use of the data to create a workable solution 11804
- * Was data available and understandable? 12204
- * Ability of resource agency participants to gather & analyze relevant data, willingness of conveners to share relevant data. 40201
- * Exchange of scientific information and ideas w/ agencies. 51301
- Science-Based Solutions
 - Technical solution 11201
 - Consensus on basic principles (eg. Science-based solutions) 20201
 - Science as basis for decision making 20601
 - Science based program by private company – their scientists was a major player in negotiations. 40501
 - The successful incorporation of research into the process. 61802
- Building on Existing Work
 - Growing recognition and acceptance of a previous document that aimed at establishing yardsticks for tracking progress and set up target conditions for completion of the task of restoring various resources. 12002
 - Building on previous work 20904
 - Good conservation strategy pre-dating Plan 40703
 - Identify work by other agencies. 50102
 - Existing “model” process & report format 50502
 - The long-term activities and planning of the Bay Environmental Study Team, which provided a well-developed context and plan framework for the SWIM plan. The plan incorporated completely the existing management plan of the Bay Environmental Study Team (BEST), which is a long-term collaborative effort of numerous interests and stakeholders in the community. 50601
 - Attention paid to previous documentation of current problems 51501

Resource Factors:

- **Political Support**
 - Partially funded/driven by international treaty (Canadian/American Great Lakes) 10404
 - Involvement by State & Federal elected officials. 10501
 - Backing of governmental officials (Congressmen, Senators, Governor, as well as local officials) 10504
 - EPA guidance 11201
 - Good oversight by local agencies. 11602
 - The Great Lakes Commission supports the Statewide Public Advisory Council for Mich. AOCs. The MCD provides grant-writing & innovative public involvement & educational opportunities to “keep the local process going”. 11902
 - Sufficient federal & provincial government support 12303

- Government backing at beginning 12402
 - Political support 20203
 - Participation of appropriate state-local agencies and lawmakers 20404
 - Broad background of power commitment to the need of program 20703
 - Support from citizens who in return put pressure on the governments to keep Peconic Estuary Program as a priority. Through the collaborative process, gained broad based support for initiatives 20801
 - Capacity & “political will” of collaborators to adjust policies and commit to action 20901
 - Federal support – state gov. support. Government support – all levels. 21002
 - The process was supported by Tillamook County Commissioners. 21202
 - Adequate support available 21203
 - Willingness of core group of locals to speak up in favor of a concept that was widely disfavored. 30603
 - High level local/Fed/State political commitment 41003
 - Political support for collaboration 50303
 - Political support by direct participation 50304
 - Local policy makers 51701
 - The successful incorporation of elected officials into the process. 61802
 - * Strength of organization and support from all parties 20401
- **Funding**
 - Governor’s Environmental Bond Fund (matching dollars from feds) 10704
 - Expectation that funding was on its way 11901
 - Struggle to find sufficient funds to carry out recommended actions. 12301
 - Money from governments to perform sediment analysis. 12403
 - Funding at all levels 20101
 - Funding 20203
 - Baseline funding which supports a Peconic Estuary Program Office and one person each @ the federal (EPA), state (NYSDEC) and local (Suffolk County Dept. of Health) level. 20801
 - Program (collaboration) fully funded by feds (EPA) 21201
 - The process was supported financially. 21202
 - Adequate resources available 21203
 - EPA has continues to fund implementation. 21204
 - Available funding 40402
 - Funding that is adequate 40702
 - Funding from oil industry 40703
 - Financial commitment combined with cost sharing 41003
 - Timely and adequate funding to effect solutions down the road 50303
 - Likelihood of implementation funding upon plan completion 50501
 - Available funding 51303
 - Money for projects 51704
 - Resources were available, funding 61103
 - Appropriate funding allocated to effort 61104
 - Shared funding for the exercise. 61804
 - Federal money was available to support planning effort. PT101
 - * We have commitment from the state and private industry for \$16,000,000 to be matched by Federal \$ 31,500,000 for our project. 10104
 - * Research money made available 10202
 - * Parties that put their \$ where their mouth is 12302

- * Meaningful financial support 20702
- * Continued efforts to fund implementation despite a \$2 billion budget deficit in the state 20903
- * Funding – Public and private sectors. 21002
- * Availability of funding to accomplish planning-related tasks. 40201
- * Funding contributions from several collaborators 50702
- * Ability to get operation & management costs, ability to get \$ to support Reserve programs (beyond O & M) 61001

Project Factors:

- Time
 - Long history of the endeavor 11901
 - Defined deadline – The plan was grant funded with a set deadline to develop a product. It kept the process moving forward. 12001
 - Not rushing or forcing decisions too quickly 20404
 - * Open ended time constraint 20702
 - * The time-frame for completion of identifiable goals 60604
- Cost
 - Cost of project 10703
 - Fair allocation of costs 41004
- Geographic Scope
 - A watershed essentially confined to one county 10203
 - Single political jurisdiction! 20401
- Authority
 - Program had authority of Clean Water Act & federal administration 21201
- Others
 - Toxic substances in the environment 10704
 - Loss of beneficial uses 10704
 - 2-day workshop 11201
 - Personnel to encourage collaboration 61103
 - Acceptance of partnership (vs regulatory) role. 40901
 - Several drafts 61002
 - Plan was an update so not controversial 50703
 - Stakeholders set goals and targets. 12904
 - Defining precisely what needs to be done to implement a recommendation and working with parties outside the process to complete a project. 12301
 - Problems that could initially be solved through technological fixes 12302
 - Broad institutional arrangement that could address the needs of the local ... system. 12302
 - Legal standing 40401
 - Steering committee kept to workable size 40601
 - Stakeholders have varying levels of interest and abilities to fund/implement planned activities, but progress has been made. 50503
 - Entities responsible for contamination were in a position to remedy the problems. 12204
 - A well thought out, inclusive plan to select a site and draw up a management plan 60602
 - Understanding the questions that the community would have before we had the public meeting 61004
 - Structure of program 20401
 - Private land ownership patterns, historical land use, lack of development pressure. 60101
 - * Realistic expectations 10704
 - * The external factors driving the process. 40401

- * Substantial in house reviews before the Plan was reviewed externally. 50801
- * The degree of focus brought to planning problems in terms of staff and other resources brought to bear on problems. 61804

Negative Determinants of Success

15. Please describe the factors that you think positively or negatively influenced the success of this collaboration. You can list as many as you like.

b. Factors that hindered success

Member Factors:

- Inclusion/Participation of Stakeholders
 - ⇒ **Inclusion of All Affected Stakeholders (Intergovernmental Participation)**
 - Did not include dialogue with corporate stakeholders 10404
 - Lack of participation by many parties (representatives chosen for “political” reasons) 11103
 - Participation was limited because of tight timeline. 12001
 - Few people involved at the end of process 12203
 - The industrial sector was reluctant to fully support the process. 12303
 - Refusal of many from development/builder/real estate to participate – we had some but not enough 20403
 - Too little representation by local governments and watershed groups. 20901
 - Lack of more industry/business support. 21002
 - Largest city was not involved in plan or process. 21204
 - Lead agency selective in involving other parties – restrictive 40904
 - Marginalized players (esp. enviros) suing and causing erosion of program benefits 41004
 - Federal representation is non voting member of board /commission. 61701
 - ⇒ Multistakeholder Involvement
 - The entire community was involved. 21202
 - Varied personalities 60104
 - Many players PT406
 - * Multistakeholder involvement? No 11604
 - ⇒ Lack of Public Participation/Input
 - There was little if any public input that affected policy outcomes – simply a series of general recommendations that were ignored. 11703
 - Limited participation of rural communities 20201
 - Not enough public input into the process 30304
 - Too little involvement by stakeholders 40402
 - Limited or no meetings 50102
 - Extent of input from stakeholders not as widespread as could be hoped for. 50402
 - ⇒ Education and Outreach
 - Additionally, we didn’t get the word out often enough about our progress in developing the plan. There was no predictability. PT303
- **Magnitude of Stakeholder Incentives**
- **Commitment of the Collaboration Participants to the Collaboration Process**
 - Lack of commitment 40102
- **Effective Leadership for the Collaboration**
 - Lack of leadership by PAC chair 12102
 - Lack of effective group leadership 12203
 - Lack of leadership in recent years 12403
 - Some periods of poor leadership 20603

- Leadership changes after the collaboration led to a divergence from decisions after the plan was adopted. 61804
- Agency Attitudes
 - ⇒ Ignoring public input/concerns by parties
 - Broader community goals and development? objectives were never brought “into the mix” – solutions therefore, while successful at one level, never were able to provide transferability of that technical achievement to more strategic community initiatives. In fact, these have to some extent been hampered by the tech solutions 11703
 - There was a perception that decisions on revisions to the management plan were finalized before interest group reps were asked for input. 30303
 - Lead agency did not listen to public input 40904
 - Didn’t always accept valid concerns and revise the plan accordingly. 50402
 - Coordinating Agency (Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game) initially tried to dismiss Dept. of Natural Resources’ concerns that NERR designation could bring with it federal regulations that determine mgt. of state-owned land and water. ADFG were minimizing these concerns for other landowners such as borough + city that would have federal laws imposed on their land 61002
 - ⇒ Inflexibility of Organizations
 - A predetermined approach by a Federal Agency. 10501
 - Paradigms of Superfund activities 10504
 - Unable to de-list segments of AOC where beneficial uses were restored. 10704
 - Reluctance to change overview policies on part of state & fed agencies to make outcomes conform to plans. 20401
 - Some reluctance to change agency behavior. 20402
 - Preexisting intergovernmental agency policies and relations 20702
 - The process was not flexible, protocols of the US National Marine Sanctuary system were sufficiently rigid to dissuade active participation by some groups. 30303
 - Conflicts between state and federal mandates 40401
 - Some, especially in the regulatory agency group, had difficulty in trying new approaches. 40504
 - Resistance to change by Local ... agencies 41003
 - Restrictive agency mandates or policies 50702
 - Government representatives unwilling to implement solutions new to them, regardless of success elsewhere 51204
 - Being married to one idea & one idea only 60102
 - * (Lack of) willingness to take calculated risk on the part of the other party 40901
 - ⇒ Turf
 - Some agencies unwilling to give up “territory” 10202
 - Turf battles among state agencies 20401
 - Initial fears of turf intrusions 20702
 - Turf battles 20903
 - Turf battles at State level. 21002
 - Agency turf 60604
 - “Turfyness” of non profit organizations ... looking at their own program needs rather than the greatest good. In minority in #'s but very vocal. Too much time in fighting petty turf/control issues 61001
 - “Turf” issues – some organizations have singular missions and compete for similar resources or profile within the community 61501
 - ⇒ Staff Turnover

- The provincial government, which is the lead agency, has changed staff and location several times during the process and has been inconsistent in its collaboration with local participants 11601
- Number of changes to personnel assigned to project 11603
- The initial study began in 1989 and finished in 1994 – over 5 years. This is a considerable amount of time to maintain the same personnel. 11704
- Staff turnover between planning and implementation 20201
- Staff/leadership turnover 21201
- Change of county commissioners. 21204
- Staff turnover w/i governmental agencies (loss of institutional memory) 40503
- Lack of institutional memory 41004
- Turnover of state program representation 61701
- Dealing with several representatives of the applicant PT406
- ⇒ Bureaucracy/Inefficiency
 - Government agencies are so heavy laden with ambiguous, contradictive behavior it's a wonder anything even gets accomplished. All agencies are so large – they don't know what they are doing & they do not work well with other fellow agencies. They have no “common” sense, no sense of cost, and unreasonable in demands & expect “you” to do what they cannot do - 10103
 - Slow wheels of State & Fed. regulatory organizations. Red tape. 10104
 - Bureaucracy at Federal and State levels. 21002
 - Too many levels of review from state and federal agencies. Constant need to educate new players within agencies. 40601
- ⇒ Inconsistency
 - Interrelation of government to contradict RAP committee conclusions 12403
 - Regulatory agencies not being consistent 40701
 - Reach consensus and change opinion later 40702
- Representative Attitudes
 - ⇒ Lack of enthusiasm
 - Lack of enthusiasm by parties at the end of the process 12203
 - ⇒ Personalities
 - Different personalities 20101
 - Some residual interagency problems that affect reaching goals 20203
 - Intransigence & arrogance of some personnel with federal agency (“We're the experts here”) brought in as consultants 21004
 - Personalities 40102, 60604
 - Egos 10301, 10504
 - ⇒ Politics
 - Political persuasion (became less important with time) 11503
 - Political agendas at state level. 21002
 - It appeared that [the agency] have their own agenda on this issue and are waiting on the appropriate political winds to favor their interest in expanding boundaries of the resource. 30102
 - Too much last minute “horse trading” diluted technical considerations 40402
 - Political position of Farm Bureau 40703
 - Parochial attitudes (NIMBY, no growth masquerading as conservation -ists) 41004
 - Legislative (state) politics and mis-appropriation of funds (targeting pet projects) 50702
 - Politics prevail!! 60604

- ⇒ Hidden agendas
 - All participants had an agenda/bias. 11804
 - “Hidden” agendas 40102
 - Hidden agendas 40702
 - Unsubstantiated opinions expressed by “experts” 50702
 - Hidden agendas were present and have subsequently hindered (but not killed) the progress of the effort. 60604
- ⇒ Sabotage
 - Non participants waiting to take pot shots... 21203
 - Sabotage by ill-informed opposition. Some individuals, some organizations. 30604
 - “Mis-information” spread by outside parties 40101
 - Presence of special interest groups with a focus on failure of effort 40201
 - Multi-party discussion of instream flow alternatives were deadlocked by certain city staff for many months. City council made last minute decision to remove commercial logging as a management tool. Insistence by City to resolve many unrelated issues in one blanket plan required much time & coordination with many parties: instream flows, logging, salmon hatchery, fish screens, fish ladders. 40303
 - Attempts by lead agency, after change “at the top” to circumvent partners’ presumed “authority” by excluding them from key decisions. 60602
- ⇒ Shortsightedness
 - Economic short term impacts considered too heavily in decision process. 12102
 - Short sightedness, not looking beyond single issue at hand, forgetting that these issues could be utilized outside of our area of concern. 60102
- ⇒ Public apathy
 - Continued public apathy 10204
 - Public apathy 12102
 - Overcoming community doubts 61004
- ⇒ Lack of knowledge and understanding
 - Lack of public understanding of the issues or their seriousness. 12002
 - Participants with insufficient background to understand complicated aspects 12203
 - Lack of depth (in scientific knowledge) of many participants. Resulted in superficial assessments and solutions 20603
 - Limited understanding of the ecosystem (including human’s roles) 20901
 - Lack of understanding by some groups & individuals of what a Habitat Conservation Plan is about. 40802
 - Impatient and ignorant private citizen 50301
 - Lack of understanding of program 60601
 - Misinformation about resource management issues (e.g. feral horses) in the local community 61201
 - (Lack of) knowledge about HCPs PT406
- ⇒ Ideological opposition
 - Problem that will require broad behavioral/societal changes. 12302
 - Belief among certain stakeholders that ESA was going to go away, was unconstitutional, etc. 40602
 - Local “home-rule” and anti-endangered species sentiments 40703
 - Ideological opposition to Endangered Species Act 41003

Process Factors:

- **Ripeness of the issue / Timing**

- **Decision-Making Structure**
 - ⇒ **Equity in Decision Making**
 - There was not equity – decision makers did not equally consider positions & recommendations of interest groups to make final decisions. 30303
 - ⇒ **Power Distribution among the Parties**
 - The regulatory agency had all the power so a lot of bad feeling resulted – still healing today. 40402
 - Tribes & sister agencies did not feel empowered 40901
 - ⇒ **Agreement on Ground Rules / Mutually agreed upon Decision-Making Process**
 - ⇒ **Proportional Representation**
- **Availability of Mediators during Crisis Points in Decision Making**
 - Lack of trained facilitator. Poor meeting management @ times 21201
- **Organization and Centralization of the Collaboration**
 - ⇒ **Rank of the Participating Agency Representatives**
 - Decision makers weren't at the meetings where they were needed 10801
 - Lack of county staff involvement at supervisory level so they could understand the compromises that were made to get to many of the actions 20403
 - Lack of policy level (decision makers) staff through out process w/i some governmental agencies, i.e. technical staff were delegated/ expected to work issues out 40503
 - Parties not being able to make decisions for their agencies. 40601
 - Regulatory agency not adequately representing the position of their agency 40701
 - ⇒ **Degree of Formalization of the Collaboration**
 - Regulation driven by the TMDL process. 51304
 - UDFWS approval process PT406
 - ⇒ **Level of Resource Commitment to the Collaboration**
 - ⇒ **Focus of Power in the Collaboration**
 - ⇒ **Focus of Control in the Collaboration**
 - ⇒ **Focus of Collaboration Goals**
 - Some agencies disagreed over testing spec's and limits (How clean is clean?) 10102
 - Diffuse communities that have conflicting priorities 10203
 - Different levels of importance (of plan, or the resource) to different parties 11901
 - Lack of agreement on roles and responsibilities for RAPs between EPA & states (GAO report has helped solve this). 11902
 - Differing interpretations of the real issues that have to be dealt with. 12301
 - Parties who would not compromise on goals and objectives 12704
 - Different agendas 20101
 - Conflicting goals among state/fed agencies. i.e. forestry vs. wildlife vs. agriculture vs. environment 20401
 - Specific issues supported at the expense of the greater picture/ecosystem 20601
 - Distraction of other multi-party collaborative concerns (especially salmon recovery) 20901
 - Parochial interest of local citizens groups, 21002
 - Use of the resource by the partners is different, leading to conflict. 21202
 - Outside parties w/ different agendas 40101
 - Failure to achieve consensus on all aspects of plan goals. 40201
 - Personal biases 40401
 - Plan development not a major priority for collaborators, one collaborator/ entity had substantially opposite goals than did everyone else. 50502

- Representatives of real estate development interests were defensive and often acted out of self-interest. County staff were reluctant to focus on root cause of the problem and act to address future impacts (urban development of watershed). 51202
- Occasionally, the ideas of an agency would conflict with the District’s mission and the goals of the SWIM Plan. In this rare case, an idea(s) may not have been able to be incorporated into the Plan. 51301
- Specialist interest groups. 60101
- Varied priorities 60104
- Special interests 60601
- People/organizations had “their own” views of what the reserve was supposed to accomplish, much of which was their own ... non written down; which caused problems! 61001
- Other commitments more closely tied to the collaborator’s mission 61103
- The only hindrance came from special interest “user groups” which were non professional recreational groups that were primarily interested in their activities not the best interests of the resource. This group was incorporated into the planning process without argument and resolved most of the planning problems. They were able to give their input and revision by consensus led to success. 61802
- Divergent goals of one organization that wasn’t faithfully reported and factored into the collaboration. 61804
- Attempts by others (outside the process), such as Sierra Club, to achieve their own separate agendas. PT416
- **The Relationship between the Parties**
 - ⇒ **Agreement on the Scope of the Collaboration**
 - Lack of initial focus and common understanding of task at hand by all members 10302
 - ⇒ **Shared Ideology / Common Ground among Participants**
 - ⇒ **Negotiating in Good Faith**
 - ⇒ **Existence of Trust in the Relationships**
 - Lack of trust between Federal Agency & corporations. 10501
 - Natural mistrust between people of widely differing education and environmental knowledge. Trust of technical information by all parties. 11503
 - Limited display of trust between the parties 11604
 - The commercial & sports fishery very distrustful. 12303
 - The unresolved boundary issue was a major distraction to the collaborators. This set up levels of mistrust among the collaborators and to some extent the credibility of the agency. 30102
 - Distrust of state/Federal gov. 60101
 - Distrust of government in general by a few parties 61201
 - Suspicion about motives between some of the parties PT406
 - ⇒ **Maintaining Good Interpersonal Relationships among Participants**
 - ⇒ **Establishing Clear Lines of Communication**
 - Not as “open” a process as previous efforts have been. 30304
 - ⇒ **Lack of Coordination and Cooperation**
 - Too many overlapping test procedures by various agencies 10102
 - Lack of coordination between programs within an agency. 10301
 - Our lake has contaminated lot. Sediments that are from some now closed industries. Hindered success as the companies fought cleanup or tried to get out as cheap as they can. 12103
 - Limited partnering with other agencies. 50102
- **Professional and Technical Capacities**
 - ⇒ **Relevant Professional and Technical Capacities: General**
 - Only one state coordinator for RAPs 10701

- Inconsistent facilitators & moderators 30502
- ⇒ Lack of Scientific/Technical Information
 - Inaccurate information 10504
 - Incomplete scientific knowledge despite vast research 11901
 - Poor data (on US side) 12204
 - Not enough science- research to fully establish extent of problems or what remedy appropriate 20401
 - Data limitations 50503
 - This was a new process for this species. Many unknowns. PT413
- ⇒ Science-Based Solutions
 - Best science often ignored 40904

Resource Factors:

- **Political Support**

- Lack of state and federal support 10703
- Government oversight fell short. 11602
- Lack of government interest at the end 12402
- Changes in political priorities of some of participating organizations – individuals still committed but mandate eroded. 13001
- Off again/on again inconsistent state support. Mixed messages as to their support & involvement. 30603
- Lately – state has withdrawn support of local governments & environmental protection 50101

- **Funding**

- Money available 10202
- Lack of significant funding to target the issues 10203
- No \$ for extensive stream restoration or full time-staff 10204
- Current state of the state (Michigan) the CMI funding is in question 10701
- Loss of funds from EPA to maintain professional guidance 10704
- Limited time and funding for staff participation. 10802
- Economics \$ 11101
- Lack of dedicated funding for the RAP effort (i.e. all of the resources were from other more general programs). 11104
- Funding fell short. 11602
- Lack of resources directed toward project 11603
- Inadequate funding 11604
- Less than adequate funding for research and implementation. 11702
- A lack of EPA Coastal Environmental Mgt funds to keep Michigan’s AOC program/DEQ staff in place over past few years. State/DEQ hiring freeze over past few years 11902
- Lack of funding (on the United States side) 12204
- Lack of financial resources. 12302
- Funding dried up as gov’t changed priorities. 12701
- Limited resources 13001
- The ease & speed at which resources are available to achieve goals. 13002
- Competition for funding 20101
- Funding to modify/implement action items. 20103
- Limited financial resources 20201
- Lack of govt agency financial commitment to do the baseline scientific data simultaneously with the planning & waiting until after approval to begin. 20403

- Insufficient funding, resistance from local governments to region wide plan in that it is perceived as an unfunded mandate 20903
- Loss of funding during third year which caused new staff to be hired and process delayed for year. 21204
- Insufficient funds to rapidly move forward on data acquisition, analysis, advanced planning. 40201
- Estimated costs continued to rise sharply as delays hampered completion. The sharp rise in costs nearly resulted in suspension of the project on at least two occasions. 40803
- \$ 41001
- Lack of money 41004
- Limited funding 50102
- Shortfalls in state funding have hampered some (but not all) aspects of implementation & updating (as required by law). 50502
- Funding limitations 50503
- Lack of specific funding for comprehensive plan implementation. This affected the planning effort, because it was understood that many plan elements would not be implemented in the foreseeable future. 50601
- No funding is coupled with recommendations, therefore no matter how good the recommendation, it will not work unless fully implemented. 50803
- Lack of adequate funds for outreach & education ... to establish identity for the resource 61001
- Control of \$\$ 60604

Project Factors:

- Time Required for Collaboration
 - Revision is taking longer than expected (getting input from all parties) 10802
 - Long turn around time for various sampling efforts, 11104
 - The initial study began in 1989 and finished in 1994 – over 5 years. This is a considerable amount of time to maintain a heightened level of interest 11704
 - Short time frame to complete (that was due to staff’s prior commitments 11901
 - The states process to define match for the federal match took too long & therefore lost some funding 12104
 - Time zone for project completion was to loose.12402
 - Time. 12904
 - Length of time 20601
 - In a continued pursuit for “buy-in” by all parties, a delay in decisions & implementation occurred. This lasted a couple of years!! 20604
 - Lack of time to dedicate to tasks 30104
 - Lack of sufficient time to thrash out issues, NOAA has an ambiguous schedule which is in my opinion unrealistic. 30503
 - Lack of sufficient staff time/resources of participating organizations caused the long delays in the effort. 40201
 - The process is time-consuming and finding time for everyone to participate equally is logistically difficult. 40301
 - No timelines/deadlines for action in federal/state agencies. 40601
 - Taking too much time such that new policys change the ground rules 40702
 - Time ⇒ Need to build trust among participant large number of small landowners who were not knowledgeable about issues 41003

- The turn-around time for reviewers to complete a thorough review, as well as the technical editors finding time to make interim changes/updates. This delayed the production period and resulted in some of the material appearing “old” in the Plan. 50801
- It took far too long to go through the process. PT303
- Cost
 - Whole process spent (spends) far too much on legal squabbling. 10404
 - Huge cost of PCB remediation. 10701
 - Costs of alternatives 10703
 - Unnecessarily costly mitigation 40402
- Geographic Scope Too Broad
 - Watershed scope sometimes too encompassing. 11201
 - Multi-national scope 11603
 - Large geographic scale of the area involved. 12002
 - The area of concern includes a huge watershed (24000 Sq km) with 24 municipalities. 12303
 - Large basin – many local governments 50101
- Issue Scope Too Broad/Complex
 - Technical complexity of river remediation and a need to develop new procedures etc. 11503
 - Complexity of the issues 12002
 - Too broad a scope of work. Program needed more focus. 21201
 - Scope of management plan too large and complex, unnecessarily controversial 30101
 - Focus of effort was too broad PT101

External Factors:

- Staff Changes at State/Federal Level
 - Changes in government administration 20801
 - Change in Presidential administration created problematic delays in the process, and introduced a new set of evaluation standards that further lengthened the process. 30101
- None
 - None. 40801
 - None that I know of. 50203
 - None.... It was all process. 50304
 - None. 51302
 - None 51701
 - None PT409
 - N/A 60802
 - + 11 no responses
- Others
 - Inability to prevent dissemination of mis-information about the project’s potential impacts 30101
 - Some biological objectives unclear 40402
 - Parts of the plan were vaguely written – subject to different interpretations over time. 40901
 - Administrative logistics 61104
 - Tended to look for “outside” (i.e. Federal or State \$) solutions to watershed problems. PT101
 - Desire to study or monitor rather than implement solution. PT101
 - Results untested – resulted in serious problems w/in two years (1996-1996) problems that still plague the HCP goals. 40904
 - Environmental issues 10703
 - Alternative remediation sites 10703
 - Switch from AOC (Area of Concern) to LAMP (Lakewide Management Plan) 10704

- Delays beyond control of participants. 12401
- Lack of progress by some specific stakeholders. 12903
- Lack of quality of work of some private sector subcontractors 21004
- State and local agencies become defensive about programs their responsible for that don't work very effectively. 20402
- Some special interest parties argue emotionally in spite of facts 20404
- Insecure government agency employees. 20702
- At times, getting consensus was difficult 20801
- The roles of some parties were not well defined (e.g. Army Corps, tribe) or too limited , i.e. King County. 40303
- The major issue regarding the size of the resource (boundaries) to be protected has not been resolved, and appears to be out of the hands of the collaborators to be decided by the Federal agency. 30102
- Some key players had issues that required resolution 40803
- Adaptive management not fully exercised. ((Lack of) willingness to take calculated risk on the part of the other party) 40901
- Overload of environmental concerns 50602
- A large amount of documentation and progress reporting that had to be summarized in an equitable manner. 50701
- There are no factors that are genuinely linked to performance (e.g., no funding is coupled with recommendations, therefore no matter how good the recommendation, it will not work unless fully implemented.) 50803
- State of the Ant. of water quality restoration 51303
- Limited “improvement” opportunities in land use. 51303
- Realization that too much development had already taken place & to buy many properties & replace a lot of infrastructures would be beyond our means. 51704
- Expectations varied 61202
- Just the fact that it's hard to coordinate all the collaborators time & schedules. 61901

APPENDIX D

HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL



Office of the Vice President
for Research
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8673 • FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM
from the Human Subjects Committee

Date: October 9, 2002

From: David Quadagno, Chair *DQ*

To: Aysin Dedekorkut
MC: 2280

Dept: Urban and Regional Planning

Re: Use of Human subjects in Research
**Project entitled: Determinants of Success In Interorganizational
Collaboration For Natural Resource Management**

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be exempt per 45 CFR § 46.101(b)2 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by October 8, 2003 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Dr. Robert Deyle
APPLICATION NO. 02.495

REFERENCES

- Abrams, Kathleen Shea, Hugh Gladwin, Mary Jean Matthews, and Barbara C. McCabe. (1995). The East Everglades Planning Study. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 225-256.
- Adler, R. W. (1995). Addressing Barriers to Watershed Protection. Environmental Law. 25(4): 973-1106.
- Alexander, Ernest R. (1992). Approaches to Planning Introducing Current Planning Theories, Concepts and Issues. Philadelphia: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.
- Allee, David J., Leonard B. Dworsky, and Ronald M. North. (1981). United States Water Planning and Management. Symposium Proceedings. Unified River Basin Management - Stage II. David J. Allee, Leonard B. Dworsky, and Ronald M. North (eds.). Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Water Resources Association. 11-42.
- Alter, Catherine and Jerald Hage. (1993). Organizations Working Together. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.c.
- Appalachian Regional Commission. (2000). About ARC: What ARC Is and Where We Work, <http://www.arc.gov/aboutarc/abtmain.htm> (25 November, 2000).
- Appalachian Regional Commission Home Page. (2003). <http://www.arc.gov/>.
- Arrandale, Tom. (1999). The Eastern Water Wars. Governing. August. p. 30.
- Ashley, Jeffrey S. and Zachary A. Smith. (1999). Groundwater Management in the West. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Babbie, Earl. (1998). The Practice of Social Research. (8th ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Beatley, Timothy. (1995a). Preserving Biodiversity through the Use of Habitat Conservation Plans. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 35-74.
- Beatley, Timothy. (1995b). Habitat Conservation Plans: A New Tool, to Resolve Land Use Conflicts. LandLines. 7(5): 6-7.
- Begon, Michael, John L. Harper and Colin R. Townsend. (1986). Ecology: Individuals, Populations and Communities. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Science Ltd.

- Beierle, Thomas C. and David M. Konisky. (2000). Values, Conflict, and Trust in Participatory Environmental Planning. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. 19 (4): 587-602.
- Berke, Philip R. and Steven P. French. (1994). The Influence of State Planning Mandates on Local Plan Quality. Journal of Planning Education and Research. 13: 237-250.
- Bernstein, I. H. (1987). Applied Multivariate Analysis. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Berry, Frances, Bruce Stiffler, and Ayşın Dedekorkut. (2003). State Agency Administrative Mediation: A Florida Trial. The Promise and Performance of Environmental Conflict Resolution. Rosemary O'Leary and Lisa B. Bingham, (Eds.). Washington, DC: Resources for the Future Press. 207-229.
- Bielo, Robert J. (1984). Letters - Susquehanna River Basin Commission. Journal Water Pollution Control Federation. 56(2): 114.
- Blodgett, Linda Longfellow. (1992). Research Notes and Communications Factors in the Instability of International Joint Ventures: An Event History Analysis. Strategic Management Journal. 13: 475-481.
- Borys, Bryan and David B. Jemison. (1989). Hybrid Arrangements or Strategic Alliances: Theoretical Issues in Organizational Combinations. Academy of Management Review. (April). 14(2): 234-249.
- Bradley, Michael D. and Judith M. Dworkin. (1980). State Organizations for Managing River Basins: A Colorado River Assessment. Symposium Proceedings. Unified River Basin Management. R. M. North, L. B. Dworsky and D. J. Allen (eds.). Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Water Resources Association. 229-238.
- Brower, David J. and Daniel S. Carol. (1987). Introduction. Managing Land-Use Conflicts: Case Studies in Special Area Management. David J. Brower and Daniel S. Carol (eds.). Durham: Duke University Press. 1-9.
- Bryant, Fred B. and Paul R. Yarnold. (1995). Principal-Components Analysis and Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Reading and Understanding Multivariate Statistics. Laurence G. Grimm and Paul R. Yarnold (eds.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 99-136.
- Bryson, John M. and Barbara C. Crosby. (1992). Leadership for the Common Good. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Burby, Raymond J. and Peter J. May. (1997). Making Governments Plan: State Experiments in Managing Land Use. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Caldwell, L. K. (1993). Emerging Boundary Environmental Challenges and Institutional Issues: Canada and the United States. Natural Resources Journal. 33(1): 9-31.
- Carroll, John E. (1993). Commentary. Natural Resources Journal. 33(1): 51-56.
- Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary. (ND). Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan Revision, www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov/nmpintro.html (5 January, 2001).
- Clapp, Gordon R. (1951). The Tennessee Valley Authority. Regionalism in America. Merrill Jensen (ed.). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Cleary, Edward John. (1967). The ORSANCO Story: Water Quality Management in the Ohio Valley Under an Interstate Compact. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Cobourn, John. (1999). Integrated Watershed Management on the Truckee River in Nevada. Journal of the American Water Resources Association. 35(3):623-632.
- Comrey, Andrew L. and Howard B. Lee. (1992). A First Course in Factor Analysis. (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Cortner, Hanna J. and Margaret A. Moote. (1998). The Politics of Ecosystem Management. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Costanza, Robert and Jack Greer. (1995). The Chesapeake Bay and Its Watershed: A Model for Sustainable Ecosystem Management. Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions. Lance Gunderson, C. S. Holling and Stephen Light (eds.) New York: Columbia University Press. 169-213.
- De Vaus, David. (2002). Analyzing Social Science Data: 50 Key Problems in Data Analysis. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Delaware River Basin Commission. (2003). Home Page: <http://www.state.nj.us/drbc/> .
- Derthick, Martha. (1974). Between State and Nation: Regional Organizations in the United States. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute.
- Deyle, Robert E. (1995). Integrated Water Management: Contending With Garbage Can Decisionmaking in Organized Anarchies. Water Resources Bulletin. 31(3): 387-398.
- DiLeonardi, Joan W. and Patrick Almond Curtis. (1988). What to Do When the Numbers are In: A User's Guide to Statistical Data Analysis in the Human Services. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Inc.
- Dillman, Don A. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: Wiley.
- Downs, Peter, W., Kenneth J. Gregory and Andrew Brookes. (1991). How Integrated is River Basin Management? Environmental Management. 15(3): 299-309.
- DuMars, Charles T. (1990). Legal Regimes for Interstate Water Allocation in the Western United States: Some Successes and Failures. International Transboundary Water Resources Issues. John E. FitzGibbon (ed.). Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Water Resources Association. 35-46.
- Endicott, Eve (ed.). (1993). Land Conservation through Public/Private Partnerships. Washington, D. C.: Island Press.
- Environment Canada. (June 12, 2000). Binational Remedial Action Plans (RAPs), <http://www.on.ec.gc.ca/glimr/raps/intro.html> (6 October 2000).
- Environment Canada. (March 23, 1999). Collingwood Harbour Remedial Action Plan, <http://www.on.ec.gc.ca/glimr/raps/huron/collingwood/intro.html> (8 January, 2001).
- Ferguson, R. B. and M. Moravek. (1990). Groundwater Quality Management in Nebraska's Central Platte Valley. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. 45(2): 265-266.

- Finder, Edwin W. (1995). Special-Area Management Planning in New Jersey's Hackensack Meadowlands: An Emerging Model for Cooperative State-Federal Planning. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 139-156.
- Fischer, Loyd K. (1981). A Critique of the Nebraska Natural Resource Districts. Symposium Proceedings. Unified River Basin Management - Stage II. David J. Allee, Leonard B. Dworsky, and Ronald M. North (eds.). Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Water Resources Association. 453-461.
- The Florida Senate. (2003). The 2003 Florida Statutes, <http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm> (January 5, 2004).
- Fowler, Floyd J. Jr. (1984). Survey Research Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fox, Irving K. (1964). Review and Interpretation of Experiences in Water Resources Planning. Organization and Methodology for River Basin Planning. C. E. Kindsvater (ed.). Atlanta: Water Resources Center, Georgia Institute of Technology. 61-87.
- Francis, George R. and Henry A. Regier. (1995). Barriers and Bridges to the Restoration of the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem. Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions. Lance Gunderson, C. S. Holling and Stephen Light (eds.) New York: Columbia University Press. 239-291.
- Friedmann, John. (1964). The Concept of a Planning Region - The Evolution of an Idea in the United States. Regional Development and Planning, A Reader. John Friedmann and William Alonso (eds.). Cambridge: M.I.T. Press. 497-518.
- Frisch, Joel and Thomas Chaney. (1981). Current Status of the Replacements for Title II River Basin Planning Commissions. Symposium Proceedings. Unified River Basin Management - Stage II. David J. Allee, Leonard B. Dworsky, and Ronald M. North (eds.). Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Water Resources Association. 327-337.
- Garson, David G. (2003). PA 765 Statnotes: An Online Textbook. <http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/factor.htm>
- Gatrell, Jay D. and Lou Fintor. (1998). Spatial Niches, Policy Subsystems, and Agenda Setting: The Case of the ARC. Political Geography. 17(7): 883-897.
- Gorsuch, Richard L. (1983). Factor Analysis. (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Gray, Barbara. (1989). Collaborating Finding a Common Ground for Multiparty Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gray, Barbara. (1985). Conditions Facilitating Interorganizational Collaboration. Human Relations. 38(10): 911-936.
- Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary. (ND). Gray's Reef Management Plan Process, <http://www.graysreef.nos.noaa.gov/mangplan.html> (8 January, 2001).
- Griffin, C. B. (1999). Watershed Councils: An Emerging Form of Public Participation in Natural Resource Management. Journal of the American Water Resources Association. 35(3):505-518.

- Grigg, Neil S. (1999). Integrated Watershed Management: Who Should Lead, Who Should Pay? Journal of the American Water Resources Association. 35(3):527-534.
- Gruber, Judith E. (1987). Controlling Bureaucracies: Dilemmas in Democratic Governance. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Grumbine, R. Edward. (1994). What is Ecosystem Management? Conservation Biology. 8(1): 27-38.
- Gunderson, Lance, C. S. Holling and Stephen Light (eds.). (1995). Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gunton, Thomas, T. M. Frame and J. C. Day. (2003). Making Collaboration Work, Lessons from a Success Story in Regional Planning, Journal of Environmental Planning and Management Draft.
- Gupta, Vijay. (2000). Regression Explained in Simple Terms. VJBooks Inc. www.telecom.csuhayward.edu/~esuess/Links/Software/RegressionExplained/regression_explained.doc
- Haefele, Edwin T. (1973). Representative Government and Environmental Management. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hagedoorn, John and Jos Schakenraad. (1994). The Effect of Strategic Alliances on Company Performance. Strategic Management Journal. 15: 291-309.
- Hair, Joseph F. Jr., Rolph E. Anderson, Ronald L. Tatham, and Willaim C. Black. (1998). Multivariate Data Anlaysis. (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Halpert, Burton P. (1982). Antecedents. Interorganizational Coordination: Theory, Research, and Implementation. David L. Rogers and David A. Whetten (Eds.) Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press. 54-72.
- Hamel, Gary. (1991). Competition for Competence and Inter-Partner Learning Within International Strategic Alliances. Strategic Management Journal. 12: 83-103.
- Hancock, John (1988). The New Deal and American Planning: the 1930's. Two Centuries of American Planning. David Schaffer (ed.). London: Mansell Publishing Limited.
- Hansler, Gerald M. (1980). The Delaware River Basin. Symposium Proceedings. Unified River Basin Management. R. M. North, L. B. Dworsky and D. J. Allen (eds.). Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Water Resources Association. 170-174.
- Hardin, Garrett. (1968). The Tragedy of the Commons. Science. 162:1243-1248.
- Hartig, John H., Michael A. Zarull, Thomas M. Heidtke and Hemang Shah. (1998). Implementing Ecosystem-based Management: Lessons from the Great Lakes. Journal of Environmental Planning and Management. 41(1):45-75.
- Hartmann, H. C. and M. J. Donahue. (1990). The Institutional Morass: Constraints and Opportunities for Issue Management. International Transboundary Water Resources Issues. John E. FitzGibbon (ed.). Bethesda, Maryland: American Water Resources Association. 329-338.

- Haygood, Leah V. (1995). Balancing Conservation and Development in Chiwaukee Prairie, Wisconsin. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 157-180.
- Holling, C. S. (1995). What Barriers? What Bridges? Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions. Lance Gunderson, C. S. Holling and Stephen Light (eds.) New York: Columbia University Press. 3-34.
- Holling, C. S., L. H. Gunderson, and J. Walters. (1994). The Structure and Dynamics of the Everglades System: Guidelines for Ecosystem Restoration. Everglades: The Ecosystem and Its Restoration. S. Davis and J. Ogden (eds.). Del Ray Beach, FL: St. Lucie Press. 741-756.
- Hundley, Norris. (1975). Water and the West: Colorado River Compact and Politics of Water in American West. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Imperial, Mark T. and Timothy Hennessy. (2002). Assessing the National Estuary Program: 15 Years of Progress or a Lost Opportunity? Paper prepared for the 18th International Conference of the Coastal Society, Galveston, TX, May 19-22.
- Ingram, Helen M. (1973). The Political Economy of Regional Water Institutions. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 55(1): 10-18.
- Innes, Judith. (1996). Planning through Consensus Building: A New View of the Comprehensive Planning Ideal. Journal of American Planning Association. 62(1): 460-472.
- Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher. (1999). Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems: A Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning. Journal of American Planning Association. 65(4): 412-423.
- Innes, Judith E., Judith Gruber, Michael Neuman, and Robert Thompson. (1994). Coordinating Growth and Environmental Management through Consensus Building. California Policy Seminar, Berkeley, CA.
- Isserman, Andrew and T. Reppann. (1995). The Economic Effects of the Appalachian Regional Commission - An Empirical Assessment of 26 Years of Regional Development Planning. Journal of the American Planning Association. 61(3): 345-364.
- Jowett, Benjamin. (trans.) (1943). Aristotle's Politics. New York: Random House.c.
- Kelly, Eric Damian and Barbara Becker. (2000). Community Planning: An Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan. Washington, D. C.: Island Press.
- Kennedy, Richard D. and James R. Cook. (1980). Managing Water Resources Through Natural Resource Districts. Symposium Proceedings. Unified River Basin Management. R. M. North, L. B. Dworsky and D. J. Allen (eds.). Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Water Resources Association. 248-257.
- Kenney, Douglas S. (1995). Institutional Options for the Colorado River. Water Resources Bulletin. 31(5): 837-850.
- Kenyon, Daphne A. (1991). Interjurisdictional Tax and Policy Competition: Good or Bad for the Federal System? Washington, D.C.: U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

- Kim, Jae-On and Charles W. Mueller. (1978a). Introduction to Factor Analysis: What Is It and How to Do It. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kim, Jae-On and Charles W. Mueller. (1978b). Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kneese, Allen V. and Blair T. Bower. (1968). Managing Water Quality: Economics, Technology, Institutions. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Kumar, Kuldeep and Han G. Van Dissel. (1996). Sustainable Collaboration: Managing Conflict and Cooperation in Interorganizational Systems. MIS Quarterly. 20(3): 279-300.
- Law School WebTeam. (3 November, 1999). Appendix C Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations 46 Fed. Reg. 18026 (1981). <http://www.law.indiana.edu/envdec/c.html#9> (3 June 2000).
- Lawley, D. N. and A. E. Maxwell. (1971). Factor Analysis as a Statistical Method. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company.c.
- Leach, William D. (2002). Surveying Diverse Stakeholder Groups. Society and Natural Resources. 15: 641-649.
- Leach, William D. and Neil W. Pelkey. (2001). Making Watershed Partnerships Work: A Review of the Empirical Literature. Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management. 127(6):378-385.
- Leach, William D., Neil W. Pelkey, and Paul A. Sabatier. (2002). Stakeholder Partnerships as Collaborative Policymaking: Evaluation Criteria Applied to Watershed Management in California and Washington. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. 21(4): 645-670.
- Leach, William and Paul Sabatier. (2003). Facilitators, Coordinators, and Outcomes. The Promise and Performance of Environmental Conflict Resolution. Rosemary O'Leary and Lisa B. Bingham, (Eds.). Washington, DC: Resources for the Future Press. 148-171.
- Lee, Kai N. (1995). Deliberately Seeking Sustainability in the Columbia River Basin. Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions. Lance Gunderson, C. S. Holling and Stephen Light (eds.) New York: Columbia University Press. 214-238.
- LeMarquand, D. (1993). The International Joint Commission and Changing Canada-United States Boundary Relations. Natural Resources Journal. 33(1): 59-91.
- Light, Stephen S., and J. Walter Dineen. (1994). Water Control in the Everglades: A Historical Perspective. Everglades: The Ecosystem and Its Restoration. S. Davis and J. Ogden (eds.). Del Ray Beach, FL: St. Lucie Press. 47-84.
- Light, Stephen S., Lance H. Gunderson, and C. S. Holling. (1995). The Everglades: Evolution of Management in a Turbulent Ecosystem. Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions. Lance Gunderson, C. S. Holling and Stephen Light (eds.) New York: Columbia University Press. 103-168.
- Lim, Gill C. (1983). Regional Planning in Transition. Regional Planning: Evolution, Crisis and Prospects. Gill C. Lim. (ed.) New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmun and Co. Publishers.c. 3-14.

- Longo, Peter J. and Robert D. Miewald. (1989). Institutions in Water Policy: The Case of Nebraska. Natural Resources Journal. 29:751-762.
- Luccarelli, Mark. 1995. Lewis Mumford and the Ecological Region: The Politics of Planning. New York: The Guilford Press.
- MacKenzie, Susan H. (1990). On the Challenge of Implementing Ecosystem Management Plans in the Great Lakes Basin. International Transboundary Water Resources Issues. John E. FitzGibbon (ed.). Bethesda, Maryland: American Water Resources Association. 69-77.
- MacKenzie, Susan Hill. (1996). Integrated Resource Planning and Management: The Ecosystem Approach in the Great Lakes Basin. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Mandelker, Daniel R. 14 January, (1998). Primer on Sources of Federal Wetlands Law. http://www.wulaw.wustl.edu/~mandelke/Land_Use/wetlands.html (2 June, 2000).
- Margerum, Richard D. (2002). Collaborative Planning: Building Consensus and Building a Distinct Model for Practice. Journal of Planning Education and Research. 21: 237-253.
- Margerum, Richard D. (1999). PROFILE: Integrated Environmental Management: The Foundations for Successful Practice. Environmental Management. 24(2): 151-166.
- Martin, Roscoe C., Guthrie S. Birkhead, Jesse Burkhead, and Frank J. Munger. (1960). River Basin Administration and the Delaware. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.
- McClendon, McKee J. (1994). Multiple Regression and Causal Analysis. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers.c.
- McCormick, Zachary L. (1994). Interstate Water Allocation Compacts in the Western United States - Some Suggestions. Water Resources Bulletin. 30(3): 385-395.
- McCreary, Scott T. and Mark B. Adams. (1995). Managing Wetlands through Advanced Planning and Permitting: The Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 103-137.
- McGuire, Therese J. (1991). Federal Aid to States and Localities and the Appropriate Competitive Framework. Competition Among States and Local Governments: Efficiency and Equity in American Federalism. Daphne A. Kenyon and John Kincaid (eds.). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press. 153-166.
- Meyers, Erik, Robert Fischman, and Anne Marsh. (1995). Maryland Chesapeake Bay Critical Areas Program: Wetlands Protection and Future Growth. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 181-201.
- Michaels, Sarah, Robert J. Mason, and William D. Solecki. (1997). Bridging Political Reality with Ecological Necessity: The Role of Public/Private Partnerships in Regional Ecosystem Management, Paper presented in the Annual Conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.
<http://nimbus.ocis.temple.edu/~rmason/acsp.html>

- Michaels, Sarah, Robert J. Mason, and William D. Solecki. (1999a). The Importance of Place in Partnerships for Regional Environmental Management. Environmental Conservation. 26 (3): 159-162.
- Michaels, Sarah, Robert J. Mason, and William D. Solecki. (1999b). Motivations for Ecostewardship Partnerships: Examples from the Adirondack Park. Land Use Policy. 16: 1-9.
- Miller, Delbert C. (1991). Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, Gary J. (1992). Managerial Dilemmas: The Political Economy of Hierarchy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mills, Mike. (1994). House Approves Measure to Reauthorize EDA. Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report. 52(19): 1210. May 14.
- Morin, Tracey. (2001). Sanctuary Advisory Councils: Involving the Public in the National Marine Sanctuary Program. Coastal Management. 29: 327-339.
- Mulford, C. L. and D. L. Rogers. (1982). Definitions and Models. Interorganizational Coordination: Theory, Research, and Implementation. David L. Rogers and David A. Whetten (Eds.) Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press. 9-31.
- Musgrove, Martha. (1992). 'Glades: Find Remedy, not Blame. Miami Herald. January 4. p. 17A.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (August 28, 2003). National Estuarine Research Reserve System Code of Federal Regulations, http://nerrs.noaa.gov/Background_Regulations.html (January 5, 2004).
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (December 16, 2002). National Marine Sanctuaries Act, <http://www.sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/natprogram/nplegislation/nplegislationact.html> (5 January, 2004).
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (September 12, 2000a). National Program, <http://sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/natprogram/natprogram.html> (7 December 2000).
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (July 29, 2000b). Legislation, <http://sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/natprogram/nplegislation/nplegislation.html> (8 December 2000).
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (1996). 1996 Program Overview for the National Marine Sanctuaries and the National Estuarine Research Reserves. National Ocean Service: Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.
- National Research Council of the United States and The Royal Society of Canada. (1985). The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement: An Evolving Instrument for Ecosystem Management. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Neter, John, William Wasserman, and Michael H. Kutner. (1983). Applied Linear Regression Models. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin.c.

- Nunnally, J. C. and I. H. Bernstein. (1994). Psychometric Theory. (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oakerson, Ronald. (1999). Governance Structures and Problem-Solving in Metropolitan Areas: Responding to (Downsian) Growth-Related Problems, Paper presented in the Workshop on the Workshop II Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis. Indiana University, Bloomington.
<http://www.indiana.edu/~workshop/wow2/publications/jun2699.pdf>
- Oates, Wallace E. and Robert M. Schwab. (1991). The Allocative and Distributive Implications of Local Fiscal Competition. Competition Among States and Local Governments: Efficiency and Equity in American Federalism. Daphne A. Kenyon and John Kincaid (eds.). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press. 127-145.
- Oliver, Christine. (1990). Determinants of Interorganizational Relationships: Integration and Future Directions. Academy of Management Review. (April). 15(2): 241-265.
- Ortolano, Leonard. (1997). Environmental Regulation and Impact Assessment. New York: John Wiley and Sons.c.
- Ostrom, Christopher L. and Stephen R. Gittings. (1996). Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary: Platforms, Partnerships, and Resource Protection. The Marine Technology Society Journal. 30(2): 3-7.
- Ostrom, Elinor, Roy Gardner and James Walker. (1994). Rules, Games, and Common-Pool Resources. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ota, Alan K. (1998). Assailed Development Agency Retains Enough Hill Support to Win a Five-Year Reprieve. Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report. 56(41): 2821. Oct. 17.
- Owen, S. (1998). Managing for Sustainability. The Cornerstone of Development: Integrating Environmental, Social and Economic Policies. Jamie Schnurr and Susan Holtz (eds). Ottawa: International Development Research Center. 117-147.
- Pallant, Julie. (2001). SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows (Versions 10 and 11). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Pedhazur, Elazar J. and Liora Pedhazur Schmelkin. (1991). Measurement, Design, and Analysis: An Integrated Approach. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pett, Marjorie A., Nancy R. Lackey, and John J. Sullivan. (2003). Making Sense of Factor Analysis. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Platt, Rutherford H. (1996). Land Use and Society: Geography, Law and Public Policy. Washington, D. C.: Island Press
- Plummer, N. W. and Eugene Hinds. (1980). Management of the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basins - An Integrated Effort. Symposium Proceedings. Unified River Basin Management. R. M. North, L. B. Dworsky and D. J. Allen (eds.). Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Water Resources Association. 79-95.
- Porter, Douglas R. and David A. Salvesen. (1995). Conclusion. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 275-283.

- Provan, Keith G. (1982). Interorganizational Linkages and Influence over Decision Making. Academy of Management Journal. (June). 25(2):443-451.
- Quinn, Frank. (1993). Commentary. Natural Resources Journal. 33(1): 363-365.
- Rabe, Barry G. (1986). Fragmentation and Integration in State Environmental Management. Washington, D.C.: The Conservation Foundation.
- Ring, Peter Smith and Andrew H. Van De Ven. (1992). Structuring Cooperative Relationships Between Organizations. Strategic Management Journal. 13: 483-498.
- Roberts, Marc J. (1971). Organizing Water Pollution Control: The Scope and Structure of River Basin Authorities. Public Policy. 19(1): 75-141.
- Robertson, Peter J. and Shui-Yan Tang. (1995). The Role of Commitment in Collective Action: Comparing the Organizational Behavior and Rational Choice Perspectives. in Public Administration Review. 55(1): 67-80.
- Rogers, D. L. and C. L. Mulford. (1982). The Historical Development. Interorganizational Coordination: Theory, Research, and Implementation. David L. Rogers and David A. Whetten (Eds.) Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press. 32-53.
- Ross, Lee and Andrew Ward. (1995). Psychological Barriers to Dispute Resolution. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. 27:255-304.
- Ruhl, J. B. (1999). The (Political) Science of Watershed Management in the Ecosystem Age. Journal of the American Water Resources Association. 35(3):519-526.
- Salvesen, David. A. (1995). Anchorage, Alaska's Wetland Management Plan. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 203-224.
- Salvesen, David. A. and Douglas R. Porter. (1995). Introduction. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife. Douglas R. Porter and David A. Salvesen. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 1-6.
- Salwasser, Hal, Christine Schonewald-Cox and Richard Baker. (1987). The Role of Interagency Cooperation in Managing for Viable Populations. Viable Populations for Conservation. Michael Soule (ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press. 147-173.
- Schoorman, F. David, Max H. Bazerman and Robert S. Atkin. (1981). Interlocking Directorates: A Strategy for Reducing Environmental Uncertainty. Academy of Management Review. (April). 6(2): 243-251.
- Schermerhorn, John R. Jr. (1975). Determinants of Interorganizational Cooperation. Academy of Management Journal. (December). 18: 846-856.
- Schuett, Michael A., Steve W. Selin, and Deborah S. Carr. (2001). Making it Work: Keys to Successful Collaboration in Natural Resource Management. Environmental Management. 27(4): 587-593.
- Senate Select Committee on Water Management Districts. (1984). A Review of Water Management Districts. Florida: Legislature.

- Slocombe, D. Scott. (1993). Implementing Ecosystem-Based Management. Bioscience. 43(9):612-622.
- Spann, Edward K. (1996). Designing Modern America: The Regional Planning Association of America and Its Members. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Sparks, Richard E. (1995). Need for Ecosystem Management of Large Rivers and Their Floodplains. Bioscience. 45(3):168-182.
- State of Florida. (2000). Surface Water Improvement and Management Program (SWIM), <http://www8.myflorida.com/environment/learn/waterprograms/waterpolicy/swim.html> (April 10, 2001).
- Stephenson, Kurt. (1996). Groundwater Management in Nebraska: Governing the Commons through Local Resource Districts. Natural Resources Journal. 36 (4): 521-538.
- Stevens, James. (2002). Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.c.
- Suchman, Edward Allen. (1967). Evaluative Research; Principles and Practice in Public Service & Social Action Programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Susquehanna River Basin Commission. (ND). Home Page. <http://www.srbc.net/> .
- Susskind, Lawrence and Jeffrey L. Cruikshank. (1989). Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes. Basic Books.
- Tabachnick, Barbara G. and Linda S. Fidell. (2000). Using Multivariate Statistics. (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tabachnick, Barbara G. and Linda S. Fidell. (1996). Using Multivariate Statistics. (3rd ed.). Northridge, California: HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Taylor, Sarah J. (1990). The Critical Area Program of Maryland: Is It Cleaning Up the Chesapeake Bay? International Transboundary Water Resources Issues. John E. FitzGibbon (ed.). Bethesda, Maryland: American Water Resources Association. 19-25.
- The Nature Conservancy. (2000). Key Conservation Areas, http://www.tncflorida.org/pages/key_conservation_areas.html (December 8, 2000).
- Thoemke, Kris. (1986). Site Diversity and Management Approaches. Proceedings of Tenth National Conference: Estuarine and Coastal Management Tools of the Trade. Volume One. New Orleans, Louisiana, 12-15 October 1986. p. 763
- Tiebout, Charles M. (1964). Exports and Regional Economic Growth. Regional Development and Planning, A Reader. John Friedmann and William Alonso (eds.). Cambridge: M.I.T. Press. 256-260.
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. (ND). Arkansas-White-Red Basins Inter-Agency Committee. http://www.ar.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/arkansas_white_red.html.
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. (November 03, 2003). HCP Database: Habitat Conservation Plans, http://ecos.fws.gov/conserv_plans/servlet/gov.doi.hcp.servlets.PlanReport (3 November, 2003).

- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. August, (1998). Habitat Conservation Plans: The Quiet Revolution. <http://endangered.fws.gov/hcp/Quiet/quietrev.html> (7 December, 2000).
- United States Bureau of Justice Assistance. (1997). East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership A Voluntary Regional Collaboration in Northern California. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. (November 5, 2003a). Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement 1978, <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/glwqa/> (5 January, 2004).
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. (January 6, 2003b). National Estuary Program, <http://www.epa.gov/nep/> (5 January, 2004).
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. (July 6, 2000). Great Lakes Areas of Concern, <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/aoc/> (6 October 2000).
- United States Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water. (July 17, 2000). About the National Estuary Program, <http://www.epa.gov/owow/estuaries/about2.htm> (6 October 2000).
- United States General Accounting Office. (1994). Ecosystem Management: Additional Actions Needed to Adequately Test a Promising Approach. GAO/RCED-94-111. Washington, DC: GAO.
- Van Atta, Dale. (1993). You Can't Kill a Good Giveaway. Appalachian Regional Commission's Pork Barrel Management Only Serves Politician's Vested Interests. Reader's Digest. 143(856): 55-59.
- Vicory, Alan. H. Jr. and Peter A. Tennant. (1995). Sustainable Management of the Ohio River (USA) by an Interjurisdictionally Represented Commission. Water Science and Technology. 32(5-6): 193-200.
- Viessman, Warren Jr. (1982). National Water Policy: The Need for Institutional Reform. Environmental Management. 6(1):35-41.
- Viessman, Warren Jr. (1988). Technology, Institutions, and Social Goals. Water Resources Bulletin. 24(3):581-584.
- Viessman, Warren Jr. and Claire Welty. (1985). Water Management Technology and Institutions. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Walters, Charles K. (1987). Special Area Management Planning in the Coastal Areas: The Process. Managing Land-Use Conflicts: Case Studies in Special Area Management. David J. Brower and Daniel S. Carol (eds.). Durham: Duke University Press. 10-26.
- Warren, Roland L., Stephen M. Rose, and Ann F. Bergunder. (1974). The Structure of Urban Reform. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books. As cited by Mulford and Rogers (1982: 16).
- Waterbury, John. (1979). Hydropolitics of the Nile Valley. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

- Watershed Partnerships Project. February (2002). Watershed Partnerships in California and Washington: Final Report for the Watershed Partnerships Project. Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California.
<http://wucdavis.edu/EPA%20final%20report%202-15-02.pdf>
- Weisberg, Herbert F., Jon A. Krosnick and Bruce D. Bowen. (1996). An Introduction to Survey Research, Polling and Data Analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Weiss, Janet A. (1987). Pathways to Cooperation among Public Agencies. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. 7(1): 94-117.
- Wenner, Elizabeth L. and Maggie Geist. (2001). The National Estuarine Research Reserves Program to Monitor and Preserve Estuarine Waters. Coastal Management. 29: 1-17.
- Westley, Frances. (1995). Governing Design: The Management of Social Systems and Ecosystems Management. Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions. Lance Gunderson, C. S. Holling and Stephen Light (eds.) New York: Columbia University Press. 391-427.
- Whaley, R. S. (1993). Working Partnerships: Elements for Success. Journal of Forestry. 91(3): 10-111.
- Wondolleck, Julia M. and Steven L. Yaffee. (2000). Making Collaboration Work: Lessons from Innovation in Natural Resource Management. Washington, D. C.: Island Press.
- Wooten, Barbara. (1945). Freedom under Planning. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Yaffee, Steven L., Ali F. Phillips, Irene C. Frenzt, Paul W. Hardy, Susanne M. Maleki, and Barbara E. Thorpe. (1996). Ecosystem Management in the United States: An Assessment of Current Experience. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

AYŞIN DEDEKORKUT

Florida State University
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Tallahassee, FL 32306-2280

Phone: (850) 644 7220
Fax: (850) 645 4841
E-mail: add6628@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Planning. April 2004. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

Dissertation: Determinants of Success in Interorganizational Collaboration for Natural Resource Management.

Dissertation Committee: Robert E. Deyle (chair), Bruce Stiftel, Richard C. Feiock.

Master of City and Regional Planning. May 1996. Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina.

Thesis: Stormwater Runoff Best Management Practices for Protection and Enhancement of Water Quality in Urban Areas

Master of City Planning Program (No degree acquired- Continued Studies Abroad). January 1993 - June 1993. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

B.S. in City and Regional Planning. July 1992. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

AREAS OF INTEREST

- Environmental planning and natural resource management with particular focus on water resources management
- Collaborative planning, consensus building, and alternative dispute resolution
- Collective action problems
- Ecosystem management and sustainability

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Graduate Level:

- **Water Resource Conflicts** (URP 5429/POS 5032). Departments of Urban and Regional Planning and Political Science, Florida State University. Spring 2003.

Responsibilities: Assisted in the selection of reading material; developed case studies used by the students as models, worked as teaching assistant and participated in the classroom, helped guide student research.

- **Introduction to Environmental Planning and Resource Management** (URP 5421/4423). Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University. Spring 1998.
Responsibilities: Participated in the classroom, assisted in grading exams and assignments, lectured as guest instructor.

Undergraduate Level:

- **Collective Decision Making** (URP 4022). Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University. Fall 2001, Spring 2002, Summer 2002, Fall 2002, Summer 2003.
- **Introduction to Planning and Urban Development** (URP 3000). Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University. Summer 2001 and Fall 2001.
- **Introduction to Environmental Planning and Resource Management** (URP 4423). Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University. Fall 1998 and Summer 2000.
Responsibilities: Full responsibility including the selection of reading material, course design, teaching and grading for the above courses.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

- **Water Governance Project, Graduate Research Assistant to Prof. John Scholz and Prof. Bruce Stiftel.** July 2002-August 2003. DeVoe L. Moore Center for the Study of Critical Issues in Economic Policy and Government, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
Responsibilities: Identified and provided background information on water related conflicts in Florida, assisted in the selection of the cases that will be studied, conducted two of the case studies that will be the basis of a conference, assisted in a Water Resources Conflicts seminar and the preparation a conference that will take place in November 2003, edited the Case Book for the conference.
- **Crime, Security and Transit Use Project, Graduate Research Assistant to Prof. Devajyoti Deka.** December 2001-August 2002. Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
Responsibilities: Prepared a literature review on transit security and assisted in the preparation and administration of a mail survey of transit employees in Florida, analyzed the data and wrote up the results for the final report.
- **Transportation Dispute Resolution in Florida Project, Graduate Research Assistant to Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium Supervisor: Prof. Bruce Stiftel.** August 2000-April 2001., Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
Responsibilities: Assisted in identifying Best Management Practices for Florida Department of Transportation through a literature review on the subject.
- **State Administrative Dispute Resolution Project, Graduate Research Assistant Supervisor: Prof. Bruce Stiftel.** January 1999-January 2000. Administrative Procedures Act / Administrative Dispute Resolution Study Group, Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
Responsibilities: Assisted in the preparation of a survey of mediation participants, administered the phone survey, supervised data entry, and conducted data analysis.
- **Ninety Six, South Carolina, Comprehensive / Strategic Planning Project Studio Team Member.** Fall 1994. Department of City and Regional Planning, Clemson University.
Responsibilities: Developed the infrastructure and public utilities inventory of the town with two classmates, and developed an alternative comprehensive plan with a group of classmates.

- **Chattooga River Watershed Coalition, Geographic Information Systems Analyst Intern.** Summer 1994. Clayton, Georgia.
Responsibilities: Worked with aerial photographs to update the USGS maps of the watershed, entered some of the information into a GIS database.
- **Comprehensive Plans of 12 Towns in the Southeastern Anatolian Project, City Planner Intern.** Summer 1991. United Planners Planning Agency, Ankara, Turkey.
Responsibilities: Assisted in information gathering and mapping for the comprehensive plans of the towns.
- **Ankara’s “Old” City Center Urban Renewal Project, Surveyor.** Summer 1990. College of Architecture, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
Responsibilities: Conducted face-to-face surveys of businesses in the old city center about the proposed renewal.
- **Squatter-Children Health Survey, Doctoral (Ph.D.) Survey Assistant.** 1989-1990. Lynn Lohfeld Yalin, Ankara, Turkey.
Responsibilities: Conducted face-to-face surveys of parents about child health, and assisted in survey coding.

BOOK CHAPTERS

- Fran Berry, Bruce Stiftel and **Ayşın Dedekorkut**. Forthcoming in August 2003. “State Agency Administrative Mediation: Assessment of Florida Trial and Prospects,” in *The Promise and Performance of Environmental Conflict Resolution*. Rosemary O’Leary and Lisa Bingham (Eds.). Resources for the Future.
- Ayşın Dedekorkut** and Nursen Kaya. 1993. “Location Decision of the Textile Industry in Ankara,” in *Ankara 2010*. Ankara: Middle East Technical University, College of Architecture. (In Turkish)

REPORTS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS

- Ayşın Dedekorkut**. July 2003. “Tampa Bay Water Wars: From Conflict to Collaboration?,” in *Adaptive Governance and Florida’s Water Conflicts: The Case Studies*. Ayşın Dedekorkut, John Scholz and Bruce Stiftel (eds.). Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University DeVoe L. Moore Center for the Study of Critical Issues in Economic Policy and Government. pp. 23-58.
- Ayşın Dedekorkut**. July 2003. “Suwannee River Partnership: A Voluntary Approach to Nutrient Management,” in *Adaptive Governance and Florida’s Water Conflicts: The Case Studies*. Ayşın Dedekorkut, John Scholz and Bruce Stiftel (eds.). Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University DeVoe L. Moore Center for the Study of Critical Issues in Economic Policy and Government. pp. 83-112.
- Devajyoti Deka, **Ayşın Dedekorkut**, Sarah Dickson and Jeff Ueland. August 2002. *An Assessment of the Relationship Between Crime, Security, and Transit Use in Florida Using GIS and Econometric Approaches*. Final report to the Florida Department of Transportation.
- Ayşın Dedekorkut** with Clemson University Planning Studio. 1994. *Preliminary Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Ninety Six, SC Volume I: Summaries of Background Studies*. Clemson University, Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture.

Ayşın Dedekorkut with Clemson University Planning Studio. 1994. "Broad Based Economic Development and Community Growth," in *Preliminary Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Ninety Six, SC Volume II: Alternative Comprehensive Planning Proposals*. Clemson University, Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture.

Dean Baker, **Ayşın Dedekorkut** and Brad Digre. 1994. "Infrastructure and Public Utilities Inventory," in *Preliminary Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Ninety Six, SC Volume III: Detailed Background Studies*. Clemson University, Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture.

EDITORSHIP

Ayşın Dedekorkut, John Scholz and Bruce Stiffler (eds.). July 2003. *Adaptive Governance and Florida's Water Conflicts: The Case Studies*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University DeVoe L. Moore Center for the Study of Critical Issues in Economic Policy and Government.

PRESENTATIONS AT PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES

Ayşın Dedekorkut. "What Makes Collaborations Successful?: Empirical Evidence From Natural Resource Management," Presented at the ACSP-AESOP Third Joint Congress, Leuven, Belgium, July 8-12, 2003.

Ayşın Dedekorkut. "An Empirical Assessment of Determinants of Success in Interorganizational Collaboration for Natural Resource Management," Presented at the 44th Annual Conference of Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Baltimore, Maryland, November 21-24, 2002.

Ayşın Dedekorkut. "Stormwater Runoff Best Management Practices for Protection and Enhancement of Water Quality in Urban Areas," Presented at the XVI AESOP Congress, Volos, Greece, July 10-15, 2002.

Ayşın Dedekorkut. "What Makes Collaborations Work?" Presented at the 1st World Planning Schools Congress, Shanghai, China, July 11-15, 2001.

Ayşın Dedekorkut. "Determinants of Success in Interorganizational Collaboration for Natural Resource Management," Presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Atlanta, Georgia, November 2-5, 2000.

Ayşın Dedekorkut. "Determinants of Success in Interorganizational Cooperation for Ecosystem Management," Presented at the 40th Annual Conference of Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Pasadena, California, November 5-8, 1998.

WORKSHOPS

- Journal of Planning Education and Research Scholarly Publication Workshop, Portland, Oregon, August 14-16, 2003.
- Association of European Schools of Planning/ Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning PhD Workshop, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, July 5-7, 2003.
- Association of European Schools of Planning PhD Workshop, Volos, Greece, July 5-9, 2002.
- 1st Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning PhD Workshop, Catalina Island, California, August 15-19, 2001.

FELLOWSHIPS, HONORS AND OTHER GRANTS

- Fannie Mae Foundation Association of European Schools of Planning PhD Workshop Travel Grant, July 2003.
- Fannie Mae Foundation Association of European Schools of Planning PhD Workshop Travel Grant, July 2002.
- Fannie Mae Foundation Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning PhD Workshop Travel Grant, August 2001.
- Lincoln Institute of Land Policy Dissertation Fellowship, June 2000.
- Florida State University Office of Graduate Studies Dissertation Research Grant, Fall 1999.
- Florida State University Conference Presentation Travel Grants, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003.
- Citation in Planning - Second Year Award, College of Arts, Architecture, and Humanities, Clemson University, 1996.
- Turkish Higher Education Council Scholarship for Graduate Education Abroad, 1993.

LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

- **Academic Personnel Committee PhD Student Representative.** Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University, December 2002- present.
- **PhD Policy Committee Student Representative.** Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University, August 1997- August 1999.
- **Editorial Board Member.** *Media*, Student Journal of Faculty of Architecture, Middle East Technical University, 1993.

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- American Planning Association, 1994 - present.
- American Planning Association Florida Chapter, 1996 - present.
- American Planning Association South Carolina Chapter, 1994-1996.
- Synoptikos: American Planning Association Student Chapter, Florida State University, 1996-1997.
- American Planning Association Student Chapter, Clemson University, 1994-1996.
- Chamber of City Planners of Turkey, 1987-1993.