

Research Note

Assessing Complexity and Stakeholder and Rightsholder Trust in Outdoor Recreation Management on the Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail

Jaclyn Fox Rushing,^a and Jennifer M. Thomsen^b

^a Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana, Missoula, MT; Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, Rocky Mountain Research Station, USDA Forest Service

^b Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana, Missoula, MT

Executive Summary

The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail (PNT) traverses 1,200 miles from the Continental Divide to the Pacific Ocean. The portion of the trail in Northwest Montana and the Idaho Panhandle is at the nexus of a complex conflict situation involving outdoor recreation, wildlife conservation, and social-cultural values. This evolving conflict has gained national attention due to the diverse stakeholder interests and litigation against the US Forest Service, who administers the trail. The tension among the stakeholder groups and the various ecological and social-cultural dimensions at play illuminate the complexity of managing long-distance trails. Administrators of long-distance trails must evaluate and mitigate social, ecological, and cultural risks. This research note explores complexity and trust ecology among key PNT stakeholders, and discusses opportunities for incorporating trust research in transboundary recreation planning and research.

Keywords

Trust, transboundary management, national scenic trails

Introduction

Designated as a National Scenic Trail in 2009 and traversing from the Continental Divide to the Pacific Ocean, the Pacific Northwest Trail (PNT) offers access to outstanding recreation opportunities through complex social-ecological landscapes. Sections of the PNT in Northwest Montana and the Idaho Panhandle are at the center of heated conflicts surrounding trail impacts to local communities, threatened grizzly bears, and cultural resources which have gained national attention. The PNT transcends political and institutional boundaries encompassing stakeholders and rights-

holders from the local to national scale; yet, there is relatively little understanding of the social complexity among PNT stakeholders and rightsholders. Trust is an essential aspect of addressing conflicts in recreation and natural resource management; thus, it is important to understand trust among stakeholders and rightsholders in the context of long-distance trails.

This study seeks to better understand the conflict situation through the following research question: how does trust ecology of stakeholder and rightsholder groups contribute to the complexity of managing a long-distance trail for multiple interests? This exploratory study's findings inform a discussion on broader research needs for stakeholder trust in complex social-ecological conflicts involving transboundary outdoor recreation contexts.

Background on the PNT

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) administers the PNT, and must provide for outstanding recreation opportunities associated with the trail, while considering the multiple states, Tribal lands, jurisdictions, and three grizzly bear recovery zones through which it travels in their planning and management of the trail. As a national scenic trail, the PNT is an "extended trail...to provide for maximum recreation potential and for the conservation and enjoyment of nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities of the areas through which such trails may pass" (National Trails System Act Sec. 3(a)(2)).

The 1968 National Trails System Act requires engagement of stakeholders by way of a Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) council to inform the trail's comprehensive management plan (USDA, 2020). The Act defines stakeholders as "the agencies that manage land and resources along the trail, the states and communities the trail travels through, trail users, and citizens" (USDA, n.d.). Per the Act, the PNT's comprehensive plan should have been completed within five years of designation. Since the designation of the PNT, the advisory council only met three times in 2015 and 2016 before the previous charter expired in 2018, and there is still no comprehensive management plan. The FAC charter was renewed in March of 2020 (USDA, 2020), but has not yet convened.

A 100-mile portion of the trail in Northwest Montana and the Idaho Panhandle, Section 2—the Purcell Mountains, is at the nexus of a complex conflict involving outdoor recreation, grizzly bear conservation, and cultural resources on Tribal land (Bolton, 2019; Kwak-Hefferan, 2020; The Western News, 2020). This section of the trail crosses the Cabinet-Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery zone, Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle National Forests, the Northwest Peaks Scenic Area, and state, private and Tribal lands. The policy surrounding the Cabinet-Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone tries to limit traffic on roads and trails in the area. If traffic on the PNT reaches a "high-use level," then the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) may need to close some surrounding roads and restrict access to locally important areas (USFW; USFS, personal correspondence).

Therefore, stakeholders and rightsholders have proposed several re-routes that route hikers away from areas of local value (e.g., sacred sites, grizzly habitat) and add substantial hiking mileage along heavily trafficked roads (Bolton, 2019; Kwak-Hefferan, 2020; Thomsen, 2019; The Western News, 2020; YVFC, n.d.). In addition to proposing two re-routes, the Yaak Valley Forest Council (YVFC) filed suit against the USFS on behalf of the Yaak Valley's grizzly bears and the protection of local access to the Yaak Valley (YVFC, n.d.). The suit argues that the USFS did not properly evaluate the impact

the route would have on threatened grizzly bears, and that the management plan for the PNT was not issued within the 2-year timeline after Congress designated the trail in 2009 (Bolton, 2019). This case is still in litigation.

Literature Review

Stakeholder Trust and Protected Area Management

Trust between communities and land management agencies is essential for stable and resilient relationships, successful planning and management, and has been linked to pro-environmental behaviors (e.g., Pretty & Ward, 2001; Smith et al., 2013; Stern, 2008a; Wynveen & Sutton, 2015). Generally, trust is the belief or expectation that another person's words or actions are reliable and good intentioned (Dirks, 2000; Leahy & Anderson, 2008; Mayer et al., 1995). Trust involves vulnerability, since expectations are somewhat uncertain (Mayer et al., 1995; Stern, 2018). "Distrust, on the other hand, indicates an explicit expectation of harm or undesirable outcome" (Stern 2018, 102). Although distrust can be damaging and lead to unproductive conflict (Barber, 1983), it can "promote active deliberation and engagement" (Stern 2018, 103).

Protected area and recreation management can be especially challenging if stakeholders have conflicting goals. It is common for conflict to occur between protected areas and the people who live adjacent to them (e.g., Davenport et al., 2007; Mazur & Curtis, 2006; Ohno et al., 2010), and distrust of managers is the most consistent driver of active opposition toward neighbouring protected areas (Stern, 2008b). Stakeholder trust in natural resource management agencies is often associated with perceptions of managers as fair and honest (Leahy & Anderson, 2008; Stern, 2008b), performance of duties consistently and professionally (Stern, 2008b), regulation compliance (Stern, 2008a), and approval of management decisions (Vaske et al., 2007). Distrust of managers can lead to increased stakeholder involvement (Smith et al., 2013), noncompliance (Stern, 2008a), and increased resistance to management plans (Cvetkovich & Winter 2003; Lachapelle & McCool 2012; Vaske et al., 2007).

Trust is complex and multidimensional and has been conceptualized in a variety of ways. Trust dimensions often include: one's general tendency to trust other people—dispositional or social trust (Leahy & Anderson, 2008; Smith et al., 2013; Stern, 2018); shared values and interests (Cvetkovich & Winter, 2003; Leahy & Anderson, 2008; Needham & Vaske, 2008; Vaske et al., 2007b); trust in adherence to moral codes and respect for the trustor's interests and values (Barber, 1983); technical competency, or the capability to perform given tasks (Leahy & Anderson, 2008; Smith et al., 2013); and a sense of procedural fairness (Leahy & Anderson, 2008). Stern and Coleman (2015) conceptualized these dimensions as dispositional trust, rational trust, and procedural trust, and discusses the role of affinitive trust (see Table 1 for definitions).

Given the complexity of relationships and the role of trust and its dimensions, trust can be likened to an ecosystem both resilient and vulnerable to disturbances. Trust ecology is a framework that seeks to understand how varying levels and dimensions of trust and distrust interact to support institutional resilience (Stern & Baird, 2015). Within the trust ecology framework, trust diversity is made up of trust richness, or the number of trust dimensions in a given relationship network, and trust evenness—the relative amount of each dimension (Stern & Baird, 2015). As in an ecosystem, having diverse forms of trust can make collaborative relationships more stable and resilient (Stern & Baird, 2015). In cases such as the PNT, resource and recreation management is complex and encompasses multiple stakeholder and rightsholder groups and per-

spectives. This research seeks to respond to Stern and Baird's (2015) call for researchers to "use, elaborate, expand, subtract, validate, or invalidate" the idea of a trust ecology framework (p. 9), and understand trust among stakeholders, rightsholders, and managers and how it contributes to the complexity of managing a long-distance trail for multiple interests.

Table 1
Dimensions of Trust

Trust Dimensions	Definitions
Dispositional Trust	• Predisposition to trust or distrust based on past experiences and culture of the trustor. It "sets the baseline from which other forms of trust emerge or are eroded" (Stern, 2018; 104). • This form of trust changes slowly, if at all, whereas the following three forms are more susceptible to change through actions of the trustor and trustee (Stern, 2018).
Rational Trust	• Rational trust is based on the trustor's evaluations of the outcomes of the trustee's actions, and includes perceptions of competence, predictability, past performance, and alignment of goals between trustor and trustee (Stern 2018; Stern & Coleman, 2015). • Rational distrust is the perception of incompetence and/or predictability based on the trustee's past performance and alignment of goals.
Affinitive Trust	• Affinitive trust is based on the rapport of the trustor and trustee and stems from feelings of connectedness, shared experiences, shared identities, and assumptions of similar basic values (i.e., right from wrong) (Stern, 2018; Stern & Coleman, 2015). • Affinitive distrust is the perception of incompatible values, experiences, or "other forms of general acrimony" (Stern & Coleman, 2015; 124).

Methods

This research took a qualitative approach to gain a nuanced understanding of stakeholder and rightsholder trust and complexity (Merriam & Grenier 2019). In total, we reached out to seven groups: three representing trail and resource managers, three representing stakeholder groups, and one rightsholder group. Participants were sampled purposively to represent the central actors in the highest conflict area (The Purcell Mountains or Section 2 of the PNT), and additional participants were selected through chain-referral (Babbie 2012; Brandenburg & Carroll, 1995). We conducted seven semi-structured interviews (one for each manager, stakeholder, and rightsholder group) with thirteen participants in April and May 2021 (two of the seven interviews were group interviews on the participants' requests). The groups represented in the interviews included: Kootenai National Forest, USDA Forest Service Pacific Northwest (USFS PNW) Region recreation staff, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (KTOI), US Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Northwest Trail Association, and two local environmental advocacy groups wishing to remain confidential.

Each of the interviews were conducted over Zoom and lasted roughly 60 minutes. Interview questions were based on the four dimensions of trust ecology and stakeholder involvement (Stern & Coleman, 2015). All interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded for both emergent and theoretically relevant themes guided by the research

question and theory (Patterson & Williams, 2002). To support intercoder reliability, data analysis consisted of detailed comparisons across all interviews and differences were systematically discussed (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Patterson & Williams, 2002).

Results

The following section presents the results of the exploratory study in Table 2 and is organized by themes and sub-themes.

The trust ecology of actors in Section 2—The Purcell Mountains—of the PNT reflects aspects of trust in other natural resource conflicts and illuminates some unique challenges for managing the nexus of recreation, wildlife, and cultural values on a long-distance trail.

Procedural Trust

Administering a transboundary trail such as the PNT is complex. Agencies must administer the trail in compliance with the National Scenic Trails Act and all other relevant policies (i.e., Endangered Species Act). Aligning the CMP with diverse stakeholder input and resource management plans can be challenging; thus, the process of CMP development can be slow and laborious.

When procedural requirements were followed, such as government-to-government meetings and the MOU with KTOI, there was trust across rational and procedural dimensions. Situations in which procedures were *not* followed and stakeholders did not meet regularly resulted in lack of trust or distrust across rational and procedural dimensions of trust.

All participants identified issues with the execution of legal processes related to the development of the CMP and the convening of a FAC. The USFS's perceived lack of follow-through weakened procedural trust among stakeholders. Further, several stakeholder groups believed the lack of CMP may be causing tension among stakeholders. Regarding the FAC, stakeholders emphasized benefits of the council and identified it as the best venue for citizen collaboration. Despite stakeholders' desire to participate in a FAC, convening the committee has been a slow and inconsistent process. Stakeholders attribute the lack of FAC on changes in Congress and presidential administrations; however more recently, stakeholders are unclear and frustrated with the inactivity of the FAC.

Dispositional Trust

Several of the participants place their blame and procedural distrust with legislative and executive branches of federal government. This is especially true of KTOI, who comes from a unique place of dispositional distrust in the government due to historic genocide, dispossession, and erasure of American Indians writ large. KTOI notes that designation of the PNT was like many instances of dispossession. Congress not only designated the trail route without consultation, but their decision also broke KTOI's "fundamental law" to steward land for all other species. Since the initial failure of Congress to consult with indigenous communities along the trail, an interviewee deemed the situation as "reconciliation in action." KTOI is one of the most involved rightsholder groups to reconcile their dispositional distrust through government-to-government and MOU procedures.

Table 2
Themes and Quotations

Theme	Sub-theme	Example Quote
Complexity of managing a National Scenic Trail	USFS Compliance Obligations	The USFS PNW Region recreation staff shared their need to ensure the benefits of the Act (i.e., access to trails offering outstanding scenic and recreation values) (#7). The USFS reflected on their mandated goals for the PNT, and their responsibility to provide for the goals of diverse stakeholders and jurisdictions (#7) For the local USFS, they are balancing goals of managing recreation and grizzly bears: "So one of the things we're managing is the grizzly bear. We're in two different IGBC [Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee] habitats" (#6).
	Challenges of Developing a Comprehensive Management Plan	Per the National Trails System Act, the management of the trail should harmonize with all the jurisdictions it runs through and align with National Forest plans or resource management plans for each jurisdiction (#7). "It can get complicated and a lot of moving parts just on the Kootenai Forest, and I can't even imagine doing that across multiple forests, multiple agencies...the complexity of a long-distance trail can be mind-boggling... so that's why I think it's taken us a little bit of time to pull that together" (#6). "It gets complicated both east and west as far as working with different user groups and agencies, and local or regional, or national interest groups...I don't think it's unique to the PNT...the challenges of working with local communities and long-distance communities is probably not all that new" (#6).
Sources of Procedural Distrust	Lack of Compliance with Development of Comprehensive Management Plan	"The absence of this comprehensive management plan, and the void that has occupied that space has allowed a lot of other people to just fill it with their ideas. That's led to the place we are right now, where there is contention about management of the trail...the lack of a plan is definitely part of it" (#3). "Without that really high-level push or vision... that's when noxious ideas set in. So, I think one of the challenges we see with the Pacific Northwest Trail is that there's been a vacuum of creating this vision that's existed now for 12 years that has allowed conflicts, that while challenging to resolve, if they're not addressed, they get more challenging" (#5).
	Lack of Compliance with Convening Federal Advisory Committee	"The FACA committee didn't start up...The interested parties applied last year at this time and then...I don't think anybody got contacted...and then it just faded away. Nothing happened" (#1). "The first meeting of the council was in 2015, and we ended up having three in-person meetings and then a lot of side-meetings...It all ground to a halt right around the administration change when the incoming Secretary of Agriculture resisted approving a charter for most Federal Advisory Councils...that's when the subcommittee for this trail went into quasi-limbo" (#4). "One concern I have is that the 2009 legislation, enabling the trail, mandated that a FACA committee be put together right away...That's been moribund for four or five years, and here we are 12 years on, and there's no sign of the reauthorization of the charter" (#5).
Sources of Procedural Trust	Convening a Federal Advisory Committee	"I think, ideally, having the advisory council reinstated and back together working on these issues would be, probably, the best avenue" (#4). "I would really be strongly in favor of seeing the [FAC] be the vehicle that moves things forward" (#5). There have not been many opportunities where all stakeholders have come together, but when they have happened, they have been really good (#7).
	Government to Government Consultation	"They [the USFS] are working as closely with us as possible in order to allow us to influence the comprehensive management plan in a way that still meets their federal rules and regulations that they have to comply with...and try to incorporate our viewpoint as an inherent government in the territory with rights and interests up there into the plan" (#3). "We have a very close working relationship with them [the USFS]. And through that relationship with the two forests, we sort of address our issues as a Tribal government with treaty rights and inherent rights" (#3).

Table 2 (cont.)

	Memorandum of Understanding	"We do have an MOU with them [Kootenai Tribe of Idaho] and we're working closely with them on different issues with the PNT" (#6). "We have an actual formal MOU with them [Region 6] that really defines how we're going to work on PNT issues... It's a really very integrated relationship with the forest, and then we have some very specific procedures for PNT" (#3).
Sources of Rational Distrust	Misalignment of Stated Goals and Actions	"Interestingly enough, a lot of that [land acquisition in linkage corridors] was done at the behest of and support by [a local environmental group], who now seems to support moving the trail into those same areas that many of them said were really important for linkage...it seems rather odd to me at least that folks would want to just dump more impacts on tops of those lands...that just strikes me as strange because I was lobbied so intensively...it just seems, again, odd to me that we would dump another impact on top of these lands that we just spent a whole bunch of money on to protect for linkage, but that's just me" (#2). "Publicly stated goals, I think, are aligned really closely...I don't think that the conversation has always been transparent about motivations and everything else...I just don't think they're willing to have an honest and transparent conversation" (#4). "I don't think I fully understand motivations, but I can see when they just don't add up like what we're being told" (#4).
	Perception of collaboration in ill-faith	"When all your communication is tactics, other stakeholders can pick up on that. They know they're being played rather than partnered with" (#4).
Sources of Affinitive Trust	Shared Values	"Many of our values are the same as the Tribe's" (#3).
Sources of Dispositional Distrust	Historic Relationship of Dispossession of Indigenous land by the Federal government	"Our involvement is one of frustration about the current route because there was no consultation between the United States and the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, Confederated Salish Kootenai Tribes, or the Ktunaxa Nation as a whole about this trail going through their territory... we're going to have to address the impacts that really were imposed up the territory because Congress failed to actually talk to...not just the Indigenous communities along the trail, and I won't speak for the other Indigenous nations...but Congress failed to consult with us. Congress failed to either consider what this trail could mean for Indigenous nations and for the settler communities as well, along the trail" (#3). "Ktunaxa people were placed in the territory to guard and keep the creation, and if they did so, the territory would take care of them. So, our fundamental law is to guard and keep the land forever. Looking out for those resources is our ultimate goal. So, if it's bad for grizzlies, then it's bad under the covenant, it's bad for the tribe" (#3). "It's sort of reconciliation and action, where we're trying to reconcile US laws and the settler communities with indigenous laws in the indigenous community with respect to this trail" (#3)

Rational Trust

Rational trust among stakeholders varied and discussion revolved mostly around transparency and alignment of stakeholders' stated goals and actions. In this case, participants reflected that one stakeholder group tended to act in ways that conflicted with their publicly stated goals and interests. This led other actors to question that group's motivations and distrust them. Additionally, one participant indicated that it felt the stakeholder group was collaborating in ill-faith because communication felt like "tactics," which made others feel "played rather than partnered with." Rational trust and "good working relationships" stemmed from shared goals among actors.

Affinitive Trust

Although this trust dimension was not as salient as others, participants indicated that having shared values was key for good working relationships.

Discussion

Our findings support previous trust research in protected area and natural resource management. In the case of the PNT, when procedures were followed such as government-to-government consultation and memoranda of understanding, rightsholders reported "close working relationships" and the ability to contribute to management of the trail and adjacent resources. Lack of follow-through on procedures such as renewing the federal advisory committee and developing a comprehensive management plan resulted in distrust among some stakeholders. These findings support theory on procedural trust—likening procedures to a safety net from which other forms of trust grow (Leahy & Anderson, 2008; Stern, 2008a; Stern & Coleman, 2015).

Interestingly, in the case of the PNT, stakeholders and rightsholders mostly discussed rational trust and distrust among each other and this theme did not emerge as much with regard to trail managers and administrators. This research identified shared values and goals as positive drivers of rational and affinitive trust among actors, which supports findings from previous research (e.g., (Mayer et al., 1995; Siegrist et al., 2000)). In other collaborative natural resource management situations, rational distrust of local residents was found to be the leading cause of conflict (Stern 2008a, 2008b, 2010). This further indicates that in this case procedural trust and distrust was the most salient trust dimension, and that stakeholders and rightsholders were more concerned about procedures being followed than the Forest Service's past actions.

Similarly, there was little discussion of affinitive trust, and when it did come up, it was between stakeholders and rightsholders rather than directed toward the Forest Service. Previous research identified perceptions of shared values and goals as strong drivers of trust resulting in compliance and support of agency decisions and actions (Cvetkovich & Winter, 2003; Needham & Vaske, 2008; Vaske et al., 2007b).

We took a trust ecology approach to understand the role of trust in the complexity of managing a national scenic trail. In this case, trust diversity is relatively low because richness and evenness were low—skewed toward procedural trust dimensions and lacking rational, affinitive, and dispositional trust. Some actors had high levels of procedural trust, while others had distinct distrust. Actors on the PNT may thus consider efforts to increase rational and affinitive trust dimensions in particular so that relationships are resilient to disturbances such as lack of executive branch and presidential administration support for renewing FAC charters.

In Stern and Baird's (2015) framework, they "confine [their] consideration...to positive trust, and treat distrust and lack of trust separately" (p. 4). We found that on the PNT, conflict and distrust among stakeholders and rightsholders in one section of the trail deeply complicates management across the greater 1,200 miles of trail. Thus, we included distrust within the trust ecology for this case. One benefit for including distrust is being able to identify what trust dimensions need future bolstering from actors on the PNT. As our research is limited and exploratory, we encourage future research to consider including lack of trust and distrust within trust ecologies.

Complexity of Managing a Transboundary National Scenic Trail

While this study's findings align with other natural resource contexts, the exceptional nexus of cultural, ecological, and recreational dimensions illuminated the unique challenges of managing long-distance trails. Our study demonstrated the tension between maximizing recreation potential with conservation of other important resources such as wildlife and cultural sites. These tensions along with the transboundary nature of National Trails result in complex social dynamics among stakeholders.

Some of these challenges have been experienced with other long-distance trails. Kling et al. (2019) explored how trails can generate conflict, but also can reduce conflict and promote trust among stakeholders in multifunctional landscapes. Their study found conflict across scales of governance was exacerbated with increasing use and tension with conservation as well as power imbalances; with this complexity, it is deemed impossible to meet the needs of all stakeholders; thus, trade-offs are inevitable (Kling et al. 2019). Federal land management agencies involved in the National Trails System are reliant on collaborative approaches that share power through diverse public-private partnerships (McPadden & Margerum 2014). For example, the Juan Bautista De Anza National Historic Trail found challenges with mission alignment, sustaining relationships, turnover to sustaining the collaborative management of the trail due to the complexity of the planning process (McPadden & Margerum 2014).

There is also a clear distinction between administering at the national scale versus managing at the local scale for long-distance trails (Kreutzer & Taylor, 2018). This can be particularly important for cultural resources and engagement with Tribes for the National Trail System. For example, the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail, local forest managers excavated large areas of the trail for erosion management, but did so without consultations of the Cherokee Nation and other Tribes, creating conflict and distrust (Kreutzer & Taylor 2018). This example along with the PNT findings, highlight the importance of integrating both natural and cultural values into trail management and the inclusion of Tribes throughout the process. Further, the Interagency Visitor Use Management Council (2016) sliding scale for risk analysis can help guide discussions and risk evaluation surrounding stakeholder engagement and impact to cultural and natural resources. This approach would allow all actors to better understand each other's interests and be able to mitigate management decisions that would have intense opposition.

Conclusion

Managing transboundary outdoor recreation opportunities such as the PNT is incredibly multifaceted, especially when there are many stakeholders with diverse interests and varied trust of each other. Stakeholders' trust largely depended on the procedural architecture of the trail's comprehensive management plan and the convening

of a federal advisory committee. To foster trust, administrators of long-distance trails should take seriously opportunities to uphold procedures for planning and stakeholder engagement. If it is not possible to follow procedures, it is essential that administrators communicate why they cannot be followed and what steps are being taken to ensure procedures are followed in the future.

This work provides an initial exploration of conflict and the role of trust in trans-boundary management of National Scenic Trails for multiple interests. Future research should engage in more “multi-directional” trust which includes land managers’ trust of stakeholders. There is extensive research on stakeholder trust of organizations such as land management agencies; however, there is very little to no research on how managers’ trust of stakeholders affects working relationships and subsequent management outcomes.

Research findings inform some key insights for strengthening trust among actors in the PNT and for other long-distance trails. First, reinstating official opportunities for collaboration (such as the FAC) is critical for convening stakeholders to establish a shared vision for trail management and facilitate informal interactions among stakeholders to gain more affinitive trust. Second, continued and enhanced engagement among National Trail System managers to share lessons and strategies specific to engagement and relationships could impart best practices across the System. Third, recognizing and integrating natural and cultural values into all stages of national and local planning and management as well as utilizing diverse culturally relevant approaches to engage with Tribes and Tribal resources can help increase trust and strengthen government-to-government relationships.

References

- Babbie, E. (2012). *The practice of social research*. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Barber, B. (1983). *The logic and limits of trust*. Rutgers University Press.
- Bolton, A. (2019, August 28). *Pro-grizzly group files lawsuit over Pacific Northwest Trail*. Montana Public Radio. <https://www.mtpr.org/post/pro-grizzly-group-files-lawsuit-over-pacific-northwest-trail>
- Brandenburg, A. M., & Carroll, M. S. (1995). Your place or mine? The effect of place creation on environmental values and landscape meanings. *Society & Natural Resources*, 8, 381–398.
- Cvetkovich, G., & Winter, P. L. (2003). Trust and social representations of the management of threatened and endangered species. *Environment and Behavior*, 35(2), 286–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916502250139>
- Davenport, M. A., Leahy, J. E., Anderson, D. H., & Jakes, P. J. (2007). Building trust in natural resource management within local communities: A case study of the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie. *Environmental Management*, 39(3), 353–368. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-006-0016-1>
- Debating the future of the Pacific Northwest Trail. (2020, March 16). *The Western News*. <https://thewesternnews.com/news/2020/mar/16/debating-the-future-of-the-pacific-northwest-trail/>
- Dirks, K. T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 1004–1012.

- Kling, K. G., Dahlberg, A., & Wall-Reinius, S. (2019). Negotiating improved multifunctional landscape use: Trails as facilitators for collaboration among stakeholders. *Sustainability*, 11(3511), 1–21.
- Kreutzer, L., & Taylor, M. R. (2018). *Cultural landscapes and historical trails: Examples from the United States*. Proceedings of the 2018 US/ICOMOS Symposium.
- Kwak-Hefferan, E. (2020, August). The Pacific Northwest Trail is pitting hikers against grizzly bear activists. *Backpacker Magazine*. <https://www.backpacker.com/stories/the-pacific-northwest-trail-is-pitting-hikers-against-grizzly-bear-activists>
- Leahy, J. E., & Anderson, D. H. (2008). Trust factors in community-water resource management agency relationships. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 87(2), 100–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2008.05.004>
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2050-0416.1927.tb05046.x>
- Mazur, N. A., & Curtis, A. L. (2006). Risk perceptions, aquaculture, and issues of trust: Lessons from Australia. *Society and Natural Resources*, 19(9), 791–808. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920600835551>
- McPadden, R., & Margerum, R. D. (2014). Improving National Park Service and non-profit partnerships: Lessons from the National Trails System. *Society & Natural Resources*, 27(1), 1321–1330.
- Merriam, S., & Grenier, R. (2019). Introduction to qualitative research. In R. S. Grenier & S. B. Merriam (Eds.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (pp. 3–19). Wiley & Sons.
- Needham, M. D., & Vaske, J. J. (2008). Hunter perceptions of similarity and trust in wildlife agencies and personal risk associated with chronic wasting disease. *Society and Natural Resources*, 21(3), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920701816336>
- Ohno, T., Tanaka, T., & Sakagami, M. (2010). Does social capital encourage participatory watershed management? An analysis using survey data from the Yodo River watershed. *Society and Natural Resources*, 23(4), 303–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920802078224>
- Pretty, J., & Ward, H. (2001). Social capital and the environment. *World Development*, 29(2), 209–227.
- Siegrist, M., Cvetkovich, G., & Roth, C. (2000). Salient value similarity, social trust, and risk/benefit perception. *Risk Analysis*, 20(3), 353–362. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0272-4332.203034>
- Smith, J. W., Leahy, J. E., Anderson, D. H., & Davenport, M. A. (2013). Community/agency trust and public involvement in resource planning. *Society and Natural Resources*, 26(4), 452–471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2012.678465>
- Stern, M. J. (2008a). Coercion, voluntary compliance and protest: The role of trust and legitimacy in combating local opposition to protected areas. *Environmental Conservation*, 35(3), 200–210. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S037689290800502X>
- Stern, M. J. (2008b). The power of trust: Toward a theory of local opposition to neighboring protected areas. *Society and Natural Resources*, 21(10), 859–875. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920801973763>
- Stern, M. J. (2010). Payoffs versus process: Expanding the paradigm for park/people studies beyond economic rationality. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 29, 174–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10549810903547809>

- Stern, M. J. (2018). Trust theory. In M. J. Stern (Eds.), *Social science theory for environmental sustainability: A practical guide* (pp. 100–123). Oxford University Press.
- Stern, M. J., & Baird, T. D. (2015). Trust ecology and the resilience of natural resource management institutions. *Ecology and Society*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-07248-200214>
- Stern, M. J., & Coleman, K. J. (2015). The multidimensionality of trust: Applications in collaborative natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources*, 28(2), 117–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2014.945062>
- Vaske, J. J., Absher, J. D., & Bright, A. D. (2007a). Salient value similarity, social trust and attitudes toward wildland fire management strategies. *Human Ecology Review*, 14(2), 223–232.
- Vaske, J. J., Absher, J. D., & Bright, A. D. (2007b). Salient value similarity, social trust and attitudes toward wildland fire management strategies. *Human Ecology Review*, 14(2), 223–232.
- Wynveen, C. J., & Sutton, S. G. (2015). Engaging the public in climate change-related pro-environmental behaviors to protect coral reefs: The role of public trust in the management agency. *Marine Policy*, 53, 131–140. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.10.030>