

**USDA Forest Service National Advisory Committee
for Implementation of the National Forest System Land Management Planning Rule
August 2-3, 2017**

Residence Inn Atlanta Midtown/Peachtree at 17th, 1365 Peachtree Street NE,
Atlanta, GA

Introduction

The National Advisory Committee for Implementation of the National Forest System Land Management Planning Rule (the Committee) held its third meeting of the third charter from August 2-3, 2017 in Atlanta, GA.

Objectives

Update the Committee on work group progress to date; continue implementation of 2017/2018 Committee work plan; and initiate an exploration of the connections between plan components, monitoring and public engagement as a means of improving efficiency of plan implementation.

Attendees

- Committee members present: Mike Anderson, William Barquin, Susan Jane Brown, Adam Cramer, Daniel Dessecker, Valerie Huerta, James Magagna, Joan May, Peter Nelson, Michelle Nuttall, Candice Price, Angela Sondenaa, Megan Sutton, Thomas Troxel, Ray Vaughan
- Committee members absent: Robert Cope, Russ Ehnes, Angelou Ezeilo, Martin Nie, Gabriel Vasquez, Lindsay Warness
- Substitutes present: Karen Hardigg
- Substitutes absent: Caitlyn Pollihan
- Forest Service: Chris French – Designated Federal Official, Tony Tooke, Andrea Bedell-Loucks, Maia Enzer, Crystal Merica, John Rupe, Jamie Barbour, Regis Terney, Shasta Ferranto, Bill Connelly, Timory Peel, Gunnar Carnwath, Marsha Moore, Judi Perez, Erin Minks, Olga Troxel, Bob Davis, Jennifer Ruyle, Matt Turner, Cat Luna, Mark Bethke, Gina Lampman, John Proctor, Al Olson, Sonja Lin, Jessica Rubado, Barbara Garcia, Peter Gaulke, Paul Arndt, Emyrs Treasure, Mary Morrison, Robin Mackie, Michelle Aldridge, Michelle Ramos, Tony Erba, Doug Chaltry, Michael Goldstein, Cheryl Carrothers, Judy York, Madelyn Dillon, Jody Sutton, Debbie McGlothlin, Emily Weidner, Kathryn Toffenetti, Dave Wear, Dennis L. Krusac.
- USDA present: Caitlin Arnold
- Facilitation Team present: Kathleen Rutherford, Pam Motley
- Public present: Meryl Harrell, Vickie Roberts

Actions and Agreements

1. The Committee will prepare a concise summary of the Plan Components Workshop (Workshop) and continue deliberations on developing future recommendations based on the learning at the Workshop.¹
2. Working groups: The Committee will continue with five working groups: Monitoring, Adaptive Management, Shared Stewardship, Readiness/Trust Rubric, and Youth Engagement. The Committee will hold two calls under the larger emphasis areas of: Adaptive

¹ The Adaptive Management Work Group of the National Advisory Committee for Implementation of the National Forest System Land Management Planning Rule's held a Plan Components Workshop with key US Forest Service planners from August 1-2, 2017 in Atlanta, GA. This workshop served as an opportunity for Regional and Forest planners to pilot an approach to dialogue with the committee about key challenges, trade-offs and innovative ways to write and sequence the key components of Forest Service Land Management Plans

Management/Monitoring and Public Engagement prior to the November meeting to ensure alignment and coordination among working groups.

3. Several working group learning calls were proposed (*see page 9 for details*). The facilitation team will work with the DFO and working groups to determine which calls will take place prior to the November meeting
4. The Forest Service will share the following documents with the Committee when they are finalized: Region's 1 PowerPoint presentation on the amendment process, summary from the July 31 Forest Service Species of Conservation Concern workshop, internal FAQ sheets on the wilderness process, final Integrating Fire into Land Management Planning Guide, final Technical Guide on Social and Economic Considerations.
5. The co-chairs will draft a memo to the Chief summarizing the key points discussed at the meeting. The draft memo will be shared with the full Committee for high level review prior to conveying it to the Chief.
6. The next Committee meeting will be held November 7-9, 2017 in Placerville, CA.

Meeting Summary

Welcome & Opening Remarks

Chris French, Forest Service Designated Federal Official (DFO), welcomed everyone to the meeting. He reflected positively on the Plan Component Workshop, convened by the Committee's Adaptive Management Work Group. It was an excellent model for effective collaborative work that the agency hopes to continue with the Committee. The agency is looking closely at how to increase efficiencies in land management planning and better coordinate with local governments and communities. The Committee can assist the agency with this by leveraging its collective learning and helping to improve land management planning and public engagement processes. There was evidence of convergent thinking along a number of key issues that the Committee can continue to deliberate on to provide recommendations that will aid the agency.

Jim Magagna and Joan May, Committee co-chairs, welcomed everyone and reminded them of the ground rules within the Committee's operating protocols. These ground rules have been helpful in shaping the Committee's inclusive and productive manner of operation.

Jim and Pete Nelson (member) updated the group on the Forest Service's July 31st Species of Conservation Concern (SCC) workshop that they attended on behalf of the Committee. Both acknowledged their appreciation to the agency for the functional and productive problem-solving environment fostered by the meeting. There is a diversity of views on processes associated with SCC identification, stakeholder engagement, national oversight and local flexibility. In their opinion, great progress is being made in improving our understanding and implementation of the 2012 Planning Rule.

Working Group Updates

- Plan Component Working Group – Megan Sutton and Lindsay Warness, working group co-chairs, shared key takeaways from the plan component workshop. They both believe that the workshop was a success and enabled learning conditions that will result in future Committee recommendations. The agency and Committee are moving beyond discussing plan components as either regulatory or aspirational. They are hopeful that the Committee will help elevate and disseminate the innovations that are occurring within current revisions. Many Committee members voiced their interest in preparing a concise summary of the workshop and pursuing future recommendations based on the learning at the workshop.

Committee feedback included: we may be putting too much emphasis on plan components and suggested that members remain aware of the social context that land management plans are being drafted in. Along those lines, another member suggested that the Committee and agency need to keep

public input in the process front and center; there is a risk that striving for ‘great’ plan components may lead to forests losing the public’s voice.

- Readiness/Trust Rubric Working Group – Karen Hardigg, working group co-chair, provided a brief overview of the draft white paper, prepared by Gabe Vasquez (working group co-chair). The idea for a rubric was borne out of the agency’s priority challenge of *how to design a relevant, implementable, and effective land management plan in an efficient timeframe* and the Chief’s question: ‘*What constitutes readiness to commence plan revisions?*’ To address these questions, the work group proposes developing a logic model for forests to use to assess and strengthen public support and relationships. Although the 2012 Planning Rule does not require forests to assess existing relationships, many Committee members noted that strong relationships with partners and communities is a key factor to success.

Committee feedback on the draft white paper included the need to: 1) emphasize the need for communication, consistent relationships, and how the agency’s turnover issues affect these; and 2) an informal suggestion that the agency reach out to collaborative specialists to assist with public relations. Committee member concerns and suggestions on the draft white paper included: 1) the paper is currently focused on western landscapes – it should have a national focus; 2) it would be better to use the term ‘strengthen’ rather than ‘prioritize’ certain partners or interest groups; 3) the paper seems overly prescriptive; 4) terminology like ‘ranking’ and ‘neutralization’ strike some as dystopian– it would be better to emphasize ‘establishing and improving’ relationships; 5) the paper suggests that the agency should assess relationships on its own – the assessment should include stakeholder perspectives as well, through surveys; and 6) using past objections as a metric of conflict is concerning – objections to projects do not necessarily indicate conflict, but can instead provide another means of engaging the public. Another member questioned whether the rubric should be a Committee priority due to the fact that the agency has already developed selection criteria for determining which forests will begin revising their plans in 2018, noting that the Committee doesn’t want to be reinventing the wheel. The working group will discuss Committee feedback on the next working group call and determine how best to proceed.

- Shared Stewardship Working Group² – Mike Anderson and Billy Barquin, working group co-chairs, provided an overview of the draft white paper. This effort builds on the Committee’s past work around the importance of partnerships, capacity, monitoring, and public engagement (including with youth and underserved communities) and addresses the need to increase overall efficiency and efficacy of the planning process and plan implementation. Shared stewardship could provide a means to accomplish more on our national forests through working together. The co-chairs believe that the Committee has the experience within its diverse makeup to provide useful insights and recommendations to advance the concept. Because shared stewardship has the opportunity to foster more efficient planning processes and the development of relevant, implementable, and effective land management plans, they believe that the Committee should develop an on-line report for agency and external audiences that describes the benefits of shared stewardship, offers successful examples, identifies enabling conditions, and provides recommendations to address barriers. The Plan

² The concept of “shared stewardship” is intended to encompass multiple approaches for the Forest Service to share responsibility for national forest management with willing stakeholders.

Components Workshop workbook provided great examples of forests already including concepts of shared stewardship.³

Several Committee members offered the following suggestions for additions or revisions to the draft white paper: 1) include structural recommendations for the agency to address turnover; 2) include examples from the Chugach's youth engagement strategies; and 3) reach out to USDA's Rural Development to learn more about current tools and programs. One member cautioned that the Committee should be mindful of a forest's readiness to initiate shared stewardship; in areas where there is controversy or strained relationships, it may not work. The member suggested that forests start small (ex. recreation and trail development projects or children's programs). When done incorrectly, shared stewardship has the potential to damage relationships. Another member suggested that the Committee assess the current hurdles and barriers to partnerships and develop recommendations to overcome these. The Forest Service suggested that the working group reach out to the agency's State and Private Forestry Deputy Area, Chugach National Forest Children's Forest and the Washington Office's Recreation Staff to learn about current successful shared stewardship programs and discuss enabling conditions and challenges/barriers.

- Monitoring Working Group – Angela Sondenaa, working group chair, provided an overview of the draft white paper. This effort also builds on the Committee's past work. The Plan Components Workshop provided additional learning on monitoring that can inform the Committee's recommendations. The draft paper suggests the following areas for continued Committee learning and deliberation: assess how to effectively engage partners (acknowledging that some monitoring lends itself to partnerships, other efforts require expertise from the agency or research stations); emphasize that monitoring is key to adaptive management – it must be grounded in Best Available Science (BASIS), sound protocols, and be used to test assumptions; identify the mechanisms that allow data-based feedback into the management decision framework; determine how to appropriately scale and prioritize monitoring; and determine how to effectively monitor social and economic conditions – what are the indicators?

Committee members provided feedback on the draft white paper including: 1) prioritize this effort because the agency needs this guidance now; 2) draw from the Sage Grouse example from the Plan Components Workshop workbook that uses clear and flexible guidelines; 3) look at ways to incentivize monitoring with partners; 4) give more attention to focal species – they are treated as an afterthought when they should to be determined at the start of the revision process; 5) use species not selected for the SCC list as focal species to develop a monitoring watch list – this would reduce the information gap and build public trust; 6) clearly articulate why the Committee believes that monitoring can build trust, reduce uncertainty, and increase the chances of implementation because it will result in outputs and outcomes; and 7) learn more about effective social, economic and cultural monitoring. The DFO stated that the Committee could offer valuable recommendations on social, economic and cultural monitoring.

- Youth Engagement Working Group – The facilitation team provided a brief overview of the draft white paper, prepared by Angelou Ezeilo and Gabriel Vasquez, working group co-chairs. The Forest Service suggested setting up a learning call with the Washington Office's Youth Alliance that already

³ To prepare for the Plan Components Workshop, the Adaptive Management WG requested that Committee members and Forest Service Regional and Forest planners provide observations and case studies on plan components. The agency compiled these examples in a workbook to be used for deliberative purposes at the workshop. As with all Committee work group documents, the workbook is not intended for broader circulation.

does a lot of work around youth engagement to hear about innovative methods currently under-way and any challenges/barriers.

Committee Discussion – The working groups will continue to ensure that their efforts address the Committee’s charter and Chief’s priority questions around readiness, efficiency and effectiveness. They noted both overlaps and leverage points within the different working groups’ efforts. One member suggested that, rather than simply rolling up success stories, the Committee focus on identifying nationally relevant gaps or barriers and draft recommendations to address these.

Public Comment

Meryl Harrell expressed her appreciation for the learning environment that the Committee fosters. She encouraged the Committee to consider emphasizing the need for concise plan components that are measurable. Specificity is not the opposite of flexibility. It is important to frame plan components at the right level of specificity and determine if they are needed to enable or constrain management. In addition, she asked that the Committee consider the human dimension and how plan components can be used to implement the plan and help with relationships. She believes that other plan content is important because the prose can help explain a unit’s vision and direction to the public.

Vickie Roberts, past Committee member, welcomed the Committee to Atlanta and updated the group on the work she is doing with private landowners.

The DFO shared public comment received in email format from Jean Public was shared with the committee. This anonymous email focuses on discontent with government waste in Washington, DC.

Forest Service Updates

The DFO shared that the agency is still learning how to implement the 2012 Planning Rule, but has made strong advancements and is continuing to build understanding. They are continuing to gain insights from current revisions and recognize that this is an iterative process. He would like to see more interaction between the Committee and Forest Service practitioners.

- Administration transition – Dan Jiron continues to serve as the acting USDA Natural Resources and Environment (NRE) Undersecretary, which the USFS reports through. The USDA is reorganizing and has made the Forest Service the only agency under NRE.
- Up-coming forest plan releases – The final El Yunque and Flathead NF plans and draft Rio Grande NF plan are expected to be released soon.
- Integrating Fire into Land Management Planning Guide – The guide has been finalized and is currently in the clearance process. Portions have been included as an appendix in the Plan Components Workshop workbook.
- Technical Guide on Social and Economic Considerations - The guide has been finalized and is currently in the clearance process. A draft copy is included as an appendix in the Plan Components Workshop workbook.
- Process for selecting new revision starts – The agency has formulated criteria for selecting new revision starts. The Washington Office asked regions to prioritize forests based on current plans that: limit the ability to implement national priorities, like fire and fuels; can tier off other planning, like state action plans; and can leverage other forest revisions to create efficiencies. The Washington Office is synthesizing the information and will make a recommendation to the National Forest System Deputy Chief for 2018.
- Guidelines for biennial monitoring reports – The EMC staff is currently working with Regional Inventory and Monitoring Coordinators on guidelines.
- Forest Service 2017 Budget – The FY 2017 Continuing Resolution combined funding for the Planning, and Inventory and Monitoring programs, and reduced the combined funding by \$2 million.

Updates on past Committee recommendations:

- Public engagement and outreach – The Washington Office has established a priority team that is gathering information, looking for ways to make public engagement more effective and efficient, and facilitating knowledge sharing. The agency has developed a webinar series and hosted a meeting in January focused on public engagement. Additionally, the Collaboration Cadre continues to provide technical guidance. At this time, the agency does not have plans to develop a national-level planning video, but several regions and forests have produced videos. The DFO requested that the Committee offer assistance and recommendations on how to better engage local governments and counties.
- Amendment to the 2012 Planning Rule – The field reports that the amendment to the 2012 Planning Rule has helped, although the process of amending 1982 plans with the 2012 Rule remains complex. Region 1 has completed several small amendments and prepared a PowerPoint explaining the process. The Forest Service will share the presentation with the Committee. Because an efficient amendment process is key to facilitating adaptive management, several members asked for a learning call with Timory Peel, Region 1, to discuss their experience.
- Species of Conservation Concern (SCC) – The agency hosted an internal meeting on SCCs on July 31. The Forest Service recognizes that this is a complex issue. The DFO appreciates the Committee's work on SCCs and believes that it has aided the process of identification, incorporation of associated plan components and general public engagement efforts. The agency is finalizing meeting proceedings and associated materials, and will share with the Committee upon finalization.
- Turnover and transitions – The agency is using the Committee's recommendations related to continued use of a Forest Service handover memo in recognition of the direct correlation between how transition is managed and the success of external and internal relationships. This continues to be one of the greatest issues that the agency faces.
- Assessments – The Committee's recommendations have been useful. As a result, forests are producing shorter, more targeted assessments – which is key to fostering more efficient planning processes. As an example, the Ashley NF recently developed a highly readable and accessible assessment document. However, the DFO noted that the Committee can continue to provide the agency with recommendations on how to address lack of trust and public concern (ex. some forests are still developing exhaustive amounts of back up reports in response to specific groups' concerns). Jamie Barbour is currently observing planning teams to determine the dynamics that lead to complex, vague documents. The goal of this exercise is to develop guidance on how to generate clear and concise documents.
- Wilderness – The Washington Office is working on internal FAQ sheets on the wilderness process that will serve as living documents and will be continually updated with new lessons learned. The agency will share the documents with the Committee as they are completed.

Exploring Approaches to Monitoring (from plans to broad scale) to Set-up an Adaptive Management Framework, Increase Efficiency & Sustain Public Engagement

The Committee invited several Forest Service monitoring experts to briefly describe how monitoring has been done to-date, what they are doing now, explain how the agency plans to transition in the future to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of monitoring, describe key challenges, and pose key questions for the Committee to help the agency brainstorm ways to improve monitoring.

Jamie Barbour, Forest Service Director of Adaptive Management, provided information on the Forest Service's approach to implementing monitoring and adaptive management within land management plans. The agency spends a lot of funding on monitoring but needs to get better about asking what we are trying to achieve – i.e. who are we collecting data for and how is it being used? Much of the current monitoring is focused on specialists' needs. Monitoring's perceived value will increase when it is made relevant to stakeholders and line officers. To do this, forests need to focus monitoring on key

management questions, engage partners and think of monitoring up front in the planning process. As an innovative approach, Region 6 is using social media to find out who is using trails to better understand usage. Jamie posed the following questions for the Committee to consider: *What types of questions should be included in monitoring plans and who is the relevant audience? What is the purpose of a land management plan – is it intent or compliance (the answer will affect what and how you monitor)?*

Emrys Treasure, Region 8 Regional Inventory, Monitoring, Assessment, and Climate Change Coordinator, presented information on Region 8's broad-scale monitoring strategy to support the 2012 rule. The region has built a broader-scale monitoring framework, the first version of which addresses climate change and social, cultural, and economic monitoring requirement to meet the pressing needs of the field. The strategy is rooted in efficiencies, supports adaptive management, provides flexibility, increases integrity and provides high quality data. Plan revisions and the biennial reports are the engine for the broad scale effort and the effort strives to maintain clear linkages between the broad scale and plan level. The agency has coordinated with state and private partners to engage them in a robust way, not just for consumption. Key questions for the Committee: *How do we build trust around 3rd party monitoring efforts and get past the 'their data' mentality? How can we narrow and limit to the right questions?*

Dave Wear, Senior Research Forest Economist, Southern Research Station, provided background on the Southern Forest Futures Project. The project assessed all the forests in the southeast to determine how forest resources are changing and provided forecasts for social and economic implications for forests' ability to provide ecosystem services (timber, water, recreation). The effort was completed in joint partnership with R&D, private landowners, and states. They hosted public meetings in 13 states to develop questions and a work plan. A team of 15 scientists then answered the questions using a science synthesis. National forests make up 6% of the land base in the south and are, therefore, an important and unique part of the landscape. The project anticipates that urbanization will result in the loss of up to 40 million acres of forest lands (all ownerships) over the next 50 years. As the regional landscape evolves, the importance of national forests increases – as a refugia and drinking water source. Key question for the Committee: *How do we package and deliver science, which is constantly progressing, with quality control and with uncertainty?*

Dennis L. Krusac, Region 8 Endangered Species Specialist/Pollinator Conservation Coordinator, presented information on monitoring of Red-cockaded Woodpecker in Region 8. The agency has been working with other Federal and state agencies, organizations, and private landowners on restoration and monitoring of populations and habitat for Red-cockaded Woodpecker. Funding for restoration and monitoring comes from multiple partners; recipients are responsible for performing monitoring. The effort continues to be very successful, although they are not able to treat the amount of acres necessary to maintain habitat. Key questions for the Committee: *Is there a way to convince the US Fish and Wildlife Service to move from monitoring populations to monitoring habitat? How can we leverage timber and provide jobs to increase the pace and scale of restoration to create/maintain habitat?*

The panelists acknowledged the need to better connect landscape scale and plan-level monitoring efforts with local perceptions of relevancy, including who has the right to decide relevancy and how do forests reconcile this? The agency needs to ask the right questions and collect data to solve a multitude of issues at the right scale. Some questions are better answered at the broad scale, others may be at a plan or watershed-scale and not transferable. Plan level monitoring should be used to address public concerns and build trust. Plan and project-level monitoring need to connect and inform implementation of the plan in real time for people to understand it's value. Forests need to start by formulating key questions; stop asking 'what can I measure?' and ask 'what decision can I make with the data?'

Breakout Session - Exploring Approaches to Broad-Scale Monitoring to Set-up an Adaptive Management Framework, Increase Efficiencies & Sustain Public Engagement

The Committee and agency used a Samoan Circle to surface the multitude of relevant perspectives around monitoring. What follows are key highlights from that process. This summary does not reflect consensus positions of the Committee or agency. This discussion will be incorporated into the Committee's further learning and deliberations to inform future recommendations.

1. How can monitoring of national forests and grasslands, in the context of a broader landscape, be most relevant across multiple scales and ownerships?

In general, the group shared the perspective that broad scale and plan-level monitoring need to be co-developed; the region and forests need to determine what questions are best answered at what scale, then document the relationships. Broad scale monitoring can carry a lot of the weight, answering questions that are relevant to all units. The group explored whether forests should adhere to national monitoring protocols. Some see efficiencies gained if forests ask similar questions and use the same protocols; data can be aggregated and interpreted to track large issues like ecological integrity and the effects of climate change. The Cohesive Wildfire Strategy and Watershed Condition Framework are excellent examples of effective broad scale monitoring, across multiple jurisdictions, using the same protocols and modeling. Others believe that forests also need to retain flexibility to address local and stakeholder concerns. Some pointed out that allowing forest flexibility creates drawbacks, including the difficult task of trying to combine and interpret data collected with varying protocols at different scales. Many voiced that a balance of the two approaches is needed – i.e. use broad scale monitoring to address pressing landscape-scale questions with national protocols based on BASI (ex. climate change, fire, restoration and resiliency) and also give forests the freedom to address localized issues that, when addressed, can expedite plan implementation and/or improve public trust.

Many concurred with the assertion that the agency can increase relevancy of monitoring by creating efficient processes that address pressing management questions and areas of conflict, expedite plan implementation and build public trust. One participant suggested that monitoring be built addressing desired conditions so that everyone understands and supports the 'why'. Others pointed out that this approach requires forests to develop measurable desired conditions. Another participant offered that key monitoring questions should address the mission and values of the agency. Several highlighted the need to better engage partners, including the use of citizen-scientists, and improve social and economic monitoring. Along these lines, one participant highlighted the multi-party monitoring that is occurring through the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) and stewardship contracting – suggesting lessons learned be parleyed into forest plan monitoring. Some pointed out that the agency is struggling with streamlining and focusing monitoring efforts. Rather than using monitoring to address key management issues, forests use the 'Christmas tree' approach – i.e. everyone keeps hanging their 'ornament'(issue) on the list, leading to exhaustive and unwieldy programs.

2. How do we build trust around 3rd party monitoring?

To increase trust in 3rd party monitoring, participants suggested: 1) develop joint protocols and periodically review data together; 2) ensure that monitoring is addressing public concerns and is feeding into management decisions and the need for change; 3) don't over promise, be realistic; 4) commit, within the plan, to address priority issues and include options for other monitoring with increased resources; 5) develop clear and concise biennial reports – communication doesn't have to be complicated and overly technical; 6) allow groups to monitor their own concerns (i.e. the Audubon Society monitors bird populations); 7) use if/then statements within plan components and create triggers and thresholds so that partners understand the need for monitoring and its implications on management (i.e. activation of standards); and 8) engage citizen-scientists by using simple and clear protocols.

Committee Business

- Working Groups – The Committee will proceed with five working groups: Monitoring, Adaptive Management, Shared Stewardship, Readiness/Trust Rubric, and Youth Engagement. Because of potential overlap and leveraging opportunities, the working groups will come together for two ‘cluster’ calls before the November meeting to ensure alignment and coordination. The Shared Stewardship, Readiness/Trust Rubric and Youth Engagement working groups will hold a joint ‘Public Engagement’ emphasis call. The Monitoring and Adaptive Management working groups will hold a joint call as well. The working groups will strive to have draft materials prepared well in advance of calls to allow members time to review. Following the Committee’s operating protocols, the facilitation team will organize and attend all deliberative working group calls.
- Learning call on intergovernmental coordination – The DFO requests that the Committee look objectively at, and provide advice on, how to effectively work with local governments and counties within the planning process. Oftentimes, the interests of local governments and collaboratives are not aligned and it becomes difficult to address and balance all interests. The Committee would like to host a learning call on this issue.

Working Group Report Outs

- Adaptive Management –
 - o *September/October 2017 Activities:* Summarize key discussion points from the Plan Components Workshop and provide input on the Forest Service’s post workshop survey of agency participants.
 - o *Proposed Learning call* – with Timory Peel, Region 1, to learn more about how the process of amending 1982 plans with the 2012 rule is working.
 - o *Anticipated output* – recommendations to the Chief on adaptive management and the use of plan components.
 - o *Timeline for output* – TBD.
- Monitoring –
 - o *September/October 2017 Activities:* continue work on draft white paper.
 - o *Proposed Learning calls* – 1) Priya and Jamie to help align what the agency is already doing, what the working group sees as lines of inquiry and where they can work together to achieve outcomes, 2) Dave Wear, Southern Forest Futures Project.
 - o *Stakeholder outreach* – Outreach to monitoring implementers (line officers, stakeholders and specialist) to find: Where are there efficiencies? What is working and what is not? What are the barriers/enablers? How do we incentivize this to make things more effective? How do we get to the right questions?
 - o *Anticipated output* – recommendations to the Chief.
 - o *Timeline for output* – Spring 2018.
- Shared Stewardship –
 - o *September/October 2017 Activities:* continue work on draft white paper.
 - o *Proposed Learning calls* – 1) Elaine Kohrman, Forest Supervisor, Cibola NF, on how they are incorporating shared stewardship in their plan (BMPs, enabling factors, challenges, barrier); 2) State and Private Forestry Department, Chugach National Forest and the Washington Office’s Recreation Staff on how they are implementing successful efforts with partners (BMPs, enabling factors, challenges, barrier); and 3) with Washington Office on intergovernmental coordination to discuss current challenges and promising practices
 - o *Stakeholder outreach* – Outreach to agency and stakeholders involved in successful shared stewardship examples to learn more about enabling conditions and existing challenges and barriers.
 - o *Anticipated output* – 1) on-line report for agency and partners based on the outline in the draft whitepaper, and 2) recommendations to the Chief on how to incentivize shared

stewardship through forest planning – identifying BMPS and enabling conditions and addressing barriers.

- *Timeline for output* – End of charter, with draft ready for review in Spring 2018.
- Youth Engagement–
 - *September/October 2017 Activities*: discuss Committee feedback to draft white paper and next steps on the next work group call.
 - *Proposed Learning call* –Washington Office’s Youth Alliance on how they are engaging youth – identifying BMPS and enabling conditions and addressing barriers.
- Readiness/Trust Rubric –
 - *September/October 2017 Activities*: discuss Committee feedback to draft white paper and next steps on the next work group call.

Memo to the Chief

The Committee co-chairs will draft a memo to the Chief highlighting key discussion points from the Plan Components Workshop and the Committee meeting. The draft memo will be shared with the full Committee for high level review prior to conveying to it to the Chief.

Next Committee Meeting

The next Committee meeting will be held November 7-9, 2017 in Placerville, CA.