



United States Department of Agriculture

Forest Plan Revision –

Forest Listening Sessions



for the greatest good

**pacific northwest
REGION**

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotope, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Forest Service held 19 listening sessions across the Northwest March – June to gather feedback from the public about forest plan revision. Plan revision has not yet begun on forests within the Northwest Forest Plan geographic area, with the exception of the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest. The listening sessions were designed to gather public feedback early in the process to enable the Forest Service to incorporate feedback in its initial plan revision strategy. The listening sessions gathered feedback on the use of science, public engagement during plan revision, and people's specific interests in plan revision.

The first three listening sessions were held in March and coordinated by Triangle consulting. The feedback from those listening sessions has been summarized in a companion report available at: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/r6/landmanagement/?cid=stelprd3831710>.

This compendium of reports summarizes the additional 16 listening sessions that were held between April 23rd and June 11th, 2015. At each listening session, participants were invited to give feedback at roundtables focused on three separate topic areas. The topic areas included: 1) what participants would like public engagement to look like during forest plan revision, 2) the use of science in plan revision, and 3) what participants would like

the Forest Service to consider during plan revision. We developed an executive summary of feedback from the listening sessions as well as summary reports for each of the three topic areas that synthesize feedback from all 16 listening sessions. Wherever possible, we worked to retain the flavor and tone of public comments.

GENERAL PLAN REVISION

A range of issues and concerns were raised related to the plan revision process. Participants would like plan revision to balance local social values and economic considerations with environmental concerns and forest health. Comments also suggested managing for forest health and resilience (especially resilience to wildfire), and thinning and fuel reduction were suggested to support resilience and healthy forests. Many participants expressed the view that fire management and fire risk need to be more fully considered in forest plan revision. Public comments also commonly expressed an interest in more salvage logging. Some community members expressed concerns about Forest Service staff retention and employee and leadership turnover. Some comments requested

additional employee presence in the woods and others recommended use of local volunteer groups and higher education systems to increase capacity for implementing projects and getting work done. Some people would like to see protection for all mature and old growth forests, age limits on harvest, or elimination of commercial logging. Others want to see compliance with NW Forest Plan timber outputs, more timber harvest of old trees, more pre-commercial thinning, or an increase in timber harvest to equal growth. Likewise, some participants wanted to NW Forest Plan protections retained or enhanced while others would like fewer restrictions. Comments related to multiple use recommended balance between uses and expressed concern about conflicts between different uses (e.g. motorized and non-motorized recreation). One of the most popular plan revision topics was recreation. Participants would like more focus on recreation and would like the Forest Service to address high use areas and conflicting uses. Road access as well as the cost and ecological impacts of road were raised. Road maintenance and safety is key to local users who value many different uses on the national forest. Some requested consistency in plan revision across forests and others stressed the importance of a local approach. Most public comments on water resources supported a continuing program to protect, improve, and support water quality and watershed health. The comment heard most often related to wildlife was to move away from single species management. Community members also talked about their desire to see biodiversity maintained or increased, including habitat and forest-floor plant species.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Two of the most common messages heard at the public engagement roundtables at the listening sessions were that people would like a transparent and clear plan revision process and that people

want their feedback to matter. Transparency was requested on the Forest Service's intent, the plan revision timeline and process, and when the next opportunities to engage will be. Clear and concise communication about what is going on was requested. Many participants shared the feeling that they don't feel listened to or that their feedback was ignored. Some noted a perception that input isn't used because an agenda is already in place and the decisions are pre-determined. In general, participants wanted to see more emphasis on the value of public input. Others noted concerns about Forest Service capacity and the lengthy plan revision timeline. Participants offered a variety of ideas for sharing information, reaching more people, and engaging with the public, including more face-to-face meetings, field tours, and surveys. Ideas about who should be engaged and the kinds of information people would like to discuss or access were also shared.

SCIENCE

Listening session participants expressed strong interest in how science will be used and shared with the public during the plan revision process. Participants would like to see more external involvement of both the public and non-federal scientists in the process. Comments suggested a broad range of science for consideration in plan revision. A strong desire for the use of unbiased science came up at the listening sessions, and questions about how the Forest Service will deal with conflicting science were common. Many comments focused on the need to put science in lay terms and help increase collective understanding of the scientific process and terminology. In addition, participants shared a host of helpful ideas about how to best share science, including field tours, public meetings, suggestions for the website, and more. The science theme with the most extensive public feedback related to how the Forest Service applies science to management. Many comments also suggested science should be informed by

practical, hands-on experience. Across the region, discussions about science inevitably resulted in discussions about values. There was a sense from many participants that science is outweighed by politics and that the Forest Service should commit to using science to guide forest management instead of being driven by other things such as recreation demand or political opposition to

salvage logging. Concern about politics overriding science was shared by those with both extractive- and conservation-leaning comments. Finally, many comments focused on the irreducible uncertainties faced by managers and suggested flexibility in management plans paired with adaptive management.



CHAPTER 1 – GENERAL PLAN REVISION ROUNDTABLES

INTRODUCTION

The Forest Service held 19 listening sessions across the Northwest March – June to gather feedback from the public about forest plan revision. Plan revision has not yet begun on forests within the Northwest Forest Plan geographic area, with the exception of the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest. The listening sessions were designed to gather public feedback early in the process to enable to the Forest Service to incorporate feedback in its initial plan revision strategy. The listening sessions gathered feedback on the use of science, public engagement during plan revision, and the plan revision process or people's specific interests in plan revision.

The first three listening sessions were held in March and coordinated by Triangle consulting. The feedback from those listening sessions has been

summarized in a companion report available at: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/r6/landmanagement/?cid=stelprd3831710>.

This compendium of reports summarizes the additional 16 listening sessions that were held between April 23rd and June 11th, 2015. Table 1 displays listening session dates and locations summarized in this report. At each listening session, participants were invited to give feedback at roundtables focused on three separate topic areas. The topic areas included: 1) what participants would like public engagement to look like during forest plan revision, 2) the use of science in plan revision, and 3) what participants would like the Forest Service to consider during plan revision. We developed an executive summary of feedback from the listening sessions as well as summary reports

TABLE 1. FOREST PLAN REVISION LISTENING SESSIONS DATES AND LOCATIONS

Listening Session Date	Location(s)
April 23rd	Mt. Vernon
April 27th	Corvallis and Prineville
April 28th	Issaquah, Olympia, Bend, and Roseburg
May 4th	Pleasant Hill, Lakeview, and Medford
May 5th	Klamath Falls and Wenatchee
May 6th	Stayton and Gold Beach
May 11th	Hood River
June 11th	Okanogan

for each of the three topic areas that synthesize feedback from all 16 listening sessions. Wherever possible, we worked to retain the flavor and tone of public comments.

GENERAL PLAN REVISION SUMMARY

A range of issues and concerns were raised related to the plan revision process. Participants would like plan revision to balance local social values and economic considerations with environmental concerns and forest health. Comments also suggested managing for forest health and resilience (especially resilience to wildfire), and thinning and fuel reduction were suggested to support resilience and healthy forests. Many participants expressed the view that fire management and fire risk need to be more fully considered in forest plan revision. Public comments also commonly expressed an interest in more salvage logging. Some community members expressed concerns about Forest Service staff retention and employee and leadership turnover. Some comments requested additional employee presence in the woods and others recommended use of local volunteer groups and higher education systems to increase capacity for implementing projects and getting work done. Some people would like to see protection for all mature and old growth forests, age limits on harvest, or elimination of commercial logging. Others want to see compliance with NW Forest Plan timber outputs, more timber harvest of old trees, more pre-commercial thinning, or an increase in timber harvest to equal growth. Likewise, some participants wanted to NW Forest Plan protections retained or enhanced while others would like fewer restrictions. Comments related to multiple use recommended balance between uses and expressed concern about conflicts between different uses (e.g. motorized and non-motorized recreation). One of the most popular plan revision topics was recreation. Participants would like more focus on recreation and would

like the Forest Service to address high use areas and conflicting uses. Road access as well as the cost and ecological impacts of road were raised. Road maintenance and safety is key to local users who value many different uses on the national forest. Some requested consistency in plan revision across forests and others stressed the importance of a local approach. Most public comments on water resources supported a continuing program to protect, improve, and support water quality and watershed health. The comment heard most often related to wildlife was to move away from single species management. Community members also talked about their desire to see biodiversity maintained or increased, including habitat and forest-floor plant species.

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMICS

Comments expressed a desire for economic viability at the forefront of every project as well as a focus on sustainability in economics. Participants would like the Forest Service to consider the cost versus benefits of treatment as well as the social and economic impacts of active vegetation management on local communities and industry infrastructure. Comments noted that long-term industry investments are dependent on quality information and volume estimates and that federal management affects opportunities on non-federal lands as well (e.g. mills). Participants requested additional timber production and voiced frustration that allowable cut is never met, impacting local communities. In addition, participants requested more stewardship opportunities and consideration of stewardship versus traditional timber sales in light of the benefits of each to the local community. Comments also suggested local use of biomass.

Also heard during the listening sessions was a desire to continue funding counties through timber sales or to fund counties through stewardship dollars.

Alternatively, compensation for counties was recommended through ecological services provided on the landscape including carbon credits, clean water credits, and fuels reduction. Others would like to see ecosystem services valued but not necessarily in support of county governance.

Participants would like plan revision to balance local social values and economic considerations (including tourism, recreation, and timber) with environmental concerns and forest health. Comments noted the domination of ecological considerations in the NW Forest Plan and expressed a sense of urgency in addressing community stability (e.g. schools, roads, jobs). One comment highlighted the importance of growth coming from the timber industry as other industries have not been successful in bringing back jobs. Others suggested less focus on short-term local community interests and more focus on long-range goals. Participants highlighted the uniqueness of their local communities as well as the special values of local geological, botanical and ecological areas and the importance of these areas to local economies. Public safety related to gunfire was raised as a social concern in some areas.

Finally, allowing more flexibility to local managers to work with local interests was recommended to rebuild respect for local managers.

ECOSYSTEM AND FOREST HEALTH

Managing for forest health and resilience (especially resilience to fire) were commonly suggested, and thinning and fuel reduction were suggested to support resilience and healthy forests. Support for accelerated restoration was expressed. While managing for forest health and ecosystem restoration, ensuring protections for threatened and endangered species was a concern for some. Participants commonly recommended the Forest

Service manage for all ages and seral stages of forest, including early seral vegetation types. Comments suggested managing systemically rather than divided by resource and incorporating complexity. Others recommended restoring older forests to their historic range of variability, and some were concerned that plan revision would destroy old growth by fragmenting the NW Forest Plan regional approach. Likewise, some comments recommended the Forest Service maintain NW Forest Plan ecosystem health principles. Comments noted that forests live, grow and change over long periods of time and that forests are dynamic. Consideration of disturbances like fire, bugs, and



disease were recommended as was recognition of the differences between westside and eastside forests, or even adjacent areas with different ecosystem characteristics. An emphasis on areas where berry gathering and cultural plant harvesting by tribal members could take place was also suggested.

Some comments expressed a desire for the FS to manage large tracts of land contiguously, to manage for intact ecosystems and entire landscapes. Comments suggested consideration of fire and disturbance at the landscape scale as well as corridors and habitat connectivity, including of late-successional habitat. In addition, participants would like to see the Forest Service be a good neighbor with adjacent land owners in managing forest health. Similarly, some comments expressed concern about the effect off-forest activities can have on national forest resources.

Sustained yield harvest was a common theme - to harvest timber at the rate of forest growth while protecting ecosystem health. Some participants suggested more active forest practices to reduce forest health issues and recommended considering Canadian methods for this work. Likewise, comments expressed frustration that the NW Forest Plan has fallen short when it comes to healthy habitat. The ability to manage for healthy late-successional reserves was specifically highlighted. Other comments recommended balancing the health of the forest with different needs and uses.

Comments received from the public reflect the need to consider climate change and carbon sequestration during plan revision. Participants suggested defining the role of national forests in mitigating (old forest carbon sinks) and adapting (habitat connectivity, forest and watershed resilience) to climate change. Some suggested that sawmills are the best carbon sink and others suggested resilient forests are best for change.

An ecological approach to management was suggested as was a holistic view that includes the cost and ecological impacts of roads. Likewise prioritizing ecological landscape restoration and de-emphasizing multiple use was requested. Participants would like to see forest management for the health for all species and resources, not just timber. Some people suggested that ecological objectives guide projects rather than extraction of commercial products. One comment noted a potential need for larger better connected reserves. Participants also recommended restoring ecological processes (such as fire events) and defining, measuring and monitoring ecological integrity.

Some comments focused on specific restoration recommendations such as restoring: culturally important tribal food and plant gathering areas, whitebark pine across regions and outside wilderness areas, damage done by past clear-cuts, and habitat. Reforestation was a suggested priority as was focusing restoration on the wildland-urban interface. However, other comments suggested that accommodation of development should not be a priority, that subdivisions are built in areas of declining forest health, and that private landowners bear responsibility. Comments also suggested aggressive treatment of invasive species and the prioritization of unique or special habitat restoration, such as oak savannahs. The importance of upland "ridge to ridge" restoration was highlighted. More incentives for restoration and finding ways to increase funding, including for aquatic restoration, was proposed.

FIRE AND FUELS

At several listening sessions, fire and fuels management was an important discussion topic. Many participants expressed the view that fire management and fire risk need to be more fully considered in forest plan revision. Some comments suggested a quicker response to forest fires, maintaining access for fire control, and

management to stop catastrophic fires. Others called for the use of wildfire as a management tool and the reintroduction of fire to the landscape. Some saw fire as the greatest threat to “everything we love about the forests”. A need for maintenance treatments was noted. Participants suggested more efficient wildland fire operations with less personnel standing around.

Public comments commonly expressed an interest in more salvage logging and many called for a speedier process to salvage timber after a wildland fire event (to avoid the high economic impact of delay). A related suggestion was to pre-plan for fires to accelerate salvage and restoration. Participants offered the idea of salvage logging as a by-product of access for wildland fire suppression. Conversely, others believed that salvage logging should not be allowed beyond small actions like hazard tree removal. Suggestions to review fire rehabilitation work and to revegetate after wildfire were shared.

Participants would like fire managers to use the best science to manage hazardous fuels reduction versus fire suppression as well as considering the costs associated with each, socially and ecologically. Participants recommended revising fire funding so it doesn't rob from other programs and to fund firefighting like hurricanes and earthquakes (i.e. FEMA). Comments suggested a shift from firefighting to fire protection and restoration to prevent the need for firefighting. Participants recommend long-term fire management to address smoke impacts and notification to communities of prescribed fire plans and smoke. The fire risk caused by slash and slash piles left from thinning was noted, as was the risk related to ATV use during high fire risk periods. Last, comments suggested working with FireWise groups to thin Forest Service areas adjacent to private land and ingress/egress to communities. Likewise, more effort to identify and mitigate wildfire safety issues in affected communities was recommended.

FOREST PLAN

Many comments received at the listening sessions addressed the forest plan revision process, outcomes, and timeline. Comments received at the listening session included concerns about political influences on the process. Some people requested unbiased plan development and others would like to see more local control and influence during forest plan revision. Participants expressed frustration because plans don't get implemented. People would like to see accountability for implementation of the plan's objectives and assurance that the spirit of the forest plan will be implemented. Comments recommended a commitment to a reasonable forest plan that is achievable and funding for it. Participants want to see forest plan revision occur quickly. Grave concern was expressed about the current lengthy plan revision process, and a three-year timeline was recommended. In addition, while some comments expressed a desire for more flexibility for ranger districts in the forest plan framework and implementation, others requested more consistency between districts in program implementation as well as funding.

Land designations were discussed at many listening sessions. Comments reflected a desire to reduce the size and redundancy of wilderness and other reserves, get rid of roaded “roadless areas”, add new wilderness areas, keep existing roadless areas, consider more research natural areas for alpine areas and rare or endemic botanical or fungal species, consider wild and scenic river additions, create a management zone around the Pacific Crest Trail, and consider new management area designations that reflect Community Wildlife Protection Plans. Participants would like to see unique aspects of forests, including geological features, recognized.

Comments recommended revisiting the adaptive management approach for all lands. Likewise, incorporating adaptable objectives and building change into plans was recommended. Participants suggested trying different management styles

across the landscape and building on what has been successful from the previous plans and the NW Forest Plan. People would like the challenges and success of the past to guide the revision process. The importance of monitoring to determine effectiveness was highlighted.

Comments suggested that revising plans together at the same time across the region could be more effective and efficient. While some people believe more of a difference could be made in spending revision dollars on projects, others believe that revision is integral to forest health and needed.

A number of issues unique to a particular national forest were raised, such as connectivity issues and proposed wilderness areas and special botanical areas on the Rogue River-Siskiyou, the Navy proposal on the Olympic, the timeline for the Okanogan-Wenatchee plan revision, East Fork Lewis River riparian management on the Gifford Pinchot, and Ochoco Creek debris and dams management on the Ochoco.

FOREST SERVICE CAPACITY

Some community members expressed concerns about staff retention and employee and leadership turnover. Comments suggested new employees don't understand local recreation and other resources and that high turnover doesn't allow employees to learn from the past. Participants believe continuity is important, including for consistency, and that incentives to stay should be created. Proper staffing levels and greater skill depth within the Forest Service was recommended as was increased staffing of districts. Others recommended having the right people – confident and knowledgeable – on the ground and able to make decisions. Some comments requested additional Forest Service presence in the woods and suggested this would create more ownership in

Forest Service activities. Others suggested increased monitoring capacity. Comments recommended use of local volunteer groups and higher education systems to increase capacity for implementing projects and getting work done in the forest. Likewise, community members suggested looking for opportunities to partner with tribes and other groups to accomplish restoration activities, including aquatic restoration. Some were concerned about the impact of new planning processes on the agency's ability to accomplish work.

Community members would like revision to be realistic and funded appropriately, including an adequate budget for public engagement. Attendees commented on the politics of forest budgets and questioned whether we fund the work we really want to see. Some suggested we manage forests to meet funding levels by either increasing staff or reducing management objectives. Comments recommended funding based on the amount of federal lands in counties, reinvesting in the forest, and increasing non-timber funding opportunities. In addition, community members would like to see a reduction in NEPA costs and firefighting costs. The financial impact of lawsuits and the reduction in funds available for work because of lawsuits was raised.

FORESTRY

Many comments focused on harvest levels. Some community members want to see protection for all mature and old growth forests (some specified 80 years old), age limits on harvest, or elimination of commercial logging. Others want to see compliance with NW Forest Plan timber outputs, more timber harvest, more harvest of old trees, more pre-commercial thinning, or an increase in timber harvest to equal growth. Participants also wanted to know whether the intentions for current harvest restrictions have been met and if the restrictions are still valid.

COMMENTS EXPRESSED INTEREST IN HARVEST METHODS INCLUDING:

- Better methods of harvesting trees to accomplish restoration goals,
- More thinning from below or more thinning in general,
- Variable density thinning,
- Only thinning or underbrush treatment,
- Overstory removal,
- More harvest of dead trees while accounting for resource needs and healthy ecosystems,
- Use of better silviculture prescriptions and designation by prescription,
- Diversity of management prescriptions,
- Utilization of historical forest management practices,
- Enhancing wildlife habitat on the westside with clear-cuts,
- A prohibition on clear-cutting,
- Longer rotations between stand treatment,
- Managing for all seral stages of forests in the landscape,
- Maintaining space between trees to make openings for tree health and wildlife,
- Continuing strategic fuel break work to provide wood products, and
- Eradicating juniper.

Other recommendations include managing for long-term growth and productivity and using silviculture to address forest health. Participants were interested in the future of the forest when all stands are over 80 and noted there may be a related reduction in Forest Service employees. Other comments expressed a desire for a steady and reliable timber supply (which

would help maintain a skilled workforce) and a practical target for timber harvest. The importance of keeping timber products in the local community or even regionally was highlighted. Participants suggested a need for post-thinning management for critical habitat restoration. Additional recommendations include making harvest a priority in areas where it is allowed, maintaining timber harvest as a management tool, managing the forest like a crop to produce revenue, and not logging in potential wilderness areas.

Some participants recommended more stewardship contracts as opposed to traditional timber sales and others suggested a mix of stewardship and traditional sales. Some thought cutting of slash piles should be allowed, and others recommended more flexibility in contracting during harvesting. Commenters also expressed a desire to see more technologically advanced tools utilized for efficiency during the thinning and restoration process. However, the limited availability of equipment was noted and one suggestion was to build equipment into the logging contract.

LAWS AND POLICIES

Many comments referred to NW Forest Plan land designations. Some comments requested maintenance of the principles, objectives, or outcomes of the NW Forest Plan. Others pointed out the NW Forest Plan has not been followed (e.g. timber harvest levels in matrix). People suggested more late-successional reserve, less late-successional reserve, and more matrix (timber-focused) land. Participants recommended retaining survey and manage or strengthening and expanding survey and manage. Comments suggested retaining the aquatic conservation strategy, including riparian reserves. Participants also requested more balance. Diverse opinions were offered regarding LSR management. For example, participants shared comments such as the NW Forest Plan does not prevent regeneration harvest in LSRs, LSRs are not

sacred, hands-off management of LSRs might not be effective, and the age limit on harvest in LSRs should be revisited. A suggestion to reconsider LSR and matrix designations based on topography was proposed. Participants want to know if the objectives of the NW Forest Plan have been met what the successes and failures have been. Some comments suggested strengthening the NW Forest Plan to address stressors.

Participants recommended removing eastside screens as well as retaining the eastside screens. Others suggested modification of the eastside screens and noted that these guidelines were meant to be temporary but have been institutionalized. Many comments expressed an interest in a more streamlined approach to NEPA and additional flexibility in the process, including when addressing catastrophic disturbances.

Participants suggested that laws, rules, and regulations need to be changed and that Congress needs to clarify the Forest Service's mission. Community members want the Forest Service to consider the mission and political climate when considering management options and would like to see the use of common sense in developing a new forest plan. Finally, participants would like the Forest Service to recognize state law and suggested that land is best managed locally and should be delegated back to the states.

MULTIPLE USE

Many participants would like the Forest Service to balance all uses and consider social, economic, and ecological values during plan revision. Public commenters want to ensure that multiple use management continues and that flexibility to accommodate multiple uses is built into plans. Some people suggested managing for one use rather than multiple uses and others suggested managing forests for non-commercial uses rather than as a source of timber products. Concern was expressed

that human use of the forest seems secondary to wildlife use. Designated recreational areas for certain uses were recommended. Comments suggested working with adjacent land owners when discussing multi-use areas, whether motorized or non-motorized. The idea of balancing various uses was commonly raised. Uses mentioned in this context include: timber harvest, county tax revenue, forest health, recreation, fish, owl recovery, habitat, watershed health, local economic contributions, and community needs.

Other comments focused on conflicts between various uses. For instance, some participants would like to see the Forest Service address conflict between timber and fuels reduction in stewardship projects. Likewise, comments suggested considering all uses (livestock grazing, recreation cabins, etc.) to make sure they are not in conflict with each other. Participants would also like to see equal consideration given to recreation and range as compared to the NW Forest Plan (species/ ecological issues).

Grazing issues were raised at several listening sessions. Participants recommended consideration of range issues within in each management area, and some suggested range management as an acceptable use in all areas. Comments suggested consideration of the impact of sage grouse management on family ranches. Conversely, comments recommended Forest Service acknowledgement of the detrimental impacts caused by public lands grazing. Mapping and maintenance of historical stock driveways was recommended though user responsibility for maintenance of stock driveways was also noted. Community members would like to see the use of science in prohibiting grazing and determining where it's appropriate. Recommendations for additional uses and considerations include:

- Recognizing the evolutionary importance of untouched areas,
- Considering the carrying capacity of the land

for both humans and wildlife and limiting use as needed,

- More opportunities for firewood collection, including in LSRs,
- Evaluation of the effects of firewood collection,
- Monitoring and adapting usage levels of non-traditional forest products,
- Increasing big game forage, and
- Addressing fence damage from snags.

PRIVATE LANDS

Participants were concerned about the impacts of off forest activities on national forest resources and were also concerned about unhealthy federal land threatening neighbors. Consideration of tribal lands and adjacent land owners during plan revision was recommended. In addition, comments expressed interest in evaluation of the landscape, and water quality, inclusive of non-federal lands. Landscape coordination between the Forest Service, private landowners, and other governments such as states was recommended. Community members shared their concerns about mixed use of national forest land adjacent to human development and residences and also suggested more treatments in the interface between private and federal lands to protect private lands. Some comments recommended boundary changes or ownership swaps to reduce fragmentation and protect threatened and endangered species, and others were opposed to land acquisitions.

RECREATION AND ACCESS

Recreation management received a great deal of focus and many recommendations from the public. Many participants noted that recreation is a key value and economic driver across the region. Community members suggested expansion of

recreational opportunities and facilities as well as a management policy shift toward recreation and special uses. Participants suggested a focus on where we want recreation to go in the life of the plan rather than codifying past activities.

Many comments expressed interest in a particular type of recreation or concern about some types of recreation, e.g. interest in more flexibility for dispersed recreation. Comments also commonly noted recreation use has changed, and activities like mountain biking, snowshoeing and off-highway vehicle use have increased. Participants suggested consideration of past and current use patterns (all seasons) and institution of a quota system. Conversely, other comments suggested the Forest Service should enable more access and not lock off lands to public use. Likewise, comments recommended keeping fees or admission prices down to keep the forest accessible to diverse incomes. Many noted competing recreation interests. Recommendations related to competing uses include:

- Provide opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized use;
- Designate quiet recreation areas, including around urban areas, where electric or motorized equipment is not allowed to ensure safety;
- Address conflicts, especially on high use trails with multiple users;
- Balance wilderness with other uses;
- Designate areas for different kinds of recreational use to mitigate impacts;

Community members would like to see high impact recreation areas addressed. Comments noted that some recreation areas are overwhelmed, and suggestions were made to encourage lesser used areas and provide field rangers to educate and assist the public. Some comments noted problems with ATVs from a fire danger perspective, and others noted that damage is caused by all user groups.

Comments noted the importance of the recreation economy and recognized that each community has unique recreation values. Participants would like the economic value of recreation considered in forest plan revision including benefits from tourism, fishing, etc. Many participants would like to see more investment and planning for recreation.

ROADS, ACCESS, AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

Many participants were interested in access issues and shared recommendations related to access and roads. Community members see roads as a critical way to ensure access and recreational opportunities on federal land. Many comments conveyed the feeling that the Forest Service has an obligation to keep roads open and maintained for a diversity of recreational uses as well as to maintain access for other purposes including timber harvest, access between local communities, and disabled access. Others expressed concerns about the cost and ecological impact of roads. Some participants would like to see road removal to improve fish passage and habitat or road closures to protect old growth while others would prefer road reconstruction and realignment. Participants requested long-term thinking on the use of roads, a right-sized road system, and a road system based on public input and commensurate with access and other uses.

People expressed concern about road maintenance and conditions of roads. Comments recommended Forest Service road crews due to the burden placed on industry and private interests because of the current lack of capacity. Others noted that conveying roads and the maintenance burden to counties is not a good solution. In addition, many comments recommended letting volunteers augment the Forest Service's work on roads and trails. Participants noted high road fees and a lack of maintenance. Comments remarked on the lack of safety on roads and the need for general repair

including brush clearing, ditch maintenance, and better management of water drainage. Participants mentioned closed roads which were not blocked or signed as such. Road maintenance and safety is key to local users who value many different uses on the national forest.

Participants offered differing opinions on motorized and non-motorized use of the forest. Many suggested separate designated areas for each type of use. A designation for quiet recreation was recommended as well. Requests for more motorized recreation or the same levels of motorized recreation were shared. Some would like to see fewer roads to create better hunting. Others would like the Forest Service to address the impact of motorized vehicles on the forest or recognize the different level of impacts from snowmobiles and ATVs.

Comments suggested analysis of the effectiveness of the Travel Management Rule and decision. Participants noted that Motor Vehicle Use Maps (MVUMs) are wrong or inadequate or need to be updated (e.g. animal retrieval areas for disabled access). Some would like to see any roads open to motorized use also be open to WATVs (ATVs that have been modified with safety equipment to be made "street-legal" on Washington state roads). A request was made to drop license requirements on Forest Service roads to allow kids to ride the roads (for example to trailheads).

Some comments focused on seasonal access and suggested a more comprehensive winter recreation analysis than was incorporated in the last plan. Participants recommended posting signs on roads with a limited travel season, brushing to the ditch line to help snowmobiles, eliminating the 60" limit on over-snow travel, and retaining current snowmobiling opportunities.

TRAILS AND RECREATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Participants also commented on national forest trails. People requested more trails as well as fewer trails. Some suggested removing parallel trails and consolidating when trails lead to the same place. Comments suggested more trail maintenance in general as well as trail maintenance to reduce impacts to water quality. Community members recommended enlisting volunteers to maintain wilderness trails as well as motorized trails. An off-road permit was recommended to help fund trail maintenance. Comments noted that wilderness trails are being lost and would like maintenance to maintain such trails. Other suggested eliminating wilderness trails and adding more elsewhere. Trail signs are appreciated. Explanation of the process for adding motorized trails was requested as was managing for the integrity of the trail experience for the Pacific Crest Trail. Community members would like horse recreation considered and don't want horses limited to roads. Participants also requested maintenance or improvement of campsites and wilderness cabins. Comments suggested a simplified, multi-agency pass system as well as enforcement of illegal use. Hunting and fishing accessibility were recommended for consideration during plan revision.

(See the Forest Plan section for comments on wilderness and other land designations.)

REGIONAL, LANDSCAPE AND LOCAL SCALE

Many participants commented about consistency across forests. Comments expressed interest in individual forest plan consistency within the NW Forest Plan area as well as consistent management of recreation resources across forests and regionally. Community members suggested building forest plan revisions off of the NW Forest Plan.

Comments pointed out the importance of considering both regional and local issues in the revision process. In addition, participants recommended a landscape approach while not excluding smaller areas in need of management. Community members would like to see forests managed contiguously. An all-lands approach that looks at the large-scale over time was of interest to many, e.g. for river management for salmon habitat improvement. Some participants suggested developing a very local approach to management plans for each forest and were concerned about plans retaining local identity. Others suggested grouping plan revision across regions for multiple forests and were more concerned with consistency across forests.

WATER RESOURCES

Most public comments on water resources support a continuing program to protect, improve, and support water quality and watershed health. Participants would like to see water management as a key component of plan revision, including timber stand management (e.g. juniper) in relation to water. Community members would like to see management that prevents degradation of water and supports healthy watersheds. Community members would like to see the Forest Service accomplish more creek and watershed restoration.

Many specific recommendations were shared. For example, some people recommended forests consider water storage capacities at current levels or augment needs in the future plan revisions. Others suggested no-touch reserves around water features, riparian buffers at current or improved levels, or management of riparian habitat within the natural range of variability. A general desire for protection of salmon, recognition of impacts on habitat, and maintenance of protections for fish and clean water was shared. Concern about habitat and river hazard management was expressed, and participants suggested balancing uses on rivers. Comments showed an interest in both maintenance of access and reduction in road density. Finally, participants suggested bringing in state partners, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and watershed-based municipalities to identify opportunities to address water resource issues and biological bottlenecks.

(For comments on the Aquatic Conservation Strategy, see the Forest Plan section.)

WILDLIFE

The comment heard most often at the listening sessions related to wildlife was to move away from single species management. Participants would like to see the Forest Service manage for multiple species or all species and resources, not just ESA-listed species or Management Indicator Species, and include common species deer and elk. Comments suggested alternate approaches to single species management should incorporate ecological processes, systems thinking, and focus on the whole ecological picture, or ecosystem management.

Community members would like to see biodiversity maintained or increased, including habitats and forest-floor plant species. Comments showed support for a long-term view of management for habitat and species. Participants would like to see the amount of habitat and the quality of habitat considered and requested protection

and conservation of old growth forests. Some participants noted that certain species are occurring in places they did not occur in the past and that this should be taken into consideration with current science. Comments suggested a programmatic plan across the range for endangered species and maintenance of endangered species habitat. Refugia for climate-sensitive species were recommended as were forage opportunities for wildlife. Participants would like to see “new” species like wolves considered during plan revision. Others suggested letting nature take its course, e.g. competition between barred owl and spotted owl. Protection for the following species was requested: spotted owl, lynx, wolverine, marbled murrelet, and species associated with old growth forest habitat, sensitive to climate change, or dependent on road density. Beaver reintroduction was recommended as was aggressive reintroduction of species to promote forest health.

Community members suggested various means of monitoring species and their habitats. Analysis of species and habitats through key indicators was recommended, as were inventories to account for diversity and gauge the effectiveness of management. Some comments suggested requiring population data for focal species. Other feedback included the recommendation to update data on species (e.g. inactive spotted owl nest sites) which might allow managers more flexibility. Participants also recommended analyzing and monitoring common species.

A common theme during the listening sessions was that better habitat corridors for wildlife or connectivity of habitats should be considered. Connectivity of mature and old growth forests was recommended, and consideration of migration routes for big game was suggested. Likewise, participants requested management for animal movement unimpeded by other uses (e.g. roads and development). Comments also noted that corridors would be more important ever due to climate change.

Finally, participants recommended calling on Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to access expertise in analysis as well as data and monitoring results. Participants noted that habitat conservation plans rely on the NW Forest Plan so any changes to the NW Forest Plan could have ripple effects on state and private lands.

(For comments on survey and manage, see the Laws and Policies section.)

PLAN REVISION MISCELLANEOUS

The issues below were raised at the plan revision roundtables and didn't fit neatly into the categories above.

- Lead and broken clay pigeons – need bio-degradable in arid climate.
- Forest planning standards and guidelines need to be site specific (e.g. browse heights in grazing different between different sites and different plant species).
- Reduce subsidies for livestock and mining, timber.
- Retain receipts for management on the Forest.
- Real issue is corporate entities.
- Use technology, such as remote vehicles/robotics to recover timber and clear out burned areas.
- Please consider products produced by the Federal Forest Carbon Coalition (report card, checklist and background papers).
- Animal damage control needs to be considered.
- Allotments are comprised of legacy fences; redesign all allotments and pastures to improve forage and grazing management.
- Contrast: small communities rely on timber revenue; Anti-government, anti-handout, yet need income from logging.
- Address permitted uses.

CHAPTER 2 – PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ROUNDTABLES

INTRODUCTION

The Forest Service held 19 listening sessions across the Northwest March – June to gather feedback from the public about forest plan revision. Plan revision has not yet begun on forests within the Northwest Forest Plan geographic area, with the exception of the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest. The listening sessions were designed to gather public feedback early in the process to enable the Forest Service to incorporate feedback in its initial plan revision strategy. The listening sessions gathered feedback on the use of science, public engagement during plan revision, and the plan revision process or people's specific interests in plan revision.

The first three listening sessions were held in March and coordinated by Triangle consulting. The feedback from those listening sessions has been

summarized in a companion report available at: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/r6/landmanagement/?cid=stelprd3831710>.

This compendium of reports summarizes the additional 16 listening sessions that were held between April 23rd and June 11th, 2015. Table 1 displays listening session dates and locations summarized in this report. At each listening session, participants were invited to give feedback at roundtables focused on three separate topic areas. The topic areas included: 1) what participants would like public engagement to look like during forest plan revision, 2) the use of science in plan revision, and 3) what participants would like the Forest Service to consider during plan revision. We developed an executive summary of feedback from the listening sessions as well as summary reports

TABLE 1. FOREST PLAN REVISION LISTENING SESSIONS DATES AND LOCATIONS

Listening Session Date	Location(s)
April 23rd	Mt. Vernon
April 27th	Corvallis and Prineville
April 28th	Issaquah, Olympia, Bend, and Roseburg
May 4th	Pleasant Hill, Lakeview, and Medford
May 5th	Klamath Falls and Wenatchee
May 6th	Stayton and Gold Beach
May 11th	Hood River
June 11th	Okanogan

for each of the three topic areas that synthesize feedback from all 16 listening sessions. Wherever possible, we worked to retain the flavor and tone of public comments.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Two of the most common messages heard at the public engagement roundtables at the listening sessions were that people would like a transparent and clear plan revision process and that people want their feedback to matter. Transparency was requested on the Forest Service's intent, the plan revision timeline and process, and when the next opportunities to engage will be. Clear and concise communication about what is going on was requested. Many participants shared the feeling that they don't feel listened to or that their feedback was ignored. Some noted a perception that input isn't used because an agenda is already in place and the decisions are pre-determined. In general, participants wanted to see more emphasis on the value of public input. Others noted concerns about Forest Service capacity and the lengthy plan revision timeline. Participants offered a variety of ideas for sharing information, reaching more people, and engaging with the public, including more face-to-face meetings, field tours, and surveys. Ideas about who should be engaged and the kinds of information people would like to discuss or access were also shared.

TRANSPARENT AND CLEAR PROCESS

Many comments expressed a strong interest in transparency during the plan revision process

which participants believe will help build trust. Transparency was requested on the Forest Service's intent, the plan revision timeline and process, and when the next opportunities to engage will be. People would like clear and concise communication about where the Forest Service is at in the process. Participants also commonly requested advance notice of meetings (e.g. 2-4 weeks) and sharing of relevant information (e.g. agenda, background materials, draft documents) prior to meetings so people can arrive prepared and ready to contribute. Likewise, comments recommended identifying the main points the Forest Service wants people to engage on and clearly identifying what is needed or wanted from the public. Community members would like the Forest Service to be honest and up front about what can and can't be changed, to acknowledge public expectations that can't be met, and to be clear about sideboards and where they come from.

Participants want the Forest Service to make sure the public involvement or engagement process is worth people's time. A recommendation was made to start with a basic orientation to the topic (what is a forest plan, why should people care) in plain language to help provide context and clarity for plan revision. Comments requested a lot of outreach, involving the public early before decisions are made, and keeping people involved throughout the process. Updates were requested at each major step in the process as well as during lulls in activity. In general, people would like more information shared. Updates as decisions are made (including how comments were incorporated or not) were appreciated. On the other hand, one comment noted that too much public engagement can bog down the process.

Participants requested focused communications and clarification of the importance of listening sessions, planning meetings, or other requests for public engagement. Comments requested clear and understandable documents and presentations as well as the use of simple, non-scientific, plain

English. Participants recommended the Forest Service use information it already knows about what the public wants and thinks is important. Others recommended the Forest Service know the concerns of all stakeholders and think through how people in communities use forest lands. Participants would like to see continuity maintained as people and stakeholders change. Participants would like engagements to be opportunities for two-way communication and specifically requested no public comment requests between Thanksgiving and New Year's Eve. Participants would like to know who the district and Forest Service contact people are for plan revision.

PUBLIC FEEDBACK

One of the most commonly heard comments on public engagement across listening sessions was some variation of people not feeling listened to or that their feedback doesn't matter or was ignored. Some noted a perception that input isn't used because an agenda is already in place and the decisions are pre-determined. Participants want to see more emphasis on the value of public input and suggested engaging the public could result in other options or solutions that may not otherwise have been considered. Many comments recommended the Forest Service find a way to show the public is being heard and that public input is appreciated.



Comments suggested the Forest Service clearly explain the process, how public input will be used, decisions, and why decisions are being made. Similarly, another recommendation was to either act on public input or provide feedback to the public about why suggestions are not being followed, i.e. transparency in how the feedback was used or not. Finally, some commenters suggested the public may feel feedback isn't worth their time since 'nothing happens', i.e. there is not a lot of output. Others would like to see public feedback become part of the official record.

Many participants suggested local input be weighted more heavily or given more consideration than other types of input such as from people in large urban cities or national interests. These types of comments were sometimes associated with the sentiment that local community concerns are not valued, that outside interests have more financial resources to weigh in, or that local people know the forests and resources while others may not. Similarly, some participants suggested that most of the information should come from Oregon and Washington because DC doesn't understand our forests and local resources. Suggestions to assign more weight to comments based on economic impacts, from people who volunteer to assist with forest work, from more frequent forest users, and from local collaboratives were shared. Some people voiced a concern that too much attention is paid to the loudest voice and specifically referenced environmental concerns in this regard. Others noted that both rural and urban interests should have a voice in the process and that public lands deserve input from all over the country. Similarly, participants recommended consideration of input from all types of interests and recommended broadening the input base and showing no favoritism. In addition, comments suggested minority opinions be respected and heard. Some participants were interested in how to engage people on the east coast or in other parts of the country on western lands issues.

Participants recognized the presence of conflicting points of view on forest management issues and had a range of suggestions for addressing it. For potentially controversial or "negative impacting" issues, comments recommended plenty of communication as well as bringing urban and rural folks together to increase mutual understanding. Similarly, others suggested getting groups or individuals with diverse or conflicting interests together in order to find common interests or goals and agree on definitions. Likewise, participants suggested the Forest Service engage interests in a profound conflict resolution or collaborative process in advance of NEPA work. Some recommended a third party mediator to address the polarization. People would generally like to spend less time arguing and more time accomplishing things.

Forest Service Capacity

Many participants noted the importance of strong, trusting relationships between local Forest Service staff and community members and interest groups. Recommendations include allowing staff to get out on the land, prioritizing relationship building, and being active participants in the community. Comments noted a loss of local knowledge among Forest Service workers and a desire for Forest Service employees to know what's happening on the forest. Others requested employees be up-to-date on revision efforts even if it isn't their department. In addition, comments expressed frustration with employee change (turnover) because conversations and input are lost. The lack of continuity makes it seem like citizen input is unimportant. Participants would like to see continuity of Forest Service representation and would like to deal with one person to increase clarity and trust. Comments suggested the Forest Service has lost skills to engage with the general public.

The special role of district rangers was noted, and suggestions for rangers include: operating collaboratively, having quarterly meetings with various interests, and attending public meetings to become more knowledgeable. One comment noted

the importance of having public affairs staff on ranger districts because traveling to headquarters is not convenient. Finally, participants recommended streamlining Forest Service financial and personnel efficiency and taking advantage of the huge number of potential volunteers available to the Forest Service.

PLAN REVISION TIMELINE

Participants were concerned about the plan revision timeline. Comments suggested the public will value a planning process that actually leads to a decision and would like certainty that the process will efficiently lead to a decision. Participants suggested staying on timeline, not letting projects slip, and staying on the path of progress rather than getting derailed by special interest groups. Conversely, one participant recommended the Forest Service not be in a hurry. Community members suggested the overall duration of planning projects causes people to disengage and spans Forest Service personnel changes, breaking the connection with the public. A recommendation was made to create a strategic stakeholders group to develop a shorter plan revision timeline as 4 years is seen as too long. Participants expressed concern about a lengthy and costly process. Finally, in areas where forest plan revision is already underway, participants expressed frustration with what seems like an endless process with little progress. Such comments suggested it's time to make decisions and move forward.

SHARING INFORMATION AND REACHING MORE PEOPLE

Participants recommended using multiple types of outreach activities to reach different audiences and different communities. Comments suggested a more user-friendly and up-to-date website as well as making forest plan revision information prominent on the regional and national websites. Likewise, comments suggested providing a link on the homepage to plan revision information. Inclusion of science information on the website was also recommended. Participants generally requested the Forest Service use more creative ways of getting the word out. Comments recommended using the website, local newspapers, local TV stations (at key times, not in morning), local talk shows, radio, PBS, and OPB to spread the news about meetings or other activities. Participants also regularly mentioned flyers as good way to reach people, including posting flyers at: post offices in small communities, ranger district offices, supervisor offices, the library, the courthouse, grocery stores, and outdoor equipment stores. Very simple flyers were recommended. Notices and information could also be posted at trailheads. In addition, participants would like sign-up sheets available at Forest Service offices, campgrounds, visitor facilities and at national park visitor centers. An email list was recommended to keep folks involved and up-to-date on the process, decisions, and scientific findings though limited online access in some areas was noted and newsletter updates/ hard copies were also suggested, especially to national forest neighbors. Comments suggested more clarity about how to sign up for the email list. One comment suggested email sublists by interest areas (e.g, trail maintenance, citizen science, etc.). Participants recommended maintaining an updated contact list

of mailing addresses and email addresses, inclusive of email addresses for clubs and non-traditional contacts that use local forests.

Participants would like the Forest Service to use plain language in their outreach materials including in newspapers, on the internet, and in group emails. Comments suggested putting public engagement topics in the forefront of the messaging and using targeted marketing to help people understand why the NW Forest Plan and plan revision is important to them. Comments also suggested making the process more interesting and paying attention to the design of materials for public consumption. One recommendation was to consider the success of the Smokey Bear campaign and perhaps create a new forest mascot.

Community members recommended sharing information with local clubs, community groups, user groups, and Facebook groups and having these groups share the information with their members. In addition, enlisting the support of local elected officials to help spread the word was suggested.

LOCATION AND TIMING

Some community members suggested local meetings for local issues and regional meetings for regional issues while others suggested engagement at the forest level or below. Similarly, some participants recommended meetings be held in areas affected by the forest or in smaller venues closer to communities (e.g. district level in community buildings, libraries, granges, and different community venues). Local meetings in areas convenient for people to get to were commonly requested. Neutral meeting settings to reduce bias were also recommended. Meetings at various times and meetings after 5:00 p.m. were requested, as were weekend meetings (especially earlier in the day).

PARTICIPANTS SHARED MANY IDEAS FOR ENGAGING MORE PEOPLE IN PLAN REVISION, INCLUDING:

- Have frontliners provide visitors with plan revision information;
- Use social media, including photos of current work and professional presentations (though others suggest not relying too much on social media for various reasons);
- Create a twitter feed on the home page (e.g. Mt. Hood);
- Reach groups who haven't been engaged through new media including cool graphics, video, and new interpretation methods;
- Have field-going folks inform visitors in forest;
- Place more effective stories in the media and keep reporters informed and in the loop (though one comment expressed concern with an agency bias in the media);
- Reach out to online environmental magazines;
- Have an interesting and fun forest planning booth at county fairs or other events (e.g. Sportsmen Show, Hood River first Friday);
- Use open forums like public schools to reach younger generations;
- Connect with local universities;
- Post on town social websites and bulletin boards;
- Offer coffee;
- Use any kind of communications; and
- Spread free pizza rumors

WAYS TO ENGAGE

Participants expressed general support and appreciation for the listening sessions, especially the local listening sessions, and would like to see more face-to-face meetings like them. However, participants would like accessibility needs, in particular for deaf people, considered. Some participants suggested gathering input from individual groups (e.g. hunters, recreationalists, timber) at separate meetings to minimize conflicts. Others suggested meetings or workshops by topic area (e.g. sustainable timber supply, riparian, recreation, salmon) open to all interest groups. Some comments suggested the traditional process gets diluted because there are too many topics. In general, participants like small meetings that allow people to engage and have group discussions as this is a good way for citizens to be heard in a respectful, non-threatening forum that provides real opportunities for dialogue. Community members would like to see an educational component included in public meetings. Smaller, less formal gatherings at local establishments were recommended as were quarterly meetings between all recreation groups. One suggestion was to collaborate with partners to host events as a way to leverage the Forest Service budget. A multi-agency meeting was suggested as was a regional citizen advisory committee. Finally, commenters noted that many folks are working hard to make ends meet in struggling counties and may lack the time or knowledge to attend listening sessions or public meetings.

A popular suggestion was to use surveys to ask the public for feedback. Surveys could provide a diversity of opinions on what issues are of concern to citizens and what the public would like to see prioritized. Mail and paper surveys were recommended as were electronic surveys. Participants also requested interactive maps, including for alternative comparison. In general, comments showed interest in maps, graphics, charts, and plenty of other visuals.

IN ADDITION TO MORE PUBLIC MEETINGS LIKE THE LISTENING SESSIONS, PARTICIPANTS SUGGESTED:

- More field trips, including field trips on weekends or evenings when more people are available – allowing people to see and experience areas will encourage them to care more about the process and help them better engage throughout plan revision.
- Field trips for different groups or clubs.
- Field trips for particular actions or issues open to a cross-section of the public – the forest is a better place to have many discussions, including on issues like adaptive management, riparian management, and risks to resources.
- Forest Service presence at local interest group events to learn about groups' issues and share updates.
- Town halls (they bring out the most people).
- Information sharing at meetings with partners on other projects.
- "Train the trainer" approach – multiplier effect by using members of diverse communities (who are embedded in the community) to pose questions to the larger community.
- Featured speaker events.
- Events to engage people, especially kids (e.g. fishing events or something fun to do in the woods).
- Focus groups with local youth.
- Interpretive information at recreation sites was also encouraged to engage new people.



Recommendations included using webinars (maybe filmed in the woods?), videos on forest plan revision, and other technology to share information and get people more involved. Some participants requested an online dialogue forum though others noted a concern with such forums providing narrow viewpoints. A webcam and blog featuring lookouts, guzzlers, pelican colonies, eagles nests, etc. was suggested.

Participants noted that low attendance is partly due to boring presentations. Presenting and engaging the public on plan revision in more interesting ways was suggested. Traditional engagement methods such as providing opportunities for open-ended comments (written and electronic) and holding public hearings or open houses were also requested. Some participants shared a belief that better comments come when they are taken onsite rather than during written comment periods.

Participants also requested a collaborative process amongst all user groups and sometimes referred to collaborative processes as true engagement because input is actually incorporated. The importance of having a common goal was noted. Community members would like the Forest Service to engage existing collaboratives and would like collaboratives to do more outreach to the public, i.e. hold public meetings or otherwise disseminate

information back to their constituents. Some areas that don't currently have existing collaborative groups would like them to be created. Others suggested the creation of forest-wide collaborative groups and stressed the importance of including all interest groups.

Specific requests were made of line officers. Comments requested that district rangers: 1) produce quarterly newsletters on plan revision, 2) open ranger district offices once a month on a Saturday to meet with interested people and build relationships, and 3) reinvigorate local contacts at ranger districts to make it easier to access data. In addition, participants requested that line officers engage all stakeholders and keep engaged with all groups (no favorites).

TOPICS FOR INFORMATION SHARING OR DISCUSSION

Participants requested more information on a range of issues, including digestible background information on plan revision such as why plan revision is needed, the plan revision process and timeline, who makes decisions on best available science, where collaboratives fit, how people can engage and why their input is important, and what the bigger picture sideboards or "planning criteria" are. People would also like clear and simple summaries of existing forest plans, the NW Forest Plan, and how they overlap. Others would like clarification on where to access existing forest plans. Many comments suggested using videos to explain both the planning process and science information. As discussed at the science tables, people would like to know what worked from the current forest plans and the NW Forest Plan and what is "stale" or needs to be addressed. In addition, people would like the Forest Service to share the results of all the listening

sessions with the public and people who attended. In general, participants saw a need to dispel the public perception that the plan is already done and the Forest Service is just “appeasing” the public.

Education and raising awareness around a suite of issues was suggested. Participants talked about the need to raise awareness of what the national forest system has to offer and what actually happens on Forest Service lands. Another suggested topic was how forest management has changed and the potential for diverse forest management for diverse values and outcomes. Participants would also like to see more education on Forest Service history and multiple use. Comments recommended education on Forest Service rules and lingo (e.g. PacFish, InFish, NFMA) as well as current protections for wildlife, streams and fish. Others suggested the Forest Service share its forest management goals, mission and congressional mandates with the public. Many requests were made for more information about science as well as acknowledgement of conflicting science or unknowns. Public engagement related to science topics is discussed in the Science Roundtables Sharing Science section.

Other topics recommended for education or discussion include:

- Forest Service management impacts (positive and negative) on small communities, including discussion of limited economic support that recreation offers;
- How communities and groups use forest lands and why;
- What the public values and wants from their forests (possible to map?) and the associated tradeoffs;
- Working forests and what forests do for people (cool water, recreation, etc.);
- Forest fires, fire suppression focus, and comparison of areas with and without fire;
- Special places;

- Recreation and recreation statistics and use estimates;
- Issues pressuring the forest (large and small scale);
- The manufacturing infrastructure required to manage forests; and
- What has changed since original forest plans were published.

Participants suggested starting small, for instance by explaining what a national forest is and what wilderness areas are. Comments showed interest in information that would detail what’s at risk and what can be gained through forest plan revision. People would like plans for public involvement included in forest plans (which could invite enthusiasm from users who like to do trail maintenance, invasives removal, etc.). Comments expressed an interest in hearing about successes throughout the process. Similarly, others requested shared information about inspirational projects and annual accomplishments. Finally, participants suggested a simplified public comment process easier for people to understand, perhaps one more like the scoping process.



APPENDIX: WHO TO ENGAGE AND MISCELLANEOUS

Participants recommended outreach and engagement of diverse interests and suggested better identification of stakeholders (broader) and better outreach. Participants recommended reaching out to:

- Tribes
- Listening session participants
- Private landowner neighbors
- Local stakeholders and community legitimizers
- Rural communities
- Neighborhood associations, granges
- Local and urban people
- Recreation groups
- User groups and clubs (esp. those already existing with mailing lists) including hunting, fishing, snowmobile, mountain biking, environmental, horseback riding, hiking, and ATV groups
- Watershed and stewardship groups
- Soil and water conservation districts
- Forest collaboratives
- Minority groups, including latinos, refugees, immigrants, and international students
- Kids and younger people, including low-income kids
- Junior Rangers, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H, Campfire
- High schools, local universities, community colleges and OIT
- Professors and college students
- Places like climbing studios to reach younger generation
- Permit holders
- Commissions or planning commissions
- County commissioners
- Other agencies (e.g. USFWS, BLM, National Park Service)
- States and state natural resource agencies
- Elected officials
- Local cities and town councils, especially along forest boundaries
- Community planning directors and parks and recreation staff
- Businesses (partner with them – posters, notices, etc.)
- Community Action Teams
- Agriculture and livestock interests, ranchers
- Timber interests
- Rafting businesses
- Beekeeper organizations
- Travel organizations
- Non-economic interest groups
- Conservation voices, including land conservation groups
- Individuals (“old timers” representing recreationists, environmentalists, engineers, loggers, FS retirees) with a life of experience

Some comments received during the listening sessions could not be easily sorted into the themes summarized above.

- Encourage FS to have public meetings in Upper McKenzie Valley and Okanogan County. Have more meetings in Seattle not Seatac. Meetings need to be held within ½ hour of Sequim, Port Angeles, and Port Townsend. Not much engagement with staff because it is “Lakeview”; perception is Klamath is left out.
- Allow FS control because of the more direct connection to the community.
- Need to follow through with promises.
- FS needs ID who – get out & meet w/groups individually.
- Do not reinvent the wheel! Use the lessons learned from our planning process in the 1980’s.

- Learn from Region 5 revision – long process with fewer and fewer participants.
- Concerned with regional process. Communication between Forest Service and county is not inclusive. Interaction between county commissioners and Forest Service, the public interest is being left out.
- Transparency in where GIS data comes from: who is collecting, how is it collected, what are the inputs.
- I want to know that what it takes to finance a Forest Plan revision is given serious consideration/discussion at all levels.
- Sustainable roads process was good.
- OFRI model of information successful at engaging public – state-run.
- Backcountry Horseman West Cascades wants chapter participants involved in discussions. They are a service group and do trail maintenance; train their own sawyers; want to train folks in general so there is a better understanding about stewardship, etc.
- Offer more incentive for participation, for example beer.
- Identify “hubs” (consistent use of communication).
- When taking public comment, write exactly what words they are using.
- Construct scenarios through media and technology now vs. then.
- Public meetings need to be managed to avoid having some take over meeting, (ex. NRA vs. Safety Advocates).
- Long comment periods.
- Re-invest in public meetings and field trips prior to preferred alternative publication.
- Alarming announcements on roads – private land users have different rules at times under permits, etc.
- Roads closed – a lot already closed – scare tactics.
- Public comment is important, but can’t replace professional expertise.
- Utilize social science to understand the public attitudes towards the revision process (and capture the public’s level of understanding).
- Need to know demographics of forest users – age, cultural background.
- Need to know demographics of non- forest users.
- When EIS or environmental analysis need public involvement, input needs to be recorded and part of public record.
- User groups use this venue to further their agenda, not give meaningful feedback.
- Lawsuits could drag out process.
- Change how litigation is funded.
- Private industry is ahead of FS because lawsuits slow down the FS.
- Instill consequences for suing FS by making appellants pay for court costs.
- Difficult to engage because not present in field ... rural stations have closed.
- We’ll come to your meetings and give our opinions and we’ll see you in the woods (blocking your crappy sales) when you come to cut them down. FOR THE WILD!
- Communicate shared responsibility to not just use, but give back, too.
- Logging interests are LAST only 3% of Oregon economy in timber now.
- FS doesn’t seem to promote their products – maps – we need vendors.
- Agency needs to encourage ownership of public lands – better travel maps; fix online links.
- Front office needs to encourage recreation.
- Get FS faster computers to make it more user friendly.
- Afraid to go out in the woods because LEO’s are ticket writing happy. People need to feel safe/secure. Focus should be on teaching – not punishment.
- Buy some black pens, less RED INK.
- What can the public do on the forest, not can’t do?

Forest Plan Revision

- Is the Forest Service directive to generate dollars for Treasure/County or who?
- How does the public get involved in FS financial decisions?
- Lot of meetings about collaborating, but not much progress.
- Possible funding for local communities to propose NEPA processes.
- Grassroots base for collaboratives more effective than agency driven.

CHAPTER 3 – SCIENCE ROUNDTABLES

INTRODUCTION

The Forest Service held 19 listening sessions across the Northwest March – June to gather feedback from the public about forest plan revision. Plan revision has not yet begun on forests within the Northwest Forest Plan geographic area, with the exception of the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest. The listening sessions were designed to gather public feedback early in the process to enable the Forest Service to incorporate feedback in its initial plan revision strategy. The listening sessions gathered feedback on the use of science, public engagement during plan revision, and the plan revision process or people's specific interests in plan revision.

The first three listening sessions were held in March and coordinated by Triangle consulting. The feedback from those listening sessions has been

summarized in a companion report available at: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/r6/landmanagement/?cid=stelprd3831710>.

This compendium of reports summarizes the additional 16 listening sessions that were held between April 23rd and June 11th, 2015. Table 1 displays listening session dates and locations summarized in this report. At each listening session, participants were invited to give feedback at roundtables focused on three separate topic areas. The topic areas included: 1) what participants would like public engagement to look like during forest plan revision, 2) the use of science in plan revision, and 3) what participants would like the Forest Service to consider during plan revision. We developed an executive summary of feedback from the listening sessions as well as summary reports

TABLE 1. FOREST PLAN REVISION LISTENING SESSIONS DATES AND LOCATIONS

Listening Session Date	Location(s)
April 23rd	Mt. Vernon
April 27th	Corvallis and Prineville
April 28th	Issaquah, Olympia, Bend, and Roseburg
May 4th	Pleasant Hill, Lakeview, and Medford
May 5th	Klamath Falls and Wenatchee
May 6th	Stayton and Gold Beach
May 11th	Hood River
June 11th	Okanogan

for each of the three topic areas that synthesize feedback from all 16 listening sessions. Wherever possible, we worked to retain the flavor and tone of public comments.

SCIENCE SUMMARY

Listening session participants expressed strong interest in how science will be used and shared with the public during the plan revision process. Participants would like to see more external involvement of both the public and non-federal scientists in the process. Comments suggested a broad range of science for consideration in plan revision. A strong desire for the use of unbiased science came up at the listening sessions, and questions about how the Forest Service will deal with conflicting science were common. Many comments focused on the need to put science in lay terms and help increase collective understanding of the scientific process and terminology. In addition, participants shared a host of helpful ideas about how to best share science, including field tours, public meetings, suggestions for the website, and more. The science theme with the most extensive public feedback related to how the Forest Service applies science to management. Many comments also suggested science should be informed by practical, hands-on experience. Across the region, discussions about science inevitably resulted in discussions about values. There was a sense from many participants that science is outweighed by politics and that the Forest Service should commit to using science to guide forest management instead of being driven by other things such as recreation demand or political opposition to salvage logging. Concern about politics overriding science was shared by those with both extractive- and conservation-leaning comments. Finally, many comments focused on the irreducible uncertainties faced by managers and suggested flexibility in management plans paired with adaptive management.

EXTERNAL INVOLVEMENT IN SCIENCE

Many participants would like the Forest Service to open up its science process and more readily embrace external partners and interest groups in incorporating science in plan revision. In general, participants expressed an interest in having more opportunities to engage directly with the science and scientists. For example, participants suggested inviting the public to participate in wildlife surveys, allowing the public to access video footage of surveys, or making survey protocols publically available. Participants would like more dialogue about the science with time to ask questions, interact in the woods, and share knowledge. People want local on-the-ground knowledge and expertise acknowledged and incorporated, from both Forest Service and community sources. Participants asked about the role of citizen science and suggested it be considered. Likewise, participants want more monitoring and recommended user groups be engaged to increase monitoring capacity.

Participants shared many ideas for better engaging the public on science topics including field trips, fun programs with Forest Service scientists, and information available for walk-in tourists. Participants also generally wanted more access to the science used by the Forest Service. Comments requested an opportunity to find out more about what research is occurring and to interact with the scientists doing the work. People want to better understand the disagreements between scientists and how the Forest Service will evaluate conflicting results in the literature.

Participants want the Forest Service to better collaborate and communicate with local academic experts and make better use of other science resources, including Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, other federal agencies (US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric



Administration, Bureau of Land Management), and non-governmental organizations. Comments recommended better inter-agency collaboration and data coordination. Community members want the Forest Service to partner with colleges to develop new studies and give local students (undergraduates and graduates) on-the-ground experience. In addition, participants want science from non-Forest Service sources incorporated and would like an opportunity to submit this kind of science for consideration.

Interest in getting academics and field people together was shared. In addition, many participants noted the importance of a public process that allows people to weigh in on and review the

science and data that will lay the foundation for plan revision. Participants requested a more respectful and inclusive approach for the public to share their information and opinions and highlighted the need to rebuild local trust. Finally, a clear line of communication between research stations, management, and congressionals was recommended.

SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT

Many comments related to science were about how to apply science information to management

situations. In fact, this subject area had the most extensive feedback from the science roundtables. Participants suggested more trust in managers' application of science to local situations and also would like to see science applied in the proper context. Many participants stressed the importance of using good judgement and common sense in addition to science. Similarly, some comments suggested science should be informed by practical, hands-on experience and that we should ensure science can be applied on the ground.

Across the region, discussions about science inevitably resulted in discussions about values. There was a sense from many participants that science is outweighed by politics and that the Forest Service should commit to using science to guide forest management instead of being driven by other things such as recreation demands or political opposition to salvage logging. Concerns about politics overriding science came from both those with both extractive- and conservation-leaning comments. Other comments recognized that decision making is about science and values and suggested that decisions need to balance science with other values, i.e. science is just one part of the plan. Related comments focused on how emotions can cloud the science and that while science is adequately captured in the forest plan, dispute resolution is the real problem.

Some comments focused on the general approach the Forest Service should use to incorporate science in plan revision. Comments supported an interdisciplinary (ID team) approach and suggested a team broad enough to capture relevant knowledge but small enough to be effective. Participants requested a catalogue or database of current science which could be accessed by the ID team. A clearly defined framework that incorporates past learning and includes clear, uncomplicated objectives was recommended, as was the use of actual on-the-ground data to inform management decisions. Another set of related comments focused on the need for specific benchmarks to measure

success, and monitoring to see how effective management strategies are at reaching these benchmarks. Participants suggested using indicators of clean water, healthy species of wildlife and wildlife corridors, and indicator or focal species, including consideration of Partners-in-Flight focal species. (For more monitoring comments, see the Uncertainty and Adaptive Management section). Finally, participants requested a more efficient process for incorporating scientific research into management.

Some participants want the Forest Service to keep management local and avoid broad policy decisions for the whole region while others want the Forest Service to manage for the big picture and focus on how Forest Service management at the regional scale will interact with BLM management of O&C lands, for example. Participants suggested the Forest Service consider multiple scales and the relevance of science at particular scales, including distinguishing between the east side and west side of the Cascades. Comments recommended consideration of how the science fits the local landscape (climate, social, etc.), local applicability in resolving discrepancies in the science, and finer-scale consideration of unique habitats. "One size does not fit all." Other comments suggested the Forest Service consider all lands, not just Forest Service lands and that the agency incorporate landscape and watershed analysis across ownership boundaries.

Many participants expressed interest in how the Forest Service will apply climate change science to management. Participants were interested in how to deal with more fires from climate change, how to manage forests to better adapt to climate change, and other questions such as whether or not climate change has been overemphasized. Others shared specific recommendations such as the need to anticipate climate effects despite uncertainty. Recommendations included improving resilience (including resilience of the road system), using climate change data to inform restoration work, reducing fuels, and keeping fisheries as cool as

possible with no-cut buffer areas. An emphasis on how larger and more intact forest ecosystems can sequester carbon was also suggested.

A subset of comments focused on how the Forest Service will apply science related to disturbances. The vast majority of these comments focused on fire. Participants encouraged consideration of the latest fire ecology science, particularly science related to the use of natural and prescribed fire, and requested better incorporation of fire disturbance into the landscape. Comments recommended the use of fire science to inform suppression decisions, including fire suppression tactics, and suggested the Forest Service stop suppressing so many fires based on fire science findings. Comments also recommended the Forest Service consider the benefits of burned areas to wildlife, the impact of insects and disease post-fire, and the impact of fire on soils (particularly re-burns). Participants suggested use of new science to drive burned area rehabilitation, including use of tree genetics to reforest burned areas. The use of science to inform decisions to salvage or leave an area alone was recommended. The integration of historic conditions, climate change, and disturbance regime into planning at larger scales was recommended, as was forest-wide anticipation of and planning for large-scale disturbance. Applying fire science to reduce the risk of wildfire, forest density and insect outbreaks was suggested.

A handful of comments focused on applying social science. Participants requested equal emphasis of social science along with ecology. Comments expressed a desire for utilization of up-to-date social and economic science to inform and balance ecosystem management with resource extraction. Multiple recommendations suggested incorporating social science and economic science in order to revisit the economic obligations of the NW Forest Plan. Comments suggested making social values and trade-offs explicit in terms of what is being valued.

Many comments focused on applying science to the timber program. Some comments suggested evaluation of harvest techniques and developing new guidance for timber operations. Others suggested using science to determine sustainable harvest levels (rather than having a timber target). A recommendation to use science, including FIA plots, to improve forest growth was shared. Participants requested consideration of thinning techniques to minimize windfall and improve wildlife habitat. Consideration of the tradeoffs between imports and domestic production as well as the dynamics of supply and demand was recommended. Participants also proposed using science to evaluate the pros and cons and costs and benefits of logging projects. Finally, participants suggested consideration of what will happen in 20 years when most plantation stands have been thinned.

A small subset of comments contained specific recommendations for applying wildlife science. These comments included recommendations to consider wildlife corridors when deciding landscape management needs, to use adequate science to ensure minimum viable populations of all species, and to reconsider the science behind girdling. More road closures than in current forest plans were called for based on current science.



A flurry of additional general comments and recommendations were shared. They include using science to answer specific questions (i.e. don't just gather all science), not using modeling that can be manipulated, erring on the side of the most conservative (cautious) science, considering the long-term (1-2 generations), not hiding new policies by calling it new science (e.g. riparian reserve widths), and doing whatever provides the most benefit for the longest period of time for all living things.

SCIENCE NEEDS

Many participants shared their ideas on new research they would like the science community pursue. Some comments expressed a desire for more integrated science. Others suggested a look back at the last 100 years to learn what we did right and what we did wrong to avoid mistakes and fix what we can (e.g. fire suppression). Some comments suggested we look to future needs and modify our science to meet these needs. Similarly, others suggested science should forecast what we can expect in the next 25 years. Resource limitations to pursue new research were recognized, and in addition to a desire for additional research funding, citizen science was recommended to add capacity.

A subset of comments focused on the need for additional wildlife research. Participants requested more research on the continued decline of northern spotted owl (NSO), NSO response to large scale restoration and to thinning, barred owls, and how increasing species diversity affects spotted owls. Participants also asked for more focus on marbled murrelet and other under-the-radar and lesser-known species (e.g. lamprey). Some participants would like to see the role of indicator species reassessed, and others would like up-to-date climate change impacts on sensitive species. Comments also expressed a need for forest-wide evaluations of all big game and non-game

species and recommended assessment of wildlife overpasses, underpasses and wildlife corridors. Finally, participants wanted to know if survey and manage worked as a management tool and would like scientists to pinpoint where survey and manage species are located (in order to loosen up current protocols).

Many participants focused on the need for additional social and economic science. People want to know what prohibited the degree of harvest outlined in the NW Forest Plan from happening and the full economic and social impact of the NW Forest Plan on rural communities. Municipal level economic analysis was requested in order to capture the true impacts of Forest Service decision-making on rural communities. Participants also requested economics research on gains from different forest management activities, stewardship contracts, job creation from restoration, thinning versus fire suppression, which corporations benefit from outcomes, and how the health of the land affects the overall economy. Investigation into the economic worth of carbon storage on Forest Service lands was recommended as was how counties could be compensated for carbon credits and other ecological benefits of conservation. Interest in recreation and its relationship to local communities was also expressed. In addition, an interest was expressed in grazing monitoring in order to demonstrate improvements and a benefit to the ecosystem.

Participants suggested an array of research needs related to the NW Forest Plan. Foremost, participants want an evaluation of if we have achieved the original goals of the NW Forest Plan, and what did and did not work. Participants want to know how the NW Forest Plan impacted management, fire suppression, spotted owls, deer, elk and salmon. Interest in the social and economic impacts of the NW Forest Plan is high. Finally, specific recommendations for the science synthesis include establishing several scientific committees or forums

(on fire, aquatics, timber, etc.) and having committee members share what they know, discuss what has been learned, and identify gaps. Such a group could also provide recommendations on how to use science.

Many participants expressed a desire for new research on timber harvest or vegetation science. Research interests range from the effects of various thinning levels and silvicultural prescriptions on other activities and resources (including water yields and water quality) to our ability to be self-sufficient in wood products in the future. Some comments wanted research specifically focused on evaluating the effectiveness of ecological forestry. More science around small clear-cuts with long rotations (e.g. 10-20 acres, 80-120 years) was requested, as was additional science around salvage logging. Participants also want science to evaluate the outcome of “do nothing” alternatives. Analysis of the benefits of wood products production, including carbon sequestration and climate change mitigation, was requested. How beetles and insects are affecting timber and how industrial forestry is impacting forests at a landscape scale are both of interest.

More research on fire was commonly requested. Participants would like to see research on the effectiveness and application of fuel reduction, particularly prescribed fire, under various conditions. The success and failure of salvage logging after recent fires and the good and bad aspects of salvage logging are of interest. An evaluation of risks that truly exist from exposure to fire was requested.

A range of additional science interests were discussed, including:

- Localized/ tailored science to address local conditions;
- Valuation of ecosystem services and a comparison of ecosystem service benefits with timber production;

- Analysis of management and recreation impacts on soils;
- Recreation impacts, user conflicts, and trail usage;
- An analysis of why there are no fish in “good fish habitat”;
- The effects of non-native fish on native fish populations;
- Whether logging or ocean conditions have more influence on fish populations;
- The effects of the road network and road densities;
- Effectiveness of collaboratives;
- An assessment of how successful travel management has been at reducing road densities;
- Analyses of carbon sequestration that include a comparison of leaving trees to logging;
- A review of the eastside screens in light of new science and information;
- An evaluation of ways to increase efficiency and not take years to find a solution;
- An evaluation of noise and electromagnetic radiation from electronic warfare; and
- More science directed towards reservoir capacity.

SCIENCE AND INFORMATION TO INCORPORATE

Participants suggested incorporating a broad range of science and information in the science synthesis and during plan revision. Participants supported using peer-reviewed science in plan revision while also incorporating local knowledge and data sources, as reflected in Table 2.

TABLE 2. SCIENCE, DATA, AND INFORMATION SUGGESTED FOR USE IN PLAN REVISION

Monitoring and Field Data	
NW Forest Plan 20-year monitoring reports to learn what works and also to identify gaps	Local monitoring and studies, including species-specific monitoring (esp. barred owl)
Data on what worked and didn't work from original forest plans/ lessons learned	Forest surveys
Field data, e.g. water quality, survey and manage	Lakeview Stewardship Group monitoring data
Research on NW Forest Plan streamside buffer effectiveness	Data-coordinate information on plants and animals from researchers
Local Knowledge and Experience	
Practical knowledge and research	Professional experience
Non-peer reviewed science based on observation and experience	Data collected by Backcounty Horsemen of America and Native Plant Societies
Local knowledge; observations over time may better reflect the resource than some peer reviewed science	Data and input from people living in or near forests. Consider this input valuable regardless of degree status or word choice
Citizen science	
Social and Economic Science	
Social and economic impacts on communities, including small rural communities	Economic studies on ecosystem services, including clean water
Economic analysis, including environmental economics	Recreation, access (roads), impacts and costs of decommissioning roads
Social science and social values and tradeoffs	Socioeconomic values of wood products
Social impacts of decrease in logging: crime, domestic abuse, poverty	Local economics, including local recreation, hunting and fishing
Economic science on nonconsumptive (quiet) recreation	
Scope and Scale of Science	
Findings from all lands/ beyond FS boundary and across scales – local to landscape, regional	Science from credentialed profit and non-profit organizations (credible and reputable)
Non-federal science (universities, NCASI, OFRI, ODFW, WDFW, Kinross, etc.)	Wide array of science topics, avoid heavy emphasis on just one area
Science with long-term implications	Site-specific research/ local science
Science from other geographical areas	
Water and Aquatic Science	
Science on buffers, water temperature interaction with productivity and fish	Best science for watershed condition and managing aquatic ecosystems
Stream - food webs disruption	Best science for fish habitat
Importance of beaver reintroduction to aquatic ecosystems	Water quality science
Hydrologic impact of forest management, including combined effects of thinning and natural disturbance	Science on peak and base flows and sediment production
Watershed science, including multiple ownerships and how they affect the watershed, including nutrient delivery	Role of riparian reserves in mitigating erosion and hydrologic impacts and mediating nutrient delivery
Impacts on municipal watersheds	Science of groundwater dependent ecosystems
Science on woody debris	

Climate and Carbon Science	
New science on climate change and carbon sequestration, including expected local effects	Effect of erosion and losing glaciers on fisheries
Climate change effect on water (including temperature) and recharge	Climate change influence on fire on the landscape
Tree stress from climate change, including management options	Effects of reduced snowpack on animals, aquatics, and forests currently and in future
Impact of no post-fire harvest on CO2	Climate change effect on habitat and species
Wildlife	
Impact of motorized recreation on wildlife in summer and winter	Benefits of insects and deceased trees to wildlife
Benefits to wildlife when roads are closed to motorized use	Research on wildlife and other species besides threatened species (for all species)
Mule deer science done by ODFW on Fremont-Winema & Deschutes	Connectivity and wolves
Fire and Disturbance	
Fire ecology and fire science, including recent Sierra Pacific study and science on historical grazing and fire frequency	Research comparing fire suppression versus letting fires burn
Research on rapid changes occurring on forest (fires/disease) that transform ecosystems	Wind pattern and geographic influence on fire behavior – severity and size
Science on fuels management and species	ALL science around salvage logging
Recreation	
Recreation impacts on wildlife and other resources	Statistics on recreational uses versus timber harvest (and other)
Trends in recreation and value of quiet recreation; best available user demand data	
	How recreation affects forest management
Miscellaneous	
Fungal ecology and importance of mycorrhizal relationships	Role of diversity and abundance of insects in overall forest ecology
Impacts to soil biota from road construction, logging, etc.	Data management science (right hand knows what left is doing)
Hinkle Creek Study	Science of clean air and water (e.g. lichens)
Historical imagery	“ESA Working Group Study” from 2014
History, including historical uses of forest	Science down to single cell organisms
Serpentine Darlingtonia Wetlands Management Strategy with groundwater dependent update	BLM – Prineville and UC Davis – science on juniper
Best silviculture science for long term sustainability	Science on importance of balance of forest age classes
Information on updated timber equipment and harvest methods (less impact)	Roadless area importance for biodiversity and connectivity
Logging and management effects on watersheds	Native American management
Science informing LSR management on eastside	Science from original NW Forest Plan
Effects of military environmental stressors on forest ecosystems, e.g. electronically radiated weaponry and war maneuvers	

UNBIASED SCIENCE

Interest in the use of unbiased science was strong at all listening sessions and across interest groups. Desire for the objective use of a broad array of science sources (but not “gray science”) was common. Some participants shared a belief that the Forest Service is using science to promote an agenda, justify management actions (e.g. logging on hydrophobic soils), and close areas to public use. Participants requested the Forest Service use the full realm of best available science and minimize politics and emotion. An issue of trust in the Forest Service was raised, and some participants shared their perception that the Forest Service is misusing science. Participants shared their concern that high Forest Service turnover exacerbates this distrust. Participants requested honesty, correct information, and transparency. Concerns about the reliability of climate science, spotted owl science and localized marbled murrelet data were raised. Some comments raised the idea that the public uses science in a biased way and should also take responsibility for looking at all available science. More transparency and information sharing about how studies were conducted and the conclusions reached was suggested.

Multiple perspectives on peer-reviewed science were shared with most participants in favor of the use of peer-reviewed science (even though it may not give anticipated outcomes) while others shared the idea that peer-reviewed science is not always equal to best available science (e.g. sometimes best science is still emerging and sometimes peer-review is biased). Participants suggested diverse reviews and interdisciplinary reviews to get beyond bias. Participants also want to hear more about contrasting views represented in the peer-reviewed science. Comments suggested that when science conflicts, the Forest Service should disclose the conflict and describe why one source was chosen over another. Another suggestion was to use adaptive management when there is conflicting science and change management over time based on robust monitoring.

UNCERTAINTY AND ADAPTATION

Participants talked about their desire to have a more flexible plan that allows managers to adapt as knowledge increases and the landscape changes. Comments suggested plans should incorporate the ability to be responsive to new science and reduce the need to create plan amendments for projects. Other comments suggested using management to test assumptions built into the plan – social, economic and ecological – and address current knowledge gaps. Likewise, monitoring to address questions and knowledge gaps was seen as essential though other comments noted the Forest Service is currently spread too thin to do effective monitoring and needs sufficient resources. Participants recommended establishing benchmarks to monitor success towards management goals.

Other comments focused on uncertainty and called for active management and trying different things while some preferred conservative action. Some suggested landscape-scale experiments combined with adaptive management. Others suggested planning for a broad range of outcomes because of the uncertainty. Several comments suggested we have humility about what we control and admit to what we don't know. Finally, comments suggested that risk-averse regulatory agencies (and other agencies) are an obstacle to creative or new approaches to problems and thus to implementing adaptive management.

SHARING SCIENCE

Participants offered a wide range of ideas for sharing science more broadly. In general, participants requested the Forest Service work to make the science understandable to the general public. The Forest Service needs a better way of communicating the science in terms and formats a layperson can understand. One suggestion was to use a

“science character” like Smokey Bear or Woodsy Owl. In addition, many comments requested more transparency – in what is being studied and how, science findings, and what science the Forest Service is relying on for its analyses. Similarly, comments suggested transparency in capturing the uncertainties in the science and clarity on what is scientific fact and what is the opinion of a scientist. A focus on continuous communication with the public throughout the process (how data is coming together, who is involved, etc.) was recommended, as was more public access to the science the Forest Service is using. Additional suggestions include: more interaction with scientists, liaisons for science communications, breaking science into digestible sections, and clearly defining terms to avoid confusion (e.g. sustainable).

While the vast majority of comments were geared toward the Forest Service sharing science with the public, some comments also suggested a need to more efficiently move science from researchers to managers in a useful form. Participants wanted to ensure that the people responsible for doing plan revision have access to and understanding of the science. Likewise, new technology transfer mechanisms were requested. Additional communication between forests so people can learn from one another was also recommended.

Participants suggested a range of events for sharing science. Comments recommended field trips around contentious issues and important topics, including for children and high school students. Webinars on particular aspects of the science synthesis were suggested. Comments advised using local presentations, open houses, and interactive public meetings (or forums) with scientists where the scientific basis for plan revision or key issues can be described. Participants would like to see the Forest Service offer opportunities to learn more about the science at community events, farmers markets, and at other groups’ events (watershed councils, fishing derby, Portland City Club, Chemeketans, Audubon, Robert Straub Center, etc.). Finally, participants

suggested having public meetings to discuss science issues.

Comments suggested improvements to the Forest Service website as one way to better share science. Participants said it’s hard to find things on the Forest Service website and hard to navigate. Comments suggested more frequent updates to the website, help finding the PNW Research Station website, and the addition of an “Ask a Scientist” feature so people can post questions.

Many additional avenues of distribution for science were recommended:

- Ted-like talks,
- Science blogs,
- Local networks and volunteer groups,
- Youtube and webinars,
- Email/ listserv and hard copy/ mailing list,
- Online database and libraries for science underpinning synthesis/ plan,
- Dropbox or sharepoint,
- Local papers,
- Copies of science synthesis in coffee shops, library, etc., and
- Schools.

Participants highlighted the importance of reaching out to young students, rural forest communities, the media, industry groups, agriculture interests, the timber community, cultural representatives, and tourism and recreation groups. Participants encouraged continuous dialogue with public leaders.

Comments suggested visual presentation of the science and highlighted the importance of better using the media in communicating what science is demonstrating about our how our forests work. Moreover, participants recommended having a known, credible spokesperson to share science data and information with the public. Comments suggested sharing high quality information on a range of science topics, including:

- What worked and what hasn't from old forest plan;
- How forest, wildlife, etc. is doing;
- How the forest has changed over time;
- Critical factors impacting ESA species;
- Economic synthesis or analysis;
- Socio-economic information;
- Successes, e.g. wildlife underpasses;
- Spotted and barred owl interactions, including barred owl control experiment;
- A layering of depiction data understandable to public and scientists;
- Benefits and costs of different actions; and
- How new science is different than older science.

COLLECTIVE UNDERSTANDING/ GENERAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

A process with integrity, accountability and full transparency is desired. Listening session participants had a lot of questions about how the Forest Service will incorporate science in its forest plan revision decisions, including how the Agency defines science and best available science, what the Agency will do when the science conflicts or information is lacking or just emerging, and who is responsible for incorporating scientific information. Participants would also like to know how the Forest Service decides which science is relevant or reputable, and who makes this decision. Similarly, some participants want to know which science the Forest Service will “weight more heavily”. Participants requested transparency around the relative value of science versus other considerations. A general concern was shared about acceptance of the science (or conversely, ignoring science) and how we get there collectively. Participants want to

understand how science is currently used in the existing forest plans and whether or not our current process is effective.

Another suite of comments focused on the need to put science in lay terms and help increase collective understanding of the scientific process and terminology, including things like what makes a good model, what model limitations are, the peer review process, and how long science (including peer-review) takes. Moreover, some participants raised the idea that science can't provide all the answers we want and asked what should be done when science doesn't have the answer. Likewise, participants pointed out that science can't “fix everything” – science can't solve value issues. Science can inform policy and highlight pros and cons of particular management choices. Some participants would like the Forest Service to share the scientific basis behind current laws and policy to increase understanding of current policies.

Participants voiced support for the science synthesis process and wanted more information such as who the peer-reviewers will be, what the budget is, how the synthesis timeline fits in with the plan revision timeline, and how the Forest Service is going to engage communities to form new partnerships during the synthesis process. Participants asked if there would be opportunities for public and agency engagement in the development of the questions the synthesis will address, the peer review process, and recommending who should be included on the review panel. Participants would like a chance to submit science publications for consideration and would also like a website that creates transparency in the science synthesis process and a way for the public to view the science findings.

SCIENCE MISCELLANEOUS

The issues below were raised at the science roundtables but did not fit neatly into the categories discussed above. The comments are interesting and valuable, and we didn't want to lose them so include them here.

- How do we incorporate science in inventoried roadless area/ protected areas management?
- Do not use the Norm and Jerry plan.
- Use best available science to better manage special use areas (rec areas in NW Forest plan management area).
- Barred owl removal experiment will create issues.
- Science can unify communities.
- Practices have not been improved due to lack of management.
- Sometimes science has counter-intuitive results (e.g. black snags (from fire) result in more snowmelt than areas without snags like clear-cuts, and clear-cuts have higher snow retention).
- FS holds itself to the higher standard it expects from others.
- Planning overload – planning for the sake of planning.
- Access to old fire road maps.
- Factor revenue into new technology, research and tourism toward creation of new jobs.



for the greatest good