

Boise National Forest
ROUNDTABLE FLIPCHART NOTES
Thursday, April 8, 2010; 1:00 – 4:00 pm; 6:00 – 9:00 pm
Boise NF Supervisor's Office; 1249 S. Vinnell Way, Suite 200; Boise ID 83709

*Notes: Agenda (identical for both meetings) attached at end of these notes.
Afternoon group "self selected" into two groups for discussion questions.*

Afternoon Participants:

Name	Affiliation
John Heimer	Self
Chuck Jones	Simplot Livestock Co
Bill Lind	NOAA Fisheries
Dan Wines	Treasure Valley Trail Machine Assn (TVTMA)
Larry Taylor	Idaho Aviation Association
Sandra Mitchell	Idaho State Snowmobile Assn
Jack Lavin	Nat'l Association of Forest Service Retirees
Charles Franks	TVTMA; Southwestern Idaho Desert Racing Assn (SIDRA)
George Bacon	Idaho State Forester (Idaho Dept. of Lands)
Jessica Ruehrwein	Sierra Club
Michelle Crist ¹	The Wilderness Society
Jonathan Oppenheimer	Idaho Conservation League
Rick Ward	Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game
Jerald Johnstone	OHV user
Tracy Johnston	OHV user
Frances Symonds	Self
Ken Cole ²	Western Watersheds Project
Phil Canody	Self
Mark Menlove	Winter Wildlands
Whitney Rearick	Winter Wildlands

Evening Participants:

Name	Affiliation
Morris Huffman	Woody Biomass Utilization Partnership
Carl Bloomquist	Idaho State ATV Association
Scot McGavin	
Edwina Allen	Self
Scott Williams	TVTMA; SIDRA
Jesse Timberlake	Defenders of Wildlife
Mark Weaver	TVTMA
Katie Fite	Western Watersheds Project
Scott Ridel	Self
Chris Jones	Trout Unlimited

¹ One handout submitted in addition to verbal comments: Feb 16, 2010 letter from TWC to Harris Sherman, USDA Undersecretary

² Two handouts submitted in addition to verbal comments: Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Wild Sheep Working Group Interim Subcommittee Recommendations for Domestic Sheep and Goat Management in Wild Sheep Habitat (June 21, 2007); Regional Roundtable Addressing the Major Questions Posed by the US Forest Service Regarding Development of a New Planning Rule (undated)

General Discussion

1. What do you think a great planning rule would look like?

- Management priority to functioning ecosystems
- Facilitate meeting Forest Service mission
- Planning rule as simple and brief as possible
- Connectivity, highly functioning resilient ecosystems
- Flexible to incorporate new information
- Pass litigation
- Manage for really long term – 100-200 years
- Address needs of all stakeholders
- Understandable for everyone
- Simplistic
- Conservation emphasis
- Broad emphasis to include everything, i.e. recreation economy, etc.
- Science –driven
- Embrace multiple-use
- Preservation of watersheds
- Consider local impacts
- Re-connect waterways/watersheds to improve fish passage
- Protect and restore natural functions
- Allow migration corridors to accommodate connectivity
- More inclusive collaboration process
- Maintain public use without excessive fees
- Work across boundaries – landowners, agency, etc..
- Method to prioritize allocations for each resource
- Fairness for all parties involved
- Set sideboards that provide flexibility to address local concerns (social, environment, economical, climate change)

2. What works now; what concepts would you like to continue into the next planning rule?

- Important to have designated wilderness areas
- Species viability
- Re-visited every 10-15 years
- Provide opportunities for plan amendments
- Wildlife population viability
- Accountability –standards and guidelines
- Requirement for public involvement
- Opportunity for public appeal
- Interdisciplinary approach
- Standards “have to do’s” in the Forest Plan – overall guidance at forest scale
- Make standards stronger
- Continue with transparency brought by Internet
- More science-based fluidity to incorporate change

3. What doesn't work; what concepts would you like to leave behind?

- Needs to include winter travel planning
- Old '82 forest plan process not working
- How to translate plans into action – need balance between planning and action – planning should not be “the end”
- Planning doesn't clearly define outcomes
- Planning is expensive given current budgets
- Increase implementation and monitoring
- Need to be dynamic, fluid, easier to amend – have to be willing to amend
- May have lost expertise and staffing in implementation (lots of planners)
- Don't maintain SPP viability
- Emphasize role of partners in implementing, monitoring
- Cost and time to re-write plan
- 5-year monitoring report doesn't work – what's the benefit of this report?
- Plans are not adaptable
- Annual monitoring reports can be improved – often don't address issue
- ASQ – leave out – it's a distraction or re-define its definition to modern times
- Amendment process takes too long – even for small projects
- Every acre shouldn't have to provide everything for everybody and every species

Plan Content

4. What kind of information should be included in Forest Plans, and should they include standards and guidelines? If so what kind?

- No net loss of forest public lands
- Inventory and be aware of traditional uses – what's currently happening
- Science to validate uses on public land
- Qualitative and quantitative data
- Standards and guidelines should be flexible – not start from scratch. Adaptable.
- Accommodate change. Standards and guidelines should be rigid to be held accountable.
- Encourage standards and guidelines in forest plans
- Firmer rules with science base
- Effects of climate change on fish and wildlife
- Broad spectrum for issues like climate change
- Balance between social and science values
- Greater transparency – making information available to decrease FOIA's.
- ACS and WCS and include guidelines for timber, weeds, resources, etc.
- Keeping standards and guidelines – monitoring the guidelines
- Consider cost and economic efficiencies
- Keep management prescriptions
- “Standards and guidelines backbone of plan. Measures accountability.”
- Goals and objectives for short/long term
- Standards and guidelines developed at local level – not at a national level
- Reference to state and local plans

- Multiple-use statements and reports
- Collaboration and adaptive management are used to get around standards – also allows FS to not use best available science
- Minimum set of chapters –broken out by topic area (every plan should address climate change, invasive species accessibility, clean water)
- Don't micromanage forest – one size does not fit all
- Money where needs are
- Clean safe drinking water needs to be guaranteed across all forests
- Management areas ought to follow watershed boundaries
- Description of desired conditions: what does success look like?
- Maintain old growth forests and rare habitats, address roads and accessibility – incorporate impacts of wilderness

5. **How consistent should plans be across the country?**

- Depends – certain issues re universal, but others need to be more specific to that area
- Consistent set of chapters, topics to address
- Address by ecosystems – consistency across all forest plans should direct and emphasize project planning to address cumulative effects
- All address ecosystem resiliency, incorporate climate change
- Diversity as a way to help maintain resiliency
- Address connectivity
- Consistent format, standards and guidelines flexible
- Broader perspective, collaborative, work with other agencies to work together
- Improve consistency to ensure quality plan. Arbitrary boundaries don't impede good management decisions
- Idaho forests have same roadless rule as other states
- Less direction from national level, more local
- Regional consistency in shared states
- Need to look the same – basic outline should be consistent, layout consistent, same components
- Same numbering system
- Allow local flexibility to address issues and concerns
- Communication between forests to address different approaches
- Regional consistency based on similarities with neighboring forests
- Coordination between similar forest situations
- Adaptive management

Process Topics

6. **What suggestions do you have from making forest planning faster, simpler, more straightforward and less expensive?**

- Keeping politician interest to a minimum
- Not revise every 15 years if not necessary
- Less emphasis on outputs and more on what forest can actually sustain. More logic and sense to what forest can actually provide.
- Streamline public input process through technology – web-based comments. Consistent platform for public input.

- Transparency/accessible information on web
- Clear policy, objectives and goals
- More public outreach
- Minimize use of consultants who tend to gloss over issues/impacts
- Forest plan that is site specific
- Follow laws to avoid legal actions
- Programmatic agreements between agencies to avoid political process
- Collaborate and extensive public involvement will make better, more accepted plan – but not shorter or cheaper
- Up-front collaboration can make it shorter, cheaper
- Collaborate on desired future conditions, then let land managers go do it
- Trust the professionals
- Hold managers accountable.
- Making some mistakes and learning – taking a little risk or nothing will get done
- Desired future condition – establish up front
- Forest plans need to be strategic
- Write for average person - simple and succinct
- More photos and graphics
- Better web sites – better graphic design
- FS – don't rely on collaboration as decision making – FS ultimately needs to make decision
- Dedicated pots of money that can't be siphoned off – i.e. monitoring
- Make monitoring mandatory
- Too much time spent on NEPA due to NEPA requirements
- Analysis is important
- Develop committees that are facilitated to work through issues to develop solutions. External groups, interdisciplinary teams. Provide opportunity for creative solutions.
- Less detail in forest plan/ more detail in project
- Don't start from scratch when revising plan. Tweak what works. Better use of adaptive management. Revision versus re-creation
- Science is being questioned – definition of what is being looked at

7. When and how should plans be evaluated to see if they are working? What should trigger plan amendments?

- Leverage current technology
- Provide consistent public comment
- Monitor incoming feedback via web
- Current system works
- Need for collaborative monitoring (representative group, public group, interested parties)
- Increase of species monitoring/evaluating
- Public involvement in evaluation process
- Variation from a standard
- Notice of a change, or change in condition
- Legal action
- Outcome of 5 year study
- Incorporate stakeholders during evaluation – to a higher degree than current
- Continue annual and 5 year report

- Currently subjective and based on new information
- More willingness – amending requires money, litigation
- Find way to amend that is less expensive
- Major event should trigger amendment
- Monitoring can trigger
- Evaluation to determine next steps
- Hesitancy to open “pandora’s box” through monitoring and evaluation
- Include a specified time for monitoring report
- Threats and how to eliminate. Monitor and evaluate
- How to build in flexibility – stressors – threats don’t necessarily follow bureaucratic timeframes – tie to timeframes that science is finding
- Shorter monitoring intervals for same items

8. What is the best way to involve stakeholders in the planning process?

- Have to know about process; via web, media, organizations
- Zillions of Forest Service users but are not involved
- Social networking in a targeted way
- Figure out how to involve young people!
- More creative meetings: roundtables a good start
- Retail locations
- Be creative with outreach
- Stakeholders aren’t just people next door: they are all taxpayers!
- Web site: ways to “register” to be involved in projects x, y and z
- Drive people to your blogs
- Some people want to get involved only when their interests are affected: how to get in touch with them beforehand?
- Trailhead signs
- Website address on permits
- People tend to want to be involved in specific projects and that’s okay!
- “Sex up” the planning process
- Technology (blogs, e-mail lists, web)
- Consistent delivery of info
- Collaboration close to the ground
- More outreach
- Innovative in public interaction (i.e., field trips, get uninterested people interested in projects; on the ground meetings)
- Open house/town hall meetings
- Public hearings – speak in microphones
- Video clips that cover projects
- Traditional methods: newspapers, radio, TV
- Through NEPA process
- Put more information on website (Forest)
- Consistency on website
- Get more user groups involved; subscribable website
- Local stakeholder groups, video teleconference; weblogs – using a number of different methods to reach audiences

- Web: having a go-to place
 - Also see notes for question 9 below
- 9. How should the Forest Service collaborate with adjacent landowners, partners, and other agencies and governments in developing Forest Plans?**
- Need for collaboration
 - Upper management needs to listen
 - Video teleconference
 - Roundtables with interested parties
 - Focus collaboration on goals and objectives
 - Engage stakeholders in the beginning
 - Also see notes for questions 5, 8 above
- 10. How can the next planning rule foster restoration of NFS lands?**
- Restoration needs to be defined: what does restoration include/exclude?
 - Desire future forest conditions should remain
 - Adaptation in terms of restoration
 - Make definition of restoration well known
 - Rule could allow forests to identify restoration areas
 - Restoration = desired future condition
 - Restoration as defining what we once had may not be realistic or achievable
 - Sustainable – protecting resources and providing what we want
 - Restoration is targeting sustainable conditions – proactive, not reactive
 - Need definition and timeframe
 - Nonmotorized fosters restoration.
 - But horses create impacts! Snowmobile tracks don't last
 - What IS restoration?
 - Areas managed for multiple use where necessary. Balance opportunity.
 - More integrated ecosystems. Creating a balance
 - Consistent definition. Find ways to minimize human disturbance as treatments. Natural systems.
 - Less engineered solutions.
 - Better job of infrastructure inventory. Knowing what we have and not building more.
 - Mitigation and monitoring instead of prohibition.

Substantive Topics

- 11. What, if any, climate change assumptions should be used when developing Forest Plans?**
- A potential assumption
 - What does climate change mean to Forest Service?
 - Recognize as potential influence and make “tweaks” as necessary.
 - Maintaining diversity at landscape level
 - Assume it's a changing state
 - Forest Plans should recognize climates will change and have always changed
 - Maintain habitats so wildlife can adapt
 - Things moving fast but still need to adhere to NEPA process
 - Rec patterns will have to change (i.e., less snow)

- Forests are carbon sinks: grazing releases carbon and makes less of a carbon sink
- Climates changing at a faster rate now (due to human influence?). More quickly than wildlife can adapt – may not be able to maintain habitats.
- Uncertainty – not sure how climate change will affect Forests – have Plans that are adaptable
- Create diversity in structure and size to enhance resilience.
- Some structures and species may be more adaptable.
- Intensive management may not be socially acceptable.
- Forest Plans should look at climate change regionally.
- Use Precautionary Principle: use caution when making decisions so as not to cause damage.
- Use existing climate change science
- Use actual knowledge – don't make assumptions
- Maintain areas of habitat that aren't fragmented
- Majority consensus to make decision: standard for percentage of agreement
- Forest can act as "safe haven" for wildlife, fauna, etc.
- Protect higher elevation lands and watersheds
- Emphasis between BLM and Forest Service in working together. Winter/summer habitat collaboration.
- Make plans with the understanding that forests trap carbon that if released will have an effect

12. How should the Forest Service take into account water availability, and water quality factors, that are outside of Forest Service control?

- Crucial water quality/quantity are not overly consumed or impacted
- Pollution concerns. Buffer to minimize impacts of pollution on water quality
- Water accessibility and availability
- Aquifers – not just what is on the surface.
- Be cautious not to overstep boundary on water rights.
- Coordinate with State and other agencies.
- Each Forest should review this based on situation.
- Issue needs to be addressed outside of the plan.

13. How should the planning rule guide monitoring and protection of at-risk species of animals and plants and their habitats?

- Species viability. Monitor species populations.
- Do we need more policy on top of existing policies: no need to replicate
- Mitigate and monitor; don't prohibit without knowing effects
- FS needs rules and regulations and to monitor. Take ownership of wildlife on FS lands.
- Multiple land-use needs collaboration. Collaborative process in place.
- Management indicator species – expand and retain
- Need more indicator species
- Lack of education on decision process for species: listing
- Mindful of mitigation corridors/habitat conditions
- Need baseline information, including systematic surveys in order to determine trend.
- Assessment over large-scale: good communication between regions to assess movement
- Determine responsibility for species to determine who monitors and pays for
- Consistency in data sources
- Maintain management indicator species ("canary in a coal mine") – make sure the ones you pick are appropriate

- Need to have the tools to deal with the threats
- FS talks across Forest boundaries and to Research
- Enforceable viability standards
- Monitoring of populations AND habitats
- Wildlife Conservation Strategy and Aquatic Conservation Strategy
- Standards and guides
- Spatial genetics
- Consultation with State agencies
- Population viability

14. What should the planning rule say about how Forest Plans deal with providing goods and services that contribute to vibrant local, regional, and national economies?

- Need to be considered
- People living near forests need a voice (rural)
- Everyone needs a voice (urban and rural, those making or not making living off forest)
- Accountability on those making a living off forest products
- Provide balance for all people, not just locals
- Every acre cannot provide everything for everybody
- Definition of goods and services changing
- Need viability (timber, wildlife, etc.) to be sustainable
- Everyone has a definition of goods and services
- Maximize goods and services
- Sustainable goods and services
- Make clear: clean water, sense of place, ecosystem values, recreational opportunities
- Make broad
- To contribute to vibrant economies, need “certainty (i.e., likely availability) of supply – on the other hand, what industry really gets that certainty?
- Loggers help us achieve our silvicultural objectives
- How do we place a value on the nonquantifiable things that are important, without privatizing them?
- People value things even if they are not next to them: national economy
- How to we maintain the skills that allow us to get the work done?
- Accept the fact that there’s not much demand for foresters, miners. Recreation helps economies keep going.
- Planning rule should say that Forest Plans should consider and account for all economies and support them.
- The change in the timber industry has forever changed the culture, lifestyle and economy in areas of rural America that traditionally made their living in the National Forest system. The planning process should incorporate considerations to address this. Some would say that the people impacted should move, re-educate or adapt to cope, but I would argue that for some this is simply not possible whether due to age, disability or other factors. The plan should consider this socio/economic factor as previous plans and policy are to, in part, blame. Ideas to generate new industry for the local economy should be considered such as recreation, alternative fuels and other modern industries.³

³ Submitted as a followup comment April 9 am.

15. What should the planning rule say about recreational access, and visitor facilities and services?

- Addressed at local level
- Develop standards and guidelines
- Follow template of Travel Rule
- Make it required
- Providing info on recreational access etc
- Make available
- Should address airstrips
- Not one size fits all
- Recognize local communities are affected economically and socially. Disagree: functioning ecosystems should be priority, not social and economic effects.
- Bicycles should be treated as non-motorized.
- No one recreational vehicle or user has more right than others.
- Open up new opportunities in addition to or in lieu of restrictions – but one size does not fit all – not true in all cases.
- Fees for mountain bikes, etc: voluntary or required. They use facilities too.
- Gas tax/motorized fee facilities are open to all!
- Honor grandfathered uses!
- Rule should require winter travel planning and account for motorized impacts (i.e., noise)
- Greater understanding of impacts that various uses cause and not assume that one use has more impact than another. Negative and positive effects. Use science to help determine impact.
- Recognize cultural and wildlife management role of hunting.
- Understanding what best places to hunt and fish look like.
- Don't privatize our lands or permitting processes.
- Important to economic situations
- Encourage people to recreate – sense of place, healthy for society
- Fancy facilities are not necessary – rustic, primitive. "Not Disneyland in the woods."
- Balance recreation with sustainability.
- Emphasis on children in woods, education
- Education outreach
- Public lands belong to everyone with all abilities. Multiple use, multiple access.
- Long-term perspective: wildlife sustainability, watershed sustainability. Availability for future generations.

16. Is there anything else you would like to suggest about the forest planning rule?

- Keep public involved
- Keep more people involved
- Keeping perspective of money – not too frugal: this is important!
- Summary for people to help with understanding
- Better understanding of current plan
- Airstrips need to be addressed
- This roundtable is good approach to hear others' interests
- Another way to collaborate with one another
- Closely evaluate cost of forming a new rule vs. making tweaks to existing rule

- Not totally convinced this new process will be successful
- Difference in approaches to various roundtables across Regions: why?
- Have 45-day comment period after FEIS, to allow for comment before a decision is made. Then make appeal period short.
- Make above true for Forest Plans and other NEPA docs.
- Need good public outreach!
- Adopt WAFMA recommendations for domestic sheep and goat management in wild sheep habitat.
- Implementing a process is not success! Sustaining the health, diversity and productivity of land and resources is!

Forest Service Planning Rule Roundtables

Thursday, April 8, 2010: 1:00 – 4:00 pm: Boise National Forest Supervisor's Office

1:00	Welcome; Agenda review; Introductions
1:10	Power Point Presentation; Q&A
1:30	General Discussion <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What do you think a great planning rule would look like?2. What works now; what concepts would you like to continue into the next planning rule?3. What doesn't work; what concepts would you like to leave behind? Plan Content
2:00	<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. What kind of information should be included in Forest Plans, and should they include standards and guidelines? If so what kind?5. How consistent should plans be across the country?
2:20	Process Topics <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. What suggestions do you have from making forest planning faster, simpler, more straightforward and less expensive?7. When and how should plans be evaluated to see if they are working? What should trigger plan amendments?8. What is the best way to involve stakeholders in the planning process?9. How should the Forest Service collaborate with adjacent landowners, partners, and other agencies and governments in developing Forest Plans? Substantive Topics <ol style="list-style-type: none">10. How can the next planning rule foster restoration of NFS lands?11. What, if any, climate change assumptions should be used when developing Forest Plans?12. How should the Forest Service take into account water availability, and water quality factors, that are outside of Forest Service control?13. How should the planning rule guide monitoring and protection of at-risk species of animals and plants and their habitats?14. What should the planning rule say about how Forest Plans deal with providing goods and services that contribute to vibrant local, regional, and national economies?15. What should the planning rule say about recreational access, and visitor facilities and services?16. Is there anything else you would like to suggest about the forest planning rule?
3:55	Closing <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ways to provide additional input: blog, attend and/or watch video streaming of national Roundtables in Washington DC (April 20-21 or May 11-12), participate in the next round of stakeholder involvement- Meeting summary will be prepared by Meridian and posted on regional and national website within a week- Thanks for attending!

Facilitators: Cyd Weiland, Boise NF (afternoon group #1, evening group)
Paul Bryant, Boise NF (afternoon group #2)

Notetakers: Cyd Weiland, Boise NF (afternoon group #1)
Christine Romero, Boise NF/Region 1 (afternoon group #2, evening group)