

Regional Summary Report
Southwestern Region 3

US Forest Service Planning Rule
Roundtable Discussions
and
Public Meeting/Open House Discussions

Albuquerque, New Mexico and
Phoenix, Arizona
April 28, 2010

Prepared by:

Lucy Moore
Lucy Moore Associates, Inc.
5 Seton Plaza
Santa Fe, NM 87508
505-820-2166
Fax 505-820-2191
lucymoore@nets.com

and

Dexter Albert
Intrinsic Consulting, LLC
1400 N. Lomalai Lane
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
(928) 522-6015
Fax (928) 522-6016
dexter@intrinsicinfo.com

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report serves as a summary of the issues raised and the suggestions offered during the Stakeholder/Agency Roundtable and the Public Meeting/Open House events held on April 28, 2010, at the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico and at the Heard Museum and Radisson Airport North in Phoenix, Arizona.

The goals of this public involvement process in the Southwestern Region 3 were:

- To offer participants information on the Planning Rule Revision Process in as clear and engaging a way as possible
- To enter into a discussion with the full range of stakeholders, agencies, and citizens with an interest in forest issues
- To gather reactions, concerns, ideas and recommendations from these participants in a way that will help inform the rule writing team
- To lay the foundation for a rule revision process that will be inclusive, informative and collaborative

We are offering below five major themes that emerged during these discussions. Since consensus was not the goal of this process -- but rather a lively and energetic discussion of the issues -- these themes do not suggest any agreement among participants. Facilitators have selected these themes as central to much of the discussion they heard during their time with attendees. More detailed treatment of these themes, and many others, appears in the Summary or Input section for each state, as well as the appendices of this report.

- **Include Us – early, sincerely, respectfully**

No matter their particular interest, the full range of participants asked to be included in processes relating to Forest planning, management and use, at the national, regional and forest or grasslands level. Whether hikers, loggers or conservationists, federal agencies, local government or traditional communities, all are interested in understanding and participating in these processes. They want to be taken seriously, listened to and they want to have evidence that they were really heard. Too often, consultation and comments seem to go into a “black hole” and the Forest Service moves forward with its agenda, satisfied that it “checked the box” for public involvement, or for collaboration – a word many are suspicious of as the latest bit of jargon. They asked for inclusion to be early, at the beginning of the process, and to be continuous, through to the conclusion. They resented the perfunctory public comment, or consultation, period after a draft document is released, and asked specifically that these planning rule concepts be shared over time as they evolve. Nearly every roundtable and small group discussion voiced the desire for greater collaboration early and throughout the development and implementation of land management plans. The desired level of collaboration includes both public involvement/participation and collaboration between all levels and jurisdictions of government agencies, as well as international agencies. Many participants desire land managers to make use of all the available science and resources to inform their efforts, independent of the source.

- **Protect our community and cultural resources**

For both Native American and Non-native communities in New Mexico, the protection of certain resources is critical to their subsistence, in terms of maintaining traditions, sustaining a healthy lifestyle, and the survival of cultural and spiritual practices. The planning rule, they said, should acknowledge, consider and protect traditional sites, practices and properties during the forest planning process. Participants pointed out that most rural communities adjacent to forest lands have specific economic, social or cultural needs related to forest resources. These needs may include gathering firewood, harvesting medicinal plants and roots, and religious and ceremonial practices at certain sites at certain times of the year. Community members need access to these resources on Forest Service land, and protection of these resources from degradation by other forest uses or activities. They also need consideration of their lifestyle and cultural practices on tribal lands when the agency is making policy and project decisions that might affect these practices.

- **Go beyond the jurisdictional boundaries**

Many throughout the discussions favored an all-lands approach to planning and management of forest lands. The jurisdictional boundaries that separate federal lands from private, local government and tribal are seen as artificial and an obstacle to efficient, productive land management. The planning rule needs to encourage collaboration with neighboring partners where boundaries are shared. There were examples of joint planning and management with tribal or local governments, or with other federal agencies, and even private landowners. For many activities – such as invasive species eradication – drawing the line at the boundary makes no sense, and results in wasted effort and money. By working on cross-boundary, collaborative projects, the Forest Service and its partners may be able to pool both monetary and staff resources for a greater impact than if each acted separately. Many participants expressed the opinion that water and wildlife do not recognize political boundaries, and efforts to conserve and restore these resources will not be effective without due consideration of factors that affect them outside of National Forest lands. An “all lands” approach is seen as an effective means of protecting and preserving contiguous lands by facilitating collaborative decision-making and information sharing across public, private and tribal ownership.

- **Protect our watersheds**

There was broad support for a national planning rule that mandates consideration of watersheds when planning and implementing projects at the local level. Water is life, water is more valuable than the timber, over 60% of New Mexico’s surface water resources originate in the forests – these were commonly heard testimonies to the importance of water in the southwest. There was an understanding that the health of resources is interdependent, and that logging, thinning, prescribed burns and other treatments of the land can have impact on resources like wildlife and plant life, water quality, and community well-being within the same watershed. Although there was not agreement on whether or not watersheds were an appropriate ecological planning unit, most were supportive of a holistic view of watersheds in the planning process.

- **Use us – we have a lot to offer**

Both local residents, neighboring Forest Service land, and other users of these lands, made offers of services to the agency.

Facilitators frequently heard: “There is more to science than the academic, peer-reviewed kind. We have local knowledge that can help you.” These “citizen scientists” from neighboring rural and traditional communities asked that they be included in the agency’s pool of expertise on forest resources. Those that have lived on and worked the land for generations have a deep knowledge of the animal and plant life, the seasonal cycles and climate shifts, soil characteristics, runoff patterns, the use of fire, and more. They are eager to share this wisdom and ask to be consulted when the Forest Service is revising plans at the national or local level, or designing projects on a particular forest. With high unemployment in many of these areas, there is often also a willing labor force, ready to work on projects, thinning, harvesting, improving roads, etc.

In addition, those who enjoy recreating on forest lands offered volunteer services to help maintain and restore forest lands. Hikers, climbers, skiers, wildlife enthusiasts, and pilots offered their help in a variety of ways, including counting wildlife, identifying plant species, and clearing trails.

- **The new Planning Rule should allow flexibility at the regional and forest level.** While many participants believe that land management plans should be developed in the context of an “all lands” approach, many also cited that a “one size fits all” rule will not be effective. Flexibility must be allowed for regional and local decision-making.
- **The new Planning Rule should emphasize sustainability as the goal for developing management plans.** Many participants expressed the desire to achieve greater balance between the objectives of economies and conservation. Sustainability should be the ultimate goal of all plans and programs.
- **The new Planning Rule should emphasize ongoing public education.** Many participants expressed concern that there is a lack of connection to forest lands, particularly among youth. This has resulted in fewer visitors to National Forests, and the lack of a sense of responsibility for their preservation. Education on cultural heritage, stewardship, and use of the land is critical to protection of National Forests and Grasslands for future generations.

These themes represent a sampling of the ideas and recommendations from the Region Three roundtable discussions and are not areas of complete consensus, although they do reflect some overlaps in perspective and issues of concern. There are many more suggestions in the roundtable meeting notes following this summary, and the participants want the rule-writing team members to know about them all.

INTRODUCTION

The US Forest Service recently announced its intention to develop a comprehensive new Planning Rule to meet future management needs for the nation's 155 national forests and 20 grasslands. As a new Rule will have significant environmental, economic, and cultural ramifications, the UD Forest Service initiated an extensive collaborative process to engage citizens, interest groups, and governments in discussions to address these issues in a new Rule. The goal is to develop an effective Rule that provides a structure for developing management plans and is effective over time.

In support of this national collaborative process, the Southwestern Region (Region 3) held a series of events in both Arizona and New Mexico. These events are described below:

Tribal Workshops:

In order to expand the opportunities for exchange between tribal governments and Forest Service staff, Region 3 hosted four tribal workshops, two in Arizona and two in New Mexico. All four workshops were held in tribally owned, or affiliated, facilities. Not intended to be formal government-to-government consultations, these conversations were informal and designed to gain early input from tribes in the plan revision process, as well as to build relationships between the tribes and the federal agency. Each workshop began with welcoming remarks from the Regional Forester (in New Mexico) and the Deputy Regional Forester (in Arizona), a video welcome from Secretary of Agriculture Vilsack and the Chief Forester Tom Tidwell, and a power point presentation given by the Region 3 Director of Planning in New Mexico and the Arizona State Liaison in Arizona, describing the rule revision process and the collaborative approach of the agency. Facilitators (Lucy Moore in New Mexico and Dexter Albert in Arizona) then led a discussion on issues relating to the planning rule. Inevitably and importantly, the group talked about other issues as well including how to improve communication between the agency and tribes, and how to insure that the formal consultation process is honored in both letter and intent of the law. Each workshop was concluded by the Regional Forester or the Deputy Regional Forester who reflected on the conversation and thanked tribal participants for sharing their wisdom with him.

The summaries of these discussions with tribal leaders are in a separate document to maintain the integrity of the comments.

Stakeholder Roundtables:

Two Roundtables were held concurrently in New Mexico and Arizona. The goal of these sessions was to provide a format for an informal discussion among a small number of stakeholders on a particular topic drawn from the eight principles set out in the Notice of Intent of December 18, 2009. Region 3 invited approximately 65 from each state, representing the full range of stakeholders. For purposes of the Roundtables, stakeholders were defined to include

all those with an interest in the development of the national planning rule -- other federal agencies, state, local and tribal government, political subdivisions of the state, business, industry, NGOs, and those with an environmental, recreational or community interests in forest lands.

The intent of Region 3 was not to exclude participants from the Roundtable process, but rather to insure a representative cross section of those with an interest in Forest Service planning processes. Facilitators contacted those who had been invited to encourage their participation; those who were not on the invitation list, but who contacted Region 3 or the facilitators were welcomed and added to the list. In addition, there were many who came to the Roundtables unregistered, and they were welcomed and included as well. In Arizona, approximately 30 had registered, with an actual attendance of 45. In New Mexico, 48 had responded, and the total attendance was 73. Organizers and participants alike were pleased by the enthusiastic turnout, and were gratified that both forums included the diversity of interests they had sought.

The Roundtables began with the same welcome and presentations as the tribal workshops. Lead facilitators (Lucy Moore in New Mexico and Dexter Albert in Arizona) facilitated a brief question, answer and comment period prior to breaking into the roundtables. During this time, participants could receive clarification on the planning process, and could raise some of the themes that were to emerge in more detail later in the smaller groups.

Each roundtable (6 in Arizona and 11 in New Mexico) was led by a facilitator. In some cases, the facilitator took notes of the discussion, in some cases there was a separate recorder taking notes. Facilitators and recorders were independent contractors to the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, a quasi-governmental organization partnering with the Forest Service in the design and implementation of this initial phase of the public involvement for the revision of the Planning Rule. They were able to interact easily with participants because of this neutral status.

Forest Service staff from the region and from the Washington Office served as support for the Roundtable discussions, but did not sit at the tables with the facilitators. They roamed, listening to the discussions, and were available if specific questions came up. Their placement was deliberate and intended to focus the conversation on the stakeholders at the table, rather than on a Forest Service staff person who might inevitably become the target of questions or comments.

Tables were assigned topics related to the eight principles, plus a table for recreation. Participants moved every half hour from one table to another as they wished. There was also a table available for those who had another issue to raise. At the end of the three rounds, the Regional Forester, or his Deputy, offered concluding remarks that reflect what he had heard and expressed appreciation to all for taking the time and energy to participate.

The six Roundtable topics were:

- Restoration, conservation, watershed health
- Climate change and adaptive management
- Diversity, wildlife
- Economies, social values
- Public collaboration, all-lands approach
- Recreation

Public Meeting/Open Houses:

Region 3 provided an opportunity for anyone to learn about the Planning Rule revision process and offer comments and suggestions at two Public Meeting/Open Houses, held concurrently in Arizona and New Mexico. Forty attended in Phoenix; forty-five in Albuquerque. The agenda for these events was similar to the Roundtable, beginning with the welcoming remarks, the video, the power point presentation, and an hour long facilitated discussion in the plenary. Following the facilitated discussion, instead of moving from one round table to the next, participants moved from station to station as they wished. Three of the four stations were based on groupings of the eight principles; one station was devoted to recreation. Each station had a flip chart with a recorder, as well as a subject matter expert to discuss the topic with participants as they came by. Following the open house, the Regional Forester, or his Deputy, again offered concluding remarks and thanked everyone for their participation.

The four station topics were:

- Restoration, climate change, watershed health
- Collaboration, all-lands approach
- Diversity of plant and wildlife, adaptive management
- Recreation

Following the events the notes from all the plenaries, roundtable discussions, and open house discussion were compiled. They can be found in the Appendix, following this report. From those notes the lead facilitators in each state have produced separate summary reports on the process, one for Arizona and one for New Mexico. Both are included in this document. Summaries of the tribal workshops are in a separate document.

MEETING OVERVIEW

Meeting Locations and Numbers of Participants:

Tribal Workshops

- Northern New Mexico Tribal Workshop
Poeh Center, Pueblo of Pojoaque, Pojoaque, New Mexico
April 27, 2010 9:00 – 11:00 am
6 participants, 2 tribes + BIA
- Central New Mexico Tribal Workshop
Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico
April 28, 2010 9:00 – 11:00 am
9 participants, 6 tribes + BIA
- Southern Arizona Tribal Workshop
Heard Museum, Phoenix, Arizona
April 28, 2010 9:00 – 11:00 am
1 participant, 1 tribe
- Northern Arizona Tribal Workshop
Hopi Administrative Offices, Flagstaff, Arizona
April 29, 2010 2:00 – 4:00 pm
7 participants, 3 tribes + NPS

Stakeholder Roundtables

- New Mexico Roundtable
Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico
April 28, 2010 1:00 – 4:00 pm
73 participants
- Arizona Roundtable
Heard Museum, Phoenix, Arizona
April 28, 2010 1:00 – 4:00 pm
42 participants

Public Meeting/Open Houses

- Public Meeting/Open House
Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico
April 28, 2010 6:00 – 8:30 pm
40 participants
- Public Meeting/Open House
Radisson Airport North, Phoenix, Arizona
April 28, 2010 6:00 – 8:30 pm
41 participants

Point of Contact for the Worksheet Summarizer and Regional Summary Report

- Lucy Moore and Dexter Albert are responsible for the compilation of the worksheets and the writing of the final summary report.
- Lucy Moore & Associates, an independent consulting firm offering services in facilitation, mediation, training and coaching, with a focus on natural resource and cross-cultural issues, was contracted by the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution to work with Southwestern Region 3 on the design and implementation of this series of forums.
- Lucy Moore contracted with Dexter Albert and Intrinsic Consulting to assist with the design, facilitation and summarizing of the Arizona meetings; Intrinsic is an independent consulting firms specializing in public involvement, stakeholder facilitation, citizen outreach and conflict resolution.
- Roundtable discussions were led by experienced facilitators, under the direction of Lucy Moore & Associates and Intrinsic Consulting. Forest Service staff did not participate actively at the roundtables but provided information and served as subject matter experts when requested by roundtable participants; however, FS personnel served as facilitators during the evening open houses.
- Person completing these notes:
 - Lucy Moore, phone: (505) 820-2166, email: lucymoore@nets.com
 - Dexter Albert, phone: (928) 522-6015, email: dexter@intrinsicinfo.com

A Note on the Written Products for Region 3

Because the rule-writing team must consolidate and consider input from many regions, each note taker at each roundtable developed a record of the discussion for Region Three consistent with the worksheet format used in other regions. The notes from each roundtable topic vary slightly to reflect the unique conversations held at each table, and are presented in their original language to honor the integrity of each of those conversations. The rule-writing team has been provided with these original notes as well as individual written comments presented at these Region 3 events, which are also included in the appendix. The original notes were submitted to the rule-writing team within three working days of the event; the final summary report within seven working days.

The notes and the final summary for the four tribal workshops are not included in this document. At the request of the Forest Service, and on the advice of tribal leadership, these conversations and comments are kept separate. They are being forwarded to the Forest Service rule-writing team on the same schedule as the other written products, described above.

Diversity of Attendance at the Meetings

The appropriate categories are checked to indicate presence at the meeting in Arizona:

Financial Users

Oil and Gas
✓ Timber Users
Outfitters
✓ Ecotourism
Ski Areas
✓ Grazing Permit Holders
Mining

NGOs

✓ Endangered Species
✓ Environmental Groups
Sustainable Communities
Environmental Justice

Users

✓ Off road Vehicle
✓ Mountain Bike
Horse Riders
✓ Hiker
✓ Wilderness
✓ Neighbor
Cabin Owner

Academic

✓ Science
✓ Economics
✓ Planning
Adaptive Management
Global Climate Change

Other Governmental Entities

✓ Fish and Wildlife Service
EPA
BLM
✓ County Government
✓ State Government
✓ Tribal Government

Forest Service Staff

✓ Regional FS staff
✓ National FS staff
including planning staff
National Grasslands

The appropriate categories are checked to indicate presence at the meeting in New Mexico:

Financial Users

Oil and Gas
✓ Timber Users
✓ Outfitters
✓ Ecotourism
✓ Ski Areas
✓ Grazing Permit Holders
Mining

NGOs

✓ Endangered Species
✓ Environmental Groups
✓ Sustainable Communities
✓ Environmental Justice

Users

✓ Off road Vehicle
✓ Mountain Bike
✓ Horse Riders
✓ Hiker
✓ Wilderness
✓ Neighbor
Cabin Owner

Academic

✓ Science
Economics
Planning
Adaptive Management
Global Climate Change

Other Governmental Entities

✓ Fish and Wildlife Service
EPA
✓ BLM
✓ County Government
✓ State Government
✓ Tribal Government
✓ US Congress

Forest Service Staff

✓ Regional FS staff
✓ National FS staff
including planning staff
National Grasslands

Affiliations of Participants in ARIZONA

An extensive outreach program was implemented to maximize awareness of the national collaborative effort to develop a new Planning Rule and to encourage a broad-ranging diversity of public participation from throughout the Southwestern Region.

The following list of represented affiliations was obtained from the meeting sign-in sheets. As some participants did not sign in or did not list an affiliation, the list should not be considered complete:

Stakeholder Roundtables

1. Arizona Forest Restoration Products, Inc.
2. Arizona Forestry Division
3. Arizona Game & Fish
4. Arizona Outdoor Sports
5. Arizona Pilots Association
6. Arizona State Forestry
7. Arizona State Parks
8. Arizona Trail Association
9. Arizona Trail Riders & Off-Highway Vehicle Club
10. Arizona Wilderness Coalition
11. Bureau of Reclamation
12. Center for Biological Diversity
13. Defenders of Wildlife
14. Eastern Arizona Counties Organization
15. Environmental Planning Group
16. Gila County Cattle Growers
17. Gila River Indian Community
18. Grand Canyon Trust
19. Grand Canyon Wildlands Council
20. Maricopa Audubon Society
21. National Forest Counties and School Coalition
22. Northern Arizona Loggers Association
23. Northern Arizona University - Ecological Restoration Institute
24. Pinal County Sheriff's Office
25. Prescott College
26. Recreational Aviation Foundation
27. Salt River Project
28. Sierra Club
29. Sky Island Alliance
30. The Nature Conservancy
31. University of Arizona
32. U.S. Dept of Agriculture-Natural Resources Conservation Services
33. Young Public School

Affiliations of Participants in New Mexico

The following list of represented affiliations was obtained from the meeting sign-in sheets. As some participants did not sign in or did not list an affiliation, the list should not be considered complete:

1. Albuquerque Wildlife Fed.
2. American Endurance Ride
3. American Wild Horse Preservation
4. Backcountry Horsemen of Santa Fe
5. Backcountry Hunters & Anglers
6. Bureau of Indian Affairs
7. Bureau of Land Management
8. Carnue community
9. Catron County
10. Central NM Audubon Society
11. Chilili Land Grant
12. Choose Outdoors
13. Coalition of AZ/NM Counties
14. Congressional staff (3)
15. Continental Divide Trail Alliance
16. Defenders of Wildlife
17. Forest Guild
18. Grant Soil&Water Conservation D.
19. Great Old Broads for Wilderness
20. High Desert Riders
21. Highlands University
22. JACO Outfitters, LLC
23. Jicarilla Apache Nation
24. Land Enterprise Products
25. Latino Ranchers Association
26. Manzano Land Grant
27. Mount Taylor Millwork
28. Nature Conservancy
29. Navajo Nation
30. New Mexico Acequia Commission
31. NM Association of Counties
32. NM Aviation Division
33. NM Cattle Growers Association
34. NM Department of Agriculture
35. NM Farm & Livestock Bureau
36. NM Forest Industries
37. NM Forest Industry Association
38. NM Game and Fish Dept.
39. NM Land Grant Council
40. NM OHVA
41. NM Pilots Association
42. NM State Forestry
43. NM State University
44. NM Trout Unlimited
45. NM Water & Wastewater Division
46. New Mexico Wilderness Alliance
47. No. NM Stockmen's Association
48. Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo
49. Otero County
50. Pathways Wildlife Corridors NM
51. Picuris Pueblo
52. Pueblo of Isleta
53. Pueblo of Laguna
54. Pueblo of Sandia
55. Quivira Coalition
56. Recreational Aviation Foundation
57. Rio Arriba County
58. Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
59. Santa Fe County commission
60. Saving Americas Horses
61. Sierra Club
62. Sierra Club Hunter-Angler Campaign
63. Ski New Mexico
64. Society of American Foresters
65. Stone Age Climbing Gym
66. US Department of Agriculture
67. US Fish and Wildlife Service
68. US Inst.for Env.Conflict Resolution
69. Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
70. Valles Caldera National Preserve
71. White Mt Conservation League
72. Wild Earth Guardians
73. Wild Horse Observers
74. Wilderness Alliance
75. Wilderness Society

Ideas and Recommendations

Outlined below are the main ideas that emerged from the roundtable and public meeting/open house discussions in both Arizona and New Mexico. These summaries are presented here to give a sense of the breadth and variety of suggestions and input, not to replace the need to review all suggestions attached. All participants did not agree on all of the following comments, but some or many participants agreed on each of them.

What would a GREAT planning rule look like?

A great planning rule would:

Set the proper tone:

- Insure that “at the end of the day, there is a Forest left for my grandson.”
- Establish a moral obligation and sense of responsibility in us all to be good stewards of forest resources, to preserve them, restore them and pass them on.

Encourage collaboration:

- Require the Forest Service, at all levels, to offer the opportunity for input by those interested in forest resources before decisions are made, and require that the Forest Service respond to those comments in a meaningful way.
- Instruct regions, districts and forests to partner and work with counties, tribes, and federal and state agencies for cross-boundary collaboration.
- Mandate that Forest Service staff working with communities be supported in the building of working relationships with local interests, be allowed to stay in those communities and learn from local wisdom.

Be clear and accessible:

- Be clear in its language and accessible in its structure, with sections relating to different uses, etc.
- Include mechanisms and sufficient clarity to ensure no confusion or bias in their interpretation by individual Forest Service employees.
- Identify existing laws that apply and present clearly, through a matrix perhaps, how these laws are being addressed

Recognize, value local communities:

- Require consideration of the human environment as well as the biological environment in the planning process.
- Recognize and seek to support local custom and culture, of tribal and other traditional and land-based communities, that depend on Forest Service lands.
- Recognize historic rights of communities that predate the creation of the Forest Service, and in some cases the existence of the United States.
- Provide for local flexibility in implementation

What does not work: Concepts from current Rule that some would like to see changed

- Would like to see greater balance between commodities/use and protection of resources. Past rules are perceived to favor economy over conservation.
- Greater accountability and enforcement of monitoring and program follow-through.

Concerns/Problems with Plan Content

- Five of the six National Forests in Arizona are proceeding with revisions to their Land & Resource Management Plans under the 1982 rule. The transition language in the new rule should allow for these forests to incorporate new directives.
- There is much confusion about the definition of terms – Restoration, Sustainability, Recreation, Access, Scale, Ecosystem - many participants would like to see some clarification, while recognizing that total consensus is not possible.

Recommendations for Plan Content

- Maintain flexibility for regional and local decision-making, and encourage planning at many levels.
- Make provisions for adaptive management to allow land managers to address newly emerging issues.
- Include forward-thinking guidance to help plans take a more proactive approach to land management.

Should the new planning rule require standards and guidelines in all plans?

- The new rule should require concrete objectives that give people boundaries and certainty (such as standards and guidelines) instead of goals related to desired future condition. Without them the plan is aspirational and can't be measured.
- Desired condition for an area is too vague – how do you know when you have come to the tipping point? The tipping point should be set as a standard. They must be enforceable. Use both the desired condition and some metric or standard for guiding decision-making.
- There should be something in the rule that allows some flexibility to get things done.
- The rule should set standards for recreation – these standards should include the type or recreation and the numbers to determine the carrying capacity of an area.

To what extent should the planning rule require national consistency and accommodate regional differences?

- The rules should reflect a mechanism so the planning processes can be uniform among and between forests
- The rulemaking process should give consideration to the local conditions and needs that may exist in a particular area; allow forest plans to individualize their diversity, etc.
- The rule should facilitate the integration of the plans into what is currently happening with the consideration of flexibility as conditions change
- When an activity negatively impacts a forest, the rule should be flexible enough to allow the area to be assessed and changes made
- Avoid a cookie cutter, one size fits all approach in defining scale; scale should vary depending on the region, the climate, cycles, etc.

Summary of Input for Substantive Principles from ARIZONA meetings

I. Plans could address the need for restoration and conservation to enhance the resilience of ecosystems to a variety of threats.

- Restoration and conservation should adhere to natural ecosystem boundaries, not simply political borders or jurisdictions. Ecosystem resiliency is the ultimate goal. Consider all components of the ecosystem, how actions impact neighboring lands.
- The Rule should aim to clarify the definition of “restoration” using clear science. Considerations when crafting the definition should include:
 - A forward-looking component as well retrospective
 - Goals that incorporate site potential
 - Time period
 - Scalability
 - Spatial area
 - Measurability
- The Rule could encourage utilization of the historical record, cultural resources and traditional tribal knowledge to determine the natural state of National Forests and Grasslands, and require clear goals for restoration.
- The Rule could emphasize consideration of endangered species and natural predators in restoration efforts.
- The Rule could encourage the investigation of alternative energies and reduction in the use of fossil fuels as part of restoration and conservation.
- The Rule could encourage the creation of jobs for restoration efforts.
- The Rule should encourage the evaluation of impacts on restoration/conservation from private interests, including grazing rights and timber, roads, and recreation.
- The Rule should recognize that the ecosystem is more important than commodities and use. If there is no ecosystem resiliency, there will be no future use.
- The Rule should encourage National Forests and Grasslands to clean up existing threats to water quality, and investigate means of recycling/reusing water with minimal chemical intervention.

II. Plans could proactively address climate change through monitoring, mitigation and adaptation, and could allow flexibility to adapt to changing conditions and incorporate new information.

- The Rule should require monitoring as the basis for triggering plan revision. Once goals are set, monitoring should happen continuously to identify variation from assumptions and projections, allowing land managers to react accordingly. Revisiting the plan should be proactive, not reactive.
- The Rule should allow flexibility at the regional and local level to accommodate differences in climate and changes in local conditions.
- The Rule should encourage Land and Resource Management Plans to allow natural processes to play their role, e.g. forest fires or insect infestations.
- Many participants feel that the current revision period is too long. The Rule should allow for more timely adjustments as needed, based on the defined triggers.
- The Rule should encourage the sharing of data generated by reliable research processes and validation by peer review. Tribal historians, cultural resource specialists, and archaeologists should be included as sources of important scientific data.
- Although the best available data should be used in making climate change predictions, the Rule should acknowledge the degree of uncertainty in any projections, as well as differing opinions on the existence and effect of climate change. The Rule should encourage contingency planning and projections for a range of events, taking a precautionary approach.
- The Rule should recognize the link between climate change and forests– restoration of the forest will help mitigate climate change, while use of fossil fuels and reduction of forest land will have the reverse effect.

III. Plans could emphasize maintenance and restoration of watershed health, and could protect and enhance America's water resources.

- The Rule should specify watershed health is a critical priority of land management planning, particularly as it relates to climate change and reduced availability of water. Opinions are divided as to whether the watershed is a logical basis for planning or simply a critical consideration.
- The Rule should specify the interconnected relationship of watershed health to ecosystem health.

- The Rule should allow flexibility at the regional or local level in addressing watersheds, as the size of the planning unit can vary significantly.
- The Rule should emphasize the relationship of upstream and downstream activities and the need for collaboration with other agencies and private land owners in proximity to National Forests or Grasslands.
- The Rule should include standards to ensure water sufficiency for the natural ecosystem and quality monitoring.

IV. Plans could provide for the diversity of species and wildlife habitat.

- The Rule should encourage land managers to take a landscape scale approach, recognizing that animal and plant species cross political and jurisdictional boundaries. However, the Rule must allow flexibility at the plan level to adjust variation in the size of ecological units, populations and natural habitats.
- The Rule should encourage greater collaboration among agencies and across borders early in the planning process, and continually thereafter.
- The Rule should require plans to maintain a viability standard for species protection. Consideration should be given to how climate change will impact species.
- The Rule should recognize that effective management can mean simply protecting habitats and letting natural systems play out.
- The Rule should require greater enforcement of laws and regulations that protect wildlife habitats and diverse species.
- The Rule should require more monitoring and encourage open sharing of data in transparent and unbiased ways, including greater collaboration between agencies, tribes and organizations conducting research. Peer reviews of data should be utilized to increase transparency and alleviate bias. Lessons learned from data should be incorporated into decision-making, and projects/personnel should be held accountable for meeting goals.
- The Rule should include ways of ensuring accountability for monitoring, including incentives and/or consequences and performance evaluations. Importantly, the Rule should provide guidelines for ensuring that monitoring is funded at a project's start. Guidelines related to monitoring must be enforceable.

- The Rule should encourage collaborative monitoring of all species, not just those currently at-risk. Although some species are not at-risk today, they may become so tomorrow without sufficient monitoring.
- The Rule should encourage public education to: cultivate public participation in protection efforts; instill a sense of responsibility; communicate limits and why they are necessary; develop future interest in the forests.
- The Rule should limit human activities and the introduction of non-native/invasive species to help protect native species and their habitats.
- The Rule should identify a mechanism for stopping harm to a species, when it occurs.

V. Plans could foster sustainable NFS lands and their contribution to vibrant rural economies.

- The Rule should define a healthy, sustainable forest and set goals for forest health.
- The Rule should encourage balance between the economic needs/impacts with sustainability and restoration efforts. Forest Service lands must be managed for the benefit of all.
- The Rule should encourage equal evaluation of all scientific studies, while maintaining a common goal of sustainability. Funding for the Forest Service is a key consideration in reaching this balance.
- The Rule should emphasize public education. Well-educated users will develop a connection with the land and protect it for future generations (heritage tourism, leave no trace, etc.). Adequate facilities should be provided for users to be good stewards of forest lands.
- The Rule should identify healthy forest density and seek to balance natural systems like fire with and utilization of resources like thinned material.
- The Rule should place greater emphasis on protection of cultural resources.

New: Plans could address recreation and enjoyment of NFS lands.

- The Rule could define recreational uses and access, and encourage plans to define appropriate uses with sustainability as the primary goal. Definition of uses will help ensure that no uses are overlooked.

- The Rule should encourage science-based analysis of the types, demand, and impacts of different recreational uses. Monitoring should be used to identify changes in demand and the emergence of new kinds of recreation, and to enforce appropriate uses.
- The Rule should allow for adaptive management to react to inappropriate uses or uses that threaten sustainability.
- The Rule should encourage public education, particularly among youth, to encourage greater connection to the land, its uses, and stewardship to protect its future. Cultural resources are underutilized as educational opportunities.
- The Rule should encourage collaboration between agencies, particularly as it relates to discrepancy in appropriate uses across boundaries.
- The Rule could provide clarity for permitting processes and stipulate higher fees for uses with higher impact. Consideration should be given to access for economically disadvantaged users.

A. Planning could involve effective and proactive collaboration with the public.

- The Rule should stipulate collaborative public participation in the development of land and management plans, beginning early in the process and continuing through completion. Public collaboration should include outreach at all levels – local, state, regional, tribal, national, and international. Transparency in the planning process is critical.
- The Rule should encourage ongoing communication with the public through a variety of vehicles – online and offline; mass media and on-the-ground – to reach a broad spectrum of the public. Many participants requested a centralized location to access information so that participants aren't left out of process due to inaccessibility.
- The Rule should encourage the formation of advisory groups to represent various interests (e.g., technical/scientific, cultural resources, stakeholder, citizens, etc.). A process for participation should be established up front. The definition of stakeholder should be continually evaluated to be as inclusive as possible of an ever-changing list. Stakeholder involvement should cross boundaries to achieve common goals.
- The Rule should encourage regular communication with organizations and associations to increase distribution of news and information through memberships, as well as to utilize the available volunteer base available from those organizations.

- The Rule should provide guidance on where coordination and information sharing is preferred or required during the planning process with an eye toward design versus review.
- The Rule should provide for greater enforcement of laws concerning consideration of cultural resources in the decision-making process.
- The Rule should stipulate guidelines for early and ongoing consultation and collaboration with tribes. Consultation early in planning process is critical. Relationships should respect history and culture of tribes, and include regular, face-to-face communication. Equal effort should be made to contact/consult with tribes as with other government agencies, while recognizing and addressing cultural issues.
- The Rule should recognize the diversity and differences between tribes culturally and in regard to available resources. Efforts should be made to preserve continuity in relationships with tribes.

B. Plans could incorporate an “all lands” approach by considering the relationship between NFS lands and neighboring lands.

- The Rule should require an “all lands” approach to land and resource management planning, in which National Forest and Grassland policies should complement and work with policies of neighboring jurisdictions and private ownership. This mandates a collaborative effort and ongoing involvement of all agencies, tribes and private land owners to make decisions that will protect and preserve contiguous lands/ecosystems.
- The Rule should provide direction for the desired outcome across all lands, but still allow flexibility for regional and local decision making.
- The Rule should encourage joint proactive planning with tribes, counties, cities and other jurisdictions, as part of the “all lands” approach. Consideration should be given to individual plans, master plans and land use plans as part of coordination with neighboring/surrounding areas.

C. Plans could be based on the latest planning science and principles to achieve the best decisions possible.

- The Rule should encourage plans to consider all sciences – social, economic, environmental, cultural/spiritual, etc. Data sharing should include scientific and historical data provided by tribes and other local communities and their residents, including oral tradition.
- The Rule should encourage use of unbiased, transparent, peer-reviewed data in the development of land and resource management plans.

Summary of Input for Substantive Principles from NEW MEXICO

RESTORATION AND CONSERVATION

- **Definition of Restoration:** The rule should require each forest or grassland to define restoration and identify monitoring and evaluation methods for its particular conditions and goals. The definition should be clear and science-based, and flexible enough to adapt to changing conditions.
- **Restoration as a priority:** Many participants noted that in Region 3, much Forest Service land is in a degraded condition. "The forest has choked itself to death," they said. The rule should focus on restoration as a means of strengthening forest resiliency to stresses of all kinds and improving watershed health. The rule should also require plans for *maintaining* the restoration, to prevent degradation from recurring.
- **Plan for the worst case:** Adopt the FEMA mentality – prepare for the worst case scenario, like the Bark beetle. Unexpected impacts will occur – from global warming, for instance -- and restoration provides a way to react more quickly.
- **Collaboration as a tool:** Whether planning, implementing, monitoring, or evaluating, the Forest Service should enter into partnerships with public and private stakeholders wherever possible. State, local and tribal governments offer experience, wisdom and resources that can help make the Forest Service efforts more effective. Neighboring communities can offer both knowledge of resources and labor.
- **Landscape scale:** The rule should encourage strategic application of restoration that supports critical habitat, crossing jurisdictional boundaries if necessary. Nested landscape scales can focus on ecosystem targets.
- **Funding:** Understanding the scarcity of funding, participants encouraged the Forest Service to prioritize its projects, and to address and restore what is currently on the ground, rather than taking on new projects.

CLIMATE CHANGE

- **Resiliency:** Whether or not participants believed that climate change should be addressed in the rule, there was general support for rules and policies that promote forest health and resiliency to deal with changing conditions. At the local level, indicators of health and degradation can be identified
- **Landscape scale:** Focus on watersheds and water resources, from both ecosystem and human aspects. Nested multi-scale approach – we have good data at large scales, but greater gaps in data at local scales.

- **Integration of all the parts:** As a first step, the rule should require forests and grasslands to integrate authorities (road-building, harvest management, etc.) in a way that provides a comprehensive view of Forest Service activities and responsibilities.
- **Advocacy for stopping/slowing climate change:** Many would like the rule to give priority to actions to stop or slow climate change. At all levels the Forest Service needs to support, where feasible, renewable energy development on forest lands.
- **Monitoring and evaluation:** The rule should give clear guidance on adaptive management and monitoring for climate change, particularly to protect wildlife habitat and protect water resources. The Forest Service needs to understand that their knowledge is limited, and to make every effort possible to seek out existing data and use it wisely.
- **Collaboration:** Participants asked that the rule promote collaboration with other agencies and organizations that are addressing climate change. This is an area where collaboration is critical, for sharing of information, resources and networks.

WATER RESOURCES AND WATERSHED HEALTH

- **Critical importance of water:** There was strong support for protecting water resources, especially in New Mexico where 67% of useable surface water originates on forest land. “Water on forest lands is more valuable than the timber,” said a participant. Over-appropriation of water is a critical issue in the southwest. The rule should recognize that watersheds affect everything, including the quantity and quality of water, and its renewability. Many supported planning in the context of watersheds, although there was recognition that it might not be suitable in all cases or geographies.
- **Linkages between watersheds:** The rule should include consideration of the linkages between watersheds and protect that connectivity.
- **Collaboration:** The rule should promote partnerships and collaboration with other agencies and private landowners in order to address the needs of the entire watershed.
- **Water quality:** The new rule should include water quality, both in forests and downstream, as a goal for forest planning at all levels. Some suggested that the new rule should move from the extractive model and value forests in terms of the quality of watershed. Plans should mandate addressing all impacts to watershed health and water quality, including uses such as livestock, recreation, logging and roads, especially in wilderness areas and watersheds that produce drinking water.
- **Threats to fish:** The rule should address poor watershed health is impacting fish populations. Migration is blocked, habitat destroyed, temperature changes cannot support fish.

- **Water Rights:** Many raised issues related to water rights. In New Mexico, many basins remain unadjudicated. How can the rule protect existing water rights, and those yet to be adjudicated? The system of awarding water rights is different in the west from the east; rights are prioritized by the date they were first put to use, giving tribal and traditional communities the right to water first.

DIVERSITY OF PLANTS AND ANIMALS

- **Suggested objective:** The new planning rule must provide for species diversity, sustain fish and wildlife populations and their habitats, and assess the effect of agency actions and changing conditions through population and habitat monitoring. Sustaining healthy fish and wildlife populations is key to the successful, long-term management of our national forests. The new planning rule must include provisions to ensure informed and balanced land management decisions to maintain wildlife diversity on our forests. Some participants supported America's Wildlife Heritage Act (H.R. 2807), currently before Congress, which provides for robust wildlife safeguards, science-based monitoring, strong coordination and cooperation.
- **Ecosystems approach to wildlife management:** The rule should maintain a balance between a broad ecosystem or watershed focus and a forest by forest approach, remembering that "one size does not fit all." Scale should be at a "functional and sustainable level." Many suggested that the rule should permit larger scales of analysis, evaluation and managed protection, in some cases watersheds, given the endemic climatic extremes in New Mexico and the unknowns of climate change and species adaptation.
- **Corridors:** The rule should require the identification and consideration of wildlife and plant corridors, including those that cross boundaries to adjacent lands, whether public or private. The rule should also consider the needs of migrating herds across communities and borders.
- **Species focus:** Some favored focus on native species, with a broad scale and long term protection/management approach. Others favored at-risk species. Some recommended a systems approach to wildlife management and moving away from single species management.
- **Monitoring:** The Rule should require robust monitoring and regular evaluation of data regarding species health and habitat viability, in order to inform any adaptive management changes. The local plan should establish a baseline. Metrics should be practical for measuring, but should also include qualitative measures. Monitoring should be done at both the local and larger scales, and beyond forest boundaries if possible.
- **Adaptive management:** The Rule should consider the range changes of plants and animals – a result of climate change, for instance -- and adjust management strategies accordingly.

- **Integrated management:** The Rule should encourage management and actions that benefit multiple uses; clearing the forest will create more forage and grazing for both cattle and wildlife.
- **Collaboration:** The Rule should require consultation and collaboration with agencies, stakeholders, tribes and communities in planning and activities relating to wildlife and habitat. Forests should explore: impacts to these stakeholders, opportunities for sharing data and expertise, law enforcement coordination, use of “citizen scientists” to assist in monitoring and data collection. New Mexico’s Comprehensive Wildlife/Habitat Management plans list species and habitats. “No need to reinvent the wheel.”

CONTRIBUTION TO VIBRANT LOCAL ECONOMIES

- **Sustainable:** The Rule should stimulate local economies and establish mechanisms that support sustainable, not extractive, local economies
- **Local access to resources:** The Rule should provide traditional communities access to the forest to use resources important to the local economy and culture, like firewood, medicinal plants, food sources, etc.
- **Employ local:** The Rule should encourage forests and grasslands to employ local companies and workers whenever possible.
- **Cost/benefit analysis:** The Rule should include benefits to local economies in the Forest Service cost/benefits analysis.
- **Compensation for property damage:** The Rule should provide a mechanism for compensating landowners for property damage resulting from Forest Service actions, such as fences destroyed in a prescribed burn.
- **Green tourism:** The Rule should support the development of “green tourism” on or near Forest Service lands. Local economies can benefit from international, as well as domestic, interest in seeing and photographing wildlife, including endangered species.
- **Holistic view:** The Rule should integrate the community needs, the provision of goods and services, and ecosystem needs. False distinction is made between vibrant local communities, provision of services, and biological integrity. Forests plans that integrate these sectors and develop a holistic plan for the area will meet both restoration goals and the requirements for a vibrant local economy. Forest Plans should also address the relationship among the social/economic/ecological. For example, if a family loses their ranch, the schools lose the kids, the tax base is diminished, the community is impacted, etc.
- **Use local models for success:** The Rule should direct regions and Forests to look for local examples of vibrant local economies, communities that have endured for generations.

- **Honor the rights of existing communities:** Both tribal and other rural land-based communities ask that the Rule recognize existing rights and traditional uses, especially those that were in existence prior to the establishment of the United States and the Forest Service lands. In New Mexico, these entities include land grants and *acequias*, historical communal irrigation systems that support the culture and livelihood of thousands of families.
- **Sustainability and transitioning:** The Rule should require that Forests determine if current practices are sustainable, given the current economic reality. The Forest Plan should address ways of moving from unsustainable practices to sustainable ones, including transitional employment opportunities. Both science and traditional knowledge will be important in sustaining resources and transitioning to new economies if necessary.
- **Metrics:** The Rule should require economic metrics be used to show that local community projects are viable and being managed sustainably.

USE AND ENJOYMENT OF NFS LANDS (INCLUDES RECREATION)

- **Wilderness:** The Rule should reconsider the wilderness designation and how wilderness lands are managed. Many urged having less strict criteria for wilderness designation, and releasing other lands from wilderness if it doesn't qualify.
- **Recreation as a designated use:** The Rule should be drafted to give value to recreation as a designated use. It is the way that many people interact with the forest, participants said, and an important way of exposing urban dwellers to forest resources, and educating them about the values.
- **Economic value of recreation:** The Rule should recognize the significant economic contribution that recreation makes to local communities.
- **Impacts from recreation:** The Rule should consider recreation in the context of each community and forest use that is impacted, negatively or positively. There were concerns about increased use of public lands creating an overflow of people and wildlife onto private lands and increased water and air pollution. The Rule needs to consider what is the breaking point for the system. "People can love it to death," said participants.
- **Coordinating Recreational Uses:** The Rule should require a balance of uses that respects the diverse needs of recreators, communities, and wildlife and watershed protection. The Rule should also consider how the planning process can include strategies for interface among diverse recreational users. Different activities need guidelines and may need to be separated geographically, or regulated as to seasons. Others suggested that multiple uses should not be segregated where possible, in order to encourage cooperation and courtesy among users. Multi-use access points make access easier.

- **Assessment of uses:** The Rule should require assessment of the impacts of various uses and the synergies between recreational uses. GIS, Asset Mapping, Restore America Executive Act, and visitor surveys and comments are tools to help determine what are most feasible and desirable recreational uses. These assessments should have a start and end date, and be made public.
- **A balance:** The Rule should strive for a balance so there is present enjoyment coupled with preservation so future generations can find that same enjoyment. Priority should always be given to the long term protection of environmentally sensitive areas that may be impacted.
- **Collaboration:** The Rule should encourage partnerships between the Forest Service and recreational organizations and groups for help with maintenance and restoration of forest resources. Volunteers are available for clearing trails, thinning, re-planting, counting and locating species, reporting problems, monitoring, gathering data, outreach to the public, etc. Funding may also be available through these partnerships.
- **Special use permits:** Participants asked that the Rule consider a standardized process for special use permits.
- **Access:** Participants asked that the Rule expand the definition of access to include air strip landings on Forest lands, where appropriate. This access has minimal impact on the resources since no roads are needed.

PLAN REVISION AND NEPA

- **Increased resources:** Forest planning requires more resources than are currently available.
- **Adequate district staffing:** District staffing needs to be sufficient to sustain the necessary work on the districts. District rangers need to be given more authority to partner with communities, and longer tenures in one place to gain critical knowledge of the local culture, customs and needs. .
- **Collaboration:** Federal and state agencies, counties and tribes, as well as political subdivisions such as soil and water conservation districts and acequias can offer data, knowledge and experience to help in the planning process.
- **Good data:** The rule should encourage efficiency and timeliness, and the use of available science and local knowledge for planning and revisions. The Rule should insure that Foresters have the most current data at hand. Use available tools like the Ecosystem System Evaluation Tool, developed by the Nature Conservancy to 1) define the scope and focal

targets for the planning area, 2) develop strategies and measures, 3) implement strategies and measures, 4) use results of measures to adapt and improve.

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

- **Flexibility:** The Rule should incorporate an Adaptive Planning Rule to accommodate changing conditions and evolving data. A plan cannot remain static in the face of climate change and other shifts. The Rule should also allow for flexibility in timelines for different forests.
- **The standard:** All planning should consider the health of forest resources a primary goal. Wildlife can be an indicator of management success or failure.
- **Monitoring:** The Rule should mandate ongoing monitoring which is critical to understanding the changes in conditions. Many were concerned about inadequate staff and funding to do meaningful monitoring. Given these constraints, carefully selected indicators should be used as measures of forest health and resiliency.
- **Science-based:** Peer reviewed science should be the standard for monitoring and assessment. Input from special interests and NGOs should have less weight.
- **Plan revisions:** The Rule should identify thresholds that would trigger actions, including plan revision. The Plan revision should not be continual but should occur regularly. Monitoring, however, should be continual.

COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION

- The Rule should include clear, strong language mandating collaboration and coordination with the full range of authorities and interests related to forest management and use. These include federal agencies, state and local government, neighboring communities, tribal governments, special interest groups, and non-governmental organizations. Some believe a “culture of supremacy” at the Forest Service is preventing good collaboration with local government.
- The Rule should require more cross-agency (federal, state and county) collaboration to combine responsibilities for managing integrated resources (e.g., elk and their forage) that are traditionally held by different agencies (e.g., Game and Fish and the Forest Service respectively).
- The Rule should specifically speak to the need to include consultation and collaboration with all indigenous governments, traditional community groups and other groups in existence prior to the Forest Service land designations, and with an interest in the forest

planning process. The customs and cultural needs of these interests must be honored and considered in any plan or project.

- The Rule should instruct the Regional and District staff to develop processes that are appropriate for each area and group, and to be open and responsive to what is said.
- Rule should encourage Regional and District staff to maintain current, complete contact information for those who have participated in public forums or in any other way indicated an interest in being included in the planning process.
- The Rule should encourage Regions and Districts to use the widest range possible of communication techniques, including websites, webcasting, twittering, facebooking, and whatever new is available. Care must be taken, however, not to assume that this kind of social media is suitable for all; in New Mexico there are many forest communities without internet access.
- The Rule should encourage data sharing and the use of existing data, management plans, assessments, studies and mapping information whenever available and appropriate.
- The Rule should require the Forest Service to respond to comments and requests in a clear, timely and responsive way. Responses should demonstrate that the comment was legitimately considered. If the content of the comment is rejected or not incorporated into the plan, the response should provide a reason why it was rejected or not incorporated. Many feel that their concerns are not heard, and that comments seem to “disappear into a vacuum.” Forest Service staff need flexibility to be able to respond directly and in a timely way.
- The Rule should address the concerns of the public that decisions are being made behind closed doors and that by the time they are invited into the process, the decision has already been made. Scoping processes are critical; early consultation with tribes; formation of working groups – all can demonstrate a commitment to listening and considering the needs of stakeholders, the public and government entities.
- The Rule should make clear that Forest Service staff are encouraged to collaborate with others, and may receive training in how to work with others, including the process for soliciting public input without violating the Federal Advisory Committee Act.
- The Rule should call for early and continued inclusion of local communities in the planning and project implementation process. The Rule should focus on vibrant communities.
- Those writing the Rule should look to Africa for models of local management and protection of resources.

- The Rule should encourage planners to incorporate local data, knowledge, and existing plans into the planning process.
- The Rule should encourage more use of the cooperating agency status in a way that is more collaborative.
- The Rule should encourage regular “check ins” with local communities, even in the absence of a plan revision or active project.

ALL-LANDS APPROACH

- The Rule needs to insure that Regional and District staff can coordinate efforts in large areas for projects that need to cross boundaries, such as eradication of invasive species. This will require sharing planning strategies, manpower, training, skills, costs, funding, safe herbicides, native plantings, etc.
- The Rule needs to address habitat fragmentation impacts on ecosystem viability, especially in relation to climate change and resiliency. Inter-agency cooperation for wildlife and plant corridor identification and management is critical.
- The Rule should consider the impacts to cultural properties and uses from boundaries and segmented management.
- On uses or management issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries (e.g. streams and rivers, fire, trails) the Rule should support harmonizing regulations with neighboring land owners/managers such as the BLM, tribes, local government to simplify compliance.
- The Rule should acknowledge that an all-lands approach involving Tribes requires government-to-government consultation, which must be done on an individual basis and must include clear feedback and open communication.

OTHER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

- **Education:** The Rule should clearly prescribe the need to educate the public on multiple uses of the land. If public understands they may be more supportive of the FS efforts. The Rule should encourage collaboration that promotes education on the value of forests and the role of the agency in restoring and maintaining the resource. Many suggested the focus be on young people, even elementary school level, in order to instill early on a personal responsibility for healthy forests. Others focused on the internships and career path possibilities.
- **Tribal consultation** is not carried out in consistent, legitimate ways, nor is it documented.

- There is currently no distinction between **affected parties and interested parties** in terms of the legal process. People who are more directly impacted by decisions should be given affected party status –should be given more weight in the appeal process. That distinction is a fuzzy one. It is hard to prove one party is more affected when you look at factors such as carbon sequestration that affects us all.
- The current planning process does not adequately consider local **custom and culture**, such as wood cutting, collecting herbs, ceremonies, etc. The current process treats culture as something that happened in the past, not as the living present. Forest Service managers arrive from other regions and are not familiar with local customs and cultures. These managers often try to impose inappropriate solutions or management on local people and resources.
- The Rule should include a standardized national set of definitions.

Conclusion

More than 200 people participated in workshops, roundtables and public meeting/open houses in Arizona and New Mexico hosted by the Southwestern Region 3. Evaluations and comments from participants in both states showed appreciation and support for this initial step in the collaborative process for the revision of the Forest Planning Rule. There was a cautious hopefulness that these sessions indicate a new commitment by the Forest Service to a more open, transparent and genuinely collaborative approach to planning. The public, stakeholders, state, local and tribal government representatives, and federal agency personnel have expressed a willingness to partner with the Forest Service in a variety of ways, from revision of the Planning Rule to implementation of projects on the ground.

Participants will be watching the collaborative process closely as the new Planning Rule is developed, and they remain hopeful that their input will be heard and utilized, and that they will be given an authentic opportunity to work collaboratively with Forest Service. The challenge is with the Forest Service to respond to this outpouring of concerns, ideas and recommendations in a way that demonstrates their value in the rule writing process. There are many in the Southwestern Region who are waiting for that response, with both skepticism and hope. Forest Service has a tremendous opportunity to open its doors and work hand-in-hand with the public to develop the national planning rule and to carry out the goals of each individual forest.

Appendix A – Notes from ARIZONA meetings

**U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

I. Plenary Session Q&A

- How can the forests using the 1982 rule incorporate new directives?
- Current plan revisions are bound to the 1982 rule. Per transition language – 1982-once NOI is filed.
- Plans are valid until the next revision.
- Are there opportunities for outside agency collaboration?
- Why are AZ forests moving forward? (depends on where they are in process and money spent) How many? (about 20 nationwide)
- How can we translate on-the-ground concerns to rule level?
- Current rule calls for revision every 15 years.
- Transition language is important for ongoing plan revisions.
- Can we include language that they have to go back and revisit some issues?
- Statewide plans are connected to the national rule

II. Substantive Topics

TABLE A: Restoration, Conservation & Watershed Health

1. How can the next planning rule foster restoration of NFS lands?

GROUP 1

- I think it is critically important to delineate unique ecosystem types, bring the natural system back into its natural range of resilience, and be careful of the broad term “restoration.” Separate other values beyond a catchall term.
- I agree, the need for a clear definition of restoration and use clear science, wildlife, biodiversity, species overall effect across the board on each level before collaborating and comparing.
- Use science based in a quantitative way to specify qualifications and grading systems referring to science level people. Sensitive to the term “wildlife” included in water and fisheries, it needs to be specified and included in the definition.
- Define what is and is not restoration. And look at it as a forward based activity to return ecosystems to their natural state. Ideas, resilience and adaptability process, maintenance...Restoration is not just retrospective – forward thinking as well.
- Make sure that specific forests consider site specific issues based on site potential. Consider the variety of site types across the Arizona. Define what the goal of the restoration is...

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Restoration has a definition based on outcomes, what are you trying to achieve. Durability, Sustainability, how will the effort last? Ecosystem consideration. Spatially. Time Period. Current condition. Scale and time. Bigger than just administrative thinking within the culture of the forest service. Durability has economic outcome.
- Restoration does not equal management. Be clear on specific terms and not cross use. Landscape scale versus individual plans. Management units are not always involved. Challenge, the scalability of project level.
- Scale, ecologically and socially, plan at scales that have important patterns that play out. We want to be planning below, at, and above what can happen. Climate change is making scales larger. We need to plan for longer and longer. Place, process, ecosystem type.
- Levels- flexible – planning to cross lands. Tier fashion preferred.

GROUP 2

- 1st. Cut some trees down... way too many... trees are overgrown and unhealthy. Put American people to work creating something out of wood. Evaluate overgrown status. Forest needs to be restored to what they were 100 years ago, utilizing logging.
- Comprehensive, ecosystem component. Treat across the board. There is confusion on the definition – need very clear definition. Historic. Forest structure. Ecosystem across boundaries. Need to move some firewood.
- Critical definition clarity. Will be hard to get consensus accepted. What is the model of restoration? Will be difficult to get the correct spirit.
- Nationally, direct each forest to look at extent, fire suppression policy, changed and evaluate the past policy and put in future context.
- Not all forest land is forest. Grass is different than forest, even if classified as forest. Scientific. Soils. Hydrology. Invasive species. Clear idea of restoring; grass, savannah, what is it going to look like and how are you going to get there. Clear outline to follow. Flexibility. Specify what actually needs to be restored. Not all lands need to be restored. Obtainable goals. Degrees of restoration.
- Ecosystem management approach. Collaboration. Tribe values. Animals and plants know no boundaries. Consider ability to grow wild species and bigger game. Beyond cattle. Consider all components of ecosystem – how actions will impact land above and below forest lands.
- Ecosystem as a whole is important.

GROUP 3

- Link the economy with restoration. Length of contract process. Scale of contract has to match the effort.
- Objectives based. Agreement of terms at beginning. Regional or geographical area.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Define resilient healthy habitat, landscape. And restore to the healthy resilient habitat it should be. Broad concepts implied.
- Ecological Restoration as an overall theme. Jobs in the woods. Values for wildlife. No targeting for commodity production alone. Consider many values.
- National goal = ecosystem resilience. Can't be vegetation level.
- Invent a new term. Restoration implies going back. "Pro-storation". Proactive. Going forward. Find a way to "prostore"... Clarify why we are changing our systems to something new. Composition of species and process. Three-fold economic, social, human sustainability. Ecological functionality.
- Level of monitoring required should be commiserate with risk of activity.
- Healthy populations of native plants and animals. Maintenance of native forces. Fire regimes. Look at larger picture. Collaborative efforts with professionals to create and agree on definitions. Use available work internationally.
- Resiliency. Rapid change. Rule priority of resilience over use. No resiliency no future use.
- Long term sustainability. Reverse. Ecosystem is more important than commodity and use. Past rule has placed more emphasis on commodities than ecosystem – would like to see that reversed – create balance.
- Recognize and say to the public that there are rules and you cannot do what you want. The forest is limited and we need to recognize and deal with and behave in such a way.

2. Should forest planning be conducted in the context of watersheds? If so, how?

GROUP 1

- Torn. There is a problem with unit stove piping. Artificial line for funding. Forest services should be planned on a water shed basis, on a logical basis. However, species, etc. are not across the board and go into other areas.
- Ownership patterns, land owner objectives, what contributions, no firm feeling. Watershed is important but unsure of how they should drive the framework of planning.
- Water health and quality fall under... don't fall under the US Forest service
- Watersheds originate in the forest service. Factor of private land, government controls, just don't drop consideration from the radar.
- Stove piping... increased collaboration. America's Wildlife Heritage Act. Ecosystem and species approach to measure watershed quality, and health. Carbon trapping. Both approaches need to be considered.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Important to maintain a healthy system. Wildlife is important. Focus on water sources. Watershed health.
- Watershed is important but should not be considered as boundaries depending on location. Compare to fire shed, invasive species, air shed, management goals on WS. Should be chosen as an additional consideration.
- Should not be a planning unit itself. Note that Arizona has lost majority of riparian watershed.

GROUP 2

- Of course they should. We all depend on the water. Clean water. Too many trees suck up all the water. OHV, mitigate water issues, proper trail design and management. Watershed is important.
- Chief and secretary, bring science based approach. Pay more attention to the scientific processes. Principle and definition will change over the process. Proper education of how science works is needed. Bigger picture. Allow the dialogue to happen about sustainability
- Water is critical. Harvest studies show the forest will grow trees. Density issues. Science. Social science is not as important as real science.
- Good basis for a planning unit and the drinking water quality. Protect Watershed. Logical measure.
- Size of Watershed should be considered. Sediment run-off. At local discretion.
- Impacts what is at bottom stream. Upstream activities compromise downstream quality.

GROUP 3

- Is healthy watershed a desired outcome or part of a process? Which comes first?
- Can't get away from watershed but shouldn't limit to just watershed. Watershed is a consideration but not basis.
- Yes, watershed health should be basis. Central feature. Critical nationally. Goal needs to have science based standards to insure water based health, monitor mechanisms, specify human stressors.
- It's getting hotter and drier. Protecting watershed is key.
- Yes, a good principle to base planning on. It makes system to ecosystem functionality. Watershed planning unit can vary.
- Yes, determine at forest or regional level which WS belongs to who.
- Yes, included in rule. Both watershed condition for its own inherent worth. How it helps humans, society. Education of values. Consider upstream and downstream.
- Can the ecosystem survive without water?
- Consider ecosystem needs.
- Planning based on just one aspect will not work. All aspects need to be considered.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

3. What if anything should the rule say about water availability and quality, including factors outside of the Agency's control?

GROUP 1

- Water quality is outside the scope. Guidelines for participating organizations.
- Include all organizations. Standards. Collaboration. Awareness of climate change. Share information for overall.
- How the individual plans will contribute to the overall goals.
- Endangered species in location specific issues.

GROUP 2

- People should come first. Shouldn't cut the farmers water off. People's lively hood, benefit, well beings. Agriculture should be more efficient.
- Clean water, significant water is a product of a healthy ecosystem. Coordinate all lands. Across agency and jurisdiction consideration. Larger collaborative approach.
- Conservation is key. Plan for the future. Water is not as abundant as past. Climate change. Dams don't fix. Conservative measures need to be taken. Educate new comers to conservation of desert.
- Shouldn't compromise entire forest use. Mitigation. Not limitation. Not used as a block for progress. Ongoing monitoring. Water quality is a concern. But monitoring can be a handicap. Specifics cause litigation. Flexibility.
- Overall assessment of forest health. At risk species need to be identified and monitored. Insure protection of ecosystem health.
- Monitoring needs to be allocated for in the beginning of the process. Level of monitoring and level of risk is key. Long term trends mitigation.

GROUP 3

- All water flowing out of the national forest, flows into other designations. Upstream actions downstream consequences.
- List of standards; obvious answer. Standards that insure ws health. Create opportunity to stop human stressors. Riparian veg. important. Real teeth to ensure watershed health. Specific. Definite. Provides for regulations forest level projects that don't degrade the watershed.
- Water quality standards for water leaving one area should be the same quality as water entering that area.
- Water sufficiency for natural biodiversity should be determined to maintain species, quality, ecosystem on and off forest. All lands. Consider surrounding areas impacts. Maintain quality. High risk = extra services above and beyond.
- One size does not fit all. Many def. are needed site level or region level.
- Impact statement considerations.

**U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

- Utilize available science, not just what agency commissions – International Society of Restoration – collaborate internationally and across agency.
- Define water availability.
- Collaboration is vital to success

4. Other Comments and Suggestions

- Definition clarity
- One size will not fit all
- National level route density standard to calculate all routes, open or closed, impact Watershed. Motor trails, aren't included. Route density for ALL routes need to be considered.
- How to calculate route density effects equation.
- Threshold definition.
- How to gain term agreement?
- Wordsmithing is difficult and level of understanding of terms will confuse the outcome.
- Use scientific knowledge.
- Touchy, but spiritual health should be considered. Understand the spiritual impact of connections and recognized for nature and human health.

TABLE B: Climate Change & Adaptive Management

1. How can a new planning rule build in flexibility to adapt to changing science, information or conditions and/or incorporate new data?

GROUP 1

- Build from the bottom up. In the past, targets were set and the plan had to meet the target. Consider the numbers last, not first.
- The planning process should be continuous – that is the point of adaptive management.
- Sometimes adaptive management indicates that you can do whatever you want. It should mean that goals should be set, and targeted, structured rules should be set and followed.
- You should also look at it in terms of what the changes would be on the local people – how they would be impacted. Those people close to the forest should be in on the discussion. They should have some say since they are impacted the most.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- They tend with these plans to go with what they know, so it is likely to massage the 1982 plan. They are buried under regulations and nothing ever gets decided. It's hard to get anything done. It needs to be more flexible and streamlined. You don't need to analyzed to death.
- There is the view that once the plan is done, you put it away and don't pay attention any more. The plan should be continually addressed and reviewed.

GROUP 2

- Begin by requiring that the FS actually does monitoring, and a good start would be monitoring wildlife populations. It is a FS requirement now, and should continue with the new rule. Size and distribution will likely change with climate change, and monitoring is necessary to seriously understand the changes and if projections are on track.
- Also monitor the vegetation.
- Have more reliance on modeling looking into the future. Modeling is based on monitoring
- Disagree – need to have the flexibility to see what's happening on the ground today, not anticipating based on what we think will happen.
- Wildlife is going to react to what is happening in the forests sooner than trees and plants. A rule needs to be written to allow for real-time changes. Climate predictions are not an exact enough science to base all of the assumptions on. The rule needs to be written in a broad enough manner so that we can see what happens now and develop predictions.
- This planning rule has to provide for reducing stressors on the system, including the impact of climate change, so there has to be adequate planning and forecasting.
- Sustainability – how do you manage climate change to achieve sustainability?
- Build the plan based on what's actually happening and modify accordingly.
- There has to be a balance. We need to look at what worked in the past, what didn't work. We must figure out how to balance the plans.
- We need to look at the bigger picture and accommodate the interagency issues. We should share how the lands are managed in an interactive manner.
- The plans need to accommodate natural disturbances that allow ecosystems to adjust to climate change over time (ex., fires, insect infestations).
- Don't over-manage natural crises.
- Didn't we kind of fail in the past by not managing our forests effectively (i.e. large fires). If we're not careful, the lack of management will create disasters that will cause us to lose forests.
- Actually, we didn't allow the forest to have its natural fires that eliminated issues that create large disasters.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- The rule needs to be long-term and objective-based but flexible enough for adaptation.

GROUP 3

- The whole concept is restore resilient ecosystems. You could look at restoring natural resources, i.e. natural fire.
- The science of climate change has to be inserted in the process without tipping over too far during the planning process.
- You'd want to ensure that the newest information is shared across agency and managers to create a structure to move data between federal, state and municipalities.
- You could consider climate extremes – how we deal with these issues (long term drought, frequent flooding etc.). Institution of plans in the event some of these things happen. Contingency planning would be beneficial. Climate change isn't necessarily something you could plan for but you could plan for the impacts.
- We need continued and better science on current conditions that allows us to predict future climate change issues. We need a higher commitment to monitoring that allows us to refresh on a more frequent, more accurate basis.
- A lot of the adaptations of climate disruptions require that we need to develop long term strategies, management objectives, goals. Need diversity of ecosystems before other types of land uses.
- There is a role in forest plans to speak to connectivity. The most proactive approach is to maintain landscape connectivity. Need to think about how forests can accommodate distribution shifts.
- Precautionary approach to land management is a key element. Need the best available science, but understand that you could be wrong.
- Updated monitoring is crucial and based on that, use historical use data and build contingency plans. We will need to start intervening to deal with climate change issues for at risk populations.

2. When and how should plans be evaluated to see if they are working; what should trigger amendments?

GROUP 1

- What should trigger an amendment? It should be a timed process, a regular process should occur.
- It would differ by what the different resources are how often they are addressed.
- That question needs to be asked every time it needs to be.
- How big of a shock do you need to have to trigger a revision? The rule should leave some flexibility.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Will the FS be looking at where the areas are in achieving the plan, and when they should be reviewed?
- 20 years is too long, and we should be looking at a trigger to determine when a review should occur.
- We need to build in flexibility. In a changing environment, the resources may not be there in a period of time. You don't want to maximize the use of any resource.
- Must consider sustainability when setting goals or deciding on levels of desired outputs. Things will change, we know that. Flexibility is crucial.
- Must monitor outcomes of what you are doing to decide how to proceed. This is the adaptive management concept.
- Consider the ability to have flexibility between different forests to set goals. Emphasize the ability to change on a local level to meet the needs of the local area.
- How do you know when to review? That's the FS job – there needs to be more collaboration with other entities that are in touch with what's going on in the area. The different groups should complement each other to achieve the goals.
- There's a disconnect between what is planned and what is actually accomplished.

GROUP 2

- Don't make revisiting the plan an emergency response. Shouldn't be reactive, should be proactive.
- If your monitoring shows that what you have been planning for is occurring, then you likely wouldn't need to change. But there might be a trend for harm that would trigger some change which would dictate modifications.

GROUP 3

- How precautionary should you be to trigger intervention?
- How do wildlife corridors address these issues? Use precautionary approach to determine if changes are needed and adapt. If corridors are too small and don't meet the needs, revise based on data.
- Select focal species to determine their sensitivity to climate change to predict impacts on other species.
- The requirements of multiple use have gotten distracted recently – elevate natural processes. It's a political decision.
- Do no harm – precautionary principal.

3. How can the planning rule be proactive and innovative in addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation?

GROUP 1

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- CEQ is meeting around the country setting guidelines for how much the climate will change. There should be collaboration with the FS about how systems should be evaluated.
- Perhaps 60 percent of Americans don't believe that there really is climate change. How can you plan if you don't believe that the climate is changing?
- If you want to be science-based, you should look at what a 95 percent of climatologists are saying. You need to err on the side that the science is right. There are a lot of multiple values to looking at how to restore a forest to what it was.
- I believe that there really is a climate change, though planning should address various approaches, no change, some change, and significant change. You should address the full spectrum of opinions out there.
- There are a lot of things the agency can control within the context of the plan regarding climate control

GROUP 2 – N/A

GROUP 3 – N/A

4. What, if any, climate change assumptions should be used in the development of plan alternatives?

GROUP 1

- You have to look at a range of possible futures.
- Climate science talks in terms of ranges, based on whatever the current science is. At least we are operating on the basis of what we know at the time.
- There are certain benchmarks that should be identified to make changes in the plan.
- Climate change projections should be used in the development of planning. Projections are different than assumptions.
- One function of the forest is environmental services and that should be inserted into the plan.

GROUP 2 – N/A

GROUP 3

- There are no real concrete assumptions we can make. Keep your option open.
- It can be agreed that climate change is occurring. We don't know exactly what's happening, but the FS should do outreach and education to its users to explain what we know.
- There are lots of viable sources to this data – need collaboration with these groups.
- We do know more now than we did even a couple years ago. Create viable scenarios on which planning can be based. Need to refresh our sense of what we know somewhere in the range of every five years.

**U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

- Would you put requirements in forest plans to acknowledge the climate change to develop contingency plans to address likely or possible issues.
- The Nature Conservancy has held forums to propose climate change scenarios for which solutions can be proposed.
- Communication with tribes is essential. Many of the communities do not have the resources to monitor but they do have elder knowledge etc. on which they base their assumptions.
- Rapid response to climate change is important. Under climate conditions, perhaps planning review should occur more frequently.
- The rule should reflect the need for Arizona forests to address climate change. This should be included in the transition language.

5. Other Comments and Suggestions

GROUP 1

- Equal concern with adaptive management and climate change – closely inter-related.
- Planning is cumbersome, and the rule needs to be addressed to determine a better, more effective way to get these changes done.
- Use good solid data – empirical data should provide the basis for planning.

GROUP 2

- Any human stressors that do not contribute to resiliency need to be eliminated.

GROUP 3 – N/A

TABLE C: Diversity, Wildlife

1. At what landscape scale and how should the Forest Service analyze and provide for diversity of plants and animals (individual unit, watershed, landscape scale)?

GROUP 1

- Do need to look at landscape scale, depends on species, big enough to accommodate area species need, ecological unit (varies) 5,000-20 million acres
- Population level for a focal species
- Planning/analysis should take place at the scale of the species' habitat (small and large scales); meta populations vs. cumulative effects
- Cumulative effects (assessments) is essential in planning rule – should be required; identify a process for determining cumulative effects
- Boundaries are irrelevant to animals

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Not administrative boundaries (all lands); include international
- Species need to maintain viable populations of species; monitor populations in a consistent and adequate way
- Strongly interactive species be allowed to maintain ecologically-affected densities
- Integrate wildlife connectivity; across jurisdictional boundaries
- Social issues tend to be the legal challenges
- Use precautionary approach to landscape management

GROUP 2

- At least at watershed scale
- Cross boundaries of land managers (forest, BLM, state, etc.)
- Look at historic ranges
- Sky islands (mountain ranges)
- Micro ranges within a larger area
- Perimeter landscapes and how they are adapting to climate changes; know or analyze what is going out around/adjacent the study area
- Analysis of how climate change affecting – boundaries of impact – ahead of curve (microclimates)-know what's happening everywhere to know how to adapt
- Scale of all landscapes (microclimates)
- Scale dependent on human footprint (adjacent land uses)
- Human footprint is less than highway corridors/energy
- Expand to f/f's boundary
- Plants and animals will determine what the "boundaries" are; need to extend out to the populations' boundaries
- Micro scale should be looked at to determine why f/f are dying out in a specific area and be addressed
- Biodiversity is essential to ecosystem health and resiliency

GROUP 3

- Big landscape scale – ecosystem level
- Allows species to adapt to a changing climate (larger area and small area); at multiple levels depending on the needs of a particular species; but maintain viability at forest level
- Forest level is a relatively small level, new rule should expand
- Concern for moving to a broader management level may lose track of species and disappear
- Micromanaging at a national level is not feasible - Plan for other species to fill void of extinct species
- Manage native species at a sustainable level (full range of species)
- FS responsible for restoration and recovery of species in specific areas (f/f that belong there)

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Include guidelines for managing human species (and their activities – water, hunting, recreation, multi-use)
- Include indicator species (needs to be kept from the 1982 rule)
- Include multiple use

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

GROUP 1

- Require that populations are monitored; require it is monitored to ensure it takes place
- Build in consequences and accountability for not monitoring; ensure there are funds to monitor
- Identify minimum amount of project –level monitoring necessary if funds are not available
- Identify science-based level of monitoring needed
- Build in a means of enforcement of monitoring requirements
- Provide incentives for doing the right thing (monitoring)
- Set aside costs for monitoring at the initiation of the project
- Monitoring could be a collaborative approach; use social pressure
- How to incorporate “strongly interactive species” with “management of indicator species”
- Prohibit actions and projects that harm species that do not show population recovery or there is no population data collected
- More coordination between species recovery plans and forest plans

GROUP 2

- Obligatory component – a way to make them do it
- Collaborative and communicate with other bordering agencies (AZGF, BLM, MGO) – share information
- Use sound science
- Use academic community
- Include ecological restoration (fire control, cutting trees) – if good for ecological restoration, good for other things
- Plan for climate change
- Include sports/game, non-game guidelines (America’s Wildlife Act); combines species and ecosystem approach; establish a sustainability of species
- Include a means for general public information dissemination, education, develop a public appreciation of species; not just for government agencies
- Educational outreach to the youth to perpetuate species stewardship

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Dedicate resources for monitoring; no follow-up/misguided leadership
- Provide strong leadership
- Risk component – feasibility of relocating species (fire destruction), feasible to plan for it – contingent sites for disaster areas
- Identify follow-up increment to following the plan (i.e., 3 years); potentially tie it into performance evaluations- accountability and progress made
- Open recovery teams to non-agency personnel
- Encourage state wildlife planning process to be collaborative and include federal input; open process up to NGO's early on and encourage collaboration on statewide planning
- Include approach to invasive species management/elimination
- Observation of surrounding areas and open constant communication
- De-emphasize commodity extraction side vs. natural side; rebalance the priority to ensure species viability
- Restoration of native extricated species should be a higher priority

GROUP 3

- Should guide level of monitoring; should be actual monitoring
- Ensure information from monitoring (lessons learned) is incorporated into the decision making
- Habitat modeling is NOT a good substitute to species monitoring; use high tech modeling with on-the-ground monitoring to get best understanding of what is happening on the ground
- Identify how/if actions are affecting species
- Incorporate precautionary principle for at-risk species (habitats); activities should not affect viability;
- Identify mechanism for stopping harm to species (activities/actions)
- Maintain viability standard for protecting species
- Ensure the standard filters down to project level
- Encourage a sense of responsibility by the forest service
- Provide/encourage consistency between forest plans/recovery plans and agencies for monitoring/managing T&E species
- Budget – provide money for monitoring to make it happen
- Ability to move forward with projects should be tied to implementing monitoring – make it conditional
- Maintain viability standard
- Monitor economic impact on American people that the monitoring causes
- Include clear, enforceable guidelines
- Should be managed for the economic benefit of the American people (timber, mining, etc)

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Trend away from unenforceable standards and guidelines – accountability
- Mechanism for stopping/do no harm
- Protection not perceived as FS responsibility
- Consistency between recovery plans and FS plans

3. Other Comments and Suggestions

- N/A

TABLE D: Economies, Social Values, All-Lands Approach

1. What should the planning rule say about the provision of goods and services (including ecosystem services) that contribute to vibrant local, regional, and national economies?

GROUP 1

- The notion of wilderness in the past hasn't been seen as a political issue.
- So many of these lands get visitors from outside of Arizona. Develop and building a personal connection to that landscape is important for getting people to come back. People will then remember their visits and want to come back.
- If you drive to Payson to Prescott, the gates are all locked. If I get a ticket, it is based on the law. How is this process going to affect that?
- If you leave every gate open, you have access everywhere. The Forest Service needs to limit access at times. There are different reasons for this.
- I think that taking into account the social, economic, and traditional scientific.

GROUP 2

- Interested in seeing forests help support local economies and increasing the value of environmental services and how they can benefit the human condition.
- The use of forest lands is very important to local communities, especially rural ones.
- Interested in the use of the forest and how it applies to communications.
- The economic impact in a particular location interests me.
- Be proactive with studies that evaluate the economic impact. We used NAU to develop a study in our region. It should be done on the front end rather than during the process or at the end. It could be a great tool for the communities.
- Doesn't the Forest Service use in-plan and out-plan?
- In the terms of ecosystem services, carbon offsets should be included. Which is currently not included in federal policy.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Closure as a resource tool should only be used as a last resort. This is the most restrictive form of management and used only if there is nothing else available.
- Liability. Lawyers shouldn't be able to dictate land use. This permeates everything.
- You need to define what closure means. Some closures can only affect cars.
- Closure gives the Forest Service latitude to manage on different levels. There should be more guidance on a national rule on closure issues.
- Carbon offsets shouldn't be the end all.

GROUP 3

- In term of economy, the next rule needs to recognize that the forest restoration needs need a funding source. If we don't allow that, there is just no solution.
- The new rule needs to recognize a balance where economy should be on an equal footing with restoration.
- The new plan will need to rely on the economy for management of the forest.
- Right now, economic impact gets hung up on some goal, which is bogging down things.
- A science based rule is fine as long as the stakeholders are involved in the process.

2. How can the planning rule reflect the interdependency of social, economic, and ecological systems in a way that supports sustainable management of national forests and grasslands?

GROUP 1

- Don't forget urban economies.
- Any plan dealing with economies needs to take a longer timeframe into account than what has been done previously. Minimum of 20 years.
- Sustainability needs to be addressed. Get the economy to help sustainability.
- Interested in talking about how recreation contributes to economies and telling the story about what happened on the land, who worked on the land, how the land has played a role.
- Permit fees that have grazing. There is currently not a collaborative effort involved.
-

GROUP 2

- One of the things the planning rule should address is the need for balance between science and economic studies. Recognize the fact that the Forest Service has a duty need to be a high priority and not solely on science. Should be a collaborative effort.
- I have concerns that science will trump economic issues. We have been able to minimize impact by prohibiting access to our electronic sites.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- I have been doing this since Clinton Administration and it seems that science has been the forefront rather than social types of sciences.
- We need to have equal valuations of several types of science rather than one type of science. The rule that was just shot down was trying to balance sustainability. It seems that the agencies are still struggling with that. I think that your bottom line is set by what your system is producing. You can use some of it but not all of it.
- The agency tends to promise everything to everything. Things should be delivered without compromising. They must be responsive to the current system.
- The focus on economic need has led to a lot of the problems we have with public lands right now. Science has to take the lead.
- In the current rule, there is supposed to take into account the current recreational values.
- Politics should be guided by science. Politics has been what has ruined the process in the past.
- Payson is economically impacted by the economy.
- You need to balance all different factors.
- What we do in certain sections can be an economic boost for a larger section of the forest area. Especially for an adjacent rural community. But it all needs to balance out.
- We have to make provisions for our growing population. How do you do this in a sustainable manner?

GROUP 3

- Interested in vibrant economies.
- Interested in social values.
- I am interested in local and national economics.
- We need to plan for something that will be sustainable and take economics into account.
- Our organization also owns another company. Sustainability all ties together but the challenge is how that can thrive without economics suffering. A balance must be kept.
- Either the agency or the economy will need to fund the Forest Service land restoration. It is not mutually exclusive.

3. Should the forest planning process move to an all lands approach? If so how?

GROUP 1

- Interested in all lands approach and the whole process. How this may integrate with other Federal rules.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- All lands approach in an encouraging concept. The problems that I have encompass all lands.
- Depending on how the rule comes out, the land management plan comes closer to what I would. I like the all lands approach.
- Competing interests on land must be considered. Grazing management approach, endangered species, etc.
- All lands approach is scary to oil, mining, and gas people. There are some people who are suspicious of the approach.
- Forest land policy should try to be a good fit with the general land uses in the area. All the land use plans should mesh.
- One agency shouldn't be telling land owners how to manage land. It should be more of a collaborative process.
- Counties develop comprehensive plans. The Forest Service should be checking with these plans to look at if adjacent communities will be compatible site uses. Take other plans into account.
- The Forest Service needs to understand that although they only own Forest Service land, the decisions that they make will impact adjacent properties.
- The current rule is not strong enough. It seems now decisions are made without regard to forest impact.
- Minimum content for plans - what about existing transmission line corridors? Consider planning for new line corridors.
- All lands can talk about the type of habitat. Get it into public mind that public forest doesn't always mean trees. The type of lands themselves should be recognized.
- We need to think more long term about protecting lands that are contiguous.
- It should be important to work across agencies to develop continuity.

GROUP 2

- In the Western states, it is the checkerboard ownership that makes it essential to have an all lands approach.
- I would like to see the planning rule so that it should be system wide and not left to one person to decide.
- There should be consistency on a national level. A local supervisor shouldn't be able to change the rules.
- Looking at things at the planning level that creates consistency.
- Consider the concept of the surrounding lands is critical. All lands would be all adjacent lands regardless of political boundaries.
- I would like to see the forest service work with other adjacent public agencies lands. If you have a wilderness area they should work together to include the BLM land, for example.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Our country is founded on rights infringing on others. I think this should apply to Forest Service lands.

GROUP 3

- I am interested in land management approach.
- A planning rule that would get a responsible planning official that they stand on outside of their forest and look in. I administer programs that go towards the area common goal. How can we weave the link and what will it take for everything to work together.
- We are going through a state wide forest assessment looking at all lands in state. I think the planning rule should tie more than just national forest and grasslands into a whole.
- Does all-lands mean diverse jurisdiction or different land types? I think it could go both ways. Ultimately I like the notion of it as an ecosystem unit. It is critically important that this is done in Arizona. The plan should not be limited to the priority of the moment. I have found there is an impassible boundary between tribal land and Forest Service land.
- All lands takes public, private, tribal lands and looks at it as a whole.
- It needs to have a vibrant multiuse. Maintain this to have available resources so economy doesn't suffer. It must be science based.
- Communication must be done across boundaries between all parties.
- In the management planning group, there must be a requirement that there must be communication with adjacent agencies for ecosystem wide management.
- Even for private land, the goals and objectives should be taken into account.
- One thing I would like to see is more specificity about recreational aspects and get them quantified so they can be balanced against other uses. Quantified through number of camping days.
- I think it is important when you are looking at the landscape, some of the things we study is the linkage between different mountain ranges. There must be a plan to include all the different types of areas. We need the same management tools in all those areas.
- Today has challenges and opportunities. Population growth will make this more difficult. The planning rule will be a way to recognize that.
- I think everything needs to be taken into account.
- What I am observing is that a lot of what exists in the current form prevents local economies. I think it is critical moving forward a lot more flexibility and decision space at the regional and district level. The rule needs to allow more flexibility. Different parts of the lands will have different values. They all need to be taken into account. We need to come to a point where a supervisor can make a decision without having to wait for direction from the federal level. If there is outcome not just

**U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

process level then that is the consistency. Should be outcome driven versus process driven.

- Once there is consensus on the what and why, we need more flexibility for decision making.

4. Other Comments and Suggestions

GROUP 1

- Is the Tonto National Forest going to do no planning until the new rule comes out?
- The rule is very important for what you do. You can really make an impact on the day to day operations. There are things within the rule that can really direct the Forest Service on how they do things.
- There is a fine balance in rule making between being too specific and too general. You have to find the middle ground somewhere.
- The contracting mechanism has to be long term to affect the policy.
- My impression is that currently there isn't that education process to bring the history element into the forest lands.
- The rule could create jobs.
- The Forest Service has had 100 years to legislate. How much change do we think we can affect to change this rule?

GROUP 2 – N/A

GROUP 3 – N/A

TABLE E: Public Collaboration

1. What is the best way to involve stakeholders, other agencies, and governments in the planning process?

GROUP 1

- Examples: State water quality assurance has a series of citizen advisory boards & Coronado had technical experts from a variety of agencies to advise strictly on the science side. Suggests two groups: 1) Citizen group for process and 2) a science-based group
- Early involvement and transparent throughout process – helps accountability
- Citizen advisory boards to continuously review process.
- Agency to agency consultation process should be open to public
- Reiterate the word “transparent”

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Several natural forests will be planning at same time and the organizations and stakeholders don't have the ability to be at all at the same time – suggests centralized location for information(i.e. website) – more convenient resource to refer to.
- Sequence of planning is currently hard to stay in tune with entire process – need to stagger meetings and comment deadlines
- Challenging to stay abreast of all current issues in state, even being on the right mailing/e-mailing list. But she was not sent this invitation. Tries hard to get on right list, and she found this meeting in a very roundabout way – almost a missed opportunity. Who did we miss being here today, that is going to wish they were? Centralized place or develop a master list on the front end and then funnel it through affiliates in other states. (2 people didn't receive notification via forest service)
- Information communication – representative from youth group recreational leader (non-profit group). Communication break-downs; hard to find the rules; how can they contribute in the way of ecology; AZGF sent e-mail advising of this meeting today.
- Need a mechanism to always tap into a very well publicized central location.
- Pet peeve: people joining in the process at the very end that weren't involved through entire process. Or at least not having major input.

GROUP 2

- Developing land management plans – blank slate, NEPA process has been shallow, Jack-in-the box process was accurate
- Collaborative planning – critical to engage stakeholders at every level (never go back in the box) re-learn this lesson on a regular basis
- Be clear up front – what are the constraints are and what we are trying to achieve (i.e. what you won't be talking about. What the parameters are.)
- Fundamental need to shift the paradigm from involving stakeholders in review process to involving stakeholder in design process. Practical idea: plan should stipulate this involvement is necessary.
- Rule making or planning: developing tools and have a collaborative process for developing the plan. Fundamental break in the process throughout the development of the plan after tools are created. Suggest: Citizen advisory committees designed to help monitor the use of these tools in an ongoing process. Will help find continuity and build key relationships through the implementation of the plans. This has not yet been seen but has been proposed.
- New mechanism to ensure collaboration through the life of the rule and/or the life of the plan – this will ensure a static product.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Whole level - planning process: fundamental need to address the limitation that has been imposed through FACA on the process. Needs to be addressed in new rule process.
- Continually be looking at how to define stakeholder. Traditionally is people who use the land, but should include a broader range. Ever-changing list.
- How federal laws intersect the process – road map of expectations and where the key intersections are.
- New rule should address limitations by the federal laws. Pre-decisional NEPA limitation as example. Collaborative process stalls out by intersection with NEPA – how do you balance this process?

GROUP 3

- Effective ways to reach a broad spectrum of the general public.
- Mechanisms: More electronic methods – e-mails, websites, etc.
- Difference between: Public involvement – agency listens but does what they want to vs. Collaboration which implies more cooperation. (ex: NEPA tried to cut the participation out).
- *Ideas from Marty: Define the differences in participation stages (International organization of Public Participation)*
 - *Inform: Objective – provide timely, accurate and easily accessible info. Promise is to keep you informed*
 - *Consult: Objective - tell what will be done with information gathered.*
 - *Involved: Objective – more authentic involvement; Promise is that we will use what we can to the fullest extent possible.*
 - *Collaborate: Objective – help find the answers, help create the product. Promise- use answers to the fullest extent possible.*
- Are you willing to keep the promises? Ability to meet the expectations of the stakeholders? Understanding the promises and the responsiveness, will determine their involvement (Biological institute).
- Once a stakeholder group is established, there should be a limitation then on who can participate. Don't allow people to jump into a process at the end. (Assuming there was a fair process that initiated the participation). Ensures consistency and fair process throughout.

2. How might planning be coordinated with other agencies and governments?

GROUP 1

- Coronado example w/ Rosemont mine : Technical assistance committee – science oriented from several agencies (approx. 30) (see quest. 1)

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Former governors of forest planning group (forest health) (governor's committee started under governor hull): Industry-NGO group and science group, met both separately and together; eventually merged into one. Successful example with a lot of consensus, transparency and good vision.
- Process was stacked about 20 to 1 in above governors committee.
- Effectiveness of governors committee was low; limited participation; difficult with changing governors.
- Process wasn't perfect, but it was an open conversation with good access to info.
- Four Fry – too large of a group (55+ people)

GROUP 2

- Combine landscape scale analysis and collaboration with agencies. Mechanism to collaborate federal and state agencies across boundaries.
- Promote the ease of working across boundaries – in the rule there should be a requirement to develop a common action involving stakeholders across boundary lines. For ex: stakeholders in national park may not be very active in state park where there is a crossover. Current rule limits your involvement by the boundaries.
- Mutually agreed upon management objectives – consistency across the conflicting. Certain conservation goals must be agreed upon in order to have some direction that is feasible.

GROUP 3

- Make it a requirement
- Consult officials by law (specific example) – model that works
- Jointly fund a position within different agencies (paid liaison).
- Rule (as a national rule) should identify where coordination with other agencies is preferred or required and perhaps suggest criteria for how this coordination should happen.

3. What kind of administrative review process should be offered to the public in the planning rule? (E.g. pre-decisional objections and/or post-decisional appeal processes?)

GROUP 1

- Make certain that the public is indeed involved and not all agencies and scientific – it is the people's forest at the bottom line.
- Currently the different levels of advisory councils information is exchanged when the reviews are done right then it needs to come right down (transparent), not filter through for a long time.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Need to know when to share the information at key points and not get wrapped up in the planning process and miss this important step. – variety of meetings, website, process to voice their input and have more access.
- Master calendar as far out and as broad of a scope as possible (DEQ is a good example)

GROUP 2

- Center for biological diversity appreciates appeals process
- Issue: participants tend to be locally derived and very specific. Resource advisory committee (RAC) – results are counter-intuitive to the intent of the plan that was created.
- Helpful process, but necessary to engage public in this process.
- Appeals/legal processes can end up being biased because of local engagement at the national forest level.
- Review vs. Design? Concern is how to participate in making the decision, not as much concerned about review of the decision after it is made. Iterative process – review process which allows the feedback to contribute to the final product as opposed to one that is based on legal issues only.

GROUP 3

- Regis clarified the difference and process of pre-decisional objections and post-decisional appeals.
- Important at all levels to have the ability post-decisional appeal of a plan. Seen a lot of “squishyness” where things are changed to solve a problem or address an objection, that don’t really solve the problem. Leaves public with only the option of litigation – issues for individual public members. Need the last final step of being able to object the final decision.

4. Other Comments and Suggestions

GROUP 1

- All lands approach needs to be coordinated and brought to the table. Several layers of planning needs to be addressed in the Planning Rule.
- Has to be a way for a minority voice to be heard. People should not feel like their voice is totally squashed.
- Summary: Transparency; centralized location for information; multiple groups – citizens and technical oriented; minorities are represented.

GROUP 2

- All lands approach needs to be in this process – rule collaboration.
- Incredible dearth of connection with the land (story of the land). This is missing on the forest service land. More interpretation of what the land means will help

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

promote coordinated efforts between agencies – telling the story in a collaborative manner. Promote what has happened on the land – conservation history of forest service land.

- Trans-active planning in the seventies and eighties is an example of a collaborative process.

GROUP 3

- Be clear with public: Is the USFS asking for collaboration on issues that they are willing to be responsive on? Are they really willing or able to make changes? Make the public aware of the capacities in the specific venue.
- 1982 rule had too many details and inflexibilities – leads to lawsuits. USFS tried to cover every process and every step. New rule needs to be workable, flexible and simple.
- Difference in opinion from above statement – agency flexibility has led to bad things happening. Need to have objective based planning with strong measures of accountability built in (i.e. standards and requirements related to objectives).

TABLE F: Recreation

1. What if anything should the planning rule say about suitable uses and/or places of interest?

GROUP 1

- Forest planning is forest specific, plan is written that way, cross county trails across many forests/ needs to be some mandate that considers regional boundaries/crossing boundaries
- Recreation fly-in forest service interaction is limited, not encourage forest service strips, wide range of opportunities across borders, uniform access opportunities/National Forest has closed down aviation in Arizona
- New rule needs more emphasis on non-motorized recreation/each district needs representative or dedication of staff person to non-motorized recreation
- New rule needs to retain emphasis on multi-use aspect/ land of many users/including motorized and non-motorized use/one use should not be favored over another/variety of opportunities
- Forest supervisor given a lot of latitude of how they feel it is enforced vs. collaborative process and regional aspect of how the rule is followed
- Rule should state in planning process the needs for specific forests need to be taken into account/regional boundaries and regions
- Grandfathered areas, should be considered for existing uses/only way for some uses to remain on the land

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Incorporate traditional uses with future uses
- Define what indicates a multiple use in the forest lands
- Embed multi-uses within rule
- Dictate planning process for forest plan, existing recreational stakeholders need to be a part of the recreational process/be a part of dialogue during the process
- Define the recreation element in the planning rule/Recreation has such a broad meaning when thought of at a regional level
- Legitimate use/“not on my forest” comment, etc.
- Plan needs to focus on type of recreation that are not resource consumptive/aspect of sustainability
- Resources in forests that are necessary for administrative purposes, why not let public use them? Multi-use management/cross usage outside of what element is originally made for – e.g. forest roads for fire protection

GROUP 2

- Carrying capacity of land for all recreational expects need to be considered when accessing recreation impacts
- Recognize impact of each element/use is having on the forest, not all uses have the same impact on each impact/cost and benefit analysis
- Analysis what type of activity is currently in that area/might not be appropriate for that area/appropriate recreation for the area/protected area vs. uses in that area, type of activities, etc.
- Provisions in planning to examine positive uses that are not damaging to the land/uses appropriate to the level of use and type of forest
- Activity allowed on forest land/how much money is it going to general is wrong reason for analyzing short and long term impacts of recreation activity (what is and is not appropriate for the use on the land it is on)
- Species, level watershed, impacts for footprint, permit system to reduce impacts/other obligations to permit holders
- Based on population/growth patterns with aspect of impacts of resources
- Recognized need of understanding and the impact of recreation specific-monitoring
- How do address the need to adapt to recreation needs in the future and impacts
- Negative impact/adaptive management to forest, how do you police the use of resources on forest land
- Should not adapt the rule to recreation demand but to environmental impacts, what recreation elements should be provided that do not damage the lands they are on
- Waited heavier than people needing to enjoy heavy impact on natural resources
- What type of balance is needed with passive recreation/ all funding is going toward active recreation needs

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Recreation being measured but not utilized/different levels of recreation in each demand/only addresses current demand/FS need to use their own research for future uses/demands
- Need to ask people (existing users) that are impacted by uses on the land/areas
- NEPA documents do not cover everything associated with the resources on the land/consider recreation uses that might be impacted by what is mentioned in EIS
- Agency that has the better science-based coordination and community
- National Forest Lands areas where people want the type of management activities to continue with the management use/beneficial to work with all agencies associated with the forest lands.
- AZ Game and Fish manage wildlife needs to know what the FS service is doing/need to coordinate and work together on
- Rule needs to define the meaning of recreation/hard to define it at a regional level/flip-side - if you don't call out specific recreation uses some uses will get lost in other

GROUP 3

- Define recreation with demand/comprehensive survey – have others complete statement comprehensive recreation plan (SCRCP).
- Younger generation not plugged into outdoors/education for youth
- Tell the story of the land/comprehensive education and interpretative of the land/people more respectful of educational interpretation if there is a story with the land/recreation responsibility/stewardship of environment/signage, etc. more of just the blank landscape/education and stories to help tie youth into the area
- Opportunity of taking youth into the forest/involved and experience first-hand it gains their respect, becomes there forest
- Define regional significance/historic events/rule needs to be setup to allow this to happen
- Rule needs to be broad enough to incorporate all recreational uses/management plans within each forest area
- Forest purpose is supplying multiple uses which includes natural and passive areas/central purpose are for multiple uses, people forget the forest are used for more than just one use
- Rule needs to be written in a way where it doesn't narrow down exclusive uses
- Scientific carrying capacity
- Effect of use based on environmental impacts/proportion of damage of users and uses to environmental impact
- Land ownership balance – BLM, Private, State Land, etc.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

2. What should the planning rule say about recreation access, visitor facilities, and services?

GROUP 1

- How closures are handled to an area should only be taken as a last resort/ area should be managed where the forest should be a resource/need criteria for closures
- Closures related should include science-based means
- What can they get from volunteer programs to benefit the forest areas
- Recreation as a service provided by the forest/value of providing amenities
- Hiking trails/define concept of what a “minimal tool” rule should be
- Forests located adjacent to municipalities/regional-ity connection to resource damage, more need for operations and maintenance, staffing and funding/nearness to metro areas
- Physical characterizes of access/uses, requires forest to standardize how access will work, standardize how one approaches access
- Define users in forest and how that user can enjoy area

GROUP 2

- Education and background balance with social aspect of more people in the woods/ great outdoors/what is the role of education with the balance of the forest land/ has this opportunity been missed
- Reconnect children with nature/access and experience to be in forest/access for opportunity/each forest needs to address education values
- Education needs to be statewide education on forest uses, how they provide/stewardship level/understanding of how to respect the forest

GROUP 3

- Rule written so recreational opportunities/ATV and recreational shooting, NF land can setup use areas that public safety can direct people to these areas
- Nature of ATV users would have an issue with a defined area/needs to reduce some of the problems that are happening with these uses happening on lands that they are not allowed
- Rule needs to dedicated recreational sites for specific recreational uses (ATV, Recreational Shooting Areas, etc.) Public safety can have better enforcement when they have areas that they can direct uses to go
- Balance accessibility with type of use/use areas should be located with uses that occur within that area

3. Other Comments and Suggestions

- N/A

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Stakeholder Roundtables Notes
Phoenix, AZ – April 28, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

TABLE G: “Wildcard” table

- FS units are fiefdoms – Ranger Districts are independent and work separately; they dictate how they operate with a “my property, my land” attitude. Want consistency across Forest Service. And, not only across the nation, but in between districts on a single unit. Even between Ranger Districts there is a lack of consistency.
- Yet, this individual has been using Forest Service strips for recreational use for 15 years. Aviators are a small group – they use the land like anybody else.
- In Idaho there are 27 strips – public use airstrips, as well as in Utah and Washington. Plus, in Montana there is a group called www.RecreationalAviationFoundation.org, 406-587-5166
- There is a FS airport near Roosevelt Lake but the local Ranger said no to aviators using the strip for recreational access. They said it’s a liability issue.
- This person also is a member of the Arizona Pilot Association and Payson Pilot Association. They want to do the work to maintain the airstrips and are willing to organize work parties. The FS should collaborate with groups like this to maintain specific areas of the forest – partner with clean-ups, etc.
- There are success stories about this kind of partnership, such as in Grand Gulch with the BLM land. Another example is in Payson, near the Rim Drive and Dickenson Flats, there is an old WWII war airfield marker. The AZ and Payson Pilots clean-up the airstrip annually by removing weeds, repainting, etc., It is a National Monument they want to preserve. This year or next, they will be creating or fixing a log fence – this is in cooperation with the FS because they will be providing logs for the project.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

I. Substantive Topics

TABLE A: Restoration, Conservation, Watershed Health, Climate Change & Adaptive Management

1. How can the next planning rule foster restoration of NFS lands?

- First have to establish the optimum point in history to strive to for restoration. It will be different for each forest.
- Set a plan for the goals to achieve and measure them on an ongoing basis.
- There must be information about wildlife and plant life; we know what those species need to be viable.
- Sometimes removing a threat can be simpler approach.
- Do scientific research and genetic research to design a tree that can withstand higher temperatures.
- Restore land to healthy habitat and animal species. Look at historical record to determine what the natural state is.
- Investigate alternatives to using timber.
- Restoration does not have to mean restricting access. Public needs to be involved.
- It's not true that all ATV users damage the forest.
- Endangered species deserve more protection. Migratory pathways are being blocked by private interests.
- Cattle abuse to USFS public lands
- Manage OHV recreation but do not promote OHV recreation.
- Plans need to adapt to the endangered species act. We need to move away from privatizing public lands. Predators need to be allowed to play their natural role.
- Forest Service should encourage reduction in use of fossil fuels in whatever way it can.
- FS should protect forests from timber and grazing and encourage use of alternative energies.
- Forests should be preserved and protected as they are.
- Grazing rights - need to look at how much private entities are being charged to run cattle on public lands. They are not charged enough currently.
- Unused roads need to be analyzed per their effect on the forest and closed if they are destructive to the land or wildlife.
- The roadless rule act needs to be incorporated into the planning process to protect key species.
- Cultural resources should be applied more in all areas and activities and projects. History Native American history, archaeology, ruins, etc.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

2. Should forest planning be conducted in the context of watersheds? If so, how?

- Buffer zones can be used to help restore ecosystems and restore watershed health. It can be an administrative tool and should be used as such.
- Protection of water needs to be a very high priority.
- Forests can be used to recycle water.
- Reintroduce beavers in the forests to encourage multiple small dams instead of big artificial, wasteful dams.
- Watershed health should be a priority.
- Water resources should not be used for cattle, so you have to get rid of the cattle.
- Water is the most important thing.
- There has to be balance in a democracy, but nature has to be above all. We have to save our water and trees for future generations.
- Cultural resources are important
- Water from national forests needs to be safe. Need to clean up as necessary and be protected.
- There has to be recognition of water rights but other resources are related.

3. What if anything should the rule say about water availability and quality, including factors outside of the Agency's control?

- Need to clean up superfund sites immediately.
- Incorporate water collection systems.
- Research ways of taking used water and reintegrating it into local and regional supplies in a healthy way that doesn't involve too much use of manmade chemicals.

4. How can a new planning rule build in flexibility to adapt to changing science, information or conditions and/or incorporate new data?

- Forest should be managed thinned so forest fires can be managed better, Thinned material can be used for biomass energy production.
- Annual community input opportunities to assess effectiveness of the forest plans. Provide support for national scientific assessments via grants, etc.
- Incorporate data generated by other reliable research processes.
- Need to be able to adapt to new information without waiting 20 years.
- Need to clearly define assumptions and expected changes. Each forest and each plan will have to make specific projections over a given period of time, monitor against

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

those changes, and if there is significant variances from those assumptions, then revisit the assumptions and expected changes.

- Have to use existing information on climate change instead of waiting for something to happen. Use existing information to anticipate what the plans will need.
- Plan should mandate that FS stay abreast of best available science on an ongoing basis.

5. When and how should plans be evaluated to see if they are working; what should trigger amendments?

- With all the available technology, we should be able to make revisions more often.
- Peer reviewed science as part of plan evaluation.
- Each region in FS should adjust to climate conditions around them. Each region should be treated differently based on the local conditions regarding resource extraction, etc. It should be reviewed on a 3-5 year basis.

6. How can the planning rule be proactive and innovative in addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation?

- Historians and archeologists as hard science resources for ideas to adapt to regional climate change. Use ancient techniques for modern climate change problems.
- Archaeologists need to be consulted in all areas of forest management.
- Forests remove CO₂ – protect certain areas with review and update
- Climate change – Native American survival
- Climate change resource usages and impacts
- Always consider the uncertainty principle in any decisions made. Err on the side of the resource, and not on the side of resource extraction.
- Learn from what history and archaeology what can teach us of past issues and how past peoples have lived with and adapted to changes in their environments.
- Find a way to have the political process regarding climate change guided by peer reviewed science.

7. What, if any, climate change assumptions should be used in the development of plan alternatives?

- The use of fossil fuels contributes to climate change.
- Climate change impacts the forests
- Forest are our best tool right now for mitigating climate change. Focus on restoration of trees and plants to reduce the amount of carbon dioxide in the air.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

8. Other Comments and Suggestions

- More enforcement of applicable laws regarding cultural resources.
- When a posse goes into to get a lost person the lost person should have to pay for the recovery costs.

TABLE B: Diversity, Wildlife

1. At what landscape scale and how should the Forest Service analyze and provide for diversity of plants and animals (individual unit, watershed, landscape scale)?

- Multiple levels concerning different issues.
- Viable populations at each sites, plants and native species.
- Specify scale a bit more.
- One rule is not all encompassing
- Take size and impact of sustainable populations of species
- Diverse forest, how much resources will be applied to specific species??
- Prioritize funding?
- Habitat connectivity across boundaries is important.
- Viable species currently listed, system devised needs to take different habitats locations and what is the future of these species
- Concerned with overlying economic and money making issues hurting species
- Not sure a balance can be made between commodity use and preservation of non money making habitats
- Non domestic animals used for private benefit, such as grazing, should be considered.
- Multiple use should not mean multiple abuse
- Having an issue with the scale
- Boundaries should be what the forest service is responsible that is it
- Each interdependence watershed, grass, species depend on are not inside political boundaries
- Interagency collaboration is important
- Certain species cross boundaries and should be considered where the habitat is located
- The smallest scale should be the forest
- An overall umbrella to watch over all the smaller groups important to the local areas
- What scale is the ability to monitor actually feasible?
- Neighboring lands approach

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- All public lands should be collaborative in monitoring and tracking species
- Protection corridors.
- Collaborative efforts across international borders
- Connectivity across borders is real and not political
- Species migrate... interagency collaboration
- Plants know no political boundaries
- The scale should be based on the cross over boundaries
- Data sharing
- Collaborative data, store, for utilization by all
- Educate the public as to what is happening on the lands
- Educate people
- Enforce provisions and consequences of illegal actions
- Hire staff to enforce rule
- Minimum tool needed to accomplish a goal.
- Lowest impact tool
- How to minimize the impact of conservation tools
- At risk species, run against legality issues
- Enforcement of legal sanctions
- Increase viable species definitions
- Fast reproducing species added to the area in a beneficial manner
- Still need predators, food chain
- Leave alone top tier food chain predators
- Key stone species collaboration between agencies on impacts and behaviors
- Good science, peer reviewed work outside of agency control
- Unbiased review of rules
- Per project and plan level resource level review
- Organization of data, cumulative data
- Digitize all data across the board
- Projections should be made and compared as a benchmark
- Have to project to make benchmarks
- What are recent findings for different species that are tracked?
- Monitor interconnectivity of multiple species
- Climate, rainfall effect, what plants need to live, development causes and impacts
- Monitor all things that coexist and the affect it has on each component
- Clear communication across regions and agencies
- More open communication opportunities at a multiple agency level
- Collaborative efforts with all agencies government or not
- Coordinate agency agendas to prevent conflictive actions
- Establish common goals

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Collaborate data and share the information and best practices
- Coordinate monitoring to be shared
- All lands approach
- Get a great deal of people invested across the board, so the effort is large and all encompassing
- A baseline year needs to be set to give the opportunity for access to shared data
- Plugged into collaborative sites
- Outreach with educational institutions
- Reach a variety of age groups to foster future interest and investments
- Be more transparent with data availability
- Even raw data should be available to anyone
- Not allow private interests to effect data collection and transparency
- All data should be raw and not skewed based on individual agendas
- Volunteer opportunity should be utilized for data collection
- Utilize students for practical experience and large amounts of free data collection efforts
- Have more citizen participation opportunities at more stages

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

- Limit access to the forest to prevent litter
- Don't allow camping, but allow hiking, manage human activities harm on species
- Over-management of non-important species take resources away from more important species
- Time it takes to notice harm should be considered
- Need an interagency monitoring of species to make sure further risk is not caused.
- New rule to endorse the idea of wilderness and roadless areas is important to just leave them alone. Manage by way of leaving them alone
- Manage corridors, where species migrate undisturbed regardless of who is in charge of the land
- We cannot lose any species, once they are gone they cannot come back
- Planning rules should require corridors and connectivity to protect species
- The species that need a habitat to survive should be considered before damaging activities harm even farther
- Habitats should be larger for mobility and species reproduction
- Cattle grazing harms spotted eagles
- Non native cattle hurt native species

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Cross contamination of fecal matter and water quality providing for visibility of species that eat out of the water
- Open education so everyone knows why they cannot do something they want to
- Cattle should be limited to conserve lands needed by other species
- Even if a species is not endangered it should be monitored and tracked as well to prevent future damage currently unforeseen
- Are tracked species population projected for the future?
- Rights should not be limited
- Conservation not destruction
- We destroyed the lumber industry due to resource management
- Minute minnows are important because you don't know how their disappearance may affect the overall species
- Education is key
- Manage the whole environment not just the at risk species
- Monitor species
- Monitor ecosystem
- Airstrip impact mitigation, maintenance,
- Should know what is happening at the landscape level to reduce further harm
- Loss of habitat, causing decline of species. What we need to do to preserve species for the species sake, not for man only.
- Maintain viable populations
- All lands approach all ecosystems impact importance

3. Other Comments and Suggestions

- A lot of education was needed for this group to understand the main questions.

TABLE C: Economies, Social Values, All-Lands Approach, Public Collaboration

1. What should the planning rule say about the provision of goods and services (including ecosystem services) that contribute to vibrant local, regional, and national economies?

- How are you balancing science vs. interests?
- To me the key thing on all this is all of this is first define what is a sustainable forest model; can't put economies in until you know scientifically effective healthy forest; based on science; THEN what is in interest of all local economies
- Did the previous rule work? Is it long?
- Cattle ranging and mountain top removal is destructive to landscape and forest, should be eliminated

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Do by percentage of local people, is it sustainable – must be sustain, can't just be based on depletion; when planning, how much emphasis is on economic vs. overall health of forest?
 - Local econ can't override the forest health – can't do state to boost economy and deplete forest and create non-sustain forest. Econ benefits of local economy can't; 1) define what the max extraction is from forest; then local econ can pull out assuming local econ will be based on extraction (recreation, etc)
 - Planning rule is philosophical statement not tactics?
 - What should occur to help the local economy as well? When making considerations for land, need help from local groups which will help their econ, must be beneficial for both FS users and local groups; local groups are outspoken in NEPA process; thinking of it as their land, not all U.S. land – see what's closest to them; public land must be managed for everyone; history of taking private land to public – eminent domain; outreach for people leaving up against pub lands; in private parties outside forest boundaries are allowed to log, graze, mine in forest – all have bite of apple; all are unfortunately abusers of resources
 - Vibrant local/national economies – logging and mining; recreation; pub lands grazing – biggest benefit of forest is what they were created for = to provide water; another issues with cattle running through there –
 - Tourism – heritage tourism is underutilized; support local/national econ in positive way – know people are interested; as long as it's well educated tourism people don't trash it
 - Keep forest lands intact – hike, bird watch, ride horses, have as resource any time to camp, have a natural experience; if kept in good quality, will always be kept up; everyone wants use of those benefits
 - Provide jobs for people in neighboring towns = support of local economy
 - How much jobs are created by FS?
- 2. How can the planning rule reflect the interdependency of social, economic, and ecological systems in a way that supports sustainable management of national forests and grasslands?**
- Energy wind and solar need to implemented more and stop depending on regulations by government to do these things focus on transportation; I bike everywhere; bike lanes, alt modes of transportation things to bridge; connectivity between planning rule and exploration of alt. modes of transp. and not relying on stupid bills Kerry and graham going through senate striping rights of EPA to lay down avenues and ways to improved energy efficiency everywhere – modify bills to stop stripping rights and start enforcing them.

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Harvesting the material that needs to be thinned – our region or in general? How applies to forest in Florida?
- Try to maintain forests; unlimited amount of resources; chipping plants; regulate that? A lot of fuel out there – make plans to take advantage of them.
- There's a lot of resources but not unlimited
- What needs to be on an acre – how much timber needs to be there to maintain the health?
- Controlled burns – what good does that do – need to utilize that material
- How much of emphasis is on logging vs. restoration? Can lay down on tree that was cut in last century (6 ft tall) on Rim. What are you restoring? Whole Rim has been logged out. Need to define baseline that we should compare to?
- Ever seen a clear cut in NW? exactly what we don't want
- Restore forest to an old growth configuration, esp. in wilderness/roadless areas. In many instances need to allow fire play its natural role – seen as destructive but actually not.
- Big fire at Yellowstone – did a lot of study on that one and found that have to just let it go. Is that part of FS? Forest fires are a good thing, or can be. How much do you interact with national parks and what they've learned off that – take their info and judge; FS is in charge of people tearing down forests
- # of fires occurring are not naturally caused; many are set/arson like one in Calif. But also area where fires have been kept back from taking place in natural system – so fire was more intense than it would have been.
- FS did have policy of destruction for so long, forests were essentially manmade forests, wildlife were manmade also, fires are good even if set by man. If forests was in natural condition would be low intensity, not huge destructive. If forest is thin, use that to make energy. Large trees survive if the fires are infrequent.
- If building more roads to pull things out; burns do less;
- BLM is selling timber at a loss – shouldn't be at taxpayer expense if it's our public property – make sure it's worthwhile to do so.
- Being responsible about this, not old school not tearing up land to get to resources
- When national forests were established it was for multiple-use; must be equal balance between them all
- Hope FS will chose what is most harmonious to Native Americans or environmentalist; water users; when areas are used should be a way to restore it; must be balanced; I don't want to see large open top mining pits;
- Camping sites, people don't take care – more education on bring in/take out
- Most people don't mind paying for camping if goes toward maintenance of sites; OHV should pay usage fee since contributing to pollution vs. hikers

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Leave no trace workshops – need incentive for people who leave no trace – encourage more use; making sure there are enough trash cans on roads;
- Are there still any mining claims in FS lands? Are they being timed out?
- 193 million acres of forest nationally – how big is country in acres? How much forest is there - %? FS should know that
- Places of interest = wilderness area? Historical things, such a generic phrase – administrative natural area; enclosure from grazing area; address these places in such a way that they continue into the future; a location of unusual scenic value; places where people like to go – places of natural interest esp. in AZ include places where there's water
- Once we've figured out what % of country is forest, go back to when 1st time country was recognizable as now (after LA purchase) – what was % then? Establish an optimum % of forest – maybe all individual. Forests are getting smaller; maintain and increase that %. Forests are taking in carbon dioxide; giving us oxygen; cleaning water – doing all these things but we don't even know what % of country is forest. Natural resource – need to preserve; things forest does should be part of our gross national product; never included; GNP is about earthquake – good for GNP because have to rebuild things. Should be about environment; put it into economic picture of country b/c never has been
- Theme of science – good science can answer these questions. How get good science? what does data mean/how put to use? Depending on who is leading country affects FS?

3. Should the forest planning process move to an all lands approach? If so how?

- Move to an omnibus lands planning system that requires all public lands to collaboration especially on issues such as climate change and animal migration corridors to allow natural processes to occur; and look at the science of climate change; make sure understand what's going on before making decisions regarding public lands. Should be conference call of all pub land mgmt agencies to discuss land mgmt issues that all should take care of together
- Regarding the planning rule on federal level, all agencies in fed government should play a part in this to establish a planning a rule that will apply to all forests, no matter what agency that manages forest
- Are they trying to streamline process by making one rule fits all?
- How does what happens in VT apply to AZ – how address the diversity
- All lands = involvement by neighboring jurisdictions? Do need to get as much inv as possible – create personal investment in FS lands – need to have everyone feeling like there is something they could lose by not being involved & saying what they

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

way want– the way to preserve resources is to have as many people saying ‘it’s mine too – my voice is just as important as oil/lumber

- What will all lands approach do, create more bureaucracy in government?
- On our border with Mexico, blocking a lot of wildlife tried to let antelope through; can’t control areas that animals will go through; try to do it in gunnery range where Mexicans generally
- Proximity with forest – can you restrict development? – work with local jurisdictions to develop more sustainable/comprehensive planning? Senior FS participate in regional planning meetings; light/noise pollution – applicable for places like Grand Canyon
- From looking at national standards for my field, they’re good. Not about rules that exist, it’s enforcement. Implementation is big problem – NEPA is good
- All forests vs. 2) all agency 3) ecosystems = all lands

4. What is the best way to involve stakeholders, other agencies, and governments in the planning process?

- NEPA is answer – involve stakeholders; has process for that; wherein other agencies fish/wildlife; all equal in process in NEPA on issues involving FS land; FS sometimes is slow at moving onto NEPA; don’t like to do it/time consuming; expensive; never satisfy all audiences; mining, logging, grazing; conflicting views; have to put all cards on table from all collaborators and partners.
- A number of orgs that I deal with, forest service visits them monthly.
- What about once you get some ideas; send out questions - what do you think about this, is this what you had in mind? Give feedback at a later date once you get everyone’s feedback.
- Should be up to agency scientist to give purely scientific answer without impacting their job.
- Peer review outside of agency/company = binding
- Am a cultural resources specialist - very confusing to go between agencies and have slightly different rules/requirements; if was more standardization would be easier to provide a quality product. The law reps cultural resources well; just insisting what’s in law actually happens; even though I know cultural resources has voice, don’t see it happening.
- Some neighboring jurisdictions are easier to work with them others BLM v. tribal v. state land, Parks and Rec, Fish and Wildlife
- When are they going to re-evaluate the plan? It’s different for each resource; within each resource the separate laws that govern them have teeth or don’t. Cultural resource laws don’t – so contractor hired to answer scientific question is under pressure to give answer that is wanted

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- FS tries to avoid NEPA b/c expensive/time consuming; will do finding of no significant impact; nothings been done. When don't do FONSI will do an EA – shortcut assessment, way to get around issues
- Reopen and re-establish old airstrips to visit different parts of forest – collaborate with other associations other states; if work with volunteer orgs, can be a big resource to FS and big national resource; Aviation Association; from grassroots level on up
- Hunting orgs, wildlife orgs – strong, well-represented groups
- Link to orgs – have a liaison for that – then will multiple comm. Thousands of times+ individual mailing lists
- Associations can help out through educate and volunteer org – don't know if FS works with them or not? Best resource to get word out to assist in mgmt of lands
- Needs better outreach from FS to neighboring jurisdictions – look at national parks do excellent job of doing outreach to people around them. NFS not so much – if at entrance of forest have ranger station to educate people; have ranger do monthly outreach with people in local communities
- International cooperation for wildlife; with other agencies that deal with same issues; plants/animals; coordinated effort is worthwhile; but people in U.S. won't do it unless agencies mandate it.
- California/ is really active; AZ active but NM less so with international cooperation on wide variety of fronts
- Park Service, AZ F&G = good example of collaboration

5. What kind of administrative review process should be offered to the public in the planning rule? (E.g. pre-decisional objections and/or post-decisional appeal processes?)

- Admin review process - consider using environmental groups as part of review process.
- Had public meetings for people to put in opinions – how many meetings with oil & gas/mining/lumber companies. Are they here tonight? Meet with them separately?
- One big problems is local input to forest district – scream about it – whole place is desolated because of snow mobiles; local group is overwhelmed. Shouldn't be only national outreach, need local outreach too.
- Get people more vested to what's going on in forest – our responsibility too – for future generations
- Once a stakeholder group is established then there needs to be limitation on who can participate (assuming fair process to create group) – can work well if people forming it are unbiased; has to be possible

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Have to have it because not everyone will go out and speak their mind (rep fairly) – representing group – need mechanism for collaborating with groups they represent; be upfront and people who have something to with working within system/not opposed to it; average person just doesn't do it – set up ways to evaluate groups
- Coconino FS is up on people walking, down on people riding vehicles – handful are walking on trails, hundreds are just walking throughout – got there somehow (through vehicles). One proposed is preventing me from using a campsite used for 50 years – just hearing out about it. Social values the majority not noisy minority. Majority is not being heard. I'd do it through surveys of people out there – go out on holiday weekend and see how many are out there hiking/backpacking vs. RVs. Several times a year to get a cross section and then redo it.
- Need to be in touch with what's happening – issue-driven process;
- Like kind of meetings like what we're doing here (like forest planning meetings a few yrs ago) break into smaller groups (5-6) around table; less chance for people to be intimidated – like best
- Would like to see more education focus, not necessarily on events, but individual situations within park; fronted by government or collaborate with non-profit; lectures/seminars/ environmental education; that way pub is informed to collaborate and have full grasp or issues
- Public collaboration – I get notice from AZ Fish and Game, otherwise wouldn't know about this meeting – very interactive with public; website, seminars, events, newsletter, every day send something out, keep people well informed of what's going on. One of best things state has going for it. But never see anything from FS or individual forests – no public involvement/hearings/seminars – may be out there but not aware of them. FS should at least have newsletter or seminars to let know what's going on with agency. Seem like a closed organization versus AZ Game and Fish = open. Park service sends info; even if done electronically have access to what's going; a lot of people do not use those methods – newspaper; PBS stations/announcements “this is happening at what time”, etc. miss a lot of people ; radio; TV public affairs show
- Unique to AZ has large pop centers and other areas that are recreation areas – a lot of hearings held around NF not in Phoenix – if look at recreation, involving more people in Phoenix – meetings should be in high population centers
- Mail postcards out; how notify them now? Is your question tied to this level of national discussion or forest?
- I like the idea of sending out simple postcard with website and brief summary of what discussion is and then going on to web site and typing in comments/chat; 3-4 times a year having pub comment periods – showing up in person; appreciate interaction

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Asked us to sign in and provided email addresses – why can't you use that. I've gone to these meetings all over state and haven't received anything yet.
- Should verify email addresses from open house; email and thank you for coming 10-20% will be wrong; let people know that you're in the database
- How does the FS use the audio print and visual media to help them to relationship to a project like this? – general media; just depends on when you do it, what else is going on at the time
- If want to know who's using forests, not saying to come here, and not there – just don't ignore either group (PHX or Flagstaff). – if there were more notice given, would have twice as many people at meetings
- Historically, FS is competing to get message out in media– competing in media; public affairs shows; where hold public meeting? Phoenix metro is massive.
- Very difficult to get a crowd any way you do it – need better method
- Is anything in plan that addresses media access?

TABLE D: Recreation

1. What if anything should the planning rule say about suitable uses and/or places of interest?

- Would it make sense instead of a piecemeal approach as we have now, better segregate or identify specific kinds of uses to ensure compatibility and to clearly define the kinds of uses that are allowed and reasonable for the type/kind of use; this will aid in communicating what can/cannot occur in particular locations
- I've heard that mountain biking isn't allowed in all forests or wilderness areas—is this the case? Answer: wilderness areas are very specific; typically only foot and horse access is allowed
- Passive recreational activities—camping, simply enjoying nature—needs to be considered a valued recreational activity; stewardship education should occur, and yes, there are some people who abuse the property, but we need to recognize that that sort of use is valuable
- Demand for types of recreational uses should be weighed when determining what types of recreation should occur; providing a minority recreational use that impairs a use with high demand shouldn't occur
- I moved out here from out East and when I first got here, I wasn't aware just how fragile the lands here in Arizona are—we need to consider what kinds of uses are appropriate in what areas—not all uses are appropriate everywhere!
- Need to analyze the types of recreation and their impacts based on size/scope/term (seasonal hunting access versus OHV year-round, etc.)

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- For active uses, especially, there needs to be more on-the-ground oversight, monitoring, and enforcement; if you're going to allow these sorts of uses, they need to be weighed against how often they are used or how close they are to metropolitan areas
- Cultural resources is an underutilized opportunity; better opportunities and educational resources should be an important recreational feature; Planning Rule needs to emphasize all resources equally, especially ones (like cultural resources) that are NON RENEWABLE
- The Planning Rule needs to incorporate adaptive management process so that one can respond quickly to new kinds of recreation, population demand, etc.
- Use email/blogs/interactive electronic communications devices to monitor trends and to allow for adaptively
- We need to get a plan for sustainable forest plan before recreation is considered; 100% of recreation has an impact; cannot have unlimited recreation today; need to analyze the impact of a recreational activity and its impact then determine what should be allowed; need to have sustainable recreation
- I'm surprised that someone would say that forest service wouldn't have considered sustainability first—shouldn't forest sustainability be the first consideration
- Indian communities shouldn't get a pass to take whatever they want (salmon out of a river)—everything in the forest needs to be subservient to sustainability (in terms of economic, cultural, environmental, etc.)
- There should be outright banning of some recreational activities that destroy—ATVs on desert for example; if destructive uses are introduced, USFS needs to react and stop it immediately (not decades later); need to be adaptive and to be allowed to REACT to inappropriate uses
- Hunting activities—if you need to haul something out, get a mule
- Recreation is important, but not to the detriment to the forest itself
- User impact fees should be considered for higher-impact recreational activities: the higher the impact, the higher fee to offset the impact of the use
- Maintenance of old roads needs to be considered; if they are not being used, management decisions need to be made because they will be used for undesirable purposes
- Need to analyze what kinds of uses are appropriate per flora and fauna
- Collaboration between agencies needs to be increased so that one agency isn't prohibiting "x" activity that directly contradicts another agencies determination that "x" activity is allowed; need to coordinate management decisions and practices between and across agencies
- Need to manage the forest asset first; where recreational impacts are unacceptable, that recreational use should be prohibited

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Congress can override all decisions, including NEPA—there is nothing USFS can do and this is a problem
- The theme of “good science” is a good one, and encouraging peer-reviewed (external) science; NEPA documents should be peer reviewed; sometimes the consultant hired to complete a study is pressured to deliver a specific outcome by the agency—incorporate outside agency, peer reviewed aspect to NEPA studies to remove potential bias (political, environmental or otherwise); cultural resources, from my experience, tend to have inadequate and biased science
- What’s the science aspect to recreation management? Answer: yes: economic, social and environmental sciences contribute to analysis
- Need to consider transportation corridors and connectivity of forests and recreational opportunities
- Don’t allow political boundaries to fragment land management, resources, and recreational assets

2. What should the planning rule say about recreation access, visitor facilities, and services?

- I’m hoping we can have aviation access; pilots can be a partner with USFS to report changes in the forest and can see the lands; airstrips can be maintained, perhaps, by users (partnership) while being provided access (by USFS); an acceptable recreational use should be aviation
- Aviation brings concerns of air pollution
- Science should be an evaluation criteria for what kinds of recreation should be allowed in what areas; uses and its impact should be evaluated
- Energy efficient technology should be applied as much as possible in new or renovated facilities
- Concept of “closure” is highlight subjective to individuals—what does “access” mean? Perhaps we should consider defining what “access” means
- We need to manage off road vehicles; we should promote non-motorized recreation OVER motorized recreation
- Are we discriminating if we promote one kind of access (off highway vehicle) versus another (non-motorized vehicle)
- We need to consider that the forest lands aren’t just for human benefit, but for ecosystem benefit (birds, plant life, water, etc.)—nature needs to be the priority over human access and use
- We need to revere the forests and allow them to be enjoyed by generations to come while balancing the opportunity and access to them
- Should peoples with disabilities be denied access to national forests because they have to access them in a wheelchair; what is “access”?

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

- Aviation is an accessibility issue—it allows more people to experience the forest
- Ranger Districts need to be more accessible—Rangers need to be out in the field interacting with constituents and educating visitors and users; Rangers historically have been a valuable
- Some of the rules and regulations are vague—I’ve been threatened by a Ranger previously for guiding a hike for a voluntary donation; vagueness provides wide latitude in permitting (specifically commercial vs. non-commercial); there needs to be consistency in how the permitting rules are applied
- Privatization of uses and access of forests is confusing; why do I pay an independent, private outfitter for use or access to a tax-paid, public use facility?
- Need to support user stewardship by providing the resources for people to be responsible (accessible garbage cans, etc.)
- Is there a permitting process for recreational uses, especially high-impact uses?
Answer: motorized access is beginning to be restricted, but no uniform application
- A lot of the people doing damage are doing so illegally, with non-registered vehicles, etc.
- Utilize tools like licenses and fees to address the impacts of the use: user impact fees
- Education needs to be provided—I want to be a good steward to the resource, but I may not know how I’m impacting the forest, or how I can better steward the land
- We need to identify some ‘sacrifice’ areas within the forest that provide an opportunity for highly destructive uses within the forest, while preserving the passive uses; need to fragment kinds of uses in specific areas so that all recreation can be enjoyed without incompatible uses ruining other experiences
- While regulations and management decisions can be made, enforcement of those regulations and management is key
- Outreach for volunteer opportunities needs to be empowered—have rangers and interpreters be more active locally (organizations, schools, etc.)
- We need to focus on getting our young people into the forest
- It is my perception that as generations pass, people are less responsible, less respectful, less prideful of the stewardship of the land; education, outreach and communication needs to be a priority
- Does the USFS have an education department? Answer: we once had localized jobs, and now we do have a conservation education focus, but over time those roles have diminished due to funding; individual forests determine if an educational role/aspect is applied
- There needs to be more education to recreational uses; different media/technology need to be made part of the condition of the agency; use opportunities to outreach to schools

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

3. Other comments and suggestions?

- How many different kinds/types of management areas are there? Answer: it varies depending on the issues and management plan for the forest
- How does the Planning Rule address recreation now? Answer: very broadly; the type/kind/demand of recreation has changed over the course of the past 20+ years
- Is Department of Interior collaborating with USDA regarding a consistent, public lands approach? Answer: not that I'm aware of
- It's important to have interagency collaboration because often the same problems are shared by different agencies even though agency missions are different—working together and integrating with each other is important
- Need to collaborate and aligning with our fellow land management agencies within the new Planning Rule; it's a step towards working together and using each agencies strengths and resources without compromising each agency mission
- Is it necessary to have all kinds of different agencies doing the same/different thing? Answer: while many different agencies share some of the same problems, each agency has a different mission and is governed by a different political entity; what we need to do is a better job at collaborating and pooling resources across agencies
- Sounds like there needs to be clearer communication and better collaboration with other agencies—don't beat each other off, instead, find ways to identify shared problems and collaborative solutions!
- Can the Planning Rule ensure enforcement to the ground-level? Answer: hard to do in a Planning Rule
- We need to monitor the implementation of the Planning Rule
- Already depend on volunteers; it's an important aspect to how USFS completes its mission
- Interpretation needs to be standardized; there should be an "interpretation standard" and a process by which rangers, employees are "certified" – this will help with education, communication, enforcement, etc.
- USFS needs to learn from the lawsuits over the Planning Rule

WRITTEN COMMENTS

Comment Form – Public Open House - April 28, 2010

Name: Bettina Bickel

Email: bbickel08@gmail.com

- Economies and Social Values: Extraction of goods and services should not override restoring sustainable ecosystems. Local sustainable economic benefits such as

U.S. Forest Service – Region 3
Public Open House Notes
Phoenix, AZ - April 28, 2010
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

wildlife, water and recreation need to be considered as more important than consumptive uses such as logging and ranching.

- Restoration: means restoring ecological processes and resiliency, including natural fire regimes and restoring predators. Predators are extremely important ecosystem regulators, but our forests are impoverished by their absence.
- Climate Change: Forests can help mitigate climate change. Connectivity over landscapes can help species move and adapt to climate change.
- Species Diversity: Science is demonstrating the importance of predators such as wolves. Planning process should focus on restoring keystone species, including predators.
- Recreation: Consider long term sustainability of recreation, and impacts on long term values such as watershed, wildlife, and soils. ORV use is not compatible with these values in most places.

Comment Form – Public Open House - April 28, 2010

Name: Bob Witzeman

Email: witzeman@cox.net

- Public statements by individuals limited to 3 minutes or whatever is appropriate.
- The process of moving from table to table provides absolutely no backup of what was said by the public citizen participants.

Appendix B – Notes from NEW MEXICO meetings

US FOREST SERVICE PLANNING RULE REVISION RECORDERS' NOTES – NEW MEXICO ROUNDTABLE – APRIL 28, 2010

[following the notes are facilitators' report out and remarks from the Regional Forester, pp. 28-29]

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE – Plenary Discussion

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

Facilitator: Lucy Moore; Recorder: Jennifer Cramer

General Q&A

Q: National Forests have Land Management Plans and Fire Management Plans (FMP), will this rule address the FMPs as well?

A: FMPs are implementation plans. The rule will be providing information that will help guide FMPs.

Q: If the planning rule will be science based, what will the metrics be?

A: Metrics may be regionally different, established for the resource area (metrics used in the South may not apply in Alaska). Regional metrics application may also differ. We want to get your thoughts today on what metrics will be used.

Response to Answer: Metrics might be important to understand economics

Q: What impact will this rule have on the existing FP revisions/how quickly will recently revised plans need to be revised again? What are the impacts on lower tier management plans?

A: The new rule should provide answers to these questions.

General Comments relevant to the Planning Rule in R3

- In the Rule planning process you identified some laws that would be met. The Rule should make clear how these laws are being incorporated in the Integrated Management Plan, perhaps using a matrix.
Interpretation: The planning rule should identify existing laws that apply and present clearly, through a matrix perhaps, how these laws are being addressed.
- Comments – even extensive ones -- made to the Forest Service in the past never seem to be resolved or responded to. Past participation in FS planning (for the Forest Plans) have not seen any response to comments.
Interpretation: The planning rule should specify that comments made to the FS as part of projects (forest plans or site-specific projects) are clearly responded to.
- Biggest concern is the human environment and that it isn't worked into the biological environment. State agencies (universities) provide local science that are relevant and aren't being used. Custom and culture issues are important here (in NM) and research indicates it will be lost within the next 3 generations. Some of these activities are forest specific; wood

gathering, grazing, hay cutting, planting on the forest. Taking these away affects the existing economy. Need a plan that addresses threats to loss of custom and culture. Cloudcroft is an example of a community that lost its timber industry and is now dependent on tourism. The community also suffers serious water shortages. Acequias and land grants, as well as tribes, have valuable customs and culture that need protection and support.

Interpretations:

The planning rule should require consideration of the human environment as well as the biological environment.

The use of best available science should include regional specific knowledge from state agencies, universities, and local scientists.

The planning rule needs to account for local custom and culture that depend on Forest Service land, including tribes, acequias and land grants, and other traditional communities.

- Taos County has had problems with the Forest Service. Talked with representatives to change manual wording because acequias were around before the Forest Service was in existence. Forest Service staff required the delay of the project which increased the cost of the funds. FS staff at the Regional level helped get the project done. What is written in the manual needs to protect people and not block their rights. Grants to plant trees are a good aspect of FS. Protect acequias and livelihood of people in the areas who need to irrigate. Don't want FS to be an obstruction.

Interpretation: The planning rule needs to give communities with historic rights to the land (e.g., acequias) the opportunity to manage the land as they see appropriate and as needed to protect the culture and livelihood of those people who depend on it. The rule also needs to direct individual forests to work with and support these communities.

- How do we work through the planning process to make plans emerge quicker? It takes 3-4 years to get through a project. Soil and water conservation are political subdivisions that should be allowed the same working relationship with the Forest Service as the counties have. Need to figure out how to incorporate the FS into more projects like EQUIP. Missing out on opportunities to do work with soil and water conservation and NRCS.

Interpretation: The planning process needs to allow for plans to be developed quickly and efficiently.

Political subdivisions such as soil and water conservation associations should be given the same working relationship with the Forest Service as counties.

Interagency cooperation (like with NRCS and their EQUIP program) needs to be facilitated and emphasized.

- For example, FS Rx burns destroy wooden fences that are used to separate range allotments or private land. These then need to be repaired or replaced.

Interpretation: Planning rule needs to accommodate for repairing private property damaged as part of a project.

- Clarity, coordination and collaboration are critical. In general, FS has been insincere, although some forests, such as the Gila, have a good working relationship with the County. **National level needs to ensure that the local conservation boards, county, etc. are included from the beginning.** Requesting material can sometimes take months to receive, then too late to act. Need honesty and transparency, don't work behind closed doors. **Involved at same time and same level.**

Interpretation: The planning rule needs to ensure that the local conservation boards (e.g., county) are involved in planning processes from the beginning and that they have an equal voice in the process.

- Draft plans coming out of AZ seem to be moving away from standards and guidelines and toward desired future condition. Standards and guidelines (such as water quality) are important to give people boundaries and certainty. Without them the plan is aspirational and can't be measured. The **new rule should include standards and guidelines.**

Interpretation: The new rule should require concrete objectives that give people boundaries and certainty (such as standards and guidelines) as opposed to aspirational goals.

- Rule should instruct FS to partner and work with counties, tribes, and federal and state agencies to form an interagency cross boundary collaboration. The FS "culture of supremacy" in making decisions needs to change.

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE – Restoration and Watershed Health

Facilitator/Recorder: Ed Moreno

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

Following is a summary of the discussion in three sessions on this topic. The points were raised by participants, but no consensus on any of them was sought.

General comments on the Rule:

Efficiency, timeliness, cost:

- time takes to do something under the rule now is prohibitive. The rule should encourage efficiency and timeliness, and the use of available science and local knowledge. “We local people know what to do, how to thin, how to plant.”
- Foresters who are responsible need good data. Keep the most current data at hand.
- Use available tools: Ecosystem System Evaluation Tool – TNC-developed tool with four steps: 1) define the scope and focal targets for the planning area, 2) develop strategies and measures, 3) implement strategies and measures, 4) use results of measures to adapt and improve.

Science-based:

- Rule must be science-based and tap available resources: universities, science, and a strategy to bring those resources together.

Monitoring:

- All agencies will have projects, but need is for monitoring and assessment: water, soil, rainfall.

Comments on Restoration: How can the next planning rule foster restoration of NFS lands?

Current conditions:

- Many participants observed that overall the forests are in a degraded condition.
- In Cloudcroft, Lincoln County, there are too many trees per-acre -- so dense you can't walk through it. Any fire would be catastrophic. Research shows the ecosystem is collapsing, there's no water available, water table is salty. Region depends on tourism.

Definition of Restoration:

- What's the definition of restoration? To what standard are you restoring? Need a clear but flexible definition, science-based, with actual metrics.

Restoration as a priority:

- Many recommended that the new rule have restoration as a priority, a primary goal. Timber operations should be allowed in the service of restoration.
- The 1982 rule was very specific to timber management, grazing, recreation and water.
- Adopt the FEMA mentality – prepare for the worst case scenario, like the Bark beetle. Unexpected impacts will occur – from global warming, for instance -- and restoration provides a way to react more quickly.
- Restoration should be the focus for the rule to strengthen the forests: fortification, resilient habitats, adaptation of animals, watershed health, stress reduction, clear and cold waters.

- Rule should require plans for maintaining the restoration, so you don't allow what caused it to become degraded in the first place.
- Set priorities, based on peer reviewed science and taking the community into account.

Collaboration:

In decision-making:

- The rule should mandate a statewide strategic discussion about priorities and where projects will occur. Presently projects are approved in isolation to what other jurisdictions are doing. Focusing resources in this way would solve a lot of problems and make the money go farther. Even if the project crosses forest boundaries, it's the most efficient and effective way.
- Should provide for early inclusion of stakeholders to better address concerns, and early involvement by the public in discussions, especially of the science.
- The rule should call for ongoing stakeholder groups to advise the forests from day one
- Better collaboration of stakeholders, science based. Stakeholders have more influence than peer-reviewed science.
- Rule should include provisions for giving priority to community interests and desires.
- Ensure a balance of interests in the rule. The forests don't belong to the adjacent landowners, or the community, but to everybody. The local and adjoining interests are important, but not dispositive.
- The rule should allow for joint evaluation, joint stewardship for indigenous entities with historic claims – Native American, Land Grant, and other traditional communities in existence before United States.
- Rule needs to focus on collaborative efforts - ongoing, with the best science, monitoring, and adaptive management.

In Activities and Projects:

- Private land owners and communities directly adjacent to FS land, should be involved in restoration and fire protection. Could participate in the restoration of hundreds of thousands of acres.
- New rule should address communities near wilderness areas. Adjoining landowners – public and private -- can cooperate in restoration and fire protection. Rule should talk about fire, working with neighboring landowners to protect their property, using the right building materials.
- Rule should compel forest plans to consider restoration efforts by private landowners, local jurisdictions, and participate in local collaborative efforts.
- Community wildfire protection could be tied to a restoration plan. County project, neighborhood project. Communities are coming together to put together. Plans are funded.
- Tap resources available by other forest users. Example: An ATV riding group agreed to avoid a 5,000 acre tract, and it became roadless elk habitat. There were ATV trails and roads around it. An effective way to improve habitat and provide access for off road vehicles.
- Another example: An area that was designated in the 1970s for habitat and roadless, but it wasn't managed properly and eventually there were ATV roads all over and it was degraded.
- Involvement in New Mexico comes from local leadership – local governments, individuals. Could be anybody. You can organize, get ranger involved, field trips.
- Forest will get funded for projects that are not necessarily the community's priority projects.

Landscape scale:

- Challenge to define geographical scale for restoration; different types of scale – watershed, ecosystem, eco-regional system, nested scales.
- Develop different, nested landscape scales to focus on ecosystem targets – understanding of what drives ecosystem.
- The rule should encourage strategic application of restoration to landscape scale.
- Identify critical habitat, big contiguous tracts that can be restored to as natural as can be.

Other considerations:

- Forests have been understaffed for years. Restoration needs money.
- Establish a moral obligation as trustees to hand the forests to the next generation in better condition than it is right now, based on sound biology. Rule should give clear guidance on education: leave it as you found it, protect it, preserve it, restore it, pass it on.
- Rule should emphasize restoration in light of climate change. There is legislation that would help feds, tribes, states, to develop plans for climate change and forest restoration.
- Planning rule should look at inventoried roadless areas and preserving their characteristics - wilderness. The rule should provide for the largest amount of forest to be un-roaded. 1.6 million acres of forest in NM, 15 percent un-roaded.
- Identify “reclosed” areas to restore habitat.
- Rule should recognize the wisdom of indigenous people. Native people know that fire is part of the ecosystem, and neglecting that has caused catastrophic fires in recent history. Listen to wisdom of ancestors.

Comments on Water Resources and Watershed Health

1. Should forest planning be conducted in the context of watersheds? If so, how?

- Landscape scale watershed protection requires partnerships between the forest and adjacent landowners.
- Restoration should be on a watershed basis. Watershed is a good understandable thing. Allows you to focus on landscape level health, one or more watersheds, multiple processes ongoing at once.
- Water is so important.
- 1982 rule is a commodity based rule. Watershed health is harder to measure. The new rule should move off the extractive model and value forests in terms of the quality of watershed.
- Allow closing some of the roads. Runoff is important.
- Managing by watershed may not be the best way to do it. Different circumstances, not the same in all cases or different parts of the country.

2. What, if anything, should the rule say about water availability and quality, including factors outside the agency’s control?

- Water is a national priority; FS should tie water to its priorities.
- We get a lot of our drinking water from watersheds – 67 percent of our water comes from watersheds. It’s important.

- The rule should address any activities that impact watershed health and water quality, including livestock, recreation and roads, especially wilderness areas and watersheds for drinking water.
- Water quality should be a goal. And allow for water quality downstream – broader perspective all clean water act goals.
- The rule needs to recognize that water rights laws in the west are different from those in the east.
- Over-appropriation of water is a critical issue in the southwest. The rule should recognize that watersheds affect everything, including the quantity and quality of water, and its renewability.
- Fish populations are in trouble – habit and temperatures are affected by watershed health. Fish can't migrate. Interconnecting those populations is an important goal. The rule should help protect high mountain populations of fish, and then allow a fix on larger scale.

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE --
April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm
Climate Change and Adaptive Management
Facilitator/Recorder: Jeff Edelstein

Adaptive Management

How can a new planning rule build in **flexibility to adapt** to changing science, information or conditions and/or incorporate new data?

- Building in flexibility is important; not too restrictive; allow going outside the box
1. When and how should plans be **evaluated** to see if they are working; what should trigger **amendments**?
 - Identify thresholds that would trigger action (plan revision...); Plan should not be static, but revisions should not be continual, but rather happening at periodic times. Monitoring, however, should be continual.

Climate Change

How can the planning rule be proactive and innovative in addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation?

- Focus on watersheds and water resources, from both ecosystem and human aspects
- Nested multi-scale approach – we have good data at large scales, but greater gaps in data at local scales.
- Integration: FS controls a lot of things, like road-building, harvest management, but hasn't put all the pieces together in an integrated way.
- Need to figure out how to address renewable energy development on the forests; need to be open-minded about using these areas for renewables.
- Science-based; peer-review processes (however, focus on science for management sake, not science for science sake)
- Collaborative approach with other agencies
- Clear guidance on using adaptive management and monitoring

Discussion:

Environmental participants wanted climate change to be addressed in new rule, while other interests such as county government, agriculture, forestry, generally did not want climate change addressed, because they either don't believe it is happening or don't believe that it is anthropogenic (although there was one forestry representative who felt it should be addressed).

An area of agreement between those who want CC addressed and those who don't is the idea of forest health and resiliency to changing conditions (regardless of cause). Both camps felt that forest health and resiliency should be the driving factors in forest management. Rule should require that a plan define what a healthy forest is, and allow for this definition to be different for different forests, regions, etc.

There was general agreement that, regardless of views on CC, indicators of health and degradation can be identified that all can agree on, and that monitoring of these indicators should be done.

Monitoring:

Monitoring was felt to be critical, but FS doesn't have enough staff and funding to do adequately. Given staff and funding constraints, the use of carefully selected indicators should be used, as measures of forest health and resiliency.

FS resource issues:

Concern that forest service personnel rotate in and out of locales too quickly to get a long-term sense of the landscape, trends, etc. FS should involve local people in a more proactive long-term manner (standing advisory committee or the like), rather than in a reactive project-specific manner (scoping sessions, etc.).

Consistent theme that forest service doesn't have adequate resources and should rely more on local partners, who have expressed willingness to help – with monitoring, project implementation, etc. Frustration at how long it takes for projects to get implemented.

1. What, if any, climate change **assumptions** should be used in the development of plan alternatives?
 - Recognition by FS that their knowledge is limited

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

Economics and Social Values

Facilitator/Recorders: Mary Davis Hamlin and Maggie McCaffrey

Support for local economies:

- The rule should stimulate local economies and establish mechanisms that support sustainable local economies
- Develop a strategic vision for rural forest based economies
- False distinction is made between vibrant local communities, provision of services, and biological integrity. These need to be integrated and looked at in a new way to enhance them – for example, forest thinning to achieve restoration goals and improve local economy. Need to look at them through vibrant economies.
- Define vibrant community using examples from NM where there are communities that have endured for generations.
- Also need to be able to implement using local contracting
- Find innovative ways to keep the money in the community, like partnering with NGOs.
- Look at success stories: BLM/NRCS/producers collaboration to keep money in community.
- Encourage local incentives to manage the resource
- Use local resources, for efficiency and effectiveness; use local resources first for FS land management activities, such as grazing to help with forest thinning, or allow wood harvesting on former commons by heirs of land grants
- Include benefits to local economies in USFS cost/benefits analysis
- Create predictability to support business risks
- Expand market evaluation beyond traditional concept of market value
- Establish consistency and predictability to support long term economic planning
- Create a baseline to be able to evaluate trends and progress

Sustainability and transitioning:

- The FS needs to assess the resources that are available to the public.
- The plan needs to look at the sustainability of the current practices, such as grazing. Address the current economic reality. Have a way to transition economies.
- Need both science and traditional knowledge and practices to sustain resources and transition to new economies if necessary.
- Should require that forests determine if practices are sustainable/can be continued. Need to transition those practices that are not sustainable.
- Need to continue evolution from focus on timber, to focus on environment, to now include local economies
- Look for ways to provide transitional employment opportunities.

All-lands approach:

- The Rule needs to address what goes beyond FS boundaries.

Community priorities/collaborating with communities:

- The rule should consider how local community's needs are brought to the table. Engage the communities early on. Ask what they value.

- Often the local communities' needs are looked at in the initial planning process, but then are dropped later in the process. Local community collaboration needs to continue through to the project level, at the level of contracting, leasing, and timber sales. Have language in the rule that requires a focus on vibrant communities all the way through.
- Do not elevate certain uses at the national level, base priority uses at the local level
One size does not fit all - lay out federal role, regional role and then local role
- Need a northern New Mexico Hispanic meeting
- Look to Africa for models of local management and protection of resources
- In the local communities, you should take care of the existing business and then diversify.

Collaboration and communication:

- National forests are NATIONAL-- need a process that brings together all interests and engages local communities, and regional/national interests as well.
- No need to wait until there is a plan or a project; Rule should require yearly updates/check-ins with the community to see where the FS is with their planning/implementation.
- The plan needs to be flexible enough so FS that has land grants or tribal lands right adjacent – allows for early inclusion of local communities to address local issues.
- Through planning process, use cooperating/collaborating agency status to have all entities working together. Collaboration/cooperating agencies should be the foundation of planning. But need a plan that is flexible – but has a framework with “teeth” (enforcement and guidelines). Within that, incorporate local values.
- Keep the 1982 requirement that designates a four step consultation process with the public. It was dropped in the more recent rules.
- Create mechanisms for on-going consultation with local entities.

Interconnectedness of community issues:

- The plan should more clearly address the relationship among the social/economic/ecological. For example, if a family loses their ranch, the schools lose the kids, the tax base is diminished, the community is impacted, etc.

Use of local knowledge/science:

- Base decisions on science. Use good science to establish best practices for viability, sustainability, renewable resources. The social and local community can't trump science. Remember to include metrics
- Process at the FS level to integrate science and local input from key stakeholders to shape forest plan in relation to the local communities and resources.
- Tap local wisdom about resource management

Value of history, culture and traditional ways of life:

- Respect treaties/historical laws, regs, such as the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo
- Respect grazing and other preemptive/vested rights.
- Recognize and support traditional uses, including grazing

Other issues:

- Be sure that at the end of the day, there is a Forest left for my grandson.
- Need large scale intervention to really restore resource -- "Forest has choked itself to death"
- There is currently no distinction between affected parties and interested parties in terms of the legal process. People who are more directly impacted by decisions should be given affected party status –should be given more weight in the appeal process. That distinction is a fuzzy one. It is hard to prove one party is more affected when you look at factors such as carbon sequestration that affects us all.
- The planning process needs to incorporate recreational users in the forest.
- Allow access to backcountry without building roads such as aviation strips
- Support trail building such as the Continental Divide Trail Alliance
- Use the permittees and outfitters to bring the increasingly urban communities into the forest.
- Allow for effective collaboration with outside entities to support educational opportunities. Use education in schools relative to forest values. Use in K-6 grades. Start youth programs
- Respect previous plans such as the "Community Welfare and Protection Plans"
- Standardize process for special use permits
- Seek out and build on local planning efforts such as CFR laws
- Keep multi-use concept
- People that pay to use the resource get less respect than those who use it for free

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE – Diversity and Wildlife

Facilitator, Joe Early; Recorder, Saman Hussain

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

Following is a summary of the discussion in three sessions on this topic. The points were raised by participants, but no consensus on any of them was sought.

Two Significant Themes:

- 1) Collaboration, don't reinvent the wheel, use existing data, management plans and mapping information from a variety of sources
- 2) Avoid a cookie cutter, one size fits all approach in defining scale; scale should vary depending on the region, the climate, cycles, etc.

Overarching principles for the Rule:

- Allow forest plans to individualize their diversity and other needs
- Need to focus on future and on youth, instill in the next generation an understanding that future use is linked to moral obligation
- Limit resource use in order to protect, and not compromise, quality of resource; quality more important than quantity; rule needs to set realistic limitations

Landscape scale:

- Given the unknowns of climate change and species adaptation, we need larger scales of evaluation, larger areas of managed protection
- NM in particular has climatic extremes – essential to have big eco-system perspective
- More emphasis on watershed management; watersheds are essential initial building blocks, then evaluate them with linkages to corridors
- Be careful to keep a balance between broad watershed focus and forest by forest approach – one size does not fit all
- Scale should be at a “functional and sustainable level”
- Focus on native species management and a broad scale and long term protection/management approach
- Need to identify wildlife corridors; consider needs of migrating herds across communities and borders.

Adaptive Management and Monitoring:

- Monitoring, continuing re-evaluation of standards. Institute metrics that you are actually able to measure
- Include other parties, interests to make sure adaptive management is open and inclusive
- Keep the management indicator portion of the old rule
- Monitor at both the local and larger scale levels
- Monitor beyond the forest boundaries, where possible
- Monitor for continual reassessment of habitat quality
- Establish baselines and continued reassessment
- Multi-species monitoring is preferable
- Insure viability of at-risk species by monitoring
- Monitor effect on species of FS actions (cutting trees, etc.)

- Make monitoring more quantitative – existing monitoring is qualitative
- Include qualitative data, not just quantitative
- Monitor the removal of invasive species and the impact it has on native species
- Manage forest in terms of future viability, economic and otherwise; don't idealize the past
- Consider the range changes of plants and animals, given climate change
- Need for better regional monitoring
- Is there a need for uniform monitoring?

Need to collaborate

- Currently collaboration is blocked or impeded due to an overly narrow focus
- Across jurisdictional boundaries within watersheds
- Consult with private, tribal, other stakeholders
- Inter-state collaboration (especially given species movement across states)
- FS needs to look at state land management plans and other existing plans and embrace them instead disregarding them
- Rule should require consultation with stakeholders/land users/locals who are being affected, or likely to be affected, species that are being protected, or whose habitat is being restored
- Need a quick reference or fact sheet that explains which agency is responsible for what, and offers points of contact
- Improve coordination among forests
- Share data and mapping to better identify wildlife corridors and protect species during migration
- Use existing information and experience in land management from federal, state, tribal and private groups; help implement some of these existing plans – like the State's Comprehensive Wildlife/Habitat Management plans, which list species and habitats needing attention -- don't reinvent the wheel
- Need better overall consultation and communication with all parties

Species priorities:

- Need multi-species management approach, not single-species management. Managing at risk species (like spotted owl) v. multi-species diversity –important not to get lost in focusing on the former at the expense of the latter.
- Identify species that are not at-risk, but whose habitat needs restoration; manage for the benefit of these species.
- Make at-risk and indicator species a priority; Forest plans should adopt the at-risk species identified in the State Comprehensive Wildlife/Habitat Management Plans.
- Focus on native and endemic species and habitat
- Focus on species that leave significant impact on the watershed.
- Focus on species that are most likely to survive climate change conditions
- Identify and increase emphasis on microbiota (fungi, bacteria)
- Replace non-native with native species, to preserve the ecosystem

Classifications: More emphasis on watershed management; be sure to look at zone classifications in addition to just "watershed" classification – especially when you enter the world of vegetation, etc. Use vegetation elevation for classifications

Other considerations:

Consider the relationship between and among animals.

Require identification of carrying capacity of plant species in a given area.

Manage in a way that prevents recreational uses from interfering with wildlife cycles; Include recreation guidelines in the rule, especially in terms of time frames; do not allow recreation when and where elk are calving, etc.

Rule should include current climatic conditions

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE -- Recreation

Facilitators/Recorders: Victoria Garcia and Maggie McCaffrey

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

The Recreational Aviation Foundation brought in and shared with the group a position paper with comments from their group (attachment A)

General Comments on the Rule:

Consistency v. local differences:

- The rules should reflect a mechanism so the planning processes can be uniform among and between forests
- The rulemaking process should consider a balance between having “too many” rules versus “not enough”, especially as they impact local communities.
- The rulemaking process should give consideration to the local conditions that may exist in a particular area
- When revising rules to prescribe how plans should develop, drafters should look at the “big picture” to make decision about such issues as roads/access. The Rulemaking should facilitate the integration of the plans into what is currently happening with the consideration of flexibility as conditions change
- The Rules should include mechanisms and sufficient clarity to ensure no bias in their interpretation by individual forest service employees (see number 6 on Attachment A); another related comment: Rules should be clear enough to remove any “gray” areas open to interpretation by staff. Clear drafting helps in the effective use of staff.
- When an activity negatively impacts a forest, Rule should be flexible enough to allow the area to be assessed and changes made...FLEXIBILITY

Management issues:

- The rules should have a mechanism for enforcement which is clear to consumers as well as employees
- The rules should give consideration to “practicality”: how much land is being overseen versus how many staff there are to enforce

Structure/organization of the Rule:

- The Rules should be one page or presented in sections. An executive summary of overarching rules will be helpful to the public. Make clear that rules are broken in to Sections so those interested in a particular area of the rules, such as Recreation, can go to that specific section

Value of Culture, Local knowledge:

- The Rules should be soundly grounded in science, both by scientists and by “community” scientists (peer review) who have maintained and will maintain the land for generations to come. Those with long term knowledge of the land should be seen as resources
- Rules should consider long term cultural matters, such as Land-grant uses, to ensure there are protections of valuable historical aspects (e.g., land grant heirs have had their cultural artifacts destroyed by recreational users...stealing head stones, graffiti)
- Rules should consider traditional purposes/uses when considering road access
- The rules should take into consideration both the historical and cultural uses of the forest/land

Other

- When areas are specially designated (e.g., wilderness), how do the rules allow “access” for particular purposes (e.g., ranching needs)
- Rules should clearly prescribe the need to EDUCATE the public on multiple uses of the land. If public understands they may be more supportive of the FS efforts
- Rules should promote on-going education efforts on the uses of the forest, both short and long term because of the evolution of population moves, draught

Recreation as a designated use:

- Rules should identify *Recreation* as a designated use of the national forests. The rules should be drafted to give value to Recreation and at all times consider the evolution of uses in forest areas
- The rule should focus more on recreation, so more access is easier.
- Rules should consider Multiple uses in all recreational areas
- Recreation is the highest use: it should be considered as part of the economics of local communities. Look for long term/potential opportunities. What already exists in an area to avoid duplication of efforts or putting new things in places that can't support them
- There needs to be enough budget to keep the forest accessible. The budgets of other agencies is also a concern.
- Rules should take into consideration how to manage/pay for recreation long term

Coordinating Recreational Uses – separate or together? Finding a balance

- Recognize diversity –there are conflicts over what uses are most appropriate
- The FS needs to balance the diverse needs to be respectful of different uses. The question is how to do that.
- Separate the different uses. Identify areas for different uses to separate out the conflicts
- Rules should consider the diverse recreational opportunities and how those diverse interests may be accommodated...Would it be helpful to explain “why not” if there is any exclusion for a particular area?
- However, have multi-use trail heads/access points so that multiple users have equal access to areas. Make it easy for all to access.
- The focus on multi-use should include firearms where appropriate (shooting ranges).
- The rule should not separate out uses. It should require multiple uses and mix use, where it can be accommodated. This will require courtesy.
- How could the rules contemplate such diverse uses as those who want quiet v. those using ATVs or other such motorized access
- The rules should consider the use of specific guidelines for uses in particular areas, including what type of access for particular recreation areas (e.g. roads); should there be consideration for quiet areas (no motorized access); horseback riding.

Impacts from recreation:

- With increased use of the public lands, there will be overflow from people and wildlife onto private lands near FS lands. This should be taken into consideration.
- The rules should be drafted to consider the economic factors of recreation uses of any type impacting the communities in impacted areas
- The rule should acknowledge the increase in the diversity of uses and the number of people using the Forests. People can love it to death, so the rule needs to consider what is the breaking point for the system.

- The rules should consider pollution issues related to the different recreational uses: water, air, etc, as well as for sustainable use
- Rules should consider recreational uses as it impacts wildlife in particular areas
- Rules should consider that no matter the type of recreation for a particular area, consideration should always be given to the long term protection of environmentally sensitive areas, e.g., wildlife, watershed, eco-systems that may be impacted.
- Rules should strive for a balance so there is present enjoyment coupled with preservation so generations beyond the present can enjoy

Collaboration for recreational uses:

- Ensure the rule is FLEXIBLE in order to develop effective collaborations. Such collaborations between FS and recreation
- enthusiasts may help fund initiatives critical to the maintenance of the forest areas
- Consider traditional historical uses and their value to the land; even those not the most “popular” should be considered so public feels “heard”
- Rules should encourage partnership between FS and volunteer organizations, where appropriate
- In a follow on, the rules should strongly encourage the development/use of outside resources for particular needs (clean up, re-planting). If rules promote the use of public private collaborations, it could diminish “reinventing” the rules
- Rules should consider how to create a central mechanism for productive collaborations between users and forest management
- Collaborative processes should be used that would incorporate lands outside FS. Work at a multi-agency level and develop collaborative plans.
- Collaborative processes should be used that would incorporate lands outside FS. Work at a multi-agency level and develop collaborative plans.

Assessment and Coordination of uses:

- Assess the impacts of various uses and the synergies between recreational uses. Such considerations may serve emergency uses.
- Consider what may already exist but be out of use to maximize those resources already in existence (e.g., old landing fields that may be rehabilitated for recreational airplane use)
- Consider Asset Mapping to provide guidance as to what resources currently exist and which can be reused
- Consider strongly the use of assessments/studies for particular uses. If they are done, there should be timelines so they don’t extend for years and then make sure the public knows the findings have been published and where they can find the information
- Every trail needs to be mapped
- When considering certain recreational uses, rule should ensure consideration is given to historical, prospective uses in order to balance access and protection of forest habitat. Consideration of balance of recreation and sustainability; the two concepts are not adverse to each other
- Needs to account for: 1) amount of use and 2) type of use.

Standards v. flexibility:

- The rule should set standards for recreation – these standards should include the type or recreation and the numbers to determine the carrying capacity of an area.

- The FS need real data to make decisions. Need to have standards for data upkeep so data is up to date and accurate. Currently have national visitor use monitoring.
- Currently use the ROS (Resource Opportunity Spectrum), which includes the categories of primitive, semi-primitive, developed.
- Desired condition for an area is too vague – how do you know when you have come to the tipping point? The tipping point should be set as a standard. They must be enforceable. Use both the desired condition and some metric or standard for guiding decision-making.
- There should be something in the rule that allows some flexibility to get things done.

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE – Public Collaboration and All Lands Approach

Facilitators/Recorders: Cathryn Wild and Karen Carter

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

Collaboration and Coordination

1. How should **stakeholders, other agencies, and governments be involved** in the planning process?

Regarding general concerns about collaboration between the FS and stakeholders of all types.

Issues raised:

- Diversity/demand/overflow of users on FS lands as a result of growing populations and division of uses.
- It is difficult for local individuals and groups to give input.
- The FS is not operating in an honest and transparent manner.
 - The FS sends information and notices only to selected individuals that they want to work with or that will agree with the FS position on issues.
 - FS decisions with other agencies are being made behind closed doors.

Suggested improvements – the new rule should ensure that:

- The FS does wider outreach to everyone.
 - The FS uses a greater variety of appropriate outreach methods.
- The FS addresses diversity, demand and overflow of users through collaboration with stakeholders of all types.
- The FS involves stakeholders of all types early in the process, so that a team is formed from the beginning
- The FS educates and train forest staff and rangers on how to collaborate, and reward collaborative efforts
- The FS gives clear direction on how to avoid FACA issues so that FS staff can work with a wide variety of groups.
- There is a clear hierarchy/structure as to how and who gets involved at which levels (federal, state, county, local, etc).

Regarding comments submitted by stakeholders of all types for FS plans, at any stage in the planning process:

Issues raised:

- Comments appear to disappear into a vacuum.
- There is no response to comments.
- No questions are answered at meetings.
- There is no way to know whether the comments were legitimately considered or simply dismissed.
- There is the appearance that the FS has already decided what to do and is merely going through the motions of getting input.

Suggested improvements – the new rule should ensure that:

- Comments that are submitted receive a response in writing or in a form readily available to the entity(ies) that submitted the comment.

- Responses demonstrate that the comment was legitimately considered. If the content of the comment is rejected or not incorporated into the plan, the response should provide a reason why it was rejected or not incorporated.
- There is a deadline for comments to be received. After this deadline, new issues may not be raised by individuals or groups that have not participated from the beginning of the planning process.
- Parties more strongly affected should be brought in first, as well as those who know the area the most. Emphasis should be on local level giving input.

Regarding how the FS works with local government agencies or other local government bodies (e.g. counties, soil and water conservation districts, acequia associations).

Issues raised:

- There needs to be better collaboration/cooperation between the FS, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the soil and water conservation districts.
- A culture of “supremacy” at the Forest Service is preventing good collaboration with local government bodies (i.e. the Forest Service feels that it has no need to collaborate).
- Local governments are currently not treated as collaborators, but handed a decision made exclusively by the FS. The FS takes it for granted that local governments will cooperate with this decision even though they had no part in forming it.
- Local governments are not receiving the enhanced consideration and role (relative to the general public) in the planning process that they should receive.
- The FS does not do enough or appropriate outreach to local government when planning efforts are getting underway.
 - The FS sends notices of planning efforts and informational materials to the wrong persons, to outdated mailing lists.
 - The information materials and notices arrive too late to be used.

Suggested improvements - the new rule should ensure that:

- Local governments are involved in FS planning processes earlier and to a greater extent than the general public.
- The general public is involved later in the planning process.
- The input from local governments receives greater weight than the general public because they have more responsibility, must enforce local ordinances, have budgets to consider, and other factors.
- There are unique meetings conducted with local government agencies, just as the FS is currently conducting with tribes.
- Outreach targets the correct persons and is done in a timely manner.
- Local data, knowledge, information and existing plans are incorporated into the planning process.
 - Specifically, that local planning efforts are recognized and incorporated. This includes community wildfire protection plans, state level plans such as the New Mexico Forest and Watershed Health Plan, the restoration or conservation plans of local wildlife groups, and the local plans of community based forestry groups.
- Use the collaborative tools we have better and more wisely.

Regarding terminology and definitions of terms in the planning processes.

Issues raised:

- The principle “Land management planning could involve effective and pro-active collaboration with the public” and the trigger question “What is the best way to involve stakeholders in the planning process?” are confusing because they do not differentiate between the general public and local governments.
- Need definitions/glossary that are understandable in regards to the planning rule.

Suggested improvements – the new rule should ensure that:

- It includes a standardized national set of definitions so that everyone is using the same terms and everyone understands what other persons mean when they use these terms.

Regarding cooperating agency status

Issues raised:

- FS needs to utilize cooperating agency status more often, and more openly to create a true collaboration.

Suggested improvements – the new rule should ensure that:

- The cooperating agency status is utilized when appropriate and that the FS collaborates with these agencies in an open and meaningful way.

2. What kind of administrative review process should be offered to the public in the planning rule? (E.g. pre-decisional objections and/or post-decisional appeal processes?)
[no responses]

3. Should the forest planning process move to an all lands approach? If so how?

Issues raised:

- Jurisdictional boundaries do not make sense. It’s about the ecology. Multi-jurisdiction issues and working across boundaries make for an inefficient planning process and incomplete implementation.
- Watershed protection—if not protected—then we can forget about everything else—grazing, recreation, wildlife, etc.
- Cultural properties and uses suffer from boundaries and segmented management

Suggested Improvements:

- Recognize common boundaries and common issues and streamline the processes.
- Watershed approach across jurisdictions should be highlighted
- The rule should reference working with each state because of the State assessments that are ongoing.
- Share data with partners, such as The Nature Conservancy
- Ensure that critical areas such as watershed are restored, managed and maintained—need to consider regional priorities.
- Cultural resources on and off national forest lands should be considered.
- Give an example or two in the planning rule as to what constitutes an all-lands approach. A Cibola NF example was given. Give some examples of elements in a rule, a land management plan, and a project plan.

Regarding working with others toward an all lands approach

Issues raised:

- The FS does not proactively participate in other local land planning processes.

- The FS does not build relationships with other local land managers.
- The FS does not share financial resources toward regional planning, restoration, conservation etc.
- Tribal consultation is not carried out in consistent, legitimate ways, nor is it documented.

Suggested improvements – the new rule should ensure that:

- On uses or management issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries (e.g. streams and rivers, fire, trails) the FS seeks to harmonize regulations with neighboring land owners/managers such as the BLM, tribes, local government to simplify compliance.
- Tribes and Pueblos—must consult with tribes about their planning rule, stewardship contracting, and tribal forest protection act—mention specific legislation in planning rule as it relates to the tribes. Document and demonstrate consultation
- FS needs to recognize legal authorities of all entities, including NM Game and Fish, in order to collaborate effectively

Regarding local customs and culture

Issues raised:

- The current process does not sufficiently consider local customs, culture, and uses such as wood cutting.
- The current process treats culture as something that happened in the past, not as the living present.
- FS managers arrive from other regions and are not familiar with local customs and cultures. These managers often try to impose inappropriate solutions or management on local people and resources.
- The Spanish Land Grants and acequia associations are often ignored as potential partners for FS planning and projects.

Suggested improvements - the new rule should ensure that:

- Local uses, customs and culture are considered and ways to help maintain these uses, customs and culture intact.
- Plans protect the rights of *acequia* associations and others that make a livelihood from forest resources.
- Historic land ownership, including land grants, and the values of these historic land owners are identified, recognized and considered, and that local forests are given both the flexibility and the encouragement to collaborate with these traditional landowners.
- Input to planning processes received from individuals who live closer to the national forests should receive greater weight than input from distant individuals because those who live nearby are the most affected.
- At least one person involved in planning should be well-versed in local customs and culture.

Other Issues:

Access:

- Concern with decreased access; need to bring public into the discussion
- Private parties are buying land for the purpose of shutting off access

NEPA:

- How is new rule referencing NEPA? How does NEPA fit it.

Region 3 Roundtable:

- We should have taped these roundtable meetings to accurately record everyone's comments.

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE – Wild Card

Recorder: Jennifer Cramer

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

Roundtable attendees were given the option of participating in a “wild card” table, rather than one of the Principle-related tables.

Key issues that emerged

- Account for existing rights and traditional uses, especially those that were in existence prior to the establishment of the United States and the Forest Service lands. These can include *acequias*, historical communal irrigation systems that support the culture and livelihood of thousands of families in New Mexico; land grants, or others.
- Allowing people access to the forest to utilize forest products (e.g., firewood, gardening, etc.) and the ability to manage the forest for community needs (e.g., *acequias*, fire prevention) without requiring permits or other special authorizations. Also, giving community groups the opportunity to utilize land for similar needs (e.g., wood) but separate from large commercial businesses.
- Including community groups (e.g., *acequias*, soil and water conservation groups) in collaboration for planning.
- Rethinking how Wilderness is defined and managed; being less strict about land being suitable for wilderness and releasing land from wilderness type management if it isn't Wilderness.
- Incorporating more local knowledge including science, citizen knowledge, local businesses into planning and also building this type of local knowledge in the Forest Service.
- Incorporating management planning across agencies and also with the public and private sector.

Needs of local communities:

- Plans should identify existing rights and traditional uses (e.g., water rights, traditional right of way, traditional access rights) that predate the United States and Forest Service.
- Plans should address how to recognize and protect the rights and traditional uses that predate U.S. and FS lands and protected by treaty rights.
Relevant discussion: Legal and prior existing rights need to be respected: for example *acequias* have legal and prior existing rights including water rights. FS wants to require licensing, which shouldn't be required on prior existing lands. Current Forest Service practice is to hold back assistance [to manage the land] and require that the *acequia* have permits to manage the land. This shouldn't be required because *acequias* have rights to the land that predate the establishment of the Forest Service.
- Rights of use and access to Forest Service land should be maintained for communities that depend on the land for their livelihoods and have historic rights to the land.
Relevant discussion: NM and Colorado are unique because community land borders NF land. People need to have access to the forest for products like wood, to use the forest, and to maintain *acequias* (which people's livelihoods, gardens, grazing land, are dependent on), but roads are sometimes blocked-off. *Acequia* water rights have existed since 1700 and before. Local emphasis is important.

- Recognize and grandfather in historic land rights (including community operated rights like acequias) to allow people access and the right to manage forest service land.
Relevant discussion: Allow maintenance of structures to allow local communities to get the resources needed from forest service land.
- Incorporate a means to evaluate the effect of designated wilderness areas as they relate to local communities?
- Plans would evaluate for the potential of disposition of FS lands to meet community development needs of indigenous community groups. Community land has been lost although private land was sometimes granted. This has affected agriculture, water quality, community needs.
- Plans need to address community needs for subsistence (e.g., firewood).
- Economic metrics needed to be included to show that local community projects are being managed sustainably.
- Plans would evaluate the impact of forest and watershed health as it relates to community needs.

Opportunities for collaboration:

- There needs to be more cross-agency collaboration to combine responsibilities for managing integrated resources (e.g., elk and their forage) that are traditionally held by different agencies (e.g., Game and Fish and the Forest Service respectively).
Relevant discussion: FS doesn't feel it has responsibility for elk and Game and Fish does not take responsibility for forage.
- Work together with local communities to achieve common goals.
- Plans will address local community economic needs by establishing a process for including local community groups including small business in plan development. Plans should establish areas that can meet local community markets that utilize the forest for subsistence (i.e., fuel wood, farming, etc.) while excluding large and big business.
- Planning rule needs to address using local communities to help maintain and restore healthy forests.
Relevant discussion: Example is for fire control. The absence of trails to clear dead trees may contribute to a large fire. Need a plan to clear and restore healthy forests.
- Planning rule needs to allow for thinning and maintaining lower fire risks around urban areas surrounded by or adjacent to forests (WUIs) and also cattle pastures and acequias within forests.

- Include consultation of all indigenous government entities and community groups (native American, land grants, acequias, or other groups in existence prior to the United States and the Forest Service land designations) that are affected by the Forest Service.

FS Staffing:

- District rangers need to be given more authority. There needs to be a longer tenure for district rangers and specialists so that districts have more knowledge of the local community. District staffing needs to be sufficient to sustain the ability to do the work on the districts.

Integrated Management:

- Integrate management for uses with similar needs but across resource areas. For example, clearing the forest will create more forage and grazing for both cattle and elk.

All Lands Approach:

- Provide the ability to manage FS land that is close to urban environments.

Relevant discussion: FS needs to be able to mitigate for impact of fire near urban environment. Maybe buffer zone.

- Give ability to sustain land around communities to the local community.

Designated uses:

- Don't manage areas that aren't wilderness as wilderness (e.g., Wilderness study areas). Designate it or manage it for something else. Forest Plans should evaluate for wilderness only on capability instead of additionally on availability and need.

Relevant discussion: A-S has lower percentage of wilderness than most of forests nationwide. Reason – unwarranted prescriptions of what can be recommended. Evaluation for potential wilderness is not only based on wilderness act but on availability and need (not in wilderness act). Availability and need are disqualifying many areas from becoming wilderness and these shouldn't be part of designation criteria. Inventoried roadless areas make reference to FSH for availability and need.

Maintain existing projects and efforts:

- Planning needs to address what is currently on the ground and account for deferred maintenance needs by continuing to manage past land uses rather than abandoning old projects or management areas for new projects or new uses, especially in light of limited funds.

Relevant discussion: Don't abandon old projects and their funding for new projects.

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE – Facilitators’ Report Out, Overarching Themes
April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm

Climate Change

- Conditions are always changing. The goal is healthy forests. Resiliency is important.
- Turnover in FS staff makes building effective partnerships with local interests and governments difficult. There is a culture within the forest service of staff coming and going. People who are present over a long time see long term trends.

Restoration and Conservation watershed health

- Forests are not in good condition and restoration is badly needed.
- Challenge to define restoration
- Need to use peer-reviewed science, coupled with common sense
- NM gets over 60% of its drinking water from national forests; some support for using watershed as planning unit
- Importance of collaboration at all times, ongoing communication, consulting with the local people who have been around for generations and know the history.

Diversity of plant and animal species

- No cookie cutter, one size fits all, approach to management. Need to focus on multiple species, ecosystems, and habitats.
- Don’t reinvent the wheel. Work with other groups that have knowledge and habitat plans in place.

Economic and social values

- Keep in mind local economic impacts. Glean from local wisdom. Use locals as primary management tools. Don’t just seek input, but build on what they are doing.
- Collaborate by using science and traditional uses as a framework to build sustainability.
- Take collaborative process all the way through. They need to be sustainable, too.
- Transition to employment opportunities for locals.

Collaboration

- Forest Service is not legitimately collaborating with people, but instead going through motions. People do not receive responses to comments.
- Not doing an adequate job of working with local governments at all levels.
- Educate FS employees on collaboration, what it means and how to do it right.
- Work with local groups and not worry about FACA.

All lands approach:

- Give examples and guidance in the rule of the all lands approach.
- Critical to work with local across jurisdictional lines, to protect traditions and culture

Recreation

- Needs to be identified as a specific use and considered from a planning point forward.
- Need a flexible rule that will allow for and support local solutions.
- Recreation groups have much to offer in terms of help with projects and as an economic opportunity
- Should be considered as part of the economics of local communities.

Wild Card

- Honor and work with people whose rights to the land existed prior to the formation of the U.S or the establishment of FS lands (e.g., acequias, land grants, treaties.)

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE ROUNDTABLE -- April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 1:00 – 4:00 pm Concluding Remarks from the Regional Forester, Corbin Newman

Regional Forester Corbin Newman reflected on what he had heard during the roundtable process.

- 1) People want to be involved. They want to understand and participate from beginning to end, from planning and analysis through monitoring.
- 2) Regulatory and legal barriers are involved, and the planning rule should address these barriers in a meaningful way.
- 3) FS folks need to have an understanding of the place they work.
- 4) The Rule needs to consider cultural knowledge, traditions, and local uses of national forest system land, particularly those that were in place prior to the creation of the NF. Region 3 needs to be the advocate for this because these issues are probably most important here.
- 5) The Rule needs to address social and economic impacts as much as environmental impacts in analysis.

**US FOREST SERVICE PLANNING RULE REVISION
RECORDERS' NOTES – NEW MEXICO PUBLIC MEETING/OPEN HOUSES
APRIL 28, 2010**

[following the notes are closing remarks from the Regional Forester, p. 37]

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC MEETING/OPEN HOUSE
April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 6:00 – 8:30 pm
Plenary Discussion

Outreach/communication/collaboration:

Outreach strategies:

- Outreach for events like this needs to be very broad, reach the greatest number of people possible
- Support use of social media, especially to reach young people [twitter: USFS southwest]
- Some conservation groups were missed in outreach for this event
- Need a variety of methods of outreach to reach all sectors
- Need to keep track of who has been involved before, who has commented on previous EAs and EISs since last planning rule
- Would like to have list of attendees at this event [participant passed around a signup sheet for those who wanted to be in touch with each other]

Will our voices be heard?

- How will we know we have been heard?
- Are some voices more important than others? [not a voting process, all voices important]
- Importance of local traditional community voice

FS as educator:

- FS can be a teacher, as with the wolf reintroduction in Yellowstone,
- FS can educate people about the natural functioning communities and ecosystems, the necessary balance of wildlife, and the role of the keystone species

All-lands approach:

- Extend collaboration beyond FS – NM is a checkerboard of land ownership
- Need inter-agency cooperation for wildlife and plant corridor identification and management

Wildlife and Plants:

- Rule should include requirement for wildlife and plant corridors and consideration of connections across boundaries to adjacent lands, whether public or private
- Need funded research to study wildlife movements
- Don't love the forest to death – provide areas for species without human interference, as well as spaces for both species and humans
- Manage areas for both wildlife and certain human uses that are compatible
- Recognize the interconnection between wildlife survival and human welfare.

- Address and mitigate conflicts between humans and wildlife

Economy:

- Rural communities can establish wildlife management areas that contribute to the economy
- World-wide market exists to view and photograph wild horses – great economic potential
- Prairie dogs are loved in Europe as intelligent and important species to the ecosystem; they can be a potential draw for the tourist dollar
- Green tourism
- Protect endangered wildlife, don't poison – can be an economic benefit

Recreation:

- An important value – city people gain experience and understanding of forest resources
- Don't compromise wildland values in the interest of recreation
- Recreational aviators – offer services:
 - Count wildlife populations
 - Nature-based surveys
 - Volunteer for other projects

Other recommendations for the Rule:

- Rule should be science-based
- Allow for creation of forums or other structures to utilize “citizen scientists,” those with either academic scientific backgrounds, or with local knowledge of the area and species
- Need flexibility to deal with changing climate; cannot remain static
- Rule should address trash in the forest

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC MEETING /OPEN HOUSE

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 6:00 – 8:30 pm

Station: Restoration, Watershed Health, Climate Change, Adaptive Management

- Restoration:
- Do not manipulate restoration, as has been done in the past; let nature run its course
- Roads cause fragmentation; prefer not to create more temporary roads in the forests; rule should address issue of temporary roads in forests
- Protect what you have first

- Watershed health:
- Protect entire watersheds
- Plan in the context of watersheds
- The water created in forests is more valuable than the timber
- Consider and protect the links between watersheds; include the protection of connectivity of watersheds in the Rule
- How does the adjudication of water rights – ongoing in NM – impact forest planning and management? If a user is awarded a water right, what is its source?
- Work with other agencies and private landowners to encompass entire watershed

- Climate Change:
- Monitor for climate change
- Information exists – question is how it will be used
- Climate change will affect habitat; focus in the past has been in restoring species and habitat as it has existed in the past, now habitats will shift
- FS should be an advocate for actions that stop/slow climate change
- Collaborate with other organizations that are addressing climate change impacts; for instance, Audubon.org and the Wildlands Network

- Adaptive Management:
- Need flexibility, an Adaptive Planning Rule because information is changing
- FS needs to learn from past, nurture institutional memory, eg. High elevation wastelands
- Need flexibility and different timelines for different forests
- Understand the intrinsic value of what you have – trees v. timber, for instance
- Recognize wildlife as an indicator of management success or failure; if wildlife is maintained, or if it is diminishing, that is an important indicator
- Look at existing data on birds, wildlife, etc.

- Economic factors:
- Scale back; hire local companies

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC MEETING /OPEN HOUSE

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 6:00 – 8:30 pm

Station: Economies, Social Values, Public Collaboration and All-Lands Approach

All-Lands Approach:

- All-lands approach is an important value
- Coordinate efforts in large areas for projects that need to cross boundaries, like eradication of invasive species
 - Coordination across federal, state and private interests is a challenge
 - Need to share planning strategies, manpower, training, skills, costs, funding, safe herbicides, native plantings, etc.
- Consider habitat fragmentation impacts on ecosystem viability, especially in relation to climate change and resilience
 - Evaluate connectivity, and its threats (like land development) of habitats for wildlife and other resources
 - Wildlife don't understand boundaries
 - Need overpasses for large wildlife – to protect both animals and motorists
- Incorporate education with an emphasis on all-lands philosophy; use all-lands education approach

Economies:

- Evaluate if rural economies are viable in an ecosystem context
- Evaluate presence of communities threatened by fire
- Need a new paradigm for local and national economies that is innovative and sustainable, not extractive

Collaboration:

- FS should share information from its environmental analyses with the state
- FS should listen to and incorporate memorials that the state has passed; a way of listening to what the states want; a way of hearing what communities desire, since the public can't vote on public land management
- Need more communication on actions; FS needs to listen and respond
- Rule should include the concept that the public using the resources must take some degree of responsibility for the land they are using, its protection, maintenance and restoration
- Solicit individuals who are interested in helping –
 - to review science as citizen scientists
 - volunteers for other projects
 - use mailing lists and sign-in sheets to stay in touch, recruit help

A Mission for the Forest Service:

- Forest management needs to be a multiple agency – soil and water, collaborative involvement, etc.
- Need to find a common mission within the agency that covers all these multiple functions

General comments on the Rule:

- Humans should not be the focus for land management; just one part of a multi-use plan; need to set areas aside where there is no human use
- Strive for simplicity in the rule so it is easy to implement and is flexible, but be sure to listen and incorporate all opinions.
- Don't be biased towards special interests and be consistent in handling different levels of input, both local and national
- Science should outweigh the input from special interests, NGOs, etc.
- Climate change and water resources should inform all decisions
- Places of interest should be advertised on the web.
- Contributions to local and national communities should be sustainable.

**FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC MEETING /OPEN HOUSE –
April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 6:00 – 8:30 pm
Station: Diversity of Plants and Animal Species**

Need for collaboration:

- Need to cooperate with other entities to enforce laws, oversight to make sure species are protected, not just on FS lands
- Need to share information among agencies – federal, state, tribal, local government, public
- Can use citizen scientists, volunteers to gather information in a scientific way

All-lands Approach:

- Use watershed for overall analysis of species and habitat
- Maintain genetic connectivity to enable genetic viability
- Ecosystem analysis should include fragmentation and connectivity of landscapes and habitats
-

Restoration/maintenance of Species and Systems:

- Need to ban toxins, etc.
- It's all about the ecosystem, from beginning to end
 - Need to adopt systems approach to wildlife management
 - Move away from single species management
 - Multiple use rule needs to take a “back seat” to at-risk species
 - Multiple use can mean “multiple “ in some cases

Adaptive Management:

- Plans need to be adaptive

Other needs:

- Process to address special habitat areas and areas for solitude
- Rule may need to address invasive species
- Both micro and macro analyses are needed

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC MEETING /OPEN HOUSE

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 6:00 – 8:30 pm

Station: Recreation

- Recreation is how many of us interact with the forest. It is very important.
- Potential for conflicts:
 - With wildlife -- Motorized recreation of any kind should be carefully considered for each particular habitat
 - Consider how diverse recreational users will interface when developing a plan
- Decision-making with respect to recreation on Forest lands:
 - Recreation should be considered in the context of each community impacted (negatively or positively)
 - Recreation should be considered in the “macro” – not just in terms of one location; look at the whole picture and its place in the array of multiple uses
 - Each use – wild horse adoption, for instance – should be considered for each area, and if designated, that use should be advertised.
 - Use GIS to identify areas of best use for particular types of recreation
 - Analyze types of calls and comments that come to the USFS to ascertain public interest in certain kinds of recreation
- Consider the economics of recreation – the costs and benefits to a community
 - Including eco-tourism
 - Consider “return on investment” for investment in recreational, or other, projects in a particular area
 - Consider opportunities of a working forest with multiple uses in particular areas, including wilderness
 - Monitor, analyze changes in rural communities – their use of the forest and economic impacts – be flexible to change
 - Use the Restore America Executive Act as an analysis tool
- Study and monitor long term impacts to forest health and sustainability
 - from forest uses
 - from foreign infestations
- Collaborate with the public and with users
 - Engage the public in reporting issues and threats to healthy lands
 - Advertise, do outreach to users on issues related to forest planning
 - Consider active collaborations around recreation in particular areas

FOREST PLAN RULE -- ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC MEETING/OPEN HOUSE

April 28, 2010, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, 6:00 –8:30 pm

Concluding Remarks from the Regional Forester, Corbin Newman

Regional Forester Corbin Newman reflected on what he had heard during the public meeting plenary discussion and in visiting the four open house stations.

- 1) The general public and stakeholders of all interests have a keen interest in the Forest Planning Rule revision. They need to be included and informed from the beginning of the process, and continuously to the end. The Region will make every effort to stay connected with participants throughout this process.
- 2) Citizens and organizations, as well as agencies, are willing and eager to volunteer and partner with the Forest Service to help with forest projects.
- 3) The Rule needs to consider the needs of both human and wildlife with respect to forest resources, and find a balance that maintains a healthy ecosystem.
- 4) The Southwestern Region is very grateful for the wisdom and enthusiasm participants have brought to this process.

Additional submission to the roundtable process:

Submitted by email to Lucy Moore prior to the Roundtable by Scotty Johnson.

new planning rule must provide for species diversity, sustain fish and wildlife populations and their habitats, and assess the effect of agency actions and changing conditions through population and habitat monitoring.

- Sustaining healthy fish and wildlife populations is key to the successful, long-term management of our national forests. The new planning rule must include provisions to ensure informed and balanced land management decisions to maintain wildlife diversity on our forests. The following provisions of America’s Wildlife Heritage Act (H.R. 2807), currently before Congress, would advance these objectives and should be reflected in the planning rule:
 - Robust wildlife safeguards: Provide managers with measurable objectives to ensure wildlife sustainability;
 - Science – based monitoring: Require comprehensive monitoring of “focal” fish and wildlife populations, at-risk species as well as their habitats. Loss of certain key species from forests can threaten forest sustainability and make forests less resilient to climate change, and habitat monitoring alone is insufficient to detect these threats; and
 - Strong coordination and cooperation: Provide mechanisms for federal and state agencies to coordinate management to sustain fish and wildlife populations across forest boundaries.