

Appendix A. Notes from Arizona Meetings

Stakeholder Roundtable Notes, Phoenix April 28, 2010, 1 – 4 p.m.

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

Substantive Topics

Table A: Restoration, Conservation and Watershed Health

1. How can the next planning rule foster *restoration* of National Forest System 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...
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

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.
- 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.

- 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 be 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.
- 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.
- 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

- 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.
- 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
- 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)
- 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
- 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)
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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”
- 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.
- 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)
- 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.
- 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 “squishiness” 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 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 enforces 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
- 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
- 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 (SCRIP).
- 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.
- 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

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.