

Sierra Cascades Dialog Breakout Group Notes

Collaborative Planning in Forest Plan Revision

March 1, 2012

The following pages summarize the flip chart notes taken during breakout discussions at the Dialog.

Table 1

Stakeholders Liked

Good that there is a Handbook and Guidelines to start with.

Page 12 – good that identifying stakeholders highlights needs to include minorities.

Stakeholders Would Change

More clarity on how to assure good communication between Forest supervisor and local communities

You need more clarification of the '4 Cs' – Collaboration, Coordination, Cooperation and Communication. They should be defined in the Handbook.

There is no clear goal here, collaboration will not work without goal.

Suggest more follow-up between plan developers and a smaller group of representatives from the interest groups to assure accountability.

The FS is not coordinating with rural counties. Collaboration is nice, but is not the same as requiring coordination.

The goal is murky. The manual needs to establish what is the common purpose.

It is important to distinguish between the collaborative approach to planning and collaborative project design. Page 14 'deal-makers and deal-breakers' is terminology more appropriate to project design.

Call out Adaptive Management. Give framework/structure for this. How will this work over time? Add the diagram on continuous management

Develop forums for subgroups of stakeholders.

Broaden definition of stakeholders, particularly commercial interests in recreation areas.

Common purpose statements will help focus where people put their attention/time.

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

What is the goal of the collaborative if the Supervisor is making the final decision?

What is the role and contribution of water agencies?

What happens when everyone doesn't agree?

What would make you want to get involved? What are good models/best practices for Forest Service to use?

Coordinate the process with County Government. That would help it to be taken more seriously. Elected officials represent stakeholders.

I would participate if I knew my views would influence the process. It is not clear that they will influence the results of the process. Will it be helpful?

Issue tracking would help with accountability – help people know that they have been heard.

Don't let comments get lost. At all points in the process issues should be characterized – how they have been responded to or how they will be responded to in the next step.

Each forest needs a clear management direction, end results, and goals. Then policies can be structured to meet these goals.

Having a goal gets all sides to the table. Then they work together to reach agreement on how to achieve the goals.

The input of local communities is important. The term 'briefing' suggests a one-way relationship. A different term would be helpful.

Include a glossary in the handbook.

Create a council of spokespersons that works with forest supervisor to help assure input.

Good example – the Pacific Forest Stewardship Council provides consensus-driver recommendations to the Forest Supervisors.

Forest Supervisor accountability to process – if the Supervisor doesn't agree with the recommendation, give some reason. If the Supervisor just fails to move a recommendation forward this causes consequences.

Page 10 defines a decision-making process. But the overall Forest Plan decision-making has not been clarified. There needs to be more transparency about input vs. decision-making.

How does the collaborative process integrate with the NEPA process? Development of Alternatives?

It is an improvement that this process provides two opportunities to directly communicate to the decision-maker:

1. Input into the process
2. Comment on decision.

Clarify the difference between programmatic planning and project planning. Many people don't understand programmatic planning.

Give people an example of a Forest Plan or compare with something they understand (like County General Plan).

Create some sort of tracking that will help bring people up to date when they join the process late:
What have we done, where are we now?

It is good that the planning process is shorter. This is more sustainable.

Keep it short! Maybe make the forest plan just 2 pages – a map with colors indicating zones and on the back the standards and guidelines for each of the zones.

Crack open the FS as the ‘keeper of information’. This helps level the playing field. An example of this is SNAMP, where information is very accessible.

Process needs clarity. Identify what needs to be changed in the old Forest Plans on a forest by forest basis over the next 10- 15 years. Develop a purpose statement. Clearly define what we’re doing in 3-4 sentences.

Table 3

Stakeholders Liked

The flexibility and empowerment it gives managers to make local decisions.

Appreciate the support & guide of the handbook – having been through several revisions before and never had this to fall back on.

Science will truly be a partner.

The timeline – objectives to be met within a certain timeframe, don’t want to see this be dragged on for extra years.

It shows the process for moving away from just consensus building (which can be hard to get) and moves toward action.

*Need to note that time, money and willpower are limited, let’s stick to the timeline and not get bogged down by minutia.

Stakeholders Would Change

Definitions on key terms must be vetted and agreed upon. What do you mean when you say collaboration, consensus, forest, consultation vs. inform, etc.?

It would be helpful to have examples of collaborations to see how this is supposed to work. Maybe there aren’t any?

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

What is the definition of what we are trying to achieve? A majority consensus, a caucus or something less? The definitions must stay within the legal limits of the plan. A revision does not mean starting from scratch but revising what we have – don’t reinvent the wheel.

Is there a commitment to professional facilitation not just at the plan level but once each district begins to implement?

Who provides the science? What is the process for accepting or declining science? This needs to be made very clear to the public.

What is the decision making mechanism for adaptive management, once the initial outreach/implementation/review is done? How are decisions going to be made about what worked and what didn't and how rapidly will any changes be made. Will we need to wait for another revision?

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Field trips

Public education including articles and speaking to groups

Website usage

*Need to show the relevance of the process to the public before they will participate.

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Knowing what the issues are, how the agreements and decisions will be made and how the information will be used ahead of time helps make collaboration more effective. Provide links to information.

Need to frame discussions specifically – if you want to come to agreements on the dbh of trees to remove, and then limit the conversation to that. But be sure to say, other talks on other issues will be addressed another time.

Use outside facilitators.

One on one meeting with FS Supervisors is the most effective. Industry/environmental/social groups/etc. should have the conversations internally before this meeting to vet out their concerns and issues. Then someone representing the group should meet with the FS Supervisor.

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Cynicism – “If you didn't do what we wanted, then you didn't listen to us”

People have an obligation to be educated before entering the debate and the FS has the obligation to be specific on what they are discussing and seeking comments on. Are we 'collaborating' to come to a consensus on a decision or just to solicit comments and inform the public?

Touch base with people. Don't let too much time go by between conversations or else you run the risk of being accused that you didn't really want them involved or that you didn't listen to them.

Collaborations must be set up correctly. More than one voice representing a point of view, such as more than one type of industry rep, or more than just Sierra Club, is needed to legitimize the discussion/decision.

The rationale for a decision must be explained. Why you chose to act one way or another.

Table 4

Stakeholders Liked

It is a good start.

It recognizes that these are public lands and others need to be involved in helping design the plan.

It will build better projects in the end.

It uses existing structures: ie. CFLR

It improves relationships.

It increases capacity.

Stakeholders Would Change

Need to reiterate that the collaborative is open to anyone.

Need to indicate scale as collaboratives function on different scales.

Need access (links) to background info for late joiners.

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

Earlier decisions will affect later decisions.

How to get “out of state” stakeholders views, as this is federal land and might need a national view.

Building up of one’s email list over time is important.

How to balance so many different opinions?

Are we going to revisit places already set aside...wilderness etc. What portion of the forest are we planning for?

Some forest supervisors are easier to work with than others.

This is not consensus driven.

Elements of the model that would support your participation

That there is real money to do it.

Seeing some early success

Evidence of Credibility

Lots of communication and success

Complete consensus is not realistic. The need for Compromise must be acknowledged.

Clear expectations

It shows itself to have teeth. – Consequences to walking away? Agreement/contract? Agree to abide by end result, and that all issues will be addressed. With a separate council?

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Chat rooms? To compliment public meetings.

Make meeting notes public.

Name tags! So people can get to know one another.

A Standing committee to deal with complaints/frustrations.

Need to keep revisiting the different between interest vs position.

Facebook

Karma points for participation redeemable for a..... free camping spot. ☺

Those who disagree must present an option.

Consistent sharing of notes (ID Teams?).

Give plenty of notice regarding meetings.

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Publish responses to all comments, even unsubstantial ones with explanations.

Prevent certain voices from dominating the conversation.

Litigation tends to increase with disillusionment.

Develop a neutral standing committee (public forum) to deal with complaints in the collaboration process.

Table 5

Stakeholders Liked

The level(s) of USFS's organization that people can affect

Timing of 3rd party collaboration to be in close unison with NEPA-driven timelines

Create more consistency of management across bioregions and ecologies that cross administrative boundaries

USFS collaboration to coordinate with counties' General Plans

Where one county houses multiple USFS local districts, a consistent approach from those separate local supervisors, as directed by Regional Directors, in dealing with county government

Stakeholders Would Change

The level(s) of USFS's organization that people can affect

Timing of 3rd party collaboration to be in close unison with NEPA-driven timelines

Create more consistency of management across bioregions and ecologies that cross administrative boundaries

USFS collaboration to coordinate with counties' General Plans

Where one county houses multiple USFS local districts, a consistent approach from those separate local supervisors, as directed by Regional Directors, in dealing with county government

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

Exact meanings of word need definitions and clarifications (e.g., "briefing")

What is the capacity of NGOs?

How are NGOs involved?

What does "monitoring" mean, and at what scale?

Should, if possible, the Plan itself be a "wiki"?

How management will be consistent across bioregions and ecologies that cross administrative boundaries?

The model appears as "fixed"; therefore, how can it be applied across USFS administrative jurisdictions, which apply things differently?

Operational consistency: can there be legal clarification for extent to which local USFS districts need to follow model?

How does adaptive management fit within Forest Plan that includes "shared learning"?

Although there is a call for a "monitoring strategy," to what extent will there be actual monitoring?

Explaining publicly how law constrains USFS responses and actions to public comments.

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Closing the feedback loop after USFS responds to public comments to ensure that public received the USFS responses

Improving quality of participation by ensuring all participants as prepared as possible

Educating the public that USFS employees do read all comments, but law dictates and constrains extent to which USFS can respond

Clarifying what USFS team is prepared to share specifically about its budget, process, capability, etc.

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Roundtable discussion between different perspectives

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Increased use of technology to engage and expand scope of communication

But how does law constrain this possibility? Can that be resolved?

Having a single, easily-identified point of contact for NEPA issues

A dedicated USFS manager to handle public engagement because USFS public relations concentrates on media inquiries, not general public communication

E.g., Region 6 has a partnership/stewardship coordinator that fills this role

This role/person needs to be empowered to be act independently rather than having to wait for explicit instruction to reach out

Rather than “localizing” USFS policy, make it more regional to ensure coordination among local supervisors

Increase coordination among all overlapping land management agencies: local, state, federal, and tribal.

Increase use of outside, knowledgeable, and effective moderators to help facilitate discussions for all stages of Forest Plan process

Table 6

Stakeholders Liked

Framework of process is positive; it encourages communication based planning including partners outside of the agency.

Like the questions under “Key Considerations” on page 14.

Stakeholders Would Change

There is a lot of pressure on the Forest Supervisor regarding expected accomplishments; considering everything else on their plates, this may be very unrealistic.

Show where adaptive management and feedback loops; where do they come into play as it’s not readily apparent. Feel that there should be regular loops clearly identified rather than just a “adapt” at end of process.

How realistic is the budget? \$600,000 for the first year and \$500,000 for the second is not a lot of money for what is being proposed, particularly the extended communications. Consider creating a range of process alternatives based on the budget.

Page 5-Looks more like 2 separate processes; agency/agency communication is not apparent; need to display feedback loops necessary for adaptive management.

Need to add a year 4 and 5.

Need to highlight the capacity of the general public (they don’t have 24/7 to work on this); need a more encompassing capacity model.

Need a more efficient scale to involve public in planning. Involving the public is bigger than just forest level. Some public partners play at different levels.

The word coordinate could be used more often especially with county partners. Where/when included in separate box in phase 1.

Page 6 – County engagement; add coordination.

The term “briefing” is not sufficient as it does not convey 2-way communication. Period. Use the word coordinate or consult instead.

Consider using similar wording from RCRC MOA or from FS Chief’s response to Congressman Herger regarding the terms coordinate/consult.

Page 15 – The term “overarching;” what fits under it and what doesn’t? Different for different people. How much discretion is in “overarching?”

The word collaborative is used a lot; be careful to identify (use it carefully) when it applies to a specific group ie. “the XYZ Collaborative.”

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

Add a Glossary

How does Forest Service or other parties for that matter represent “silent majority?”

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Too much reliance on internet could negatively affect rural areas or specific groups

Thoughts are captured accurately during public meetings and recorded similarly in meeting notes.

Avoid tendency to paraphrase as meaning is often lost. A secondary problem is because public meeting comments are rendered useless they are of no value to planners who then must reply on written feedback, diminishing public meeting feedback.

“Response to Comments” can be lacking if original comments aren’t captured accurately. In other words, “Issues” aren’t “ID’d” sufficiently/correctly.

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Community wildfire plans have lots of good information and have been adopted by the Counties. They should be included in the process; handbook should clearly id what phase (assessment? coordination?) they and other plans such as those from Collaborative Groups (ACCG/CFLRA) come into play.

Maps with post-it notes

Meetings work when community invites community. In other words, not just the Forest Service is doing the inviting.

Transparency with group transactions: community pressure for commitments & agreements
Finding a way for everyone to buy-in to product-not sure what the tool is.

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

More Forest Service fieldtrips with variety of partners; discussions are best out in the field

More field trips sponsored by external stakeholders

Community is encouraged to develop their solution and encourages Forest service to listen

Clear tracking between comments and #'s or names.

Clear identification of issue. Too much grouping dilutes meaning with broader generalizations.

People doing content analysis must have sufficient background to understand and articulate issues

Real collaboration with a really defined timeline. Real collaboration is defined as all parties in place; FS open to comments & suggestions; expedited process to show-up/get comments/write plan. Too much time/too drawn out. Get it done.

Conduct some public involvement while developing proposed action. Do it early before formatting occurs. Clarify FACA issues with externals coming together.

General Comments

Capacity: can we handle expanded outreach & information much less use it to plan and then implement

Table 7

Stakeholders Liked

The commitment to science synthesis (especially socio-economic)

Early involvement of stakeholders

Use of bio-regional assessment

Collaboration on developing forest plans

3rd party identification of stakeholders

Like the whole idea of "year 1". It often gets skipped

Briefing local officials up front

The lay out; it is user friendly

It's on paper, so using forest resources that supports jobs

Stakeholders Would Change

More early involvement on alternatives development (its too late to just collect comments on the DEIS
Need a mechanism to identify non-local interests (regional forest users). Maybe use a visitor-use survey?

More emphasis on data collection and incorporating in year one planning

More public outreach; use a socioeconomic spin to attract more people

Be clear/specific on how coordination will occur with state agencies and local officials

Inconsistencies in language: briefings cs. Coordination

Need a mechanism to make public engagement more efficient. All people attending meetings should be volunteering to be there so its equal and we all are donating time. Government employees should not get paid or take furlough days

Make legal sideboards more clear

Set expectations more clear up front on Forest Supervisors can/cannot do

Include a glossary

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

Timing of meetings (weekends, evenings, off times)

“Rolling” meetings with multiple shifts or open houses

Public noticing that targets groups that live close to the forest

Planning “charets”; a 3 day meeting (or whatever timeframe) where people roll up their sleeves and get immediate feedback/ability to come to decisions

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Strong facilitation of public meetings

Involving industry in conversations

Going to existing local meetings

Focusing outreach to affected communities

Focus groups facilitated by a third party neutral

Public education of issues and marketing

- About forest planning
- People CAN be a part of the decision
- Why forest planning is important

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Do an accounting of local benefits and bring it into the conversation

Look at the “visitorshed” of users and target them

Give groups standardized worksheets that they can work on amongst themselves

Surveys (survey monkey) that are available online and on paper

Use addressed stamped envelopes to request feedback

Ask participants their preferred way of communicating when they show up for meetings (snail mail, email, etc.)

Outside facilitation; either an FS enterprise team or third party neutral

Note takers, stenographers

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Set clear expectations the challenge the Forest Service faces on balancing multiple views; not everything can be accepted/incorporated

Clarity on what are “drafts” and clearly show when changes are made and how input is incorporated

Transparency

Table 8

Stakeholders Liked

Clarity of data on chart on page 5 of handbook

Stakeholders Would Change

Have meetings be more “hands on” – more participation by individuals. For example, have maps of forests for each individual at each table; each map would show proposed actions or programs

- participants can see exactly what and where changes will be on their own maps
- participants can write or draw their own ideas on their own maps
- participants should be allowed to suggest their own changes

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

On page 12, what exactly does the term, “Minorities” mean?

Current handbook is not clear on how to deal with Bioregional vs. Forest-Specific issues

- If forests will be analyzed on an individual basis and plans revised:
 - Does this mean we will lose the prior research done?
 - How will we avoid losing the benefit of prior research?
 - How will we avoid duplicating earlier efforts?
 - Why would we take a step backward and lose the benefit of prior research?

- How will various organizations with their own individual complex planning procedures interact with each other?
- Which decisions will be subject to change?
- How should we determine which decisions get overruled and which remain in place?

Need clearer data on segmentation of the Bioregion.

There should be more detailed explanations in the information on the Bioregion vs. individual forests in Section A of page 6.

Communication is not clear

- How will information be disseminated to the public?
- The data on page 5 should be moved into the chart on page 17, under the heading, "Collaboration and Communication Plan."
- Collaboration and communication with stakeholders should be continuous and should start very early in the process.

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Have more participatory meetings facilitated by neutral third parties.

Consensus that facilitation by neutral party was beneficial to the collaborative process.

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Giving people specific tools or criteria to use in expressing their opinions or giving input is helpful.

- Allows more "hands on" involvement and "buy in" of final results.
- Example: Collaboration involving definition of fire shed areas, where participants were given detailed maps and data and could draw their own suggestions.

Consider having outings or meetings at the sites under discussion, so people can actually see the areas and what needs to be done

The collaborative process in the Stanislaus Forest worked well.

- Brought different groups together.
- Presented groups with data they already had developed.
- Worked well on already defined issues.

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Could have radio or TV programs to respond to issues raised and to publicize local meetings.

Wiki site could help as a tool.

- What if some people don't have internet access?
- The Wiki site is not very personal.

- How will people know the decision makers have heard their comments?
- Decision makers should be involved.

Collaboration not going to work on “forced plans”

- Won’t work where stakeholders feel the plan has already been set and they are just asked to rubber stamp approval.
- Parties will get frustrated and resort to litigation.

Not going to work where basic issues are not already clearly defined.

Some groups are uncomfortable with science-based decisions because they believe that the decision makers will defer to scientific findings and will ignore the needs of others. The process we are using is better than just basing decisions on scientific findings because with this process, people feel they are being heard and their needs considered.

Several group members expressed frustration at not being heard or included.

- Example: “Recreation” not included on list, despite repeated insistence from various stakeholders.
- Most find better way to respond.
 - Maybe more one-on-one.
 - This facilitation/collaborative process could help.

Table 9

Stakeholders Liked

Style, layout, and language of handbook – “It reaches beyond the Forest Service.”

Stakeholders Would Change

“Briefing” – the word does not imply two-way communication.

Need to add feedback loops to make the handbook “adaptive.” (pp. 7&8)

Need to expand the overview (p. 3) to describe where the forest plan fits in the overall scheme of things to help manage expectations (i.e., the plan is strategic – a project is specific).

Leave out list of stakeholders –you’ll always leave someone out!

Add row to diagram with Year 4 and out for implementation and project level-collaboration

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

The diagram needs to better reflect the time involved in developing/writing the FEIS.

The word “consultation” needs to be better defined (i.e., legal requirement for Tribes)

What about the other forests? What is the timeline beyond the first three early adopters?

To better manage expectations clearly, identify the role of the Forest Service as it moves through the revision process (dialog/develop/decision).

What's the difference between cooperation, communication, collaboration, consultation, and coordination?

Words matter – be explicit in language use – build into the process mechanism(s) for feedback (i.e., briefings are one-way communication, consultation is ?, etc.)

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Connect people to place in a way they can relate to (beyond the “usual suspects”)

Draw on the importance of relationships to share information and increase understanding.

Getting people “on-the-ground” is critical to achieving understanding – particularly in more “obtuse” topics like “desired conditions.”

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Educate people about the *process* through NPR/local access channels/information meetings.

Define what successful outcomes look like at the beginning of each collaborative activity: focus on outcomes.

Professional facilitation is a critical factor in a successful collaboration.

Addressing frustration

Parameters must be realistic and specific. For example, what does “local” mean?

Tie the pieces together. For example, what is the inter-relationship among the social/economic/ecological components of the plan?

Stakeholders want to talk to the decision maker in conjunction with a third-party neutral facilitator.

Feedback on “Our Forest Place” (OFP)

Need to connect to Natural Resource schools and universities through professors

Need to link to other sites

Need “push out” messages

Need to describe the intersection of OFP and the NEPA process

Table 10 and 11

Stakeholders Liked

Concrete formalization and presentation of the model – a good transparent start.

Stakeholders Would Change

Add to the handbook: What are the next steps to translate [strategy] into action – i.e. clarify implementation and funding of plans.

Recognize that people have busy lives – Add more ways to participate (for example, through electronic and social media)

Facilitate input from a wider audience than usual – reach beyond the usual suspects

Add public participation via GIS (Geographical Information Systems) into the document

Explain strategies that will be used to ensure that the core planning team will include Forest Health and other Specialists (the handbook is now heavily weighted towards Wildlife)

Include more explanation of who will be involved, how, and with what resources

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

How the adaptive-management process will work

Where is the money going to come from? (And how will money used for this process affect other budgets)

How the input of diverse stakeholder groups will be managed and kept in balance.

What mechanisms will ensure that timeframes are met?

How you will create consistency and co-ordinate between adjoining forests

How you will demonstrate that feedback is being responded to?

How will the many diverse sources of input be integrated into a whole?

Elements of the model that would support your participation

It's an avenue for input

There are more visible opportunities to participate than usual

There are more diverse opportunities to participate

Feedback seems a mystery – the mechanics are not obvious

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Integration of GIS into the process – to ensure that everyone was looking at the same data and at the facts

Clarity about what you want people to bring to meetings (e.g., scientific data, references): The “California Mortality Task Force” had a good process for this; “PRBO Conservation Science” has a process for this

Time-efficient exercises

Use of photos in meetings: e.g., “then and now” photos (time-efficient – photos can communicate much info quickly and with impact)

Giving people cameras and having them take photos

Exercises that help people get to know each other as people

Exercises that make sure everyone is talking about the same shared context; that people are talking about the same world

Giving people of differing views a chance to resolve issues with one another and understand each other’s perspectives

Exercises to identify common, shared, agreed-upon goals

“The Logic Model” – a method by which participants identify shared desired outcomes

Identified imagined “worst” and “best” possible outcomes at the outset and kept these visible during the rest of the process

Use consensus processes (i.e. not majority voting)

Nobody goes to lunch until the problem is solved!

Meetings with food – e.g. informal potlucks that help create connection

Constituents meet in homogeneous stakeholder groups to create “wish lists” – helps get all issues out on the table quickly, even from quiet people

Enable people to speak as individuals from their perspective and expertise, rather than as “representatives of organizations” (so they can speak more freely)

Meetings in the field -- Seeing is believing, like “a picture is worth a thousand words”

Meetings on neutral ground

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Use people’s own words

Give direct feedback about the response to input – clearly state how and why input has been incorporated or ignored

Go to the communities and have school kids draw pictures to illustrate important messages

Have methods to store and track input, and to enable others to read and comment on input – use online tools for this (Don’t have input go into a black box)

Even when there are consensus recommendations, include expressions of concern and hesitations

Hold meetings in the field, especially with decision-makers

How would you characterize the main gist of each of our two small group discussions today?

We still don't have clarity about how this is all going to come together

We advocate multiplying avenues for participation and engagement: use many diverse and innovative tools and techniques

Table 12

Stakeholders Liked

The objection process is better than the appeals process

Starting with collaboration is a big improvement

Being flexible and asking the public to help before the final collaboration strategy is adopted is a useful change

The proposed approach allows for goals and expectations for collaboration to be identified at the start of the process. That is good for everyone

The inclusiveness of the proposed program can be applied to other projects

Stakeholders Would Change

Some forest planning should start in the northern Sierra to avoid alienation of that region

Details should be added to describe the form of the proposed actions in the final forest plan

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

The intended procedures for coordinating with the plans of local government and other agencies should be made clear.

The process that forests will use to assess their capacity for collaboration should be lined out in the handbook.

The governance structure that will be used to insure that all interests receive consistent and fair treatment should be identified.

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Inclusion of all parties consistently and often will be a big improvement.

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

The Dinkey Collaborative is having some successes now.

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Better use of social media to keep people engaged and report progress

Video conferencing

The biggest factor will be to provide multiple ways for people to stay engaged and track key steps and decisions through iterative processes

Consider “learning libraries” and other multi-party ways to gather, synthesize, and discuss important information

Augment responses to written comments with response that are given in other forms such as input at public meetings

Prepare charters to clarify how input will be received and used

Decision makers can visit with participants to describe how the information that was presented was considered and how that information relates to the decisions that were made

Table 13

Stakeholders Liked

Sharing the model

Use of technology

Establishing a charter / commitment and clarity

Sets up accountability

Allows for a paper trail

Conscience decision to have a consistent process for every forest

Collaborative Plans will be published and transparent

Stakeholders Would Change

Add year four and beyond. How does process continue for implementation, monitoring, and adaptive management

What does an adaptive plan look like?

Having professional / independent facilitators

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

Define and explain use of terms

Use of terms *brief*, *consultation*, *engage*, and *interview* creates confusion. Does not see equitable

Feels like some stakeholders have more of a say

Define scale, involvement of workshops

Understanding that each unit is different

How do we engage the non-“squeaky wheels” respectfully?

How do we make more convenient and flexible?

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Online available materials and documents

Additional meetings to inform folks about scientific knowledge that is foundational

Record and make available online video, webcasts, podcasts, live and interactive

Consider short and focused

Consider those who can't attend

Brief / short updates on web so folks can keep up with process

In addition to meetings, like the Sierra Cascades Dialog

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Collaborative workshops to review alternatives **before** they become official alternatives

Shaping issues that solutions are being brought up to address

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Content analyses, even if we don't address a question, issue or comment, explain why or say where it is

Share with stakeholders suggestions for how best to communicate with the Forest Service. Help stakeholders understand how to get their point across. Consider a template or “tool” format. How do we speak your language? Or, how do we help you understand ours?

Consider technology knowledge and hardware limitations in your communications.

Consider public libraries as a point of contact

Articulate the main point up front in your requests for input or sharing

Be clear about when/how/who input is needed

Consider a field guide to collaboration

Personal touch is important: write back, call back, invite, and face time

Table 14

Stakeholders Liked

Process is laid out

Specifics on how to do collaboration
Clarifies that the focus on collaboration, not consensus
Makes collaboration very transparent
Good skeleton that provides guidance, but not too prescriptive
Living document
General framing in the collaboration “handbook”

Stakeholders Would Change

Better clarify how collaboration works at the different levels of planning
Needs a separate chapter on education
Need more information on how to make the planning process more inclusive – e.g . how to incorporate science with local knowledge
Need to spell out how to include non-traditional /people into the USFS effort
Need more illustrations and graphics
Needs to spell out the collaboration process past year 3 (follow up)
Need more clarification about year 3 – need to keep informing, even in the objection phase
Incorporate an after action review (AAR) process at each stage to improve the document
Include in key audiences: universities, students and staff (future researchers, community colleges, high schools, etc.)
Be careful to not disproportionately let collaborative groups drive the process. Include some kind of self-assessment throughout the process to provide checks and balances.
Include something in the handbook to clarify the relationship with the WO FACA committee.
Rename it HANDBOOK, not GUIDEBOOK. Guidebook has an established meaning in USFS that is more prescriptive.

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

What is the goal of collaboration? Before the nuts and bolts, identify the goal of collaboration.
What or when is the end of planning? Is there an ending point?
How do you connect scientists with local knowledge, so you can keep this process real to the public/non-technical people?
What is the role of the national FACA committee? Need to clarify that relationship.

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

To enhance communication/collaboration – use VTC in Supervisor’s office and social media tools to include virtual audiences.
If you aren’t going to use the information, don’t ask (don’t overpromise)
Be clear about what is on the table and what is to be decided. The USFS is the final decision maker. Be honest about the real decision space up front.

In the handbook, give a range of tools and options for collaboration, then let the local forests design their process.

The forest should design their process based on the skill base in the forest (internal capacity) and the constituency and prior engagement (community capacity)

Give examples of what has worked well in the past/Tools or processes

General

Going out to the woods to see what is “real”

Hold well-facilitated meetings, so everybody can be heard and listen to others

Don't use the word “group” in connection with collaboration. Must be a much more permeable concept (so that some individuals/groups don't drive the process.)

Start with clear expectations and realization that all should try to see things differently

Be realistic about the fact that values are hard to change – most of the conflict is values driven

Have a way to accommodate people with individual/focused issues – so they can provide input, but not feel they have to attend meetings

Make sure the meetings are on week-end/nights to accommodate people's schedules – and BRING FOOD!

The quality of the conversation relates to the quality of the facility. Nice facilities/close to the woods/good food and tablecloths – translate to more productive conversations

Make sure that time frames for projects are real – need to be clear that the day-to-day work will continue.

EXAMPLES

Types of collaborative processes:

Collaborative Learning/Joint Fact Finding

- Expectations for collaboration learning rather than decision-making. Focus on hearing range of voices – identify areas of tension and areas of common ground. (Develop “how to” lessons for forests on doing collaborative learning.)
- Bring together interested parties. Have them identify key issues. Bring in people with expertise, so they can learn together.
- Example of collaborative forum.

Focused dialogues/Deliberative Dialogues

- Kettering Foundation financed a national issues forum to address “wicked problems.” They hosted a facilitated conversation on the pros and cons of key issues. Everybody was engaged in seeing/understanding each other's positions.
- Focus on a problem, rather than the whole of a “wicked problem.” Agree to single out/identify a single problem or issue – and then all focus together. Agree on what they will work on and agree on what they will NOT work on.
- Be clear about collaboration – is it about decisions or about learning?

- Learning about the problem/learning about each other’s values and perspectives.

Integrating science into deliberative process

- Find a way to deal with “dueling scientists.” The synthesis is a way to integrate “all science.”
- Much of science is values based. Don’t have different expectations (that it will be neutral.)

Build capacity to collaborate

- Build the capacity of all to be a collaborative participant. Provide training in IBN facilitation. (Sierra Nevada Conservancy provided training)
- Build capacity to be collaborative – focus on building relationships.
- Replace the idea of collaboration with relationships, to show the respect and long-term commitment. Make collaboration and relationship-building the way we (USFS) do business.
- Recognize that collaboration takes time – need to build relationships
- Provide training sessions on “community building?” not just collaboration
- Use the collaborative to get input for the landscape analysis, and incorporate input as an addendum, so people can see how it was used.
- Build the collaboration capacity for the whole community first. Use that as a way for the whole group to assess the skill base for collaboration in:
 - Landscape analysis
 - Project planning
 - Monitoring

Table 15

Stakeholders Liked

Being inclusive

Encompassing as many people as possible

Local decision making has lots of authority

Local involvement at the planning level and locally-driven decisions (Locals know the slopes and land very well.)

Stakeholders Would Change

Broaden stakeholder interest groups when listing them—hard to list interest groups because someone is usually left out.

Add adaptive management

Add water agencies

Consider urban users: urban users rely on forests for recreation and water

Consider holding meetings in the evenings

Collaborative capacity—stakeholders and Forest Service need skills and training for how to collaborate

Stakeholders Suggest Needs Clarification

Cost of planning

Goal is to protect watersheds

Elements of the model that would support your participation

Fine tune the communication to meet the needs of individual communities.

Seek the involvement of elected officials. Give the input of elected officials more weight.

Tools for collaboration that have worked well in the past

Have elected officials identify stakeholders and individuals who might be interested in participating.

Staggering the process is good. This will help national groups and others that have to participate in more than one plan revision.

Small meetings, maybe more meetings

Third party facilitation

Field trips

Hold at least one public meeting in a metropolitan area.

Webinars are only helpful for one-way communication. Not good for really communicating back and forth. Webinars might work with youth. People benefit from interacting with Forest Service staff and realizing that they are real people.

Webinars are good when they are project-focused or task-driven.

Keep dialog fresh between meetings.

Need the “right face” on the project. A “local face” that is recurring and present will also help to address institutional distrust of the Forest Service.

The right mix and depth of scientific information; Compass is a science tool that is useful for helping communicate complex subjects in simple language.

Provide a role for local knowledge to be tied to the science.

Tools to demonstrate that comments are heard and responded to

Document comments.

Recognize up front that not every comment can be in the Forest Plan.

Prepare meeting notes.

If people don't agree with the outcome, they will often say they were not responded to or heard.

“Newsletter” of agreements and areas of disagreement accompany the Forest Plan and are presented in a transparent way.