

U.S. FOREST SERVICE NATIONAL SCIENCE FORUM

March 29-30, 2010

**Panel 5: Incorporating the Best Available
Environmental Science and Monitoring Methods into
a Planning Rule Using the Core Principles of
Contemporary, Professional Planning**

A LOCAL CERTIFIED PLANNER'S PERSPECTIVE

Michael A. Harper, FAICP

Remarks

- **4 PLANNING “TRUTHS”**
- **SELECTED ISSUES FROM N.O.I.**
- **CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS**

1. Planning is not a science

- **Process oriented**
- **Integration of**
 - **Vision**
 - **Goals**
 - **Policy**
 - **Process**
 - **Regulations**
 - **Political decisions**

2. Plan-making is not regulation

- **Primary focus: vision, goals, policy**
 - **Vision: aspiring, touchstone of plan**
 - **Goals: defines vision parameters**
 - **Policy: prioritizes goals; supports regulations**
 - **Regulations: legislate boundaries**
 - **DANGER: mixing regulations into plan**

3. “End State” Plan not viable

- **Planning involves politics**
- **Adaptive management limited**
- **Out-of-date on day of adoption**

4. Non-implementable plans not worth effort

- **Successful plans lead to results**
 - **Results can be**
 - **Change in direction and/or**
 - **Successful implementation of projects/activities and/or**
 - **Efficient allocation of resources**

“Land management planning could involve effective and pro-active collaboration with the public”

- **“...foster collaborative efforts...”**
 - **I.D. & map affected audience & issues**
 - **I.D. state/local planners (public/private) who can provide info/perspective**
 - **Interactive program to collect & organize & respond to comments**
 - **Establish initial time-table & keep to it**
 - **Focus on key issues**
 - **Place-based planning**

“Land management planning could involve effective and pro-active collaboration with the public”

- **“...kinds of information, methods, analysis...”**
 - **Engage state/regional/local organizations**
 - **Encourage web links**
 - **Encourage unified organization responses**
 - **Directly engage public on issues not normally managed at state/regional/local level**
 - **Directly engage state/regional/local government on issues re: services provided by them affected by forest plan**
 - **K.I.S.S.**

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

- **“...account for relationship between ...NFS lands and neighboring lands”**
 - **Evaluate state/regional/local plans for relationship/perspective on NFS lands**
 - **Example: conservation, economic, recreation, public facilities/services elements in master plans**

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

- **“...other planning & assessment efforts...that could inform “all-lands” approach.”**
 - **Partner with state/regional/local organizations on info & comment sessions**
 - **Concurrent planning with state/regional/local planning partners**

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

- **“...creation of a shared vision...”**

- **Develop process for creation of broad & national vision for forests & grasslands**
- **Develop process for creation of vision for each forest unit that tiers off national vision**
- **Identify state/regional/local visions that relate to forest units**

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

- **“...planning rule allow a choice of planning processes?”**

- **Process should define**

- **Subjects**

- **Public participation procedures**

- **Compliance with statutory requirements**

- **Ideally process allows flexibility**

- **Local/regional differences & values**

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

- **“...plans...viewed [as]...strategic...or
...make project or activity decisions?”**

- **Plans typically strategic & tactical**

- **Strategic: vision & goals**
- **Tactical: policies**

- **Plan-making involves choices**

- **Adopted plan provides direction:
projects/activities**
 - **CIP identifies timing/location (after plan)**
 - **No project/activity approval in plan**

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

- **Planning process moves from general to specific (aspirational to guidance)**
- **Plan I.D.s ideal defined by present**
- **Circumstances change**
- **Empirical data crucial**
 - **I.D.s & assesses change**
 - **No amount of data collection, analysis or modeling substitute for GOOD PLANNING**

A dense forest of tall, thin evergreen trees, likely cypresses or similar conifers, filling the frame. The trees are a vibrant green color. Overlaid in the center of the image is the text "THANK YOU!" in a bold, yellow, sans-serif font.

THANK YOU!