



Region One

Coeur D'Alene Planning Rule Roundtable Report

April 13, 2010

Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary.....	3
II.	Introduction.....	4
III.	Background.....	5
IV.	Themes.....	6
V.	Meeting Documentation.....	8

I. Executive Summary

The Forest Service is revising the Planning Rule, the rule under which individual National Forest plans are developed. The rule will be revised through a collaborative process, part of which has been to conduct roundtable meetings in each Region.

In Region One of the Forest Service, headquartered in Missoula, Montana, three roundtable meetings were held simultaneously on April 13, 2010. Approximately 200 people participated in the Region One roundtables in person.

Participants selected discussion topics from four topic categories including;

- General: What makes for a great planning rule?
- Plan Content: What information should a plan contain?
- Substantive: How should forest plans deal with restoration, climate change, watershed health, plant and animal diversity, ecosystem services, contributions to local economies, and uses of National Forest and grasslands?
- Process: How should plans be developed?

Roundtable meeting attendees supported transparency and collaboration in developing the new rule and subsequent Forest Plans. There was a general belief that the current process is too complex, time consuming, and expensive. Participants encouraged the Forest Service to involve all potentially interested parties--adjacent landowners, forest users, local government, state and federal agencies--early and throughout the process, using a variety of media to communication information, and making it convenient to participate.

Attendees acknowledged that forest planning is taking place with many uncertainties. They generally supported flexibility and adaptability in planning as long as course corrections were based on monitoring results and sound science. Ecosystem resilience, forest and watershed health were recurring themes with restoration supported when specific goals and outcomes could be identified.

Finally, participants at each meeting asked that the Forest Service recognize and consider appropriately local communities' interests and ties to the public land and the impacts that National Forest decision-making has on their communities.

This report was prepared by the facilitation team independently of the Forest Service. Interested individuals are encouraged to read the meeting documentation in Section V.

II. Introduction

On April 13, 2010, three all-day roundtable meetings were held simultaneously in Region One. The three venues, Missoula, Montana, Billings, Montana, and Coeur d'Alene, Idaho were linked through the Forest Service's video technology system. Opening remarks were made by the Chief of the Forest Service via video and in person by the Regional Forester, Leslie Weldon. Regional Forester, Weldon, spent the entire day at the roundtable in Missoula. Local line officers were present at the Billings and Coeur d'Alene roundtables.

The public roundtables were noticed in the Federal Register, through local newspaper articles, posted on the regional and national websites, through letters of notification, and through personal contacts with tribal officials. Letters of notification were mailed to approximately 400 stakeholders identified by the Forests one month prior to the roundtables. Participants were asked to pre-register for the meetings to help with logistics, but pre-registration was not required.

There were 131 participants at the roundtable in Missoula, 35 at the roundtable in Billings, and 30 at the roundtable in Coeur d'Alene. Non-Forest Service facilitators and recorders, and some Forest Service employees are not counted in these numbers. A wide variety of interests were represented across the regional roundtables including; recreation, timber, environmental, education and research, oil and gas, grazing, other state and federal agencies, local, state and national elected officials and/or their staff, Forest Service retirees, and current Forest Service employees (planners, specialists, leadership.)

The roundtable agenda was organized to provide two discussion sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Participants selected the two topics of most importance to them and participated in table discussions on these topics. The topics were categorized under the following headings; General, Plan Content, Substantive, and Process. The discussion topics under each of these headings were based on the principles published in the Federal Register Notice of Intent in December 2009.

The roundtables were facilitated by the Beck Consulting team of four facilitators retained by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. Flip chart recorders were provided for each of the small group discussion tables. Recordors captured all key points made regardless of whether there was agreement. The recordors consisted of a combination of independent contracted recordors, University of Montana students from the College of Natural Resources, and Forest Service employees.

III. Background

The Forest Service is undertaking a collaborative process to revise its planning rule. The planning rule provides the guidance for preparing individual Forest Plans. The collaborative process has several components. These components include; a national science forum, three national roundtables, a national tribal meeting, a federal inter-agency group, an internal working group, roundtable meetings in each of the Regions, and new media to make access to all of the planning information readily available and transparent.

The regional roundtables will be completed by the end of May 2010. The Forest Service timeline calls for Chief approval of the proposed rule in August, Chief approval of the final rule in June 2011 and publication of the final rule and Record of Decision in the Federal Register in November 2011.

The goals and objectives of the planning rule process are:

- Open and participatory process
- Address Notice of Intent principles
- Develop a durable planning rule
- Develop a practical and efficient rule
- Incorporate an all-lands approach to address relationships of NFS lands to surrounding landscapes
- Develop a process that uses contemporary planning methods to incorporate the latest science into land management plans



Missoula Roundtable

IV. Themes

While there was inadequate time to achieve consensus, a number of themes emerged from the roundtable discussions. Many of these themes transcended individual discussion questions and crossed more than one of the principles. The themes below are those ideas that were either expressed frequently, appeared to enjoy wide-spread support, and/or arose during discussions from several different topics. Once again, readers should not assume consensus was achieved on the following themes and divergent viewpoints did exist. They are listed below with no priority order.

I. General

- Incorporate the things that have worked in past planning rules into the revision
- Rule needs to meet legal requirements
- Rule should be responsive to local government
- Rule should be based on good science
- Rule should strive to balance uses
- Rule should result in plans that can be implemented

II. Plan Content

- Forest plans should address long-term forest health
- Monitoring should be required to inform adaptive management
- Land managers should be held accountable
- Plan should have 50-year horizon
- Plans should contain a regular schedule of outputs
- Plans do need an overarching vision starting from the statutory basis
- Plans should contain standards and guidelines
- Rule needs to allow for implement-ability across the nation while allowing for regional differences and commonalities within regions

III. Substantive

- Recognize the economic benefits of forest users
- Recognize the contribution of National Forests in local economies
- Rule should allow for changing economic conditions--changes in goods and services
- Need strong standards to ensure meeting future needs
- Rule should describe process to determine suitable uses
- Local users should be involved in suitable use decisions
- Recognize ecological function in determining suitable uses
- Access, visitor facilities, and services should be addressed at individual forest level
- Emphasize connecting people to the land
- Development of roads/trails/facilities should be limited to the extent of the ability to maintain them so they do not degrade soil and water quality

IV. Process

- Forest planning process should be transparent
- Make extensive use of electronic communication
- Engage the public at-large
- Focus on caring for the land and caring for the people
- Include science in collaboration
- Minimize political influence
- Monitor/review implementation
- Amend frequently if necessary
- Need ability to adapt
- Involve stakeholders, use monitoring as basis for flexibility
- Don't use uncertainty to avoid making decisions
- Incorporate better long-range sustainable timber harvest planning
- Rule should be developed with collaboration

1. GENERAL FEEDBACK

What would a GREAT planning rule look like?

- Take all things from past rule that worked and include in the 2011 Rule
- Implementable
- Simple
- Meet legal requirements
- Clear definitions that the Collaborative Process defines – not the courts
- Facilitate restoration of the land to a state of ecological sustainability
- Terminology of the rule captures the spirit/vision of the intent
 - Has the potential to extend the plan over the long term and change with ideology
- Strong management component with basis on Regional Areas
- One that works; allows for active management of NF
- Something every person can understand
- Responsive to local government
- Based on good science
- Flexible to allow for new science
- Include standards and guidelines
- Ensures species viability
- Balanced between different uses on National Forests
- Provide for improved forest health
- Flexibility to allow for differing local conditions
- Does the right thing for forest health
- Allows the land managers to do their jobs
- Discourages gridlock of the court system
- Reduce analysis gridlock
- Include local mediation in standards and guidelines, possibly 2x prior to litigation
- More action on ground, less in office
- Promote continuation of RACs; encourage collaboration
- Coordinate planning and policy with local governments
- Landscape scale planning; especially climate change
- Draw from local conditions
- Incorporate monitoring; allow for flexibility on ground
- Be able to adjust based on changed local conditions
- Promote managing the resource mechanism for collaboration built into process at beginning of project
- Ensure incorporation of human element
- Watershed restoration a priority

- Committee of scientists throughout the planning rule process
- Balance humans, wildlife and environment

2.1 What Currently Works about Forest Service Planning?

What concepts would you like to continue into the next planning rule?

- Focus on statutory requirements of the Forest Service – specifically plant and animal section of NMFA
- Something that would get implemented
- Something that would get plans completed in 2 or 3 years
- Equal access by all users – don't take rights of way
- Build upon consensus
- Sustainable recreation guidelines
- Adaptable and flexible to different areas
- Focus on 3 aspects of sustainability
- Economic
- Ecological
- Social
- Planning Rule should be kept brief and general
- Focus on strategy rather than prescriptive
- Update recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS)
- Clear definition of terminology used
- Definitions –
 - Restoration – clear definitions – what are we trying to do – be clear – what do these terms really mean
 - Really meet the needs of the people
- Reflect more on what NFMA states
- List of succinct goals
- Public integrated with collaborative process
- Not much
- Dispute resolution process; identified and laid out
- Retain standards and guidelines
- Scientific committee through process
- Define right forest supervisor for the forest – relationships
- Retain RAC process
- Retain collaboration
- Expand and broaden RAC process to other areas

2.2 What Doesn't work?

What concepts would you like to leave behind?

- Carry forward the objection process rather than the appeal process
- Standards provide better clarity as opposed to guidelines
- Idea behind multiple-user
- Having non-discretionary stands that ensure viability of all native species.
Ensures sustaining soil productivity and clean water
- Planning rule not site specific – this Rx works well
- Continue coordination with state, private, tribes, etc (specific local governments)
- Follow the statutory requirements
- Continue focus on multiple use concept
- Greater enforcement of forest rules
- Like the revision of 10-15 years
- Never ending roadless designation; find an endpoint
- Open access for general public – not working
- No standard procedure; no consistency in agency
- Paralysis of analysis
- Narrow or closed bureaucracy
- Add more transparency to decisions and planning
- Utilize internet more
- '05 and '08 – leave vagueness and lack of standards/guidelines
- Do away with reference to ASQs; decision based on forest health/forestation (allowable sale quantity)
- Determine best achievable solution; not the perfect
- Too many laws that limit themselves to obstructionism
- Laws make decision space too narrow or non-existent
- Reduce internal personal bias in interpretation
- Emphasis on forest health – weeds, recreation, fuels, fire to reduce conflict

2.2 Other General Input

- Conflicting procedures/definitions (ie – sustainability) Dichotomy in the law sends you down 2 pathways
- Lack of transparency
- Land exchange process – value for value
- Trying to accomplish things that are out of control (ie – climate change)
- Failure to require analysis at all levels of planning of roadless area boundaries and wilderness values
- Notions of pre-conceived outcomes

- See more coordination between state and federal – ie? Park and Rec desires vs. Forest Service
- The rule needs to provide more support for the economics of local communities
- Focus on procedures so they don't lose in courts
- The rule should clarify the role of NEPA in the development of plans – see Ohio forestry
- Rule should provide information on land exchange process and need
- Should have clearer definition of recreation, for example: mountain bikes are managed similarly to motorized users
- Better communication during the comment period for forest plan revision
- More transparency in process
- More up-to-date information on economic, ecological, and social aspects
- Year-round closers specific to seasonal animals don't work
- More up-to-date information on what is the best available science
- Move away from prescriptive plans toward strategic plans
- Move responsible official to Forest Supervisor
- Rule needs to provide for more flexibility and adaptive management

3. PLAN CONTENT

What should the rule require of plan content? (NOI process principle 3)

3.1 Information and Issues

What information and topics do you want to see in a plan?

- Multiple uses and needs for public lands and everyone working together – TOLERANCE with differences
- Address the long-term health of the forest (how will a plan do this?)
- How will it utilize the public who live adjacent to public land – use the knowledge of the locals/ADJ land-owners. To help manage the land
- Bottom up approach as opposed to top down
- Non-discriminatory standards
- Restoration principles
- Monitoring required to inform adaptive management
- Objectives for economic and ecological sustainability
- Requirement for scientific peer review of the forest plans

- Provisions for land manager accountability
- Address local communities and economic activities occurring at local communities and strive for economic sustainability @ the local level
- Balance of different ideals (ie – recreation, ecology, etc.) and adaptability of plan to keep these balances
- Wilderness
- Timber sale plan
- Recreation
- Travel plan
- Motorized recreation use
- For each land allocation – what will land look like in 5 years/15 years/50 years so public/FS will know what they'll see when they visit
- Some over-arching guidelines in all the plans but still allow for regional differences
- Plans for expanding recreational use
- What does this land look like after 50 years – now vs. 50 years of mgmt
- New definitions for recreation planning
- Succinct definition of forest health in existing conditions and for those problems that are identified what will be done about them and when
- Guidance on economic development and trail tourism
- Habitat needs and management requirements of resident fish and wildlife
- Primitive non-motorized designations that allow for mountain biking
- Over-arching land adjustment plans
- How will the plans do/redeem/execute the collaborative process – how will the plan address this – need specifics on this process
- Watershed health
- Regular schedule of outputs (economic, timber sale schedule, habitat and recreations improvements, etc.)
- All forms of recreation
- Additional and clearer definitions for recreation planning

3.2 Shared Vision

Should the planning rule support the creation of a shared vision for each planning area and, if so, how?

- Yes, by recognizing that different uses need to be managed in different areas
- How to draw in historical, ecological, etc. vision that recognizes the difference – the HOW is hard

- Sharing – would need to go beyond the “human” community
- Irrespective of the planning rule we have to have the shared vision @ the plan level so that stakeholders can agree on projects
- Recognize need to have representation @ both national/regional and local level for the shared vision. Not losing sight of each other’s vision as we work through the process
- By whom and at what level?
- Yes, over-arching guideline that would say what we need the shared vision to do – national consistency in guidelines but the local level would figure out how to meet this shared vision
- A definition of ‘planning area’ would be provided in rule
- Yes, but, how would we word the shared vision?
- Definition could provide for flexibility or could limit what’s done within a planning rule
- Basis for the shared vision should start with the statutory requirements/basics (ie – recreation – a statutory requirement lays the foundation for a shared vision)
- Vision should seek to provide levels of equality among the resources/uses
- Maybe some resource should carry more weight than others (ie – forest health)
- Balance
- Vision should not be restrictive – not specific – don’t get into the weeds
- Forest plans would determine how the shared visions would be accomplished
- Hard to have consistency between how/what we manage and natural processes
- What are the consequences of doing nothing? We need to be more forthcoming about a “do nothing” option/vision
- Have the courage to articulate a vision that addresses doing nothing

3.3 Standards and Guidelines

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

- Yes, if they didn’t, what would it contain?
- Yes, with a balance of each in the plan with clear definition of what each means (including legal direction and glossary) and have some degree of flexibility throughout life of the plan

- Yes, both. Some hard and fast rules (standards) and some guidelines for adaptability
- No. in anticipation of exceptional situations
- Yes, but rules must be scale-able
- Yes, because without non-discretionary standards forest plans can have visionary language and grand objectives, but no accountability when managers don't get there
- Yes, and work coherently together – not be in conflict with each other
- Standards and guidelines that support the vision
- Yes, over-arching standards with flexibility to address regional/local differences
- S&Gs should focus on the intent of the S/G rather than on the prescriptive of the S/G – this would allow for flexibility
- FS should review the history of the S/Gs that have caused problems in court/litigation – why would we continue to use them?
- Yes, have standards that deal with recreational planning
- Focus on S/G should be on a strategic basis rather than a prescriptive basis

3.4 Scale

How should the planning rule treat national consistency and regional differences?

- From the ground up
- Rule needs to allow for implement-ability across the nation while allowing for regional differences and commonalities within the regions (i.e.: R3 different from R1, or commonalities with R2 – i.e. Kootenai and IPNF)
- Broad level where plans – more at ground level to allow to take into account project specific issues
- Rule would require plans to have an adequate science-based description of the landscape
- Have a clear discussion of the competing uses and how they would influence the future conditions
- Rule should treat national consistency by having same requirements in Forest plans across the nation
- Regional differences should require how sound science be applied for economic /ecological and social across the local and regional scales
- More cohesive historical perspective at all levels

- Plan should address regional/national consistencies but leave room for local differences
- Management prescription should be at the local level and management objectives should be at the national level
- Planning on national level addresses only national issues and provides flexibility and requirements to address these issues at the local level – a tie back to national issues

Other Content Input

SUBSTANTIVE TOPICS

4.1 Restoration (NOI substantive principle 1)

- *How can the next planning rule foster restoration of national forest system lands?*

4.2 Climate Change (NOI substantive principle 2)

4.3 Watershed Health (NOI substantive principle 3)

4.3.1 Watershed Approach

4.3.2 Watershed standards, guidance and Best Management Practices (BMPs)

4.4 Diversity of plants and animals (NOI substantive principle 4)

4.4.1 Providing for Diversity

4.4.2 Protecting At-Risk Species

4.4.3 Monitoring

4.5 Ecosystem Services (NOI substantive principle 5)

4.6 Contribution to vibrant local economies (NOI substantive principle 5)

What should the planning rule say about how plans deal with the provision of goods and services that contribute to vibrant rural and national economies?

- It should address it
- Planning rule should give priority to local and community need over national idealisms
- Recognition that users bring economic benefit to local economies
- Recognition that hunters and fisherman bring into local economies
- Planning rule should recognize the MUSYA (multi-use sustained yield act) equal to the other act – like ESA, wilderness act, in order to contribute to the rural economy
- Emphasis on local collaboration to gain ownership of plans
- Forest needs to explain more how plans are implemented
- National Forests are major contributors to rural communities. The rule needs to recognize this and disclose in the development of plans - should have a major link in improving these areas
- The rule should allow for changing conditions related to changing economics and local economics – potential changes in goods and services
- Consolidation of district/forest has not helped collaboration and trust with local communities
- Planning rule should incorporate local needs of the communities
- The planning rule should direct the plan to do economic analysis for local communities – including needs and benefits and capacity, social, and ecosystem services
- Plan should provide for an inventory of what is possible
- Need to be aware of the educational benefits a plan can provide
- The planning rule should require the forest plan to recognize and understand that the provision of goods and services must not diminish ecological sustainability nor foreclose on the economic well-being of future generations
- Forest plan needs to look at items like carbon storage and watershed health. Need strong standards and guidelines to ensure we meet future needs
- Planning rule should direct forest plans to recognize a balance between economics and ecological functions
- The provision for goods and services should not threaten species viability. Species viability should be basis for Forest Plan
- Need to get rid of ASQ

4.7 Use and Enjoyment of NFS Lands (NOI substantive principle 5)

What should the planning rule say about suitable uses?

- The rule should only say what the process is to determine how to address suitable use – suitable use should be determined specifically to each Forest
- Local users should have input into determining suitable uses
- Define suitable uses
- Use the same test for timber in '82 rule for other uses – capacity, availability, suitability
- Existing laws/regulations should be used to help determine sustainability
- Don't be arbitrary – is limiting in defining suitable uses
- The rule should not limit, endorse or prohibit any use
- The rule should not emphasize one use over another
- Include aircraft as recreational use
- Individual plans should determine suitable uses based on local conditions
- Forest Plan should consider National and local issues when looking at suitability
- Direct forest plans to develop appropriate land management that recognizes suitability for each of the multiple uses
- Require analysis of non-use factors
- Suitable uses should not be limited to economic benefits or ecological concerns – education based benefits as an example
- Require assessments that recognize that ecological function on the land define which uses are suitable in which locations
- Use should be evaluated with a formal process to evaluate impact and allow for plan amendments, including cumulative impacts at the landscape level

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

- Enforce rule you make or don't make it. Don't rely on state and county to enforce the rule – should require enforcement
- Use local input when determining access needs visitor facilities and services. Can't determine at national level
- Nothing – the rule should not determine this...each forest should
- The rule should clarify how travel planning and rule fits into forest planning
- Access should not exclude aviation use
- Mountain bikes want their own category and not be managed as motorized or non-motorized. It's a major use and needs to be recognized
- Meet the needs of the people
- The level of trails/roads/facilities must be limited to the extent that there is adequate funding to maintain them in a condition that does not degrade soil or water quality

- Require the forest plan to analyze the need to maintain access to accomplish management options
- Direct the Forest Plan to conduct a needs/impact analysis regarding forest access, and to recognize different types of access, which may or may not be compatible – specifically areas for quiet recreation
- Must have educational and other access for visitor facilities and services
- Emphasize connecting people to the land
- Emphasize the need for continuation of the recreation fee program, or other method of funding for specific uses
- Access standards and guidelines should be developed that protect ecosystem function while providing for a variety of forest users
- Need to allow for changing needs for access
- Require forest plan to address noxious weeds and access

4.8 Other Substantive Input

<h2>5 PROCESS TOPICS</h2>

5.1 Plan Revision Process (NOI process principle 3)

5.1.1 Improving Timeliness and Efficiency

What suggestions do you have for making forest planning faster, simpler, more straight forward, and less expensive?

- More extensive use of electronic communication - computer, email, etc.
- Use consensus planning – more agreement at start – less tie up in court later
- Anyone interested should be able to get information, emails, etc.
- Use pre-decisional process instead of post-appeal
- Less burdensome, less procedural, more implementable on the ground
- Less analysis paralysis
- Postcard notification – informational for people without computer access
- More public awareness
- Concern about legality of social media
- Planning based on watershed goals, not standards
- Establish communication between Forest Service and specific organizations
- Concern about polarized focus of specific organizations
- Avoid being too politically manipulated
- Engage the public at large

- Focus on caring for the land and caring for the people
- Base upon good science can help simplify and be more objective
- Take politics out
- Agree on science; committee of scientists, included
- Very well defined procedure in place
- 10 yr life of plan- not extend beyond
- Collaborative groups including scientists to identify what's working and narrow differences
- Utilize established standards
- Timeline on appeals process and adhere to it
- Reduce need to bullet-proof NEPA documents
- Focus on specific problems – not through the whole thing out
- Use 1982 rule – what worked, what didn't – possibly as a starting point for rule processes

5.1.2 Scheduling of Revisions

How often should plan revisions occur, and should the entire forest plan be redone in each cycle?

- So much involved – hard to revise frequently
- Don't throw all out the door when revising
- On the ground work is more efficient with a stable plan
- Maintain as much as consistency as possible
- Every 15-20 yrs
- Only revise sections that are issues with stakeholders
- Review every 10 yrs but within the 10 yr period have analysis of problems, develop solutions and revise those pieces
- Avoid political need/pressure to revise
- Limit quantity of paper
- 15 years is too long
- Needs to be dynamic with continual revisions as necessary
- 2 years is sufficient to incorporate changes
- Solicit input 3 years prior to beginning of new planning effort
- Do not reinvent the wheel each time
- Incorporate current science
- Fully evaluate monitoring every 5 years
- Adjust to trends

- Landscape scale is necessary...not smaller
- Compare local and national trends with data
- Research stations and forests work together/communicate
- Carry research to its conclusion

5.1.3 Addressing Uncertainty

5.2 Local and Regional Difference?

5.3 Planning Update (Amendment) Cycle (NOI process principle 3)

5.3.1 Ease and Frequency of Doing Amendments

5.3.2 Adaptive Management

How can a planning rule build in flexibility to adapt to changing science, information, or conditions and/or incorporate new data? How should the rule deal with uncertainty?

- Planning process is a check and balance – keeps managers from doing wrong thing
- Adapt to changing science
- Must be solid and applicable for a long term
- Use historical trends to formulate
- Give flexibility in national rule to allow regions and forests to adjust
- Need adaptability to issues such as climate change
- Less prescriptiveness – be strategic instead
- Forestry is not an exact science – needs flexibility due to change
- Do the right thing
- Established stakeholders help determine when and amount of flexibility
- Draw on long-term knowledge of specialists in resource areas
- Stewardship of lands important
- Don't underutilize knowledge of resource specialists
- Avoid oxymorons
- Forest stewards should be open to many views – not focused on personal views
- Consider balanced uses; recreation
- Uncertainty shouldn't stop agency from making a decision
- Build in monitoring to provide flexibility

- Add scenario modeling to adjust
- Don't react to uncertainty with closures
- Incorporate better long range sustainable timber harvest planning
- Actually use adaptive management, not just say it
- Periodically review standards and guidelines for resources by activity – logging,, recreation, update if necessary
- Collaboratively define the end result – work together to get there
- Total agreement not necessary – but agree on how to get there
- Based on sound NFMA – not political pressure
- Allow for experimental testing of new practices – could determine more restrictive or less restrictive

5.4 Forest Planning Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NOI process principle 3) Complying with NEPA in the Development of Forest Plans

5.5 Collaboration and Coordination (NOI process principle 1)

5.5.1 Public Involvement

5.5.2 Coordination with other Agencies and Governments

5.5.3 Review and Appeal Processes

5.6 “All-lands” approach (NOI process principle 2) Whether/How to Use an “All-Lands” Approach

What is the best way to involve stakeholders, including adjacent landowners, in the planning process?

- Communicate process and educate on purpose
- Get feedback
- Sincerity and honest reception to input from public
- Public meetings/forums
- Stakeholders need to take responsibility for not being engaged
- Include all local, state, tribal governments to be formal stakeholders or cooperating agencies – by invitation from FS
- Walk the talk – if you state you are transparent – then be so
- Be more open in processes
- Balance interests of current stakeholders with future ones
- Fall back on science to make informed decisions
- More broad-scale notifications – more transparency

- Use internet – other forums
- Allow stakeholders to submit questions/comments before meetings
- 2 way communication; educate the public about history of areas and dynamic process
- Include many varied interests
- Broadly and easily accessible
- RSS feed mail lists
- Avoid acronyms – use lay language
- Make requirements/laws more accessible
- Identify other resources (publications, workshops) so folks can better understand the rule

5.7 Rulemaking compliance with NEPA (NOI process principle 3)

5.8 Other Process Input

6.0 OTHER TOPICS NOT NOTED ABOVE
