

USFS National Advisory Committee – Forest Planning Rule Implementation
September 30-October 2, 2014 – Washington, DC
Sheraton Pentagon City, Galaxy Room

Introduction

The new National Advisory Committee for Implementation of the National Forest System Land Management Planning Rule (the committee) held its inaugural meeting from September 30-October 2, 2014, in Washington DC. The objective of the meeting was to welcome the new committee, identify and explore key areas of interest for the workplan, and dialogue with USDA and Forest Service leadership to ensure alignment of interests.

Committee members present: Mike Anderson, William Barquin, Susan Jane Brown, Robert Cope, Adam Cramer, Daniel Dessecker, Russ Ehnes, James Magagna, Joan May, Martin Nie, Angela Sondenaa, Lindsay Warness, Peter Nelson, Candice Price, Vickie Roberts, Greg Schaefer, Rodney Stokes, Thomas Troxel, Lorenzo Valdez, Ray Vaughan; *Committee members absent: Chris Topik.*

Staff: Tony Tooke-DFO, Leanne Marten, Chris French, Annie Goode, Chalonda Jasper, Anne Acheson, Jennifer Helwig, Regis Terney, Dan Dallas

Facilitators: Kathleen Rutherford and Pam Motley

Agreements and Actions

1. The committee will review and affirm or suggest modifications to the operating protocols by October 17.
2. The committee agreed to an Initial working group structure with ten workgroups (See page 8) Previous workgroups from the first term will be re-initiated as needed. Membership for all workgroups is open. Kolibri Consulting Group (KCG) will set up doodle polls to launch the working groups. The first two calls will be dedicated to fleshing draft workplans.
3. KCG will work with the committee and the USFS to refine a list of topics to explore on a series of learning calls. Those calls may be for workgroups or for broader committee participation.
4. To finalize the co-chair selection process, committee members will send nominations (including self-nominations) to KCG by October 13. KCG will then organize brief interviews with the nominees, and work with the coordination group to assess and propose a co-chair for the committee's consideration.
5. The committee and agency agreed to the goal of releasing the Citizens and Government guides concurrently with the final directives.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Committee Purpose

Tony Tooke, Acting Chief of Staff, USDA Forest Service and the committee's Designated Federal Official (DFO), welcomed the group and thanked the committee for their service and commitment. He explained that he uses this committee as an example of collaborative problem-solving across the country, inspiring the types of policies the Forest Service wants to implement on the ground. Leanne Marten, National Director of Ecosystem Management Coordination, welcomed the group and expressed that it is a privilege to work with everyone. Chris French, Deputy Director of Forest Management, stated that he is looking forward to working with the committee over the next two years on key agency challenges. Ray Vaughn, serving as a continuing co-chair for this meeting, also welcomed the group.

Icebreaker/Orientation Exercises

Committee members introduced one another, explaining what the other's interests in national forests are and why they are serving on the committee. Interests included: the plight of rural communities; protecting forest dependent jobs; protecting old growth and supporting forest restoration; protecting tribal religious rights; addressing the impacts on neighboring lands due to restrictions on Forest Service lands; protecting forest health for clean air and water; protecting viable livestock grazing; highlighting the quality of life that we all gain from our national forests; highlighting the universal societal importance of forests; ensuring that recreational opportunities on national forests are there for everyone; maintaining forest health; protecting clean water and wildlife; ensuring our children have the same opportunities on public lands; public outreach; conservation of birds on forests; protecting resources on forests especially wildlife; protecting traditional land based communities; incorporating economics into forest planning and encouraging people to be good stewards of our forests.

Values Exercise

The committee participated in a values exercise in order to see the array of agreement/disagreement among the members with respect to many complex issues pertaining to the development of the workplan and the process of how to interact with early adopters.

Where We've Been, and Thoughts on Where We Are Headed

Forest Service Update on Planning

The directives were delivered to the Office of General Counsel (OGC) in July for clearance. There is no firm date for release of the final directives. Forest Service staff worked hard to maintain fidelity to the committee's recommendations overall. After OGC review and final regulatory clearance, the Forest Service will discuss the final directives with the committee prior to their release. Early adopters will be required to adhere to the final directives moving forward (but will not need to make retroactive changes). The Forest Service presented a table with a timeline of all forests undergoing revisions with the '82 and 2012 rules and a briefing paper on the four-year monitoring transition (Appendix 1).

The Forest Service presented a briefing paper on 'Lessons learned and challenges of implementing the 2012 Planning Rule (Appendix 2). Highlights of the presentation include:

- Timelines: The long (8-11 year) processes under the '82 rule are not working well. The quality of the plans and public support are low. The Forest Service is hoping for 3-4 years with the 2012 rule. This may not be feasible in all circumstances. Assessments are taking longer than anticipated and are much larger. This is a new approach so planning teams are covering all bases. Forests are afraid to go out with incomplete information. The committee could investigate the balance of perfection and precision in assessments.
- Staffing issues have caused delays. Some early adopters have had incomplete IDT teams in place at the commencement of revisions. Some struggle with losing key people; there is a need for structuring IDT teams with redundancy of specific skill sets.
- Regional planning teams have been very successful in assisting with capacity, consistency among plans, and identifying regional analysis needed in plans.
- Forests have embraced collaboration/public engagement and have undertaken innovative solutions.
- There are questions about how to develop the 'need for change' and Notice of Intent (NOI). The Forest Service could use the committee's help on this.
- Forests have been open to 'learn as you go', revising plans with draft directives.

The Forest Service has taken these lessons learned and begun to make changes to improve the planning process. The agency has initiated an effort to provide early adopter staff a weeklong workshop on collaboration, public engagement, and planning called 'Leaders as Conveners'. Feedback has been great.

Regional offices are creating regional planning teams to ensure redundancy and consistency. The Forest Service is integrating these teams into local teams to acquire lessons learned to take to the next forest. The Forest Service has scaled back the initiation of new revisions during 2015 to ensure that forests revising using the 2012 rule can be supported and lessons learned captured to inform future plan revisions. The agency is also preparing planning guidance on several issues including Species of Conservation Concern, focal species, level of discretion that national forests have, public engagement, and social and economic considerations.

The Forest Service highlighted several areas for committee attention including: assessing the assessment process; enhanced public engagement in the planning process; commenting on the Forest Service planning guides; balancing competing goals to meet social, economic and cultural needs and ensure ecological integrity and providing guidance on broad scale monitoring.

Transitions

Tony Tooke has taken on a new assignment as Acting Chief of Staff and Chris French recently became the Deputy Director of Forest Management. At the Montana meeting in June 2014, Tony made the commitment that he, Chris and Leanne would stay connected to the committee. In the next few months Leanne will transition into the DFO role. Chris French will continue to serve as liaison to the field and some of the EMC staff will transition in to support Chris. The rule has cross cutting issues that affect the entire agency, not just planning. It is important to bring more agency staff from all departments into the committee's work. The group agreed that the 2012 rule is a sea change for the agency and that there is a need to continue to go back to the intention of the regulation and not allow people to go back to their old ways. This is true for agency staff, local elected officials and members of the public.

Review Key Accomplishments, Options for Moving Forward

Citizens Guide –The group discussed what is needed to complete the guide. There are several sections that require attention including climate change, recreation, groundwater/recharge as part of the water section, outreach/diversity and fire and fuels. The target audience for the guide is the general public that has an interest in planning. Editing is needed to make the language accessible to the public and the insertion of graphics. The workgroup will complete all sections of the guide before giving it to a Forest Service editor. When asked if the guides will need OGC clearance, the agency stated that it will coordinate any needs with OGC.

Government Guide –The target audience is state, local and tribal governments and Forest Service staff. The guide is close to completion. Workgroup members will add information comparing coordination under the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and a segment on the Historic Preservation Act. There is a need to remove abbreviations and jargon prior to sending to the editor.

Overview of Convening Report

Kathleen gave a brief overview of the Convening Report. The one-on-one committee interviews confirm continued interest in the major topical areas articulated in the draft workplan but highlight the need for a more structured process to ensure that workplan activities are completed. There is a need to better define how the interactions should be structured. There is also a desire to have greater input from the Forest Service on the priority areas identified by the committee.

Dialogue with USFS Leadership: Identifying Priority Areas for Action

Tom Tidwell, Chief of the Forest Service, thanked the committee members for their time and the positive difference that they are making. He appreciates the new perspective that the committee brings to the agency and feels that the citizen's and government guides will be useful tools. He encouraged the

committee to find ways to use their diverse insight to assist the Forest Service in accomplishing the intent of the rule. Areas that could use the committee's help include:

- 1) Assessments – provide recommendations on how to use the assessment process as it was intended – to develop a foundation for the need for change and plan components. Forests should not try to strive for perfection because they will never get there. It is much better to come together with something that works and then use adaptive management to change course as needed.
- 2) Difficult Issues – assist the agency in moving forward with the intent of the rule by addressing difficult issues like suitability, species of conservation concern (SCC) and wilderness. Forest Service planning teams are usually involved in only one large planning process in their career. The committee has the unique opportunity to learn from multiple early adopters across the country and develop recommendations on a national scale. He encouraged the committee to keep a national perspective and not get too far down in the details of local forests.

Robert Bonnie, Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and the Environment, thanked the committee for their service and the 'sweat equity' that they have put into the process to date. He feels that the committee's work has already made a big difference for the rule and agency. When presented with difficult issues, he always asks, "Where is the committee on this"? The committee's fingerprints are all over the final directives. He asked the committee to explore how forests can produce solid plans based on an open process that have public ownership and are completed in four years. This is challenging and requires adaptive management. How can the committee help the agency build support and understanding for adaptive management?

Leslie Weldon, National Forest System Deputy Chief, stated that she appreciated the vibrant dialogue and strong outcomes from the committee's first term. She encouraged the committee to be as effective as possible in this second term and to nudge the agency with the realities of what the committee is seeing on the ground.

Meryl Harrell, Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary, thanked the returning members and welcomed the new members. She stated that the Department was really appreciative of the committee's recommendations on the directives. She was both excited and thrilled to see how far the committee had exceeded all of their hopes. The committee's shared learning, collective conversations, and ability to work through issues were fundamental. The agency is looking for further input from the committee, building on the institutional knowledge of rule and what folks on the ground are trying to accomplish.

Forest Service Leadership Priorities

The Forest Service presented the committee with a briefing paper: 'Outlook for the 2nd term of the Planning Rule FACA Committee (2014-2016)' (Appendix 3). The document summarizes the agency priorities for committee work, identifying those issues that would provide the greatest leverage of the committee's strengths, have a long term effect and that are weaknesses within the agency. The agency suggests that the committee take on several key issues and delve deep into them, rather than taking on too much. The agency respects the committee's desire to address additional items such as turnover, the objections process and monitoring transition.

1. Balancing competing goals to meet social, economic and cultural needs and ensure ecological integrity. The agency would like to harness the committee's ability to collaborate and problem solve, providing recommendations on how to integrate diverse interests into balanced plans. There are numerous difficult and polarizing issues like suitability, Species of Conservation Concern, wilderness, and designated areas that create conflict, causing stakeholders to want to carve up the national forest. The committee could help the agency explore how to create plans that balance multiple uses while supporting ecological integrity. It was suggested that the agency throw polarizing issues on the table and have the committee wrestle with them.

2. Provide Recommendations to the Agency Regarding Enhanced Public Engagement in the Land Management Planning Process. The committee can provide 1) input on the planning guide on public participation; 2) recommendations on coordinating planning and NEPA. In particular, are there lessons to be learned from recent programmatic project-level NEPA; and 3) recommendations on a communications guide database, a structured manner to share information with the agency and public.
3. Assessment of the assessments. The assessment and assessment process have an enormous impact on subsequent planning phases. If assessments don't effectively address needs of issues like Species of Conservation Concern or uncertainties then you have compounding problems in plan components and proposed actions. The committee can help to answer the following: How do we ensure that the assessment informs the need for change? How do we address uncertainty? How can assessments set up effective monitoring plans? How can we keep people engaged? How can we complete assessments in timely manner? How do we help the public understand and support the agency's sea change on rule and planning? Should assessments mirror public desires or should they tee up development of plan components? What is the convergence between monitoring, public engagement and the assessment?
4. Broad scale monitoring. Broad scale monitoring will only be successful if it is collaborative, involving the public, local governments, NGOs, and tribes. The committee can help to identify potential partnerships, better define how broad scale monitoring fits into the adaptive management on individual forests and identify what is best monitored at a broad scale. It was agreed that broad scale monitoring must have community buy-in and respect private property rights.
 - a. Monitoring/Adaptive Management. The committee can help the agency better define and explain the process: 1) assess current conditions, trends and uncertainties; 2) identify desired conditions; 3) develop plan components to achieve desired conditions; 4) develop a monitoring plan to see if forests are achieving desired conditions and/or if desired conditions are correct; 5) if not, adapt. Monitoring is part of implementation and is key to a plan's success.
5. Citizens and Government Guides. The agency sees that the guides will serve as valuable tools. It was agreed that the preamble of the citizen's guide should explain the chronology of the process and answer 1) why should they care; 2) why we needed a new rule –a better way of doing business; 3) how does the new rule work? The cornerstones are: collaboration, public participation, partnerships, and the new paradigm of adaptive management that recognizes and embraces uncertainty. The planning process should look for solutions that work for everyone; we have an opportunity to move away from the zero sum game that used to plague planning processes. The committee and agency agreed to the goal of releasing the guides concurrently with the final directives.

The committee and Forest Service engaged in a dialogue regarding the agency's priorities, with the committee providing feedback. The following are highlights of these discussions.

Collaborative Capacity – The group discussed the importance of building collaborative capacity on early adopter forests prior to initiating plan revisions. By ensuring that forests are well prepared, skill sets are in place, and the necessary training has occurred, the agency can avoid 'cold starts'. It was suggested that the citizen's guide include a preamble on 'why planning matters', discussing outcomes rather than outputs. It was also suggested that we look to successful forest collaboratives for lessons learned and best management practices, like citizen scientist monitoring.

Climate Change – The agency believes that the committee could help to better clarify the role of climate change in planning. Since drafting the rule, there has been substantial progress in understanding how climate change will affect forests. There are place holders within the rule. The committee can assist the agency by identifying and better articulating these place holders and encouraging adaptive management for climate change. It was agreed that the identification and documentation of the absence of information (i.e. uncertainty) during the assessment phase is key. The rule should insert a level of humility into the

process. The plan can then validate modeling or show deviation. There is a need to develop a new skill set within the agency, one that embraces uncertainty. This is new for an agency that has always relied heavily on data and science. The committee can assist the agency by exploring: What management is need to allow for resiliency and adaptation to stressors and higher frequency, erratic disturbances? What does this mean to the services we are used to receiving from the forest? How do we best manage landscapes to handle frequent, intense disturbances like insects and disease, invasive species and wildlife? How do we address resiliency on a regional scale? It was suggested that the bigger solution come through intergovernmental cooperation and coordination by looking at the larger landscape. The Cohesive Strategy has developed methods for working across jurisdictional boundaries.

Local Governments/Communities – Committee members encouraged the agency to collaborate with local, state and tribal governments to increase efficiency and effectiveness. These partnerships will be key to successful planning. It will also be important for forests to investigate possible negative externalities. Forest should seek to see if local governments, tribes and/or communities have strategies to address issues like monitoring, climate change, drought and changing conditions that the agency can learn from and incorporate rather than undermine. It is also important that forests incorporate the Cohesive Strategy into planning efforts, using prior valuable work to build off of rather than reinventing the wheel.

Suitability – With respect to suitability, Chief Tidwell stated that there is a need to look at the larger picture of ecosystem health rather than carving the forests up for different uses. He feels that the committee could offer guidance on finding this balance, adding that the committee’s recommendations on suitability shouldn’t limit local level input but provide national level guidance.

Transitions – It was agreed that turnover can hamper the planning process. Everyone involved is interested in helping to make the revision process successful and timely. The committee can offer advice on how forests can best retain key staff members, ensure continuity within turnover and avoid disruptions and public frustrations.

Diversity/Outreach – Committee members identified that there is a need for more training at the forest level on how to effectively engage new publics (non-traditional users) – particularly youth, diverse ethnic groups and urban populations. The agency agreed that this is an area of weakness to which the committee could offer valuable advice. Non-traditional users can offer a fresh perspective and support of balanced forest management. The committee can leverage its skills and networks to identify successful practices. There are several agencies (National Park Service, US Fish and Wildlife, state governments) that are already spending money to reach these same people.

Enhance Public Engagement – There is oftentimes resistance to the 2012 rule from traditional users (engaged publics). The committee can investigate ways to change negative perceptions. Several committee members highlighted the need for informing the public by making agency specialist’s knowledge accessible. There is a need for shared learning within the public and agency in order to create balanced plans that have public support – informing, not educating.

Objections – Members are interested in learning from the four recent cases on forests that have finished plans under the ’82 rule and employed the 2012 rule objections process. The agency observed that some cases have worked better than others and that they have learned and adjusted accordingly. The committee will review the cases and offer advice and recommendations consistent with the intent of the rule. One member questioned whether the ’82 rule plans will miscolor the interpretation of the objections process. The committee will keep this in mind during deliberation. The committee can also look at what went wrong and offer strategies to address issues early and avoid objections.

Speed and Cost of Planning – A few committee members are interested in gaining a better understanding of the cost of the planning process. It was agreed that planning is a means to an end; implementation of the plan is the end goal for everyone.

Adaptive Management of the Planning Process – It was suggested that the Forest Service apply adaptive management to the planning process itself, an ‘ark’ to gather lessons learned, approaches, Best Available Science used, and BMPs. Future planning efforts can then benefit from early adopter efforts. The agency has set up a Share Point site to gather this information. It was agreed that the committee could assist with building lessons learned, beginning with reviewing the objections process.

Monitoring/Adaptive Management – Both the agency and the committee identified a need to delve deeper into plan monitoring and adaptive management. The agency does not have a good track record on monitoring or making swift and necessary amendments to plans based on monitoring feedback. The committee can look for trends and innovations and give national policy advice. The committee can also help to inform the public of the importance of the monitoring/adaptive management cycle.

Integrating Planning with Landscape Scale Restoration – Committee members identified that this is one of the six objectives of the charter and that the committee would be remiss to not address it. It was agreed that plans can set the stage for successful landscape scale restoration efforts. A forest should write plan objectives correctly, identify and prioritize areas and provide enough information so that purpose and need and more specific desired conditions have been identified. In this way, forests will not need to reinvent projects after planning.

The group discussed the idea of whether the Forest Service should lead in developing work streams or if the committee should identify priority areas. It was agreed that a balance of the two parties’ interests will create the most productive workplan. The agency will highlight several key priority areas but they also look to the committee to bring issues that arise in the field to the agencies’ attention. The committee can augment the agency’s capacity. The agency can use the committee’s help in 1) explaining the rule’s intent to the public; 2) translating the directives to the public; 3) providing implementation feedback; 4) catching areas of inconsistencies, effectiveness, gaps; and 5) giving feedback and guidance.

Committee Interactions with Early Adopters

The group discussed the process for committee interactions with early adopter forests. The agency desires to give the committee access but requests that the committee develop specific questions for forests prior to engagement. The agency would like interactions to be effective but also respect how busy early adopter staff are. The leadership does not feel that it is appropriate for the committee to give recommendations directly to early adopters, citing that this is not in the committee’s charter. The agency did agree that early adopters can benefit from being appraised of the committee’s national recommendations and advice. Everyone agreed that the committee will not get involved in specific local issues. The Forest Service encouraged the committee to take a broader view on advice than just formal written recommendations. The agency (both leadership and early adopters) benefit greatly from simply interacting with the committee.

Ecosystem Services Framework Guide Presentation

Sally Collins and Lydia Olander from the Nicholas Institute presented on the Ecosystem Services Framework Guide, an online resource developed for federal natural resource agencies that seeks to bridge the gap between concept and practice with respect to ecosystem services, promoting consistency by building a common framework. The guide will assist forests and stakeholders in gaining a better understanding of the broader suite of benefits obtained from public lands. The guide will instruct forests in how to incorporate ecosystem services (or benefits from national forests) into each step of the planning process, improving

stakeholder engagement and leading to a more effective NEPA process. Once planning is complete, the guide can help forests prioritize work by focusing on the important issues. It could also possibly lead to partners paying for ecosystem services (Denver Water's partnership was cited as an example).

Workplan Development

The committee divided up into three working groups (Monitoring, Implementation and Public Outreach) to formulate key questions, resources needed, outputs and timelines. Workgroups reported out to the full committee for deliberation. A draft workplan was sketched out, identifying ten workgroups. Standing workgroups from the first charter will be reconstituted to deal with emerging issues as needed (wilderness, etc.). Membership on workgroups is open. The workplan will remain flexible. If emerging issue arises, the Forest Service or a member can bring new issues to the committee. The group agreed that prioritization should be given to those issues/activities that 1) offer the greatest leverage; 2) create long term effects; 3) use the committee's strengths; and 4) are not being addressed by other professional groups. The facilitators will schedule the first two workgroup calls. Workgroups will refine questions, finalize workplans, develop timelines and select roles and responsibilities for members. Workgroups have the ability to populate workgroups with outside experts that can participate at a complete level.

Balancing Competing Issues – The group further discussed the idea of role playing within the committee to find a balance for 'gnarly' issues. The Forest Service is very interested in the committee serving this role, explaining that this technique will draw on the expertise and diversity of the members. Several committee members were open to the idea but observed that the process should frame all issues with the goal of ecological integrity. The intent of rule is to not have one interest trump another but to find a balance. The committee could help to ascertain a process to achieve this. Others questioned the usefulness of the exercise and its translatability to the ground level, stating that the agency has struggled with multiple uses for decades; there are no easy fixes. Everyone agreed that it should not become a black hole of the committee's attention. The exercise will need clear parameters to avoid this. In the end it was agreed that it was within the purview of the charter, citing the language in 219.10 and 219.11 of the rule. The Forest Service agreed to provide the Committee with recent and forthcoming objections. These will be examined and possibly used as a jumping off point to more concretely examine how competing interests could be possibly balanced in the future. If selected committee members cannot find agreement, this too will serve an important purpose in that it will highlight potential areas of future conflict or concern. The members agreed that the committee will not deliberate on any cases that members are currently involved in. The members will offer full disclosure.

Assessing Assessments – The Forest Service will use Dropbox (or another on-line storage system) to share current assessments and Notices of Intent with the workgroup. It will be more difficult to get supporting documents from early adopters. It is best if the workgroup identifies specific needs and then the Washington Office will do data calls.

Input from Stakeholders – The facilitators will develop interview protocols for early adopter planning team members and key stakeholders based on questions designed by workgroups. Balanced teams of 2-3 committee members plus facilitators will conduct telephone interviews to gather information. The Forest Service and committee members will help identify key stakeholders. This will be an iterative process.

Forest Service Planning Guides – The Forest Service is currently working on several planning guides that will cover Species of Conservation Concern, focal species, level of discretion that national forests have, public engagement, and social and economic considerations. The committee will review the public engagement and social and economic considerations guides as soon as feasible. The committee will have the option to review the remaining guides when the Forest Service has developed final drafts.

Workgroups

- **Assessing the assessment** – Martin Nie, Greg Schaefer, Pete Nelson, Mike Anderson, Chris Topik, Tom Troxel, Jim Magagna, Adam Cramer, Dan Desseker
- **Objections** – Lindsay Warness, SJ Brown, Billy Barquin, Angela Sondenaa, Jim Magagna, Ray Vaughan
- **Turnover** – Lindsay Warness, Robert Cope, SJ Brown*, Ray Vaughan, Billy Barquin
- **Restoration** – Mike Anderson, Pete Nelson, SJ Brown, Tom Troxel, Robert Cope, Lorenzo Valdez, Chris Topik, Martin Nie, Billy Barquin
- **Balance of Competing Issues** – Martin Nie, Russ Ehnes, Pete Nelson, Lorenzo Valdez, Joan May, Tom Troxel, Dan Desseker
- **Monitoring** – Lorenzo Valdez, Pete Nelson, Mike Anderson, Chris Topik, Jim Magagna, Angela Sondenaa, Robert Cope, Billy Barquin, Tom Troxel, Dan Desseker, SJ Brown, (Vickie Roberts – suggestion because of private land owner perspective)
- **Public Outreach/Integration** – Russ Ehnes*, Candice Price*, Vickie Roberts, Adam Cramer, Rodney Stokes, Joan May, Lindsay Warness
- **Citizen’s Guide** – Russ Ehnes, Tom Troxel*, Joan May, Candice Price, SJ Brown*, Mike Anderson, Chris Topik,
- **Government Guide** – Billy Barquin, Jim Magagna*, Rodney Stokes, Lorenzo Valdez, Joan May, Robert Cope
- **Climate Change** – Joan May, Greg Schaefer, Robert Cope, Chris Topik, Ray Vaughan

*Indicates workgroup chair/co-chairs

Future meeting dates – locations TBD:

- Jan 27-29
- April 28-30
- Aug 4-6
- Oct 6-8