

National Advisory Committee for Implementation of the National Forest System
Land Management Planning Rule
Meeting #1 – September 11-13, 2012
Final Meeting Summary

Introduction

The National Advisory Committee for Implementation of the National Forest System Land Management Planning Rule (the committee) held its inaugural meeting from September 11-13, 2012, in Washington DC. The committee fulfilled the following objectives as set forth in the meeting agenda:

- Introduce the committee members and hear their values and their hopes for the planning rule's implementation
- Ensure that the committee is grounded in a solid understanding of the 2012 Planning Rule
- Identify key issues and begin scoping those issues
- Identify key milestones for the committee's work over the next year
- Identify how the committee will work (e.g. working group structure), goals and objectives for next meeting

Final meeting materials, including agenda, presentations, and written public comments can be found at the committee's website here <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/planningrule/committee>.

Committee members present: Mike Anderson, William Barquin, Susan Jane Brown, Robert Cope, Adam Cramer, Daniel Dessecker, Russ Ehnes, James Magagna, Joan May, Pamela Motley, Peter Nelson, Candice Price, Vickie Roberts, Greg Schaefer, Rodney Stokes, Christopher Topik, Thomas Troxel, Lorenzo Valdez, Ray Vaughan; *Committee members absent:* William Covington, Stephen Kandell

Staff: Tony Tooke-DFO, Chris French, Cherie Hamilton, Jennifer Helwig, Chris Iverson, Regis Terney, Kathryn Toffenetti

Facilitators: Kathleen Rutherford and Michael Hughes; *U.S. Institute:* Kim Caringer

Agreements and Actions

1. The committee discussed and adopted operating protocols (see separate attachment).
2. The committee agreed to an initial working group structure with four groups: 1-Adaptive Framework including Assessments; 2-Social and Economic Assessment and Analysis; 3-Collaboration, and 4-Communication. Facilitators will set up doodle polls to schedule working group calls (2-4 calls per group before the next meeting).
3. The committee agreed to the following dates for the next two committee meetings: the priority date for meeting #2 is January 30, 31 and February 1. Alternative dates for meeting #2 are February 20, 21, 22 and February 27, 28 and March 1. Meeting #3 is scheduled for the week of May 6 through 10. The third meeting is a full week to include a site visit and tour, perhaps to an early adopter forest.
4. The facilitators will circulate a draft meeting summary for the committee to review, refine as necessary, and adopt.
5. The facilitators will work with the committee and the USFS to refine a list of subjects to explore on a series of learning calls. Confirmed topics include natural range of variability and the objections process.
6. To select committee co-chairs, committee members will send nominations (including self-nominations) to the facilitators; they will talk with all nominees and make recommendations for the committee's consideration.

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome and Committee Purpose

Tony Tooke, Director of Ecosystem Management Coordination, USDA Forest Service and the committee's Designated Federal Official (DFO), welcomed the group and touched briefly on the composition and overarching objectives of the committee, planning rule, and staff and committee member roles and responsibilities. Mr. Tooke first observed the historic aspect of this Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) committee convened to generate national level advice on implementing the planning rule. The committee represents a full range of public interests with a balance of twenty-one appointees from diverse backgrounds – from conservation organizations, industry, science, state and county officials, tribal perspectives and the public at large (please see the committee list here-<http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/planningrule/committee>). This committee demonstrates and strengthens the USFS commitment to collaboration and can help the agency move to implementation by identifying gaps and generating options to address those. Mr. Tooke described the high level objectives of the committee as generating national-level advice from the wide range of constituencies and networks, learning from one another and the agency, and becoming ambassadors of the rule. Some of the key objectives of the rule are to be collaborative, utilize a science-based planning process, and to contribute to social and economic sustainability; as well as to reflect public values and significantly reduce the time it takes to produce a forest plan.

As DFO, Mr. Tooke has several responsibilities. He serves as the liaison between the committee and the agency, ensures compliance with FACA and ethics regulations, works with the co-chairs and facilitators to formulate meeting agendas, and ensures the committee focuses on an appropriate scope of work. Members of the planning rule team include Regis Terney, Chris French, Jennifer Helwig, and Cherie Hamilton with assistance from Kathryn Toffenetti from the Office of General Counsel. Mr. Tooke also introduced the facilitation team, Kathleen Rutherford and Michael Hughes, as well as the US Institute on Environmental Conflict Resolution represented at this meeting by Kim Caringer.

Mr. Tooke noted that written public comments would be accepted at this meeting, and that reading copies of the rule had been provided for the public. All final public materials, including the meeting agenda, summary, and any public comments will be posted to the committee website.

After reviewing and agreeing to the agenda and basic committee ground rules, committee members then introduced themselves.

Leadership Panel: History, Experience and Aspirations

Following the committee's introductions, a Department and Forest Service leadership panel thanked the committee members for their commitment to join this undertaking, and each shared their thoughts, hopes, and aspirations for the rule. The panel consisted of Harris Sherman, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, USDA; Arthur "Butch" Blazer, Deputy Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, USDA; Thomas Tidwell, Chief, US Forest Service, and Leslie Weldon, Deputy Chief for National Forest System.

The panel noted the vital role the USFS plays in protecting the nation's water supply, flora and fauna, and multiple uses including outdoor recreation, timber, grazing and renewable energy industries in such a way as to provide ecological, social and economic sustainability. One of the key roles the panel envisions for the committee is to advise the Forest Service on *how* to advance these key principles in

planning. To do this work, the speakers underscored the roles of respect, understanding, and trust building in collaborative problem-solving. They requested advice on how to move from random acts of conservation to landscape-scale conservation while improving our relationships with our neighbors -- including improving the relationship between the tribal lands and the adjacent national forests. Leadership also looks forward to extensive feedback on the directives-- identifying gaps, ensuring clarity, and also ensuring that implementation advice is efficient and cost-effective. Finally, the leadership panel emphasized their hopes that committee members will help the agency educate the stakeholders and the general public about why the rule matters, to engage and communicate effectively with interest groups, and to give the new planning rule a chance. The overarching desire is to engage the committee in helping to create an environment for collaboration from the very start and throughout the process. The panel closed with more expressions of gratitude to the committee and an assurance of open doors to committee members as the work unfolds. A brief question and answer session followed.

Understanding the Planning Rule: An Overview

To help shape the presentation that would form the basis of the first substantive conversation for the committee, members were asked to write down one important question. In aggregate, these questions spanned a range from inquiries about increased and enhanced engagement in the planning process to the relationship between the planning rule and strategies that are not part of the rule (e.g. restoration strategy). Participants formulated questions about human and financial resources, clarifying the desired results of collaboration, management implications (e.g. limiting the power of individual managers while also ensuring managers have adequate flexibility), how to ensure intergovernmental and cross-jurisdictional collaboration, how will multiple uses and competing interests be prioritized, definitions of rule terms (e.g. landscape scale, sustainable recreation), mechanics of monitoring, and whether and how different kinds of knowledge and science will be integrated in a more holistic fashion (e.g. anthropology, ecology, socio-economics, etc.). The Forest Service team used the committees' questions to tailor their overview presentation. After thanking participants for their thoughtful questions, they offered to schedule learning calls for those issues that require more time. (Please find the presentation at <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/planningrule/committee>.) Key topics of the presentation highlighted below include the relevant laws and key features of the rule. These are accompanied by a more detailed treatment of the role of collaboration, science, assessments, ecological sustainability, landscape scale work, diversity of plant and animal communities, monitoring and multiple uses.

Statutory and Regulatory context for the Rule

The USFS shared a graphic representation of the hierarchy of relevant authority, in descending order, from the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), to the U.S. Forest Service Planning Rule (the rule), to Land Management Plans, to Project or Activity Decision. The planning rule governs planning; plans govern projects. Consistent with the principles of the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act, (MUSYA), the overarching objective of the rule is to create a collaborative and science-based planning process that will guide management of Forest Service lands so that they are ecologically sustainable and contribute to social and economic sustainability.

Key features of the Planning Rule

Key themes and distinguishing elements of the rule include the following: a focused and efficient planning process – with more time on the front end developing high-quality assessments in a collaborative way, the plan development and amendment can be done quickly, thereby enabling the

Forest Service to deal with unexpected changes and significant events. Collaboration and the use of best available scientific information are central to the rule. Other distinguishing factors include the all-lands approach; ecological sustainability and the approach to species diversity; emphasis on outcomes versus outputs; social and economic sustainability, ecosystem services and multiple uses. Another key distinguishing factor in this rule is the recognition of limits of agency authority, fiscal capability and inherent capability of the land. Finally, the adaptive framework (Assess-Plan-Monitor) was highlighted, with an emphasis on the role of collaboration required throughout.

Collaboration- 219.4

This section elaborates a number of collaboration requirements, including: engaging the public early and throughout the planning process – using social media and going beyond asking for feedback on agency-generated documents; consultation with federally recognized Tribes and Alaska Native Corporations; recognition of and coordination with other government planning bodies; and requesting information about native knowledge, land ethics, cultural issues, and sacred and culturally significant sites.

Best Available Scientific Information (BASI) - 219.3

Requirements for the use of Best Available Scientific Information (BASI) include the responsible official (RO) must use BASI to inform the planning process, the RO shall determine what information is accurate, reliable and relevant to the issues of the planning unit, and must document the use of BASI in the assessment, plan decision and monitoring program. This section also recognizes the use of local experience, native knowledge, etc.

Assessments - 219.6

Assessments are conducted before plan revision and when the responsible official determines an assessment is needed for plan amendment. They focus on rapid identification and evaluation of existing information on 15 topics and plan areas. The RO has discretion to determine the scope, scale and timing of assessment, and will document the assessment in a publicly available report. There is also a requirement for Tribal coordination and collaboration in the assessment phase. The USFS is looking to the committee for input as the directives describe the processes for assessment. It was noted that the rule is designed to create an environment for exchange of information and to allow for cooperating agency status where appropriate while retaining the agency's authority for land management decisions.

Ecological Sustainability - 219.8

This section requires that plan components maintain or restore (1) ecological integrity of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems; (2) air quality, soil productivity, water quality and water resources; and (3) integrity of riparian areas with established widths for riparian management zones. This section also requires establishment of National Best Management Practices for water quality. The notion that sustainable systems are a necessary precursor to sustained yields was also discussed.

Landscape scale -219.8a

The presentation for this section addressed relevant questions that the committee members posed about fire, all lands approach and cross-boundary issues.

Diversity of plant and animal communities - 219.9

One driver for the approach in this section of the rule was that the 1982 rule provisions for diversity of plant and animal communities were difficult (if not impossible) to meet. The coarse filter should maintain or restore ecological conditions for the vast majority of species. When the coarse filter is insufficient to provide conditions for threatened and endangered or proposed species, candidate and species of conservation concern, the fine filter is applied, and additional plan direction developed to provide conditions to contribute to recovery of the listed species, to conserve the candidate and proposed species, and to maintain a viable population of species of conservation concern in the plan area, where possible. These filters are to be applied within the constraints of the inherent capability of the land, and the agency's fiscal capabilities and authority.

Species of Conservation Concern (SCC) should be identified in the assessment phase. SCC must meet a two-part test: first they must be known to occur in the plan area, and second, evidence raises a substantial concern that the species is at risk of persisting in the plan area. Threatened and endangered, candidate and proposed species are not SCC. In response to participant questions, presenters clarified that under section 219.9 the USFS is required to engage across jurisdictional and other boundaries to appropriately factor for transient populations (e.g. grizzly bear). The USFS indicated they have not, as yet, contemplated international implications for these issues, as was suggested by at least one participant who gave as an example caribou that move between the United States and Canada.

Monitoring - 219.12

Monitoring will occur at two levels- the plan at National Forest System unit scale and broad scale at the regional level. The rule's monitoring requirements apply at the plan, not the project level. The rule requires monitoring of eight ecological, social and economic conditions. A collaborative approach - working with other partners such as tribes, states, local governments and other organizations- is encouraged. Presenters noted that this is the only section that provides a deadline; every plan must have a monitoring program that complies with this section of the rule within four years of May 9, 2012, the effective date of the rule.

Multiple Use - 219.10

This section of the rule creates a framework for integrated resource management that advances multiple uses, services and benefits; in the plan development or revision process, it will be important to generate alternatives to which all stakeholders can react in order to prioritize among the many uses.

Additional Questions from the Committee

Committee members asked additional questions about the restoration strategy, concerns around ensuring adequate understanding at the congressional level for financial support for robust restoration, and clarifications around advancing social and economic analysis.

The Forest Service explained that implementation of the planning rule and restoration strategy will be concurrent- they work together. Committee members noted that education and outreach to Congress on what is needed and what the budget provides for will be necessary for robust restoration. The Forest Service responded that one reason that fiscal capability is part of the rule is to ensure that everyone wrestles with the financial requirements and the realities of what the unit will have available. The committee could provide testimony or briefings to Congress, but cannot lobby on

behalf of the planning rule. The 2012 rule does away with the 1982 rule requirement to analyze alternatives that are not feasible for implementation. The committee's advice on how to go about satisfying requirements to advance economic and social sustainability will be a critical contribution.

Outside the planning rule the Forest Service is pursuing options to more effectively work with other federal agencies, states, and local advocates on sharing data. To do so they must first determine the priority questions that drive data collection, as well as shape the methods of data collection. It is possible that a useful update on this effort could be provided to the committee at the next meeting.

Exploring Fundamental Values and Initial Scoping of Key Issues and Interests

The committee went through a facilitated exercise in which binary or competing issues were paired, and within which individuals arrayed themselves according to their values along a spectrum of strongly agree to strongly disagree. Many registered (pleasant) surprise at the degree to which the group frequently concentrated between the two ends of the described spectrums.

Building on the values exercise, the committee was then asked to offer a statement of their core interests. In aggregate, these statements hewed toward striking a democratic balance. They spanned a range from working for future generations and non-traditional stakeholders, to increasing the quality of engagement with tribal members and governments, ensuring that more people- and governments- with a legitimate stake in this process are brought into the conversation. The committee hopes that this will lead to increasing the durability of decisions and decrease litigation, ensuring the USFS engages with other public land managers and private land owners, exploring the links between forest health and community health, and addressing the perception that no action is good for forests with degraded ecological conditions. In summary, the value statements from the committee emphasized the following points:

- Protect the multiple uses – and the democracy of the forests
- Forest health is paramount
- Important to find ways through the litigation and other barriers to the best management practices
- Engaging the next generation builds the Forest Service's future workforce
- We have to move beyond political gridlock
- Allowing all recreation into the mix and giving an even-handed evaluation to all potential uses; making recreation of all kind available on our public lands
- Ensure that forests are managed in a way that is ecologically sustainable and use that standard to give rise to economic and social sustainability
- Protect the American heritage that is imbedded in our open spaces
- Important to pursue win/win solutions regarding restoration and economic and social benefits
- Important to recognize that there are places where collaboration is advancing all of these
- Important to grasp the opportunity for productive solutions
- Important that we bring more people and communities with legitimate stake in this process into the conversation about the rule – connecting more people to the planning processes leads to better durability, less litigation, better for landscape
- Important to provide access to and development of mineral resources
- Important to realize the potential in the rule to reduce conflicts and complexity so that it can take less time to write plans
- To foster the appreciation for the fact that livestock grazing is an important component of forest planning

- Need to underscore the serious negative consequences of failing to act; it is important to help communicate that the widely held public perception that hands-off is the best way to go is, in fact, wrong
- Important to appreciate that communities and cultures and traditions coexist in nature

Ethics Training

Lorraine “Raine” Luciano, Branch Chief, Office of Ethics Forestry Ethics Branch provided a presentation on applicable standards of conduct for committee members. (The full presentation can be found on the committee website.) The presentation covered the three designations of advisory committee members: 1. Regular government employees; 2. Special government employees; and 3. Representatives, who are not federal government employees and which is the category that this FACA committee’s members belong. Ms. Luciano also presented information on ethical obligations for regular and special government employees and presented an in-depth review of the conflict of interest provisions, applicable to all categories of FACA committee members, found in the ethics statement in Section E of the committee charter.

Operating Protocols

Participants discussed, revised and adopted operating protocols – the edited protocols are included as a separate attachment on the committee website.

Future Meeting Locations and Dates

The priority date for Meeting #2 is January 30, 31 and February 1. Should the release of the directives require more time, the group agreed to hold February 20, 21, 22 and February 27, 28 and March 1 as alternative dates. Ease and cost of travel, as well as proximity to early adopter forests were suggested as potential decision criteria for the location of the next meeting. Potential locations include Denver, Phoenix and Albuquerque. Meeting #3 is scheduled for the week of May 6 through 10. The third meeting is a full week to include a site visit and tour to a forest, perhaps an early adopter. Idaho is an option.

Directives

Purpose, Structure and Chapters

The planning directives will be in both the Forest Service Manual (1920) and Forest Service Handbook (1909.1). The manual lays out policy and conveys responsibilities. It includes few areas of discretion, and is mostly written with ‘must’ and ‘shall’. The handbook elaborates methods, procedures, techniques, and definitions and is used by the resource specialist and planning staff to build plans, assessments, and monitoring. The directives provide guidance on how to implement requirements of the rule. (The complete presentation includes the chapter titles, timeline and review process and can be found here: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/planningrule/committee>.)

Discussion focused on the importance of specific language and how that relates to elements of decision making, judicial review, and enforceability. Specifically the group discussed the degree to which words such as ‘must’, ‘shall’, ‘may’, and ‘should’ carry requirements or convey discretion. It is important to understand how courts (or courts in specific districts where litigation may take place) will view the enforceability of the manual, handbook and directives. The committee also noted that it was important to encourage public participation so that the planners have local support for discretionary choices, and concluded that transparency and a well-described decision-making process are essential. Although Handbook Chapter 40 (Public Participation and Science) and Chapter 10

(Assessments) are still under development, the Forest Service shared and discussed parts of the draft text with the committee.

Public Participation

Key elements of the rule that are woven throughout the planning process – the adaptive management framework, public engagement, use of best available scientific information, and consultation—are elaborated upon in chapter 40. The adaptive management framework was described as more conceptual than directive. Public participation is used to identify or clarify issues, conflicts, constraints, values, beliefs and expectations, gather information, seek common understanding of facts and issues, identify information gaps, and find areas of common ground.

Increase transparency in decision-making – Definitions, principles, objectives, guidance and opportunities for a spectrum of public participation activities throughout the process, up to and including the role of collaboration and consultation are outlined. NEPA definitions for collaboration are applicable (36 CFR 219.9), and the CEQ NEPA Handbook on Collaboration and NEPA is also referenced in the rule definition of the term. Chapter 40 will elaborate the following principles of public participation: occurs early and throughout; is meaningful; is transparent; is accessible to interested and potentially affected parties; promotes problem solving and constructive dialogue; is efficient and practical for both planning unit staff and the public. The process of government-to-government consultation occurs with federally recognized Tribes. The directives will also recognize the importance of outreach to gather traditional knowledge and cultural information from all tribes and de-tribalized peoples. The USFS will work with the Office of Tribal Relations (OTR) to ensure both are appropriately included.

Chapter 40 will also encourage outreach to non-traditional stakeholders—urban dwellers, young people, low income and minority populations, and private landowners affected by the planning process. The directives will recognize that these processes should be scoped within capacity and fiscal capability of the planning team and the public’s ability to engage. It also recognizes that successful collaborative groups may be led by external partners and need not be managed by the Forest Service.

Discussion of this chapter by committee members revealed high support for collaborative approaches and diversification of outreach targets and strategies. The committee recognized the importance of flexibility to craft locally meaningful processes, as well as the challenges inherent in doing so, such as finding ways to engage community members with busy schedules or who are marginalized and distrustful of government. The role of documentaries was touched upon as a tool to encourage people to talk and can uncover concerns and sources of distrust. Effectively harnessing social media was also discussed. The committee encouraged framing participation on planning efforts to improve a community’s capacity to enhance contributions to the social, economic and ecological sustainability.

The Role of Best Available Science

In this rule, science is central to informing the decision-making process and must be documented. Science that is used must be relevant, accurate, and reliable. Peer review is not required, and the inclusion of traditional knowledge is encouraged. Best available just means that – the information we can get – synthesis from divergent sources. It is not a requirement to develop new scientific information. It is not intended to produce final answers but rather to be an iterative part of adaptive management.

Committee discussion began with the observation that science in the service of political agendas is corrupt. In response to a question about whether social sciences would be treated the same way as natural science, the answer was yes; the plan has to address social and economic questions and collect relevant, accurate, reliable information related to socioeconomics. It was also observed that too often we assume that untested hypotheses are true; we have to articulate and test hypotheses.

Chapter 10: Assessments

The draft directive indicates the need to assemble existing information that is relevant to the development of plan components– not an encyclopedic collection of information and not a requirement for new scientific investigation. The assessments should document existing conditions and trends. They are intended to be rapid – not be a 5-year investigation.

The process should produce a document that the public can understand and is useful to developing plan components. In this section of the draft directives, there are very few ‘must’ and more ‘should consider’ and more ‘may consider’ with the goal of not paralyzing the planning process in analysis at this stage. The draft directive provides **bold** wording where it quotes rule text. In addition, the draft directive on assessments includes these elements:

- A reference to the confidentiality of tribal historical knowledge used in the assessment
- A circular connection from assessment to revision to monitoring to adaptation and back to assessment in an adaptive management framework
- An indication of the importance of public participation and collaboration
- An indication that the assessment doesn’t establish immovable sideboards and that additional relevant information can come in as the planning process moves forward
- A commitment to reaching out and gathering information from others, including other Federal, state and local agencies
- An all-lands approach that puts what’s happening on Forest Service land in the context of the surrounding landscape

Specific to ecological components, the draft directive follows the structure of the planning rule and works at the ecological level and the species level. At the ecosystem level, the goal is to maintain and restore ecological integrity of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. This leads to an assessment of the composition, structure and function and the natural range of variation among key ecosystem characteristics, again, with an eye toward relevance to plan components.

There are methods for identifying key ecosystem characteristics – vegetative habitat types and classification schemes are important – so that the planners pick key characteristics and that’s what we want to identify the natural range of variation around. It is important to understand the variability; we once thought of systems on a single trajectory and now we know that the systems are dynamic. There was variability in the past and this is very important. If we look at sustaining species, if you have the components that are within the historic range of variability you will support those species. When there is insufficient information to describe NRV, the directives provide for alternative approaches such as ecosystem representation and redundancy. Again, this is an all-lands approach that sets these in context. For example, it is important to know what the forest contributes to water quality and quantity as those benefits accrue outside the forest itself.

When we focus on individual species, the directive, like the rule, is structured around threatened and endangered species, proposed and candidate species, and species of conservation concern. With

species of conservation concern, it is important that the species is 'known to occur' in the plan area; and we must also have substantial evidence of a significant concern. We don't want to fall prey to lack of evidence and a system that encourages a return to the flawed 'survey and manage' principle; we want the assessment to document why there is a risk of the species not persisting within the forest. This is a forest-specific analysis. Some species need specific analysis – state and Federal lists for example could be considered if they meet the test of risk of persistence on the forests. The assessment only identifies potential concerns; we want to know the threats and concerns, so the plan component can address it through the process. We want the coarse filter to do the heavy lifting as we develop the plan components to sustain the diversity of plant and animal communities.

Topics for This Committee's Work

The committee discussed possible topics for their work between meetings 1 and 2, before the directives are released to the public. Some of these could also be further explored in the learning/capacity building calls. The list includes:

- Advising the Forest Service on communication, outreach and messaging about what this process is about – making it understandable – how to talk about it plainly; including using social media to reach young people
- Advising the Forest Service on how best to outreach to nontraditional stakeholders
- Forming recommendations for the Forest Service on collaboration – outlining collaborative approaches, best practices
- Learning more about the transition from the appeals to objections process
- Learning more about adaptive management-impacts on relationships between people and the land; how to close the loop between monitoring and management
- Learning how plans are amended
- Identifying good examples of successful adaptive management that the agency could consider
- Monitoring - ensuring a focus on the relevant data – quantifiable metrics; jobs, ecological conditions, etc.
- Identifying best management practices for restoration and other ecological services
- Learning more about agency capacity
- Creating a learning environment, accessing information and tying this to public involvement
- Advising the Forest Service on best ways to connect to outside resources/partnerships; integrating with other agency work; looking for opportunities to leverage shared interests; partnering
- Learning more about climate change – coming to understanding of what this means to the planning process and how it might affect implementation
- Monitoring the process and plan – begin with the end in mind – what questions do we want to be able to answer at the end of the planning process?
- Discussing what is appropriate for broad scale monitoring –multiple forests, regions, states; good examples
- Learning more about all-lands approaches and landscape-scale work – clarifying definitions, getting more thinking on landscape forestry, etc. definitions and best practices
- Discussing social and economic dimensions in the plans; particularly in restoration projects, what it means for the local economy and local communities – direct effects of projects and the economic and social benefits of ecosystem services as forests and watersheds are restored

Establish Working Groups for Committee

From the longer list, the committee agreed to establish four working groups. Kathleen and Mike will convene these groups between meetings 1 and 2.

Adaptive Framework including Assessments	Adam, Chris, Tom, Pete, SJ, Joan, Dan, Billy, Wally
Social and Economic Assessment and Analysis	Adam, Mike, Rodney, Pete, Vickie, SJ, Russ, Lorenzo, Pam, Jim, Billy
Collaboration	Mike, SJ, Billy, Russ, Pam, Ray
Communication	Candice, Vickie, Joan, Mike

Referring to the FACA regulations, it was noted that as long as the working groups aren't making decisions or directly advising a federal official, they can meet without a public involvement component. The USFS will also check to ensure this is consistent with USDA guidance.

Closing

Chief Tidwell and Deputy Chief Weldon offered closing remarks. They expressed confidence in the diverse interests represented in the committee to help the Forest Service tackle the tough issues, emphasizing how committee input will improve Forest Service decision making. Many of their remarks characterized how the time has come for a different kind of collaboration than has been used in the past. They recognized the committee as one form of that type of collaboration, and discussed the role committee members can play to help the agency implement the rule. Finally, Chief Tidwell and Deputy Chief Weldon expressed hope that the committee's accomplishments live well beyond the time span of its charter.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

1. Kathleen and Mike will send these items to the committee:
 - a. Draft meeting summary and a deadline for review
 - b. Final protocols
 - c. Electronic surveys to schedule working groups
 - d. The two-sentence statement that the committee wrote to summarize the outcome of the first meeting
 - e. Official Forest Service press release summarizing first meeting – working with Forest Service planning and public affairs staff
2. Working with Forest Service staff, the facilitators will schedule conference call learning sessions for the whole committee. Possible topics for these calls include the objections process, natural/historic range of variability, and collaboration best practices. Kathleen and Mike will work with Forest Service staff and the committee to identify additional topics.
3. Co-chairs – committee members will send nominations (including self-nominations) to Kathleen and Mike. They will interview all nominees, consult with the USFS, and make recommendations for the committee's consideration.
4. Interview summary document – please send questions or comments to Kathleen and Mike. They will finalize and distribute the final document to the committee.