AGENDA

- Update
  ◦ Committee's Work Thus Far

- Requests for Committee Action
  ◦ Review FAQ
  ◦ Create Work Plan Going Forward

Collaboration Workgroup(CWG)

Update

- Objective/Scope

- Deliverables
  ◦ FAQ
  ◦ Criteria/indicators
  ◦ Principles/best practices
  ◦ Best approach to enhancing agency resources on collaboration

- Context/Framing Key Issues

CWG

Requests for Committee Action

- Review and Discuss FAQ
- Review and discuss internal brief on collaborative initiatives
- Contribute to shaping the work plan moving forward

CWG

Collaboration Work Group Background for February 2013 FACA COMMITTEE Meeting #2

Objective:

To generate recommendations for the FACA committee to consider around implementing the collaboration focused aspects of Rule while not losing track of the broader objectives around expanding public involvement.[1]

Scope of Collaboration Working Group (CWG):

The WG scope is grounded squarely in section 219.4 of the Rule, and as such the scope should include public participation, objections process, intersections with monitoring and assessment, and partnership building (how to identify partners, how to tap into planning resources of other entities), etc.

Deliverables/Outputs:

1. FAQ (questions under separate cover)
2. Criteria and/or Indicators to define critical outcomes of collaboration, assess stages of collaboration and levels of success
3. Principles and best practices (following release of directives)
4. Best approach to enhancing agency resources on collaboration
   - Dec 5: Presentation from Collaboration Cadre
   - Survey of various agency and other resources

1. **FAQ-**
   - Our current thinking is that the list could have several uses, ranging from a guide to help the FACA committee evaluate the draft directives, to a more formal Q&A product of the committee that would provide supplemental guidance on planning rule implementation. The eventual use(s) of the list will be a fruitful topic for discussion in future WG and committee meetings.
   - **(see below for full list of FAQ as of 25 January 2013)**

2. **Criteria/Indicators- (***these will be completed following release of the draft directives***).**

Collaborative process can and will vary; what are the design requirements of effective collaboration? How might those be translated into criteria to facilitate successful design and implementation?

1. Can it be segmented- different outcomes at different stages?
2. What does success look like at each stage? What is the end goal/outcome or output at each stage, and how do those inform the broadest scale question of defining success?
3. How does decision making work? How is that communicated?
   a. Does everyone need to meet together everytime?
   b. Is it presumed to be consensus? How is that defined?

---

[1] This objective was settled on after a number of conversations that acknowledged an inherent tension around collaboration and public engagement- e.g. should collaboration under the Rule focus on developing a smaller group that works closely with USFS collaboratively, eg CFLRP or broader public outreach?

c. How to address concerns re: FS in his/her decision making capacity under this rule?
d. How can the USFS best communicate its role to the public, esp. in those circumstances where they are leading the collaborative work (vs engaging a third party facilitator)
e. Will USFS adopt recommendations of group directly, or take under consideration?

4. Guidance for appropriate and effective stakeholder identification and representativeness?
5. How to include those NOT engaged in collaborative groups?

3. **Leveraging and Enhancing Existing Resources**

- Collaboration Cadre overview
- Survey of existing Collaboration Initiatives and Tools (USFS briefing paper, below)

4. **Principles/ Best Practices**- this will be developed once draft directives are released. The end product here could look like either a synthesis of existing material, or simply references to good resources. Existing material and resources can be garnered from the USFS, USIECR, and WG and other Committee members.

In order to learn more about what is happening on the ground, Region 5 provided a brief overview of their approach to collaboration in implementing the new rule , including key challenges/solutions and lessons learned. For complete details, please see the 9 January – CWG meeting summary on basecamp.

Highlights include:

Approach:

- R5 includes three contiguous Early Adopters, they share stakeholders
- As the rule was being developed, they held well attended public forums which began to surface issues relevant across the Sierra Nevada. Consequently R5 initiated a wider bioregional assessment to join the three existing (forest level) assessments.
- The collaboration plans are made with each forest, including stakeholders from the outset.
- Hold a clear distinction between collaboration and Tribal consultation

Key challenges:

- Governance/Designing the path forward
  o Avoiding stakeholder fatigue is paramount
  o Resistance to change from within the USFS
  o Efficacy/coordination
- *Innovative solutions:*
  o Forging links between individual forests to the broader Sierra Nevada region: through the Sierra Dialogue Process and Bioregional assessment
  o Online collaboration + wiki space: enables stakeholders to converse directly, including USFS personnel; Wiki space is being utilized to develop "living assessment" collaboratively
  o Clearly chartered committees, codes of conduct

Questions About Collaboration and Public Participation
Under the 2012 Planning Rule

Planning Rule
- What does the new planning rule require in regards to collaboration?
- How does the new planning rule define "collaboration"?
- What are the variations of collaboration in the new planning rule?
- Are there different "definitions" or "levels" of collaboration envisioned by the new rule depending on various stages of the Forest Planning process?
- What are the levels of collaboration for the new planning rule? What parts of the forest planning process would benefit most by being developed through collaborative processes?
- How does collaboration, as intended by the rule, differ from consultation, coordination, or traditional public involvement practices?
- Does the Forest Service envision some elements or phases of the planning process will be best developed through collaboration, some through consultation, and others through coordination or traditional public outreach? If so, are there suggestions for when to apply these different approaches?
- How does the planning rule's focus on collaboration help to foster greater public involvement in the planning process and support for the final outcome?
- How will it be possible to accomplish the relationship building necessary for successful collaboration within the planning rule's accelerated 3-year time frame for completing plan revisions?

Public Involvement and NEPA
- How can collaborative processes help meet the goal of broadening and deepening democratic engagement?
- What is the relationship between collaboration and public involvement?
- How can collaboration fairly engage the public at the outset of the planning process, prior to the start of the normal NEPA process?
- How can collaboration enhance the NEPA public involvement process and vice versa?
- In the context of land management planning, how can the Forest Service utilize both collaborative processes and NEPA public involvement in a way that capitalizes on the strengths of each?
- How is collaboration different from a robust NEPA process?

FACA

- How does the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) apply to collaborative LMP revision processes?
- What types of collaborative processes or actions by a collaborative group trigger chartering a committee under FACA?

- Will the Forest Service be establishing new FACA committees as a way to engage stakeholders and the public in forest planning?
- Can the Forest Service use existing FACA committees or subcommittees in the planning process?
- Does the Forest Service have contemporary guidance for how to implement and engage in high-functioning collaboration as envisioned by the planning rule without creating the need to engage a FACA chartered committee?
- Does the Forest Service generally endorse the BLM's guidance materials on FACA and collaboration? (*http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/adr/natural_resources/faca.html*)

Best Practices

- How would a Forest identify the key partners and parties to engage in a collaborative process? Does the Forest Service envision multiple collaborative groups or one all-inclusive effort?
- Can a person or organization initiate a collaborative process? How?
- What are the rules for collaboration?
- How do you ensure collaboration is inclusive, transparent and available to individuals who do not live in close proximity to the landscape?
- Does collaboration require a roundtable, or are there other approaches to achieving the benefits of collaborative processes without physically having people in a room together (which can often be difficult for some)?
- How can the Forest Service ensure that the input by those not actively participating in the collaborative process is considered and incorporated into plan development processes?
- Is agreement and/or consensus the expected outcome of collaboration?
- Is the Forest Service required to adopt collaborative recommendations for action?
- Given the potential for Forest Service staff and participant turnover during a Forest Planning process, what are best practices for managing leadership and participant transitions?
- What are the most common issues and barriers to participation in a collaborative process that the Forest Service may need to address in designing the process?
- What types of staff or skill sets are needed to facilitate a collaborative process? When should external expertise be used? Are there standards for engaging this expertise?
- Are there likely to be additional agency costs (time, staff capacity and resources) needed to effectively engage in and implement a collaborative process?
- How might a plan revision process unfold in landscapes where there is already a high-functioning forest collaborative in place?
- How does a person participate in an ongoing collaboration?
- In a collaborative process, how do you ensure that the best available science is used -- as well as contemporary, experienced-based, locally adapted practices -- to inform the recommendations made by the members of the collaborative?
- How can the role of collaboration be clarified to ensure its validity and avoid the perception that it is a closed process – i.e. "How to collaborate without colluding."
- How can one deal effectively with a difficult person in collaborative contexts?
- What examples of collaborative planning can provide success stories or lessons learned?

U.S. Forest Service

Natural Resources & Environment

Briefing Paper

Topic: Collaboration Initiatives and Tools

Issue: A number of initiatives and projects, including tool development, are currently underway (or have been recently completed) that are designed to expand the capacity or improve the ability of the agency to conduct its business in a more collaborative fashion. Most of this work is included in the program of work for one or more staffs in the agency. For all of this work, it is imperative that a collaborative approach is taken that leverages what works, shares knowledge, and responds to shared needs by working together. Some of these efforts include:

Empowering Collaborative Stewardship: An over-arching initiative focused on identifying priority work needed to grow the collaborative capacity of the agency and improving the alignment and integration of collaboration tools. A workshop with agency and external practitioners resulted in the identification of four "dimensions" of collaboration that are the focus for implementing specific actions. Dimension groups were formed and are currently working on collaborative actions related to: Leadership, Policies and Practices, Relationships and Learning. The specific improvements and tools discussed below fit within the context established through this effort. Contacts: Peter Williams at pwilliams@fs.fed.us and Andrea Bedell-Louckes at abloucks@fs.fed.us.

eCollaboration: This is a business-driven, web-based initiative with three primary goals: (1) Support agency and partner efforts towards collaborative public land management through on-line planning tools; (2) Facilitate internal and external exchange of ideas and knowledge among partners, communities-of-practice (CoP), and communities of interest or place; and (3) Enable FS-sponsored CoPs and others to harvest innovations through secure, transparent use of standard information, datasets, applications of advanced sciences, and tools designed for communities and end-users. Examples of electronic tools and other work to be delivered under this initiative include the National Collaboration Atlas, collaborative mapping efforts, and other electronic tools; and completing Phase I of FS Partnership

Resource Center and FS Inventory, Monitoring, and Assessment (IM&A) websites. Contact: Peter Williams at pwilliams@fs.fed.us

National Collaboration Cadre: The Cadre is a unique network of practitioners from around the US who provide workshops, training and coaching assistance to National Forests and their stakeholders who are interested in developing collaborative efforts to address complex land management issues. Much of the Cadre's efforts have been on establishing collaborative approaches for individual units who are revising forest plans under the new planning rule. The Cadre consists of community leaders, Forest Service employees and academics who have extensive experience participating in and leading collaborations. Contacts: Sharon Timko at stimko@fs.fed.us or Rich Ullrich at rullrich@fs.fed.us

Talking Points Collaborative Mapping Tool (TPCM): TPCM is an interactive web-based mapping tool designed to enhance public involvement and collaboration in national forest planning and other forest planning efforts. TCPM melds traditional interests of public involvement with new computer aided technologies, permitting both a greater degree of geographic specificity in public involvement as well as opportunities for dialogue and learning. It allows public commenters to communicate with each other as well as with Forest Service staff in "real time" discussion as opposed to traditional collection of public comments. Contacts: El Aran at earan@fs.fed.us or Pat Reed at preed01@fs.fed.us

Economic Profile System – Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT): These software tools address the need for reliable, up-to-date, consistent, defensible, formatted and easily retrievable county-level social and economic information for a range of users and purposes (including national, regional, and forest-level planning, plan project implementation, collaboration, congressional inquiries, applied research, and social and economic administrative studies). As such, EPS-HDT is valuable to all in the NFS who must retrieve, analyze, and report socio-economic data for planning, collaboration, policy analysis and research.   The EPS-HDT system has been available for use by FS personnel since January 2012. A help desk has been established to provide assistance to users and the system has recently been made 508 compliant. Contact: Pat Reed at preed01@fs.fed.us

National Collaboration Atlas: An interactive, geospatially enabled map is being developed that will show all collaborative efforts that the Forest Service is either leading or engaged in by any Deputy Area of the agency anywhere in the country. The map will be available publicly through the Partnership Resource Center and any FS unit or staff will be able to link to the map from any of their webpages. It will allow the FS to tell its story about how much work is occurring through partnerships and collaboration, where that work is occurring, and how to help. Contact: Peter Williams at pwilliams@fs.fed.us

Practitioners' Network for Large Landscape Conservation: The Practitioners' Network launched in May 2011 as a complementary response to the Department of Interior's (DOI) Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCC). The Practitioners' Network is also partnering with the USFS to advance shared goals in improving the science, practice, policy, and performance of large landscape conservation (LLC) (Figure 1). LLC occurs across administrative boundaries, across ownerships and jurisdictions, and across interests. The Network's goal is to assist practitioners and resource management professionals who work at the large landscape scale. Assistance focuses on helping network participants grow capacity, capture lessons learned, and leverage non-governmental resources. The Universities of Arizona and Montana (Center for Natural Resources and Environmental Policy) are helping lead the effort with several other academic institutions, federal agencies, and non-governmental organizations also directly involved.   Contact: Peter Williams at pwilliams@fs.fed.us

Collaboration with the National Park Service (NPS): The NPS and FS have established an Interagency Agreement (IAA) to inventory FS information sources and tools the NPS might use for integrated vegetation management. This work addresses several implementation actions identified during development of the FS's National Inventory, Monitoring, and Assessment (IM&A) Strategy. Contact: Peter Williams at pwilliams@fs.fed.us

Several additional emphasis areas on the joint program of work for the National Partnership Office and Ecosystem Management Coordination staffs (Contact: Peter Williams) include:

- **Leadership Development**: Develop multi-generational leadership through training and work with partners (e.g., Grey Towers, National Forest Foundation, Center for Environmental Conflict Resolution) and by leveraging ASC's "Get the Edge" efforts (e.g., MLP and SLP).
- **Competency Development**: Establish clear principles and competencies for collaboration and partnerships. Actions include leveraging ASC's Center of Learning core training elements, including NEO and Ag Learn, to grow those competencies and modeling collaboration to support Early Adopters.
- **Community of Practice**: (1) Establish supporting tools to create a culture of collaboration; (2) establish a temporary "Dialogue Group" that would engage national office cross-Deputy staff members to coordinate current collaboration efforts and propose a general model for future coordination if needed; (3) establish a general Community of Practice around collaboration and partnership using a combination of SharePoint, regular virtual meetings, and integration with existing groups.
- **Inventory of Friends Groups**: Deliver an inventory of Friends Groups as a resource to Leadership and a networking mechanism for agency employees and partners.