



# Improving Environmental Analysis and Decision Making Processes SUMMARY REPORT

## Eastern Regional EADM Partner Roundtable

March 12, 2018

Midwin National Tallgrass Prairie, Illinois  
and 14 USDA Forest Service Units across the Region

### OVERVIEW

#### WHAT IS THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND DECISION MAKING CHANGE EFFORT?

The USDA Forest Service (USFS) has launched an Agency-wide effort to improve processes related to Environmental Analysis and Decision Making (EADM). The goal of the EADM change effort is to increase the health, diversity, resilience, and productivity of National Forests and Grasslands by getting more work done on-the-ground through increases in efficiency and reductions in the cost of EADM processes. The USFS is working internally at all levels of the Agency and with its partners to thoroughly identify and consider areas of opportunity.

Internally, the Agency has identified a number of impediments to efficient and effective implementation of work on the ground, including lengthy environmental analysis processes, staff training and skill gaps, and workforce issues related to budget constraints and the increasing costs of fire response. As the USFS works to improve EADM, it will continue to follow laws, regulations, and policies and deliver high quality, science-based environmental analysis.

USFS has explored opportunities to improve EADM for over thirty years, and there are compelling reasons to act now:

- An estimated 6,000-plus special use permits await completion nation-wide, a backlog that impacts more than 7,000 businesses and 120,000 jobs.
- Over 80 million acres of National Forest System lands need cost-effective fire and disease risk mitigation.
- The non-fire workforce is at its lowest capacity in years.
- A steady increase in timelines for conducting environmental analysis, with an average of two years for an environmental assessment (EA) and four years for an environmental impact statement (EIS).



The USFS aims to decrease cost and increase the efficiency of EADM processes by 20% by 2019. In working toward this goal, actions may include:

- Training Agency subject-matter experts on contemporary approaches to implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other environmental laws.
- Reforming compliance policies under NEPA and other laws by expanding use of categorical exclusions (CEs), capitalizing on process efficiencies, and enhancing coordination with other agencies.
- Standardizing approaches and electronic templates for CEs, EAs, and administrative records.

Leaders at all levels of the USFS are fully engaged in this effort and challenging USFS employees to be creative, design new ways to advance the USFS mission and embrace change while maintaining science-based, high-quality analysis that reflects USFS land management responsibilities. To this end, employees were recruited from all USFS levels to form EADM Cadres that are tasked with developing and implementing change efforts in each local USFS unit; within USFS regions, stations, and areas; and at USFS headquarters. The USFS is creating multiple collective learning opportunities to tap into the Cadres' knowledge, expertise, innovative ideas, and networks in support of these changes.

## REGIONAL PARTNER ROUNDTABLES

Within the EADM change effort, USFS leadership recognized that partners and the public can offer perspectives and lessons that complement the Agency's internal experiences—leading to greater creativity, cost-savings and capture of talent/capacity. To support this recognition, the USFS asked the National Forest Foundation (NFF) to assist in hosting ten EADM Regional Partner Roundtables across the country in February and March 2018 (see Appendix A for the schedule) with the objective of collecting diverse partner feedback to inform EADM processes on local, regional and national scales.<sup>1</sup> The NFF and USFS worked closely together to plan, coordinate, and facilitate the Roundtables. The NFF was charged with preparing a summary report for each Roundtable as well as one national report that synthesizes themes emerging from partner input at all of the Roundtables. These reports summarize partner-identified challenges and barriers, desired outcomes, and strategies and solutions for effective and efficient EADM processes.



---

<sup>1</sup> The National Forest Foundation (NFF) is a Congressionally chartered nonprofit organization dedicated to conserving and restoring National Forests & Grasslands, and supporting Americans in their enjoyment and stewardship of those lands. NFF is non-advocacy and non-partisan, and serves as a neutral convener and facilitator of collaborative groups engaging with Forest Service and also works with local nonprofits and contractors to implement conservation and restoration projects. To learn more, go to [www.nationalforests.org](http://www.nationalforests.org).

The specific purposes of the Regional Partner Roundtables were to:

- Share why changes are important for achieving the USDA Forest Service’s mission
- Identify, discuss, and capture partner perceptions on barriers and solutions
- Explore what roles partners can play moving forward
- Support dialogue to strengthen relationships between partners and the USDA Forest Service
- Explain how partner inputs will be incorporated from the Roundtables and from participation in the formal rulemaking process.

The Roundtables are a major piece of USFS strategy to integrate the public and partners into its EADM effort. The Agency invited representatives of highly-engaged partner organizations, Tribes, governmental entities and the business community to participate in the Roundtables. USFS also requested formal comments from all members of the public in response to an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) in January 2018 regarding the National Environmental Policy Act, and is working toward issuing a proposed rule in the summer of 2018 for additional comment. The USFS may choose to issue additional ANPRs or draft rules on other aspects of EADM as a result of the EADM change effort.

This report is a summary of activities and themes emerging from the **Eastern Regional EADM Partner Roundtable**, held at the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie near Chicago, Illinois, and at 14 USFS units connected by video teleconference (VTC) on March 12, 2018.

## **ROUNDTABLE MEETING DESIGN**

The USDA Forest Service (USFS) and National Forest Foundation (NFF) hosted the Eastern Regional EADM Partner Roundtable, creatively designing this Roundtable to be inclusive of the large number of USFS units spread geographically across the region. The Eastern Region developed an invitation list of partners that regularly engage with the USFS in project design; comment formally and informally on policy, process, and projects; and/or bring a depth of understanding about the laws, rules, and regulations under which the USFS operates. A total of 208 partners participated in the Regional Partner Roundtable. Please refer to Appendix B for a full list of participants in the VTC-based Roundtable. The chart below describes the units, locations, and number of participants by unit.

USFS UNIT	UNIT LOCATION	PARTICIPANTS
Allegheny NF	Pennsylvania	11
Chippewa NF	Minnesota	12
Chequamegon-Nicolet NF	Wisconsin	12
Green Mountain & Finger Lakes NF	Vermont	35
Hiawatha NF	Michigan	12
Huron-Manistee NF	Michigan	5
Hoosier NF	Indiana	6
Mark Twain NF	Missouri	22
Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie	Illinois	18
Monongahela NF	West Virginia	10
Northeastern Research Station	West Virginia	3
Ottawa NF	Michigan	8



Shawnee NF	Illinois	10
Superior NF	Minnesota	34
White Mountain NF	New Hampshire	10

Roundtable design included context-setting presentations ([click here for presentation](#)), question and answer sessions, and multiple small group discussion opportunities. Presentations were delivered to participants via VTC by: Chris French (Associate Deputy Chief for the National Forest System), Mary Beth Borst (Deputy Regional Forester), and Tony Erba (Regional Director of Planning, Appeals, Litigation and Landscape Scale Conservation). The presentations provided participants with context to support small group discussions in each local unit, organized by EADM themes. The NFF provided neutral facilitation from the Roundtable’s base location at Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie.

Facilitated small-group discussion provided participants located in 14 unit offices across the region with an opportunity to share their perceptions of the EADM reform effort. The individual USFS unit discussions were moderated by the Forest Supervisor or other local USFS staff from the EADM Regional Cadre. Note-takers recorded examples of ineffective or inefficient EADM practices shared by partners and the solutions offered during these discussions, which provided the basis for the EADM Thematic Tables.

To prompt discussion and identify themes at each Roundtable session, partners were tasked with discussing challenges, solutions, and resources for effective EADM interactions with the USFS. The following questions were prompted by facilitators:



**Challenges –**

- *What are barriers to effective EADM in the Forest Service?*
- *What obstacles prevent us from addressing forest health or customer service needs?*
- *Can you give an example or provide more details?*

**Solutions –** For each barrier identified during the challenges discussion, the following questions were prompted:

- *How would you address this?*
- *What would you change?*

**Resources –** For each solution identified during discussion, the following questions were prompted:

- *What do we need to succeed in this?*
- *Who can help?*
- *What role can partners play in addressing EADM?*

## **WHAT PARTNERS SHARED: THEMATIC TABLES OF EADM CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS**

Ideas captured in the main-session and Unit-based small-group discussions during the Eastern Regional EADM Partner Roundtable are organized below by top themes. These are presented in the tables below: (1) USFS Culture; (2) USFS Personnel Policies and Staffing Decisions; (3) USFS Capacity and Resources; (4) Forest and Community Collaboration and Partnerships; (5) Analysis Documents and Specialist Reports; (6) Tribal and Interagency Consultations; and (7) Scaling Environmental Assessment and Decision Making. See Appendix D for a list of acronyms used in the following tables. *\*Note that blanks or incomplete information in the table mean that no ideas were mentioned for that heading during the Roundtable. Some themes include a “desired outcomes” column if partner input included appropriate content.*



## A. USFS CULTURE

The USFS was established in 1905 and since that time has developed cultural norms that guide how the Agency operates and how it relates with its public. The history of remote District Ranger outposts has led to persistent autonomy at the District and Forest levels despite changes in technology and current national directives. Both USFS leadership and partners spoke to an inconsistency in practice across the country. Partners described frustration with a lack of communication from the Agency regarding decisions, and a desire to see innovation, risk-taking and effective risk management rewarded and encouraged.

USFS CULTURE CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	USFS CULTURE SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Risk-averse USFS culture at all levels	Excessive documentation.		Increase line officer confidence to manage risk. Line Officer gives specialists direction on quantity of analysis desired. Scope the problem (as well as the project).	<u>Tools</u> : Risk management training. “Right-size analysis” training for USFS staff. Recommend, Agree, Perform, Input, Decide (RAPID) process.
Lack of consistency between districts on a Forest.		Projects that address a problem (i.e. aspen) at a Forest level are also addressed via the Forest Plan.	Create Forest-wide policies and distinguish the district-specific concerns. Universal approvals for certain types of signage (e.g. trail markers/blazes) in a forest unit.	
USFS insular culture neglects communication needs of partners.	Use of jargon and acronyms in conveying public information.		Spell out acronyms. Use more visual representation of NEPA outcomes.	



**B. USFS PERSONNEL POLICIES AND STAFFING DECISIONS**

The USFS has a long history of encouraging employees to change positions and move frequently to gain breadth and depth of experience, and to move up in responsibility. Aims of this policy include adequately preparing USFS employees to advance professionally; ensuring employees are able to make unbiased and professional decisions in managing public lands; and enhanced consistency and shared culture across the agency. While moving employees to different units can support a transfer of good practices and new ideas, it also means that employees are in a frequent learning curve to understand the relevant forest conditions, ecological systems, and community interests and dynamics. Often local relationships become fractured and have to be rebuilt, taking time and efficiency from EADM processes and frustrating local partners.

PERSONNEL POLICIES & STAFFING CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	PERSONNEL POLICIES & STAFFING SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Turnover of both leadership and staff in the course of one project.	One partner forced to work with many different wildlife biologists because of turnover. Tribes already have to work with multiple agencies. Turnover adds to the burden when protecting cultural resources.		Avoid turnover.	
Imbalance in USFS staff lessens capacity to produce quality EADM.	Staff lack clear roles, responsibilities, and decision-making power.		Cross-train staff to build consistency. Managers forecast staffing needs for the next three to five years.	<u>Tools</u> : The Nature Conservancy “Highly Effective Teams” (project management tool).



**C. USFS CAPACITY AND RESOURCES**

Training in management, resource specializations, and EADM itself remains an unaddressed need throughout the USFS. Budget shortfalls and statutory mandates on funding for fire response combine with a shortage of trained employees in areas other than fire and/or a frequent diversion of staff to fire duty. This situation hampers the ability for the Agency to make progress on stewardship of important forest and grassland resources. Moreover, the complexity of landscape-scale approaches to ecological management of public lands demands a high level of expertise and a deep knowledge of forest conditions at the unit level.

CAPACITY AND RESOURCES CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	CAPACITY AND RESOURCES SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Lack USFS staff to properly conduct EADM.	Non-fire personnel loss. USFS losing employees without an ability to readily replace them. NEPA Coordinators often end up being Project Managers.		Create/use a template for consistency in staffing with resource specialists to help NEPA leads. Increase number of NEPA Coordinators on a Forest/Prairie.	
			Implement more efficient design and contracting of survey work to save on time/cost of reporting and drive time.	<u>Tools:</u> Contractors.
			Deploy partners to promote USFS open houses, scoping documents and other opportunities for outreach and engagement.	<u>Tools:</u> Partners.





CONTINUED | FOREST SERVICE CAPACITY AND RESOURCES

CAPACITY AND RESOURCES CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	CAPACITY AND RESOURCES SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
EADM management lacks quality.	Staff not motivated to properly conduct EADM.		Encourage staff productivity using personnel policies and pay scales.	<p><u>Tools:</u> Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association pay-for-performance system. Training, (including in project management e.g. Lean Six Sigma, Project Management Institute).</p> <p><u>Resources:</u> Performance measures.</p>
USFS averse to using capacity that could be provided by external sources.		USFS uses contracted personnel.	Train and utilize contracted support. Train NEPA Coordinators in project management. Recruit input from partners before proposed action is scoped. Use local knowledge, engineers/other professionals, and materials in USFS projects. Develop local forest friends group.	<p><u>Tools:</u> Contracts. Training provided by Forest Products Association.</p> <p><u>Resources:</u> Contractors. Volunteer trail crews and trail sponsors.</p>
			Make use of the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA).	<p><u>Tools:</u> Red Pine Thinning EA as model (in Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest).</p>



CONTINUED   FOREST SERVICE CAPACITY AND RESOURCES				
CAPACITY AND RESOURCES CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	CAPACITY AND RESOURCES SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Overwhelming number of heritage sites that require assessment of whether or not they are eligible for national register.				<u>Tools:</u> Database and GIS that captures heritage concerns.
USFS underfunded.	Decommissioned Middlebury, VT USFS office; no presence in northwest Vermont. Winter trails and parking areas not plowed, cutting off public access. Only one member of Congress with forestry background.		Educate members of the Senate and House of Representatives to gain more support from leaders in the Administration and Congress.	



**D. FOREST AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS**

In the last ten to fifteen years, the USFS has recognized the opportunities offered by the rise of collaborative groups in addressing resource management conflicts and building agreement in project design. Not all units, however, regularly welcome collaboration and partnerships, and stakeholders expressed frustration with an inconsistency in USFS transparency, skill, communications, and use of scientific and traditional knowledge contributed by the public.

COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS CHALLENGES		COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Lack of USFS effort/ability to collaborate with stakeholders on forest planning and implementation.	Disparate and late invitations for stakeholders to join the process and provide input.	Begin collaboration at the project design level. Invite interested collaborators to participate before the scoping process begins. Inform partners of implementation steps (day-to-day operations related to projects) beyond the planning stage. Value input from stakeholders. Involve partners in after action reviews.	<u>Tools:</u> EADM templates and common set of standards for project development and decision making. Partner requests for procedural information. USFS personnel directories.
Partners cannot plan or are ill-equipped to participate effectively in USFS meetings.		Define expected meeting outcomes upfront. Share local work plans with partners prior to the beginning of the year. Partners are prepared when they join meetings with USFS.	
Inadequate degree/ quality of partnering with states and counties.	Lack of understanding of state versus USFS National Forest requirements for SHPO sites.	Explore opportunities to scale-up projects to state and county levels.	
No public “buy-in” for USFS conclusions.	Closing roads and access to trails makes older people feel like USFS does not want them on the land.	USFS clearly explains proposed action, revealing motivations and priorities. USFS and partners share scientific data. Integrate partners into scientific review. Open up available trails to multiple-season use (e.g. by ATVs and snowmobiles).	



CONTINUED   FOREST AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS			
COLLABORATION CHALLENGES		COLLABORATION SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Public concern that if the scope of analysis is reduced, special concerns will be unaddressed.		Explain that the level of analysis varies from project to project, depending on anticipated extent of effect.	<u>Tools:</u> Partner trainings on what should be excluded and included in NEPA documents.
Lack of quality partner outreach.	Broken web links.	Increase accessibility to USFS/resources.	<u>Tools:</u> Online options for access. Online platform where project applications and past decisions can be shared. User-friendly websites.
Partners and USFS do not realize they have common goals.		Common USFS-partner understanding of what “effective collaboration” means. Identify goals common among partners and USFS.	<u>Tools:</u> Training in goal-setting.
USFS offending public (cultural problem).	Public called “customers” rather than “owners.”	Change semantics to be respectful of the American public and the fact that we all technically own USFS lands.	
Timing of EADM information emanating from USFS.		Conduct annual meeting to inform partners on status of current projects, new projects planned, and projects completed. Communicate timeline changes.	<u>Tools:</u> Timeline published on the website. Regular email updates. Press releases.  <u>Resources:</u> Social media messaging by youth. Newspaper article placement.
Lack of quality or sharing of data and maps.	GIS mapping is inaccurate and inaccessible.	Data useable by and shared with partners. Engage partners in data collection and provide guidance to ensure it is standardized. Create local clearing-house for use/reuse of data. Include maps in scoping documents distributed.	<u>Tools:</u> Data Basin.  <u>Resources:</u> Trained Citizen Scientists.

CONTINUED   FOREST AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS			
COLLABORATION CHALLENGES		COLLABORATION SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Decisions appear to be made for political reasons.	Trust is damaged when local decisions are overruled by higher-level USFS decision-makers.	EADM processes are transparent. Value trust-based partnerships.	
Decision-making is disconnected from communities near Forests.		USFS strives to maintain a quality of place for communities surrounding the Forest. Unit-hosted community meetings to discuss outdoor recreation economy. Involve community and county leadership and also political entities, so they understand the “why” of decisions made.	<u>Tools:</u> Project site tours.
		Tie in ecosystem services when addressing multiple values of projects.	<u>Tools:</u> The Wilderness Society economic metrics for quantifying ecosystem benefits.
		During scoping, consider accommodating utility concerns (e.g. burying a power line) that longer term would result in fewer disturbances for maintenance.	<u>Tools:</u> Interactive pre-NEPA planning map that allows partners to provide site-specific feedback.
Lack of public understanding about what a “working forest” is.		Include loggers in public outreach and project planning. Address misinformation about timber harvests (not always “bad,” can be good for forest health and create wildlife habitat).	<u>Tools:</u> Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest video on logging trucks sharing road with snow mobiles.

**CONTINUED | FOREST AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS**

COLLABORATION CHALLENGES		COLLABORATION SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Lack of response during EA comment periods.	<95% response rate to mailings during a scoping exercise.	Recognize the unspoken approval of proposals when there is a lack of response. Use more innovative contact/response mechanisms. Make it easier to find projects on a Forest/Prairie website. Remain aware that not everyone has internet access. Inform office visitors of project plans.	<u>Tools:</u> Forest/Prairie websites
		Use more innovative contact methods.	<u>Tools:</u> Survey Monkey. Court records of land ownership (related to project site).
		Communicate project timelines effectively, from project inception.	
USFS not including value-added input that could improve EADM.	Partners not engaged during scoping and/or Schedule of Proposed Action.	Engage partners early in the EADM process.	<u>Tools:</u> State models of public engagement.
Ineffective partner collaboration disallows creation of better documents.		Survey partners on what they would like to see in EAs. Ensure partners understand their roles in meetings and what USFS expects of them. Capture lessons learned from collaboration.	<u>Tools:</u> Farm Bill Interpretation & Education CE that specifically requires collaboration. USFS official guidelines for partner/public engagement.



**CONTINUED | FOREST AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS**

COLLABORATION CHALLENGES		COLLABORATION SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Lack of public understanding of USFS EADM process, timeline, and how/when they can engage.		Create an EADM process tool that incorporates partner timeline considerations. Create clear “yes” and “no” lists of common actions.	<u>Tools</u> : Process template/flowchart. List of site-based CEs. Collaborative mapping to accept public comments on the spot.
		Clarify who is the point of contact for NEPA on the Forest/Prairie.	<u>Tools</u> : Employee directory that the public can access.
“USFS-centric” thinking.	Lack of signage and picnic tables at trailheads; website difficult to navigate	Create process for public reporting of specific needs that looks for patterns and addresses efficiently. Effectively interpret state regulations.	
USFS overwhelmed by expectations to partner.	Partner engagement is inefficient and/or overly time-consuming. Not all partners understand or use the NEPA process correctly.	Identify the key members of the public to loop in with lots of detail early on. Partners identify a point of contact. Combine scoping and 30-day Notice & Comment period.	<u>Tool</u> : Template for agreement with landowners (e.g. The Nature Conservancy model agreement that is 90% boilerplate). <u>Resource</u> : Partnership Coordinator position on staff.
	Partners competing for resources. Having to make decisions aligned with a multiple-use mission in the context of user conflict.	Partners and USFS pool resources to complete projects. Partners bring a coordinated set of interests and recommendations.	<u>Tools</u> : Tribal model in Wisconsin – input comes in the form of prescriptions in final draft form.



CONTINUED   FOREST AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS			
COLLABORATION CHALLENGES		COLLABORATION SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Long EADM timeframes challenge partner capacity.	Partner frustration and sentiment that limited resources are wasted. Partner burnout/inability to continue to expend resources to stay engaged.		
Partner resources underutilized.	Non-governmental organization, state, county and other local experts not tapped for projects. Licensed professionals with proven experience across multiple units are scrutinized by the RO/WO.	Trust private sector to provide and produce quality input and analyses. Leverage public outreach that trusted partners can provide. Identify partner projects with common threads.	<u>Tools:</u> Certifications for certain skills (e.g. chain saw). Creative contracting.  <u>Resources:</u> Trout Unlimited's methodologies for restoring streams after a road decommissioning project. In-kind match. Volunteers.
		Technical support is reciprocal. Deploy shared staffing methodology to increase outputs and efficiency in project implementation.	<u>Tools:</u> Shared staffing model.  <u>Resources:</u> Shared specialists.
Proposal ideas are set in stone before stakeholder process begins.		Enable proposal input and shaping before scoping.	





**CONTINUED | FOREST AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS**

<b>COLLABORATION CHALLENGES</b>		<b>COLLABORATION SOLUTIONS</b>	
<b>Barriers</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Tools and Needed Resources</b>
Partner resources inadequate to enable them to keep on task with EADM responses.	Partner budgets flat or declining. Volunteer-driven partners have expectations that projects will be completed on time and drop off when projects dragged out.		<u>Tools:</u> Wisconsin DNR model of stakeholder engagement process.
Partners send in the same or similar comments on EADM.		Encourage and enable partners to consider comments from other partners to reduce duplication. Encourage partners to collaborate on comments with other organizations.	
Litigation is recurring challenge for USFS.		Establish third-party certification of sustainability standards for the timber industry streamlines analyses and reduce prospect of litigation.	Sustainable Forestry Initiative certification.



### E. ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS

Federal environmental laws require analysis of the physical, biological, social and economic effects of an action on public lands or waters. Risk aversion and a history of legal challenges to USFS decisions have led to the “bullet-proofing” of environmental analysis documents and specialist reports. Rather than being understandable by the public, documents tend to be extremely long and hard to read. Partners offered suggestions to help streamline documentation and process without sacrificing quality of analysis.

ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIAL REPORTS SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
EADM documents are hard for partners to comprehend.	Forest Plans are not decipherable by the public. USFS staff lack writing skills.		Use visuals. Identify specific project areas that can help partners understand USFS management.	<u>Tools:</u> Photos; computer modeling. Writing courses for USFS staff that focus on story-telling.
Multiple special use permits requested for the same type of use of forest resources.			Lump reviews of applications for similar types of special use permits.	
CEs inadequately utilized.	Unlike USFS, Bureau of Indian Affairs uses CEs extensively. CEs developed for the West may not be applicable to scale of Eastern forests.		Utilize CEs wherever possible. Prioritize fire condition classes for CEs.	<u>Tools:</u> Region-wide CE categories. State exemptions as a form of “CE”.

CONTINUED | ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS

ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIAL REPORTS SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Excessive use of EAs.	<p>Redundant EAs for objectives in a Prairie Plan.</p> <p>EAs and EISs typically do not have to be done for NRCS conservation practices (only done for major projects like dam construction).</p>		<p>Set a “significance” threshold for whether an EA or EIS is needed. If an EIS is completed for a forest/prairie plan, reduce EAs required by linking proposed actions to past findings.</p>	<p><u>Tools:</u> NRCS model<sup>2</sup> (covers all conservation practices covered by NRCS).</p>
Excessive documentation because EADM not scaled appropriately	Arbitrary page limits for NEPA documents.	Review process is scaled to be appropriate to resource impacts.	<p>Eliminate redundancy in reviews by choosing to scale from Forest Plan to Integrated Resource Project to individual project. Consider scaling at a larger land base. Maximize acreage under EAs.</p>	<p><u>Tools:</u> Model decisions made by BLM. Ketchikan, Alaska model EA (under 20 pages).</p>
Small, non-controversial NEPA projects not getting done.		Increased USFS capacity for small projects and streamline the process, particularly when collaborative.	<p>“Small NEPA Day” for clearing CEs and SUPs. List of projects that are easy to approve.</p>	

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/nrcs143\\_006910.pdf](https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs143_006910.pdf)

CONTINUED   ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS				
ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIAL REPORTS SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Time wasted to secure sense of quality.	“Encyclopedic” versus strategic information used.		Balance tradeoffs between efficiency and quality to ensure decisions are sound. When mitigation is planned in a project, minimize analysis.	
“Reanalysis.”	Specialists each have their own guidelines for ensuring NEPA accountability. Cultural resources (archeological) do not move yet analysis is repeated. Long EADM timeframes mean conditions change (i.e. ESA listing occurs) requiring new analyses.		Use data and analyses from past EADM that captured resource considerations effectively. Apply lessons learned from past decisions. Make use of state and other partner staff that have the skills to conduct stand exams and pre-NEPA surveys.	<u>Tools:</u> Roadless area analysis.  <u>Resources:</u> Dual-certified state employees.



CONTINUED   ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS				
ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIAL REPORTS SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Limited ability to use CEs effectively.	If insect and disease infestations not yet present on a forest, 2014 Farm Bill CE tool cannot be used. Concerns that CEs could lead to cumulative negative effects and/or lack of public involvement.		Use CEs specifically designed to address invasive species control and prescribed fire. Increase acreage for which a CE authority is granted (may be possible under new Farm Bill).	
EADM documents do not evoke public confidence.	Takes little time to get to 95% confidence in NEPA document, and months to get to 100%.		Include all tools necessary to meet the Desired Condition during EADM. Standardize what supports a Finding of No Significant Impact versus attempting to make documents litigation-proof. Include economic data in pre-planning step of NEPA projects.	<u>Tools:</u> Checklists. <u>Resources:</u> Metrics.
SUP process. Limited USFS personnel to respond to SUP requests.	Authorizations are slow and narrow.	SUP applications are complete upon submission.	Clearly communicate the SUP application requirements.	<u>Tools:</u> SUP forms on USFS website by group (e.g. commercial filming/photography).



CONTINUED   ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS				
ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIALIST REPORTS CHALLENGES		DESIRED OUTCOMES	ANALYSIS DOCUMENTS AND SPECIAL REPORTS SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Lack of monitoring for compliance after project implementation that could support future project decisions.			Add a research component to project plans. Ensure monitoring for compliance with EADM.	<u>Tools:</u> Model of BLM reports done at the state level.  <u>Resources:</u> Citizen Scientists trained in monitoring techniques.
Inaccurate and inconsistent data in databases and analyses.			Use and update data using information technology.	



**F. TRIBAL AND INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION**

Federal laws require multiple agencies to consult with each other about how the fish, wildlife and cultural resources on National Forests and Grasslands could be affected by an action. The USFS also consults and coordinates with Federally-recognized Tribes in a government-to-government relationship. The lack of adequate staffing, complexity of the issues, and inconsistent approaches and coordination has led to lengthy consultation processes.

CONSULTATION CHALLENGE		DESIRED OUTCOMES	CONSULTATION SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence		Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Misunderstandings about what different tribes value culturally about a forest resource (e.g. clay versus birch bark).	Access is cut off to stream banks where Tribes access clay for traditional ceramics.		Utilize Eastern Region model of tribal consultation.	<u>Tools:</u> Bay Mills Indian Community Biological Services' survey data.
Cumbersome interagency consultation requirements.	Constant re-initiation of consultation due to extensive length of implementation. Too many signatures needed to move forward.	Procedural steps are standardized.	Use templates for ESA consultations to pinpoint information actually needed. Share data across agencies. Streamline interagency reporting requirements. Revise the National Historic Preservation Act to make State Historic Preservation Officer reporting uniform across the country.	<u>Tools:</u> Supplemental Information Reviews (SIRs). Cross-train with state DNR and/or Departments of Conservation on Lean Six Sigma.

### G. SCALING ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND DECISION MAKING

Participants identified a number of issues related to the scale of project analysis, at what level decisions are made, and how local information is or is not reflected in decisions. Partners raised questions about how forest plans and the required large-scale analysis relates to project-level decisions. The discussion also highlighted the challenges of climate change and other cross-boundary issues, and the complexity of natural resource projects.

SCALING CHALLENGES		SCALING SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Forest/Prairie unit lacks necessary autonomy.	Lack of flexibility to allow deviation from standards where necessary to resolve a problem.	Delegate more authority to units and allow them more flexibility in decision-making.	
	Increased time to conduct Section 7 analyses for Wild and Scenic Rivers now that decisions made at the regional level.	Conduct Section 7 analysis at Forest unit level.	
Forest Plan not used effectively or often enough for project-scale decisions.	In Wisconsin, the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest plan has enabled Wisconsin to be the number one paper-making state in the country.	Forest Plan “package” shared with the public for project-scale decisions draws visibility to the local collaboration that underlies the FP decisions. Tier EADM to existing Forest Plans. Reference previous decisions of a similar geographic or project scope. Use EIS plus appendices that support the Forest Plan to avoid additional documentation. Apply more programmatic planning to unit-based decisions. Identify routine practices at the unit level; build out a beneficial CE list for that unit.	<u>Tools</u> : Programmatic analysis and decisions.



CONTINUED   SCALING ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND DECISION MAKING			
SCALING CHALLENGES		SCALING SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Local issues not adequately addressed, and at risk when a national standard is imposed.	Partners do not feeling engaged.	Consider social and economic, as well as ecological, scales of analyses.	
Projects are large and complicated.	Size of projects limit small business participation.	Utilize small demonstration areas to show how the EADM process works to meet USFS regulatory requirements.	
		Align with the state DNR when conducting regional-scale analyses.	<u>Tools:</u> Multi-agency partnerships.
	Utility pipeline may cross several USFS units.	Address pipeline impacts at a regional office level.	
EADM at unit or regional scale not effectively tiered to use existing project analyses.		Refer to applicable analyses already conducted.	
		Tier to analysis in a way similar to producing a scientific article.	
		Use monitoring & evaluation results to inform new proposals.	<u>Tools:</u> Monitoring and evaluation results from other projects.
Sweeping impacts like the new climate regime and invasive species impacts are not accounted for in EADM.		Apply ecological integrity principles from the Forest Planning Rule. Factor anticipated effects of climate shifts into vegetative management projects and Forest Plans generally.	
Excessive engineering standards imposed without balance or flexibility.	Assessing a hiking or biking trail takes the same EADM time as a \$500K bridge.	USFS decision-making flexible enough to consider the difference in engineering requirements. Scale analysis to cost and impact of projects that require engineering. Consider size and localization of a proposed project.	<u>Tools:</u> Engineering standards set to scale.

CONTINUED   SCALING ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND DECISION MAKING			
SCALING CHALLENGES		SCALING SOLUTIONS	
Barriers	Evidence	Strategies	Tools and Needed Resources
Regional control of project design involving structures.		Delegate certain budgetary decisions to local forest unit.	
Resource impact considerations extend beyond the Forest.	Fracking near Monongahela National Forest risks resources that are considered protected under current Forest Plan. State wants to increase timber production.	USFS takes a balanced approach to achieving its multiple-value mission. Partners proactively develop recommended Forest Plan directives and guidelines should apply to non-Forest System lands adjacent to NFs.	
USFS inability to actively respond to insect and disease problems.	The impact of insects and disease in the East is comparable to wildfire in the West. Insects and disease problems not covered in 2014 Farm Bill.	Seek to include authorities in 2018 Farm Bill. Address invasive insects and diseases in the context of forest health. Scale analyses to ecosystem level versus project types. Organize management by ecological systems in particular segments of the forest.	

## **THE EADM CHANGE EFFORT**

EADM Partner Roundtables were held in each USFS region and in Washington, D.C. Information in this regional report, as well as the national report, will be used by USFS leadership to refine business practices, information sharing, policy, and direction toward improved efficiencies. As they are developed, the NFF will post summary reports from all of the Roundtables and a national report that synthesizes the themes heard around the country regarding EADM challenges and solutions ([click here](#)).

The NFF will present information generated at the Roundtables to USFS leadership and the staff teams working nationally and regionally on the EADM change effort.

The USFS will consider the input from the Roundtables as it develops its proposed rule regarding NEPA. The Agency will also review the input received at the Roundtables as it considers other priorities and actions to improve EADM processes, which may involve changes in practices, improved training, altered staffing structures, and/or steps toward improved rulemaking.

## **RESOURCES**

### **USFS EASTERN REGION EADM CADRE**

- Kevin Amick, NEPA Planner, Hoosier National Forest
- Leah Anderson, Public Affairs Specialist, Regional Office
- Connie Cummins, Forest Supervisor, Superior National Forest
- Theresa Davidson, Wildlife & Fisheries Program Manager, Mark Twain National Forest
- Sierra Dawkins, Regional Botanist, Regional Office
- Tony Erba, Director of Planning, Administrative Review, Litigation & Landscape Scale Conservation, Regional Office
- Marlanea French-Pombier, Biological Scientist, Ottawa National Forest
- Carrie Gilbert, Environmental Coordinator, Regional Office
- Rich Hatfield, District Ranger, Allegheny National Forest
- Glenn Howard, Forest Environmental Coordinator, Allegheny National Forest
- Stacy Lemieux, Natural Resources Staff Officer, White Mountain National Forest
- Nicholas Pardi, Director, Public & Governmental Relations, Regional Office
- Lois Pfeffer, Environmental Coordinator, Chippewa National Forest
- Tim Pohlman, District Ranger, Shawnee National Forest
- Robin Redman, Environmental Coordinator, Hiawatha National Forest
- Tony Scardina, Forest Supervisor & Cadre POC, Wayne National Forest
- Jay Strand, Forest Planner/NEPA Coordinator, Green Mountain & Finger Lakes National Forests
- Peter Taylor, Forest Environmental Coordinator, Superior National Forest
- Jeff Tepp, NEPA Planner, Midewin Nat'l Tallgrass Prairie
- Elizabeth Tichner, Zone NEPA Specialist, Monongahela National Forest
- Kristine Vollmer, Forest Environmental Coordinator, Regional Office
- Robert Witmer, Director of Office of Knowledge Management, Northeastern Area State & Private Forestry



## RESOURCES

- USDA Forest Service EADM webpage – [www.fs.fed.us/managing-land/eadm](http://www.fs.fed.us/managing-land/eadm)
- National Forest Foundation EADM Webpage – [www.nationalforests.org/EADM](http://www.nationalforests.org/EADM)
- USDA Forest Service Directives – [www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/](http://www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/)
- Environmental Policy Act Compliance – [www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/01/03/2017-28298/national-environmental-policy-act-compliance](http://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/01/03/2017-28298/national-environmental-policy-act-compliance)



**APPENDIX A**

<b>Environmental Analysis and Decision Making Regional Partner Roundtable Dates</b>		
<b>Region</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>1 – Northern</b>	March 14, 2018	Missoula, MT
<b>2 - Rocky Mountain</b>	March 19, 2018	Lakewood, CO (and by video teleconference in Cody, WY; Pagosa Springs, CO; and Rapid City, SD)
<b>3 - Southwestern</b>	March 21, 2018	Albuquerque, NM
<b>4 - Intermountain</b>	March 29, 2018	Salt Lake City, UT
<b>5 - Pacific Southwest</b>	March 27, 2018	Rancho Cordova, CA
<b>6 - Pacific Northwest</b>	February 22-23, 2018	Portland, OR
<b>8 – Southern</b>	March 20, 2018	Chattanooga, TN
<b>9 – Eastern</b>	March 12, 2018	Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie, IL (and 14 Forest Unit locations by video teleconference)
<b>10 – Alaska</b>	March 22, 2018	Juneau, AK
<b>Washington, D.C.</b>	March 14, 2018	Washington, D.C.



## APPENDIX B

### EASTERN REGION EADM PARTNER ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANT LIST

**SUMMARY:** Eighteen partners participated in the Roundtable at the central base location at Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie, and 190 partners participated via videoteleconference at 14 USFS unit locations across the region. The participants represented a broad range of regional forest interests and revealed strong experience with USDA Forest Service EADM processes.

#### PARTNER PARTICIPANTS

##### **Allegheny National Forest**

Mitchell	Blake	National Wild Turkey Federation
Jack	Hedland	Allegheny Forest Alliance
Amanda	Hetrick	Forest County School
Autumn	Kelley	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 1-0
Cliff	Lane	McKean County
Kylie	Maland	Western Pennsylvania Conservancy
Mike	Messina	Penn State University
Pauline	Steinmeyer	
Cecile	Stelter	Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Sarah	Stewart	Cameron Energy
Sue	Swanson	Allegheny Hardwood Utilization Group

##### **Chippewa National Forest**

Ben	Benoit	Division of Resource Management - LLBO
Brian	Bignall	Potlach Deltic
Andrea	Brandon	The Nature Conservancy
John	Faulkner	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - Forestry
Jeff	Hines	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - Wildlife
Keith	Karnes	Division of Resource Management - LLBO
Ashlee	Lehner	Minnesota Forest Industries
Sara	Ploetz	Enbridge
Jerry	Richards	Norbord Minnesota
Greg	Snyder	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - Forestry
Jaime	Thibodeaux	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - Environmental Review
Katie	Zlonis	Division of Resource Management - LLBO

##### **Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest**

Janet	Clark	U.S. Senator Ron Johnson
Matt	Dallman	The Nature Conservancy
Rebecca	Diebel	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources - Forestry
Timothy	Dombrowski	Keweenaw Bay Indian Community



Paul	Koll	Stockbridge-Munsee
Dick	Krawze	Federal Sustainable Forestry Committee
Michael	LaRonge	Forest County Potawatomi Community
Laura	McFarland	Trout Unlimited
Jeff	Olson	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources - Forestry
Teaque	Prichard	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources - Forestry
Henry	Schienebeck	Great Lakes Timber Professional Association
Tom	Tallier	Federal Sustainable Forestry Committee

### **Green Mountain & Finger Lakes National Forest**

John	Acciavatti	Moosalamoo Association
John	Atkinson	Vermont Mountain Bike Association & Mad River Riders
Bruce	Audet	Vermont Horse Council
Jean	Austin	Vermont Fish & Wildlife Department
Tom	Beggy	
Nancy	Bell	The Conservation Fund
Doug	Blodgett	Vermont Fish & Wildlife Department
John	Buck	Vermont Fish & Wildlife Department
Tony	Clark	Blueberry Hill & Moosalamoo Association
Alexi	Conine	Slate Valley Trails
Scott	Darling	Vermont Fish & Wildlife Department
Mike	Debonis	GMC
Matt	DiBona	National Wild Turkey Federation
James	Duggan	Vermont Department of Housing & Community Development/Historic Preservation
Jamey	Fidel	Vermont Natural Resources Council
Robert	Fields	A. Johnson Co., LLC
Marge	Fish	Meadow Vista Trails Association
Cathy	Foutch	Killington Parks and Recreation
Kyle	Lapoint	Backcountry Hunters & Anglers
Doug	Little	National Wild Turkey Federation
Molly	Mahar	Vermont Ski Areas Association
Angus	McCusker	Rochester Area Sports Trail Alliance
Hawk	Metheny	Appalachian Trail Conservancy
Elena	Mihaly	Conservation Law Foundation
Andrew	Milliken	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike	Purcell	Vermont Mountain Bike Association
Greg	Russ	White River Partnership
Bill	Sayre	A. Johnson Co., LLC & Associated Industries of Vermont
Mike	Smith	Vermont ATV Sportsman's Association
Hilary	Soloman	Poultney Mettowee Natural Resources Conservation District
Jim	Sullivan	Bennington County Regional Commission
Ethan	Swift	Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation
Matt	Tetreavit	Vermont Association of Snow Travelers
Margo	Wade	Sugarbrush



Tom Yager A. Johnson Co., LLC

### **Hiawatha National Forest**

Karen Anderson U.S. Representative Jack Bergman  
Matt Birk Cloverland  
Jim Caron Michigan Department of Environmental Quality  
Linda Hansen Michigan Department of Environmental Quality - Water Resources  
Division  
Travis Heikkinen Potlatch  
Tim Kobasic Hiawatha Land Trails Association  
Emily Leach Superior Watershed Partnership & Great Lakes Conservation Corp.  
Aubrey Maccous- Bay Mills Indian Community  
Leduc  
Kristin Matson Michigan Department of Natural Resources  
Jarrod Nelson Michigan Department of Environmental Quality  
Pete Postula Cloverland  
Robert Tykla Michigan Department of Natural Resources

### **Huron-Manistee National Forest**

Ryan Boyer National Wild Turkey Federation  
Ari Cornman Little River Band of Ottawa Indians  
Derek Cross Michigan Department of Natural Resources  
Lisha Ramsdell Huron Rivers  
Kenny Wawczyk North Country Trail Association

### **Hoosier National Forest**

Steve Backs Department of Fish & Wildlife - Indiana  
Stephan Ball Department of Natural Resource Conservation - Indiana  
Diane Hunter Miami Tribe of Oklahoma  
Brian Kruse Natural Resources Conservation Service - Indiana  
John Seifers Indiana Department of Natural Resources  
Joe Tutterow The Nature Conservancy

### **Mark Twain National Forest**

Richard Anderson DocRun Company  
Audrey Beres Missouri Department of Conservation  
Richard Blatz Missouri Department of Conservation  
Brian Brookshire Missouri Forest Products Association  
John Burk National Wild Turkey Federation  
Chad Doolen National Wild Turkey Federation  
Hank Dorst Mark Twain Forest Watchers  
John Fox Osage Nation  
Parker Hall USDA Wildlife Services  
Karen Herrington U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Rob Hunt Missouri Department of Natural Resources





Rebecca	Landewe	The Nature Conservancy
Ken	McCarty	Missouri State Parks
Paul	McKenzie	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ginny	Moore	The Conservation Fund
Chris	Neaville	DocRun Company
Joe	Richards	U.S. Geological Survey
Jenni	Riegel	U.S. Representative Jason Smith
Brian	Schweiss	Missouri Department of Conservation
David	Stokely	U.S. Senator Claire McCaskill
Mike	Sutherland	Missouri State Parks
Mark	Yingling	DocRun Company

### **Midewin Tallgrass National Prairie**

Paul	Botts	The Wetlands Institute
Ken	Brubaker	Environmental Law & Policy Center
Maggie	Cole	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Carol	Ference	Midewin Alliance
Marian	Gibson	Village of Elwood
Rachel	Granneman	Environmental Law & Policy Center
Fran	Harty	The Nature Conservancy
Andrew	Hawkins	Forest Preserve District of Will County
Jim	Herkert	Illinois Audubon Society
Andrew	Hunt	Hunt Farms
Madeline	McLeester	University of Notre Dame
Stacy	Meyers	Openlands
Luke	Phalen	U.S. Representative Adam Kinzinger
Andrea	Pletzke	Will County Trail Riders
Gail	Pyndus	Midewin Alliance
Lorin	Schab	Midewin Heritage Association
Mark	Schurr	University of Notre Dame
Sandy	Vasko	Will County Historic Preservation Committee

### **Monongahela National Forest**

Lew	Freeman	Allegheny-Blue Ridge Alliance
Matt	Kearns	West Virginia Rivers Coalition
Kent	Karriker	Community Stakeholder
Kate	Leary	Friends of Blackwater
Beth	Little	West Virginia Highlands Conservancy
Judy	Rodd	Friends of Blackwater
Hugh	Rogers	West Virginia Highlands Conservancy
Angie	Rosser	West Virginia Rivers Coalition
Dustin	Wichterman	Trout Unlimited
Mary	Wimmer	Community Stakeholder

### **Morgantown National Forest**



Jason	Bladow	Natural Resources Conservation Service - West Virginia
Joe	McNeal	West Virginia University - Forestry
Barb	McWhorter	Natural Resources Conservation Service - West Virginia

**Ottawa National Forest**

Will	Cooksey	The Trust for Public Land
Kari	Divine	Sustainable Resource Institute
Don	Helsel	Michigan Trails and Recreation Alliance of the Land and the Environment
Calvin	Kangas	North Country Trail - Ni-Miikanaake Chapter
Karl	Jensen	North Country Trail - Ni-Miikanaake Chapter
Ric	Olsen	North Country Trail - Ni-Miikanaake Chapter
Linda	Shulz	Michigan Trails and Recreation Alliance of the Land and the Environment
Alex	Wrobel	Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission

**Shawnee National Forest**

Cade	Bursell	Citizen
Ryan	Campbell	Southern Illinois University
Dennis	Connolly	Resident
Chris	Evans	University of Illinois
Michael	Sertle	Ducks Unlimited
Jody	Shimp	Shawnee Resource Conservation and Development
Sam	Stearns	Friends of Bell Smith Springs
Tabitha	Tripp	Citizen
Mark	Wagner	Southern Illinois University
John	Wallace	Forest Neighbor

**Superior National Forest**

John	Bathke	North Shore Forest Collaborative
Myron	Bursheim	Cook County Board of Commissioners
Marge	Coyle	MN DNR Ecological and Water Division
Scott	Dane	Associated Contract Loggers & Truckers of MN
Lindberg	Ekola	Northeast Landscape Program
Craig	Engwall	Minnesota Deer Hunters Association
Jason	Evans	Louisiana Pacific Corporation
Craig	Hansen	Grand Portage National Monument
Larry	Heady	Delaware Tribe
Brian	Hiti	Iron Range Rehabilitation Resource Board
Frank	Jewell	St. Louis County Board of Commissioners
Janet	Keough	Water Legacy
Kelsey	Johnson	Iron Mining Association of Minnesota
Lisa	Kerr	Cook County Board of Commissioners
Tonia	Kittelson	Friends of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area
Chris	Knopf	Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness



Bill	Latady	Bois Forte Band of Chippewa
Duane	Lula	Sugarloaf:North Shore Forest Collaborative
Nancy	McReady	Conservationists with Common Sense
Matt	Norton	Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness
Steve	Olson	Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa
Jim	Parma	Bell Timber-Eastern
Dan	Prazak	MN DNR- Division of Forestry
Becky	Rom	Save the Boundary Waters
Brad	Sagen	North Star Chapter Sierra Club
Clarissa	Spicer	MN DNR Division of Forestry
Rich	Staffon	Izaak Walton League Duluth Chapter
Rich	Sve	Lake County Board of Commissioners
Tony	Swader	Grand Portage Trust Lands & Natural Resources
Molly	Thompson	Sugarloaf:North Shore Forest Collaborative
Darren	Vogt	1854 Treaty Authority
Mark	Weber	St Louis County Lands Department
Mike	Young	MN DNR - Two Harbors
David	Zentner	Izaak Walton League Duluth Chapter

#### **White Mountain National Forest**

Alexa	Bernotavicz	Bretton Woods Ski Area
Joe	Boyer	Penn State University
Paul	Cunha	Appalachian Mountain Club
Dave	Dean	Waterville Valley Resort
Chris	Gamache	New Hampshire State Parks - Trails Bureau
Dan	Gould	New Hampshire Snowmobile Association
Jessyca	Keeler	Ski New Hampshire
Jay	Scambio	Loon Mountain Ski Area
Matt	Stevens	Appalachian Trail Conservancy
James	Wrigley	Appalachian Mountain Club

#### **ROUNDTABLE PLANNING TEAM**

Kayla	Barr	National Forest Foundation
Tony	Erba	Director, Planning, Administrative Review, Litigation, and Landscape Scale Conservation, Region 9
Marcia	Hogan	National Forest Foundation, Facilitator
Ben	Irey	National Forest Foundation
Mike	Tighe	Writer/Editor, Region 9
Alice	Ewen	Acting Assistant Director, Cooperative Forestry, WO



## APPENDIX C

### EASTERN REGIONAL EADM PARTNER ROUNDTABLE AGENDA

**Monday, March 12, 2018**

- 9:30 am EST/8:30 am CST Welcome and Meeting Overview
- 9:50 am EST/8:50 am CST National Overview and Introduction of EADM Effort *Chris French, Associate Deputy Chief for National Forest System*
- 10:30 am EST/9:30 am CST Regional Overview and Perspectives on the EADM Effort  
*Tony Erba,*
- 11:00 am Est/10:00 am CST Forest and Prairie Conversations
- 12:30 pm EST/11:30 am CST Lunch
- 1:30 pm EST/12:30 pm CST Forest and Prairie Conversations Continued
- 3:00 pm EST/2:00 pm CST Summaries of Forest and Prairie Conversations
- 4:30 pm EST/3:30 pm CST Close-out
- 5:00 pm EST/4:00 pm CST Adjourn



## APPENDIX D

### ACRONYM LIST

ANPR	Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
ATV	All-Terrain Vehicle
CE	Categorical Exclusion
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
DNR	Department of Natural Resources
EADM	Environmental Analysis and Decision Making
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ESA	Endangered Species Act
GIS	Geographic Information System
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFF	National Forest Foundation
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
RO	Regional Office
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIR	Supplemental Information Review
SUP	Special Use Permit
USFS	USDA Forest Service
VTC	Videoteleconference
WO	Washington Office

