

## **FY 2012 TEMPLATE ECR Policy Report to OMB-CEQ**

On November 28, 2005, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued a policy memorandum on environmental conflict resolution (ECR).

The memorandum requires annual reporting by departments and agencies to OMB and CEQ on progress made each year. This joint policy statement directs agencies to increase the effective use and their institutional capacity for ECR and collaborative problem solving.

ECR is defined in Section 2 of the memorandum as:

*“third-party assisted conflict resolution and collaborative problem solving in the context of environmental, public lands, or natural resources issues or conflicts, including matters related to energy, transportation, and land use. The term “ECR” encompasses a range of assisted negotiation processes and applications. These processes directly engage affected interests and agency decision makers in conflict resolution and collaborative problem solving. Multi-issue, multi-party environmental disputes or controversies often take place in high conflict and low trust settings, where the assistance of impartial facilitators or mediators can be instrumental to reaching agreement and resolution. Such disputes range broadly from administrative adjudicatory disputes, to civil judicial disputes, policy/rule disputes, intra- and interagency disputes, as well as disputes with non-federal persons/entities. ECR processes can be applied during a policy development or planning process, or in the context of rulemaking, administrative decision making, enforcement, or litigation and can include conflicts between federal, state, local, tribal, public interest organizations, citizens groups and business and industry where a federal agency has ultimate responsibility for decision-making.*

*While ECR refers specifically to collaborative processes aided by third-party neutrals, there is a broad array of partnerships, cooperative arrangements, and unassisted negotiations that federal agencies enter into with non-federal entities to manage and implement agency programs and activities. The Basic Principles for Agency Engagement in Environmental Conflict Resolution and Collaborative Problem Solving presented in Attachment A (of the OMB/CEQ ECR Policy Memo) and this policy apply generally to ECR and collaborative problem solving. This policy recognizes the importance and value of the appropriate use of all types of ADR and collaborative problem solving.”*

The report format below is provided for the seventh year of reporting in accordance with this memo for activities in FY 2012.

The report deadline is February 15, 2013.

We understand that collecting this information may be challenging; however, after compiling previous reports, the departments and agencies are requested to collect this data to the best of their abilities. The 2012 report, along with previous reports, will establish a useful baseline for your department or agency, and collect some information that can be aggregated across agencies. Departments should submit a single report that includes ECR information from the agencies and other entities within the department. The information in your report will become part of an analysis of all FY 2012 ECR reports. You may be contacted for the purpose of clarifying information in your report. For your reference, copies of prior year synthesis reports are available at [www.ecr.gov](http://www.ecr.gov).

Name of Department/Agency responding:	USDA Forest Service
Name and Title/Position of person responding:	Joe Smith/Partnership Coordinator
Division/Office of person responding:	National Partnership Office
Contact information (phone/email):	(P) 202-205-2801 (E) jdsmith03@fs.fed.us
Date this report is being submitted:	February 15, 2013

## Section 1: Capacity and Progress

1. Describe steps taken by your department/agency to build programmatic/institutional capacity for ECR in 2012, including progress made since 2011. If no steps were taken, please indicate why not.

[Please refer to the mechanisms and strategies presented in Section 5 of the OMB-CEQ ECR Policy Memo, including but not restricted to any efforts to a) integrate ECR objectives into agency mission statements, Government Performance and Results Act goals, and strategic planning; b) assure that your agency's infrastructure supports ECR; c) invest in support or programs; and d) focus on accountable performance and achievement. You are encouraged to attach policy statements, plans and other relevant documents.]

The US Forest Service continues to take steps to build programmatic and institutional capacity for ECR and collaboration at the local, regional, and national levels. New key steps taken in FY2012 as well as ongoing efforts extending from previous fiscal years include:

- Finalized the 2012 FS-NFMA Planning Rule to integrate ECR objectives into strategic planning at the National Forest, National Grassland, and agency levels.
- Established interagency agreement with NPS to deliver interactive, dynamic inventory of electronic tools supporting cross-boundary, integrated vegetation management.
- Established partnership agreement with Practitioners' Network for Large Landscape Conservation to support collaborative, community-based conservation nationally.
- Renovation and re-launch of on-line portal incorporating electronic tools and resources for ECR and collaboration, part of the Partnership Resource Center ([www.fs.usda.gov/prc](http://www.fs.usda.gov/prc)).
- Initiated a "business requirements assessment" for three needs: A National Collaboration Atlas, Community of Practice functionality in the Partnership Resource Center, and a new Inventory, Monitoring, and Assessment website. Each of these needs relate to establishing the foundation for multiple Communities of Practice that grow collaborative capacity inside and outside the agency.
- Ongoing development and delivery of peer-learning sessions to improve partnership and collaboration skill sets within the Agency, facilitated through the National Forest Foundation.
- In FY2012, twenty Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR) projects received \$40 million in CFLR funds to accomplish high priority restoration work on National Forest System lands. Ten of these projects have received funding since FY2010, and ten were selected for funding in FY2012 by the Secretary of Agriculture. In addition, the Chief of the Forest Service identified three additional High Priority Restoration Projects to be funded outside of CFLR, but managed similarly. All projects operate through collaborative groups and include partnership efforts on forest restoration treatments that reduce wildfire risk, enhance fish and wildlife habitats, and maintain and improve water quality.

- Established a Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) committee to support collaborative implementation of the 2012 FS-NFMA Planning Rule
- The Forest Service continued to support the inter-agency (FS, BLM, and NPS) distance learning course entitled “Managing by Network.” Through peer-learning sessions, employees are introduced to emerging skill sets for managing public resources in a complex, networked environment—including the use of partnerships, collaboration, volunteers and alliances. The year-long course is offered once each fiscal year, and approximately 100 employees from across the land-management agencies are able to participate.
- Continued implementation of the interagency Creeks and Communities Strategy, aimed at building land managers’ and stakeholders’ capacity to address contentious issues surrounding riparian-wetland resources.
- Continued investment in “Empowering Collaborative Stewardship” effort, which is engaging hundreds of agency employees in the development of critical new resources and strategies for collaborative leadership direction, performance evaluation, policy practice and learning.
- Supported the Secretary's appointments of members to all 118 Secure Rural Schools Act resource advisory committees. To date the committees have recommended nearly 4,400 projects valued at \$172 million in more than 300 counties across the country.
- The national Collaboration Cadre developed multiple versions of a collaboration training curriculum, provided assistance to two national forests and set the stage for working with several others in FY 2013:
  - Three versions of collaboration training to meet agency and field needs;
  - An enhanced capacity for the Francis Marion and Sumter National Forests and the people of the South Carolina Piedmont region to engage in community-based collaboration on a variety of natural resource management issues;
  - New and enhanced stakeholder relationships and partnerships for the El Yunque National Forest in Puerto Rico to assist public involvement and collaboration for their forest plan revision effort; and
  - Organized to conduct collaborative efforts and training to assist several other national forests scheduled to initiate land management plan revisions and large scale collaborative projects.
- An interactive public involvement mapping tool is under development with US Geological Survey and was expected to be ready for piloting in early 2012.
- Initiated a “business requirement analysis” of needs associated with delivering a “National Collaboration Atlas” with dynamic, interactive functionality to help grow and support communities of interest, place, and practice.

*Further examples of such capacity building are included in the Forest Service Summary Data accompanying this report. Tables 6-1 through 6-5 of the Supplement describe actions taken by individual national forest units in response to the November 2005 ECR Policy Memo.*

*Note: The term “ECR” is not used extensively above. It is understood that the term “collaboration” as used above includes the evaluation of the situation to determine if ECR is appropriate or if the use of collaboration without the use of a third party neutral will meet the needs of the situation.*

## Section 2: Challenges

2. Indicate the extent to which each of the items below present challenges or barriers that your department/agency has encountered in advancing the appropriate and effective use of ECR.

	Extent of challenge/barrier		
	Major	Minor	Not a challenge/barrier
	<b>Check <u>only</u> one</b>		
a) Lack of staff expertise to participate in ECR		✓	
b) Lack of staff availability to engage in ECR		✓	
c) Lack of party capacity to engage in ECR		✓	
d) Limited or no funds for facilitators and mediators	✓		
e) Lack of travel costs for your own or other federal agency staff		✓	
f) Lack of travel costs for non-federal parties			✓
g) Reluctance of federal decision makers to support or participate			✓
h) Reluctance of other federal agencies to participate			✓
i) Reluctance of other non-federal parties to participate			✓
j) Contracting barriers/inefficiencies			✓
k) Lack of resources for staff capacity building		✓	
l) Lack of personnel incentives			✓
m) Lack of budget incentives			✓
n) Lack of access to qualified mediators and facilitators			✓
o) Perception of time and resource intensive nature of ECR		✓	
p) Uncertainty about whether to engage in ECR		✓	
q) Uncertainty about the net benefits of ECR			✓
r) Other(s) (please specify): n/a			✓
s) No barriers (please explain): n/a			✓

### Section 3: ECR Use

3. Describe the level of ECR use within your department/agency in FY 2012 by completing the table below. [Please refer to the definition of ECR from the OMB-CEQ memo as presented on page one of this template. An ECR “case or project” is an instance of neutral third party involvement to assist parties in reaching agreement or resolving a dispute for a particular matter. In order not to double count processes, please select one category per case for decision making forums and for ECR applications.]

	Cases or projects in progress <sup>1</sup>	Completed Cases or projects <sup>2</sup>	Total FY 2012 ECR Cases <sup>3</sup>	Decision making forum that was addressing the issues when ECR was initiated:				Of the total FY 2012 ECR cases indicate how many your agency/department	
				Federal agency decision	Administrative proceedings /appeals	Judicial proceedings	Other (specify): ECR initiated before issue was in a formal decision-making forum	Sponsored <sup>4</sup>	Participated in but did not sponsor <sup>5</sup>
<i>Context for ECR Applications:</i>									
Policy development	3	1	4	3	0	0	1	2	2
Planning	31	9	40	34	2	1	3	33	7
Siting and construction	2	2	4	3	0	1	0	1	3
Rulemaking	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
License and permit issuance	9	1	10	10	0	0	0	3	7
Compliance and enforcement action	1	2	3	2	1	0	0	2	1
Implementation/monitoring agreements	14	3	17	16	1	0	0	13	4
Other (specify): n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>24</b>
	(the sum should equal Total FY 2012 ECR Cases)			(the sum of the Decision Making Forums should equal Total FY 2012 ECR Cases)				(the sum should equal Total FY 2012 ECR Cases)	

<sup>1</sup> A “case in progress” is an ECR case in which neutral third party involvement began prior to or during FY 2012 and did not end during FY 2012.

<sup>2</sup> A “completed case” means that neutral third party involvement in a particular matter ended during FY 2012. The end of neutral third party involvement does not necessarily mean that the parties have concluded their collaboration/negotiation/dispute resolution process, that all issues are resolved, or that agreement has been reached.

<sup>3</sup> “Cases in progress” and “completed cases” add up to “Total FY2012 ECR Cases”.

<sup>4</sup> Sponsored - to be a sponsor of an ECR case means that an agency is contributing financial or in-kind resources (e.g., a staff mediator's time) to provide the neutral third party's services for that case. More than one sponsor is possible for a given ECR case.

<sup>5</sup> Participated, but did not sponsor - an agency did not provide resources for the neutral third party's services for a given ECR case, but was either a party to the case or participated in some other significant way (e.g., as a technical expert advising the parties).

4. Is your department/agency using ECR in any of the substantive priority areas you listed in your prior year ECR Reports? Indicate if use has increased in these areas since they were first identified in your ECR report. Please also list any additional priority areas identified by your department/agency during FY 2012, and indicate if ECR is being used in any of these areas. Note: An overview of substantive program areas identified by departments/agencies in FY 2011 can be found in the FY 2011 synthesis report.

List of priority areas identified in your department/agency prior year ECR Reports	Check if using ECR	Check if use has increased in these areas
Grazing Rights	✓	data not available
Forest Plan Revision	✓	data not available
NEPA Planning Process	✓	data not available
Travel Management	✓	data not available
Timber Management	✓	data not available
Forest and Ecosystem Restoration	✓	data not available

*Note that these priority areas were identified in the data collected for the FY12 report. Substantive policy areas had not been identified in FY11 or earlier reports, so data on trends within such identified areas is not available.*

5. It is important to develop ways to demonstrate that ECR is effective and in order for ECR to propagate through the government, we need to be able to point to concrete benefits; consequently, we ask what other methods and measures are you developing in your department/agency to track the use and outcomes (performance and cost savings) of ECR as directed in Section 4 (b) of the ECR memo, which states: *Given possible savings in improved outcomes and reduced costs of administrative appeals and litigation, agency leadership should recognize and support needed upfront investments in collaborative processes and conflict resolution and demonstrate those savings and in performance and accountability measures to maintain a budget neutral environment* and Section 4 (g) which states: *Federal agencies should report at least every year to the Director of OMB and the Chairman of CEQ on their progress in the use of ECR and other collaborative problem solving approaches and on their progress in tracking cost savings and performance outcomes. Agencies are encouraged to work toward systematic collection of relevant information that can be useful in on-going information exchange across departments?* [You are encouraged to attach examples or additional data]

Efforts are underway to improve our ability to demonstrate savings and to improve performance and accountability measures. Separate briefing papers are available upon request. Principle Forest Service efforts are the: National Collaboration Atlas, Geospatial Accomplishment Reporting Project (GARP), Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR), and integration of the Wildlife Fish and Rare Plants (WFRP) database with the Watershed Improvement Tracking (WIT) database.

Each of these efforts will be interconnected. The Atlas will be a cornerstone for the purposes of demonstrating ECR-relevant information. It will display any collaborative effort focused on land managed by the Forest Service or in which the Forest Service has a notable role. That display will use geospatial technology on an internet platform that will allow dynamic filtering of the available information. The filtering will allow someone using the Atlas to display only information of interest and to choose any viewing scale. Information will be “metadata” about each project, including data about relevant accomplishments reported in other Forest Service databases. That metadata will include hyperlinks to local information about each project, as well as to summary accomplishment reports. Examples of those databases include WFRP, WIT, GARP, and CFLR. This is a collaborative approach to tracking accomplishments across staffs within the Forest Service, across other federal agencies and Departments, and with external non-governmental partners where appropriate.

We also are renovating our Partnership Resource Center website and establishing a new website dedicated to Inventory, Monitoring, and Assessment. Each of these websites will improve our ability to demonstrate savings publicly, as well as serving as a platform for sharing information that will improve performance.

Lastly, we have initiated an effort to establish meaningful measures of collaborative efforts and partnerships. The goal is to measure accomplishments and outcomes in ways that contribute to the workflow of a collaborative effort, as opposed to introducing a separate reporting process.

6. Describe other significant efforts your agency has taken in FY 2012 to anticipate, prevent, better manage, or resolve environmental issues and conflicts that do not fit within the Policy Memo's definition of ECR as presented on the first page of this template.

Significant efforts taken in FY12 occurred agency-wide, regionally, and at local levels. Notable agency-wide efforts include work to grow collaborative capacity by expanding training to employees and expanding support to field units. Renovation of the Partnership Resource Center website ([www.fs.usda.gov/prc/](http://www.fs.usda.gov/prc/)) provides a central hub for distributing much of the newly available information and existing resources. This investment will provide a single-point venue or entryway to a wide array of information about collaboration and partnerships, from training to fundraising, from multiparty monitoring to dispute resolution.

Other notable national efforts include the collaborative approach to establishing a new Planning Rule, national support for CFLR and Watershed Restoration projects, and Public-Private-Partnerships. In addition, the Forest Service's State and Private Forestry Deputy Area, with participation from those in other staff areas, plays a key role in the National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy. In it, the federal and non-federal partners highlight the importance of collaborative approaches to address common issues. Each of these efforts provides a forum to anticipate, prevent, and better management environmental issues.

Also, the Forest Service's Research and Development Deputy Area has several research scientists whose work focuses on creating and disseminating greater knowledge and understanding of collaborative efforts and partnerships. Relevant questions include those about community capacity, community vulnerability, and community preferences related to collaborative work and partnerships. Continued investment by each Research Station in "Science Application and Integration" means greater, more widespread availability of the knowledge and understanding developed by these scientists.

Similar to the supportive work contributed by Research and Development, the Forest Service's Business Operations Deputy Area has made significant investment in ECR-related training programs for agency employees. Examples include training in facilitation, collaborative leadership, and coaching. Beginning in FY12, the Forest Service's Collaborative Stewardship initiative began a concerted effort to identify ECR-related training needs, available programs to meet those needs, and gaps between needs and programs. The work focuses on competencies related to collaboration and partnerships, and those competencies underpin the work of ECR.

At Regional and local field-unit levels, significant efforts include CFLR projects, Watershed Restoration projects, and engagement with Landscape Conservation Cooperatives initiated by the Department of Interior. There are many other specific examples as well. Among those are numerous efforts to work collaboratively with Native American governments and members to address shared environmental concerns in a way that fulfills nation-to-nation obligations while using collaborative approaches when appropriate.

## Section 4: Demonstration of ECR Use and Value

- 7 Briefly describe your departments'/agency's most notable achievements or advances in using ECR in this past year.

As with previous years, units contacted while developing this report noted many outstanding achievements in using ECR. Specific examples of notable achievements include the following examples.

- *Daniel Boone National Forest.* The Red River watershed collaboration is composed of federal agencies, members of the public, and user groups. It is facilitated by a state organization focusing on water quality. This group completed a stream clean-up and participated in several river learning walks, focusing on private lands in the northern portion of the watershed. The Red Bird River watershed collaboration, similar in nature, held three river clean-ups in FY12. It also partnered with PRIDE, a state organization promoting environmental ethics to elementary school-aged children, to provide some education on the importance of good water quality and proper disposal of trash. The Red Bird River Collaborative Restoration project evolved out of the Southern Appalachian Restoration initiative started by R8. A collaborative meeting held in Knoxville yielded a focus on the Red Bird River watershed by many of the participants, who expressed concern about the water quality in light of a number of extractive industries prevalent in the area (timber, coal, natural gas). The R8 regional office funded the DBNF to conduct a Watershed Assessment, and DBNF then hired Kentucky Waterways Alliance as the third-party to conduct the assessment.
- *Tongass National Forest.* Currently there are five on-going stream and forest restoration projects which are on the October 1, 2012 SOPA. These projects involve correcting stream channel flow, increasing fish habitat with placement of large woody debris back into the streams, creating pools and riffles to increase salmonid spawning habitat. Forest health involved utilization of needed thinned woods for use in the stream projects. Other forest vegetation projects include thinning old clear-cut units for both wildlife habitat improvement and improved forest health. Movement toward healthy forest restoration is a very big notable achievement that has come about either through direct or indirect involvement in the ECR.
- *Flathead National Forest.* Established an agreement with the Institute of ECR in FY12 to support early work related to starting a Forest Plan revision under the 2012 planning rule, which emphasizes collaboration. The forest determined that using ECR to help strategize a collaboration plan and the use of a neutral facilitator would increase the success of the revision effort. Project consists of: project set-up and internal assessment; selection of an independent facilitator; assessment of key stakeholders and issues; convening of collaborative working group; facilitation and management of collaborative working group; and interagency working group. If we receive additional funds, the second phase of

the agreement - public engagement - would be implemented. This includes e-collaboration, public engagement of the draft forest plan and DEIS, and public engagement during roll out of final forest plan and Final EIS. We did not implement any part of the agreement in FY 2012. What has been implemented occurred in FY13 and will be reported next year.

- *R5 (California) Regional Office.* Sierra Cascades Dialog focuses on bringing a wide range of interests to address long term management opportunities on NFS lands and adjacent ownerships to sustain ecological, social, and economic systems. ECR is funded by the FS R5 RO and integrated through the planning and meeting phases. This is an ongoing project without an established timeline. It meets three times a year with approximately 150 participants.

## 8. ECR Case Example

- a. Using the template below, provide a description of an ECR case (preferably completed in FY 2012). Please limit the length to no more than 2 pages.

### Coronado National Forest ECR Case

Overview of problem/conflict and timeline, including reference to the nature and timing of the third-party assistance, and how the ECR effort was funded

Beginning in February 2012, the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution kicked off a third-party initiative to develop a collaborative public alternative to each District's proposed action for making changes to its motorized transportation system. Looking at the routes in a District's proposed action, a 15-member team comprised of persons representing diverse stakeholders and interests were given an opportunity to work toward consensus on one or more of the following components of each proposed motorized transportation system:

- (1) adding specific unauthorized roads to the National Forest Service (NSF) roads database, thereby, legitimizing their use as part of the District motorized travel system;
- (2) removing specific NFS roads from the NFS roads database (i.e., decommissioning);
- (3) closing or otherwise obliterating unauthorized roads by the use of signing, physical barriers and other methods that deny access for motorized use;
- (4) revising designated uses, seasonal closures, and/or maintenance levels (MLs) assigned to NFS roads (e.g., from "open to the public" to "administrative use only");
- (5) Adding or converting roads to motorized or non-motorized trails; and/or
- (6) Designating roads or removing corridors where motorized travel will be allowed within a set distance of certain designated routes for the sole purpose of dispersed camping.

The effort was concluded in August 2012 for 4 Districts and October 2012 for the remaining District. Funding was provided from an allocation to the travel management process using an engineering staff job code.

Summary of how the problem or conflict was addressed using ECR, including details of any innovative approaches to ECR, and how the principles for engagement in ECR were used (See Appendix A of the Policy Memo, attached)

How principles for engagement were used:

1. Informed commitment: The Forest Supervisor addressed a group of individuals with diverse interests before the collaborative process was initiated to personally commit to himself and all Forest staff to the process.
2. Balanced representation: Participation in the process was strictly voluntary, and Forest staff encouraged diametrically opposed stakeholders to engage in the dialogue as members of a "collaborative alternative (development) team" (CAT).
3. Group autonomy: After members of the CAT and alternatives were designated, a charter was developed to define rules and expectation. Oversight of the group was transferred to the neutral facilitator (U.S. Institute), who managed meetings and workshops of the CAT, reviewed work products/deliverables, and kept the effort on

schedule.

4. **Informed process:** Throughout the CAT effort, the Institute guided participants, interpreted rules and decisions to be made, and ensured that relevant information was provided to the team by Forest staff.
5. **Accountability:** The CAT was advised at the outset that their facilitated negotiation and consensus would produce an alternative action that would be considered equally with the other alternatives by the Forest Supervisor as part of decision-making. Therefore, to have their interests represented, each member was accountable for his or her participation.
6. **Openness:** A schedule of meetings and a definition of steps in the collaborative process were shared with the CAT at the onset of the effort. Forest staff were available throughout the effort to answer questions and provide guidance through the Institute.
7. **Timeliness:** With the exception that some of the CAT meetings were rescheduled to accommodate members, the process was completed on time.
8. **Implementation:** The NEPA reviews for each District are still in progress. At the closeout meeting for all Districts, the Forest Supervisor reiterated that the CAT alternative would receive equal consideration for implementation with the other alternatives analyzed in the NEPA review.

Identify the key beneficial outcomes of this case, including references to likely alternative decision making forums and how the outcomes differed as a result of ECR

The CAT process benefited the forest by bestowing ownership of a NEPA alternative to the group. This alternative solely accommodates and reflects, to the extent practicable, the mutual interests among the parties. The CAT alternative is expected to be more well-received by the public than an alternative developed solely by the Forest Service in response to issues and concerns raised by the public during the scoping of the NEPA review.

Reflections on the lessons learned from the use of ECR

It is expensive to engage in ECR. After our NEPA documents are released for public review, we will be able to measure the value-added to the NEPA review process.

- b. Section I of the ECR Policy identifies key governance challenges faced by departments/agencies while working to accomplish national environmental protection and management goals. Consider your departments'/agency's ECR case, and indicate if it represents an example of where ECR was or is being used to avoid or minimize the occurrence of the following:

	Check <u>all</u> that apply	Check if	
		Not Applicable	Don't Know
Protracted and costly environmental litigation;	✓		
Unnecessarily lengthy project and resource planning processes;	✓		
Costly delays in implementing needed environmental protection measures;	✓		
Foregone public and private investments when decisions are not timely or are appealed;	✓		
Lower quality outcomes and lost opportunities when environmental plans and decisions are not informed by all available information and perspectives; and	✓		
Deep-seated antagonism and hostility repeatedly reinforced between stakeholders by unattended conflicts.	✓		

9. Please comment on any difficulties you encountered in collecting these data and if and how you overcame them. Please provide suggestions for improving these questions in the future.

Difficulties in collecting, assimilating, and synthesizing data were minimal. For the third year in a row, 100% of Forest Service units responded to the online survey utilized to collect the necessary data for this report. The use of that online survey, combined with clear points of contact at the Washington Office, identification of regional ECR survey managers, and a central field coordinator, has led to improved information gathering and a report that likely has greater validity and reliability than could otherwise be provided.

***Please attach any additional information as warranted.***

Report due February 15, 2013.

Submit report electronically to: [ECRReports@omb.eop.gov](mailto:ECRReports@omb.eop.gov)

Attached A. Basic Principles for Agency Engagement in Environmental Conflict Resolution and Collaborative Problem Solving

**Basic Principles for Agency Engagement in Environmental Conflict Resolution and Collaborative Problem Solving**

<b>Informed Commitment</b>	Confirm willingness and availability of appropriate agency leadership and staff at all levels to commit to principles of engagement; ensure commitment to participate in good faith with open mindset to new perspectives
<b>Balanced, Voluntary Representation</b>	Ensure balanced inclusion of affected/concerned interests; all parties should be willing and able to participate and select their own representatives
<b>Group Autonomy</b>	Engage with all participants in developing and governing process; including choice of consensus-based decision rules; seek assistance as needed from impartial facilitator/mediator selected by and accountable to all parties
<b>Informed Process</b>	Seek agreement on how to share, test and apply relevant information (scientific, cultural, technical, etc.) among participants; ensure relevant information is accessible and understandable by all participants
<b>Accountability</b>	Participate in the process directly, fully, and in good faith; be accountable to all participants, as well as agency representatives and the public
<b>Openness</b>	Ensure all participants and public are fully informed in a timely manner of the purpose and objectives of process; communicate agency authorities, requirements and constraints; uphold confidentiality rules and agreements as required for particular proceedings
<b>Timeliness</b>	Ensure timely decisions and outcomes
<b>Implementation</b>	Ensure decisions are implementable consistent with federal law and policy; parties should commit to identify roles and responsibilities necessary to implement agreement; parties should agree in advance on the consequences of a party being unable to provide necessary resources or implement agreement; ensure parties will take steps to implement and obtain resources necessary to agreement