**Breakout Session 1: WORLD FORCES**

**Day 2 - Tues, Feb 2, 2021**

**Breakout Group Composition:** Breakout Mix A (Groups 1A – 10A)

**COMPILATION**

| **Group 1A** | **Budget Changes** |
| --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Wendy Jo Haskins**  |
| **World Force description: Forest Service Budget**Allocation by Congress-remains flat now and into the foreseeable futureHigh emphasis on fireIs needed to accomplish the mission and program of work |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| New budget system-first year-learning year | **x** |  |  |
| Next year correct course; year three established budget system |  | **x** |  |
| Shifts in allocations based on political priorities  | **x** |  |  |
| Less discretion at the unit level and more at the Regional level | **x** |  |  |
| Budgets remain flat – how to cut up the pie | **x** |  |  |
| Release of climate funds  |  |  | **x** |
| Effects on hiring i.e. TOS, S&E, etc. | **x** |  |  |
| Employee anxiety  |  | **x** |  |
| **Associated Risks/Threats:*** Individual programs may not have what is needed to achieve their individual priorities
* Lost flexibility in how we could utilize allocations i.e. S&E vs. Discretionary and the ability to adjust through the year
* Had more flexibility on how many can hire (staff up) vs. contracting, etc.
* Still not enough to accomplish all the work
* Partnership at risk due to prioritization of discretionary amounts
* Incident response incentive
* Loose unit autonomy for program of work
* Difficult to establish a workforce plan, and one that provides for flexibility
* May lead to lack employee retention due to lack of work incentive
* Employee anxiety about the change and ability to adjust and make it work
* Program of work vs. budget and the ability to stay the course and accomplish all the priorities across the board
* Going to have to focus on what can be done with the budget given
* How to still meet the needs of all the multi aspects of the Forest Service
* More scrutiny at a higher level
* Lack of understanding of the Forest Service total picture and all the aspects; land management mission is compromised
* Moral
* To make sure and not turn into the Fire Service and all the other aspects become irrelevant
 |
| **Associated Opportunities:*** Recent release of climate funds may provide more (at least a little)
* New approaches to how to spend the money more efficiently, coordinated, and effectively, unit collaboratively
* Incentivizes a more regional approach in program of work
* Consideration of utilizing new technologies which leads to budget savings & budget shifts
* Consider employee input on how to make the change be effective, engagement, new ideas
* Consider process to effectively create a program of work that balances with budget not driven by it
* Ability to have a true accounting of the overhead and employee cost
* Overtime this will become the norm and perhaps be able to be prepared and executed more smoothly
* Present what is unique about the Forest Service, it’s contribution to society, and what the Forest Service provides in total and perhaps what the focus (big picture is can could be)
* Ability with the public to make them aware of what the Forest Service unique contribution and become advocates and contribute
 |

| **Group 2A** | **Climate Change** |
| --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Debbie Cress: Jennifer; Tom; Kim; Kurt** |
| **World Force description: *Changes in the earth’s climate are being brought about by many factors. Human activities contribute to climate change. There are environmental, economic, and health consequences associated with climate change as a result of unpredictable weather, increased temperatures, longer fire season, shorter winter season.***  |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| *Longer fire season, shorter winter season* | **XX** |  |  |
| *\*Increased water consumption, demand for water- water needed for agriculture is needed by cities, communities, industry (water demand, water availability dominating R3 world forces)\** | **XX** |  |  |
| *Animals adapting to change- bird migration is altered* |  | **X** |  |
| *Drought effects are increasing, impacts to grazing programs are significant, also community socioeconomics* | **X** |  |  |
| *Not an accepted sociopolitical theme for solutions- a centralized approach by political parties at all levels (municipal, state, federal, global). Resources become dependent on political viewpoints.* | **X** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *More frequent, intense fires- grasslands converting to different vegetation, species moving up in elevation, species dying out,impacting livestock grazing; more intense effects noticed in systems that are not fire-adapted such as Sonoran desert; post-fire flooding reduces watershed health* | **X** |  |  |
| *Increase in hurricanes frequency, severity and flooding in coastal areas* |  |  | **X** |
| **Associated Risks/Threats: (what are we monitoring)***\*Continued growth through populations, mining, industry will continue to impact water systems, spreading across states and state lines**\*Threatened wildlife populations through reduced resources (water) will lead to increased workload around threatened and endangered species.**\*Livelihood of people and communities will be threatened by reduced natural resources**\*Economic cost to society as competition for resources grows and available resources shrink**\*Reduction of food supply, food sources both for humans and wildlife (difficulty meeting USDA guidance for feeding communities)**\*Air quality will become unhealthier (increased smoke from wildfire, increasing temperatures and storm events requiring fossil fuel support; loss of vegetation leads to rising CO2 levels). Shifting wind patterns are reducing events which clear out pollution in class 1 airsheds of R3 and leading to stagnant air (could impact prescribed fire use).**\*True costs for operating will be going up across all aspects of forest management- supplemental efforts to operations such as livestock grazing will increase unless these activities are reduced.**\*Impacts to resource-dependent recreation such as ski areas as snowpacks reduce, temperatures warm; shifting recreation habits and patterns will emerge as temperatures warm and water sources diminish.**\*Opportunities to address risks are not cheap! Legal involvement, pushback from industry (mining, grazing), agency resources to work through agreements, permits, etc.* *\*Our agency systems, authorities, and policies are not nimble enough to respond quickly when opportunities present themselves for effecting change. Implementing new authorities is difficult. Capacity is a driving force in this risk.**\*Agency technology for effective communication is cumbersome. If this was improved, we could reach more people more effectively for messaging opportunities and needs around climate change.* |
|  |

| **3A** |  **FS Culture** |
| --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Steve Hattenbach/Rita Skinner** |
| **World Force description:** FS Culture: Slow to adapt to change due to our strong military organizational structure, can do work ethic, tradition, and aversion to adopting new technology. |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| (trend) Military structure -governance results in certain behaviors:* (looking up line for direction). Line vs others. Big D and little d – but (in general) folks are afraid to make little d without checking with line. Some line (especially new) want all decisions to go through them, including little d. Lack of empowerment.
* Don’t give up decision space (works against shared decision making and partnering)
* Communication hierarchy – there are still many situations where you must follow the chain of command. Makes sense in situations like fire but hamstrings regular communication.
 | **X** |  |  |
| (trend) Fix – it mode, muscle memory. | **X** |  |  |
| (trend, evolving with new employees) Rooted in “this is how we do it” – long history of managing this way, not always successful |  | **X** |  |
| (trend) Work ethic – strong, too much work, too little capacity (all the basement stuff) – we compensate by “donating time” just to get it all done. We are a go-to agency for Shuttle recovery, hurricanes (why do we take these and other things on?). We don’t want to miss out on opportunities – we like shiny objects to chase. “I can help” mentality | **X** |  |  |
| (events, evolving) Flexibility to do the things we are interested in – R3s 3Rs provided focus but left out things we like to do – so we kept doing what we like to do. * Lack of accountability allows folks to still do what they want. We make people take training, outline performance, identify priorities. But are we held accountable?
 |  | **X** |  |
| (event, evolving) Recognition (entitlement) – new generations desire more recognition and expect quick moves up the ranks, promotions, etc. causes a rift.  |  |  | **X** |
| (event) Inclusiveness – we evaluate based on numbers. Creates a culture that allows some small groups to be more vocal. * Ex: Smoke Jumpers - We don’t take a hard evaluation of small programs because they are vocal and we don’t want to exclude them.
* PMFs – small group with big voice that doesn’t represent workforce.
* Many (regardless of race/sex) worked their way up the ranks, but sometimes we overlook that fact and apply to just certain groups.
* Are we creating a missing middle where some don’t feel they can share their experiences.
 | **X** |  |  |
| (event) Emerging Cultural Issue: Wildland fire – big voice. A rift is building and there is some belief that they should be a separate agency (fire service) – not be forestry technician. It used to be everyone (resource specialists) did fire, now mostly just those that are in the fire org generally do fire. Separation of disciplines and less reciprocity/cross pollination between fire and resource management. |  |  | **X** |
| (trend) Technology – people who like to be in the woods and don’t like technology. In a changing world that relies on technology, we have folks being left behind and it impacts efficiency. * Ex: drones – monitor range exclosure with a drone vs someone riding out to check.
* Look-out tower staff (vs drone and cameras), Smoke Jumpers (vs drones, flights). Transition can be difficult for folks.
 |  |  | **X** |
| (trend) Changing administrations – we have a culture of “riding the fence”. * We never drift too far from the middle so we can respond to the next swing without too much effort. Does this prevent us from truly aligning with our mission?
* Are we taking a hard look at what we should be doing to care the land, serve people? Ex: grazing. We see negative impacts and we remove cattle, but if permittees call their rep – we get wishy-washy.
 |  | **X** |  |
| (events) Social unrest, political polarization (overlaid with pandemic) – how does FS culture support and not divide?  |  |  |  |
| Leadership culture of “visioning” not implementing. Field culture of implementing. Thus disconnect between field and leadership.  |  |  |  |
| **Associated Risks/Threats:**Risk - focus on inclusion for some groups is creating a new missing middleRisk – holding our decision space can turn away partners, new ideasRisk – riding the fence, not drifting from the middle, can prevent us from hard decisions regarding our mission.Risk – can do, not linking technology, working on our own time to do everything – catastrophic failure, people will crumble. Work/life balance not achieved. Risk – can do and not holding folks accountable (to priority work), results in us taking on work outside our mission.Risk – not holding people accountable (performance based), undermines morale |
| **Associated Opportunities: (not something to do)**Embrace technology (such as drones) to streamline work Evaluate how we approach inclusivity work to allow all voices (vs creating a new missing middle of folks afraid to speak) Bridge gap between field and leadership (at various levels)Develop leaders that share decision making (internal and external) and empower employees. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4A** | **View & Role of Gov’t** |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Treva Slaughter**  |
| **World Force description: (4A) View and Role of Government** |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| Internet Age/Social Media Changing perception of Roles and Responsibilities: technology provides individuals with a voice to broader audiences providing opportunity for changed views of Government’s role in society | **X** |  |  |
| World Views are Reshaping the Role of Government and the role of government is reshaping world views | **X** |  |  |
| Increased awareness of the benefits and importance of Public Lands; recreationists, Nations, traditional communities, specialists, industry all have an individual connection to public lands and want buy in on how those lands are managed | **X** |  |  |
| **Associated Risks/Threats:**Managing Expectations for Real-time Participation while meeting various demands on timelinesPairing the Role of Convener/Synthesizer with Legal Decision-making authoritiesAgency No Longer Viewed as the Sole Expert on Issues How do we message our role and engagement to Internal/External Audiences How to Engage Stakeholders, Partners, and the Public to meet the goals of Shared StewardshipDynamic tension over Shared Stewardship: Increased role of partners/public in land management. The culture of government serving as expert leaders/conveners but lettingAgency shifting to serving as Facilitators for tho  |
| **Associated Opportunities:**Shared stewardship broadens opportunities to engage partners/stakeholders/tribes/public in land managementPower of representation; when individuals see their thoughts represented there is increased desire to engageIncreased diversity of thought provides more solutions to issuesIncreased public buy-in for Agency missionImproved trust and improved resiliency (internal and external)Trust and improving our relationships and having partners and nations more involved in decision making |

| **5A** | **Pandemic** |
| --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Erin Swiader (5A)** |
| **World Force description:** Global Pandemic, worldwide spread of COVID-19. |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** **(all are high)** |
| We are in a global pandemic. People are dying. This has affected everyone. Economic: Financial struggles. Businesses are closing. People are losing their homes. Loss of jobs. Lack of technological and physical infrastructure to support new working and living conditions/paradigm.Lifestyle/Family:Limitations and/or loss of social connections. Increase in other types of social interactions. Changed lifestyles, changed work style/environment. Movement from cities. Baby boom? Reduction in opportunities and options for recreation. Unprecedented, massive concentration of public use on public lands. Children are not in school. Parents are having to school children. Trend is that almost everyone is working from home. Health/Safety:Overloaded health care system. Limited vaccine supply. Inconsistencies in vaccine rollout/distribution. Inconsistencies in direction. Rapidly evolving science. Lack of trust and speculation from public. Increase in depression, mental health issues, suicides, domestic violence and divorces. Higher risk of exposure for essential workers. Loss of capacity in supply chain/systems (from TP to vaccines). Unsafe working conditions, greater exposure to public and contaminated surfaces. Potential for increased violent encounters. Social-political:Social-political response to pandemic has caused great division amongst all levels of society. Social unrest and racial injustice movement. Disproportionate impact on indigenous and highly vulnerable communities.  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| **Associated Risks/Threats:**1. Impact on mission delivery/public services
2. Increased recreation use: facilities, land/natural resource impacts, environmental hazards
3. Supply chain: timber
4. Tribal relationships
5. Interagency partners and public (federal/state/local/NGOs/etc.)
6. Mental and physical well-being
7. Work
8. Family needs
9. Personal: Destructive behavior, external factors affecting mental health and safety

3. Work environment:1. Productivity impacts? distractions, work not getting done
2. Work prioritization/what is not going to get done?
3. Technology/tools
 |
| **Associated Opportunities:**1. Leverage new public users to encourage and increase engagement conservation stewards.
2. Leverage additional and appropriate funding.
3. Explore new ways/platforms to engage with tribes and partners. New ways of doing business.
4. Give employees flexibility/working when/where they can.
5. Shifting/narrowing of regional priorities. Refocus POW.
6. New ways of working with interagency partners and collaborative efforts.
7. Explore/investigate the physical footprint to virtual options
 |

| **6A** | **Politics** |
| --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Heather Provenico** |
| **World Force description: POLITICS** |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| Wide swing in USDA Agendas: shift from compliance to conservation; outputs to outcomes; emphasis on climate change | X |  |  |
| Racial equity focus |  | X |  |
| Extremism: community / employee alignment with disparate beliefs | X |  |  |
| Greater acceptance for telework |  | X |  |
| Shift from extractive uses to preservation: increase in environmental activism | X |  |  |
| Gap between “haves” & “have nots” widening pressure for economic opportunity on public lands | X |  |  |
| Greater push for pandemic safety measures  |  |  | X |
| **Associated Risks/Threats:** **Climate change:** push to convert fleet to electric ($/time); sequester carbon(shift from Rx/ccf)**Racial equity:** open dialogue leads to expression of extreme beliefs that are counter to Agency goals; further divide employees who believe differently.**Extremism**: Just culture/dialogue-based approach may highlight divisions/radical ideas that are counter to Agency goals; personal agendas vs science/law/regs-based approach to decisions; employees will only promote/work on projects they agree with; threats to employee physical and emotional safety.**Telework**: is it safe to shift back to office during the pandemic (schools are)**Environmental Activism**: demoralizing for employees to have their professional integrity questioned; litigation; response to complaints is a time sink. **Use of NF for economic opportunity:** insufficient staffing to respond to special use requests and special initiatives.**Pandemic Safety Measures:** confusion on how to respond to more restrictive use of PPE on fed lands/facilities;uncomfortable to wear mask 24/7; will folks in shared employee housing have to wear masks 24/7? |
| **Telework – that’s political. Think change in that. Last sec said have to be in person****Les extractive more conservation. Increased env activism****Economic gap with public – widening of that gap. Think it will put pressure for opportunity on public lands****Oandemic- see big shift in how we’re asked to operate in pandemic under new admin** |
| **Associated Opportunities:**Overall: because USFS does not have political appointees (we are public servants), we fare shifts in administration more easily; regardless of administration, we do what’s right for the land.**Climate change:** shift to electric fleet and more telework reduces our carbon footprint; facility/utility cost reduction; restoration work more holistic (not just about timber).**Racial equity:** anchor to/emphasize our TiWWA code and commitments and values; anchor to our cultural history in R3 and how land has been used through history; **Extremism**: anchor to/emphasize our TiWWA code and commitments and values; anchor to laws/regs/science; teach employees how to respond to public complaint; share our stories of success from projects. **Telework**: cost savings; efficiencies; improvements in use of tech; reduces carbon footprint; reduce cost of maintaining/using facilities; **Environmental Activism**: tell our success stories; anchor to science/law/regs/policy **Use of NF for economic opportunity:** reinvigorate national initiatives like CCC/WPA. That work will help address deferred maintenance issues and other neglected services on public lands.**Pandemic Safety Measures:** communicate early and provide PPE; deal with the issue before we transition out to relieve employee anxiety; clarify intent of changed policies and operationalize. |

**Prescribed fires could take a different role if a focus on climate change.**

**Restoration work become more holistic under climate change**

**Racial equity- can lead to expression of extreme beliefs and divide employees who believe differently. Opportunity to anchor to and emphasize TIWWA. Anchor to our cultural history, how we and different cultures used this land in history**

**Extremism – dialog based approached. Counter to agency goals and values. Threats to employees by public, other employees. Think about that. Opportunity – anchor to code, commitment, values.**

**Telework – risk –**

**Admin change – usually doesn’t change mission work. Capacity work is what will change. Not outward mission work that is going to eat our time**

| **7A** | **Public Perception** |
| --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Nancy Brunswick** |
| **World Force description: FS largely unknown to general public, except wildfire suppression; specific “users” expectations conflict; emerging demand for access.**  |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| Confusion – the public doesn’t always know who we are, know how to get information. | **X** |  |  |
| Public does not recognize the distinction between various land management agencies.  |  | **X** |  |
| Covid and substantial increased recreation use. People have discovered National Forest Lands, and have made an investment in time and equipment to enjoy FS lands.  | **X**  |  |  |
| Public does not understand wildfire management and suppression. Shouldn’t have to put a closure order when there is fire, don’t recognize the risks.  | **X** |  |  |
| In R6 the FS is a timber resource. In R5, recreation is FS. In R3 range is FS. Does the public understand the mission and activities of the agencies?  | **X** |  |  |
| Do we know who we are? Are we choosing we want to be, or do we let the public define us? Do we attempt to be everything to everyone?  | **X** |  |  |
| If you want to make a career in fire, go to R3 or R5. (Finding Niche)  | **X** |  |  |
| We have an identity crisis internally. We don’t know who we are. Challenges of multiple use.  |  |  |  |
| Emphasis on partners, keep saying yes to respond to partners requests. Many different requests with different outcomes. Overwhelms the agency. Lack of clarity. Constantly changing hats.  |  |  |  |
| As an agency we have to do it all, but we don’t have to be it all. We are not a timber region. What is our niche? What makes us unique?  |  |  |  |
| Ecological restoration agency. How do articulate that?  |  |  |  |
| For most people, the relationship is with the Forest landscape, not the agency. Recreation and fire suppression are most important for most people.  |  |  |  |
| Do we have to be involved with everything? We develop our programs of work to try and do it all. Expectations for employees is that we have do it all.  |  |  |  |
| External trends are beyond the agency. Influx of people as a result of the pandemic. We have new users to national forest systems. Outside influence of horses that people want to protect. Are we missing an opportunity to explain who we are and what we do.  |  |  |  |
| 20 range permittees compared to 400 people at a trailhead at one time. Pandemic is driving a new user group, we are not communicating with this group and taking advantage of their relationship with the National Forest. Missing income or support.  |  |  |  |
| Not effective at communicating with the public.  |  |  |  |
| How do we as an agency figure out who we are?  |  |  |  |
| Do new employees know who we are?  |  |  |  |
| So what? Does it matter if people realize that they are on national forest lands and that the Forest Service is managing those lands. People want to go to Yellowstone and the experience of Yellowstone, they don’t care who is managing.  |  |  |  |
| Enforcement side of our agency can be confusing.  |  |  |  |
| We are a can do agency, and that drains us.  |  |  |  |
| **Associated Risks/Threats:****Internal*** **Retention and recruitment of employees can become a problem**
* **Budgets are reduced**
* **Stressed out work force**

**External** * **We need to remain relevant so that the public values their public lands and the public choice could be to sell off the public lands.**
* **Long term sustained resource damage and we don’t have the knowledgeable, experienced work force to take care of it.**
* **If we don’t have a clear understanding of our niche, we don’t contribute to the right jobs.**
* **Reduction in staff has resulted in less exposure to employees, and fewer people to communicate.**
 |
| **Associated Opportunities:*** Partner differently with local communities.
* How do we support the community locally?
* Explore public perception.
	+ Develop a better understanding.
	+ Are we doing the right work?
	+ Work together with the public to identify the best scope of work.
	+ Are we getting the right funding for the right work? For example, if a Forest is primarily recreation, does it make sense to receive timber funds?
* Identify better ways to communicate with are various users.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8A** | **Socio-economic Shifts** |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Bill Sapp** |
| **World Force description: Socio-economic shifts; Rural-Urban split in the nation and the SW; various constituent populations see opportunities to sustain life differently. Between the Rural and Urban there is a different land ethic (recreation vs. work/subsistence); influence politics. Disposable income in Urban world is greater than the Rural world. A dynamic tension exists, but there is a trend to a urban ethos. There are different but overlapping splits that drive expectations: Rural-Urban split/ political split/ land ethic split**  |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| Rural communities are struggling economically; partnerships are more difficult to develop and maintain and sustain | **X** |  |  |
| Centralization (modernization) of agency functions leaves rural areas lacking in a FS presence, relationships are more challenging to develop |  | **X** |  |
| Rural-Urban split is often ideological and political, different expectations from different constituencies  | **X** |  |  |
| Traditional, adjacent land-owning communities, Native American, land grant, and acequia communities, have different outlooks on growth and, future development. Expectations are often quite different; opposition of Tribal communities to development that provides recreation opportunities to outside communities.  | **X** |  |  |
| Different uses by different constituencies are based on different land ethics tied to how they define basic needs | **X** |  |  |
| Fear of the other. |  | **X** |  |
| 1. Increasing use by different constituencies with different land use ethics, driven by the pandemicthat is expected to continue.
2. Shifting political winds (who is in power and what do they want) overlap with this category.
 | **X** |  |  |
| **Associated Risks/Threats**: more difficult to attract residents to rural communities that don’t offer a wide range of goods and services; potential for conflict between groups with competing interests hasn’t been greater in a long time. Managing expectations of conflicting interests. Managing different expectations in shifting political environments.  |
| **Associated Opportunities:** engagement with local communities; education; finding areas of common understanding; demonstration of compassion and empathy with all constituencies. Educating people on how to relate to the land, including climate change, given increasing use from the pandemic. Develop better understanding of our different constituencies.  |

| **9A** | **Technology** |
| --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Ian Fox** |
| **World Force description: Technology: Agency is currently unable to adapt to the speed of change to realize the level of efficiency we need to accomplish our mission and meet the demands of the public and attract world class talent.** |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| **Communication is digital, can’t do our jobs without it, without it our job would be more difficult based on the amount of information exchanges** | **X** |  |  |
| Published Info is doubled every 18 months, reduces our and the public’s focus and just based on the amount of info we are inundated with  |  | **X** |  |
| **without strong internet connectivity in rural areas we cannot use updated technology and systems to gain efficiencies for our day to day jobs with shrinking workforce (infrastructure is degrading across the US)** | **X** |  |  |
| Public expectation to have our services online such as buying and accessing permits.  |  | **X** |  |
| Public expects quick access to info and responses in certain formats that are visually appealing and well put together | **X** |  |  |
| Hiring processes/technology do not always give us access to the candidates that have the skills and training to assist moving the FS into using new technology | **X** |  |  |
| Many of our comms policies are pre-internet and this impacts new employees that are used to using digital technology for information sharing. Essentially an analog vs digital conflict |  | **X** |  |
| Policies and regulations that prevent us from purchasing new and useful technology such as drones. | **X** |  |  |
| **People – retirements and reduction in capacity, technology could help this transition; expectation is to do more with less, technology is the only way to overcome** | **X** |  |  |
| **Support functions – the type of people needed? Being elevated at the highest level but not in FS. Need more IT experience so that we can adopt technology faster and more appropriately**  |  | **X** |  |
| **Getting access to the scale of technology needed to conduct multiple-use resource management-**  | **X** |  |  |
| **Associated Risks/Threats:*** **Fail to provide the public and each other the expected customer service associated with the technology everyone uses outside of FS platforms**
* **Continued loss of trust from the public and we will become “under a microscope” as we try rebuilding trust**
* **Reduced employee morale and retention**
* **Fail to realize the true efficiencies that technology would deliver and provide for**
 |
| **Associated Opportunities:*** Update policies
* Assist reducing communication virga associated with tension of decentralized and centralized organization
* Improved communication and trust with the public
* Adapt quickly to technology changes to enable the FS to maintain being the premiere conservation organization in the world
* Quickly jump on trends to maximize efficiencies, such as Rec with increase use and impacts. We can educate on how to recreate sustainable
* Reduce the need for capacity with the proper use of technology, increased employee morale and reduce workload
 |

| **10A** | **Wildland Fire vs Land Management Org** |
| --- | --- |
| **FINDINGS TEMPLATE: World Forces** | **Process Person: Travis Moseley (Note taker and report out Neil Bosworth)** |
| **World Force description: Effects of multiple use mission by increase in wildfire. Firefighting organizational needs and costs are increasing every year which has an impact on other resources along with large structural changes within the firefighting workforce as a whole.** |
| **Events/Trends (list with brief explanation)** | **Impact on the Region** |
|  | **Hi** | **Med** | **Lo** |
| Fires are longer, hotter, and more frequent | **X** |  |  |
| Funds are being diverted from other resources to fire suppression |  |  |  |
| Fire season length is growing |  |  |  |
| Firefighters are getting more and more hours every year |  |  |  |
| Supporting resources are overtaxed and fatigued (Leadership, HR, PPS, etc) |  |  |  |
| Public and political scrutiny is increasing every year |  |  |  |
| We are unable to keep up with the increase in biomass across the NFS |  |  |  |
| Inability to describe the program internally and externally |  |  |  |
|  |
| **Associated Opportunities:**Lessons learned from COVID – less spread of illness, larger opportunity for to connect with large audience leading to increased transparency, reduced travel risk.Have a political and public audience to support needed changes.Opportunity to leverage the capacity of the workforce with better use of manpower tools.Increased ability to change funding mechanisms…blur the definitions of different fires…no longer prescribed vs wildfire. Just fire. Increase budget flexibility to accomplish work. There is a desire to have budget black and white…less discretionBlur the lines of natural vs human caused fire regarding objectives, management actions, and accomplishments.  |
|  |

**Whole Group Discussion:**

Driving us toward an organization within the organization. It’s happening to us. Are we taking advantage of intentionality of that? As fire grows bigger, grows bigger shareholder of company.

Culture group – talked about all of these things in that lens. FS culture – keep us on walk the fence with administration change. FS technology. Saw lots of culture infused into these groups. Some groups had narrow focus, some very high level. What we select needs more finessing and defining terms. Shared leadership, shared stewardship, shared decision making, In comments drawing distinction. Need to have common definitions.

Do we see shared agreements about what we see as significant? But we won’t move forward without defining terms. Will all be on same page.

Heather – I feel comfortable with climate change. Well positioned. Spotlight on it right now. Feels doable. Very mission related. Capacity stuff brought up – makes her nervous Feels undoable. How does it fits into our strategic plan?

Rebecca clarification – Regions capacity or capacity as world forces. Heather – both. Budget is a world force. Expenses, inflation. Means doing more with less. Less $ to invest in technology. Suggest you go back and reread world force example. Talks about capacity forces. Help you frame things that aren’t definitive a little better. Framing how we talk about it.

Dale – Suggests global environmental change instead of climate change

Adam - Lumpers vs splitters – how do we tease this out since they are so interrelated? How far do we go with that?

Rebecca – only chose 5-6 or too much. We will combine. We want to get high enough up to frame the force instead of talking about specifics. If we can see where the convergence is, so we know where we want to head and explore.

Sandy – captured lots of connections. We need to think about Do we put culture component in each one?

Anyone have interest, drawn to these to help tease out the wording? Dale Deiter; Wendy Jo Haskins; Adam Mendonca; Shayne

Wendy Jo question – what circumstance define context the org exists. Feels forces are broad and missed point of why FS exists. Public lands, how we serve communities, not in there. How does that fit together?

Rebecca – more mission and vision. We go there tomorrow and Thurs.

Elaine – picking words or forces that really drive us that we don’t control is pertinent to our employees. Framing it around 3-5 forces that help are employees that cause them concern is going to be helpful

Public perception matters. We have a separate fire budget because Congress. Pub perception is key to who we are in all these aspects. Political, budget (can’t lobby on budget)

Public perception weaved through all. Telling our story helps our public perception. Take the time to tell our story, like the Bin Laden compound built on our land for training special forces

Public perception can be weaved in, not own force.

Neil – how do we get that word out? It does go through all the forces but I think it’s important enough to highlight on its own. Climate change – effects a lot of these. Thinks it too big. Need to focus on lack of water availability, not as big as climate change. IT’s too big. Lose self in it.

Wendy Jo- public perc – role to tell public value of public lands. Maybe rolls into culture? But it is at the core of everything and it really came out during COVID-19, how important public lands are for citizens. Expressing our value is so important at core.

Ian – one of top 3 was fs culture. Reflecting on TIWWA – thinks its great. If we spend more time in the present doing it, living and knowing that, how will that change/influence public perception, employees to be more resilient to world force things. Having our culture/unity/identity, it is a foundational piece. Can’t change other but can change self, type of thing

Dale – as we pare down to 5, the other forces will get folded into final set. Shooting for achievable desired conditions or desired conditions. Two different things and have different impacts. Laws, like ESA, aren’t going to be agile enough to react to species conservation. Need to build capacity to work through that more efficiently. Become actionable at our level. Don’t rearrange deck chairs on titanic. Need common vernacular. Sees public perception something we focus on than a world force.

Shayne, pick impactful, simple messages and stories. There’s so much noise in the system so people can’t figure out who we are.