**May 2021 RLT: Strategic Planning**

**Breakout #1: Org Prin & Focus Areas/Goals**

**COMPLIATION (7 Grps)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Findings Template: Organizing Principle/Focus Area Goal Statements** | | **Note taker:** Wendy Jo (Grp1) | |
| **Group Names:** Kerwin,James D., Michiko, Steve H., Chris G. | |
| **EXAMPLE 1: Outcomes of what we do** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| All three work but this one is broad enough and works well and resonates and covers a broad perspective.  Broad enough to hit a lot of our work; can see the 3Rs; familiar and fits our work including partners and aligns.  Leaving the flexibility is good  Resonates without current frame. Easier to communicate. More consistent with current frame. More aligned with outcomes and end state.  Does align with FP  Easiest to understand and frame of reference yet the others have values to be added.  It is easier to see how this can lead to organizing and prioritizing ways.  Relatable.  Partners may be able to relate better too. | Should include maintain and improve.  Should recognize the shared priorities and our commitment to them.  Social benefits goals-access not only to NFS lands for the many uses (inc. traditional uses), but economically such as contracts, etc. needs to be added; traditional cultural tradition (homeland)-including resource dependent-subsistence element needs to be added;  How to emphasize the admin. and support;  People understand and care in addition to receive (needs to be added)  Receive is not broad enough. Need to include public service and FS lands value—customer service; what is the resolution that determines economic vitality  Recognition that economic vitality needs to include other factors beyond monetary benefit and values  Include the educational, diversity, and other values into the goals.  Change National Forest lands to Forest Service to be more inclusive and public service. | | Needs short definitions  Still a fine line on knowing specifically  Define landscapes to be inclusive of all the land and habitat types including water management. But at the same time be able to create focus. i.e. favorable flow of water; watersheds; scalability.  Are we setting up a frame of reference that is exclusive of one another. How to get a diversity of perspective i.e. of economically. |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Landscape Type** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| But consider if this would provide focus for the 5 yrs.  Covers the landscape.  Helps to call out the other landscapes in the Region that we sometimes don’t focus on. | Goals would require a lot more work to be inclusive of all we do. | | Reflects conservation and health of the landscape well but may not reflect other aspects of what we do.  The goals would have to include some of the aspects that may be missing.  Rangeland type.  This would be a challenge toward Regional focus. |
|  |  | |  |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Scale of Impact** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| Covers so much of everything. Can encompass the items above. International connection in the mission-inclusive including tribes, land grantors, outside the borders, global aspects and how it is bigger.  Inclusive of international programs and culture. Connection of not only people but could be water and wildlife. Inclusive of cumulative effects  Like the scale | Consumptive uses result in ecologically and economically sustainable…  Mining, grazing-either the American people have to accept the outcome including consumption and international perspective. | | Review “American way of life” since we are including international- think about another term.  It is difficult to see international. The tribes and land grantors are more placed based-rural, may fit better the connection to base. Though tribes are nation to nation.  Goal statements need to be redefined to include all the aspects of the three scales.  Struggle with lumping rural and urban together as these have differences that are hard to lump as a focus. |
|  |  | |  |
| **Common to all three** | | | |
| Think about 1 and 3 to be combined in some way. |  | | Timescales needed so we know the focus points for the goals. And thus be able to prioritize the actions—present benefits and future benefits (outcomes but may need more thought-sustainability, generational)  May lead to more work than what we can do, the ability to prioritize may be more difficult |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Findings Template: Organizing Principle/Focus Area Goal Statements** | | **Note taker:** Heather Provencio Grp 6 | |
| **Group Names:** Lorrie Baines, Kurt Davis, Robert Trujillo, Danny Montoya | |
| **EXAMPLE 1: Outcomes of what we do—\*\*\*Liked this best** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| Everyone can see themselves in this. Focuses on the big why of what we are doing. Scale of impact can fit in here too.  Social Benefit: General enough that it can catch everyone, every user, every employee.  I’m new to Region/work and it’s understandable to me. Like that these are flexible to change as we need to adapt.  I can easily wrap my head around. I understand what this means.  Great lens for capturing the work thats needed in totality. Objectives that are regularly updated will help us achieve this goal.  Good that its close to home. Our mission won’t generally change, but this organizing principle gives the ability to focus on objectives that will be game changers. | Not certain I like the raw material piece under economic vitality, because for example O&G doesn’t use raw materials. Maybe “native materials” or “raw materials” or “resources”  Economic vitality: say “NF Forests and grasslands support”  Change infrastructure to “roads and trails” or “access to NF” because otherwise it implies buildings. | | Regional vitality (from scale of impact) fits under economic vitality (under the work) and national way of life (scale of impact) concepts fit under economic and social (the work)  Goal 1: Its not just about conservation, it is about uses for perpetuity. Today we are divided on this. Maybe add…maintaining the ecological integrity and resiliency of these lands so that we can continue to use.  More important to find ways to counter-balance against climate change. Are we finding ways to keep things as they were in the past or are we trying to ADAPT to climate change?  Will this help us focus our work? Is it the right acres? If it is, this is a game changer. Time horizons on our objectives will assist with focus too.  We are having impacts from the surge of recreationists (eg Red Rock OHV use). Could throw law enforcement at it but it won’t make the change we need. |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Landscape Type** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| I like the vision of mountain, desert, grassland  I think I can articulate this to employees  Like water statement under mountains  Intuitive  Fits under goals of ecological restoration | There are micro landscapes within these, so does the goal display that.  Statements not inspiring. Have a hard time wrapping my arms around this. | |  |
|  |  | |  |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Scale of Impact** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| Describes the potential impact by the work we do.  Like international connections and how they include tribes.  Regional vitality good.  Like the goals. | Regional vitality is a 10 dollar word. “National Life” is a divisive term (us and them) | | Are we catching everything that comes to the Region? The term “supply”… are we talking material supply or recreation or vegetation supply or native American values?  As we become more inclusive, what IS the American way of life? Are we changing with civil unrest? We are in a changing social dynamic.  Way of life for rural residents entirely different than folks outside area…do we really have a “national way of life?” Every community vastly different (Flagstaff vs Cuba).  If organized on more localized scale of impact or work that is regional in nature or the work is national in nature. |
| **Brainstorm other Organizing Principles, with 3 Focus Areas & Goal Statements for each**  SCALE OF IMPACT Suggested Revision | | | |
| **Geographical Relevancy** (local-regional-national)    **Goal:** R3 engages communities to hear what is important to them ensuring success in maintaining local ecological integrity and resilient landscapes.  **Obj 1:** Fuelwood access for local communities (Mayor Domos fuels project on Carson; tribal fuelwood program )  **Obj 2:** access to recreation accommodated and sustainable while protecting ecological resiliency. | **Economic Vitality**  **Goal**: National Forests and Grasslands support economic development, providing resources and access necessary to sustain communities.  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**  **Goal:** The work we do at the Region focuses across place-based communities and build ecological resilience.  But ecosystems going to change and to a certain degree we won’t change that. Counteract may be too strong a word.  Capacity objective: an agile organization to adapt to changing priorities/needs.  Right tools in place to meet particular needs. | | **Social Benefit**  **Goal**: Nation-People receive the broad range of benefits from National Forest lands, including direct experiences, information, and well-being.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Goal: Region 3 innovations are leading/impacting how we approach natural resource management at a national scale. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Findings Template: Organizing Principle/Focus Area Goal Statements** | | **Note taker: Jennifer Ruyle Grp2** | |
| **Group Names: Kim Giang, Tom Torres, Rita Skinner, Jennifer Ruyle** | |
| **EXAMPLE 1: Outcomes of what we do** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| Easy to grasp,  Focus Area 2 pulls in a variety of things  Makes the most sense from the perspective of a new person  It’s broad  Best Alignment with legislative agenda, MUSYA, FLPMA  Easiest to communicate to workforce  Things like mining and powerlines can be recognized and explained  Employees can find themselves in this model | Removed the work “maintain” from the Ecosystem goal statement because that word does not do a good job of describing the destination. New wording, **Goal:  The landscapes of the southwest are ecologically intact and are resilient to disturbances.**  Added “shared leadership” to Social Benefits goal.  New wording: **Goal: People receive the broad range of benefits from National Forest lands, including direct experiences, shared leadership, information, and well-being.** | | Economic needs to capture grazing and articulate uses that are important to the public.  Language needs to be inclusive, that all workforce can understand  Considerations of our partners, they are actually our team mates. |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Landscape Type** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| Made us think a little differently  Place based, which could help focus |  | | Water, soil and biodiversity are all appropriate to all the goals  Seems like they were all the same, identical, with just the place changed.  Where does riparian fit? Under all, so the same again  We have different landscapes that span these places that are not captured (e,g. woodlands) |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Scale of Impact** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| Consumptive uses are recognized  Calls out and recognizes a commitment to the greater good, bigger picture |  | | Focus areas are apples and oranges. Not really a difference between the three goals, so not really an organizing principle |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Findings Template: Organizing Principle/Focus Area Goal Statements** | | **Note taker: L. Holley Grp8** | |
| **Group Names: Sapp, Parker, West, Lewis** | |
| **EXAMPLE 1: Outcomes of what we do** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| **Intuitive, captures the tensions that happen at the field level. The bins make sense. Relatable to 3 R’s. Offer more opportunity for alignment with current allocation structures. This is how we are currently thinking.** |  | | What is our timeframe for the outcome? Lacks temporal component? (Are we ever going to get there?) |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Landscape Type** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| **We like that it’s simple, easily understood.** | **If we did keep landscape type, perhaps use “cultural landscape”, “historical landscape”, or “ecological landscape type”** | | **Our landscape is more than 3 bins. Goal under each focus areas is the same thing, ecological resilience. Lacking human element makes it unrelatable.** |
|  |  | |  |
| **EXAMPLE 3: Scale of Impact** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| **Recognizes our role in connecting things that are influential/ beneficial at multiple scales. Creates a sense of purpose to a greater scale. Answers the bigger why question. Speaks to new generations of employees, and reaffirms what folks that have been around may have figured out themselves. Articulates a sense of equity and equality. Our meaning is found. Gives us a way to frame and explain our actions internally and externally. Expands our capacity and reinforces our awareness of dynamic tensions, creates transparency with employees on outcome of work and scale of impact.** |  | | **Wordsmith it a bit to make sure it works..**  **Scale is relative, how big is big?**  **There are some dynamic tensions within this one, direct impact is focus area one that connects to this one.**  **Example 1 and Example 2 are ephemeral (change with time and space), Example 3 (Scale) is transcendent. (Durable)** |
| **Landscape Type- (Redefined what the landscape is)** |  | |  |
| **Brainstorm other Organizing Principles, with 3 Focus Areas & Goal Statements for each** | | | |
| 1. **Cultural Landscape Resiliency and Inclusion** | 1. **Physical Landscape Resiliency and Inclusion** | | **Socio-Political Landscape Resiliency and Inclusion (Economics included)** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Findings Template: Organizing Principle/Focus Area Goal Statements** | | **Note taker: Sandy Watts Grp7** | |
| **Group Names: Judy Palmer, Adam Bromley, Neil Bosworth, Nancy Brunswick** | |
| EXAMPLE 1: Outcomes of what we do | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| **Adam – feels clear, relates to widget discussion – operating in that system for a while – familiar – something everyone can understand.**  **Judy – agree with Adam – familiar and resonates – how we work now – do need a base we start from – thinking from employee perspective, need grounding** | **Adam - Process is familiar – forces us to change how we think of the process – for example counting acres great but what are the right acres we need to accomplish**  **Judy – outcome measures vs performance measures needs to be highlighted** | | Sandy – because it is familiar – doesn’t stretch us or get to the innovation we need to get to  Judy – this example doesn’t identify well outcome vs performance  Adam – is this a big enough step in a different direction? Feel like we are trying to go into a different direction – if we are going to change – is this the change – big enough step – or just rebranding?  Neil – if premise we are tying to do business in a new way – don’t know if that is necessarily true – more of trying to focus on what we are doing and what is important. Need constant check on where we are and are we going in the right direction. |
| EXAMPLE 2: Landscape Type | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| Judy – loved this one, can touch feel see it, resonates well because on the ground visible.  Sandy – grabbed me because it felt out there and innovative. Inspired. Gets at diverse landscapes in the Region.  Neil – bins are clear – logical. The Region is super unique because of these three landscapes – will help us focus based on those landscape types.  Adam – Does identify that we want functioning ecosystems. | Mountains – state what is different about our mountains – hot, dry, water scarcity – more important that just produces water – produces water in a water-limited area. | | Neil – Goals were general. Some objectives were pie in the sky, i.e., fire playing natural role.  Adam – agree we should identify we are a diverse region – doesn’t really change our overall outcomes. Feels like we will set different goals per landscape type – all over the place.  Judy - Not sure it led to a different outcome but enjoyed it.  Adam - Just telling me where I’m working not giving me the why and what I’m doing. |
|  |  | |  |
| EXAMPLE 2: Scale of Impact | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| Adam – shows where we fit in. Think of international connections as climate change, visited by folks all over the world. Providing a social impact to rest of world. We have outputs – copper – touches other countries. Not sure if organized quite right but like the idea. Shows that we matter beyond what we can see. Resonates – tells him “Why” – this org principle is closest to providing that.  Sandy – feels out there – more so “the work” – allow for innovation.  Neil – looking at scale of impact – team did a good job but won’t have much of an impact on climate change, logging, etc. | Relate more to rural/urban/city – should be thinking broader  R3 doesn’t have an international program, not a lot of cross pollination outside of our border.  If international is important – rural/urban, special uses – different understanding of public lands and what they are used for. Payson a different relationship than Phoenix.  Rural/Urban/City – organizing principle is more about types of use not scale of impact. | | Neil – don’t understand international focus. SW isn’t a carbon sink – SW is more of a source – what role do we play? Only can think of migration corridors as an international connection. Don’t see tribes as international. Should international be a focus area of this Region?  Judy – international didn’t resonate. Agree with Regional vitality. Struggled – not something I could relate to.  How will this filter down to objectives?  Conversation around how the team got to these 3 focus areas from the group work. Rural/Urban/Cities was more around the diversity of use and perception of public lands. Some think water, Phoenix think recreation, New Mexico – rural/small communities rely on wood for heat – yet this doesn’t help write objectives. |
|  |  | |  |
| Brainstorm other Organizing Principles, with 3 Focus Areas & Goal Statements for each | | | |
| Org Principle: Convening (big part of our job, sharing decision making, sharing stewardship)  **Employees**  Goal: Everyone has the opportunity to be the best they can be every day.  Employees understand why we are working on what we are working on and the decision process.  Employees work across boundaries/disciplines coming together to steward the whole.  Employees feel valued for opinions, ideas, and contribution to achieving mission outcomes. | **Stakeholders** (Partners, volunteers, Permittee, User)  Goal: Stakeholders are a true partner – influence  -Decisions (trade-offs)  -Priorities  To help meet our collective outcomes. (internal/external labels are gone) | | **Government** (local, state, federal)  Goal: Local, State, and other Federal government entities are true collaborators on our collective outcomes (trade-offs decisions are made together and supported).  Local, State, and other Federal government entities are full partners into setting priorities and establishing our collective outcomes. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Findings Template: Organizing Principle/Focus Area Goal Statements** | | **Note taker: Deiter Grp4** | |
| **Group Names: Nuttall, Martin, Fetterman, Kruger** | |
| **EXAMPLE 1: Outcomes of what we do** | | | |
| **What we like about it** | **Proposed changes rationale** | | **Weaknesses and/or questions** |
| Hit the mark, are general enough to fit our work in, creates room for other work beyond ecological conservation  Like outcomes of work, where we see the mission getting accomplished, challenge in how to measure outcomes – general sense on performance measures being inadequate and may not be providing the right message |  | | By having numbers can read as a ranking process within the focus areas (1,2,3), Economic Vitality and social benefit still need to be ecologically sustainable – have to have #1 to assure 2 and 3 |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Landscape Type** | | | |
| **What we like about it** | **Proposed changes rationale** | | **Weaknesses and/or questions** |
| – no issues with landscape type with focus area and goals  – like landscape type because covers R3 diversity of landscapes |  | | – no affinity to landscape since focus seems only on the landscape, too far removed from a person’s experience  - landscapes hard to separate when occur intermixed across the landscape |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Scale of Impact** | | | |
| **What we like about it** | **Proposed changes rationale** | | **Weaknesses and/or questions** |
| – scale of impact, see a connection to “the work”, where is the yardstick to measure that, “National Way of Life” difficult to digest, eg. UTVs/OHVs that can impact the land as part of their use, same with recreating past stay limits – AZ forests contribute to global carbon sequestration globally and grasslands  Resonated similar to above, outcomes and scale are more comprehensive | Drop the first word off each of the Scale of impact focus areas, to get past potential for political trigger, this change resonated with group and even shifted preference for some (see below) | | - for scale of impact speaks more at us and perhaps less impactful for the public  - still absorbing scale of impact, but feels less inclusive of the environmental impact, eg. Deserts  - Some audiences take offense to contributing to international outcomes instead of local benefits which tend to be more immediate to a persons views, not using our $ to help other countries – speak rather to contributions, goal is fine, but focus area name a concern, esp. for social media |
|  |  | |  |
| **Brainstorm other Organizing Principles, with 3 Focus Areas & Goal Statements for each** | | | |
|  |  | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EXAMPLE 3. Mission Work Organizing Principle: SCALE OF IMPACT** | | |
| **Focus Area 1: ~~Regional~~ Vitality** | **Focus Area 2: ~~National~~**  **Ways of Life** | **Focus Area 3:**  **~~International~~ Connections** |
| **Goal: R3’s forests and grassland contribute to rural and urban communities in an economical and environmentally sustainable manner.** | **Goal: Consumptive uses result in ecologically sustainable contributions to national supply that support the evolving ways of life.** | **Goal: National Forests and grasslands contribute to improved health of globally connected ecosystems.** |
| Change to the titles more organic and less hierarchical feeling more inclusive of other thought processes, structures, and belief systems – more universally applied, more relatable to a diversity of people – don’t just have to be USFS, would draw interest  4FRI contributing to vitality, h2o, wood, ecosystem services – ways of life through wood industry, and national supply chain, get fuelwood to native communities – contributes to regional climate strategy and global efforts  See people and places in the focus areas and goals so comm and engagement can easily see themselves in this organization principle – setup is inclusive, and can use as launching pads to talk about bigger and better things  See connections to everything in tribal relations fitting under this both internally as well as first nations  Touches everything in FAM, recreation, 4FRI is a project that is inclusive of many aspects of what we do, same with CFRP – need to think about this holistically and not focus on a target | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Findings Template: Organizing Principle/Focus Area Goal Statements** | | **Note taker: Ian Fox** | |
| **Group Names: 5A Mark j, Elaine, Cara S** | |
| **EXAMPLE 1: Outcomes of what we do** | | | |
| What we like about it | Proposed changes rationale | | Weaknesses and/or questions |
| see the world this way w/ distinction and interrelationships; aligns with 2012 Planning Rule; no boundary to work it looks beyond NFS lands | Remove the word “their” from focus Area 1 to read - southwest maintain ecological integrity: add We envision to the beginning of each focus area description; | | Need to recognize disturbance is coming & lands may not have the same integrity in the future;  Org principle title implies more, the word outcomes is misleading |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Landscape Type** | | | |
| **What we like about it** | **Proposed changes rationale** | | **Weaknesses and/or questions** |
| Puts land front and center; like the interplay b/w fragility & resilience in deserts focus area; like highlighting soils in grasslands; water in Mtns is regenerative; new and useful way to look at work with climate change | In Mtns change produces water to “capture, store and releases water”;  Focus Area 1 Deserts change to- We envision R3’s deserts contribute to flourishing biodiversity of the planet.  Add “We envision” at the beginning of Focus Area 2 and 3 description | | Under Mtn focus are it is not accurate to say ‘produces water” they store and supply;  Seems to be a gap b/w the three focus areas in terms of riparian areas.  People are not evident |
| **EXAMPLE 2: Scale of Impact** | | | |
| **What we like about it** | **Proposed changes rationale** | | **Weaknesses and/or questions** |
| Like the title, Epiphany on how to broaden our thinking based on Scale of Impact; has a vertical and horizontal approach to how we see the work (i.e. nested and broad) | Focus Area #1 change “economical to socio-economical  Focus Area #3 – remove improved and replace with healthy globally connected | | National way of life is vague on its social tie with Recreation Focus Area 3 description does not have the human piece clearly stated |

**[Group 5 Edits in yellow highlight]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EXAMPLE 1. Mission Work Organizing Principle: OUTCOMES OF OUR WORK** | | |
| **Focus Area 1: Ecological Conservation** | **Focus Area 2:**  **Economic Vitality** | **Focus Area 3:**  **Social Benefit** |
| **Goal: We envision that the landscapes of the southwest maintain their ecological integrity and resilience to disturbances.** | **Goal: We envision National Forest lands support economic development, providing raw materials and infrastructure necessary to sustain communities.** | **Goal: We envision people receive the broad range of benefits from National Forest lands, including direct experiences, information, and well-being.** |
| **EXAMPLE 2. Mission Work Organizing Principle: LANDSCAPE TYPE** | | |
| **Focus Area 1: Desert** | **Focus Area 2:**  **Grasslands** | **Focus Area 3:**  **Mountains** |
| **Goal: Marked by little precipitation and overall fragility, R3’s deserts continue to play their vital role in contributing to flourishing biodiversity of the planet.** | **Goal: The soils of this intact ecosystem support an ample diversity of flora and fauna.** | **Goal: This ecosystem, as the source of the vast majority of water needed for life, produces water in alignment with its natural capability.** |