



SNAMP Facilitating Collaborative Adaptive Management Followup Workshop notes

Auburn – August 1st, 2013 10:00 to 4:00pm; Oakhurst – October 21st 9:00 to 3:00

In attendance:

Auburn:

Jane Beaulieu – US Forest Service
 Walter Clevenger – Sierra Nevada Conservancy /Placer County RCD
 Scott Conway – US Forest Service Tahoe NF
 Julie Griffith Flatter – Sierra Nevada Conservancy
 Peter Hopkinson – UC Berkeley
 Kim Ingram – UC Cooperative Extension
 Lynn Lorensen – Nevada Co. Resource Cons. Dist.
 Susie Kocher – UC Cooperative Extension
 Gia Martynn – Plumas Corp
 Frank Mosbacher – USFS Eldorado NF
 Elisa Noble - Placer County RCD
 Pete Stine – US Forest Service PSW Research
 Rich Walker - Cal Fire/FRAP
 Katherine Webb-Martinez – UCANR Off of Pres.

Oakhurst:

Pat Althizer, Photo Safari Yosemite LLC
 Elissa Brown - Consultant
 Jenny Castles - Local resident
 Larry Duysen - Sierra Forests Products
 Rebecca Garcia – USFS, Sierra National Forest
 Jeannie Habben - Chowchilla/Fresno Watershed
 Jerry Jensen - Retired forester
 Nicholas Kunz - CA State Water Qual. Control Board
 Anne Lombardo – UC Cooperative Extension
 Erin Stacy - Sierra Nevada Research Institute
 Mark Stamas - Local resident
 Craig Thomas – Sierra Forest Legacy

Both:

Kim Rodrigues – UC Cooperative Extension

I. Introduction and review

At both events, Kim Rodrigues reviewed the content and format of the follow up workshop and the goals of the whole workshop series: to improve communication and facilitation skills between natural resource managers and stakeholders, to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the collaboration process, and to develop these skills in others for future involvement. The follow up workshops were held about 6 months after the three part series in each location. The goal was to provide review, practice and a forum to discuss current collaboration issues being faced by participants. Participants were asked to name topics they thought needed review and specific issues /scenarios they were facing during registration. The workshop was structured around these review needs and scenarios.

Kim asked participants to introduce themselves by using an active listening exercise. In Auburn, participants were paired off to share their name/affiliation and to answer the question: “What famous person would you most like to have a meal with and why?” In Oakhurst, people were similarly paired up and asked to answer the question: “What does successful collaboration look like to you?” Then they introduced their partners.

II. Key tools in Collaborative Adaptive Management

One page handouts summarizing curriculum presented at the first three workshops were reviewed and discussed with examples given. Curriculum reviewed included: Ground Rules, Measures of Success, Stakeholder Analysis, Desired Outcomes, Organizing for Success, Active Listening, Building Agreements, Stages of Discussion, Boundaries and Constraints, Process vs Content, Decision making tools, Tools to Manage Conflict, Dealing with Difficult Behaviors, and Evaluation and Follow-through.

In Auburn, the group reviewed the definitions of collaborative process success provided by participants at registration:

Having a voice:

- “All stakeholders had a voice...”
- “Effective dialog among community of interests on defining best strategies for engagement...”
- “Where after the process the participants feel that their concerns were heard and acknowledged...”
- “Frequent communication”

Mutual learning and active listening:

- “At minimum, collaboration creates opportunities for collaborative learning.”
- “A respectful group of stakeholders who explore the interests and perceptions that leads to mutually acceptable management direction.”
- “Learning on all sides”
- “Working together means willing to hear and consider all viewpoints”

Clear knowledge of the desired outcomes and the decision making process:

- “A successful collaborative process is where there is buy in on what the desired outcome is to be and folks work together to achieve that outcome”
- “Decisions made with input...”
- “Maximum number of people are comfortable with the decisions and the decision-making process”
- “moving towards consensus”
- “...coordinators actually incorporate the new information as best they can”

Support for the final outcomes:

- “...be willing to make compromises to meet the common goal”
- “Most participants come to a workable solution to the issues at hand”
- “...everyone can live with the outcomes”
- “No surprises”
- “Reaching an outcome that is not litigated”.

III. Lessons learned from Collaboration - Guest Speakers

After lunch, participants listened to guest speakers and participants were able to ask questions. In Auburn, it was Scott Conway, Vegetation Management Officer, Truckee Ranger District, US Forest Service. He spoke about lessons learned from the Sagehen Collaborative Project. In Oakhurst it was Craig Thomas from Sierra Forest Legacy and Larry Duysen from the Terra Bella Mill in Porterville talking about lessons learned from the Dinkey Creek Project.

In Auburn participants asked Scott:

Question: Have you compared the costs of extra planning with the costs of litigation?

Answer: That isn't actually knowable because we can't know if we would have been litigated. However instead of completing the planning phase in two years, it took about five.

Question: Is the USFS actually organized to be able to collaborate with others? Did you get extra funds to develop this project?

Answer: The Truckee Ranger District actually has a very small staff and did not get additional resources to develop the collaborative project. However, they did have understanding from their leadership that this project would take quite a bit longer and they were given some relief from typical acreage targets and timelines.

Others said it can be risky for USFS leadership to develop these types of projects which can be time consuming and out of the normal comfort zone. Keeping an attitude that something is possible is important.

In Oakhurst, participants listened to Craig Thomas of Sierra Forest Legacy and Larry Duysen owner of Sierra Forest Products talk about learning how to work together in the Dinkey Creek Collaborative after years of conflict. The shared interest that brought them together was concern over the management of public lands to include addressing both environmental and community (social/economic) concerns. Participants of that collaborative, because of its long complex nature, have been asked to sign on to a charter, designed by the group. The development of this clear purpose statement has been important as it can be revisited to assist in redefining the group's goals/desired outcomes and various processes. The group works towards consensus, using science to inform the discussion and promote mutual learning within the group. Outliers from the growing consensus are actively listened to, allowed to share their perspective and back up their viewpoints with peer reviewed science. The group seeks further discussion on the issue and if disagreement remains, it is noted. Differences of opinion are explored, incorporated or acknowledged. But, the group as a whole is seeking to move forward so they can't stall on any single issue forever. The group goal is to move the conversation forward so at some point they accept that a subject has been explored and agree to disagree and move on.

Question: How do you handle late comers to the Dinkey Creek conversations, as it spans years of working time?

Answer: An off road vehicle group that joined the collaborative late provided a challenge in terms of catching up and feeling left out. This touches back on the value of a good stakeholder analysis in the early stages of any collaboration.

Question: How do you handle people who provide too much of a challenge for the collaborative?

Answer: They have been approached by the facilitator to determine if their commitment to collaboration is sufficient to make it worth involvement in the project.

Question: How do you deal with difficult people?

Answer: It's important to have respect for others in the conversation, acknowledge that everyone is learning/adapting and continuing to look for science to inform the dialogue on the issues, and to return to the documents they already have for support like the charter.

IV. Scenario Discussion – Facilitation Practice

Participants then discussed the specific scenarios they have been involved in or are currently facing and solicited input from the group on how to address collaboration problems. This led to review of specific

curriculum. In Auburn it involved going over and practicing ways to deal with difficult behaviors and managing conflict.

VI. Wrap up: next steps and evaluation

Participants were asked to fill out the workshop series post survey so researchers with the Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project could measure their learning during the workshop. Results, when known, will be shared with the group. Then participants were asked what worked well in the workshop and what could be better next time. Participants in Auburn said they liked discussing the real world scenarios, the one-page summary handouts, Scott Conway's presentation and emphasis on collaboration lessons learned, having multiple instructors with different experiences and depth of knowledge, and the variety of information covered. Participants in Oakhurst said they especially liked the presenters Craig Thomas and Larry Duysen and the stories they told, lunch was good as was the room.

Suggestions for improving the workshop in Auburn were to have an on-line tool as part of workshop support, have a big picture introduction for those who did not attend the previous workshops, have more ice breakers and examples of collaborations that worked. Suggestions in Oakhurst were to provide a success triangle handout (process, relationships and results), have less paper handed out as part of the diagram, and have more breaks and to address agenda time constraints.

Follow up actions included adding new participants to the Collaborative Tool site, as well as Scott Conway's power point presentation.

Participants also filled out written evaluation forms. They ranked the workshop as very good/excellent. Their expectations for this workshop were met (60%) and exceeded (40%). 89% said the pace of this workshop was just right, 11% said it was too slow. 53% said it exceeded their expectations, while 47% said it met them. Additional comments and rankings are shown below.

What I found most helpful from this workshop was:

- Real world examples and lessons from guest speakers (4)
- Handouts (2)
- Discussion and feedback from instructors and participants
- Scenarios
- Useful, practical knowledge
- Ways to deal with difficult people
- Experiences shared by instructors
- How to work with myself to be open

Ideas for improving or strengthening this workshop include:

- More time, more in depth
- Include online tools available for improving collaborative efforts
- Would like to do the detailed sessions
- Include material on stakeholder analysis
- Organizing through a big picture introduction
- Closer to honoring agenda
- Better room set up - circle or u shape.

I would like to see additional training in:

- Setting up collaboratives
- Building org capacity
- Decision making tools
- Facilitation
- Charter drafting

Additional comments:

- It was all good

- Great workshop - thanks for all the valuable information and resources
- Thank you
- Too many questions

Evaluation results for August / October 2013 CAM follow up workshops N = 20

