



## **SNAMP Facilitating Collaborative Adaptive Management Follow Up Workshop**

March 26, 2014, 10am to 4pm, Amador County General Services/Department of Agriculture building (12200 B Airport Rd., Room A, Martell, CA)

### ***In attendance:***

Cathy Koos Breazeal – Amador Fire Safe council

Sue Britting- Sierra Forest Legacy

John Heissenbutle – Amador Calaveras Consensus Group

Bud Hoekstra – Berry Blessed Farms

Kim Ingram – University of California Cooperative Extension

Susie Kocher – University of California Cooperative Extension

Kelly Larvie - CalFire

Anne Lombardo – University of California Cooperative Extension

Rebecca Miller- Cripps – UC Cooperative Extension

Mandy Vance – Sierra Nevada Conservancy

***I. Welcome and overview:*** Susie Kocher welcomed the group and went over the set meeting goals and asked for any additional participants' input.. On registration, participants said they were interested in a refresher of the prior workshops – more practice, they wanted to:

- Be more astute & skillful in manipulating situations
- Pick up some tips on working with multiple agencies and stakeholders to accomplish complex objectives in controversial issue areas
- Improve skills in reducing and managing conflict between stakeholders.

The group did an active listening exercise in which they listened to each other talk about their best or worst facilitation moment

***II. Key tools in Collaborative Adaptive Management:*** Next the group started reviewing elements from the first training that was requested. This was done by analyzing real world scenarios provided by participants in this and previous SNAMP CAM workshops.

Stakeholder analysis review: The group used the following real world scenario to help illustrate the module:

A proposed action to change allowable management levels for wild burros went out to the public. One morning several days later the District FAX machine started running continuously receiving comments

from wild horse group members. The staff let it run out of paper so it would not break and asked what to do.

A better stakeholder analysis could have prevented the agency from being inundated by irate faxes. Stakeholders identified by the group included: horse groups (adoptions/rescue/trail riders), PETA, NRA, Sierra Club, OHV groups, agency staff (help them understand just what the reactions might be), wildlife society, local tribes, farm bureau, cattle ranchers, conservation groups, and private/adjacent land owners.

Building key agreements review: The group reviewed the following real world scenario to illustrate the module:

I have been involved in a high profile collaborative effort with a very focused goal, but the nature of the issue has garnered a lot of interest and it has been difficult to balance openness and inclusion with keeping a smaller number of people with appropriate expertise and commitment to achieve the goal of the final product/s of the workshop.

The group came up with the following ideas:

- identifying different levels of participation (observers/small working group/ decision makers/etc.);
- presenters must present a proposal for addressing the group as opposed to just showing up and expecting to talk;
- create a process for sharing outcomes/products; keeping discussions open; forming small working groups.

Agreements to review include: focusing on meeting objective; using the Parking Lot; transparency, and clear goals and objectives.

Desired outcomes review: The group discussed the two models under debate by the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group for the "triple bottom line".

**III. Guest Speaker:** Sue Britting - Executive Director of Sierra Forest Legacy addressed the group, describing their organization's goals and participation with collaborative groups and using a powerpoint presentation that has been uploaded to the Collaborative Tools website. She answered questions from the group.

#### ***IV. Key tools in Collaborative Adaptive Management***

Decision making process review: The group discussed the following real world scenario to illustrate the module:

The local integrated regional water management planning group had agreed to consensus decision making. By definition, to arrive at consensus, each member's response had to be "in favor of," "not

opposed to" or "can stand aside." When a potential grant project appeared in a short time-frame, one "cannot stand aside" response killed the entire project, even though most of the attendees were in favor of going forward with the grant application.

We talked about the need to define 'consensus' including 'modified consensus' which was a term brought up at a CAM/facilitation workshop in Tahoe. They use 80% need to agree to reach consensus. The ACCG uses consensus with the caveat if someone doesn't agree/support the decision then they must bring an alternative to the table. We also reviewed the ideas of using more time to deliberate/clarify/finesse in order to reach a decision, supporting ground rules, and having a 'plan B' in case the primary decision making method does not work.

Dealing with difficult behaviors review: Participants discussed the following real scenario to illustrate the module:

PROJECT: Roadside Habitat for Native Pollinators. Pollinators are declining because of habitat destruction & fragmented habitat. Roadsides can provide sites to enhance habitat. One participant asked what about honey bees? The answer was that the focus is on natives & honey bees will be helped by default. This participant was dismayed to tears that we didn't care about honey bees. How can we sell the idea to the public if we don't care about honey bees? Data will not help this individual understand the concept. How to introduce the "Bambi" factor to draw in those who are not data driven is my question.

We brainstormed different tools to deal with the situation including using introductions up front that also include your issues/values related to the topic; taking a break; accept/legitimize/deal with or defer; how it is important to know your audience and their issues before you even begin and make sure you include something about the various perspectives; to not take the outburst personally; and to clarify who should even participate – maybe this group just wasn't for her?

Managing conflict review: Participants discussed the following real world scenario to illustrate the module:

It was our 3rd meeting, 5 sheriffs attended for the first time (we wanted 1, none of them RSVP, or made contact). They got VERY stuck on a point about code/regulations and they would not move off of it. Many folks in the room were getting frustrated. The sheriffs wanted to "fix" something that was outside of our goals and even our level. It is a constraint that we never are going to be able to tackle. It was a bit frustrating for me as the lead, our facilitator could not make it, the group wanted the sheriffs to attend and then they complained when they showed up.

We brainstormed ways to deal with this situation and came up with:

- sharing the agenda/goals and objectives with the Sheriffs before the meeting as well as at the start of the meeting with everyone there;
- use the 'parking lot';
- ask for 1 sheriff to speak to represent the group instead of all 3;

- reinforce ground rules/ take a break;
- be sure to use a facilitator or the power of the group;
- defer the discussion to a later time/form a sub-group to deal with the sheriffs issues
- use first names always to help breed familiarity
- use your surroundings to manipulate the audience; and think strategically of where people should sit.

#### Parking lot issues

We had two issues that came up that need to be addressed in the near future. First, asking people to share their references/literature on the pro's and cons of biomass; and secondly, Bud will share the link on the German Concentration camp example.

***V. Wrap up: next steps and evaluation:*** Participants said they appreciated the use of real scenarios in the training, all the participation and Sue Britting's presentation. Lunch and the handouts were also good. They would have preferred there to be more participants. Its possible more notice would help with that. They also suggested that there be more opportunity to train collaborators in facilitation. Written evaluation results are displayed below.

## Evaluation results from the 3-26-2014 Follow up CAM workshop in Jackson (N=6)

