

United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

Rocky
Mountain
Region



Draft Cimarron and Comanche Grasslands Land Management Plan

Public Participation Process

August 10, 2006



Cover photo by David Augustine, Comanche Ranger District, 2004.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotope, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

Contents	iii
List of Tables.....	iii
1. Overview	5
2. Public Participation and Collaboration for the Grasslands Plan.....	5
2.1. Getting Started	6
2.2. Round One, June - August 2005: What Do You Want the Grasslands to Look Like in Ten Years?.....	7
Groundwork.....	7
Methods and Materials	8
2.3. In the Interim, September 2005 - May 2006	8
2.3.1. Release of the Draft Plan and Public Comments	9
2.3.2. The First Science Review	9
2.4. Round Two, June - August 2006: Do These Plan Components Embody What You Want?	9
2.4.1. Groundwork	10
2.4.2. Methods and Materials	10
2.4.3. The Second Science Review.....	11
3. Lessons Learned	11
3.1. Methods	11
3.2. Facilitators and Third-Party Neutrals.....	13
3.3. Participants.....	13
4. Activities Fulfilling the 2005 Planning Rule	14
Works Cited.....	31

List of Tables

Table 4.1. Chronology of Events	15
Table 4.2. Collaboration Activities and the 2005 Planning Rule	22

1. Overview

In October 1999, the revision of the 1984 Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands Land and Resource Management Plan was announced by Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register¹. This revision project included the development of the Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands Land Management Plan (Grasslands Plan). In April 2005, the project, which had begun under the 1982 Planning Rule, was transitioned to be completed under the 2005 National Forests System Land Management Planning Rule² (36 CFR 219). Associated new planning directives (Forest Service Handbook and the Forest Service Manual) were released in 2006³.

The draft Grasslands Plan was released on December 31, 2005, beginning a 90-day comment period. The Grasslands Plan, which is expected to be finalized in the spring of 2007, will be the first stand-alone land management plan for the Grasslands⁴. The Grasslands Plan will also be the first land management plan approved under the 2005 Planning Rule.

The 2005 Planning Rule and associated directives emphasize the importance of public participation as a way for the public and interested parties to participate meaningfully in developing the Plan's five components, monitoring, and the unit's environmental management system (EMS).

This report describes public participation and collaboration activities carried out during the development of the draft Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands Land Management Plan (draft Plan).

2. Public Participation and Collaboration for the Grasslands Plan

Our collaborative strategy (the methods, processes, and tactics) was developed after considering what other Forests, including the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forests, had done in developing and carrying out their collaborative process, and by working closely with the Regional Office social scientist to refine our approach. .

¹ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1999. Revised land and resource management plan, Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Comanche and Cimarron National Grasslands, Headquartered in Pueblo, CO. FR 70(250): 54613-54617.

² U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2005 National Forest System land management planning, final rule. 36 CFR 219; FR 70(3): 1023-1061.

³ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2006. National Forest System land management planning directives. FR 71(20): 5124-5153.

⁴ Revision of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests Land Management Plan has begun; the final Forests Plan is expected for release in the fall of 2009.

2.1. Getting Started

2002. In 2002, the third ID team leader for the revision effort was hired and the steering committee began meeting, but the Hayman Fire in June of that year put progress on hold.

2003. During 2003, the Grasslands faced continuing uncertainties about the proposed planning rule and the new plan model. Roles between the RO and an anticipated revision team were discussed, as was the revision process itself and the relationship between the steering committee and revision team. The ID team leader encouraged internal interest and participation by circulating internal newsletters about the status of revision, the plan model, and the specialists' (existing conditions and trends) reports that were currently under way. Potential team members (a core and a support team) were identified.

2004. During 2004, discussions about public participation strategies began, lists of potentially-affected individuals were drawn up, letters were sent to affected Tribes, and discussions about potential issues and need-for-change topics continued. The ID team leader circulated an internal review copy of a mock-up of what the Grasslands Plan would look like using the new plan model, while the steering committee worked on possible configurations of an ID team (who was available, how much time could be spent on the revision, etc.). The steering committee decided against having a dedicated ID team, due to fiscal and personnel constraints.

Collaboration with The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in FY 2004-2005 resulted in our using four, rather than five, ecosystems in the Grasslands Plan. The release of the 2005 Planning Rule began a period of questioning, re-thinking, evaluating what was needed, and studying.

2005. Foundational evaluations and assessments, including existing conditions and trends reports, were completed; the existing conditions and trends reports would become the comprehensive evaluation report (CER).

In June 2005 the PSICC revision Web site went live. Eager to make the existing conditions and trends reports available to the public, we posted them on the PSICC Revision Web site. We invited public comments and asked people to sign up to our mailing list; they could use our online form, call us, e-mail us, or send a letter. All pertinent documents, reports, maps, and evaluations are posted on the Web site as soon as possible, as were summaries of public meetings and our responses to public comments on the draft Plan.

Because the 2005 Planning Rule is so new and so important, we posted a few FAQs that point out some similarities and differences between the previous and the new planning rules, highlight some key changes in how the public can be involved, and explain why revisions are done at all.

2.2. Round One, June – August 2005: What Do You Want the Grasslands to Look Like in Ten Years?

This first round of public meetings focused on identifying what people believed to be the main topics to address and what they would like the Grasslands to look like in the future—what needed to change and the desired conditions. Meetings were held in four locations: Elkhart, Kansas; Springfield, Colorado; La Junta, Colorado; and Pueblo, Colorado.

The potential topics that had been identified by the ID team and District Rangers, based on their interactions with the public and their experience and expertise, were: fragmentation, invasive species, plant species diversity, recreation and tourism, sustainable elk populations, tamarisk infestation, using fire and livestock grazing, scenery management.

Groundwork

To prepare for Round One of our public participation activities, we first launched our Web site, where we posted the existing conditions and trends reports, along with maps and other pertinent information. We encouraged people to come to the meetings—or just to send us their comments—through several media:

1. **Newsletter 1:** We listed the schedule of the up-coming public meetings, and gave our URL, e-mail address, and mailing address; we included a short article about the 2005 Planning Rule, why revision happens, and listed potential need-for-change categories that the public meetings would center around. Newsletters were sent to our mailing list of over 1000 people or organizations.
2. **Invitation letter:** With the newsletter we mailed a letter that also listed the meeting schedule.
3. **Phone calls:** In Elkhart, several interested parties were contacted by telephone and invited to the meetings.
4. **News release:** Local news media (radio, newspapers, etc.) were asked to share a new release about the public meetings.
5. **Fliers:** Listing the public meetings' details, fliers were sent to each District office and were posted in several popular local gathering-spots in the four towns; they were also posted internally.
6. **Postcard:** We sent a postcard to our mailing list, announcing the development of the draft Plan, inviting participation and suggestions, and listing our URL, e-mail address and contact information.
7. **Postcard:** We sent a postcard to our mailing list members asking how they'd like to receive their Draft Plan (electronic or CD).
8. **Newsletter 2:** To our mailing list we sent a newsletter that summarized the June and August, 2005 meetings and the numbers of people who agreed and disagreed with the identified need-for-change topics, explained the 2005 Planning Rule's objection period and changes regarding management indicator species (MIS). The newsletter was also posted on our Web site.

Methods and Materials

The goals of the meetings were to share information about the development of the draft Plan, to find out what vision the public had of the future Grasslands, and to talk about what they felt should be changed.

At all meeting locations, we displayed maps and posters showing pictures of what we anticipated would be the potential topics, and several handouts. The handouts included fact sheets describing the potential topics, maps of the ecosystems that would be used during Plan development, and information about the 2005 Planning Rule. We spent a part of the meeting time talking one-on-one about the exhibits and maps we'd brought.

In two of the four meeting locations (Springfield and La Junta), participants split into groups, where we did a structured exercise: each group talked about and decided on one headline about the Grasslands that they'd like to see in their newspaper in ten years. The headlines were then discussed in the broader group. We also asked participants to fill out a questionnaire about what they felt should be the focus of the Plan development; almost everyone did so.

In one of the meeting locations (Elkhart), we held a traditional open house, because it was deemed to be more accommodating for that area, which was in the midst of wheat harvest. We distributed a ranking form "Your Grassland Visual Preferences" to find out what people would like the Cimarron National Grassland to look like in the future.

In one of the meeting locations (Pueblo), because of the small turnout, we held a group discussion that focused on the potential Plan topics. Participants also filled out the questionnaire.

2.3. In the Interim, September 2005 – May 2006

Between Rounds One and Two of public meetings, we revised, rewrote, had reviewed by the WO and RO, and finally released the draft Plan. We also carried out a Level 3 science review on foundational assessments and evaluations.

The draft Plan was released on December 31, 2005, for a formal 90-day comment period. During this comment period, we reviewed and discussed the comments we received through the CAET Team, and, after the 90-day period, we began responding to those comments.⁵

Also in the interim, the District Rangers, sometimes with available specialists, made presentations to interested grazing associations, NRCS, the Audubon Society, CDOW, and TNC. The ID team leader met with BLM and gave a presentation and answered questions about the 2005 Planning Rule. We collaborated with TNC and the RO on monitoring questions and performance measures, which were then distributed for science

⁵ For a summary of the comments, and our responses, see Response to Comments on the PSICC Revision Web site: http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/psicc/projects/forest_revision/gr_pub_participation.shtml.

review and posted on the Web for public comment.

2.3.1. Release of the Draft Plan and Public Comments

The Federal Register notice of the 90-day comment period related to our release of the draft Grasslands Plan was published on December 31, 2005. The draft Plan and associated documents were available on the Web site; paper copies were sent with letters to those who had indicated a preference for a paper copy.

All comments about the draft Plan were received by the CAET team. We were able to read the comments as the CAET team received them, and kept a paper binder of them. At the end of the comment period, CAET team sent us a report that summarized the comments, along with a list of commenters.

In May 2006, the ID team responded to comments that the CAET team had received. Those responses were gathered into a report, which was posted on the Web on June 22, 2006 and postcards were sent to the mailing list.

2.3.2. The First Science Review

To ensure that we had taken into consideration the best available science we held two Level 3 science reviews on two sets of documents. The first review, August through September 2005, addressed foundational documents⁶. The second review, June through July 2006, addressed the draft Plan, and the related monitoring questions and performance measures.

Reviewers who agreed to participate were specialists in several grasslands-related areas, such as rangeland management, disturbance ecology, mammalogy, and grassland ecology. Many are professors at regional universities.

In both reviews, we received substantive comments and suggestions, in spite of the short notice and quick turn-around that our deadline necessitated. Our responses to the reviewers' comments and suggestions have been posted to the Web site.

2.4. Round Two, June – August 2006: Do These Plan Components Embody What You Want?

The second round of concerted outreach centered on the draft Plan—especially the monitoring questions and performance measures. The aim of Round Two was to ask again and to get input on the monitoring questions and performance measures that we had developed in cooperation with TNC. Meetings were held in the same four locations as the Round One meetings: Elkhart, Kansas; Springfield, Colorado; La Junta, Colorado; and Pueblo, Colorado.

⁶ Existing conditions and trends reports; roads analysis; scenery management system assessment; species diversity evaluation: fish; wild and scenic river evaluation draft.

2.4.1. Groundwork

We invited interested parties to join us at the public meetings, or to just share their comments, through three media:

1. **Postcard:** We mailed postcards to those on our mailing list; postcards included the meeting schedule, URL and contact information, the topics to be discussed, and how to get the monitoring questions and performance measures (the Web or request a paper copy).
2. **Fliers:** Fliers listing the topics to be discussed, meeting schedule, and how to get the monitoring questions and performance measures were sent to the District offices for public and internal posting.
3. **Web:** The meeting schedule was posted along with a packet of the monitoring questions, performance measures, meeting schedule, and how to respond (electronically or paper copy).

2.4.2. Methods and Materials

For the second round of meetings, we brought two neutral facilitators (employees from the Environmental Protection Agency) to manage meeting discussions and capture participants' thoughts and suggestions about the draft Plan. To learn what interested parties thought about particular components of the draft Plan contents (identified by the District Rangers), we designed a discussion-collaboration activity.

At all locations, the meetings were opened and introduced by one of the District Rangers (Elkhart, Springfield, La Junta) or the Forest Supervisor (Pueblo). On display were updated maps and posters showing Grasslands resources and changes we were considering for the final Plan. Handouts were also available of the revised monitoring questions and performance measures. All meetings lasted approximately 3 hours.

In two of the four meeting locations (Elkhart and Springfield), participants worked in groups, of four to six members; each group was given either one of the four ecosystems or two of the resource areas chosen by the District Rangers (minerals and energy, and livestock grazing) described in the draft Plan. Each group member was given a paper copy of the draft Plan. The groups reviewed the parts of the Plan they'd been given and then discussed their opinions among themselves. Each small group included two Forest Service facilitators to help explain and facilitate the exercise. After the small group discussions the findings, suggestions, and comments were discussed among the larger group. The group exercise and the associated discussion took approximately 1.5-2 hours.

In two of the four meeting locations (La Junta and Pueblo), because of the small turnout, we held a group discussion that focused on the draft Plan, planning process, monitoring program, and the EMS.

2.4.3. The Second Science Review

The first Level 3 science review, held in the interim between Round One and Round Two, had addressed foundational documents⁷. The second Level 3 review, held June through July 2006, addressed the draft Plan, including the desired conditions, objectives, guidelines, special areas, and suitability of areas, and the related monitoring questions and performance measures. We also pointed the reviewers to the foundational documents, such as the existing conditions and trends reports, for more detailed references.

Reviewers who agreed to participate were primarily specialists in several grasslands-related areas, such as rangeland management, disturbance ecology, and grassland ecology. Some had participated in the first review. Many are professors at regional universities.

In both reviews, we received substantive comments and suggestions, in spite of the short notice and quick turn-around necessitated by our deadline. Our responses to the reviewers' comments and suggestions were posted on the Web site in August 2006.

3. Lessons Learned

Based on our chosen public participation strategy, we successfully exchanged information and ideas and brought a number of people together to discuss grasslands topics and issues who otherwise might not have done so. We were able to get people talking who otherwise might not have done so, and we also initiated relationships that, we hope, will continue. We received constructive criticism and suggestions from public meetings, formal and informal comments, science reviews, and collaborative work.

On the other hand, the constraints we faced prevented us from holding more meetings, hosting field trips, and holding the round tables that we had talked about. Members of the public repeatedly let us know that they wanted more meetings and more opportunities for participation.

3.1. Methods

Headline exercise and group discussion: Without a diverse group, or at least with people willing to operate in an open and collaborative manner, the exercise does not fare as well as it would if we had a more diverse group. Maybe gathering people into more small groups instead of a few larger ones can discourage "group-think". When we realized that there were more participants of one viewpoint than there were of the opposing viewpoint, we would have done better to redistribute the groups. In other meetings, with a more varied range of viewpoints represented or a more balanced representation of viewpoints,

⁷ Existing conditions and trends reports; roads analysis; scenery management system assessment; species diversity evaluation: fish; wild and scenic river evaluation draft.

the headline exercise works very well to stimulate hypothetical thinking and create openings for “what if” problem-solving.

Traditional open house with visual preference survey: The survey did help people think about more than just their favorite features on the Grasslands and was a good tool. It would have been more helpful to have had small group discussions about the survey after people had finished their evaluations. The majority of the people who came were interested enough to stay almost the full two hours.

Small group discussion: We got a lot of good information from people in the Pueblo-Colorado Springs area, and many of those people are actively engaged with grasslands issues. The discussions went well partly because the participants were well-informed about administrative processes and the Grasslands and also because they shared a similar view of the future Grasslands and its unique values. We were able to spend more time discussing the substance of the topics, and less time explaining related matters.

Small group review of documents: People seemed especially pleased to get their own paper copy of the draft Plan. Encouraging people to focus, in small groups, on sections of the actual draft Plan document seemed to give people a sense of concreteness and confidence that may be lacking with only dialogue.

We recognized that a majority of the participants had a number of Federal-related issues not related to the Grasslands Plan on their minds, from the fate of the Pinyon Canyon Maneuver site to the basic processes of how government works. We also recognized that most people aren’t informed about, much less current on, planning rules and processes. We had talked about holding short sessions to explain how land management planning works and the 2005 Planning Rule main features, but in the end had to focus on the draft Plan and its related or supporting documents. Pointing people to our Web site and the FAQs and answering as many questions as possible had to suffice.

Not surprisingly, two main views were represented in the public meetings and comments: those who feel their traditional lifestyle is threatened by economic conditions, drought, government interference and the influx of “city folks”, and those who advocate quiet-use recreation and habitat and wildlife protection. These two groups are often in opposition. However, we were delighted to find that on several occasions they did hear one another and shared not only ideas but also contact information.

3.2. Facilitators and Third-Party Neutrals

Had we had the time to apply for grants, locate, and secure funding for third-party neutral facilitators, we would have done so and would certainly have benefited from it. A skilled non-Forest Service facilitator can free Forest Service employees to participate and answer questions in the meetings, rather than playing several roles at once. In Round Two we accepted the help from two EPA facilitators who were somewhat effective in resolving the conflicting FS roles. However, had they been contracted facilitators that we had been able to work with from beginning (in collaboration design) to end (in developing summary reports of all meetings) our expectations in capturing meeting notes and developing summary reports would have been better met

3.3. Participants

Many participants in public meetings and in the development of the draft Plan have been members of the general public, ranchers, permittees, property owners, users (tourists, city-dwellers, and other). More specifically, we have engaged with the following:

- Tribes involved include: Comanche Tribe of Oklahoma, Northern Cheyenne, Northern Arapaho, Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, Wichita and Affiliated Tribes, Fort Sill Apache, Kiowa, Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho, Jicarilla Apaches, and Southern Ute. Correspondence continues. Formal meetings have not been requested.
- Bureau of Land Management, Colorado Department of Wildlife, Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, county commissioners.
- The Nature Conservancy; several chapters of the Audubon Society; Forest Guardians; local grazing associations; Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory; Colorado State University Extension Office
- Ecological evaluations and recommendations of the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and the Rocky Mountain Research Station resulted in the identification of seven special areas in the draft Plan.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's proposal that the Forest Service provide management focus for black-tailed prairie dog habitat in several areas, along with public comments, available data and research, led us to identify the black-tailed prairie dog as a species-of-concern.

4. Activities Fulfilling the 2005 Planning Rule

The main public participation and collaboration activities carried out by and for the development of the draft Grasslands Plan are listed chronologically in Table 1. We have also included pivotal events that influenced the progress of the project, such as the Hayman fire and the release of the 2005 Planning Rule. Table 2 correlates 2005 Planning Rule public participation requirements with activities carried out for the development of Grasslands Plan.

Table 4.1. Chronology of Events

Activity item #	What	When	2005 Rule met
1	Notice of Intent (to prepare EIS for LRMP revision)	October 7, 1999	219.9(b)(1)(i) 219.9 (b)(2)(i) 219.9(b)(3)(i)
2	ID team leader hired	2002	
3	Revision Steering Committee begins meeting	May 2, 2002	
4	Hayman Fire (137,760 acres)	June 8 – July 17, 2002	
5	Hayman BAER	July 17, 2002 – August 2003	
6	Release of proposed planning rule (2002 proposed rule)	December 6, 2002	
7	Steering Committee meetings continue; no ID team yet, only ID team leader. Staffing, budget; uncertainty about planning rule and plan model; roles between RO and revision; interrelations between revision and steering committee; expectations; etc.	2003	
8	ID team leader discussions with RO Planning staff (revision process, etc.)	January 2003	
9	Internal newsletter sent (status of revision matters)	June 5, 2003	
10	Internal newsletter sent (status of revision, specialists reports, plan model, etc.)	July 25, 2003	
11	Hayman BAER Phase 2 completed	August 2003	

Activity item #	What	When	2005 Rule met
12	Potential ID team members identified (core and support). Existing conditions and trends reports in process.	October 2003	
13	Internal newsletter sent (status of revision, meetings, etc.).	November 3, 2003	
14	Collaboration planning session (strengths, existing opportunities, identify issues, talking points, strategy, tasks, timeline).	January 12, 2004	
15	Collaboration strategy meeting	March 15, 2004	
16	ID team meetings (discuss potential revision need-for-change/issue topics, potentially-affected individuals lists)	June – August, 2004	
17	Letters to Tribes sent	June 29, 2004	219.9(a)(3)
18	Distribution to steering committee and leadership team of mock-up what the Grasslands Plan could look like formatted in the new plan model .	September 2004	
19	Strategy meeting (refine talking points, strategy, tasks, timeline)	October 21, 2004	
20	Steering committee continues to discuss ID team make-up and time commitments, etc.	December 13, 2004	
21	Release of final planning rule	January 5, 2005	
22	Release of interim planning directives	March 23, 2005	
23	Web site launched	May 25, 2005	
24	Transition notice of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands Plan Revisions to 2005 Planning Rule	May 26, 2005	219.9(b)(1)(i) 219.9(b)(1)(v) 219.9 (b)(2)(i) 219.9(b)(3)(i)

Activity item #	What	When	2005 Rule met
25	Web site launched	June 3, 2005	219.9(a)
26	Existing conditions and trends reports posted on Web	June 2005	219.6(a)(1) 219.9(a)
27	Grasslands Plan newsletter 1 to mailing list (announce public meetings; new rule; categories for need-for-change; why revise; URL and contact informatin), posted on Web	June 14, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2) 219.9(a)(3)
28	Letters mailed with newsletter; invitation to upcoming public meetings	June 15, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2) 219.9(a)(3)
29	Phone invitations to public meetings (Elkhart)	June 20, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
30	News release (public meetings)	June 21, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
31	Fliers posted internally and in several public locations in Elkhart, La Junta, Pueblo, Springfield	June 21, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
32	Public meeting, Elkhart, KS	June 27, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
33	Public meeting, Springfield, CO	June 28, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
34	Public meeting, La Junta, CO	June 29, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)

Activity item #	What	When	2005 Rule met
35	Public meeting, Pueblo, CO	June 30, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
36	Postcard mailed to mailing list announcing revision, inviting to join mailing list, URL, contact info	July 14, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2) 219.9(a)(3)
37	Postcard mailed to mailing list asking how they prefer to get Plan info	July 21, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2) 219.9(a)(3)
38	First science review	July – August 2005	219.11
39	Grasslands Plan newsletter 2 mailed to mailing list (summary of June public meetings, number of people who agreed and disagreed with our identified need-for-change topics; new rule-objection period & changes regarding MIS.	August 5, 2005	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2) 219.9(a)(3)
40	Federal Register notice of 90-Day Comment period (release Grasslands draft Plan)	December 21, 2005	219.9(b)(1)(ii) 219.9(b)(3)(i) 219.9(b)(3)(ii)
41	News release (of comment period w/ draft Plan release)	December 21, 2005	219.9(b)(2)(i) 219.9(b)(3)(ii)
42	Ranger presentation to Kim Grazing Association annual meeting (Comanche)	January 9, 2006	
43	Ranger and FS specialists presentation to Pritchett Grazing Association annual meeting (Comanche)	January 30, 2006	
44	Release of final planning directives	January 31, 2006	

Activity item #	What	When	2005 Rule met
45	Ranger and FS specialists presentation to Timpas Grazing Association annual meeting (Comanche)	January 31, 2006	
46	ID team leader presentation to BLM on Grasslands Plan, 2005 Rule, EMS	February 6, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
47	Ranger presentation to Baca County Commissioners board meeting (Comanche)	February 10, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
48	Ranger presentation to Kim Grazing Association board meeting (Comanche)	February 13, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
49	Ranger presentation to Timpas Grazing Association board meeting (Comanche)	February 15, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
50	Ranger and FS specialists presentation to Campo Grazing Association annual meeting (Comanche)	March 6, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
51	Ranger and FS specialists presentation to Campo Grazing Association board meeting (Comanche)	March 6, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
52	Ranger & FS specialists presentation to Pritchett Grazing Association board meeting (Comanche)	March 13, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
53	Letters sent to Tribes, announcing revision and invitation to participate	March 16, 2006	219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2) 219.9(a)(3)
54	Ranger and FS specialists presentation to The Nature Conservancy (Comanche)	March 17, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
55	Ranger and FS specialists presentation to the Audubon Society and Colorado Division of Wildlife (Comanche)	March 27, 2006	219.9(a)(2)

Activity item #	What	When	2005 Rule met
56	Signed MOU with USFWS	April 25, 2006	219.9(a)(2)
57	Begin collaboration (workshop) with The Nature Conservancy on monitoring questions and performance measures	May 2-3, 2006	
58	Ranger presentation at NRCS District Conservation Representatives meeting (Comanche)	May 18, 2006	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(2)
59	Second science review	June – July 2006	219.11
60	Flier sent to Districts for internal and public posting and posted on Web page, announcing public meeting schedule and response to comments coming June 17, 2006	June 5, 2006	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1)
61	Postcard mailed announcing public meetings, topics, contact info, URL, e-mail, and response to comments coming June 17, 2006	June 6, 2006	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1)
62	Responses to public comments on the draft Plan posted on Web site	June 17, 2006	219.9(a)
63	Draft monitoring questions and performance measures packet posted on the Web with request for comments	June 19, 2006	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1)
64	Postcard mailed asking for comments on draft monitoring questions and performance measures		219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
65	Public meeting: Elkhart, KS	June 27, 2006	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
66	Public meeting: Springfield, CO	June 28, 2006	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1)

Activity item #	What	When	2005 Rule met
67	Public meeting: La Junta, CO	July 6, 2006	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
68	Public meeting: Pueblo, CO	July 13, 2006	219.9(a) 219.9(a)(1) 219.9(a)(2)
69	Summaries of public meetings posted on Web	August 9, 2006	
70	Public participation process report posted on the Web	August 9, 2006	
71	Science review and science review process posted on Web	August 9, 2006	219.11
72	Responses to public comment on draft Plan posted on Web	August 18, 2006	
73	Public responses to monitoring questions and performance measures posted on Web	August 18, 2006	
74	ID team responses to public responses to monitoring questions and performance measures posted on Web	August 18, 2006	

Table 4.2. Collaboration Activities and the 2005 Planning Rule

Table 2 reproduces the section of the 2005 Planning Rule on public participation, collaboration, and notification. To indicate how the Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands met requirements, each requirement in 36 CFR 219.6 cross-references the table of activities above.

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>The Responsible Official must use a collaborative and participatory approach to land management planning, in accordance with this subpart and consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and policies, by engaging the skills and interests of appropriate combinations of Forest Service staff, consultants, contractors, other Federal agencies, federally recognized Indian Tribes, State or local governments, or other interested or affected communities, groups, or persons.</p>	<p>See below.</p>	<p>The Grasslands Plan and associated documents are developed by interdisciplinary teams: a core team, an ad hoc team, and an extended team. Each team represents the fields pertinent to grasslands management.</p> <p>The draft Plan, monitoring questions and performance measures, and pertinent foundational evaluations and assessments were reviewed by science reviewers who are specialists in their respective fields; a majority of the reviewers are outside the Forest Service.</p> <p>Announcements of and invitations to participate in the development of the Plan are sent to Tribes, parties on our mailing list, and to the public at large. Our mailing list includes a number of groups, agencies, and tribal representatives.</p>

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>(a) Providing opportunities for participation. The Responsible Official must provide opportunities for the public to collaborate and participate openly and meaningfully in the planning process, taking into account the discrete and diverse roles, jurisdictions, and responsibilities of interested and affected parties. Specifically, as part of plan development, plan amendment, and plan revision, the Responsible Official shall involve the public in developing and updating the comprehensive evaluation report, establishing the components of the plan, and designing the monitoring program. The Responsible Official has the discretion to determine the methods and timing of public involvement opportunities.</p>	<p>CER: 26-35</p> <p>Components: 27-35 63-73</p> <p>Monitoring: 57-61 63-73</p>	<p>CER: The existing conditions and trends reports (CER) were developed before the release of the interim planning directives. Reports were posted on the PSICC revision Web site in early June 2005. The public was made aware of this by a letter and newsletter sent to our mailing list, invitations to public meetings, news releases, and fliers. At the public meetings, people were encouraged to review the reports and given the URL.</p> <hr/> <p>Components: See the response for CER. Information about the new form of the Plan and what the components were was shared in newsletters, public meetings, and on the Web.</p> <hr/> <p>Monitoring: The Grasslands, members of Region 2 planning, and TNC worked together to develop monitoring questions and performance measures. The public and science reviewers were invited to review the draft monitoring questions and performance measures and share comments; they were also discussed at public meetings.</p>

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>[a](1) Engaging interested individuals and organizations. The Responsible Official must provide for and encourage collaboration and participation by interested individuals and organizations, including private landowners whose lands are within, adjacent to, or otherwise affected by future management actions within the plan area.</p>	<p>23-38 39-55 57-58 60-73</p>	<p>Appropriate Federal Register notices were published</p> <p>Two rounds of public meetings were held; newsletters, fliers, and news releases were sent</p> <p>Grasslands rangers and employees held meetings with permittees and grazing associations</p>
<p>[a] (2) Engaging State and local governments and Federal agencies. The Responsible Official must provide opportunities for the coordination of Forest Service planning efforts undertaken in accordance with this subpart with those of other resource management agencies. The Responsible Official also must meet with and provide early opportunities for other government agencies to be involved, collaborate, and participate in planning for National Forest System lands. The Responsible Official should seek assistance, where appropriate, from other State and local governments, Federal agencies, and scientific and academic institutions to help address management issues or opportunities.</p>	<p>27-39 45-54 55-59 62-66</p>	<p>Appropriate Federal Register notices were published.</p> <p>Agencies, Tribes, groups, etc. are on our mailing list and so were asked to participate, given information sources, etc.</p> <p>A majority of the participants in the science review were outside the Forest Service.</p> <p>Grasslands employees work with CDOW and KDOW regularly.</p> <p>The ID team leader, rangers, and employees met with grazing associations, BLM, the Audubon Society, etc., to discuss plan development and the 2005 Planning Rule.</p>

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>[a] (3) Engaging Tribal governments. The Forest Service recognizes the Federal Government’s trust responsibility for federally recognized Indian Tribes. The Responsible Official must consult with, invite, and provide opportunities for federally recognized Indian Tribes to collaborate and participate in planning. In working with federally recognized Indian Tribes, the Responsible Official must honor the government-to-government relationship between Tribes and the Federal Government.</p>	<p>17 27, 28 36-39 53 60-64</p>	<p>Tribal contacts are on our mailing list, so receive all mailings we send out, in addition to formal letters.</p>
<p>(b) Public notification. The following public notification requirements apply to plan development, amendment, or revision, except when a plan amendment is approved contemporaneously with approval of a project or activity and the amendment applies only to the project or activity, in which case 36 CFR part 215 or part 218, subpart A, applies:</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>[b] (1) When formal public notification is provided. Public notification must be provided at the following times:</p> <p>[b(1)](i) Initiation of development of a plan, plan amendment, or plan revision;</p>	<p>1</p> <p>24</p>	<p>The NOI was published October 7, 1999.</p> <p>The transition notice was published May 26, 2005.</p>
<p>[b(1)] (ii) Commencement of the 90-day comment period on a proposed plan, plan amendment, or plan revision;</p>	<p>40</p>	<p>The notice of 90-day comment period published December 31, 2005.</p>
<p>[b(1)] (iii) Commencement of the 30-day objection period prior to approval of a plan, plan amendment, or plan revision;</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>pending</p>
<p>[b(1)] (iv) Approval of a plan, plan amendment, or plan revision; and</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>pending</p>
<p>[b(1)] (v) Adjustment to conform to this subpart of a planning process for a plan, plan amendment, or plan revision initiated under the provisions of a previous planning regulation.</p>	<p>24</p>	<p>The transition notice was published May 26, 2005.</p>
<p>[b](2) How public notice is provided. Public notice must be provided in the following manner:</p>		

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>[b](2) (i) All required public notices applicable to a new plan, plan revision, or adjustment of any ongoing plan revision as provided at Sec. 219.14(e) must be published in the Federal Register and newspaper(s) of record.</p>	<p>1 24 40-41</p>	<p>News releases were sent to newspapers of record when Federal Register notices were sent out for publishing.</p>
<p>[b](2) (ii) Required notifications that are associated with a plan amendment or adjustment of any ongoing plan amendment as provided at Sec. 219.14(e) and that apply to one plan must be published in the newspaper(s) of record. Required notifications that are associated with plan amendments and adjustment of any ongoing plan amendments (as provided at Sec. 219.14(e)) and that apply to more than one plan must be published in the Federal Register.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>[b](2) (iii) Public notification of evaluation reports and monitoring program changes may be made in a manner deemed appropriate by the Responsible Official.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>[b] (3) Content of the public notice. Public notices must contain the following information:</p>		
<p>[b(3)](i) Content of the public notice for initiating a plan development, plan amendment, or plan revision. The notice must inform the public of the documents available for review and how to obtain them; provide a summary of the need to develop a plan or change a plan; invite the public to comment on the need for change in a plan and to identify any other need for change in a plan that they feel should be addressed during the planning process; and provide an estimated schedule for the planning process, including the time available for comments, and inform [ibid] the public how to submit comments.</p>	<p>1 24 40</p>	<p>The NOI was published October 7, 1999.</p> <p>The transition notice was published May 26, 2005.</p> <p>The notice of 90-day comment period published December 21, 2005.</p> <p>In addition to sending information about public meetings, and in addition to the meetings themselves, we urged members of the public to get familiar with the 2005 Planning Rule and the new directives, to understand the changes from the previous planning rule, and to participate in any way they can. We share information about the Rule, planning, and how to get involved on our Web site, which we point people to frequently, and encourage people to send in their comments and suggestions in any of several means available (including a Web-mail form).</p>

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>[b(3)] (ii) Content of the public notice for a proposed plan, plan amendment, or plan revision. The notice must inform the public of the availability of the proposed plan, plan amendment, or plan revision, including any relevant evaluation report; the commencement of the 90-day comment period; and the process for submitting comments.</p>	<p>40 41</p>	<p>The notice of 90-day comment period published December 21, 2005.</p> <p>News releases were sent to newspapers of record when Federal Register notices were sent out for publishing.</p>
<p>[b(3)] (iii) Content of the public notice for a plan, plan amendment, or plan revision prior to approval. The notice must inform the public of the availability of the plan, plan amendment, or plan revision; any relevant evaluation report; and the commencement of the 30-day objection period; and the process for objecting.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>[b(3)] (iv) Content of the public notice for approval of a plan, plan amendment, or plan revision. The notice must inform the public of the availability of the approved plan, plan amendment, or plan revision, the approval document, and the effective date of the approval (Sec. 219.14(a)).</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

36 CFR 219.9 Public participation, collaboration, and notification.	Activity Item #	Additional comments
<p>[b(3)] (v) Content of the public notice for an adjustment to an ongoing planning process. The notice must state how a planning process initiated before the transition period (Sec. 219.14(b) and (e)) will be adjusted to conform to this subpart.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Works Cited

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2006. Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands Land Management Plan: Science Review Process. Pueblo, CO: Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands, Supervisor's Office. 62 pages.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2006. National Forest System Land Management planning directives. FR 71(20): 5124-5153.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. December 30, 2005. 90-day comment period on the Draft Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands Land Management Plan (Draft Grasslands Plan). Federal Register 70(250): 11373-77374.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. May 26, 2005. Land management planning—Transition to 2004 planning rule for previously initiated plan revision. Federal Register 70(101): 30411.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2005 National Forest System land management planning, final rule. 36 CFR 219; FR 70(3): 1023-1061.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. October 7, 1999. Revised land and resource management plan, Pike and San Isabel National Forests and Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands [Notice of intent to prepare an EIS]. Federal Register 64(194): 54613-54617.