

---

## APPENDIX A – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

---

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>A-1</b>
<b>General Strategy .....</b>	<b>A-2</b>
<b>Public Notification and Access to Information .....</b>	<b>A-2</b>
<b>Validating Need for Change and Proposing Scope of Change.....</b>	<b>A-3</b>
<b>Commenting on the Notice of Intent to Revise the Plans and Refining Scope of Issues to be Addressed.....</b>	<b>A-4</b>
<b>Development of Preliminary Alternatives .....</b>	<b>A-7</b>
<b>Consultation with Indian Tribes and Other Government Agencies .....</b>	<b>A-8</b>
<b>Review and Comment on Draft EIS and Proposed Forest Plans.....</b>	<b>A-10</b>
<b>For More Information .....</b>	<b>A-18</b>

### Introduction

During the planning process for land and resource management the public is expected and encouraged to participate. . The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Section 219.6 and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 40 CFR parts of 1500-1508 direct federal agencies to conduct an analysis of environmental effects of proposed activities. Forest Service directives for implementing the NEPA include specific wording about public notification and keeping the public informed and involved during project planning.

Forest Service Objectives for Public Participation:

- *Broaden the information base upon which land and resource management planning decisions are made;*
- *Ensure that the Forest Service understands the needs, concerns, and values of the public;*
- *Inform the public of Forest Service land and resource planning activities; and*
- *Provide the public with an understanding of Forest Service programs and proposed actions.”*

Public involvement was part of the Forest Plan Revision process for the Chippewa and Superior National Forests beginning with determining the scope of issues to be addressed. The definition of issues described in Chapter 1 of this document are reflected in the alternatives in Chapter 2 and the analysis of environmental effects in Chapter 3. Continued public involvement is integral to the Forest Plan Revision process and will continue with review of and comment on the DEIS and Proposed Forest Plans and on through implementation and monitoring of the final Revised Forest Plans.

## General Strategy

The public involvement strategy for the revision of Forest Plans for the Chippewa and Superior National Forests was based on the following concepts:

- Keep Forest Service employees involved and first informed.
- Encourage public involvement early and often.
- Facilitate an open and unbiased process
- Strive for employee and public acceptance of identified needs and management options
- Highlight consultation with tribal governments and other governmental agencies
- Be efficient and timely with appropriate information
- Avoid surprises to stakeholders or Forest Service.

Key stages for public notification and access to information:

1. Validating need for change and proposing scope of change
2. Commenting on the Notice of Intent to Revise the Forest Plans and refining scope of issues to be addressed.
3. Development of preliminary alternatives.
4. Through review and comment on the Draft EIS and Proposed Forest Plans, identify additional information needs and options to be considered in the Final EIS and decision.
5. Participate in implementing the selected alternative.

Specific events are listed in the chronology of public involvement at the end of this appendix. The following narrative describes the objectives and outcomes for each key stage of the process.

## Public Notification and Access to Information

Communicating appropriate and timely information is essential to effective public involvement and involves many “tools”.

### Objective

*... “Consistent with the importance of the action, keep the public informed of the progress of the environmental analysis. For major actions, this includes notifying the public that the action is under consideration and providing feedback on the results of scoping and subsequent stages of the analysis. Monitor and consider the interests and concerns of affected publics, and respond to individual requests for information.” (Section 219.6 Public Participation, 1982 Planning Rule)*

### Strategy

- Use a variety of media to provide information to interested parties including internet posting, newsletters, press releases, public meetings, and focused meetings.
- With the advent of the world-wide-web, the Chippewa and Superior National Forests were the first National Forests in Region 9 of the Forest Service to establish a web site that included Forest Plan Revision information.
- Notification of key actions is announced in the web page, newsletter, press releases, and Federal Register.
- Newsletters provide updates and introduction to more detailed information posted on the web site.
- An update on Forest Plan revision is included in both the Chippewa and Superior National Forest NEPA Quarterly reports.

- The web site includes electronic copies of fact sheets, maps, interim reports, final documents, and links to related sites. Paper and CD copies are made available on request.
- Individual requests for information are evaluated and routed to appropriate team members for response.

### **Outcome**

- To-date, 15 mailings of the newsletter have been sent to a list of over 1,400 interested parties.
- The Forest Plan Revision web page has received over 1200 visits (hits) during the period from August 2002 to January 2003 when counting was monitored. This averages about 60 “hits” per week.

## **Validating Need for Change and Proposing Scope of Change**

### **Objectives**

- Solicit public input to validate issue descriptions and prioritize issues
- Identify top 3-5 questions to address for each issue.
- Solicit public input to help determine the extent of environmental analysis required for a proposed action.

### **Strategy**

- Information packages were prepared and sent to 1,500 individuals and organizations who had identified themselves as interested in Forest Plan Revision.
  - The information packages described 21 potential issues to be addressed by revision.
  - These issues were identified through a review of changes in Forest Service management direction, results of monitoring and evaluation, new scientific information, and changing public demands.
- The Forest Service requested that recipients rate the issues (Hi-Med-Low) for inclusion in revision and indicate their rationale for inclusion.
- The Forest Service sponsored workshops where representatives from tribal government, various interest groups, other agencies, employees and the general public collaborated to validate and prioritize the proposed questions to address. Scientific resources were consulted during the workshops.
- A two-day public workshop was facilitated by experienced non-Forest Service personnel.

### **Outcome**

In response to the mailing of the information packages, the Forest Service received 168 written comments (189 including duplicates).

Based on the medium and high rated issues, the Forest Service developed a set of reference papers containing background information relevant to the highest ranked issues. Twenty-one medium and high-ranked issues were carried forward for further discussion. Low-rated items were deferred for later action

A total of 60 participants attended the public workshop where participants reviewed 11 most controversial reference paper topics-and validated the information in the associated reference papers.

Nine Forest Service working groups, including representatives from MN Department of Natural Resources and tribal government, proposed recommendations to resolve questions and issues associated with the nine highest

priority topics identified from the workshops.

The working groups confirmed that Forest Plan Revision was the appropriate means to address the top 12 issues and recommended tactical approaches to topics that previously had only been identified as “needs”. Task Team Reports were provided to the Planning Team.

Based on the reports from the Task Teams, 12 issues were proposed in the Notice of Intent (NOI) as defining the scope of the analysis for Forest Plan Revision on the Superior and Chippewa National Forests.

## **Commenting on the Notice of Intent to Revise the Plans and Refining Scope of Issues to be Addressed**

### **Objectives**

- Inform public about the proposed process for revising existing land and resource management plans (Forest Plans).
- Formally announce initial proposal to change existing Forest Plans.
- Solicit comments or suggestions from the public that focus on issues relating to the proposal for revising Forest Plans and possible alternatives for addressing the issues associated with the proposal. Comments will help to frame the analysis included in the Draft EIS.

### **Strategy**

- The Notice of Intent (NOI) was mailed to 2,070 people who had expressed interest in Forest Plan Revision.
- A press release and the newsletter announced the release of the NOI.
- Fourteen open houses were held around both Forests to introduce the NOI and encourage comments.
- Uncoded comments were made available at Forest Service offices for viewing by interested public and employees. Copies were available for a fee.
- A content analysis was performed.
- The Forests reported back to the public through presentations and with a written summary of public comments to the NOI.

### **Outcome**

At the request of several interests, the 60-day comment period was extended to 90 days. Following release of the NOI, 462 comments were received. Within these comments, an additional 16 issues were raised. The most dominant request was to add roads and recreation to the issues addressed by Forest Plan Revision. A total of 21 issues were carried forward as the basis for developing alternatives and analysis of effects.

Excerpt from NOI Content Analysis Summary:

*“Comments received indicated what laws the respondents felt the Forest Service is to follow and, in some cases, what laws the respondents felt the Forest Service had violated in the 1986 Forest Plans or in the NOI. Comments pertinent to public involvement fell under three categories - logistics, obtaining and using public input, and education. Overall, there were many comments which spoke in favor of involving the public in the revision of the Forest Plans.*

*While most commentors are in favor of public involvement and input, some caution that public opinion should not replace science when making management decisions. Some also believe there is pre-decisional language in the Notice of Intent which precludes the public from being able to participate in*

*the planning process to the fullest extent. Some respondents showed a level of distrust concerning when, how, or if the Forests will use input received from the public.*

The statement and organization of issues to be addressed during Forest Plan revision have continued to evolve since the workshops in 1998. Several issues are categorically beyond the scope of a Forest Plan and were not discussed further. These issues are addressed in Chapter 2.

**Several related issue topics were combined under functional headings during the following stages:**

- **Pre-Revision Information** - Before plan revision began several issues had been identified in the process of monitoring implementation of the current plan. These totaled 38 tentative topics.
- **Lake States** – The regional *Great Lakes Issue Assessment* was a broad effort to identify issues common to multiple national forests. This assessment confirmed several potential issues already identified.
- **NFC Public Scoping** – The Need for Change (NFC) analysis included public input into identifying potential issues to be addressed by Forest Plan Revision. The previous 38 topics were sorted and recombined into 21 potential topics that the public was asked to prioritize.
- **Public Reference Paper** – Reference papers were developed to help define several issues.
- **Public Workshops** – Seven potential topics for revision were the focus of discussion at two workshops, one for employees and one for the public.
- **Inter Agency Task Team** – Focused teams evaluated the highest ranked issues.
- **NOI** – The Notice of Intent (NOI) was the formal announcement of the proposal to revise the Forest Plans with 12 issues proposed to be addressed.
- **Added after Content Analysis** – The planning team added several issues based on the comments to the NOI.
- **Non-revision Issue** – Some potential issues were found not to be appropriate to address during plan revision.
- **Added later by Forest Service** – These issues were either added to respond to legal requirements or as refinements to general issues.
- **Carried to DEIS** – These are the issues that are addressed in this DEIS. For more detailed descriptions see Chapter 1.

**This evolution is summarized in the table on the following page.**

**Table A-1. Tracking Revision Issues Development**  
 Issues & sources from pre-revision to DEIS 

Issue	Pre-Rev Info	Lake States	NFC Public Scoping	Public Ref paper	Public Work Shop	Inter Agency Task Team	NOI	Added after content analysis	= a Non-Rev Issue	Added LATER by FS (in the AMS)	Carried to DEIS
Age Class Distribution	X	X	X	X	X		X				X
ASQ (see Timber supply)	X		X	X	X	X					X
Biodiversity (see Forest Age & Composition)	X	X	X			X					
BWCA fire ignition									X		
Climate	X	X							X		
Change in Tree Species (see Forest Age & Composition)	X						X				
Ecosystem Health Forest Health (see Forest Age & Composition)	X	X	X	X		X					X
Fish Habitat	X		X	X		X	X				X
Fire Mgt	X		X	X			X				X
Habitat Fragmentation (see wildlife Mgt)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
Indian Trust Responsibilities			X	X							X
Impoundment direction									X		
Landscape patterns (see Forest Age & Composition)	X	X	X								
Land Adjustment	X								X	X	X
Water access (see Recreation Opportunities)								X	X	X	X
Minerals (gravel) mgt	X		X						X		
Net loss wetlands (see riparian)									X		
Old Growth (see Forest Age & Composition)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
ORV Trails (see Recreation Opportunities)								X		X	X
Riparian Mgt	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
Roads Mgt			X					X	X	X	X
Temporary roads and closures	X								X		
Roadless areas									X	X	X
Recreation Opportunities	X	X	X					X			X
Rare Resources	X	X	X	X		X	X				X
River corridor planning									X	X	X
Social & Economic Sustainability of Communities		X	X					X	X	X	X
Recreational residences									X		
Special Uses	X		X						X		
Soil and Water Protection (see Riparian)	X		X								
Shorelines (see Riparian)	X	X							X		
Silvicultural Prescriptions (see Forest Age & Composition)	X		X	X	X	X	X				X

**Table A-1. Tracking Revision Issues Development**  
Issues & sources from pre-revision to DEIS 

Issue	Pre-Rev Info	Lake States	NFC Public Scoping	Public Ref paper	Public Work Shop	Inter Agency Task Team	NOI	Added after content analysis	= a Non-Rev Issue	Added LATER by FS (in the AMS)	Carried to DEIS
Traditional Use (see Indian Trust Responsibilities)	X	X						X			X
Timber Supply	X	X								X	X
Visuals Mgmt/ Visual quality	X		X						X	X	X
Wildlife Habitat	X		X	X	X	X	X				X
Watershed Health								X			X
Forest Age and Composition										X	X
Potential Wilderness Areas								X			X

## Development of Preliminary Alternatives

### Objectives

- Develop a range of alternatives that responds to the purpose and need for revising the Forest Plans and addresses issues, concerns, and needs identified during NOI scoping and comment.
- Facilitate public involvement in building alternatives by collaborating with others.
- Ensure that participants understand what makes an alternative and feel comfortable using Forest Service information to describe management options.
- Ensure that participants are able to express their desires for future forest management on the National Forests in Minnesota.
- Attempt to develop at least one alternative each participant can relate to.
- Follow regional FS guidelines regarding management areas and allocations.
- Map alternatives on the Superior or Chippewa National Forests.

### Strategy

- Employee workshops were held to explain preliminary alternatives and request input into development of alternatives.
- An invitation for interested parties to participate in the development of alternatives was announced in a press release, on the web page, and via the newsletter.
- Personal invitations from the Forest Supervisors were sent to key contacts including tribal governments, elected officials, and resource agencies.
- An Alternative Develop Workbook was prepared and sent to respondents with understanding that participants would be required to perform pre-work prior to workshops and follow the process outlined in the workbook.
- Significant issues, identified in the workbook, were used during the workshops to initiate the development of alternatives to be addressed by this EIS.
- The Forest Service conducted carefully organized workshops to facilitate a collaborative process. These workshops were facilitated by non-FS personnel and Forest leadership.

- Workshop notes were offered to participants. The monthly newsletter summarized the workshop outcome.
- Preliminary alternatives and maps were presented and discussed at 5 public meetings.
- Preliminary alternatives were described in the newsletter and descriptions and maps were posted on the web page.
- The Forest Service conducted government-to-government consultation regarding preliminary alternatives.

NOTE: At the time, this was an unusual and highly collaborative approach. It was the first time that the Minnesota National Forests asked the public to help develop preliminary alternatives for a Forest Plan.

## **Outcome**

Proposed themes for alternatives were validated and supplemented during public and employee workshops held in August 1998 on the Chippewa and Superior National Forests. There were a total of over 200 attendees at the workshops.

Workshop participants suggested themes for 30 alternatives. Following the workshops, voluntary groups focused on 9 themes and assembled a preliminary alternative using applicable minimum management requirements.

The planning team reviewed the feedback from the public workshops and identified a list of dominant “drivers” or themes behind the 30 suggestions for alternatives. The team then combined alternatives with similar drivers to arrive at the seven alternative themes that have been carried forward in this document.

The last step of the process was to map and describe desired future conditions for each alternative. The volunteer groups of representatives attempted to perform the mapping and define desired future condition. Not all volunteer groups concluded this task and, for many of the themes, the Forest Service interdisciplinary team completed this work based on the input received during the workshops. The planning team made several decisions regarding allocations such as recreation opportunities, watershed management, economic emphasis, RNA’s and SMC’s that would develop a reasonable range. Some alternatives were merged due to strong similarities in management emphasis.

The requirement to follow regional guidelines for developing MA’s was dropped in March 2002. The planning team decided to revise MA’s 1-4 to better reflect vegetation management objectives.

Teams integrated wilderness evaluations and initial species viability information Oct 2001 into preliminary alternatives, design maps, establish desired future conditions form management areas and working on rules for modeling alternatives.

## **Consultation with Indian Tribes and Other Government Agencies**

The Forests have kept county, tribal, state, and other governmental agencies apprised of the status of Forest Plan revision and consulted on common management concerns. Under the FACA (Federal Advisory Committees Act) national forests may consult with sovereign nations and elected officials differently than private citizens and organizations.

## **Objectives**

- Developing long-term relationships with key public figures and organizations for improved communications relating to Forest Plan revision and eventual implementation.
- To provide continuity and a personal contact point for key publics throughout the revision process.

- To share relevant data developed by the Core Planning Team for professional feedback.
- To represent the joint effort of Chippewa and Superior National Forests to our key publics.
- To keep Forest Leadership informed and engaged throughout the revision process.

## Strategy

- Beginning in 1997, a system to contact key opinion leaders was established and updated approximately every two years.
- Forest Leadership regularly delivers consistent messages to assigned contacts from a list of approximately 100 individuals by using fact sheets and background information.
- All county, state and tribal governments were encouraged to designate official representatives to coordinate participation.
- Consultation regarding Forest Plan revision was approached through already established regularly scheduled briefings that the Forests hold with counties, state agencies, tribal government, and other federal agencies.
- Regular briefings have been provided at the Minnesota Forest Resource Council (MFRC), which is composed of representatives from stake-holding organizations in the state.
- The Forest Service has coordinated with other forest management efforts in the State including:
  - Including MFRC maps, data, and other products in analysis
  - Participate in MFRC forest management guidelines
  - Cooperate with MFRC on a landscape assessment and identify desired future conditions for the landscape across all ownerships.
  - Continue involvement of the Resource Management Partnership (REMAP) group.
  - Recreational Motor Vehicle Management
- Initial consultation was conducted with Minnesota State agencies, 7 counties adjacent to national forests, and 4 tribal governments review preliminary alternatives.
- In follow-up to initial consultation, the Forest Service held one-on-one dialogue with key contacts to refine specific preliminary alternatives.
- Conduct ongoing consultation with four Minnesota bands of the Ojibwe. The Chippewa National Forest has focused on their relationship with the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe (LLBO) and holds minimum of quarterly review of projects with LLBO. Superior conducts minimum of quarterly meetings with the Grand Portage, Bois Fort, and Fond du Lac bands.
- Pre-release of Draft EIS and Proposed Plans in consultation with other agencies, and tribal government.

## Outcome

The counties, other agencies, and interest groups have generally indicated acceptance of the range of alternatives. There is a high ownership of specific alternatives by interest groups, and high public expectations of an open involvement process. All groups desired individualized attention and have been active, long-term participants during the revision process.

### *Tribal Involvement*

The LLBO designated the Director of their Division of Natural Resource Management as the official representative for Forest Plan Revision consultation and designated representative to help map areas of tribal significance. Monthly consultation meetings were established to work on tribal revision issues separate from Monthly NEPA review meetings.

The LLBO and Forest Service conducted a joint survey of band members to help identify traditional uses and use areas. A minimum of 43% of tribal members responded.

Representatives from all four bands participated in key activities including issue identification, development of preliminary alternatives, PVA, and task teams. LLBO representatives worked jointly with Forest Service on proposed standards and guidelines. LLBO also organized and conducted separate public involvement activities focusing on band members.

### *Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) Involvement*

Similarities in management responsibilities and policy development between the National Forests and MnDNR in management of forested lands within the boundaries of the National Forests has resulted in ongoing consultation during each agency's planning.

The MnDNR provided coordinated input through a representative designated by the Governor. This included coordinated participation of MnDNR in the resource-specific task teams addressing revision issues.

Representatives from the MnDNR contributed to key activities including issue identification, development of preliminary alternatives, PVA species expertise, task teams, information technology transfer, and policy coordination.

### *County Involvement*

Counties that are adjacent to Forest Service lands on the Chippewa are members of REMAP and received updates at their regular meetings. The counties designated official representatives who participated on Task teams. The regional development commissions were contracted to conduct the Forest Service data collection and public involvement with Social Assessments and Roads Analysis. The county boards provided comments.

## **Review and Comment on Draft EIS and Proposed Forest Plans**

### **Objectives**

- Create an understanding of the alternatives, the analysis, and Proposed Forest Plan.
- Encourage interested parties to review and provide substantive written comments regarding the DEIS and Proposed Forest Plans.
- Provide substantive feedback to substantive comments.
- Obtain additional information to help make an informed decision.
- Participants feel validated that their input affects direction of planning.

### **Strategy**

- A focused briefing will be provided to employees.
- A 90-day comment period will follow official announcement of the Draft EIS and Proposed Forest Plans in the *Federal Register*.
- Release of the documents will also be announced in local and regional media, in the newsletter, and on the web page.
- A personal notice and invitation for review and comment will be presented to key contacts.
- A focused briefing will be provided to local and regional media.
- The Chippewa and Superior National Forests intend to host public meetings to facilitate review and comment of the draft documents.

- A Review Guide will be provided with the Draft EIS and Proposed Plans to help formulate comments that address factual information, professional opinion, or informed judgment specific to Forest Plan Revision proposals.
- All written comments, including emails, that are received during the comment period will be considered, however, detailed responses will only be prepared for substantive comments.
- Documentation of the planning team responses to comments will be included in the FEIS.
- Work with other governments and agencies to coordinate efficient comment procedures or host extended informational meetings.

**(Desired) Outcomes:**

- Affected and interested parties review and comment on the Draft EIS and Proposed Plans.
- Reviewers understand the discussion of issues, alternatives, environmental effects and rationale for conclusions.
- A high percentage of comments regarding the Draft EIS and Proposed Plans that are received are substantive and can be addressed in the Final EIS.

*A substantive comment* provides factual information, professional opinion, or informed judgment that is germane to the action being proposed.  
Substantive comments are *specific, comparative, or solution-oriented*.  
Potential topics include, but are not limited to:

- ❑ Range of Alternatives (specific concerns not addressed by range of alts)
- ❑ Appropriateness of Analysis (specific gaps, corrections, clarifications)
- ❑ Alternatives (specific concerns, modifications)
- ❑ Direction in Proposed Forest Plan (specific gaps or needed adjustment)

**Table A-2. Summary of Revision Public Information and Public Participation**

<b>Date (month year)</b>	<b>Public Activity</b>	<b>Purpose/Results</b>
May 96	Public Comment Package Mailed to 1,000-1,500.	Requested rating of 21 issues (Hi-Med-Low) for inclusion in this revision and rational for inclusion. Low-rated items were deferred for later action. 168 written comments were received (189 including duplicates). 68 people expressed interest in attending a workshop to discuss the issues.
May 96	Draft MOU	Discussion on amendments to a Draft MOU developing between the Leech Lake Band and Forest Service specific to Forest Planning consultation, General management cooperation, and mutual enforcement of laws, regulations and ordinances. (Executive Order 13007 passed regarding access to and ceremonial use of sacred sites.
Dec 96	Tribal Consultation-Reference Paper	An overview and background paper on <u>American Indian Trust Responsibilities</u> related to Forest Plan revision was reviewed by members of the Leech Lake Band, FS Office of General Council, and the interdisciplinary planning team. Used in conjunction with public comments for inclusion of issues in this revision process.
Dec 96	One public workshop on 11 issues, lasting 2 days, and separate work with LLBO on a reference paper.	Validated new information (described in a set of Reference Papers) and questions to be addressed through revision. 60 attendees addressed the 12 most controversial topics of the 21 proposed.  There was a separate employee reference paper review meeting.
Jan-Feb 97	Workshop Follow-up	Participants were sent updated versions of Reference papers.
Feb – March 97	Tribal Consultation-9 Interdisciplinary Task Teams	Nine Forest Service working groups proposed recommendations to resolve questions and issues of nine most-controversial topics. (3 included a representative from MN Department of Natural Resources, or tribal gov't). Task Team Reports were provided to the Planning Team.
June 97	Revision Newsletter	Content: Purpose of Forest Plan and Revision, overview of process steps
Aug, 97	Pre-release	Pre-release of the draft Notice of Intent (CA letter #495)
Aug 97	Notice of Intent Issued Mailed to 2,070	Synopsis printed in the <u>Federal Register</u> . The NOI includes provisions specific to Indian Tribes and this is different from the old plan, a significant effort worth mentioning to show response to tribes input. 60-day comment period was extended to 90 days. 462 comments received, 16 issues raised.
Sept 97	14 Open Houses Tribal Consultation	Notice of Intent introduced. Total of 93 attendees. Five separate open houses were held to reach Tribal audiences in Oct-Nov 97.
Jan 98	Revision Newsletter	Content: update on Notice of Intent, overview of process to develop Alternatives
April 98	Tribal Consultation	Leech Lake DRM selected an employee to assist planner with identification and mapping of areas of tribal significance.
April 98	Revision Newsletter	Content: Review of public response to Notice of Intent and Notice of Intent relationship to development of Alternatives, overview of revision process.
May 98	Content Analysis Report sent to 2200	Summary of Public Comments to Notice of Intent: Most dominant request was to add roads and recreation to issues addressed by revision.
May 98	Executive Order	Executive Order 13084 acknowledges the unique consultative relationship of US Government with tribal government.
July 98	Revision Newsletter	Content: update on public workshops and development of alternatives.
Aug 98	3 Progressive Public Workshops & Tribal Consultation	Instructions for Developing Alternatives. 200 attendees created 30 alternatives using 7 established themes and based on comments to Notice of Intent. A workbook of background info was prepared in advance. Tribal representative participated in workshops.

<b>Table A-2. Summary of Revision Public Information and Public Participation</b>		
<b>Date (month year)</b>	<b>Public Activity</b>	<b>Purpose/Results</b>
Sept 98	Public Letter	Content: Thank you to workshop participants.
Sept 98	Workshop Summary	Workshop notes available by request. Stated that the first set of preliminary alternatives would be disclosed when mapped.
Sept – Nov 98	Consultation with LLBO- 3 meetings	Development of desired future conditions for treaty rights, access and resource management.
Oct 98	NEPA Quarterly	Content includes update on Revision activities
Nov 98	Tribal Consultation-Survey	Leech Lake tribal members responded to a questionnaire to help identify important traditional resources, access and habitats.
Nov 98	Tribal Consultation - meeting	Met on topics of access, collecting leeches, minnow, wild rice, and fish habitat, riparian areas, and wetlands.
Dec 98	Tribal Consultation-meeting	Review of alternatives.
Jan 99	Public web site	Timeline and revision process descriptions go online
Jan 99	NEPA Quarterly	Content: Workshops resulted in 30 different proposals and we expect 6-8 alternatives to emerge. Work of the Alternatives Team is expected to be shared in February 99.
Feb 99	Revision Newsletter	Content: The Planning organization takes official Pause to consider how best to analyze and organize Plan Revision.
April 99	NEPA Quarterly	Content includes update on Revision activities
April 99	Revision Newsletter	Content: The Pause is over; employees reviewed pool of Management Areas, The planning team is preparing information for benchmarks. Analysis of Management Situation should be available in May 99. Info meetings expected at Districts and other locations in July 99.
May 99	Tribal Consultation- 2 Meetings	Forest Service leadership meet with newly appointed LLBO leaders to set up monthly consultation. LLBO-DRM specialists review preliminary alternatives and request participation in developing minimum management requirements. Unique participation we followed up on – see original tribal consult table.
June 99	Tribal Consultation – letter	Tribal chairs asked to formally designate a representative to help refine preliminary alternatives.
July 99	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Leech Lake DRM Director and the Executive Director present issues to the Chippewa Forest Leadership Team. Action items noted in a letter of August 1, 99. Director of Leech Lake DRM proposed for appointment as Forest Planning liaison
July 99	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	LLBO -DRM and LLBO Natural Resource Advisory Committee provide input on the preliminary set of alternatives and review minimum management requirements proposed for each alternative.
Aug 99	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Continued discussion with the LLBO Natural Resource Advisory Committee on the preliminary set of alternatives as well as the initial standards and guidelines.
July 99	NEPA Quarterly	Content includes update on Revision activities
July 99	Revision Newsletter	Content: Forests reviewed the preliminary alternatives; government/agencies will review in July-Aug 99. Publics can expect opportunities to review later in year at open houses. The planning team is integrating Recreation, preparing the Analysis of Management Situation and mapping potential candidate Research Natural Areas.

**Table A-2. Summary of Revision Public Information and Public Participation**

<b>Date (month year)</b>	<b>Public Activity</b>	<b>Purpose/Results</b>
Aug 99	Storm Recovery Begins	Storm Recovery work temporarily supercedes Plan Revision and will be incorporated. Weekly Storm Recovery fact sheets.
Sept 99	Inter-Governmental /Agency Review	MN State agencies, 7 counties, and 4 tribal governments review preliminary alternatives and set up for interagency data sharing.
Oct 99	Revision Newsletter	Content: July Wind Storm required reevaluating landscape changes, Governmental review of preliminary alternatives has begun, Public review expected to follow governmental review.
Oct 99	NEPA Quarterly	Content: Proposal for New Planning Regulations released and national open houses planned for November 99, intergovernmental/agency Review of Alternatives continues.
Nov 99	2 National Public Meetings	Overview of National Planning Rule-making and introduction of roadless area initiative. (150 attendees)
Dec 99	Revision Newsletter	Content: Introduce new planning team members, Population Viability Assessment begins, meetings on new planning regulations expected, and information about roadless initiative.
Dec 99	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Discussion of issues of importance between Superior National Forest and Fond du Lac, Bois Forte, Grand Portage, background of the planning process, and potential for tribal input. Distributed information on the Roadless Area Conservation Policy with a national comment deadline of Dec 19.
Dec 99	Tribal Consultation - Inter-organizational decision	Establishment of Quarterly NEPA Review Meetings between Chippewa National Forest and Leech Lake Tribal leadership and their respective program managers.
Jan 00	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Quarterly Meeting with LLBO on current and proposed projects. Content: ongoing coordination with governments/agencies, public review of preliminary Alternatives expected soon, update regarding proposed changes to planning regulations.
Jan 00	NEPA Quarterly	Content: ongoing coordination with governments/agencies, public review of preliminary Alternatives expected soon, update regarding proposed changes to planning regulations.
Jan 00	Public Letter	Content: Notification for 5 public meetings in Feb/March to introduce the preliminary Alternatives.
Jan 00	Species Expert Panels & Tribal Consultation	60 species experts convene to assess the needs of 200 species, groupings and priorities applicable to revision. Tribal reps from 4 bands contribute to 5 of 16 panels.
Feb 00	Tribal Consultation -National Issue	Separate and required public involvement occurred with tribes related to the Roadless Area Conservation Proposal with documented input Feb 22, 00 applicable to the revision process. <b>Director of LLBO Natural Resources appointed as liaison for Forest Planning.</b>
Feb 00	Public Letter	Content: invitation to Plan Revision Progress Report meetings.
March 00	Public Meetings in 5 locations	Content: introduced 7 preliminary alternatives and process that behind them.
March 00	Tribal Consultation - meeting	Quarterly Meeting with LLBO on current and proposed projects.
April 00	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Quarterly Meeting with LLBO on current and proposed projects
April 00	NEPA Quarterly	Content: Report from public meetings, Roadless initiative, Roads Mgt Rule
April 00	Tribal Consultation - Workshop	DRM and FS present a Forest Plan Revision Progress Report to tribal members including national forest and treaty history, pertinent laws affecting revision, status of maps and descriptions of preliminary alternatives. About

<b>Table A-2. Summary of Revision Public Information and Public Participation</b>		
<b>Date (month year)</b>	<b>Public Activity</b>	<b>Purpose/Results</b>
		6 people attended.
May 00	National	Leech lake commissioner participates in Draft Report of the National Task Force on tribal Relations as presented to the National Leadership Team.
May-June 00	4 National Public Meetings/ Hearings	Explanation and comment session on Roadless Areas Proposal (300 attendees)
July 00	NEPA Quarterly	Content includes update on Revision activities
July 00	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Quarterly Meeting with LLBO on current and proposed projects
July 00	Congressional Hearing	Senators Gram and Wellstone hear feedback on effectiveness of Storm Recovery response and future planning (350 attended)
Sept 00	NEPA Quarterly	Comment period closed for proposed changes to planning rule.
Oct 00	National	Leech lake reps visit with Deputy Chief Sally Collins about band history and relations with national forest.
Nov 00	Tribal Consultation – Meeting	Leech Lake Tribal Historic Preservation Officer attends Chippewa leadership meeting. Agreement to share future agendas.
Dec 00	Work Session	Met with LLBO to draft initial Standards and Guidelines related to tribal interests
Dec 00	NEPA Quarterly	Team working on draft Chap 1, answering questions for modeling, benchmarks, and defining management objectives.
Jan 01	Meeting	Quarterly Meeting with LLBO on current and proposed projects
Jan 01	Interagency Meeting & Tribal Consultation	LLBO Tribal Council, FS Leadership (local, regional and national), and state agency identify consultation problems and potential corrections. See original tribal consult table.

**Table A-2. Summary of Revision Public Information and Public Participation**

<b>Date (month year)</b>	<b>Public Activity</b>	<b>Purpose/Results</b>
April 01	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Quarterly Meeting - Discussion between Chippewa National forest and LLBO prior to initiating Roads Analysis Process.
April 01	NEPA Quarterly	Content: Implementing adopted Road Management Regulations
May 01	Tribal Consultation-meeting	Review of projects and status of programmatic agreement sensitive to Section 106 of Historic Preservation Act .FS Representative on the Advisory Council on historic Preservation provided comments on the 1997 Draft MOU between LLBO and Chippewa National Forest.
June 01	Work Session	Meeting with LLBO on Section 106/Programmatic Agreement progress. Decision to separate Programmatic Agreement from revision consultation and MOU development and accomplish in stages.
July 01	Forest Service Regional Office Review chartered by Forest Supervisors	Regional Office staff checks the course of Minnesota and Wisconsin's revision efforts and validate next steps using the re-established 1982 Planning Rule. Draft Recommendations provided.
Aug 01	Revision Meetings	Overview of Roads Analysis Process, provided descriptive flyers available of dates, purpose etc. (Contracted with Rural Development Commissions) Chippewa held 5 meetings, 100 people attending. Superior held 3 meetings with 16 attendees.
Sept 01	Tribal consultation - meeting	Chippewa Forest Supervisor addresses LLBO Tribal Council to discuss consultation procedures.
Oct 01	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Quarterly Meeting with LLBO on current and proposed projects
Nov 01	Tribal Consultation - Meeting	Quarterly Meeting with LLBO on current and proposed projects
Oct 01	NEPA Quarterly	Content: Summer accomplishments included integrating wilderness evaluations and initial species viability into preliminary Alts, designing maps, establishing Desired Future Condition for Management Areas and finalizing modeling rules.
Dec 01	Revision Newsletter	Content: Review Notice of Intent, key issues, overview of process, Landscape Ecosystem approach, Range of Natural Variability,
Dec 01	NEPA Quarterly	Content includes update on Revision activities
Jan 02	Tribal Consultation – letter	Tribe provided comments on National Task Force Team Draft Consultation Policy.
Jan – Feb 02	Tribal Consultation – meeting	Regular meetings deferred.
March 02	Revision Newsletter	Content: Summary of preliminary alternatives and management areas, species viability evaluation, wilderness evaluation, announce public open houses.
March 02	7 Public Open Houses	Update and overview of revision process, provided fact sheets, maps (200 attendees)
March 02	NEPA Quarterly	Content includes update on Revision activities
March 02	3 Leech Lake Band Public Meetings (independently held meetings at tribal Districts)	Status of Forest planning was one of 3 topics addressed. Described the issues that LLBO would like incorporated into revision, showed maps of alternatives. Follow-up meetings between DRM and CNF are planned for April 16, May 16 and June 20.
March 02	Tribal Consultation – letter	Letter to Chief on timber harvest and effects on future trust responsibilities (and response Aug 02 - WO Correspondence)
March 02	Tribal Consultation – meeting	Chippewa Planner and Traditional Resource Coordinator met with LLBO Director of Resource Mgt (DRM) to present revision update. Provided

<b>Table A-2. Summary of Revision Public Information and Public Participation</b>		
<b>Date (month year)</b>	<b>Public Activity</b>	<b>Purpose/Results</b>
		potential wilderness maps and GIS plots of preliminary Alternatives. Agreed to work with DRM to draft tribal standards and guidelines for Forest Leadership consideration into Propose Plan.
April 02	Public Workshop	Concurrent groups focused on specific questions regarding recreational motor use, Range of Natural Variability, modeling, special Management Areas designations. (33 attendees)
April 02	Species Expert Panels	50 species experts convene to evaluate the extent that Alternatives to Minnesota and Wisconsin's proposed alternatives provide adequate habitat for 160 species.
May 02	Revision Newsletter	Content: overview of modeling for plan revision, social assessment.
May 02	Tribal Consultation-Meeting	Monthly meeting with LLBO, Forest Plan Revision update
June 02	Tribal Consultation-Meeting	Monthly meeting with LLBO, Forest Plan Revision update
June 02	Tribal Consultation – meeting	Chippewa finalizes Tribal Liaison position description with LLBO, pending budget availability.
June 02	Tribal Consultation –meeting	Introduction between Leech Lake Tribal Chair and new Region 9 Forester.
July 02	Revision Newsletter	Content: status of new Planning Rule, Roads Analysis process, Recreation Opportunity Spectrum.
July 02	Tribal Consultation –meeting	Monthly meeting with LLBO, Forest Plan Revision update
Aug 02	Tribal Consultation –meeting	Monthly meeting with LLBO, Forest Plan Revision update
Sept 02	Revision Newsletter	Vegetation Management Objectives, Recreational Motor Vehicle Management, Update, Definition of Preferred Alternative.
Sept 02	Tribal Consultation –meeting	Monthly meeting with LLBO, Forest Plan Revision update
Oct 02	Tribal Consultation-meeting	Monthly meeting with LLBO, Working group on tribal standards and guidelines,
Oct 02	Tribal Consultation-meetings	Superior National Forest establishes quarterly meetings with Fond du Lac, Bois Forte, Grand Portage bands of the Ojibwe.
Jan 03	Revision Newsletter	Present matrix of alternatives by issue. Announce Social Assessments, Roads Analyses, benchmark analysis, wilderness inventory. Overview of Proposed National Rule. Request for response to receive documents.
Jan 03	Tribal Consultation –meeting	Monthly meeting with LLBO, Forest Plan Revision update
Jan 03	NEPA Quarterly	Release of documents expected by Spring 2003; encourage review and comment. Request for response to receive documents. .
March 03	Tribal Consultation - Meetings	Anticipate pre-release of DEIS and Proposed Plans with tribal government and agencies.
April-May 03	Public Meetings	Expected informational meetings for public and LLBO-sponsored meetings about content and use of the DEIS and Draft Plan.

## **For More Information**

Detailed records of information summarized in this appendix are retained in the planning record that is available for inspection upon request. The planning record includes all correspondence or records related to the process of issue identification and narrowing the scope of the plan revision effort, including meeting notes, comments received on the Notice of Intent or other public review documents, and copies of interim reports (such as Reference papers, Task team reports, and the Content Analysis Report).