



## **Forsythe II Multiparty Monitoring Group Kick Off Meeting Questionnaire Findings**

9-20-17

A questionnaire was provided for attendees of the Forsythe II Multiparty Monitoring Group kick off meeting on September 20, 2017. A summary of response from 22 attendees is as follows:

### **Type of monitoring the group is most interested in (in order of priority based on number of responses, taken from initial question and overall responses)**

1. Design involvement
2. Compliance/Implementation
3. Effectiveness

### **Anticipated level of involvement from respondents (+ percent of respondents):**

1. Level 2 -- Actively involved in reviewing and deliberating monitoring results and interpretation, but not actually collecting, organizing or analyzing results (45%)
2. Level 1 -- Actively involved in collecting, organizing, analyzing, and interpreting field data (23%)
3. Level 3 -- Interested in monitoring process results and progress, but won't be actively involved; keep apprised of monitoring activities (23%)
4. Don't know yet (36%)

### **Willing and able to participate in multiparty monitoring meetings or field trips during the weekday given advanced notice (+ percent of respondents):**

- Yes (32%)
- No (14%)
- Occasionally (23%)

### **Components that respondents were most interested in monitoring (listed in order from most to least + percent of respondents)**

- Being involved in design and layout process – be able to share local knowledge with USFS prior to design and layout to ensure that community values are shared and to understand USFS process (45%)
- Implementation monitoring – ensuring that implementation aligns with EA and Final Decision design criteria (45%)
- Preservation of wildlife, wildlife habitat, and movement corridors (27%)
- Social and recreational values (27%)
- Social health – air quality, water quality, noise pollution, property values, etc. (23%)
- Visual impacts of forest management (9%)
- Fire mitigation (9%)
- Forest health (9%)

- Watershed protection (4%)
- Preservation of understory (4%)

**Respondents' hopes for the multiparty monitoring process for the Forsythe II project (listed in order from most to least + percent of respondents)**

- USFS will take community input on unit specific design application to ensure on the ground layout and that task orders follow criteria from the Final Decision (45%)
- Protection of wildlife, wildlife habitat, and movement corridors (27%)
- Keep local public lands aesthetically pleasing and useable for recreation (14%)
- Make forests more resilient to forest fires (9%)

**Respondents' concerns for the multiparty monitoring process for the Forsythe II project (listed in order from most to least + percent of respondents)**

- USFS will override community input (32%)
- Primary multiparty monitoring group decisions and operating space will gravitate toward USFS with little input from community over time (32%)
- USFS will create schedules or deadlines at the last minute, challenging the community input process (18%)
- Initial multiparty monitoring goal of being involved in design and layout of management units is rushed and may lead to frustration or collapse of MPM group efforts due to lack of time to create learning and discussion amongst group (9%)
- Community will not be able to participate in communicating goals and desires for management units to contractors (4%)
- USFS will value timber harvest over social, ecological, wildlife and other values (4%)
- Professionals and residents that *do* agree with the EA, DDN, and Final Decision are not well represented in the MPM group at the outset (4%)
- Design criteria for future project should be influenced solely on MPM group data and results, not personal values (4%)

**Respondents' other concerns regarding the multiparty monitoring process for the Forsythe II project (listed in order from most to least + percent of respondents)**

- Meetings should take place when the majority of people can make it, and should not take place in the middle of a work day (4%)
- There is desire to participate in the multiparty monitoring process, but only if community input will ultimately have value (4%)
- More background on the project, contention, and process should be provided to new participants (4%)

For more information, please contact Marin Chambers, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute at [marin.chambers@colostate.edu](mailto:marin.chambers@colostate.edu)

