COLLABORATION PRINCIPLES
BLM TIMBER MOUNTAIN/JOHN'S PEAK
OHV RECREATION PLAN WORK GROUP

The Draft Collaboration Principles were originally presented as Attachment A to the Independent Assessment Report, dated December 16, 2011. There were revisions in response to some of the comments received since it was distributed on January 3, 2012. The Collaboration Principles were approved by the Work Group at the January 29, 2012 meeting.

I. Process Goals Statement

The BLM is interested in achieving a broadly supported plan for OHV recreation in the Timber Mountain/John's Peak area, while minimizing negative impacts to landowners and the environment. The goal of convening a Work Group (WG) and conducting a facilitated process is to provide an opportunity for stakeholder input, dialogue, and problem solving.

Nothing in the Independent Process Assessment and Recommendation Report, these Collaboration Principals, or this process waives the legal rights or responsibilities of any participant.

II. Work Group Charge and Scope of Work

A. Charge

The Work Group will make recommendations to the BLM regarding elements of the proposed plan. While the BLM has ultimate responsibility for decision-making as to which recommendations to implement, it is committed to supporting consensus recommendations from this collaborative (ADR) process. As a result, it will move forward with such a recommendation as the Proposed OHV Management Plan Alternative in the final EIS. If there is consensus on specific aspects of the project, but not on a complete plan, BLM will move forward with the consensus aspects, creating a separate alternative, or incorporating them into the BLM's Proposed Alternative.

Additionally, there are ongoing efforts to swap/sell lands between the City of Jacksonville and the Motorcycle Riders Association. There is an ongoing effort to create a non-motorized trail through the Timber Mountain/Johns Peak management area. This ADR process will not directly consider those efforts. However, participants can include their specific needs or opportunities related to those efforts in the negotiation process.

Finally, this ADR process is not a NEPA public comment process. Therefore, there is no current "scoping" or public comment opportunity for those who are not directly involved in this ADR process. Because the WG meetings will be open to the public, BLM will put meeting dates and information pertinent to this ADR process on its website. Any plan developed through this ADR process will be reviewed through a subsequent environmental impact statement (EIS) process. BLM will consider *all* public comments related to *all* alternatives then, regardless of one's affiliation with the ADR process. Alternatives with substantial consensus will rank higher in BLM's evaluation.

B. Scope of Work and Timeline

The Scope of Work and Timeline for this process will be developed collaboratively by the Work Group and will evolve over time. The process is to begin in January 2012 and continue through the June 2012. While it is the intent of the BLM to conclude this collaborative dialogue and advisory process within a six-month period, it is impossible to contemplate all eventualities. As a result, dates are projected, not fixed.

C. Public Involvement

The meetings of this Work Group will be open to the public. BLM staff will provide meeting information/notices, in advance, and regularly update the website with process-related information, documents, and meeting announcements.

III. Work Group Membership and Support

The number of members/interests are *not* intended to be evenly balanced between the potentially competing views. Rather, the members/interests were selected to bring together the spectrum of views to explore the creation of a consensus.

A. Members

INTERESTS	MEMBERS
Residential Landowner	Jack Duggan (Olena Black, alternate)
Residential Landowner	Shayne Maxwell (Laurie LeDoux, alternate)
Environmental Group	Chris Bratt
Environmental Group	Joseph Vaile, KS Wild
Industrial Landowner	Randy Brown, Spalding
Industrial Landowner	Eric Hippler, Plum Creek
OHV Proponent	Steve McIntyre, MRA (Chuck Steahly, alternate)
OHV Proponent	Jack LeRoy, MRA (Chuck Steahly, alternate)
Non-Motorized Recreation	Mike Bronze, Rogue Valley Mt Bike Association (Joe Davis, alternate)
Non-Motorized Recreation	Ken Chapman, Applegate Trails Association (Michele LaFave, alternate)
BLM *Ex Officio (Non-Voting)*	John Gerritsma
City of Jacksonville *Ex Officio (Non-Voting)*	Jim Lewis
Oregon Parks and Recreation *Ex Officio (Non-Voting)*	Ron Price

B. Chair

There will be no chair. Sam Imperati of the Institute *for* Conflict Management, Inc., will facilitate the WG meetings.

C. Work Group Alternates and Replacements

Due to the complexity of the process, it is best to have one person represent each interest throughout the planning process to maintain continuity of discussion and recommendations. If necessary, Work Group members may identify an alternate to represent them in their absence, preferably at the outset of the process.

It will be the responsibility of the primary WG member to keep the alternate informed so they can represent their group in case the primary WG member is absent. Alternates may attend WG meetings, but will not sit at the main table or vote, unless they are substituting for the primary WG member. Notice of substitution must be submitted to the WG facilitator in advance of WG meetings.

WG member resignations, changes, and replacements must be submitted in writing to the WG Chair by the representative interest group/organization.

D. Project Staff

The Bureau of Land Management will staff the WG process. John Gerritsma, Field Manager, and Dennis Byrd, Ashland Reserve Area Resource Staff, are the primary project staff at the BLM.

The BLM commits to:

1) Clearly define opportunities where the public can provide timely input so that there is an opportunity to affect change.

2) Be accessible, inclusive, meaningful, regular, timely, open, fair, and honest. This includes providing information in as much advance as practical.

3) Ensure a collaborative public involvement process between the BLM and stakeholders, and meet the planning timelines.

4) Provide an ongoing record of public input, questions, and responses, as well as a mechanism to make this information available to the public.

5) Provide the public with a way to stay involved and informed during the process.

6) Provide the WG with the relevant, objective information, in a timely fashion, necessary to make informed decisions. Presentations will provide the facts – pro and con – surrounding the issues in a readily understandable format.

7) Provide the big picture context and interconnections surrounding all issues, before asking the WG to make a recommendation.

8) Be responsive to WG member requests for information and process support, be clear and transparent about staff positions, and be open to carefully considering Work group recommendations.

E. The Facilitator

An independent facilitation firm has been hired as a process manager by the BLM, separately from the other consultants. They will assist the Work Group and staff. They will also facilitate WG meetings and provide advice on the public involvement program. The facilitator's "client" is the Work Group process, but neither WG membership, nor process participation is a substitute for independent legal or other professional advice. That is the responsibility of the process participants and is encouraged. The facilitator will be responsible to ensure the WG process is fair, well run, and productive. The facilitator will be available as a resource to the BLM for minor conflict resolution and process improvement suggestions. As a neutral collaborative process provider, the facilitator will not act as an advocate for anyone on any substantive issue. However, the facilitator may propose substantive suggestions for Work Group consideration, but will not make decisions on substantive issues.

The Institute *for* Conflict Management, Inc. (ICM, or the facilitator) has been hired for this process. ICM's Executive Director, Sam Imperati, will act as the lead facilitator. Melissa Egan will act as the Assistant Facilitator. ICM, Sam Imperati, Melissa Egan, and any subcontractors are not employees of any participant. ICM's written contract is available for review. The facilitator will not be influenced by payment source.

The facilitator may have non-confidential, informal communications and perform facilitation activities with staff and WG members, between and during meetings. The facilitator will address situations where it appears a participant is not acting according to these Collaboration Principles and will advise the BLM if it appears unlikely that the WG will be unable to fulfill its Charge.

IV. <u>Collaboration Protocols</u>

A. Quorum

A quorum is a simple majority of voting WG members or their alternates. If there is no quorum, the chair can cancel/reschedule or conduct the WG meeting and send all meeting notes and materials to the members for voting at the next meeting.

B. Open Meetings

Meetings of the Work Group are open to the public. Notice will be posted in advance of meetings on the Timber Mountain OHV Area website (http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/medford/recreation/timbermountain/index.php). WG meeting summaries will be posted on the website.

C. Caucus

Work Group members are welcome to caucus with members of their constituency group or others during meetings. Caucuses can occur at the formal breaks in the agenda or may be requested, as needed.

D. Public Comment

The facilitator will provide a public comment opportunity for non-WG members during meetings before the WG makes a decision. Comments from the public will be limited in time to allow sufficient opportunity to conduct the other portions of the WG agenda. The public is encouraged to submit written comments to ICM for circulation to the full Work Group.

E. Meeting Agendas and Meeting Materials

ICM and the BLM will draft Working Agendas for WG meetings. Meeting agendas and meeting materials will be mailed or sent electronically to WG members one week in advance of the meetings, and will be posted on the project website. WG meetings will begin and end as scheduled.

F. Work Group Member Commitments to Each Other

The Work Group members, project staff, and participants will participate in good faith, which means:

1) Prepare for and set aside time for the meetings and the whole process,

2) Participate fully, honestly and fairly, commenting constructively and specifically,

3) Speak respectfully, briefly and non-repetitively; not speaking again on a subject until all other members desiring to speak have had the opportunity to speak,

4) Allow people to say what is true for them without fear of reprisal from WG members, or the BLM,

5) Avoid side conversations during meetings,

6) Provide information as much in advance as possible of the meeting in which such information is to be used and share all relevant information to the maximum extent possible,

7) Generate and explore all options on the merits with an open mind, listening to different points of view with a goal of understanding the underlying interests of other WG members,

8) Consult regularly with their interest groups/organizations and provide their input in a clear and concise manner,

9) Agreeing to work toward fair, practical and durable recommendations that reflect the diverse interests of the entire WG and the public,

10) When communicating with others, accurately summarize the WG process, discussion and meetings, presenting a full, fair and balanced view of the issues and arguments out of respect for the process and other members,

11) Success depends on a full airing of the ideas and opinions of each committee member. Members should be forthcoming and honest during discussions and in the

consensus process. When a consensus recommendation is reached, each member owes it to the others and to the process to not attempt to effect a different outcome outside of the WG process once the WG has reached a consensus recommendation,

12) Strive vigorously for consensus and closure on issues, and

13) Self-regulate and help other members abide by these commitments.

V. <u>Decision-Making Process</u>

A. Developing Recommendations

The facilitator will assist the Work Group in identifying objectives, addressing the diversity of perspectives, and developing substantive, practical recommendations to implement its Charge. The WG will use a *Consensus Decision-Making* model to assist the process.

B. Representative Voting

Each Work Group member will have one vote except non-voting, Ex Officio members. A vote represents that the member will recommend to his or her organization or group that they should support the voted-upon proposal consistent with the member's vote. The names of those voting in favor and those voting against a proposal will be noted and included in the WG's recommendations to the BLM.

C. Consensus

Consensus decision-making is a process that allows WG members to distinguish underlying values, interests, and concerns with a goal of developing widely accepted solutions. Consensus does not mean 100% agreement on each part of every issue, but rather support for a decision, *"taken as a whole."* This means that a member may vote to support a consensus proposal even though they would prefer to have it modified in some manner in order to give it their full support. Consensus is a process of *"give and take*," of finding common ground and developing creative solutions in a way that all interests can support. Consensus is reached if all members at the table support an idea or can say, *"I can live with that."*

C.1. "1-2-3" Consensus Voting Method

The facilitator will assist the WG in articulating points of agreement, as well as articulating concerns that require further exploration. WG will use a "Consensus Voting" procedure for testing the group's opinion and adjusting proposals. In "Consensus Voting," the facilitator will articulate the proposal.

Each WG member will then vote "one," "two," or "three," reflecting the following:

- "One" indicates full support for the proposal as stated.
- "Two" indicates that the participant agrees with the proposal as stated, but would prefer to have it modified in some manner in order to give it unconditional support. Nevertheless, the member will fully support the consensus even if his/her suggested modifications are not supported by the rest of the group because the proposal, taken as a whole, is worthy of support, as written.
- "Three" indicates refusal to support the proposal as stated.

The facilitator will repeat the consensus voting process, as reasonably necessary, to assist the group in achieving consensus regarding a particular recommendation, so that all members are voting “one” or “two.”

C.2. Cooling-Off Period

If a consensus is not reasonably forthcoming, the facilitator may table the issue for additional discussion with constituencies, the gathering of new information, or perhaps just sufficient time to consider options more carefully. The “cooling off” period recognizes we value getting as close to consensus as possible by way of dialogue, clarification, and consideration of alternatives. Absent an emerging consensus, the facilitator may make a recommendation for the WG to consider taking into consideration all of the available information and views. The WG may then revisit the issue.

C.3. No Consensus – Majority and Minority View

If a consensus on an issue is still not reasonably likely, as determined by the facilitator, the votes of those present at the meeting will be taken and recorded as a majority - minority vote. Majority is defined as at least 50% plus one of the WG voting members in attendance. The proposed language and reasoning supported by the majority will be noted along with their names in the WG’s recommendations. Members voting in the minority will have their names, proposed language, and reasoning noted. The facilitator will document issues, the differences of opinion involved, and submit the report to the BLM staff for inclusion in the WG recommendations, along with other stakeholder comments.

C.4. Interpretation and Use of WG Documents/Reports

On those issues where a consensus is reached, there is a high likelihood that view would receive wide support in the community. Where there is no consensus and majority-minority views are noted in WG documents/reports, no conclusions can be reached as to the support that proposal would or would not receive in the community. WG discussions, documents, and reports are not intended for any use other than to help BLM be more informed on its analysis of the alternatives for the Final EIS for Timber Mountain/Johns Peak.

VI. <u>Additional Understandings</u>

A. Communications Outside of the Work Group

WG members and staff can refer press, public, and other inquiries to the WG facilitator or the BLM project managers.

B. Meeting Summaries

The facilitator will prepare WG meeting summaries. They will be provided electronically in draft form to the WG for proposed correction and comment. The final meeting summaries will be posted on the project website.

C. Public Records and Confidentiality

WG records, such as formal documents, discussion drafts, transcripts, meeting summaries, and exhibits are public records. This is not a mediation. It is a facilitation. As a result, WG communications (oral, written, electronic, etc.) are not confidential and may be disclosed.

D. Process Conclusion

The WG process will conclude with submission of its recommendations to the BLM, when necessary funding and resources are no longer available, or when the BLM determines it is unlikely the Work Group will fulfill its Charge.

E. Amendment and Interpretation

Amendments to this document can be made by vote of the Work Group. The facilitator shall lead a WG discussion designed to reach a consensus on any process dispute or proposed amendment to these Collaboration Principles.

VIII. Signatures

We agree:

INTEREST	MEMBER	SIGNATURE
Residential Landowner	Jack Duggan	
Residential Landowner	Shayne Maxwell	
Environmental Group	Chris Bratt	
Environmental Group	Joseph Vaile, KS Wild	
Industrial Landowner	Randy Brown, Spalding	
Industrial Landowner	Eric Hippler, Plum Creek	
OHV Proponent	Steve McIntyre, MRA	
OHV Proponent	Jack LeRoy, MRA	
Non-Motorized Recreation	Mike Bronze, Rogue Valley Mt Bike Assoc	
Non-Motorized Recreation	Ken Chapman, Applegate Trails Association	
BLM *Ex Officio (Non-Voting)*	John Gerritsma	
City of Jacksonville *Ex Officio (Non-Voting)*	Jim Lewis	
Oregon Parks and Recreation *Ex Officio (Non-Voting)*	Ron Price	