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Executive Summary

In 2005, the USDA Forest Service initiated a visitor use capacity analysis in response to an appeal of the Sumter National Forest’s Revised Land and Resource Management Plan by advocates of whitewater boating. The capacity analysis is intended to provide data to be used in evaluating the management decision and adjusting or amending the Forest Plan as appropriate. Since 1976, the upper portion of the Chattooga River, from the headwaters to State Highway 28 bridge, has been closed to whitewater boating as a recreational use.

The Forest Service requested assistance to determine how collaboration among stakeholders can best occur throughout the remaining stages of reassessing the current management decision on boating in the Chattooga Wild and Scenic River. The visitor capacity analysis process is approaching completion of the initial phase of data collection (Phase 1). Various levels of collaboration and public involvement have been a part of the capacity analysis to date, and the Forest Service is seeking assistance on how to best involve interested parties, share information, and work as collaboratively as possible on the completion of this effort, scheduled for fall 2007.

The purpose of this project is to assess the perceptions of a broadly represented subset of river users about the application of a collaborative approach in developing management decisions for recreational use of the Chattooga Wild and Scenic River. The situation assessment coincides with the completion of the Phase 1 analysis, and the results of the assessment may be used to guide decisions on how to structure and conduct the remaining public involvement steps of the capacity analysis before and during the NEPA analysis.

The situation assessment involved three major tasks: (1) gathering data through interviews and secondary sources (2) analyzing the data based on the public involvement literature and professional experience, and (3) making recommendations on how best to structure and conduct a public involvement process during the pre-NEPA and NEPA process.

Telephone interviews were conducted with 24 individuals. Most had previously been involved in the planning process for the Chattooga River. The affiliations and number of respondents belonging to that affiliation are listed below:

- Backcountry Angler (2)
- Birder (1)
- Commercial Boater (1)
- Economic Development (1)
- Emergency Responder (1)
- Forest Service Employee (1)
- Hiker (2)
- Private Boater (5)
- Resident (3)
- Resource Manager (not USFS) (2)
- Scientist (1)
- Wilderness Advocate (4)
In addition to data collected through interviews, information was gathered through secondary sources including forest plans and maps, agendas and summaries of previous meetings, web sites, news articles, and participatory process literature. The secondary sources assisted in developing a context for the situation assessment, defining a chronology of the situation, and in understanding the dynamics among the parties.

**Significant Findings**

1. All of the respondents shared one important value: that protection of the Chattooga River now and in the future is of great importance. Another value shared by many is maintenance of community, whether they are residents in North Carolina, South Carolina, or Georgia.

2. A significant subset of respondents reported a willingness to try collaboration. Many see collaboration as a means to meet their interests. Another subset of respondents remain skeptical that collaboration will promote their interests, but are willing to accept changes in river use if they are science-supported and new uses are closely monitored. A third subset of respondents reported an unwillingness to engage in collaboration. Their preference is to maintain the status quo believing that additional use will result in significant environmental degradation.

Several respondents specified preconditions for collaboration. These were:

   a. The user capacity analysis should be completed and data made available to the public. This will help stakeholders identify problems, and establish standards for river access and use.

   b. "Foot travel only" stakeholders, (i.e., front- and backcountry anglers, hunters, photographers, swimmers, etc.), as well as interested community members and Forest Service personnel must be present or represented in a collaborative process.

   c. Commitment from American Whitewater that access to the upper portion of the Chattooga is not being used as a legal precedent for opening the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone river corridor in Yellowstone National Park;

   d. Some limitations on boating (and boaters) are necessary including maintaining woody debris in the river.

3. Respondents clearly understand their limits of authority in the process and have realistic expectations about their contribution to the final decision. They understand that the Forest Service will make the decision with respect to boating use on the upper Chattooga. However, it is not clear how many of the participants are familiar with the NEPA process and how their active involvement assists in informed decision-making.

4. A collaborative process must contain the following elements:
   - A clear decision space
   - A structured process that is fair and open and encourages meaningful interaction
   - Information must be shared openly and readily
   - The "right" people are participating
   - Satisfaction of multiple interests.
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- Attainment of a higher goal (protection of the resource), while also dealing with the immediate issue of boater access in the upper Chattooga

5. Significant misperceptions and assumptions held by some users about other users must be overcome to create a climate for collaboration. These identity-based conflicts stifle effective communication and lead to misunderstanding, adversarial tones when discussing the “other side”, and frustration and intolerance for other points of view. Information is often used strategically to promote a position or win a point.

6. While some parties are willing to collaborate on the issue of boater access, it is not clear whether an alternative exists that can minimally satisfy the interests of the parties, i.e., that there is a zone of possible agreement.

Recommendations

1. Because respondents share the overarching values of protecting the Chattooga River and maintaining a sense of community cohesion, consideration for ongoing and long-term public involvement should be a Forest Service priority. Two possible mechanisms for this are to establish a Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) or a non-profit entity that serves an advisory role to the USFS and to the communities. Leaders, within the community can help build the capacity to sustain and support long-term collaborative approaches in order to foster management decision-making, if a structure exists for them to do so. A non-profit or RAC not only can serve as mechanisms for gathering feedback from stakeholders, but also can serve as a forum for ongoing monitoring and dialogue. A long-term public involvement approach will help the communities and the USFS maintain communication and accountability about the management decisions.

2. The Forest Service is encouraged to go beyond minimum requirements for citizen involvement defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Share with the participants recent efforts on modernization of the NEPA process, including the Council of Environmental Quality Citizen Guide to the NEPA: Having Your Voice Heard.

3. Establish working groups to explore topics, develop proposals, and resolve differences.

4. Establish a process advisory committee to assist the facilitators or meeting leaders in developing agendas and guiding the decision-making process.

5. Establish a technical advisory team of partnering agencies and researchers to provide important information to the group. Develop a technical review team to help review studies, preliminary and otherwise, and provide comments and suggestions prior to distribution to the general public.

6. Consider following the example of the San Juan National Forest Plan revision. There, they established working groups to address specific issues. All groups were facilitated by outside, neutral facilitators. Working groups recommended ideas to include in one or more NEPA alternatives. Ideas that had wide support would appear in several alternatives, and ideas with fewer advocates would appear in only one. This process engendered hard work and loyalty among citizens involved in the process, and spawned a great deal of public participation in a later Forest Service efforts.
Chattooga Wild & Scenic River: A Situation Assessment

Introduction

Background

The Chattooga River originates in the mountains of western North Carolina and forms a portion of the border between Georgia and South Carolina. Congress designated the 15,432-acre corridor along the upper reaches of the Chattooga as Wild and Scenic in 1974 for its "outstandingly remarkable" fish, wildlife, recreation, scenic, and historic values. The 8,724-acre Ellicott Rock Wilderness borders the river. The Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forests in Georgia, the Nantahala National Forest in North Carolina, and the Sumter National Forest in South Carolina share management of the watershed. The Sumter National Forest manages visitor use associated with the Chattooga Wild and Scenic River.

During the initial forest management plan which included the Chattooga River Management Area, the river was divided into five geographically-based management zones, and included closure of the upper Chattooga to boating above Hwy 28 Bridge. The 2004 revision of the Sumter National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan retained the 1976 closure on boating use upstream of Highway 28 (about 21 miles). The decision to maintain closure was appealed in 2005 by American Whitewater (AW), and the US Forest Service (Forest Service) agreed to reassess that management decision as part of broader examination of visitor capacity issues on the upper Chattooga River.

In 2005, the Forest Service initiated a visitor use capacity analysis on the upper Chattooga River. The data gathered through the capacity analysis will be used to reevaluate the management decision, and adjust or amend the forest plan as appropriate. The Forest Service is employing a Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) planning model to evaluate visitor use and potential impacts on the environment. A crucial component of the LAC planning framework is public involvement.

Purpose of the Situation Assessment

Various levels of public involvement have been part of the visitor use capacity analysis to date. Currently Step 4 (Inventory Conditions & Collect Data) of the capacity analysis is nearing completion. Consequently, the Forest Service requested the assistance of the Natural Resources Leadership Institute (NRLI) on how best to involve interested parties, share information, and work as collaboratively as possible throughout the remaining Steps of the LAC process, both prior and during the NEPA analysis. The Natural Resources Leadership Institute, a program of North Carolina Cooperative Extension at NC State University, specializes in collaborative-based approaches to address public resource problems and opportunities.

The purpose of this project is to assess the perceptions of a broadly represented subset of river users about the application of a collaborative approach on future management decisions for the Chattooga Wild and Scenic River. The situation assessment coincides with the completion of the Phase 1 analysis, and the results of the assessment may be used to guide decisions on how...
Finding an effective solution to address a public resource issue or opportunity requires an understanding of the problem, including its dynamic mix of procedures, relationships, and substance (Carpenter & Kennedy, 2001). Although public disputes may share common characteristics such as numerous parties with different levels of expertise, interests, and decision-making approaches, each conflict is unique. A situation assessment is an integral part of a decision-making process centered on a contentious issue. By developing a thorough understanding of the situation and the specific components of the conflict, the parties involved may have a better chance to establish an effective strategy for managing conflict and making decisions.

A situation assessment principally involves gathering information from a cross-section of organizations and individuals and may include data from secondary sources. An assessment is a means to gain insight and understanding of the issues, the diverse perspectives of stakeholders, the sources of conflict, and the willingness of those involved to improve the situation. The assessment culminates in recommended strategies for addressing the situation, including collaborative solutions based on the respondent’s recommendations.

A situation assessment can be beneficial to all involved. It can: 1) serve as a reflective tool, to clarify respective interests, positions, and issues; 2) educate those involved about the various aspects of the situation and thus builds a shared body of information and knowledge; 3) provide starting points for bridging interests and working relationships; 4) ensure the right parties are engaged in the problem-solving effort (Carpenter & Kennedy, 2001); and, 5) offer insights on how to proceed in a contentious situation.

In addition, the framework of the situation assessment is based on the literature of conflict analysis and resolution, environmental decision-making, public involvement, and collaborative problem-solving (Bingham, 1986; Carpenter & Kennedy, 2001; Creighton, 2005; & Wondolleck & Yaffee, 2000). Hence, the major components of the assessment are based on the principles of practice in the areas.

This assessment is not an extensive study of the many individuals and organizations involved in upper Chattooga River. Instead, the assessment captures a range of perspectives and ideas and sheds light on the subtleties of the issues driving this particular situation. Although this report makes recommendations on how to work through some of the issues and concerns, those interviewed as well as those who did not participate or were not contacted will have an opportunity to provide additional comments during the pre-NEPA and NEPA analysis.

**Methodology**

The situation assessment includes three major tasks: (1) gather data through interviews and secondary sources (2) analyze the data based on the public involvement literature and professional experience, and (3) make recommendations for how best to structure and conduct a public involvement process during the pre-NEPA and NEPA process.
Data Collection

The researchers developed an interview protocol, or questionnaire, in consultation with Forest Service planning staff. The purpose of the protocol was to gather stakeholder perceptions about structuring and conducting a collaborative process to assist the Forest Service in identifying management actions for recreational and visitor use on the Chattooga Wild and Scenic River. The participants were informed about the purpose of the interviews. The protocol consisted of a series of open-ended questions designed to help survey respondents think about collaborative processes and reflect on how such processes might be applied in the Chattooga River case.

Open-ended questions are useful for gathering qualitative information and enabled the researcher to clarify and test the meaning and nuance of initial responses. Subsequent questions were asked to clarify or test the understanding of the responses. For instance if a respondent said, “The river is healthier now than what it has been.”, an example of a question of clarification would be, “Please tell us what “healthier” means to you.”, with which the respondent might state: “Litter is reduced, illegal campsites are cleaned up and removed, damage to the trails and river bank is mitigated.”

The interview protocol (reference Appendix A), included the following lines of inquiry:

1. Ability and willingness of the parties to participate in a collaborative process;
2. Ability and willingness of the affected stakeholders to work with other stakeholders, even if he or she does not (and may not) agree with them;
3. Determination of the issues that could be/should be resolved collaboratively;
4. Structural constraints such as time, distance, and availability that could affect process design;
5. How the results of the data collection can best be shared and applied;
6. Actions that should be taken by the USFS and others for management decisions to be seen as legitimate;
7. Views about how a collaborative process should be conducted; and
8. Determination of the obstacles on the road to success and ideas for how to overcome those obstacles.

Personal interviews provide a rich source of information. The elements that contribute to a robust situation assessment are the willingness of people to engage in the interview process, the openness of the participants in responding to the interview questions, and the critical thought participants’ offered in responding to the assessment questions. Those who participated in the interviews were responsive to our timeline, generous with their time, and thoughtful in their responses.

The process for identifying groups or individuals to interview was incremental. It began with an initial list of interviewees provided by the Forest Service. This initial list contained contact information for people who had participated in the Chattooga River user analysis and planning meetings, and was neither prescriptive nor preferential in nature. The initial list was divided into four main groups: public agency personnel (including Forest Service personnel), wilderness advocates, river users (including boaters, anglers, hikers, and swimmers), and area residents.
A first round of interviews was conducted with individuals in each category. Toward the end of each interview, respondents were asked if they could recommend other people and organizations that should be part of the respondent pool. This step initiated the subsequent list developed in consultation with the individuals interviewed as new names were added to the potential list of interviews. Recognizing the need for a wide range of perspectives, individuals were asked to contribute additional names of potential interviewees, particularly if that person could provide different information or perspectives than what had been provided during the interview. The respondents were often thoughtful in their response, offering names of individuals that could present different information either along a similar or dissimilar perspective.

Interviews were conducted by telephone over a three week period between March 23, 2007 and April 13, 2007. Interviews lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. In all, 36 people were contacted, or contact was attempted, and 24 interviews were completed. Contact attempts that were not successful included: wrong numbers, no answer, no reply to voice mail messages, no reply to email messages, referrals to someone else (some thought another individual was more appropriate to participate in the interview process) or were not interested in participating. Due to the limited time frame available for conducting the interviews, not all of the potential interviewees were contacted.

Interview respondents were identified by a code number that was not connected to information that could identify that individual by name or organization. Instead, respondents were identified by general affiliation as described by the respondent himself or herself. The affiliations and number of respondents belonging to that affiliation are listed below:

- Backcountry Angler (2)
- Birder (1)
- Commercial Boater (1)
- Economic Development (1)
- Emergency Responder (1)
- Forest Service Employee (1)
- Hiker (2)
- Private Boater (5)
- Resident (3)
- Resource Manager (not USFS) (2)
- Scientist (1)
- Wilderness Advocate (4)

In addition to data collected through interviews, information was gathered through secondary sources including forest plans and maps, agendas and summaries of previous meetings, web sites, news articles, and participatory process literature. The secondary sources assisted in developing a context for the situation assessment, defining a chronology of the situation, and in understanding the dynamics among the parties.

Data Analysis

Interview results were compiled and organized into key themes along the lines of inquiry that formed the interview protocol. The assessment does not focus on "majority views" but rather identifies central ideas captured from a cross section of individuals. Individual responses were clustered according to categories or themes, and presented without direct attribution. In identifying themes, the assessment considered issues or perspectives across the pool of people interviewed and within the context of each interview. Themes are a means to present findings and are formed around specific issues, topics, and perceptions about issues, events, or other users. Topics, issues, and perceptions that appeared frequently were considered “key” or “significant” and became the basis for a theme.
A topic, issue, or perception that is shared by few respondents or unique to a single respondent could also be considered significant and form the basis of a theme if it clearly defined a particular stance or view that has explanatory power regarding the issue under study. For example, a perspective held by one person that describes a motive or rationale for a particular set of beliefs – say, private property rights – may be presented by only one respondent, but may become the basis for a theme.

Using the thematic grouping of responses, the researchers identified essential elements that should be considered in the approach to and design of a collaborative decision process for developing management alternatives on the upper and lower sections of the Chattooga River. These elements included citizen perceptions and expectations about collaboration, substantive issues that should be discussed and resolved through collaboration, interpersonal or inter-group dynamics that may affect group interaction and processes and techniques that respondents considered important or necessary. How issues are raised and solutions pursued are as important as the substance of those issues. Hence, it was important to understand the history of the central issues and concerns, the level of trust among the parties, the openness of the communication, and their willingness to work together.

The analysis also sought to identify the possibilities of collaboration. That is, interview responses were analyzed to determine whether there existed sufficient common interest among river users to seek a mutually satisfactory solution. It must be noted however, that it was beyond the scope of this study to identify and evaluate the potential for a negotiated outcome among river users. In other words, the study did not attempt to define the conditions (e.g., days, water levels, time of year) under which river users may be willing to accept boating on the upper reaches.

**Basis for Recommendations**

Based on the results of the survey and analysis of the data, the NRLI provided a written report to the Forest Service. The report summarizes the substantive and process issues raised during the interviews and identifies concerns that if not addressed pose obstacles to collaboration. The assessment provides suggestions based on the participant’s responses and the professional expertise of the NRLI. The following criteria form the basis of the analysis for indicating the type of public involvement and design considerations:

1. Parties understand the limits to their authority in the process and have realistic expectations about their contributions.
2. Parties agree on goals for the collaborative problem solving effort (options vary for an agreement on a course of action, identification of new options, joint fact finding on the impacts of various options, joint projects, shared learning about one another’s interests and concerns, etc.).
3. Parties agree on a manageable number of interdependent or related issues. There must be a sufficiently well developed factual base to permit meaningful discussion and resolution of the issues.
4. Participants interested in or affected by the outcome of the collaborative solving effort can be identified, and the number of anticipated participants can be managed within the process as designed.
5. The collaborative problem-solving effort is inclusive – all parties relevant to the issue and its resolution are able to participate. Moreover, all parties have an equal opportunity to participate in designing the process. The process must be explainable and designed to meet the circumstances and needs of the situation.

6. The collaborative problem-solving effort is structured to allow for continuous dialogue over many weeks/months – meetings are scheduled in advance and parties are able to attend meetings. Dialogue is continued from one meeting to the next and participants are able to move the discussion along from meeting to meeting, i.e., discussions do not have to be repeated because participation changes from meeting to meeting.

7. Parties are interested in participating in good faith. They are likely, if not more likely, to achieve their overall goals using collaboration as they would through their alternatives.

8. Parties can obtain adequate resources to participate, including technical support; all parties have equal access to relevant information and the opportunity to participate effectively throughout the process. Flexibility can be designed into the process to accommodate changing issues, data needs, political environment, and programmatic constraints such as time and meeting arrangements.

9. Collaborative problem solving effort will not cause unreasonable delay.

10. Parties are accountable to the process that they have agreed to establish.

11. Mechanisms exist to consider the feedback of interested parties.

Analysis and Results

The response data, and subsequently this report, is divided into four major topics: (1) respondents’ perceptions about the issues; (2) respondents’ perceptions about collaboration; (3) collaborative methods, techniques and procedures; and (4) use of and access to information. Within each major topic, subtopics are identified based on what the data revealed. Each major topic is introduced with an explanation and summary, as are the subtopics. Because the interviewees’ responses to the questions hold significant explanatory power, direct quotes and summarized statements make up most of the report.

Respondent’s affiliations are attributed to specific comments in the first two major sections. Though the interests of the person can be implied by his or her particular affiliation, attributing by affiliation reveals additional information about the perspectives of the respondents. Similar attribution is not necessary or helpful on comments regarding preference for collaborative methods, techniques and procedures, except where noted

Issues Framing the Collaboration

Respondents were asked to describe the key issues they believe need to be discussed for a collaborative effort to be successful. This question was asked early in the interview to provide substantive context to questions about process, and to provide an outlet for the respondent to comment on the issues that he or she considers important.
Responses were categorized into ten themes. As expected, most respondents considered river access, acceptable uses, separation of uses, and resource management to be key issues that need to be discussed in a public process. Respondents also voiced concerns about the Forest Service’s decision making process and the application of data and information for decision making, and believed that these issues need to be raised and sufficiently addressed in future meetings. Other issues mentioned were setting of precedent, user safety, trout, and the perceptions (or misperceptions) that of stakeholders hold of one another.

River Access
Most respondents believed that the issue of river access must be addressed in any future public meetings about river management. Geographic location of access, access via private lands, and access by boater type (private vs. commercial) were concerns that were raised by respondents. Some of the comments on river access by respondents were:

- **Private Boater:** Access, use, and management of the private land section of a wild and scenic river is not clear.
- **Private Boater:** The Forest Service needs to identify the infrastructure needs for meeting existing and potential uses. For example, portage trails around rapids and illegal campsites.
- **Wilderness Advocate:** Boaters will be trespassing on private lands above Grimshaws Bridge.
- **Private Boater:** One private landowner is strongly resisting access below the private property area in Whiteside Cove. It is not clear if this is perception is shared by other Whiteside Cove residents.
- **Wilderness Advocate:** Access by boaters between Grimshaws Bridge and the Old Iron Bridge will require infrastructure – a road and a parking area. This is the last little piece of the forest without roads.
- **Wilderness Advocate:** If the river is opened up to private boaters above Highway 28 there will be pressure from commercial outfitters to use that stretch of river too. This would require parking and improved access at Burrells Ford Bridge.
- **Wilderness Advocate:** Boaters don’t have to have every stretch of water open to them nationwide.

Acceptable Use
Closely related to issues of access were uses that would be deemed acceptable or unacceptable by other users. Several respondents voiced concerns about the resource impacts of recreational use – boating as well as other uses – and believed that this issue needs to be a focus of discussions. Responses pertaining to this issue were:

- **Commercial Boater:** Need to understand how the very presence of one user alters the use of another.
- **Birder:** Concentration of boater use will lead to environmental degradation. Wildlife disturbance is a big problem already with the concentration of swimmers, picnickers, and anglers. Boater put-in and take-out activities will lead to bank erosion.
- **Private Boater:** The Forest Service needs to acknowledge that there is heavy non-boating use of the upper river corridor and that that use must be managed.
Wilderness Advocate (p.15): Wilderness uses are specifically designated to protect the resource. Not all uses should be allowed. Unauthorized uses (wildcatters) are a problem in many areas, not just the Chattooga. They need to be regulated and enforced.

Hiker: Solitude is an important factor to consider when deciding how much use to allow in the upper reaches. When people are having fun on the river, they are pretty noisy.

Separation of Uses
As some respondents brought up the issue of acceptable use, in a similar vein many thought that the potential for separating uses should be a topic of discussion in a collaborative process.

Wilderness Advocate: Some wilderness advocates could live with a solution that separates groups by water level and restricts the number of users between Bullpen Bridge and Highway 28.

Backcountry Angler: One option that may reduce conflicts between boaters and anglers is to separate based on a 2.5-gage cut off. Also could separate by time of year. Trout fishing is best in March, April, May, October and November. A gage can be installed at Bull Pen Road Bridge and Burrells Ford Bridge and permits could be obtained via a website.

Wilderness Advocate: The boaters want to ride the crest on high water after storm events. Fishermen want to be fishing even during these events. The conflict will not be resolved by allowing boating only during high water events.

Resource Management
Most respondents brought up the issue of resource management as a key issue that needed to be addressed through a collaborative process. Respondents were nearly unanimous in their concern for the river and their belief that the river resource needs to be managed and protected. Most believed that resource management should be the central focus of any discussion around river access and use. Some specific management issues, aside from river access and use included:

Wilderness Advocate: The Forest Service merged districts in the Sumter National Forest. There are fewer forest professionals managing a resource that is growing in use resulting in less than adequate policing and enforcement.

Wilderness Advocate: The Forest Service should wait for the US Fish and Wildlife Service to complete its study on cougar sightings before making a decision about opening the upper Chattooga to a new class of users.

Resident: Hemlock wooly adelgid is a problem between Walhalla and the river. Hemlock mortality caused by the pest may affect water quality if the river banks become exposed.

Forest Service Decision-making Process
Another key issue that respondents believe must be addressed straight on is the process the Forest Service is using to make decisions about river access and use. Regardless of how respondents feel about the Forest Service’s decision process, most believe that that should be a topic for discussion, or if not discussed, at least made clear. Many respondents expressed the opinion that the Forest Service could help resolve the issues simply by clarifying what is legally
and managerially within their power to do. Some of the more illustrative opinions expressed by respondents on this issue were:

**Wilderness Advocate:** The Forest Service needs to explain the legal issues related to restricting access. There is significant confusion about what is legal and what isn’t. They need to define the ‘floor and the ceiling’ of what is possible and clarify the rhetoric coming from the disputing parties.

**Private Boater:** The Forest Service’s decision making process has changed since the 1980s, and it is no longer as transparent as it once was. The agency seems to change its mind on issues without good reason.

**Private Boater:** The Forest Service needs to develop a management plan and follow it. Don’t try to let user groups solve the issues themselves. The statements made by people attending the meetings have been nonproductive, and some have been plain ridiculous. The Forest Service needs to exert some leadership at these meetings.

**Wilderness advocate:** The access issue on the upper Chattooga has been too narrowly focused as a conflict between boaters and anglers. Other uses must be considered in this decision.

**Private Boater:** The Forest Service is basing decisions on conflict resolution among users and not on management of the resource.

**Private Boater:** The Forest Service has not been sufficiently clear or firm in its decision making. They need to take a stand and stick to it.

**Resource Manager:** The primary issue that the Forest Service should concentrate on is the characterization and quantification of user conflicts, real or perceived. Once defined and quantified, use the results of the LAC to make the appropriate management decision.

**Commercial Boater:** The Forest Service has not presented an accurate picture of their management goals and objectives.

**Private Boater:** The Forest Service has been reactive and has lacked a vision for leadership. They need to be clearer about the decision space.

**Private Boater:** Boaters are being excluded from the upper Chattooga because of others’ perceptions, not because of resource concerns.

### Data and Information

Many respondents expressed concern or doubt in the Forest Service’s data gathering process and/or use and application of data and information in its management decisions. Many believe that the Forest Service should be clear and transparent about how it applies data and information to it management decisions. Some of the comments regarding issues of data and information include:

**Private Boater:** No existing data on resource use in the upper Chattooga.

**Private Boater:** The Sumter Forest Draft Plan was not clearly written and was confusing to local people. Convoluted language about boating caps stimulated conflict.

**Private Boater:** Data is not being collected on the use of the resource by all user groups. No confidence in the data gathering process.

**Researcher:** Need to concentrate on anticipated future uses of the resource and future use pressure.
Wilderness Advocate: It would be good to know what the rationale was for separating uses between the upper and lower back in the 1970s.

Private Boater: The consultants that prepared the LAC study should be involved in future meetings about this issue.

Private Boater: Disappointed with the Whitaker study.

Wilderness Advocate: There is a question of objectivity with the Whitaker study. Some people perceive that Whitaker is an AW advocate.

Private Boater: The full suite of studies under the cap analysis need to be presented in their entirety.

Precedent Setting Issues
An issue that was raised by two respondents was the belief that boater advocacy groups want to remove all boater access restrictions on the Chattooga so as to set a precedent from which other federally managed rivers could be also be opened up. At least one respondent stated that if this were the case, he would have a difficult time working with boating advocates on seeking a collaborative alternative.

Wilderness advocate: A precedent setting decision on boater access on the Chattooga will set the stage for further action in other rivers.

Backcountry Angler: AW wants to use the upper Chattooga as a precedent to aid their cause in opening up the Yellowstone River to boating.

Safety
A few respondents raised the related issues of visitor safety and rescue operations. One respondent holds the strong conviction that increased boater use will eventually result in rescue operations that could cause environmental damage and degradation. Some boaters, on the other hand, stated that boaters pose no more hazard than any other class of river user and that this line of reasoning is not valid. Boaters and nonboaters alike believe that this issue should be discussed in a collaborative process, but for different reasons. Illustrative comments include:

Wilderness advocate: Belief that rescues will require disturbance or destruction of wilderness in the upper reaches

Private Boater: Safety is not a criterion that the FS can use to restrict a particular use. Safety is being used by boating opponents and it is a ‘red herring.’

Private Boater: Most rescues have been for swimmers and hikers. In fact, in many cases the first responders are boaters.

Trout
An issue that arose in the analysis is that of trout stocking in the upper reaches. There is seems to be a modicum of disagreement among some respondents about trout stocking and the resulting environmental impact of stocking and subsequent angler use. Respondent comments on this issue include:

Resource Manager: Trout are not stocked in the upper reaches. Brook trout can be outcompeted by non-native browns and rainbows.
**Private Boater:** Government shouldn’t be spending good money stocking trout in the upper reaches. Stocking encourages over-use of the resource, and high visitation rates by fishermen causes resource damage.

**User Perceptions (about other users)**
Problematic interpersonal relationships were brought up by several respondents as issues that should be addressed and resolved in a collaborative process. Some perceptions expressed by respondents about other users include:

**Private Boater:** Locals who don’t want to see boaters perceive them as irresponsible thrill seekers.

**Private Boater:** Trout Unlimited is a very powerful organization and exerts significant influence on Forest Service decisions about use and access. TU funds a lot of Forest Service projects, and the Forest Service doesn’t want to jeopardize that funding stream.

**Private Boater:** Many local users trash the resource. They leave litter in their campsites. I’ve cleaned up their campsites.

**Private Boater:** Most people who use the river care deeply about it and want to protect it. The leaders of the boating and angling groups are the ones pushing the conflict over access to the upper reach.

**Resident:** The local people need to have an opportunity to have their concerns heard.

**Perceptions About Collaboration**
A primary objective of the assessment was to gather information about what people think about collaboration and how they think collaboration might work in dealing with the issues of river access and use. Respondents were asked a series of questions to elicit their views about collaborative processes.

First they were asked to describe collaboration and the conditions under which it works best. Following a question about the issues they believed needed to be discussed in a collaborative effort (discussed in the previous section), they were asked to consider both the benefits and the consequences of participating in a collaborative process, and what they would experience if a collaborative process was going successfully. Lastly, they were asked to describe a successful outcome of a collaborative process that dealt with issues of river access and use. These five lines of inquiry and the themes that emerged within each are discussed in the sections to follow.

**CONDITIONS FOR COLLABORATION**
To gather information on what respondents considered to be necessary conditions for collaboration, interviewees were asked two simple questions, “From your perspective, what is a collaborative effort?” and, “How does it work best?” These questions generated a significant volume of information on how respondents viewed and understood collaboration and the conditions they considered essential for collaboration to work. Nine themes emerged from the data:
Define the decision space
Adhere to a process that is structured, fair, and open
Engage the “right” people
Communicate effectively
Handle data and information fairly
Work together toward a common solution
Work toward a higher goal
Develop a full range of alternatives
Take responsibility for actions

Define the Decision Space
A significant number of respondents commented on the need for defined “sideboards” that would govern the Forest Service’s management decision. Many wanted a clear legal or managerial definition of what is possible, and others cited the need to define management actions based on science. Regardless of the preferred standard for decision making, many believed that the Forest Service should exhibit strong leadership in clarifying the debate about river use and access. A sample of the key comments on this include:

Wilderness Advocate: The Forest Service needs to explain the legal issues related to restricting access. There is significant confusion about what is legal and what isn’t. They need to define the ‘floor and the ceiling’ of what is possible and clarify the rhetoric coming from the disputing parties. They need to openly discuss the rhetoric coming from both parties and clarify the issues.

Researcher: Once the groups are identified, the core issues of each group need to be clearly defined and specified. No one is going to get everything they want, but no one should lose entirely.

Private Boater: The Forest Service needs to develop a management plan and follow it. Don’t try to let user groups solve the issues themselves. The statements made by people attending the meetings have been nonproductive, and some have been plain ridiculous. The Forest Service needs to exert some leadership at these meetings.

Emergency Responder: We need to have an understanding of what each agency is willing and able to do and offer.

Private Boater: The Forest Service has to be clear about what is and is not possible or allowable under the law.

Hiker: The existing river zoning policy was determined through some form of public input. The rationale for this decision needs to be investigated. This can serve as a starting point for discussions.

Wilderness Advocate: A collaborative process should use science as a guidepost. This issue is primarily about the resource, and secondarily about people. Protection of the resource comes first and should frame the discussion. When people get together to collaborate about the uses of the river, the shared vision should be one of a holistic view of the river, not just one section or another to be divided like a pie among stakeholders.

Private Boater: The Forest Service needs to define a clear decision space and lay out a set of conditions that are legal and consistent with Forest Service policy.
Backcountry Angler: Collaboration should not take place until the LAC standards are in place and workable.

**Adhere to a Process that is Structured, Fair, and Open**
A common element of successful collaboration cited by several respondents was the process in which deliberation would occur. Respondents said a collaborative process needs structure, should be lead by a neutral facilitator, and should be fair and open. For example:

Resource Manager: A collaborative process should be managed; it shouldn't just be ‘thrown together.’ The number of people and user groups should be determined in advance. A clear time frame should be established and adhered to.

Backcountry Angler: The Forest Service should hire a skilled, neutral moderator (facilitator) to run the process.

Private Boater: For collaboration to work, we need to agree on the process in which we can work together – this includes agreeing on the facts that form the premise of negotiation and the conditions or constraints that form the decision space.

Private Boater: I could accept an outcome that was arrived at in a fair and transparent process.

**Engage the “Right” People**
Many respondents commented on the need to have the right people involved in order for collaboration to work. The right people were variously described as those who represent a particular perspective, and those who’s demeanor and personality enable them to remain objective and open minded during discussions. Some illustrative remarks in this regard include:

Resident: Not everyone can or should be involved in a collaboration. You need to have people who a open minded and objective. People need to be able to compromise.

Private Boater: If collaboration on this issue is to be possible, some of leaders of the key organizations will have to step aside and let others work on this for them. People who hold intractable positions can’t be the ones to negotiate. They cannot back down from their positions without losing face.

Wilderness Advocate: All the relevant parties need to be involved in a collaborative process. Cast a wide net and get representation from any group or organization that uses the river and associated resource.

**Communicate Effectively**
Clear, effective, face-to-face communication was cited by a few respondents as a necessary ingredient for collaboration. Talking about the issues with others, learning about others’ perspectives, and getting to the facts of the case were key points that emerged:

Resident: There is a lot of emotion about this issue. We need to get beyond emotions and get to the issues. We need to be focused on the facts. People need to have respect for others’ views, and respect for views needs to be part of the problem-solving process.

Resident: Discussion of the issues needs to be done face-to-face. The previous meetings were very controlled and limited face-to-face discussion.
**Resident:** Collaboration involves people sitting down face-to-face and talking. This prevents people from misinterpreting comments posted on websites, email or other written documents.

**Handle Data and Information Fairly**
Many respondents voiced concerns about how data and information would be used by the Forest Service in their decision process (more on data and information is presented later in this report). Since data is a key component in framing the decision context in complex issues, trust in the data was considered by several respondents as an essential element in a collaborative process. Some comments in this regard included:

*Private Boater:* The consultants that prepared the LAC study should be involved in future meetings about this issue.

*Private Boater:* The Forest Service will have to open up and be honest with people. Since resource impact is the constraining factor on use of the river, the Forest Service needs to identify the sources of the impacts and spread the blame equitably.

*Private Boater:* Use the data collected by the consultants to frame the discussion.

**Work Together Toward a Common Solution**
For many of the respondents, collaboration means working together to develop a common solution to the issues at hand. Terms such as ‘negotiation’, ‘consensus’, ‘seeking agreement’, and ‘common ground’ were used by many respondents. For example:

*Resident:* Collaboration means sitting together and trying to understand others' differences.

*Private Boater:* Collaboration is when all the different groups sit down and try to find common ground, a solution everyone finds acceptable. People have to test their assumptions about other user groups.

*Birder:* People should come together to work on the same goals and seek to work out the best solution.

*Resource Manager:* The key to collaboration is to seek agreement and attempt to reach consensus, or a very strong super-majority, on the issues.

*Private Boater:* Collaboration means negotiation. Users have to come together and negotiate how the river will be used and managed.

*Resident:* People need to act in a civilized manner for collaboration to work.

*Private Boater:* Collaboration is most or all stakeholders getting together to work out a solution in advance or parallel to the regulatory process. A decision made through collaboration should result in outcomes that are better than what the agency could develop alone.

**Work Toward a Higher Goal**
Many respondents felt that in order for collaboration to work among people in conflict, they must all seek a higher goal. In this case, the higher goal most commonly cited was protection of the river resource.
Private Boater: A collaborative process should result in a resource that is managed for the public, not just one single group or use.

Wilderness Advocate: Everyone should reach for a higher goal rather than focus on getting what they want to the exclusion of others. Protecting the river resource should be that goal. People have to be willing to give something up for the common good.

Develop a Full Range of Alternatives
At least one respondent knowledgeable about the NEPA process talked about using collaboration as a way to develop decision alternatives. For example:

Backcountry Angler: Collaboration should be used for developing alternatives.

Take Responsibility for Actions
Personal responsibility was considered a hallmark of a successful collaborative process by at least one respondent.

Private Boater: The participants in a collaborative must take responsibility for their actions and for the outcomes of the collaborative process.

COLLABORATION MILESTONES (HOW YOU KNOW YOU ARE COLLABORATING)
Interviewees were asked, “Given your definition of a collaborative process, what are some milestones that tell you that you are on a successful path?” Responses to this question were expressed in a similar vein to the previous question, that is, if a collaborative process must exhibit specific elements to work, then the milestones of success are that those elements are in place. However, as many of the comments reveal, this question elicited more nuanced statements about collaboration. Respondents also tended to answer this question within the context of the issues and stakeholders relevant to boater use and access on the upper Chattooga, thus shedding light on processes that might yield positive results in this case.

Five themes emerged from the responses to this question. These are namely:

- People are working on the problem
- Good data and information are being applied to the problem
- The “right” people are involved
- A process is in place
- People’s ideas and values are acknowledged

People are Working on the Problem
In response to the question about milestones of a successful collaborative, most respondents focused on the resolution of the problem at hand. A common thread among these responses was that people were focused on the problem and doing what it takes to get it resolved. Some of the responses consistent with this theme were:

Resident: Everyone has an open mind, understands the desired condition of the other user groups, and recognizes how their use of the resource affects other users.
**Private Boater:** The boaters would be willing to listen to the notion of avoiding the delayed harvest stretch or some kind of level-based management regime as long as it was reasonable (reasonable means no restrictions in the winter and a shared resource in the summer).

**Economic Development:** People are given the opportunity to freely express their opinions.

**Backcountry Angler:** AW has taken their mandate for unrestricted use off the table.

**Forest Service Employee:** People are coming to the table and willing to agree to disagree. People can recognize differences and seek ways to resolve them. They ask, “What can we do to make this work?”

**Resident:** People are stating their opinions in a civilized manner. Options are put forward for people to explore and discuss and people are listening to one another.

**Emergency Responder:** People are open to communicating and understanding each other’s capabilities and needs.

**Good Data and Information are Being Applied to the Problem**
The importance of data and information arose again in response to the milestone question. Responses consistent with this theme included:

**Private Boater:** The user capacity report is out and everyone agrees that it is factual. The Forest Service comes out with a legal perspective that defines the decision space.

**Wilderness Advocate:** The Forest Service has mapped out the biological resources and the impacts of use and access.

**Private Boater:** We develop a means to quantify use in the future.

**Scientist:** People are working together to gather and evaluate information relevant to the LAC study.

**Wilderness Advocate:** Comprehensive analyses of the social and biological conditions are completed.

**The “Right” People are Involved**
Whereas the respondents’ descriptions of the “right” people to involve in a general collaborative process were nonspecific, respondents were somewhat more direct in response to this question. Some respondents offered direct recommendations of who should, or should not be involved in a collaborative effort to address the boater access issue. Included in these responses were:

**Wilderness Advocate:** The Forest Service has sought out and involved people and organizations that aren’t a part of the warring factions. Forest Service administrators from Washington DC are not involved.

**Private Boater:** AW and Trout Unlimited are talking.

**Backcountry Angler:** People who are not members of regional or national organizations are participating.

**Scientist:** People who are willing to work together are at the meetings.
Resident: Participation by key people and organizations is consistent and ongoing, though others are welcome.

Backcountry Angler: All stakeholders are present, including those not represented by regional or national groups.

A Process is in Place
The need for a managed, structured process was again reiterated here. Notable comments on this theme included:

Resource Manager: User conflicts are quantified and managed. The Forest Service has identified ranges of alternatives for mitigating user conflicts. State and federal agencies are working cooperatively where a federal/state nexus exists.

Wilderness Advocate: The Forest Service is “honest” with the process and is dedicated to make collaboration work.

Wilderness Advocate: The Forest Service will have announced that a collaborative process is in place. A facilitator is present for the meetings, the process is open to everyone, and deadlines are set.

Resident: People are working in a step-wise fashion toward some agreed-up goal.

Hiker: The Forest Service has well-advertised meetings held in a large enough space at a time and day that people can participate. The meeting is kept under control, and people are free to express their opinions.

Wilderness Advocate: All the pieces to a collaborative process are considered and put into place.

Private Boater: A well thought out process is in place and is explainable. Bogus arguments are minimized. Each river section is discussed thoroughly and each section is settled separately.

People’s Ideas and Values are Acknowledged
The importance of people’s ideas and values being acknowledged by other stakeholders clearly emerged in response to this question. Although this element was expressed in several ways and was captured in themes mentioned previously such as ‘working together toward a common solution’ and ‘communicating effectively’, it was expressed very clearly here. Two such responses were:

Private Boater: The concerns of day hikers and weekend users are considered. All groups are treated equally.

Private Boater: Other user groups have to acknowledge that they are part of the problem and that their impact is greater than ours. They need to acknowledge that I am as legitimate a user as they are, I have as much right to be there as they do, and my right to solitude is just as valuable to me as it is to them.

SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES OF COLLABORATION
Interviewees were asked what they would consider to be a successful outcome if a collaborative process were to be organized and conducted to address the boater access issue. Responses to this question were categorized into four themes:
Chattooga Situation Assessment

- The river resource is protected
- Use and access conflicts are resolved
- Decisions are fair
- The status quo is maintained

These themes are consistent with elements of success found in the conflict resolution literature. Moore (1986) identifies three types of interests that must be satisfied if a conflict is to be resolved successfully. These are substantive interests – the ‘things’ that stakeholders want, such as access, solitude, and so on; procedural interests, i.e., that the process is fair; and psychological interests, i.e., that they were heard and respected.

**The River Resource is Protected**
The desire to protect the river resource was spread among respondent affiliations. This was a unifying theme that nearly all respondents mentioned at some point during the interview. Some illustrative responses include:

  *Private Boater:* The river is healthier than what it is now. Litter is reduced, illegal campsites are cleaned up and removed, damage to the trails and river bank is mitigated.

  *Wilderness Advocate:* The outstanding and remarkable values of the headwaters remain intact.

  *Private Boater:* There is less impact on the Chattooga River.

  *Wilderness Advocate:* The resource is successfully protected better than it is now.

  *Backcountry Angler:* A compromise is reached that protects the Chattooga main stem, the North Fork, and other tributaries.

  *Wilderness Advocate:* Everyone agrees that they are working in the best interests of the resource.

  *Backcountry Angler:* The future impact on the river is minimized. Boating is managed on the tributaries to protect the resource – keeping the large woody debris intact.

**Use and Access Conflicts are Resolved**
A number of respondents felt that a successful collaborative process should result in resolution of the principal conflict over river access and use. Several respondents offered examples of options for shared use, most of which mentioned some form of limitation such as seasonal or geographical restrictions. Comments related to this them were:

  *Resource Manager:* The river is open to boaters but management is in place to minimize conflicts between competing user groups. The management decision must be practicable and enforceable.

  *Resident:* If boating were allowed at all, it would be limited and would take other users into account. Limitations are particularly important in the summer months.

  *Commercial Boater:* Access and use by boaters on the upper reaches could be capped by number of days. Rules regarding safety would be set (example: ban tubing on the upper reaches).

  *Wilderness Advocate:* There is room for anglers and boaters to use and enjoy the resource. Management restrictions will have to be in place
Private Boater: The impacts of all user groups are responsibly regulated and managed. The Forest Service takes a leadership role in solving the problem.

Wilderness Advocate: Boating is allowed in the upper reaches for some users and times of use.

Private Boater: Try a temporary rule, see how things work. Make changes as needed.

Emergency Responder: Parties come together to meet the needs of the general public.

Private Boater: Everybody has something they can live with. A new management plan is in place that is legal and nationally consistent.

Resident: Everyone is satisfied with the outcome, no user group gets everything, but all get something they can live with.

Backcountry Angler: Boaters have some access to upper reaches but not in the summer months – need to keep the boating population to those who take the sport seriously. Keep large woody debris in place for its ecological value.

Decisions are Fair
A fair process was listed by some respondents as necessary for a successful outcome. Boaters in particular cited the fairness criterion when considering a successful outcome. This is likely due to the notion that some boaters perceive closure of the river to their use as unfair to begin with.

Private Boater: The decisions treat all users fairly. All groups have equal use and answer to the same regulations.

Private Boater: A river that is managed consistently with every other wild and scenic river in the country.

Private Boater: A management decision is reached in a fair and impartial manner.

Status Quo is Maintained
For some respondents, a collaborative process that resulted in boaters being allowed to float the upper reaches of the river would be directly counter to their interests. Hence they were reluctant to consider an outcome to be successful if it did not preserve the status quo. For them, resolution of the conflict was not necessarily a measure of success. For example several respondents viewed success to be:

Birder: The upper Chattooga remains closed to boating.

Economic Development: The decision is to keep the upper reach closed to boating.

Resident: Leave it like it is, the North Fork does not need more boating pressure.

Hiker: Keep the policy as is.

Hiker: Maintain the status quo.

BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION
Interviewees were asked what they considered to be the possible benefits to be gained by them and others by participating in a successful collaborative process with respect to the Chattooga River. This question was designed to gain further insights into what stakeholders may want or need from a collaborative process. Seven themes emerged from the responses to this
question, including the idea that no benefits would accrue to certain individuals. The themes are namely:

- Achieve a larger purpose
- Manage the resource
- Achieve a fair solution
- Avoid litigation
- Improve relationships
- Benefits accrue to my interests (desired outcomes)
- No benefits

Many of the themes drawn from this question align directly with similar found under ‘Conditions for Collaboration’, ‘Collaboration Milestones’ and ‘Successful Outcomes.’ The repetitive themes are namely, achieve a larger purpose, manage the resource, and achieve a fair solution. No additional commentary is necessary for these themes. Respondent remarks are included for explanatory purposes.

**Achieve a Larger Purpose**

*Wilderness Advocate:* Stakeholders might be able to address the broader issue of resource protection and move past the current conflict.

*Wilderness Advocate:* People come together in good faith and work to protect the river.

*Economic Development:* We are able to enjoy what we have there.

*Resident:* The intrinsic values of the Chattooga—natural, cultural and spiritual – are saved for future generations.

*Emergency Responder:* The local community benefits from a better managed resource, improved relationships among people and organizations, and a better river experience overall.

*Boater:* If we don’t come together, we will miss the opportunity to protect the river.

**Manage the Resource**

*Resident:* We could manage the river for a diversity of recreational activities that do not impinge on one another.

*Resource Manager:* Recreational uses can be allocated along the river in accordance with a sound plan.

*Commercial Boater:* Appropriate uses and frequencies can be determined and managed for.

*Scientist:* The Forest Service has a plan for managing the resource.

*Boater:* The 1.7 miles of river abutting private lands will be protected and managed.

**Achieve a Fair Solution**

*Wilderness Advocate:* Everyone gets heard and has an opportunity to have their interests met. No one walks away with everything.

*Scientist:* People compromise and each group comes away with something.
Avoid Litigation
The obvious benefit of collaboration cited by many respondents is that litigation is avoided, the issue stays out of court and remains within a local venue for resolution.

  Resident: Keep the issue out of court.

  Wilderness Advocate: Avoid litigation for all parties.

Improve Relationships
A compelling benefit gained from successful collaboration cited by several respondents was improving soured relationships among local stakeholders. Many respondents commented on the strains that this issue has placed on otherwise amicable relationships between anglers, boaters, and other river users.

  Resource Manager: All agencies and organizations get to know one another and learn to work together under difficult circumstances.

  Wilderness Advocate: The polarization of people and organizations over this issue is mitigated.

  Resource Manager: People and organization can be recognized as part of the solution, not the problem.

  Scientist: People are able to build working relationships that enable them to focus on long-term resource management.

Benefits Accrue to My Interests (Desired Outcomes)
When asked to comment on the potential benefits that they would gain from collaboration, many considered the degree to which their primary interests could be met. By its very nature, collaboration should result in win/win outcomes were benefits are spread among all participants. These sentiments were expressed by users from nearly all affiliations. However, it must be noted that not all who responded in this vein had other users’ interests in mind.

  Private Boater: The Forest Service acknowledges that there is heavy boating use in the upper river corridor and that they manage that use appropriately.

  Backcountry Angler: Only foot traffic is allowed and the pristine nature of the area is preserved.

  Hiker: A successful outcome for hikers will be to leave the policy as it stands.

  Private Boater: We get to paddle on the river legally.

  Resident: The river stays at least as it is now, or with even less visitor impact.

  Private Boater: We will get to paddle the river.

No Benefits
A few respondents could see no benefits resulting in collaboration if the outcome were to be some amount of boater access in the upper Chattooga. For example:


**Birder:** A collaborative process that results in boating access in the upper reaches will have no benefits to me or my organization.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NO COLLABORATION**

Similar to the previous question, respondents were asked what the potential consequences might be to them or others if a collaborative is not undertaken or is not successful. Themes that emerged from the responses to this question were:

- Litigation
- Loss of stakeholder “voice”
- Decision made by forest service
- Suboptimal decisions
- Erosion of relationships
- Negative impacts to the river resource
- Benefits accrue to my interests (desired outcomes)
- Benefits accrue solely to other interests (undesirable outcomes)

A few of the themes were merely antithetical to themes described under benefits of collaboration. Themes falling into this category are litigation, erosion of relationships, negative impacts to the river resource, and benefits accruing solely to one interest the other. No additional commentary is necessary for these themes, although respondent comments are provided.

**Litigation**

There is concern that litigation may continue whether whitewater boating is open or not in the upper reaches of the Chattooga River.

- *Forest Service Employee:* Probably have to deal with more litigation. It will take longer to get long-term management in place.
- *Wilderness Advocate:* Parties other than AW are likely to litigate any decision reached by the Forest Service.
- *Wilderness Advocate:* One or more parties could drag this out through appeals and lawsuits, a costly and unpredictable outcome.

**Loss of Stakeholder “Voice”**

A few respondents expressed concern that if a decision could not be reached locally, then the decision would be made by someone else who might not have local interests in mind. Not all respondents believed that this would be a negative consequence. For example:

- *Resource Manager:* We lose control over decisions made about the river.
- *Resource Manager:* The Forest Service will have to rely on social and biological data to make the decision.
- *Wilderness Advocate:* The Forest Service will have to do their job and make the decision based on the facts (and take their lumps).

**Suboptimal Decisions**
A few respondents believe that decisions made without stakeholder input would result in less desirable outcomes. For example:

_Private Boater:_ We may end up with kind of level-base compromise forced upon us. Many will view such a compromise as an ‘open river,’ but it will not be.

_Private Boater:_ We end up with no responsible management plan.

_Backcountry Angler:_ A decision could be made that is not enforceable.

**Erosion of Relationships**
Some respondents believe the working relationships will continue to erode. For example:

_Resource Manager:_ We will see an erosion of working relationships among people and organizations.

_Private Boater:_ Groups will remain polarized, which is not healthy for a community. We may see added violence in the extreme case.

**Negative Impacts to the River Resource**
_Wilderness Advocate:_ In the final analysis, I'm more interested in protecting the resource than I am in making myself or anyone else happy. The best thing to do is back off and take it slow. If it takes 20 years, fine.

_Private Boater:_ We'll miss opportunities to protect the river and have the best possible outcome for everyone.

_Backcountry Angler:_ The court decides and the resource loses.

**Benefits Accrue to My Interests (Desired Outcomes)**
_Resident:_ We maintain zoning on the river.

**Benefits Accrue Solely to Other Interests (Undesirable Outcomes)**
_Economic Development:_ The entire river is opened up to boating. The river has heavy use now and cannot support additional use.

**Perceptions About Process Design**
In this section, we examine respondents’ comments with respect to how a collaborative process could be structured and conducted. We also investigate how respondents perceive interpersonal dynamics as well as their preferences for process structural elements such as time, distance, and availability. We also examine perceived barriers to successful collaborative processes and ideas for overcoming them. Specifically, respondents were asked to comment on the following points of process design:

- A feasible group size that is inclusive and productive;
- Workable meeting days and times, including how long to meet and where;
- Constraints and barriers that could impede a successful process (i.e., value differences, personalities, conflicting technical information, or lack of communication) as well as suggestions for how to overcome those constraints and barriers;
Techniques or methods that could be employed to help interested parties engage more effectively with each other; and

Specific procedures or processes that could assist them and others in working to resolve problems related to recreational and visitor use in the Chattooga Wild & Scenic River.

INCLUSIVE AND PRODUCTIVE GROUP SIZE
Respondents were asked what size group they believe would be inclusive and productive. Responses differed for both criteria (inclusive and productive). To maintain group productivity, respondents listed group sizes such as 10 people or less, 12, 15, and 20 people or less. With respect to inclusiveness, other respondents stated that the "group size should be as large as needed to include anyone who wants to be involved."

Based on comments provided by respondents regarding preference of group size and composition the following criteria are suggested for organizing a collaborative group:

- Strive for inclusivity while maintaining opportunities for learning and engagement that lead to productive group work.
- Identify key stakeholders before bringing them together, perhaps 1 to 2 people from each agency, organization, community or affiliation who are most interested in working with others.
- Use a multiple group approach. Working groups or subgroups could conduct work projects or focus on specific issues. Provide opportunities for subgroups to interact and learn what other groups are doing. (Note: some respondents expressed dissatisfaction with small group work, stating that these kinds of process are simply a means to gather information and are not useful for group dialogue or addressing general questions).
- Maintain consistency within the groups or with those who attend the meetings.

WORKABLE MEETING DAYS, TIME, AND LOCATION
Respondents were asked which days, times of day, length of meeting and location are best. Respondents provided some general comments with respect to scheduling and duration of the meetings such as:

- No matter what time we have a public meeting, we’re going to miss somebody. Hence some examples of how to include those who cannot attend: determine standing meeting dates and consider possibility of rotating meeting dates; someone from a work group communicates what went on in the meeting; meeting summaries are provided following the meeting and posted in an accessible location; or conference calls may be conducted.
- Provide ample notice and distribute supporting meeting information (agenda, studies, handouts, fact sheets, etc.) online and to other outreach venues such as libraries about six weeks before the public meetings.
- Several responded that nothing is more important than future discussions and decisions on the Chattooga River, so anytime and anywhere would work. Many expected to be able to work within constraints set by others, e.g. those who have to juggle their work and meeting schedules and who have to travel long distances to meeting sites.
- The fewer the meetings, the better; make it an efficient process.
In general, there was a wide range of preferences for the best days to meet, though there was broad agreement not to schedule meetings on Wednesday evenings and Sundays.

- For those who need to travel more than several hours to the meetings, week days are often not the best times to meet, and thus there is a preference for Friday evenings or Saturday, and in some cases a Monday evening (for those who can travel on Sunday).
- For others, depending on the meeting agenda, a Saturday late morning or early afternoon is a practical alternative, though one person scheduled hikes on Saturday. Others prefer to limit the number of meetings held on the weekends since this is family time.
- For some local residents, Tuesdays and Thursdays evenings are preferred.

With respect to time of the day, there was general agreement to meet in the evening and thus to see fewer all day meetings though holding longer meetings was also encouraged, if this was limited.

- Depending on the purpose of the meeting and agenda, several suggested that the meetings last from several to 3 hours, starting sometime between 6-7pm.
- Another option proposed was offering the same meeting at different times of the day or another day of the week, starting one in the late afternoon, and another in the evening.
- Someone suggested holding meetings in the early morning beginning at 9am.
- Someone else suggested holding all day meetings to reduce the number of meetings overall.

There was general agreement among respondents to rotate the meeting sites, to hold the meetings near the Chattooga area, and to hold the meetings in a public venue where there was enough seating for those who to sit who attend the meetings. Many respondents commented that rotation of the current meeting sites at Walhalla, Clayton, and Highlands was a fair way to offset travel costs and time, demonstrating respect for the three US Forest Service districts, the various recreational users, and local residents. The exception to this for example, would be someone who needed to travel a further distance, for example someone from Columbia. Traveling to either site could be burdensome if the meetings were held on a weekday, especially if management of the resources was not his or her primary job. Several respondents offered suggestions for meeting sites including:

- Hold the meetings outdoors, hike a mile up to the next waterfall – Burrell’s Ford bridge;
- Near the Andrew Pickens district office;
- Meeting facilities in both state parks, especially Oconee (has a barn that holds at least 125 people).
- City of Walhalla has auditorium facilities.

**CONSTRAINTS AND BARRIERS IMPEDING A SUCCESSFUL PROCESS**

Respondents were asked to describe their perceptions about constraints or barriers to a successful process (i.e., value differences, personalities, conflicting technical information, or lack of communication). Responses fell into eight categories of potential constraints and
barriers. Some are explicit limitations that could be encountered in pursuing an objective while others are potential barriers or obstructions to achieving a goal such as “intolerance is a barrier to understanding.”

Some respondents perceived constraints as “givens” such as time, or simply just not being able to work with each other. Others described process challenges that may impede group work but could be overcome. The constraints can be grouped as:

- Budgetary Constraints
- Time Constraints
- User Group Perceptions
- Personalities of Leadership
- Lack of Trust
- Shadow of Lawsuit
- Unwillingness to Explore Collaboration: A Barrier

**Budgetary Constraints**
There is general concern that with federal budget cuts across the board for the national forests it will become more and more difficult for forest staff to manage the resources. Hence there is a concern about the following:

- Funding for meeting management
- Implementation and monitoring decisions once made (perception that there is not enough staff to monitor the current management decisions, adding any new management actions might strain current resources).
- Adding more responsibilities to current staff
- Spending money on outside contractors (could use consultant money on additional user surveys or other studies rather than looking at process).

**Time Constraints**
Time is a given, there is not much of it. A management decision on the use of the upper Chattooga will be made by December 2007. Yet, there is concerned expressed that the entire river corridor requires a user analysis, not simply the upper Chattooga.

**User Group Perceptions**
During the interviews, some of the respondents referred to other user groups in very generalize terms – “the boaters, the anglers, the hikers,…”, making few distinctions about levels or kinds of use. Some of the respondents did provide these distinctions for instance, the differences between “front-country anglers and backcountry anglers.” The researchers believe it will be important for the community to begin to learn to make distinctions about the various users, level and kind of use in order for a collaborative discussion to move forward.

- Concern expressed that the more organized groups could influence the less organized users or users that are not affiliated with an organization (i.e., front-country anglers, local residents,…)  
- Concern expressed that some user groups are simply out to meet their self-interests, and are not in the process for the long haul nor interested in local community concerns, which would involve protecting and managing the river not only current but also future use.
Concern expressed that a change in use, even with factual data, would take awhile for general acceptance in the community, been a way of thinking for a longtime.

Some individuals have made previous attempts to find workable solutions and were ignored. Attempting to reach out while being snubbed has damaged the potential for working relationships. It will take awhile to rebuild working relationship, assuming this is possible at this point.

Concern expressed that if any allowance or exception to the present policy is made, there will be a rescue attempt that will degrade the pristine environment.

Concern that other user conflicts are not being managed or identified because the focus for so long as been angler and boater conflicts.

Concern that the same rhetoric and arguments will prevail at the meetings instead of listening to one another and learning from each other.

Leadership Personalities
Some respondents commented about the current leaders who have been readily involved in the Chattooga River, who have very strong personalities and are very hard on each other. The concern is that the current leadership of some organizations may have a difficult time in leading others in a collaborative, if they are not able to communicate with each and are closed off to other views. There is also concern that there are disgruntled forest service employees, disgruntled at having to review the 2004 forest management decision, disgruntled because they are being asked to do much with little and thus are battle work and non-trusting, and disgruntled because Washington, DC may measure their performance on the number of lawsuits filed.

Lack of Trust
There are several issues of mistrust. There are respondents who believe that the Forest Service has a personal stake in the outcome, namely wanting to maintain the status quo. The belief is that Forest Service may not want to admit any error in any previous decision. One respondent stated that there is “somebody well up the USFS line who has enabled this thing to get as far as it has. The career forest service people aren’t going to stick their neck out and no one is listening to the line officers”. There are other respondents who believe that the Forest Service is too concerned about making people happy and as a result, take its eyes off of the resource, which leads to breeches of trust.

There are certainly issues of mistrust between the user groups, in part because direct conversation between the groups has been lacking; there are misperceptions about the user groups in general; and there are value differences related to what is “solitude” and how to maintain it; and there are age and generational differences between the user groups – between those who value the extreme sports and the thrill, and solitude to those who enjoy the solitude.

Shadow of the Lawsuit
Some have expressed reservations about the AW lawsuit and how it may impact future deliberations. The concerns are:

- The potential to strain future discussions and conversations, some user groups or individual may feel constrained to be forthcoming and transparent since any group may be willing to sue, not simply AW, once a decision is made, and use the discussions to that group’s advantage.
• That AW is using the Chattooga River to set a precedent, not simply with USFS but also within the National Park Service, as a legal precedent to access the grand canyon of the Yellowstone.

Unwillingness to Explore Collaboration
Discerning whether an issue is ready or "ripe" for problem-solving or resolve is just as important as understanding the kinds of issues the parties face (Zartman, 2003). Parties look to resolve their conflicts when they are ready to do so. On one hand, the situation is "ripe" for a collaborative problem-solving effort, since many respondents are willing to try and engage in a collaborative effort. However, some of the respondents are not willing to engage in a collaborative effort, in part due to personality differences, in part because data is not readily available to substantiate whether boating use would or would not impact the resource, and in part because there are strongly held historical values about the kinds of use that should be allowed in the various sections of the river corridor. Hence the concern is that there cannot be a collaboration given the unwillingness of some parties to work together.

Some user groups, in particular the hiking and birding groups, have clearly identified that they are not willing to collaborate. Other user groups are more willing to explore a collaborative effort if some specific conditions are met (i.e, monitoring and maintaining woody debris in the river; clear understanding that the Chattooga is not precedent setting for the grand canyon river corridor of the Yellowstone; and that the LAC data has been gathered and is complete before any discussions commence).

SUGGESTIONS FOR OVERCOMING CONSTRAINTS AND BARRIERS
When asked about how to overcome perceived constraints or barriers to collaboration, respondents provided the following:

▪ Need factual data to support any decision to change use on the river.
▪ Each group has its own positions- pick the best negotiator of the team. Improve the level of understanding and communication between the various users and the local community, and between the more assertive user groups.
▪ Good facilitation. Need a facilitated process led by a facilitator with assertiveness and a good knowledge base of what are the bounds of the problem solving process – legal and factual bounds.
▪ Need a paradigm shift in the discussion. Unless a collaborative process gets beyond the usual discussion we won’t get anywhere. The usual discussion: is should we or should we not, rather than how can we improve recreational access and experience?
▪ The Forest Service said they were going to study 4-5 alternatives: no boating, some boating, more boating, unlimited boating. There is a bunch more activities going on already – how do these impact the river? The spectrum for alternatives should be no recreation to unlimited recreation, with another alternative to address these issues.
▪ Threats to others should not be tolerated by anyone.

TECHNIQUES OR METHODS TO ENHANCE EFFECTIVE INTERACTION
Respondents were asked to describe methods or techniques that could help them engage more effectively with other participants. From the responses to this question, three major techniques or methods emerged:

- Meeting Format
- Specific Techniques
- Facilitation

**Meeting Format**
Respondents made a number of suggestions regarding meeting format, some suggestions were compatible, others were conflicting. These were:

- Limit the number of meetings, perhaps a monthly meeting.
- At subsequent meetings, the expectation is that the meeting participants would refine previous products and processes, and reflect what has been done and build on that.
- Engage people effectively through small group interaction. Go into break out groups or discussions as well create activities where everyone can work together.
- Additional comments related to small groups were:
  - Breaking into small groups of the same affiliation does not work; talking to the choir and not learning from each other. In addition, some groups may be too large for small group work, consider less than 12 people per group. Small groups are not effective if they are not accountable to the larger group. Have a lot of interests.
  - Group meeting with different voices in small break out group; mixed groups – hear each other out.
  - Consider the use of focus groups or groups focused on a specific topic or issue.

Some lessons learned from previous meetings included:

- Presentation of data at meetings: separate problem-solving meetings from informative meetings. The informative meetings often do not provide time for questions and thus are not very educational, simply a means to gather comments.
- Listening tables (various steps of the study of the literature review, river levels)… none of the meeting information was captured or recorded for the public to view and learn from.
- Design of initial meetings was well done. Good job last year, being more specific on meeting goals, on the right track. Regrouped last year which helped people engage better.
- Responses not forth coming when questions were asked. Nor how the results from the meetings were used.
- Define the decision-space. The Forest Service (decision-makers, locally and otherwise) need to be present and introduce at what level decision making occurs.
- Additional comments related to decision making were:
  - Determine how the group will make decisions (voting – consensus).
  - Let the USFS present the facts – what’s legal, what the impacts of access would be, state up front that there would have to be restrictions on use below iron bridge. State those conditions, gather the facts, and bring in the silent minority.
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- Need to match the facility to the anticipated number of people; everyone needs a seat so that people are not standing in the halls.
- A reasonably comfortable chair is all I need.
- Prepare for and structure the meetings in order to:
  - Develop our understanding about the ground rules and the facts of the situation.
  - Follow an agenda and clearly stated purpose for the meeting.
  - Provide a vision of the process: the starting point and end point.
  - Come to the meeting prepared to engage with an understanding about the meeting purpose and outcomes based on information distributed prior to the meeting.
  - The meeting structure is independent of any one interested party. People buy in to the goal of the meeting before you walk in.
  - Have stronger meeting leadership; use an independent facilitator, someone who is comfortable with anxiety and conflict.

**Specific Techniques**

Respondents offered several suggestions on specific techniques that could be used to enhance group interaction. These included:

- Recognize a common agreement – protection of the current and future resource. All parties need to make clear to each other the value placed on the resource.
  - A highly diverse and qualified group of stakeholders who have more than their own personal interest in mind.
  - Get those willing to talk to each other – to talk
- Regardless of the outcomes; establish clear facts and broad common goals.
  - Develop ground rules that set up an agreement on how people will act with each other.
  - Keep rules simple and to a minimum.
- Provide administrative support to help prepare and make accessible meeting summaries.
  - Take down what people have to say; summarize this information and make it available so people begin to understand each other and previous efforts taken.
  - Meeting summary is distributed several weeks following the meeting; post on website. Interested parties can distribute using their networks.
- The Forest Service needs to have people who are actively involved in recreation uses and policy at the meetings; someone who is intimately involved in the issues and can respond to questions on the spot and clear up any misperceptions.
- Presentation of Technical Data:
  - Use clear and consistent language; limit jargon.
  - Request fairness and transparency in the information.
  - Have consultants present their information and respond to questions directly.
  - Make accessible in order for participants to attend meetings.
  - Frame technical data in a way that can people can understand it; have visuals available – reference info.
- Provide refreshments like pizza.
Facilitation
Many respondents commented on the need for a meeting facilitator though some suggested he or she could facilitate the process. Several respondents supported the USFS facilitating the process though others preferred an outside party to facilitate the process.

- Facilitators are critically important. A skilled facilitator who is neutral and knowledgeable can have a profoundly positive impact on the discussion; one versed in these management issues, who can write fast and is even tempered.
  - Who is independent; not weighted with an outcome
  - Who will focus on the flow of the meeting; the process
  - During small group work, provide a mediator/moderator for each small group.
  - Who is a trained arbitrator/facilitator specialist –someone who has understanding or familiarity of the situation
  - Mediator/moderator who can find the commonality of the group. Knows not to force the group into one direction or another.
  - Need strong facilitation, given the strong personalities at the meetings and their desire to change the process.
- Facilitator? Not sure it would be worth the cost. Hell, I can facilitate it

PROCEDURES & PROCESSES FOR RESOLVING PROBLEMS RELATED TO RECREATIONAL AND VISITOR USE
Respondents were asked to identify procedures or processes that could assist them and others to resolve problems related to recreational and visitor use on the Chattooga River. Responses were grouped into the following categories with respect to specific procedures and processes to resolve problems:

- Determine long-term vision of the Chattooga
- Determine sideboards to future conversations or deliberations
- Recognize the efforts of the Forest Service
- Listen to shared stories to build understanding
- Incorporate study findings into decision-making

Determine Long-Term Vision of the Chattooga
Provide a framework for long-term thinking, which includes a vision and long-term planning documents. Protect the river first now and in the future – its greater good and address all of the issues.

Determine Sideboards to Future Conversations or Deliberations
Similar to remarks provided about collaboration, respondents reiterated the need for some process structure and leadership from the Forest Service. Remarks included:

- Understand where the floor and ceiling is, not only with the Forest Service but also with other parties.
- Understand the legalities
- Need to get past the bad blood and negative feelings. That needs to be cleared up.
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- Understanding that baseline before people walk in is really important. FS needs to combat the misinformation rhetoric.
- Complete LAC process before bringing a collaborative effort together
- Clear understanding from AW that any resolve will not be used for precedent setting with recreational use of the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone.
- Maintain woody debris in the river.
- Understand the willingness of others to adhere to ground rules
- Know the USFS makes final decision regardless

Recognize the Efforts of the USFS
Give credit to the USFS for having to do something other than what was on their plate.

Listen to Shared Stories and Build Understanding
Respondents commented on ways that participants in a collaborative process can work to improve communication and build understanding. These included:
- Stay away from divide and conquer strategy. People need to be able to address all stakeholders in the collaboration venue is key.
- Each agency needs to be responsive to learn the capabilities and constraints and help each other and them community – find a workable solution – human and natural environment
- Think through complex process – use a continuum of options to help see other’s viewpoint
- Neither side has set at the same table and talked to each other about what is important.
- What is on your mind and what is important to you – what are people willing to give
- If the timing is right, and the analysis complete, and reviewed by people, then encourage the USFS to show its hand on the EIS and EA, to suggest a range of alternatives – do nothing or do everything. Show alternatives before collaboration, react, encouraging side meetings (and open). React and then come up with alternative.
- Everybody go around the table and say their opinion; get to know each other more – personal where people are coming from and why.
- Create productive learning environment. Start by writing down individual thoughts before speaking or paraphrase others ideas

Incorporate Study Findings into Decision-making
Suggestions were made to incorporate information into the collaborative process:
- Better user studies would be good – better user data.
- Negotiate based on the different sections.
- Take beyond the LAC- or info gather process- prior to management decision. Shift and gather info for the indicator.
- Develop solutions to individual problems. Brainstorming solutions to small pieces of the big puzzle. In the alternative development process, need to consider lots of options. Start with the easy ones first. Describe the opportunities before us as a sweeping
management plan with lots of options. Not simply a dispute between boaters and anglers. Break the big issues into digestible small pieces. Capacity issues need to be dealt within acceptable user management practices and protocols. Forest Service needs to come out with their management practices. Some things need to come off the table – those things that are illegal or not based on good information. There are facts, practices, policies and science that govern this process.

### Use of and Access to Information

Respondents were asked to describe their preferences about the use of and access to information. Specifically, they were asked about:

- The kinds of resources (i.e., technical support) needed to participate effectively
- The kinds of information needed to participate effectively
- To identify the best ways for them to understand (manage) technical information
- The kinds of information he or she could bring to a collaborative process
- The best ways for information to be presented
- To identify the most effective means of sharing information with others
- To identify the best ways for the Forest Service to receive feedback from the respondents about the process and during the process.

### Resources Needed (i.e., technical support, relevant information) to Participate Effectively

The respondents offered the following suggestions to support effective participation.

- **Structured Forums of Engagement**
  - Provide an independent structure for controlling the meeting.
  - Create an educational environment: provide pre-reading materials in advance.
  - Discuss and ensure familiarity with the river itself (geography and physical layout)
  - Increase contact or availability of district rangers, in particular the Andrews Pickens District. Supervisor’s office in conducting study. To build working relationships and connect with partners, need their involvement and face to face attention.
  - Prefer meeting summaries; make public once approved by group
  - Provide meeting summaries of each meeting (someone captures the data and composes a meeting summary; group approves meeting summaries and the post to a public website.

- **Decision-Making Space & Boundaries**
  - Good understanding of the boundaries of a collaborative effort- what are those including any known geographic boundaries.
  - Outline of forest service expectations for its user groups using existing law: the wild and scenic river laws; laws pertaining to all user behavior and expectations; and restrictions pertaining to the user groups. For example: three uses were initially restricted on the upper Chattooga - ORV use, horse backing, and boating.
  - FS needs to describe what is possible under the law.
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- **Deal with Misperceptions**
  - USFS should deal publicly with the issues that concern the boating community (may defuse much of the tension; believe USFS has operated under gag order with respect to discussing elements of the lawsuit initiated by American Whitewater).
  - Prior to collaboration, these lawsuit claims should be explained by the USFS to help clarify the issues regarding management of the Chattooga. The three key points from the lawsuit that have infuriated the boating community are:
    1) Limiting access to any user group is illegal on a Wild & Scenic River
    2) White water kayaking are the only user group with restrictions.
    3) USFS cut a "back-room deal" with anglers to restrict boats
  - I would like to know who in the FS is so dead set against opening this river and why. I've worked with many of them and they don’t seem to be at the bottom of this. I want to know who feels so strongly in the agency about keep the river closed and why. Is it JT? Chuck Myers? Who is it?

- **Methods to Present Info**
  - Provide study information on possible use of upper Chattooga – take 10 years of water levels for a 60 year history; how many days are realistically possible to boat the upper. Chattooga – 20 days? Is this what we are talking about?
  - User analysis on all the users and their respective impacts; information to assist in designing a management user plan for Chattooga. For instance: using a bell-curve model, show when boaters will put on say between 10-noon in comparison to when anglers fish which may be earlier morning or later evening, depending on the kind of fishing they do. Make it more predictable as to what point are you likely to see someone that use may be incompatible with yours.
  - USFS should issue the unedited and uncensored reports from the consultants; the consultants should present their findings, not USFS.

**Information Needed to Participate Effectively**
The respondents stated the following information is needed to participate effectively.

- **Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) Info**
  - Complete the LAC process started before discussing management alternatives. (Concern about trying to have a collaborative group help frame an alternative when LAC information is not complete. This data is important to help determine what is on the table and what is of.
  - Using the planning framework (LAC) for all user groups and impacts to environment.
  - There is no effort in their LAC process to articulate indicators of baseline standards that would be changed or compromised that would be changed by changing the character of the area. Limitations, credibility issues with this information since the LAC deals with higher-order ecological and landscape scale form and function. Ok for looking at camp-sites etc but is predominantly user centered. Need to go beyond any user’s perspective.

- **Update Current Baseline Data**
  - Wildflower updates
  - Bear data updates
  - Eastern cougar sightings; how does US Fish & Wildlife Service weigh in on sightings and what are implications for future USFS decision-making.
  - GIS map of the corridor – where are highly eroding soils; soil maps
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- **EA or EIS**
  - Full environmental info available. Alternatives before critical issues to be addressed in an EA or EIS.

- **Implications for Future Use**
  - Future on future generations- what are the desired future conditions.

- **Information from Current Studies**
  - Full access to all consultant’s reports including NRLI: example the boater trials (helpful study)
  - Data from public meetings.
  - Desired conditions and indicators from past meetings.

- **Historical Data**
  - What historically occurred across the country
  - What is the current status of fishery management now and nationally.
  - Provide historical data about the issue; what was thinking then and why; does it hold true now.

- **Baseline Data on Comparable Areas**
  - Study comparable areas for comparisons like Overflow Creek on the West Fork with its floating, fishing, hiking, etc.

- **Aquatic Baseline Data**
  - Be sure to include DNRS in discussions. Need to determine why it is acceptable to stock with non-native trout species like brown and rainbow. If the resource is over used and adversely impacted by human activity, why stock fish and attract people to the resource?
  - Review speculations that brook trout may not be native; how would this impact future decision-making.

- **Biological Baseline Data**
  - Gather info on the critical biological resources: what are they; where are they.
  - Determine nonnative invasive species in riverway: what are they; where are they.
  - Require full and complete analyses of the biological issues, both the ecological and wilderness character. The biophysical and the human experience. There is no effort in their LAC process to articulate indicators of baseline standards that would be changed or compromised that would be changed by changing the character of the area. I’m disappointed with the LAC. LAC has a weakness in dealing with higher-order ecological and landscape scale form and function. It works ok for looking at camp-sites etc. it is too user-centered. Need to go beyond any user’s perspective.
  - Large woody debris and impacts on fish habitat (need to maintain in riverway- some boaters may remove for safety reasons).
  - Woolly adelgid and impact on riverbank hemlocks. Infestation will create large woody debris- may provide fish habitat but create safety concerns for boaters.

- **User Group Baseline Data**
  - Baseline data on user groups, past and current. For instance: what % of fishing is done by “front country” anglers; by “back country” anglers; and what % by a mix of users. A respondent believes that 70% of fishing is done by ‘front country’ anglers
and that this seasonal group may not be well represented at the public meetings or in
gather data about the users.
- Amount of usage- baseline data info – usage of capacity (impacted by users). Lot of
different user of rivers- full impact of the users.
- Background info on the various groups; what are their respective limitations; what do
they value about the river. Conflict at normal water levels and 2.5 under (younger
people want it at 2.8). front country fishers will have a different experience (bait and
spinner fishing – may near bridge) not backcountry fly fishing.

- **Safety Data**
  - Safety is an important issue. Need to have someone who can show that restricting
  uses to less disturbing activities is important. Show the value of low intensive uses.
  - Discuss new technology of boater craft and skill level required for paddling down the
creek.

- **Costs**
  - Emergency financial costs
  - Forest Service personnel to support new management tasks
  - County Emergency & Rescue
  - If capacity increases (for any usage) – who pays?
  - Costs to monitor all user activity – staff and travel
  - Costs for upgrading physical parking lots for access to upper reaches.
  - Bring in views of economic benefits to the community. (sales tax to the county).

**Management of Technical Information**
The respondents made the following suggestions for how to manage technical information.

- **Clarification of Common Terms**
  - Wide open access: what does that mean- 330 days of no boating
  - Anglers – the word is often used as if anglers are one and the same. Need specificity
  in the dialogue to understand what is being talked (generalizations may be create
some of the conflicts).
  - Boaters - the word is often used as if boaters are one and the same. Need specificity
  in the dialogue to understand what is being talked (generalizations may be create
some of the conflicts).
  - Users- some users are multiple users (boater, angler, hiker) but are lumped into one
  particular use rather than discussing with the multiple users their perceptions on the
issues.
  - Define users by actual use: infrequent, occasional, frequent. Factor in the
perspectives of infrequent and occasional users.
  - Reduce USFS jargon when presenting information
  - Restrictions- what users have been restricted to the upper and when (boaters,
horseback riders, and ORV).

- **Provide Preliminary Info Prior to Meetings**
  - Great job- sending info ahead! And trying to look into conflict resolution; consultant
has been calling and emailing- get touch and communicating. How to design a
process to manage the issue (wasted the first year to go a group hug).
- Rather have the information prior to the meeting so that I prepared to come the meeting to discuss issues.
- Provide summary of studies and management uses for general public
- Good information in a timely manner; include access to report and data behind
- Develop a less guarded stance with information; in face being more accessible may reduce some data conflicts. The data is there – use it. It may help users understand the technical considerations they are not considering.
- Provide consultant reports to the public
- Need info prior and a reasonable timeframe in order to share information with constituents. We can act as a outreach source for the project. As project progresses, need to obtain info and then turn it around and give it to people for feedback. Electronic format is preferred.
- We are required in NEPA to supply information in specific formats. Our staff will have to have the time necessary for review, comment and decision.

- Developing or enhancing partnerships with other researchers and agencies
  - Involve other regional area scientists or researchers like the highlands biological station. Recognize previous research. For instance Gordon Howard did earlier research on the Chattooga – what the original thinking was and if it is legitimate anymore.
  - Where do federal partners weigh on the issues

Information Respondents Can Bring to the Process
Some examples of information that respondents can contribute to a collaborative process include:

- Personal Experience
  - Use the river 3-4 times per week; can bring knowledge of the river and how I use it; can bring appreciation and understanding of the river and its management.
  - Knowledge about the river from several user perspectives: birder (“stand and stare perspective”), angler, boater, hiker, and emergency response.
  - Could provide information but what qualifies as useful and pertinent? So many of us feel ownership of the Chattooga. Need to consider the long-range views on keeping the wild parts wild.
  - Local perspective and knowledge – including historical and cultural.

- Professional Expertise
  - An understanding about the river system – both technical and scientific.
  - Knowledge about the history of the management polices.
  - Knowledge about the safety concerns and education that boaters participate in order to do what they love to do.
  - Twenty-two years of history, knowledge and passion and objectivity about the river system (and maybe bias as I have not boated)
  - Expertise in the forest management planning process

- Literature (research, studies, opinion pieces)
  - A ton of stuff in my own files.
  - Would be willing to share what I have.
  - NGOs have info to contribute such as information on former studies (Trout Unlimited, AW, and others)
Best Ways for Information To Be Presented
Suggestions for how to present information included:

- **Develop a known schedule for presenting or making information accessible**
  - Have information readily available to prepare for meetings or discussions.

- **Working face to face with others**
  - Expertise of working with others (form study groups)
  - Face to face meetings maybe twice a year and communicate with the local groups and others on how to engage, the updates from the local level/district level not at the Columbia level.

- **Use of Technological Resources**
  - Emails
  - Online Bulletin Boards
  - Blogs
  - Website – information available to prepare for a meeting including meeting summaries from previous meetings.
  - Be mindful that some users do not use technology or may not have access
  - Use technology to make information readily available but not everyone has access
  - Provide public notices and press releases using current and new methods of outreach including printed materials (flyers, newspapers,..)

- **Printed Copies of Information**
  - Deliver more pertinent information as a printed hard copy (and by snail mail) such as the user analysis report.

- **Mixed Approaches**
  - Use a mixture of approaches including have information readily available to prepare for upcoming meetings or discussions; use visual and auditory information formats including maps, graphs, charts, perhaps summaries of info followed with the details.

Best Ways to Share Information With Others
Examples of the best ways to share information with each other included:

- **Face to Face**
  - Form study groups – learn from the expertise of others
  - Face to face best for deliberations, to get to know each other.
  - Willing to give time by personal interviews – real feedback (use the situation assessment model)
  - Maybe twice a year and communicate with the local groups and others on how to engage, the updates from the local level/district level not at the Columbia level.

- **Use of technological resources**
  - Emails
  - Online Bulletin Boards
  - Blogs
  - Website (update often)
  - Be mindful that some users do not use technology or may not have access.
  - Use technology to make information readily available but discuss in person
Printed Materials
- May need hard copies of studies and other reference materials.
- More pertinent info may need to be delivered by hard copy (and snail mail) such as the user analysis.
- Provide public notices and press releases using current and new methods of outreach

Mixture of Approaches
- Use all kinds of means. Need to be able to share information, to make it accessible.
- Want a systematic approach to things. Use technology in order for us to access info - visuals, maps, graphs, meeting summaries, and charts, with a summative intro followed with details, yet provide face to face to discuss. FS likes to roll things out and present the data at a meeting. Not necessary to do that. Can get data from the website. Meetings should be devoted to face to face dialogue/discussion.
- Update outreach plan to include reaching out to old time local people, firehouses like station 8, churches, public libraries, county administrator offices in Highlands, Cashiers, SC, GA, Oconee & Rabon County, community centers, extension offices, NCRCS, the local AM and FM radio stations, & local newspapers and regional newspapers like Smoky Mountain News.

Receiving Feedback (About the Process)
The respondents identified the following methods as the best ways to receive feedback from the USFS about the process:

Written Feedback
- Can be in letter format
- Can be via email (also listserv)
- Can be via email followed with a confirmation letter
- Info to interested people – one page thing and ask for comment – can be done by letter or email. Other options available.

Phone
By phone when it’s a less than formal question or comment

Website
- Can post accessible information

Mixed Methods
- Kept in the loop by email or website
- Summary or survey after each workshop to express feedback – like a question that was not asked or responded to as clearly
- Set up a multiple means to work; phone calls are ok; emails are ok; bulletin boards that are not moderated are not effective (moderators maintain the purpose of the bulletin board and will not allow abusive language and disrespect of other members).

Receiving Feedback (During the Process)
The respondents identified the following methods as the best ways to receive feedback from the USFS during the process:
Chattooga Situation Assessment

- **Small group discussion**
  - Have it facilitated, summarized, and shared.

- **During meetings**
  - Share feedback face to face to get to know and understand the people and the issues.

- **Written feedback**
  - In general, email works fine though USFS needs to respond to questions. Seems there is a lot of info given to the Forest Service but it is not clear how the information is being used or has been used.
  - Typed letter is the most professional way to do it followed by email, thirdly by telephone.
  - Provide information to those who are interested people (for example: a one page thing and ask for comment – can be done by letter or email. Other options available).
  - Need to be able to file comments and write letters

- **Moderated BLOG**
  - Avoid the Chattooga Blog which continues to post the same old arguments and debates and does not focus on solving the problem. Where there are contradictions or inaccurate information, the USFS needs to correct this inaccuracies and perhaps discourage inaccurate information from circulating.
  - The BLOG got to be stupid- inflammatory comments at each other.

- **Convey how the feedback or information gathered and used by communicating using the following means:**
  - Website
  - Bulletin board
  - Email comments
  - Written letters
  - Direct meetings – let people know what is going on- report back (LACs-report back – best way).

- **Use a mixture of methods**
  - Use technology to make info readily available, identify users who require hard copies of info and make it available to them this way, use phone or email for questions of clarification, and meet face to face – prepared to discuss the info. Have meeting summary to work with and other supporting documents to discuss points at hand.
  - Willing to give time by personal interviews – real feedback (use the situation assessment model)
Conclusions and Recommendations

This section provides a summary of conclusions followed by a list of specific recommendations that can contribute to the Forest Service’s public involvement plan. Many of the suggestions provided by the participants focused on how to improve the existing forums for sharing information and clarifying issues, as well as some different methods for generating alternatives to controversial proposals.

CONCLUSIONS

1. All of the respondents shared one important value: that protection of the Chattooga River now and in the future is of great importance. Another value shared by many is maintenance of community, whether they are residents in North Carolina, South Carolina, or Georgia.

2. The situation is suitable for a collaborative problem-solving effort. A significant subset of respondents reported a willingness to try collaboration. Many see collaboration as a means to meet their interests. Another subset of respondents is skeptical that collaboration will promote their interests, but is willing to accept changes in river use if they are science-supported and new uses are closely monitored. A third subset of respondents reported an unwillingness to engage in collaboration. Their preference is to maintain the status quo believing that additional use will result in significant environmental degradation.

Several respondents specified preconditions for collaboration. These were:

   a. The user capacity analysis should be completed and data made available to the public. This will help stakeholders identify problems, and establish standards for river access and use.
   b. "Foot travel only" stakeholders,(i.e., front- and backcountry anglers, hunters, photographers, swimmers, etc.), as well as interested community members and Forest Service personnel must be present or represented in a collaborative process.
   c. Commitment by American Whitewater that access to the upper portion of the Chattooga is not being used as a legal precedent for opening the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone river corridor in Yellowstone National Park;
   d. Some limitations on boating (and boaters) are necessary including maintaining woody debris in the river.

3. Respondents clearly understand their limits of authority in the process and have realistic expectations about their contribution to the final decision. They understand that the Forest Service will make the decision with respect to boating use on the upper Chattooga. However, it is not clear how many of the participants are familiar with the NEPA process and how their active involvement assists in informed decision-making.
4. A collaborative process must contain the following elements:
   - A clear decision space
   - A structured process that is fair and open and encourages meaningful interaction
   - Information must be shared openly and readily
   - The "right" people are participating
   - Satisfaction of multiple interests.
   - Attainment of a higher goal (protection of the resource), while also dealing with the immediate issue of boater access in the upper Chattooga

5. Significant misperceptions and assumptions held by some users about other users must be overcome to create a climate for collaboration. These identity-based conflicts stifle effective communication and lead to misunderstanding, adversarial tones when discussing the “other side”, frustration and intolerance for other points of view, and strategic use of information to promote a position or win a point.

6. While some parties are willing to collaborate on the issue of boater access, it is not clear whether an alternative exists that can minimally satisfy the interests of the parties, i.e., that there is a zone of possible agreement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following criteria form the basis of recommendations on the design and implementation of a public involvement process for making a final decision on boating use and access on the upper Chattooga River:

1. Parties agree on goals for the collaborative problem solving effort (options vary for an agreement on a course of action, identification of new options, joint fact finding on the impacts of various options, joint projects, shared learning about one another’s interests and concerns, etc.).

2. Parties agree on a manageable number of interdependent or related issues. There must be a sufficiently well developed factual base to permit meaningful discussion and resolution of the issues.

3. Parties understand the limits to their authority in the process and have realistic expectations about their contributions.

4. Parties agree on goals for the collaborative problem solving effort (options vary for an agreement on a course of action, identification of new options, joint fact finding on the impacts of various options, joint projects, shared learning about one another’s interests and concerns, etc.).

5. Parties agree on a manageable number of interdependent or related issues. There must be a sufficiently well developed factual base to permit meaningful discussion and resolution of the issues.

6. Participants interested in or affected by the outcome of the collaborative solving effort can be identified, and the number of anticipated participants can be managed within the process as designed.
7. The collaborative problem-solving effort is inclusive – all parties relevant to the issue and its resolution are able to participate. Moreover, all parties have an equal opportunity to participate in designing the process. The process must be explainable and designed to meet the circumstances and needs of the situation.

8. The collaborative problem-solving effort is structured to allow for continuous dialogue over many weeks/months – meetings are scheduled in advance and parties are able to attend meetings. Dialogue is continued from one meeting to the next and participants are able to move the discussion along from meeting to meeting, i.e., discussions do not have to be repeated because participation changes from meeting to meeting.

9. Parties are interested in participating in good faith. They are likely, if not more likely, to achieve their overall goals using collaboration as they would through their alternatives.

10. Parties can obtain adequate resources to participate, including technical support; all parties have equal access to relevant information and the opportunity to participate effectively throughout the process. Flexibility can be designed into the process to accommodate changing issues, data needs, political environment, and programmatic constraints such as time and meeting arrangements.

11. Collaborative problem solving effort will not cause unreasonable delay.

12. Parties are accountable to the process that they have agreed to establish.

13. Mechanisms exist to consider the feedback of interested parties.

The following recommendations about structuring and managing future public involvement are based on the information gathered through the situation assessment

1. Because respondents share the overarching values of protecting the Chattooga River and maintaining a sense of community cohesion, consideration for ongoing and long-term public involvement should be a Forest Service priority. Two possible mechanisms for this are to establish a Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) or a non-profit entity. Leaders, within the community can help build the capacity to sustain and support long-term collaborative approaches to forest management decision-making, if a structure exists for them to do so. A non-profit or RAC not only can serve as mechanisms for gathering feedback from stakeholders, but also can serve as a forum for ongoing monitoring and dialogue. A long-term public involvement approach will help the communities and the USFS maintain communication and accountability about the management decisions.

2. The Forest Service is encouraged to go beyond minimum requirements for citizen involvement defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Share with the participants recent efforts on modernization of the NEPA process, including the Council of Environmental Quality Citizen Guide to the NEPA: Having Your Voice Heard.

3. Establish working groups to explore topics, develop proposals, and resolve differences.

4. Establish a process advisory committee to assist the facilitators or meeting leaders in developing agendas and guiding the decision-making process.

5. Establish a technical advisory team of partnering agencies and researchers to provide important information to the group. Develop a technical review team to help review studies,
preliminary and otherwise, and provide comments and suggestions prior to distribution to the general public.

6. Consider following the example of the San Juan National Forest Plan revision. There, they established working groups to address specific issues. All groups were facilitated by outside, neutral facilitators. Working groups recommended ideas to include in one or more NEPA alternatives. Ideas that had wide support would appear in several alternatives, and ideas with fewer advocates would appear in only one. This process engendered hard work and loyalty among citizens involved in the process, and spawned a great deal of public participation in a later Forest Service efforts.
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Appendix A: Interview Protocol

Respondent Number:  
Date of Interview:  

Info on Stakeholders:  
The first few questions are about you, your connection to the Chattooga River, and your experience with the Forest Service management planning process.  
1. Please tell me a bit about yourself. What is your connection to the Chattooga River?  
2. Have you participated in the Sumter National Forests Management planning process, especially the part dealing with the Chattooga River?  

Views About Collaboration:  
The next set of questions is related to working collaboratively with other groups. Collaboration can often mean different things to different people. We want you to think about a process that will allow you to work with others in identifying management actions, even if other parties may or may not share your perspective on how the Chattooga River should be managed for visitor and recreational use.  
3. From your perspective, what is a collaborative effort? How does it work best?  
4. What are the key issues you believe need to be discussed in order for this collaborative effort to be successful?  
5. What could be the possible benefits to you and others in participating in a successful collaborative process with respect to the Chattooga River?  
6. What might the potential consequences be to you and others if a collaborative is not undertaken or is not successful?  
7a. Given your definition of a collaborative process, what are some milestones that will tell you that you are on a successful path?  
7b. What will you consider to be a successful outcome?  
8. Collaborative efforts as a general rule are inclusive. Who do you think needs to be aware of or should participate in this process?
9. Would you be interested in participating in a collaborative effort? If not, what would need to happen to encourage your participation?

**Defining meeting process:**

10. During a collaborative process, are there any techniques or methods can be employed to help you engage more effectively with the other participants? Examples include ground rules, small group interaction, accessible meeting summaries, refreshments, verbal & visual descriptions of technical data, training in collaboration, …)

11. What are some procedures or processes that could assist you and others in working to resolve problems related to recreational and visitor use in the Chattooga Wild & Scenic use?

12. Are you aware of any constraints and barriers to a successful process (i.e., value differences, personalities, conflicting technical information, or lack of communication)? If so, what are those constraints and barriers and how could you overcome them?

13. What are the resources (technical support, relevant information, …) you will need to participate effectively?

14a. What information do you need to that will help you be an effective participant in a collaborative process?

14b. What information can you bring to the process?

14c. What is the best way for information be presented to you?

14d. How do you want to share information with others?

15. What do you think are the best days of the week, times of the day and for how long, and places to meet?

16. What size group do you think will be most inclusive and productive?

17. What are the best ways for the Forest Service to receive feedback from you about the process? During the process?

18. Are there other people or organizations that I should contact about the Chattooga River who could provide additional information? If yes, can you provide contact information?

19. Do you have any questions for me?
# Appendix B: List of Individuals Contacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Milt Aiken</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rick Huffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doug Adams</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Brock Hutchins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mike Bamford</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chris Kempgton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>David Bates</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Don Kinser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>John Benbow</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Doug Landwehr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Doug Bessler</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tom Manning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jim Bleckley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Stanley Owens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Charlie Breithaupt</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dave Perrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rodney Burdette</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dan Rankin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Butch Clay</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Dick Rust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kevin Colburn</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Terry Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Charlene Coleman</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mark Singleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Heyward Douglass</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chad Spangler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jeff Durniak</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bill Stringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Joe Gatins</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Jerome Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>William Hammit</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Alice M. Wald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Carla Hedden</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>James Whitehurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>George Hedrick</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Buzz Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individuals we attempted to contact by phone or email.*