

## **Real World Case Study Exercise**

---

**Process:** Each small group (table) will be given a scenario to work on. Each group will be directed to discuss and brainstorm responses to the following questions for their scenario:

- (1) How could collaboration have been better used to avoid the situation?
- (2) What collaborative next steps could be taken to improve the situation?

In the large group, each small group will present its solution. Facilitator will guide group discussion of the different recommendations.

### **Scenarios:**

A - Local collaborative group has worked with the agency for over a year to design a project and has recommended a preferred alternative. The agency releases its Record of Decision, which selects a different alternative than the one preferred by the collaborative group. Some collaborative group members are outraged, saying the agency should have selected the group's preferred alternative, or at least held a meeting with the collaborative group to discuss why it was planning to select a different alternative before announcing it.

B – A collaborative group, consisting of representatives from state, local, and federal agencies local citizens has worked for over a year to design a restoration project that they believe will best meet the community and the forest's needs. The lead agency releases a draft EIS for the project using the HFRA categorical exclusion option, considering only one alternative (the one developed with the community). An environmental group complains that the proposed action was not developed through a collaborative process because they were not invited to participate in discussions and threatens to appeal.

C – A community group, local environmental groups, and local, state, and federal agencies are all working together to collaboratively develop a forest restoration project. They all agree on the goals of the project – to improve habitat diversity and reduce the risk of unnatural fire - but there is disagreement over the prescription. The agency has a standard prescription that has been used many times before. The non-agency partners have other ideas for the prescription that they would like to test out, and they believe that the federal requirements for collaboration give them the right to be involved in the prescription.

D – Local fire departments, municipal government, state lands, interest groups, and the agency have all worked collaboratively to develop a CWPP that covers 2.5 million acres. Next year, the agency will be initiating its forest plan revision, and the forest planner says she won't be considering the CWPP when developing that plan.

Created by Ann Moote, Ecological Restoration Institute  
and Laura McCarthy, Forest Guild  
November 2005