

QUESTION 2

MEMBERS

1. and working groups/ committees should be meeting at least once a month
2. The answer to this question largely depends on what the Roundtable's goals and function will be - I think this needs to be addressed first before determining a meeting frequency.
3. depends what's on the table and if it's moving
4. The meeting schedule should be driven by need. In my opinion, the Roundtable was never meant to be a "standing" regional body like Southeast Conference or similar. It exists for the specific purpose
5. we get stale and paranoid between meetings, possibly webcasts or other use of technology
6. We should postpone the December meeting until early next year.

ALTERNATES

1. Perhaps more based on ad hoc committees & issues

INTERESTED PARTIES

1. There has been an incredible amount of money spent on transporting people; money that could be better spent on forest restoration.
2. Instead of spending money on travel, people can meet via teleconference.
3. once every two years
4. never
5. as needed
6. the process is sufficiently flawed to warrant cancellation
7. you should not meet at all unless you change the makeup of the roundtable to more honestly reflect SE Alaska
8. No more meetings -- it is time for the Roundtable to come to an end.
9. End the Roundtable. Do not meet at all.

10.Never again

11.Never-should be disbanded due to ethics/lobbying

12.If more productive more frequently, productive subcommittee meetings more frequently

QUESTION 3

MEMBERS

1. the membership is to forest, conservation, FS focused. Need to broaden the participation
2. The TFR is big enough, though it could grow slightly. It may need to be more inclusive and interactive outside its own narrow circle, but these things may be accomplished without growing it. Again the answer to this question depends on what the TFR's mission is going to be moving forward. Will it be to advance pragmatic solutions (implying a centrist set of problem-solvers) or will it continue to include fringes who are not interested in (for example) advancing the solutions concept currently on the table?
3. There should be better representation of ALL of the stakeholders, not just FS, ADF&G, TIMBER and enviros...fishing, tourism (cruise operators, day charters, kayakers it makes up 22% of the economy of southeast and yet there is one legitimate member from this group on the roundtable).
4. Work towards accepting less than 100% consensus for agreement on action items.
5. small scale outfitter/guides; more tribal interests; minerals; hydropower interests
6. We are never going to get the perfect representation on the TFR. We are unwieldy at 35 as it is. If we're trying to be a decision-making body, expanding would be a nightmare. If we're just a group that likes to discuss ideas, then maybe expansion is okay. It might be worth revisiting whether foundations representatives should be members or not.
7. We are never going to get the perfect representation on the TFR. We are unwieldy at 35 as it is. If we're trying to be a decision-making body, expanding would be a nightmare. If we're just a group that likes to discuss ideas, then maybe expansion is okay. It might be worth revisiting whether foundations representatives should be members or not.
8. Roundtable is not and was never meant to be a "representational" group -- we need to remind people of that
9. I think the current mix is good
10. Don't expand but make more diverse. Include more that actually live in Southeast Alaska, industry people, small business, mining and health care for example.
11. one or two more mayors/ another Native member/guide/large tourism
12. more Native interests and small business owners

ALTERNATES

- 1.It depends on whether or not the format and topics change.
- 2.Native Alaskans need to be better represented
- 3.Stick to Timber Issues
- 4.More representatives from each community.
- 5.I believe efficiency could be increased by reducing the membership by 50%
- 6.membership should live in SE Alaska
- 7.IRA Tribes& small communities
- 8.small communities in SE

INTERESTED PARTIES

- 1.Include those who express divergent opinions, not just those who are willing to hand over national forest into the hands of the timber industry or the State of Alaska.
- 2.More Tribal Membership.
- 3.The people who hold the seats do not represent the full spectrum of interests on the Tongass. Seats should be divided numerically to provide for business, recreation and environmental issues.
- 4.Any interested parties should have a right to join, independent of any internal vetting process
- 5.if the roundtable does continue it needs a better balance of interests
- 6.Again, you need different people, not expansion.
- 7.A lot of strongly interested conservation voices have been deliberately excluded from membership. Membership should be expanded to include them to make it a legitimate process.
- 8.evaluate if we have the right members...
- 9.What is needed is government conducted process, open to all comers on an equal footing. Public hearings and comment, not a Roundtable.
- 10.Should be an open public process, not limited to selected groups or should not exist at all.

11. Get the FS out of membership and stop saying the members represent any one but themselves

12. TFR is heavily skewed to industry reps or quasi greens. If you don't disband then expand to include ALL Americans who own the Tongass (this is called "NEPA")

13. hunting/fishing guides and outfitters

4. Those not committed to working things out within this process (i.e. organizations that advocate the roadless rule be imposed, appeal timber sales, etc. should be expelled

QUESTION 4

MEMBERS

1. We need much better facilitation
2. The Roundtable has a dismal record for taking action and, unfortunately, it is unlikely to improve in the near future. We need to recognize this limitation of the organization.
3. It would be great if we could take collective action to achieve our mission. However, I believe our mission is flawed in its current form. It is far too broad in scope, making decisions next to impossible. Anything and everything about the Tongass fits under our current mission, hence our regular paralysis. There are almost no sideboards.
4. It would be great if we could take collective action to achieve our mission. However, I believe our mission is flawed in its current form. It is far too broad in scope, making decisions next to impossible. Anything and everything about the Tongass fits under our current mission, hence our regular paralysis. There are almost no sideboards.
5. Stronger committee structure, this is where the work gets done
6. I will agree that this is a group of well meaning people each with their own agenda that all too often forget about the people living in the forest they are trying to save or use. The original reason for the roundtable was a good idea but I fear cannot succeed. We need to redirect our energies or disband.

ALTERNATES

1. We are regional leaders
2. the roundtable seems unable to take action, so why not use it for what it really is good at?

INTERESTED PARTIES

1. Open discussion is the key to solving all problems
2. TFR has had three years to accomplish something, time to fold the tent
3. Most important: save all old-growth forest
4. You will NEVER accomplish any of the above goals w/ the current roundtable makeup. You're just continuing the problems.

5.The Roundtable cannot legitimately fill any of these purposes because it has been constructed specifically for timber issues, yet has intentionally excluded many who have interest in those issues. The Roundtable should simple be disbanded.

6.The Roundtable has no legitimate function. It was organized to promote a timber industry that is a loser, a waste of taxpayer money and anathema to the fishing industry and the visitor industry. TFR should be dissolved.

7.Stop advocating the logging of the Tongass

8.I cannot in good conscience check q #4. I do not think the TFR is a legitimate group OR process. It is secretive despite its "convening value" claims that it will include "open, inclusive, and transparent" processes to reach out to all Tongass voices.

9.I would have rated action Group 1, if there was action was by majority and not consensus

QUESTION 5

MEMBERS

- 1.three quarters majority
- 2.Majority outcome will depend on the make up of the group.
- 3.To change it now would give the appearance of nullifying and minimalizing the descending opinions currently at the table.
- 4.would like to seek full consensus, but not sure this group can attain
- 5.The Roundtable is not a representative cross-section of Southeast Alaska and should not try to impose their beliefs on Southeast Alaska communities.
- 6.full consensus brought discipline, but it has since been abandoned in large part

ALTERNATES

- 1.Organize discussions around specific questions, as opposed to "random" topics
- 2.Action items and resolutions needs consensus, possible straw votes on anything else

INTERESTED PARTIES

- 1.Roundtable needs to move away from current model of decision making and facilitating. Roundtable needs to set a target date for completion of its major work, change its methods to accomodate the target. Debating how to vote on a solutions concept for hours- spending more time on that than the merits or lack thereof of the solutions concept- is amazaing- and a waste of time and resources.
- 2.TFR does not represent the public-so no consensus is possible
- 3.NEPA
- 4.Degree of consensus should be accompanied by comments from dissenters

QUESTION 6

MEMBERS

1. Communities sustain themselves through a variety and diversity of clustered economic and social opportunities. The sum of these opportunities can be maintained over time at a relatively consistent level, meet the community's vision for itself, and allows for flexibility in changes of values and circumstances over time. Clean water, clean air, local sources of food are important. Use of natural resources is such that several generations down the line maintain consistent

2. Ability of a community to advance economic development and social equity objectives in a way which maintains a quality environment and sustainable employment on an ongoing basis.

3. Residents who desire to, and core institutions/infrastructure, able to stay in place over time.

4. clean air clean water stable employment over the long term, multi

5. The capability of the community to continue giving a quality way of life opportunity to the people of the community with utilization of the resource opportunities on a sustained basis.

6. "if you build it - they will come"

7. self sustaining through a diverse set of opportunities without reliance on government subsidy.

8. Providing jobs and infrastructure that facilitates the creation of business and job such that communities can continue to operate, schools can stay open, and services are provided to residents.

9. A "middle vision" where a diversified economy, cultures, and environmental protection co-exist.

10. Maintaining economic viability and diversity within a community. This likely will require a variety of economic opportunities that can help a community sustain its population and quality of life.

11. There are many ways to define sustainability. The simplest definition is: A sustainable society is one that can persist over generations, one that is farseeing enough, flexible enough, and wise enough not to undermine either its physical or its social systems of support. Timber in any form in Southeast Alaska is no longer, and hasn't been for at least two generations, sustainable without the investment by tax payers in the form of

subsidies. Subsidies and Sustainability should never be mentioned together when talking about a sustainable community.

12.economic stability and growth

13.providing opportunities for communities to be economically stable...communities have responsibility to take advantage of opportunities...

14.a lot

15.It means communities are able to maintain the infrastructure necessary and continue economic viability without subsidiesF

16.Community can maintain its quality of life while living within its means -- it includes good family wage jobs, but also includes not compromising the quality of life of future generations by diminishing resources in a way that is not renewable

17.ability for a community to not compromise it's future by current actions and to strive for diverse economic, social and educational opportunities.

18.Traditional resource based jobs and an economy that is not hindered by excessive government regulationsT

19.Wage earning jobs for the majority of the citizens, open functioning schools, financially healthy government, cultural freedom and diversity

20.A discrete and focused policy mandate to USFS to engage in community sustainability programs "beyond timber" and a clear recognition in any legislative initiative for same.

21.Vibrant community activities based on stable, balanced population with sustaniable economic base.

22.Jobs

23.Diversified economies.

ALTERNATES

1.taking care of basic needs; providing residents with clean water, affordable housing, health care, fire & police protection, food, reliable, clean and renewable energy.

2.Healthy ecosystems and communities

3.Relatively stable human population; the local natural environment remains productive for F&W, clean air & water, and forests.

4. Human activity only uses nature's resources at a rate at which they can be replenished naturally.

5. Sustained livelihoods for communities and businesses over the long term.

6. Communities have the opportunity to pursue lives and livelihoods in a manner that respects the natural values of the Forest and compensates them at levels which allows them to remain viable economically over time.

7. Communities with a diverse enough economy and associated jobs so as to be able to survive downturns in one sector or another. Services are available and population is stable

8. Stability, diversity and growth.

9. Ability to make a living in a community (or close proximity) and to contribute to the betterment of that community

10. Maintaining the ability for a rural community to take advantage of the social, cultural, and economic opportunities provided by its surrounding natural renewable resources. Fundamental to this definition is maintaining the ecological integrity of the Tongass National Forest through responsible, sustainable management practices.

11. The ability of each individual to live their chosen lifestyle where they wish without undue burden upon their chosen lifestyle; i.e. a wide range of reasonable job opportunities that provide a livable wage, reasonable utilities cost, reasonable transportation cost and no limiting restrictions imposed by land use policies.

12. To have jobs and good schools, utilities and to work with other entities.

13. People in communities are able to thrive and remain in place because there is some level of economic stability in place

INTERESTED PARTIES

1. Not allowing what has happened in Kake and POW to happen to another community. Both of them have seen massive timber harvest disrupt the subsistence lifestyle of the locals; when the trees are cut, people leave to look for jobs elsewhere leaving the communities in worse shape than before cutting.

2. It does NOT mean that every community ever established needs to continue as an incorporated, full service community forever. Company mining towns, logging camps, salmon canneries, fox farms, summer camps and even some winter camps have come and gone throughout history. Also, NOT every community needs to be a full service community.

3. Year round Jobs

4. Healthy year-round economies, stable community populations.

5. Providing long-term eco-friendly economic opportunities so that residents can maintain good jobs and good land stewardship.

6. It means not allowing what has happened to Kake and POW to continue. Trees are cut too fast since the Tongass is a slow growing forest. Since we have cut too rapidly, we must stop round log exports and be realistic about the amount of wood this forest can provide while taking into account the amount of carbon sequestration of the Tongass.

7. The ability of community members to work with a broad array of individuals and institutions to find, establish and maintain systems that keep the community whole into the future.

8. The ability to exist without federal interference, subsidies or special treatment by any government entity.

9. being able to perpetually live in a location without jeopardizing the natural productivity and character of the terrestrial and marine environment.

10. It does NOT mean continuing to log old-growth forest in the Tongass

11. Communities continue to exist in a reasonably healthy way long into the future- in a way they decide, not well-meaning nonresidents.

12. It means independent community voices, small, local groups advancing their own agendas to adapt to climate change and maintain sustainable businesses like fishing and tourism. It means some communities transitioning entirely out of timber. It means stopping old growth logging and minimizing the use of thinning to only small, non-commercial amounts of proven benefit to wildlife.

13. Using your surrounding landscape w/o doing long-term damage. Focus on fishing and alternative energy and restore places damaged by past logging. Timber harvesting is a part, but a SMALL part.

14. Many things, but most importantly (1) an end to logging practices that harm the climate, wildlife, and wild places, and (2) an end to development that requires annual government subsidies. Then we can focus on economic activity that does not depend on constant government infusions of money and that does not harm the environment that SE Alaska residents and visitors value so highly. That would lead to community sustainability and stability.

15. community sustainability combines environmental, economic, and social needs of the people of SE Alaska. it is to develop jobs and resources in a way that preserves the

ecological integrity of the region while also guaranteeing continuance for future generations

16. Communities functioning socially and economically without impairing the resources and ecosystems around them (or elsewhere).

17. having enough year-round family wage jobs to maintain the social infrastructure needed for a better quality life than most SE towns presently have. Having stable education systems, responsive health and emergency caregivers, a diversity of employment sectors, healthy and productive natural resources capable of sustained yields for residents and visitors alike, affordable sanitation utilities, safe drinking water, affordable, renewable power, etc, etc.

18. I do not see the point in sustaining communities that were intended to be temporary to begin with. What needs to be sustained are the communities of deer, wolves, bear, raven, eagle and the other wildlife. The livelihoods of fishing families need to be sustained by sustaining fish spawning grounds and habitat.

19. Keeping the Tongass pristine should be the future goal for economic development

20. Community sustainability means providing sufficient lifestyle, economic and social opportunities to support a long-term population large enough to be a community. There is a lower limit in numbers where a "community" simply becomes a few houses. To me a community is one that provides an opportunity for schools and has some form of community government, although it may be rather informal.

21. Stable timber supply, considering 96% of the Tongass is not available for development and the amount of acres in Wilderness, National Monument etc, the other factors in sustainability, fish and wildlife resources, are well protected therefore it simply comes down to can the timber supply be stable and sufficient to support an integrated industry so it can contribute to the SE economy.

22. functioning communities surrounded by functioning ecosystems

23. Just what it implies sustaining the community not the Roundtable.

24. That a community is viable within the constraints of opportunities available to its residents.

QUESTION 7

MEMBERS

1. But I think it is very very important.
2. However, whatever the goal/mission changes to will depend on my participation.
3. It is highly unlikely that there will be a large scale, long term solution for a Dead Industry
4. Political and judicial solutions will continue in spite of what the roundtable's efforts.
5. I could live with a smaller scale long term solution
6. There will be no silver bullet solution so I don't think this is even possible.
7. The individual beliefs are too diverse to reach a consensus.
8. The Tongass has been an environmental "trophy hunters" paradise for too long. more modest, even small gains can collectively be more nuanced, responsive to successive change and achievable.
9. every generation has different priorities. There will always be conflict

ALTERNATES

1. The Roundtable is not responsible to "come up with a solution". However, it must be forum and clearinghouse for such a solution.
2. That is the understood primary purpose of the group
3. That is an unreasonable charge for this group
4. Not realistic. Political and judicial influences outside of SE AK will likely continue to have strong influence.

INTERESTED PARTIES

1. Permanent Protection is a fallacy.
2. the TFR talks, and the USFS lays out massive timber sales. USFS has broken the faith.
3. You will NEVER achieve a solution w/ the current group.

4.This is not a realistic goal. We should quit wasting so much time on logging and focus on issues where there are genuine opportunities for consensus and mutual benefit.

5.I am a reluctant participant, and I participate only because the Roundtable's limited and self-selected so-called representation is a significant threat to the best long term interests of the region and its people.

6.Our organization has been excluded from participation and relegated to by-stander status. The Roundtable exists only to do more long term harm to the Tongass and should disband.

7.not possible TFR stakeholder process is a flawed lie

8.I am not allowed to participate due to your hand-picked selection process. However, if I were I would quote Leon Wieseltier who writes in the upcoming New Republic: “ The common ground is not always the high ground. When it is without end, moreover, the search for common ground is bad for bargaining. It informs the other side that what you most desire is the deal — that you will never acknowledge the finality of the difference, and never be satisfied with the integrity of opposition. There is a reason that ‘uncompromising’ is a term of approbation.”

9.I think it is unlikely that this will occur. I do however believe that the stakeholders can greatly help in finding common ground and defining the irreconcilable conflicts that must be decided by the land managers.

10.This is important and desirable so TFR should work diligently on this but it may not be possible to reach total solution. If some progress can be made it may be best to take partial success and defer the rest to another day.

11.let the community decide the fate of Old Growth not the Roundtable

QUESTION 8

MEMBERS

1.I think the Roundtable needs to come up of help to catalyze a viable working proposal in the next few months (1-6 months). This would be an imperfect proposal but it would be substantial enough and have some sort of interim solution such that people could continue to believe there is likelihood of a solution and can work for the longer time horizon that is likely for a large-scale solution (1-3 years)

2.The lack of a management program does not allow long term economic development of timber utilization so without a solution is stopping other potential uses for the communitys and the country. What then must the communities do?

3.1-3 months for interim agreement and 6-12 months for long term solution. If TFR not willing to do this or not capable then disband.

4.I picked a short time horizon here because I think the TFR needs to show serious progress and leadership SOON. That does NOT necessarily mean that the final solution is completely implemented legislatively and on the ground in a few months. It DOES mean that significant progress needs to be shown in the next few months, with a clear set of steps down a pathway to a future that most can agree is better than the current conflict and uncertainty.

5.Great Bear took the better part of 10 to 15 years, if you think you can do it faster, you are misinformed

6.If a solution is to be found the sooner the better

7.I don't mean that the Roundtable needs to complete a "solution" in this timeframe. That's impossible. But they do need to come to agreement on the solution they want to promote, particularly since it will take a long time to win others over

8.Never. We have been down this road before and the communities and resource industries always get mistreated.

9.I am frightened by a massive solution--it is presumptuous, arrogant and unnecessary

10.We need a process to resolve conflict. Every generation wants to redo an prior deal

11.Enacting a long-term solution within 3-5 years is important, but does not necessarily need to be a direct accomplishment of the Roundtable

ALTERNATES

1.A solution should be put in place within the next year.

2. See comment #7

3. Need to be realistic. Current situation has been 30+ years in the making.

4. The BC model is over 15 years and still largely unresolved.

5. I don't think the Roundtable is capable of developing such a solution in its current form. However, it may be capable of influencing the management of the Tongass by helping the USFS incorporate input from Southeast communities into TLMP.

INTERESTED PARTIES

1. I don't think there is a long term solution.

2. time to fold the tent

3. The current group does NOT honestly reflect SE Alaska.

4. It must quit taking up so much time.

5. The Roundtable is incapable of arriving at a reasonable solution, because of its concept, structure and membership.

6. You've had three years to work on that - and still have no traction... As long as SE is predominantly public land - there will always be a desire from one group or another, for a better solution. A couple nuggets of wisdom to consider (they are not mine, but are worth sharing). 1) "The world is divided by those who think they are right." 2) "There is no solution - seek it lovingly."

7. The Roundtable will never arrive at an acceptable solution and should stop wasting the resources it takes to hold the meetings.

8. It will not happen

9. This process has already taken up a lot of valuable time and money. It's time to agree to disagree so folks can get back to what matters to them most.

QUESTION 9

MEMBERS

- 1.tantrum throwing and race baiting need to cease
- 2.Personel Agendas and a concensus format perhaps are not the most productive use of the group time but what other choices are there?
- 3.next to last statement-if folks would only read it then this question would not have been framed this way.
- 4.Questions 10 and 16 appear to be duplicates.
- 5.We should revisit our goals and purposes. As they currently structured, we will be stuck in an endless loop of random, half-finished discussions on the same topics. We need better facilitation, more structured agendas that lead us to real outcomes, and a narrower scope. Absent those, I do not believe it is worth meeting anymore.
- 6.We should revisit our goals and purposes. As they currently structured, we will be stuck in an endless loop of random, half-finished discussions on the same topics. We need better facilitation, more structured agendas that lead us to real outcomes, and a narrower scope. Absent those, I do not believe it is worth meeting anymore.
- 7.Seems that the full RT only talks and the real work is being done at committee level
- 8.A solution has to focus on creation of sustainable economic activity in the villages and communities
- 9.There are solutions to the conflicts but with a consensus nothing well ever get done.

ALTERNATES

- 1.The TRT should not become another chamber of commerce. Its value is providing a forum for discussion and exchange of ideas between diverse interests.
- 2.The Roundtable is a perfect forum to learn more about the goals and desires of Native Alaskan groups in SE.
- 3.Just Timber vs Wilderness is wrongheaded

INTERESTED PARTIES

- 1.If you see what has happened in the Black Hills of South Dakota and Wyoming after Senator Daschle legally established a RAC, you will get a sense of the value of going that direction. It is working very well there.

2.again, time to fold the tent

3.Too many egos, not enough heart.

4.I answered above as if the Roundtable will continue to exist; however, I believe the Roundtable is operating contrary to the public interest and that it should be disbanded. Also, the Roundtable cannot legitimately serve as a RAC for many reasons stated above and also because it is under the undue influence of the organization that staffs it -- TNC.

5.Notwithstanding the answers above, the existence of the TFR is not in the public interest and should be stopped.

6.HS/DC is dead and so should be the RT

7.The roundtable is a quasi-governmental body and has no right, legal or otherwise to set forest policy. The science is completely absent in the TFR and proposals coming out of the TFR/Devil's Club lack science. There is no way these proposals can assure species viability or long term sustainability.

8.I think the best success will be with specific projects on specific tracts of land that are smaller than the Tongass. I think the TFR needs to continue the larger discussion, but not let it totally dominate everything.

9.I think the roundtable needs better facilitation, too much time is spent rehashing the same topics and soap boxing by the same people.

QUESTION 10

MEMBERS

- 1.A. Degree to which important areas across the region are managed with subsistence and healthy fish and wildlife habitat as the priority management goals B. The Roundtable creates a feasible and legally-implementable framework for community management of a portion of the forest C. Number of decent-paying jobs with benefits we create that are not based on clearcutting of old growth forests
- 2.Measurable objectives that can be benchmarked so that the roundtable can monitor and adapt to progress or lack thereof.
- 3.Supermajority of members agrees that trust has increased in previous 12 months. Supermajority of non-members interacting with Roundtable express interest in its continuing. Roundtable contributes to availability of timber within 12 months.
- 4.tentative approval of a solutions map
- 5.A definition of old growth that would allow continued utilization on a community level of small scale operations do value added and biomass projects as well as other alternative power projects. Second some how make some long term commitments by the large public land owners (Federal, State, Mental Health) for a given amount of long term availability of wood products so that value added operations and good utilization can be financed long term and developed on a smaller scale; no pulp mill operations and export operations.
- 6.committee's to meet and make recommendations and "final decisions"/"implementation(s)".
- 7.a short term solution that limits anymore job losses in SE Ak.
A long term solution that has the majority of members in agreement with trying to implement.
- 8.3% Increase in Jobs in the region... due to timber products; withdraw of LogJam lawsuit
- 9.1. The number of spinoff groups or efforts that grew from TFR and are now addressing or solving real problems. 2. The ability to link these small-scale spinoffs with a big-scale solutions concept AND package that actually has "legs" and forward momentum.
- 10.A majority opinion support for a compromise solution for resolving the balance between timber and conservation that works for local communities.
- 11.(1) Thin out the current representation on the roundtable, there should be only one rep. for federal and state agencies. Remove members that do not have a direct impact on the

economy of Southeast. (this will open up at least half a dozen, if not more seats).

(2) Replace those vacancies with sport fishing charter reps, kayak outfitter reps, commercial fishing reps (Bruce represents himself, not UFA, they are an association and as such Bruce can not speak on their behalf without full board approval, for which he has never given them information on the happenings of the TFR, therefore he is not representative of the commercial fishermen).

12. Agreement to accept less than 100% consensus. Actual support for 'Mom and Pop' timber sales.

13. Timber sector stabilizes.

Economic Diversity improves.

Outward migration from SE reverses.

Ecological conditions are sustained and improved.

14. dependable timber supply, less conflict

15. We identify a true and workable "bridge" timber supply for the next 10-15 years that moves industry out of old growth.

We implement a long-term, 10-years stewardship contract somewhere in southern SE that provides local economic opportunity, community benefits, and ecological improvements.

16. We identify a true and workable "bridge" timber supply for the next 10-15 years that moves industry out of old growth.

We implement a long-term, 10-years stewardship contract somewhere in southern SE that provides local economic opportunity, community benefits, and ecological improvements.

17. coming to agreement on whether to put energy into the latest proposed solution or the forest plan as a basis

18. completion of YG inventory

current forest products industry is stabilized

bioenergy projects are begun in more communities at a variety of scales

19.1. Agreement to support sufficient economic timber sales to sustain at least the existing medium size mills in Wrangell, Klawock and Ketchikan as well as the small mills in Southeast Alaska

2. Acceptance of the fiber supply needs for a viable, sustainable timber industry.

3. Stronger support for full manufacturing integration with reasonable profitability.

20. One undisputed timber sale coming out of the TLMP.

One project presented by a community that all members would agree on. i.e. Coast Guard Biomass project with sustainable harvest to give them assurance it can be successful for years to come.

21.1.recognition of the Tongass as the Traditional Homeland of Tlingit and Haida Peoples in any legislation proposed and a focused effort to acknowledge and imprint that fact on the Tongass in programs and policy mandates.

2. In addition to land designations there will be clear policy mandates and/or legislative recognition and program dictates for community sustainability that allow use of Tongass lands appropriately, synergistically but specifically for community sustainability.

22.1. timber sale without judicial challenge

2. support of a sustainable economic project in the Tongass

23.Accepting Forest Service decisions regarding current timber sales and moving on.

Picking a project and all members supporting the project whether it is energy, social or economic development

24.The development and implementation of on-the-ground collaborative projects. An active working group focused on something beside the timber program.

ALTERNATES

1.a solution to the land wars;

a Sealaska bill that resolves the land entitlement issue without sacrificing the future of any Tongass community;

2.1. An identified set of bridge timber areas, coming with a commitment to transition out of old growth. 2. A demo or example project backed by the Roundtable linking community development with sustainable land management.

3.One we have already accomplished: being able to sit and rationally discuss very contentious issues with a wide range of stakeholders. A second specific outcome would be develop a region-wide plan that creates at least three new jobs in each Tongass community.

4.Bulk of FS resources dedicated to working on restoration; mills have bridge timber for scaled-down industry

5.# of recommendations to the Forest Service

of joint activities between environmental groups and native corporations/businesses

6.The creation of mutually agreed upon jobs/infrastructure through the support of the RT.

Continuation of RT as a facilitator of smaller groups'efforts to assemble a larger solution to Tongass Land Use Designations.

7.Outward migration from SE AK stabilizes and reverses. The Roundtable's work gravitates beyond its large focus on timber issues.

8. Committee work on young growth.
Committee work on communities

9. No issues that serve as indicators for success

10.1) No litigation from Roundtable affiliated groups on a timber sale.
2) Continue to meet and discuss Tongass issues

11.1.) Agreement to manage the Tongass based on the existing Forest Plan for a trial period of 10-13 years.

2.) Work towards increasing job opportunities in SE communities.

12. there are more ideas coming to the table, more discussion.

INTERESTED PARTIES

1. Allow people to represent groups that have not been included in the process.
If Foundations give money to come up with a solution, do not lean toward the solution they encourage; otherwise these Foundations that do not have a permanent stake in the Tongass will control the outcome.

2.1. Forest Service establishes and implements a well funded stewardship contracting program and schedule. 2. Adequate funding for (a) restoration work and (b) management of non-timber resources forest wide.

3. Agreement on what the timber industry in Alaska should look like in 5 years.
Agreement on enough specific timber harvest to keep the existing industry alive for the near term.

4. The Roundtable should review its progress toward meeting the five Sitka principles.
Meeting any of those would be partial success.

5.1) When groups that are not part of this group have access and input to decisions.

2) When the long-term sustainability of the Tongass is adequately protected

6.1) It already is! Nothing will ever be the same again -- because real relationships have been developed, and real solutions now have to be found.

2) Prevent litigation as the initial action by various groups.

7.(1) Size of membership at TFR.

(2) Full agreement of entire "Green" community on any given issue.

- 8.1. No more logging of old-growth forest.
2. No more logging of old-growth forest.

9. The Roundtable meets its demise (with perhaps annual meetings thereafter to drink and pat themselves on the back- and of course to assess how things are going.

- 10.(1) an endorsement of the idea that the entire Tongass National Forest should be offered up to the global community as a carbon sink with no logging;
- (2) a reallocation of federal budget funding from wasteful thinning projects to projects that really will have efficient long-term benefits like culvert replacement and road decommissioning.

11. If you changed your membership to more honestly reflect SE Alaska and if you opened your forum to more public involvement.

- 12.1. Stop trying to carve up the Tongass.
2. Identify projects with broad support that can benefit communities in the region

13. implemented projects; policy statements sent to decision makers for action

14. I think harms are more likely than successes from the Roundtable. And from what I have seen, any successes by the Roundtable will probable indicators of harm.

15. Can't think of any

16. The Roundtable is illegitimate will never be a success.

17. The funders stop wasting their money on the RT

- 18.1. Acknowledge that the Roundtable is a farce and collaboration only can work when people have shared values.
2. Acknowledge that you have no right to dictate Forest Policy for people that have had no opportunity to have input.
3. Acknowledge that real science has not been used in the TFR process. Politics has been the driving force by the majority of TFR participants and that they have a vested interest in industrial use of the Tongass. Many of their ties to this vested interest are apparent although they are in self-denial of this fact.
4. Acknowledge that the TFR has not been open and honest with the public and apologize for wasting our time!

19.1. Working together to address the full range of stakeholder concerns on one or two specific project areas.

2. Direct input and participation by stakeholders in project/policy areas such as bioenergy and second growth management (achieved).

20.1) Stable economic timber sales sufficient to support an integrated forest industry and
2) Creation of a forum to develop local solutions to the Tongass issues so national groups
lose interest and quit fanning the flames of controversy.

21.a strongly facilitated meeting that brought to vote a contentious issue. The issue is
passed or failed because of a strong (or lack of) majority vote. A new issue is brought
forward for timely, relevant discussion and another strong majority decision is made.

22. Have not seen any Roundtable success----you have brought no new jobs except for
yourselves

QUESTION 11

MEMBERS

1. I think the last meeting was very important as for the first time we did not just settle for the most acceptable vote to all -- we need to do this more if we are going to get to the root of our conflicts, even if we keep a consensus model of decision-making. We still veer away from the hard discussions we need to have. We have, for example, never had a real discussion of the Sealaska land legislation and the difficult questions it raises. We all talk about "community sustainability" at each meeting and spend more time accusing each other of not doing it than having the terrifying and real discussion about what makes a community truly sustainable, how we're going to measure that, and whether or not we have communities that fundamentally are not sustainable.

At the same time, I think this forum is the closest we have to real discussion and dialogue, and that it can still play a leading role in creating the region we wish Southeast Alaska to be.

We need to find a way to not try to demand the solution to all the problems out of each step in our efforts -- we need to break the problems down and solve them in interlocking and meaningful pieces.

We need to come up with a better way to have our dialogue -- going around and around in circles in a series of speeches like we did on Day 2 of the last meeting is not taking us to the next step.

2. Lack of achievement of addressing specific directions is very wearing on a lot of the hard working members of the round table; we need more honesty from members on what they want to accomplish and honest participation with the subgroups.

3. The TFR needs to define what it wants to be and what it is willing to work for or disband so that a group that can do this can be formulated.

4. I think the TFR needs to deal with its wishy-washiness when it comes to efforts that most can support but not all. Nobody will agree with all the details of any one path forward. That is not the point - the point is to find something that most major stakeholders can actually live with (even if that means swallowing hard) and finding ways to make that change happen in the real world. The TFR does not have to accomplish this all by itself - it is a vehicle for creating subgroups and spinoffs and processes to accomplish this change. The TFR also needs to deal explicitly at EVERY meeting with small-scale, local, one-issue solutions AND with big-scale, landscape-level comprehensive solutions - and to map the former onto the latter so that the small stuff advances the big stuff even while solving more limited problems.

5. Need to move beyond consensus.

6. I value my participation in the process. I hope somehow we can get to some kind of solution.

7. Although they may not say so, the non-member anti development groups are disruptive and continue to be positionally based.

8. I think a different facilitator would be of benefit. I don't believe the one we use now provides much besides being a timekeeper and calling on people in order. There would be benefit to using a facilitator who can help the group stay focused on the topic and bring more closure to discussions.

9. The Roundtable has been great for building relationships. Everyone will tell you that. But we definitely need to revisit our purpose and goals. And the meeting structure and process tends to lead to frustration and a lack of productivity. The way to achieve outcomes is to set a thoughtful agenda and lead the group to the place they want to collectively go.

10. The Roundtable has been great for building relationships. Everyone will tell you that. But we definitely need to revisit our purpose and goals. And the meeting structure and process tends to lead to frustration and a lack of productivity. The way to achieve outcomes is to set a thoughtful agenda and lead the group to the place they want to collectively go.

11. Without congressional support and strong encouragement I'm not sure this group will ever be fully successful. It seems too easy to play lip service but not really deliver nor change or compromise with this group.

12. The full RT failed to act on the recent Hemlock proposal, seems there is no commitment by some and they may be using the RT as a delay strategy while they push for roadless on the Tongass. This concerns me.

13. Some Roundtable members are not honoring the agreement to keep Roundtable discussions within the group - unless a consensus is reached to take discussions outside the Roundtable.

With a two-day meeting, it is hard to keep up with our regular jobs. Longer or more frequent breaks would allow us to take care of our regular business and would allow members to privately discuss Roundtable issues with other individual Roundtable members

14. The roundtable is an opinion forum. There is no commitment from anyone to follow through with what is said at the roundtable. Things are said and implied for our leaders at the roundtable and then opposite action is taken outside.

15. The Roundtable has great potential in terms of thinking and working on regional basis. It fills a missing gap in dealing with the Tongass in this time of economic and political transition.

16. The discussions go on too long and sometimes get off track, but at the same time everyone should have the opportunity to speak. Some members "hog" the floor. Maybe a limit on how long a person can speak or how many times. A more modern answer may be where each member has a keyboard and can comment to what is being said that would show up on the power point. Frequently by the time a person gets the microphone the subject has moved on to the point that when person number 14 gets to talk it then starts the original conversation all over again and then it is rehashed!!

17.n/a

ALTERNATES

1. The overall scope of the Roundtable is too broad, especially when operating under consensus. Either narrow the focus, or just make it a discussion forum.

Get funders off the Roundtable. Their contributions (apart from dollars) are limited and they often push pre-determined agendas with limited local knowledge or understanding of impacts.

2. Keep at it!

3. Non-Roundtable members who are present at most meetings (largely representing more extreme environmental interests) are disruptive and use the forum to gather "intelligence" to advance their unwavering positions, and to undermine consensus among members. While recognizing the Roundtable's democratic philosophy, this has been frustrating and very irritating.

4. The ad hoc work by the DC has probably created more harm than good.

5. Need to bring in Fisheries reps, as the current stream rehabilitation plans are in conflict with good fisheries habitat in the Tongass, i.e. Harris River Stream rehabilitation.

6. The inefficiency of the Roundtable must be addressed. Order must be improved. So much gets lost in the discussion that we become high centered on differing fundamental principles rather than finding common ground where compromises can be made.

7. Work on solutions to smaller pieces of the big issues.

8. would like agenda items sent to members before the meeting

9. I am wondering if the Round table has outlived its usefulness, since everyone seems to continue with their own agenda when they are outside of the group.

INTERESTED PARTIES

1. Stick to the Agenda.
2. The roundtable needs officers, perhaps co-chairs, to run the meetings and direct the process.
3. The Roundtable may try choosing a subject and going with it until comments run out, then moving to the next subject. Oftentimes a person is responding long after they raise their hand and were put on the list to speak. Often by then the topic has changed. Thus the feeling the members talk in circles.
4. Because the process is driven by Foundation money that seeks collaboration without understanding that collaboration can be disastrous for the forest, the entire idea is flawed from the outset.
5. It is the greatest and best future that SouthEast Alaska -- where I live -- has, and has had for a very long time. Keep after it, and recognize that some things won't work, but many things will.
6. TFR should be a discussion group only. When it steps beyond these bounds it only becomes the voice of the most powerful in the group....thus it ultimately becomes a lobbying group for big business.
7. Too much focus on supplying timber to Viking mill. Unrealistically optimistic view of value and potential of second-growth timber. Should have taken the USFS to task regarding high-grading Alaska-cedar and western redcedar as well as round-log exports.
8. The environmental stakeholders at the Roundtable are co-opted by industry funding, from out-of-state and hired just to facilitate a timber industry deal, and not representative of the views of the environmental community, resulting in an entirely flawed process
9. You should either disband (quit) or change your current roster. You will never get new results using the same tired ideas, or having the same old hacks present.
10. I am particularly concerned about the Roundtable's proposal to give a million acres of the Tongass to the State of Alaska. This would transfer game management authority from the Federal Subsistence Board to the Alaska Board of Game. This would be disastrous for subsistence users in Native and other rural villages. Shifting land management authority from the Forest Service to DNR would also be disastrous for conserving the habitat on which subsistence species and other species depend.
11. The Roundtable was an interesting experiment at the beginning, but it is a troublesome, illegitimate body masquerading as the opposite. It should have been disbanded years ago -- now is the time to finally do that.
12. I would like to see the carbon footprint of each TFR meeting published along with the cost to taxpayers for federal and state employees to attend.

13.Its a waste of money and time and a lie

14.Allow the PUBLIC process to work and let the chips fall where they may.

15.I think the roundtable would greatly benefit by having more structured large meetings.

1) Set an agenda with specific topics for the plenary session and stick to them. People will be more prepared and there will be a cutoff for discussion. I think the breakouts are absolutely essential and should not be preempted by the plenary session. I think at least half of the breakouts should be pre-scheduled. You can use surveymonkey to pick topics or just email. I think the Anchorage devil's club discussion was the right priority, but it would have benefited from stronger parliamentary procedure to cut off discussion, call the question and move on. I think overall discussion has been very beneficial, as has relationship building. As a non-member, I highly value the opportunity to participate freely in the breakouts and to discuss issues with members outside the plenary. The full consensus is too high a bar.

16.A grand solution that does not address the landless communities land claims can be considered as a solution.

17.The local people should have the majority of the input as to Roundtable policies.