

**Threats to Private Forests Workshop Draft Agenda
Central Plains
April 15-16, 2009**

**Lied Lodge, National Arbor Day Foundation
2700 Sylvan Rd, Nebraska City, NE**

Objectives:

- Engage and empower stakeholders throughout the west to raise visibility on threats to western private forests
- Develop a detailed outline of the threats in the Central Plains
- Review major past efforts to describe threats
- Articulate potential solutions to the threats to be passed on to final report drafting committee

Wednesday, April 15

8:00 a.m. Opening comments

8:10 a.m. Agenda review

8:20 a.m. Introductions

8:35 a.m. The Western Threats Assessment Process

A brief explanation of the context for the workshop, how the workshops are organized and the expected final outcome. Review of threats that describe the challenges for the Central Plains region.

Description of the process and how we arrived at the themes to be discussed for the day. There is also the potential adding of other threats to the list.

9:00 a.m. Briefings on Threats

Workshop organizers will brief each of the four threats/issues identified as challenges for the Central Plains region by reviewing studies to understand the impacts of the threats on forests in the Central Plains.

These threats are:

- Urbanization/subdivision of prime forest land
- Competition for water with agriculture
- Relatively few commercially valuable woods available
- Invasive species

Question and answer will be included as part of the briefing.

9:50 a.m. Break

10:00 a.m. Discussion

The group will be asked to discuss the threats and to work to discuss the underlying causes and impacts of the threats to private forestry. How are these threats changing the economic and social parameters of private forestry? Some potential questions include:

- Is the threat a symptom of a larger threat or a cause of other symptoms or both?
- What is the nature of the threat? What is the definition?
- Is it different in different locations?
- How is this impacting private forests?

**Threats to Private Forests Workshop Draft Agenda
Central Plains
April 15-16, 2009**

- 12:15 p.m.** **Lunch**
- 1:00 p.m.** **Discussion**
How are the threats related to each other?
What are additional threats and how are they related to the discussion?
- 2:30 p.m.** **Review of outline** of threats and discussion of how they should be bound together/ organized.
- 4:00 p.m.** **Adjourn, Day 1**
- 6:00 p.m.* *Dinner out?*

Thursday, April 16

- 8:00 a.m.** **Discussion of Day 1**
Any additions or changes from the previous day.
- 8:30 a.m.** **Review of outline:** Is this the way it should look? What changes are necessary?
- 9:15 a.m.** **Solutions: Given the outline of threats, how can solutions be applied?** Solutions that were mentioned during discussion will be reviewed and new ideas will be invited.

How can we overcome barriers to achieving productive private forests in the Central Plains?
- 11:30 a.m** **Next steps, comments on workshop**
- Noon** **Adjourn**

Threats to Western Private Forests

State	Name	Organization	Email	Telephone
NE	Constance Miller*	Nebraska NRCS Forester	Constance.Miller@ne.usda.gov	402-437-4102
ND	Craig Stange	NRCS, Forester	Craig.Stange@nd.usda.gov	
	Dana Coelho	WFLC	dcoelho@fs.fed.us	303-445-4364
ND	Dr. Joseph Zeleznik	North Dakota Extension Service ND State University - Extension Forester	Joseph.Zeleznik@ndsu.edu	(701) 231-8143
NE	Gerry Steinauer	Natural Heritage Program botanist, Game and Parks Commission	gerry.steinauer@nebraska.gov	
CO	Greg Sundstrom	Colorado State Forest Service	greg.sundstrom@colostate.edu	970-491-5342
NE	James Luchsinger	Middle Niobrara Program Director, The Nature Conservancy	jluchsinger@tnc.org	402-376-3621
KS	John Strickler	Kansas Association for Conservation and Env. Education	Jstrickl@ksu.edu	785-565-9731
KS	Larry Biles	Kansas State Forester	lbiles@ksu.edu	913/532-3300
SD	Leroy Smith	West River Cedar		605-775-2105
SD	Les Labahn	Randall RC&D	leslie@cme.coop	(605) 487-7035 (605) 481-9929
NE	Michele Schoeneberger	Rsch Project Leader National Agroforestry Center	mschoeneberger@fs.fed.us	402-437-5178
NE	Scott Josiah	Nebraska Forest Service, State Forester	sjosiah2@unl.edu	402/472-2944
KS	Tom Jacobs	Env. Prog. Mgr., Mid-American Regional Council	tjacobs@marc.org	816-474-4240
	Will Singleton	Facilitator	will@singletonstrategies.com	303-895-7570

*Attended first day only.

Western Forestry Leadership Coalition
Threats to Western Private Forests
Central Plains Workshop Summary
Nebraska City, NE April 15-16, 2009

In Attendance:

Constance Miller	Craig Stange√	Gerry Steinauer√
Greg Sundstrom√	Jim Luchsinger√	John Strickler√
Larry Biles√	LeRoy Smith√	Les Labahn√
Michele Schoeneberger√	Scott Josiah√	Tom Jacobs√
Dana Coelho√	Will Singleton – <i>Facilitator</i> √	√ = <i>Attended Day Two</i>

Workshop Objectives:

- Develop a detailed outline of the barriers to forestry on private lands in the Central Plains
- Articulate potential solutions to overcoming the barriers to the drafting committee
- Provide guidance to the drafting committee for the Central Plains section of the report

Action Items / Next Steps:

- Workshop participants are asked to review the draft workshop summary carefully to ensure that it is complete and accurate
- WFLC will post the finalized summary on a private website for participants' reference
- Flip chart photos will also be posted on the Web
- Once the summary is finalized, invitees who did not attend will be asked to add their perspectives that will be an appendix to the summary

Process Summary:

The Western Forestry Leadership Coalition is conducting five workshops throughout the western United States to identify threats to maintaining private forests as working lands. This workshop was the fourth of the five. Its focus was on the private forests of the western plains states including: Nebraska, Kansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado and Wyoming. The workshop was organized to ask participants to delve into the issues in depth. The results of the workshop are going to be incorporated into a report to be approved and published by the WFLC board. The major steps of this process are:

- Workshops held in five regions throughout the West
- A drafting group is assembled to draft a report
 - The report will summarize the results of the workshops but will also synthesize the themes of the workshops to produce a unified report that reflects the entire region
- Workshop participants will be asked to review the report and ensure factual accuracy as well as determine their willingness to have their names associated with the report as "Workshop Participants"
- The draft report will be reviewed by the WFLC board, changes may be suggested/requested
- A finalized report will be produced by the drafting committee
- Drafting committee members and workshop participants will be asked if they want to sign on to the report
- The report will be published by WFLC, printed, posted on the Web and distributed to key policy makers
- WFLC expects to print a final report by the early fall of 2009

The report will be used to inform policy makers at the local, state and federal levels about the challenges that private forests face in the West, to establish a policy context for approaches to

address the challenges, and to make appropriate recommendations to address the barriers to maintaining private working forests in the western states.

A general **timeline** follows (Note: dates are approximate):

April	Regional Workshops are conducted
May	WFLC forms a drafting committee
June – Aug	Drafting committee develops its report
Aug 15	Drafting committee sends its report to the workshop participants for comment
Sept.	Drafting committee sends the report to the WFLC Board for comment
Sept. 15	Drafting committee considers comments and finalizes reports Workshop participants are asked to sign on to report

Workshop Results:

A. Summary of Actions

Workshop participants engaged in a day and a half of discussions centering on conditions in the Plains. After an initial review of themes that were developed through interviews with WFLC members, the participants discussed the nature of barriers to maintaining private working forests.

The discussion was framed around three central organizing categories: **Ecological, Economic, and Social**. This framework was used to organize participant described threats and solutions to private forests in the plains states. The participants were asked to draw a Venn diagram reflecting the threats in the geographic area in which they work (i.e. Kansas City or North Dakota). They were asked to draw the diagram to reflect which of the three groupings were the most important (Ecological, Economic, or Social) and they were asked to identify their three priority threats.

The **Venn diagrams** showed that social issues are the largest overall concern. All but two participants defined social issues as the biggest set of challenges to forestry in the region. These diagrams were scanned and are going to be used to inform the drafting committee on the variability in the region. Each participant was asked to give his/her top threats/barriers. Issues identified more than once are connoted with a 4.

Through the discussion, workshop participants identified **barriers** under the three categories. Some participants indicate that “threat” is a poor descriptor because of its emotional connotations. In the context of some of the conflict that forestry has with other issues, threat may be too loaded of a term to be constructive.

Solutions were discussed on day two and are attached at the end of this summary. They are also grouped into the three large categories of Ecological, Economic, and Social.

Finally, as a result of the discussions, an **outline** was suggested that might be a format for the Central Plains “chapter” of the eventual west-wide report. Participants stressed the importance of establishing the right context, the importance of private lands as a part of the landscape. They stressed that there are many important opportunities that are associated with the threats and barriers.

A description of threats, solutions and a proposed outline follow. The last item is a list of reports, examples and initiatives that can be used to inform the writing of the report.

B. Discussion of Threats/Barriers

Ecological

- Forest health issues such as:
 - Invasive species and growth of other less valuable species
 - Exotic species⁴
 - Climate change⁴
 - Pests
 - Fuel accumulation, fire and need for prescribed fires. Cedar is very flammable and severity of fires and mean a conversion back to grasslands. Areas are increasingly fire prone with failure of cottonwoods. Ash mortality will also add to the fuel mix. Lower waterflows will make the situation worse.⁴⁴
 - Little regeneration
 - Lack of water
- Fragmentation of linear forests as a result of extreme weather and fire
- Impacts of herbicide on forests in urban and agricultural areas
- Difficult climate complicates forest management (i.e. cold winter, high soil Ph, dry summers)⁴⁴
- Hydrology is changing in some areas
- Cedar impact on landscape with encroachment, increased fire danger and removal of rangeland

Policy/Economics

Tax policies have unintended consequences

- Over reliance on sales taxes as opposed to property tax. This drives urban land conversion as counties and municipalities try to attract new residents and businesses and interacts with state and local tax policies⁴
- Land is taxed at agricultural use value
- Terminology and its use can be a barrier – “culled” materials ends up being a deterrence to investment, forested lands are taxed as “wasteland” even though they can be high value this leads to misunderstanding between disciplines and an undervalued market⁴
- Federal and State policies lead to poor management practices
 - Working tree practices are not defined in Forest Inventory Assessments
 - Many forests are linear and not 120ft wide
 - This means that many acres of potential feedstock are not counted when investment in infrastructure is considered
 - FIA definition of what is commercially valuable leaves out high value stock and species (i.e. the size of the log)
 - The Farm Bill leads to incoherent federal policy – the Farm Bill defines practices without regard to forests. Drafting of Farm Bill regulations can be untimely.
- There is not enough capacity to meet forest management needs
 - There is a lack of baseline data⁴
 - Programs are not outcome oriented. Funding is spent but results may not follow
 - Decisions at the local level are made without landscape attributes and forestry data
 - NRI does not have benchmark data at the right scale
 - Decreased funding from the federal government for core funds and an increase in competitive grants. This means that the state forestry offices are becoming more oriented towards getting grants than meeting their core mission⁴
 - Federal budget cycle vagaries create uncertainty when capacity is needed
 - The Central Plains are not at the core mission of the USFS
 - Often forestry expertise is delivered too late to impact decisions

- There has been a decline in capacity for developing resistant species
 - There is a lack of knowledge among forestry tree professionals because of high turnover
- Management is not happening for future trends
 - State foresters may be keeping a focus on production and be resistant to necessary new roles, biodiversity not a priority⁴
- Changing demographics and economic factors have meant new competition for forestry as an economic land use
 - Land appears to be at a bargain price to outsiders – they do not share values with the locals who may have multi-generational stewardship as a priority⁴
 - For the private land owner – active forest management costs money that they may not have or do not see the value in spending⁴
 - Riparian buffers and windbreaks are being removed because of perceived profit of putting more lands into agricultural production. This conversion is having an impact on water quality. It may be that with changed erosion control practices (such as no till) some riparian buffers are considered to be unnecessary
- There are many actors at different levels of government. It can be hard to create institutional structures that encourage collaboration and integrate decision-making to take a broader view and are cross-sectoral.⁴
- Agencies lose credibility with conflicting messages [*Les Labahn writes: The issue is the agencies are not providing landowners and public the complete “picture”. Certain species can be both a “wanted” and in other circumstances an “unwanted” tree. In South Dakota we have private landowners who rely strongly on cedar in their windbreaks and insist when putting in new plantings that cedar is included. The same landowners are removing cedar from areas of grasslands and other sites where they are not wanted.*]
- There is a lack of economic value given to ecosystem services through monetization. Land owners are not compensated for the ecological values that their lands and land management provides⁴⁴⁴
 - Land owner does not follow through with tree planting contracts
 - Weed management is landowner’s responsibility when there are much larger landscape level hazards at stake

Social

- Public perception can undervalue trees⁴
 - Irrigators can see competition from trees⁴
 - Urban areas have a desire for “clean” trees rather than the ones that may be most appropriate for the location
 - Hard to fit forestry into a “cows and plows” culture⁴⁴⁴⁴⁴
 - Farmers can be unknowledgeable about forest practices
 - Media coverage highlighting trees as a problem
- Some trees are considered weeds until land is sold for recreation
- Forestry, with its 50 – 100 year timeframe can lead to disconnect with more short-term oriented land owners
- Some land is being acquired by recreational users and those who “just want to have it”, this has an impact on other parcels in the area⁴
- Demographics in the region are changing altering the values that drive land use decisions
- Absentee land owners lead to less active management of forested lands and issues that were once manageable are now big such as invasive species and bigger fuel loads⁴
- The labor force has changed. It is now hard to find labor that is knowledgeable about forest management practices⁴
-

C. Discussion of Recommendations

Environmental

- Recognize savannah as an intermediate system and consider the areas' active management.
- Move towards biodiversity values in forest management and forestry:
 - Subsidize fuels reductions
 - Take market driven approaches – create markets through installing local facilities fore heating and cooling (such as blowers in schools)
 - Target institutions that require lots of energy (such as schools)
 - Provide the feasibility studies
 - Provide capital for equipment
 - Provide increased funding for utilizing wood in energy programs.
- Develop an inspection program for invasive species
- Ash seed storage programs should be integrated across the Plains to glean unique characteristics
 - Southeast Michigan RC&D has a program to process ash into wood products
- Establish methodologies to regenerate against brome grass

Policy/Economics

- Tree thinning funding could help management through prescribed fire as well. These could work together for biomass as well as maintain woodlands
- Farm Bill Conservation Stewardship Program to compensate landowners for beneficial services that they provide. Be at the table to determine the practices that would be compensated.
- Zoning – Leverage resources as planning for development occurs
- Research – Pull different disciplines together and pull integrated science together for the best information within each discipline.
 - RC&Ds can be used to bring together different disciplines through their area plans
- Capacity – Grow expertise in forestry
 - Train foresters on planning and partnership opportunities
 - Put in positions for partnership and institutional development – look at how state/private forestry programs are structured to support such positions at the state level (NRCS/USFS)
 - Utilize existing capacity for grant making (i.e. sustainable agricultural research and education producer grants)
- Energy – promote markets for wood as a renewable energy source:
 - Subsidize fuels reductions
 - Take market driven approaches – create markets through installing local facilities fore heating and cooling (such as blowers in schools)
 - Target institutions that require lots of energy (such as schools)
 - Provide the feasibility studies
 - Provide capital for equipment
 - Provide increased funding for utilizing wood in energy programs
 - Promote local use at a small scale to overcome transportation cost barriers
 - Build partnerships with municipalities on solid waste
- Technical Assistance – prevent inappropriate land conversion through onsite technical assistance to the land owner
- Integrate – Seek out opportunities to integrate across scales, disciplines, time frames and government levels. Actively engage in other sectors' meetings/processes. Some of the following possibilities were identified:
 - Convening of natural resource societies

- National Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative
- Education for land owners through extension
- State technical committees
- RC&Ds
- Conservation Districts
- Establish state-wide forestry collaborative
- Regional Initiatives such as the Colorado Front Range Forest Health Initiative (Plains Forestry Conservation Initiative?)
- Councils of Governments and other regional planning organizations
- Local comprehensive land use plans and visioning within those plans
- Agriculture/capitalization/cap and trade discussions
- 25 by 25
- Monetize Ecosystem Services – Work towards a national policy to establish markets for ecosystem services for carbon and water. State foresters could provide landowner extension services so that they can take advantage of the new program. Partner with agricultural interests and seize opportunities for differential payments.
 - Do a CRP program for forest lands
 - Build and identify national interest in ecosystem services – quantify economic value for ecosystem services
- Tax policy – Tax favorability already exists but naming under tax regulation is wrong. Areas defined as “wasteland” need to better reflect the larger societal value of the resource. This is state dependent. In many states, land is taxed at highest use value (recreational values versus agricultural). Generally this is based on comparable sales data.
- Data – Develop a new model for inventory that would better show linear forests (as opposed to FIA) utilizing new mapping technologies (NRCS/USFS)
 - Use the technology to identify invasive species trends
 - Use the technology to delineate quality forests
 - Utilize cumulative effects phenomena to prioritize where services need to be focused

Social

- Media – Have a plan for mass media with follow up on importance of riparian areas
 - USFS Resource Center Station have radio ads
 - Focus messages and use marketing principles to reach land owners (this is not education – its marketing)
 - Make websites more user friendly
- Agriculture Outreach – Focus USFS resources on agriculture extension – have a dedicated person in each state
- Establish sustainable forestry programs targeted on riparian forest issues and address social-cultural. Economic values. Gather base data and use resources inventories to determine compensation for landowners.

D. Proposed Outline

I. Context:

Describe importance of private forests in the region – almost all forested lands are private. Forests in the plains include linear rangeland forests. There is a different mentality towards forests in the Plains states. (A participant commented in to the draft summary: *Need to include in this discussion the importance of agro forestry or tree-based plantings (versus what most would perceive of as a private forest, forests, rangeland forests etc as stated above). Most important in context is recognizing the main matrix for Central Plains is agriculture versus that*

for much of the other western states/regions being looked at for this report: see map <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/NRI/maps/lqif/m5922l.gif>

(The participant also added: Central Plains is a land of working trees - more often than not, esp. these days - planted. For the other "forested" regions, discussions are how to protect them from threats; In the Plains, the discussion is probably better framed on the potential these plantings have to address the multiple demands being made on agricultural lands.)

The forests of the central plains have or are impacted by the following:

- Tree species that are not very commercially valuable
- Loss of forest land to urban growth
- Changing societal values
- Perceived competition with agriculture for water, land area, grazing, space for food production.

The Plains region is unique because of their historic perspective on how trees came to the region. One participant said that trees were planted in many areas to make life in a barren landscape more livable. They are oases in an otherwise harsh environment.

Interests: Private forests in the central plains can be small landowners (1 – 9 ac), medium landowners (in KS, 100,000 owners have parcels averaging 20 ac); forests can be incidental to agricultural operations. The region has a unique emphasis on urban forests. The National Woodland Owner Data Survey says that owners want to leave the forests as is, use for firewood, to preserve the natural and scenic beauty of the land. Some primary concerns are: trespassing and misuse, taxation and keeping the land for future generation.

The role of state foresters in the region is to provide technical assistance to land owners and local communities; to understand natural systems; to administer federal grant programs; work to generate markets for forest products; be advocates for forests and trees on plains; and be a coalition organizer of many actors at the local, state and federal levels.

Types of Forests: There were three different types of forests identified in the workshop. They are:

- Windbreak forests: for livestock protection, snow fences, are human planted, can provide important wildlife habitat
- Urban/Community forests: they are planted and maintained for their ecosystem services, they tend to be more diverse and resilient by design, and can emphasize riparian areas. They are useful for: storm water reduction; flood control/sewer overflow; energy conservation; air quality attainment (although Clean Air Act precludes their use as part of solutions to AQ problems).
- Natural and riparian forests: includes upland forests of pine and cedar, are important for recreation and tourism, ecosystem services including erosion control, biodiversity and wood products (biomass, walnut). These areas provide natural habitat, tend to be more valuable than grasslands in taxes because of their wildlife and scenic values.

Opportunities: *(This is intended to be the section of the introduction that informs the reader of what is at stake, where the opportunities are.)* This is a unique moment to seize many opportunities that have converged:

- Riparian areas are important assets to the Central Plains region. There is now greater attention and concern being paid to water quality and flooding and the role that treed areas can play in addressing flooding and sedimentation of reservoirs. Forested riparian zones are good alternatives to flood/siltation remediation.
- There is greater understanding of the need for cross-sectoral decision-making. Integrative planning can grow respect for forestry as a discipline and give foresters a bigger toolbox. This might include planning on invasive species.
- With the important short and medium term issue of tree mortality, there is an opportunity to focus on what can be done with dying trees as well as think about what the right replacements might be for these areas – what is the new order?
- With many federal programs driving funding to the state level, there are resources at the state level to act and develop contracts for conservation agreements.
- Climate change, energy costs, energy security, and the need to address water quality and water quantity are all policy imperatives right now. These issues can all be addressed in part by utilizing forest resources.
- The Emerald Ash Bore is an opportunity to prepare permanent programs to plant and maintain trees that are resistant to pests.

II. Barriers and Threats – These should be broken up into the three different types of forests

III. Strategies and Recommendations – identify desired outcomes and how to measure those achievements.

IV. Glossary – given that definitions are a problem, it would be helpful to include terms and definitions in the report.

E. Resources

Allen, S.B.; Dwyer, J.P.; Wallace, D.C.; Cook, E.A. 2003. Missouri River flood of 1993: role of woody corridor width in levee protection. *Journal of American Water Resources Association*. 39: 923-933. <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118849561/PDFSTART>

Dwyer, J.P.; Wallace, D.C.; Larsen, D.R. 1997. Value of woody river corridors in levee protection along the Missouri River in 1993. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 33: 481-489. <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/119177206/PDFSTART>

Geyer, W.A.; Nepl, T.; Brooks, K.; Carlisle, J. 2000. Woody vegetation protects streambank stability during the 1993 flood in central Kansas. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. 55: 483-486.

Green Topeka - The City provides sewage treatment and flood prevention for the community and seeks to improve surface and ground water quality by filtering stormwater runoff through native plant systems. - <http://www.greentopeka.org/>

Growth in the Heartland: Challenges and Opportunities for Missouri - This report provides the most comprehensive body of research yet assembled on growth and development patterns in a bellwether Midwestern state. Overall, the report documents that Missouri's population is spreading out to an extreme degree that imposes substantial fiscal, economic, environmental, and social costs on communities and taxpayers. - http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2002/12metropolitanpolicy_program.aspx

Helmets, M.J., T.M. Isenhardt, M.G. Dosskey, S.M. Dabney, and J.S. Strock. 2008. Chapter 4: Buffers and Vegetative Filter Strips. Pp. 43-58 in Upper Mississippi River Sub-basin Hypoxia Nutrient Committee, Final Report: Gulf Hypoxia and Local Water Quality Concerns Workshop. Special Publication. American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers, St. Joseph, Michigan. <http://www.unl.edu/nac/research/2008helmetschapter4.pdf>

The Kansas Natural Resources Conference focused on *Where Do Trees Belong in Kansas - The Role of Trees on the Kansas Landscape* - <http://www.k-state.edu/fisheries/KNRC/>

Metro Green - MetroGreen® is a proposed 1,144-mile interconnected system of public and private open spaces, greenways and trails designed to link seven counties in the Kansas City metropolitan area. - <http://www.marc.org/metrogreen/>

The Missouri River Ecosystem: Exploring the Prospects for Recovery resulted from a study conducted at the request of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. - http://books.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=10277#toc

The Mortensen Ranch in Stanley County, SD has been referenced in a number of news outlets and scholarly journals for its approach to riparian restoration and range management.

- Profiled in “Our Changing Planet” public television episode by the Upper Midwest Aerospace Consortium - <http://www.umac.org/ocp/videos/mortensonRanch.html>
- Boettcher, S.E. and Johnson, W.C. 2005. Cattle and Wooded Draws: A Second Look. *Rangelands*. 27(4):40-42.

Perry, C.H., C.W. Woodall, G.C. Liknes, and M.M. Schoeneberger. 2008. Filling the gap: improving estimates of working tree resources in agricultural landscapes. *Agroforestry Systems*: <http://www.unl.edu/nac/research/2008fillingthegap.pdf>

Perry, C.H., C.W. Woodall, and M.M. Schoeneberger. 2005. Inventorying trees in agricultural landscapes: toward an accounting of working trees. In: Brooks, K.N. and Ffolliot, P.R. (eds). *Moving Agroforestry into the Mainstream. Proc. 9th N. Am. Agroforestry Conference*. Rochester, MN. 12-15 June 2005 [CD-ROM]. Dept. of Forest Resources, Univ. Minnesota, St. Paul, MN <http://www.unl.edu/nac/research/2005aftaperry.pdf>

A pilot project funded by the EPA on **Plum Creek** in the Bad River Watershed (South Dakota) reduced sediment by more than 87%.

- <http://www.epa.gov/nps/Section319II/SD.html>
- <http://water.usgs.gov/owq/cleanwater/success/bad.html>

Schoeneberger, M.M. 2008. Agroforestry: working trees for sequestering carbon. *Agroforestry Systems*: DOI 10.1007/s10457-008-9123-8 <http://www.unl.edu/nac/research/2008sequesteringcarbon.pdf>

West, E. and G. Ruark. 2004. A long, long time ago. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 59:105A-110A. <http://www.unl.edu/nac/research/2004riparianhistory.pdf>

A General Forest Resource Inventory and Estimated Volumes for Eight Counties Along the Missouri River in South Central South Dakota”. This inventory was a partnership effort between Division of Resource Conservation and Forestry, SD Department of Agriculture; Randall

Resource Conservation and Development Association, Inc.; and 6 Conservation Districts. Web site is www.state.sd.us/doa/Forestry/publications/Final%20Version-Forest%20Resource%20InventoryReport-Complete.pdf

This inventory documented that there is substantial “re-generation” occurring in our privately owned natural forests, except for cottonwood species on the Missouri River bottomlands which no longer experience flood events. This inventory provides “benchmark” for assessing in future years health of the forestry resource.

F. Workshop Debrief

Good:

- It was good to have regional planners at the meeting
- A good mix of interests
- Good location/facility

Needs improvement:

- More landowners are needed
- More conservation districts
- Better define terminology (i.e. threats, barriers, etc)
- More senior feds would be useful