

Western Forestry Leadership Coalition
Threats to Private Western Forests
Drafting Committee Meeting Two
October 7-8, 2009

Location: Marriott San Francisco Union Square
480 Sutter Street, SFO
tel: 866-912-0973

Meeting Room: Russian Hill Room

Objectives:

- Achieve clarity on target and nature of recommendations
- Develop initial recommendations that flow from the drivers section
- Discuss focus and orientation of the report - identify possible companion products
- Delineate a work plan for completion of the report with dates and task assignments

October 7, 2009

7:30 a.m. *Breakfast served in 30th Floor Reception*

8:15 a.m. **Introductions and agenda review**

8:30 a.m. **Discussion of progress to date**

So that everyone is up to speed, we will review the steps that have taken us to where we are today. This discussion will include:

- Review of status of the drafted sections
- Who has been involved in the drafting
- Where we are in terms of our schedule

9:30 a.m. **Discussion of drivers**

The clear delineation of drivers of the threats to western private forests is key to a good report and to well-reasoned recommendations. This discussion will focus on the drivers in the current draft section, how they were identified and what they mean.

10:30 a.m. **Break – 30th Floor Reception**

11:00 a.m. **The meaning and target of recommendations**

Because recommendations are going to be a major output of Meeting 2, a discussion to achieve clarity on the nature, scale and target of the recommendations will help all to target their efforts. Discussion will also focus on how to write an effective recommendation, what are the components that make it actionable?

12:20 p.m. **Lunch – *Members are on their own.***

Optional working lunch and tour of Basecamp led by Dana

- 1:30 p.m.** **Review of recommendations from the workshops**
Quick review of pre-work – how summary recommendations relate to the drivers – by Dana and Rachel. Open for discussion.
- 2:15 p.m.** **Subgroup breakouts**
Based on the three drivers, the working group members will break out to develop no more than **5** recommendations that follow the format, scope, scale and targets identified earlier in the day. Subgroups may use refined versions of recommendations developed at the regional workshops if they choose. Each subgroup should have a “scribe” to capture the recommendations in writing for presentation and review to the larger group.
- 3:45 p.m.** **Review of recommendations**
Each subgroup will present their recommendations to the group – commentary is encouraged.
- 4:20 p.m.** **Review of agenda for Day Two**
- 4:30 p.m.** **Adjourn**

Dinner for drafting committee members is being sponsored by the Western Governors’ Association (thanks Ann!). Please join us for drinks and dinner starting at 6:30 pm, location TBA.

October 8, 2009

- 7:30 a.m.** ***Breakfast served in 30th Floor Reception***
- 8:00 a.m.** **Review of Day One and agenda for the remainder of the meeting.**
- 8:15 a.m.** **Recommendations reconsidered**
With a night’s sleep, what changes need to be made to the recommendations as they are written? Are there recommendations that people cannot live with? How can they be changed?
- 9:30 a.m.** **Break – 30th Floor Reception**
- 9:45 a.m.** **Format of the paper and companion products**
What are the additions to the plain text that can make the paper a dynamic policy tool? Are there additional products that should be developed? What should the format of the paper be? What insets and graphics should be used?
- 10:45 a.m.** **Work plan**
What are the steps necessary to get to a complete draft? Tasks, dates, and assignments will be delineated for clarity.
- 11:30 a.m.** **Review of work plan, upcoming dates, and next steps**
- 12:00 noon** **Adjourn**

Threats to Western Private Forests

Name	Organization	Email	Phone
Ann Walker	Western Governors Association	awalker@westgov.org	303 623-9378 x109
Brian Kernohan	Forest Capital Partners	bkernohan@forestcap.com	208-859-2364
Caitlyn Peel*	Western Forestry Leadership Coalition	caitlyn.peel@colostate.edu	303-445-4363
Dana Coelho	Western Forestry Leadership Coalition	dcoelho@fs.fed.us	303-445-4364
Don Motanic	Intertribal Timber Council	donmo@teleport.com	503-282-4296
Ed Smith	Landowner/TNC Forest Program Manager	esmith@tnc.org	928-774-8892 x4
Faye Stewart	Lane County Commissioner	Faye.Stewart@co.lane.or.us	541-682-4203
Gregg Servheen	Idaho Fish and Game	gservheen@idfg.idaho.gov	208-287-2713
Jim Paul	Oregon Department of Forestry, Private Forests Division	jpaul@odf.state.or.us	503 945-7206 □ 503 931-0483
John Perez Garcia	University of Washington, College of Forest Resources	perjohm@u.washington.edu	206-685-2315
Mo Bookwalter	Northwest Connections	mo@northwestconnections.org	406.529.8386
Rachel White*	PNW	rachelwhite@fs.fed.us	
Ralph Thier	National Association of Conservation Districts	ralph-thier@nacdnet.org	202-547-6223
Sara Leiman	Private Landowner	bsleiman@peak.org	541-847-5590
Susan Rich	NM Forestry	susan.rich@state.nm.us	505-345-2080
Tom Jacobs	Mid America Regional Council	tjacobs@marc.org	816-474-4240
Will Putman	Tanana Chief's Conference	will.putman@tananachiefs.org	907-452-8251 x3373
Will Singleton*	Facilitator	will@singletonstrategies.com	303-895-7570

* Indicates member of the steering committee, not the drafting committee.

Western Forestry Leadership Coalition
Threats to Private Western Forests
Drafting Committee Meeting Two
October 7-8, 2009

Attendees:

Ann Walker	Brian Kernohan	Dana Coelho	Don Motanic
Ed Smith	Faye Stewart	Gregg Servheen	Jim Paul
John Perez-Garcia	Mo Bookwalter	Ralph Thier	Sara Leiman
Susan Rich	Tom Jacobs	Will Singleton*	Will Putman
Caitlyn Peel*	Rachel White*		

** Not members of the drafting committee.*

Objectives:

- Achieve clarity on target and nature of recommendations
- Develop initial recommendations that flow from the drivers section
- Discuss focus and orientation of the report - identify possible companion products
- Delineate a work plan for completion of the report with dates and task assignments

I. Decisions/Next Steps:

For October 13 Conference Call

- **(Completed)** Recommendations to be refined by task teams
- **(Completed)** Define “private working forest”
- **(Completed)** Integrate 2 pps into the intro draft
- **(Completed)** Systems theory explanation

For October 27 Conference Call

- Completed comments on full draft by all DC members and Core Team
- **Don Motanic** – Describe “Tribal Forest Protection Act” and prepare “lessons learned” for report.
- **Rachel White** – Work with Dana to provide smooth prose?

October 30 – Draft sent to WFLC Executive Board

- **WFLC** – Develop tactics for implementation (a plan to be presented at 3rd meeting)

November 18 – 19 – Denver Meeting

November 24 – Conference Call

December 4 – Final draft due to WFLC

December 8 – Conference call

December 14-16 – WFLC Annual Meeting (and expected approval)

II. Discussion Summary:

Meeting the scope of the challenge: An important theme that ran throughout meeting two was the desire of the DC members to have the report articulate and meet the scale of the challenge facing private forests. The report will need to balance vision with practical ways of moving towards solutions.

- 40 million acres of private forests will be lost over the next 50 years. How can the report communicate and recommend resolution to this kind of scope?
- Over the next few years, a “wall of wood” is expected from foreign suppliers. This will decimate domestic supply/capacity. After about 10 years of foreign glut, there is expected to be a shortage of wood.
- What can be suggested in the short term to stem losses without losing the importance of a structural change in the way our society values forests?
- The continued decline in wood markets will require more and other sources of income.
- A marginal increase in profitability could have a profound effect on forest loss.
- The shift that is needed should bolster existing good markets and create new ones.

Status of Paper: At the start of the meeting, two major section drafts had been completed: the introduction and the drivers section. The DC discussed the status of the draft at the beginning of the meeting and the direction in which they hoped the report would develop. Most of the comments were on the **introduction**. The key points were:

- There needs to be clarity of the terms and what the report talks about. The definition of “private forested lands” needs to be clear;
- The paper should cover what happens when public forests impact private forests – the report needs to discuss public forests without confusing the reader about the scope of the paper;
- The meaning of the word “working” needs to be clear as well. Physical forests and the services they provide to the public – access the use of “work” as a buzzword associated with “working lands” – include economics, cultural/heritage, and ecological elements;
- The paper should state that timber and ecosystem services can coexist and are actually mutually supportive, that timber is an ecosystem service;
- The urban/rural theme is important;
- Consider including terms that people in specific regions will identify with such as woodlands;
- Trends in harvest levels (public vs. private) should be included in the introduction;
- Draw from Dana’s previously written paragraphs;

Comments on the **Drivers** section:

- We need to tie “WOWs” into description of the drivers- items that will catch the readers’ attention;
- Add paragraphs on systems theory as background to how the section was developed;
- Definitions of the drivers and other key terms need to be included;
- State that the report is covering potential national policy change, engagement at the regional level and ultimately cumulative decisions made at the local level.

Recommendations: A major objective for the DC was to develop initial recommendations to be included in the report. The group developed a common format for all recommendations to follow, it was:

Rationale: (linking back to a challenge in the drivers section)

The target or actor: (who will the recommendation be pitched to?)

Recommended action: (providing examples if appropriate)

Expected outcomes: (what does success look like and how can it be measured?)

Recommendations should be written to keep the end in mind, be as simple as possible, and inspire action from the target. Instead of being highly detailed, recommendations should give the actor a sense of how to get started.

Potentially, the recommendations could be seen as a “road map” for policy makers. The recommendations would include bolstering traditional markets, assigning economic valuation to ecosystem services, deploying of regulations with incentives and, as a last resort, regulation with takings.

The recommendations could be considered in a few different ways. One was according to a matrix with the different scales of potential action/impact on one axis and the three “super-drivers” (climate change, economics, and cultural/demographic shift) on the other axis. Another approach would be to consider an “if, then” approach. If a driver was causing a certain set of conditions, then the following actions are recommended ways of addressing the issue/s.

The DC discussed the “tool box” of potential actions that recommendations could utilize. Recommendations might include one, two or all three of the following:

- Policy/institutional actions
- Management solutions
- Communications

The DC was broken into three groups to develop no more than 5 recommendations per group. These were to cover each of the “super-drivers” and two extras. Members were encouraged to refer to the recommendations developed from the workshops as well as their own thinking as the foundations for the recommendations. Each group developed draft recommendations. These were reviewed and discussed by the whole DC and compiled for review as a first draft. The recommendations seemed to be clumped into three major groupings:

1. Development of incentives to curb conversion including remuneration for ecosystem services
2. Cross boundary collaboration to treat the forest as one functional whole
3. Quick steps to redefine biomass to allow access to unused resources

The draft can be found on Basecamp dated October 7.

Other DC Outputs: DC members want the report to capture the attention of people who learn through many different means. Some will sit down and read the report. Others need case studies, focused web resources and other products to internalize the developed content. DC members began the discussion of how to make the report dynamic. More discussion is expected at meeting 3 and on conference calls. Key points were:

- Develop case studies that show the integration of forests into the considerations of other sectors of government through ecosystem services (e.g. Landcare)
- WFLC develop benchmarks for implementation of the recommendations?
- One pager focused towards specific types of actors (state foresters, members of Congress, county commissioners, etc.) available in print and on the web