

**Western Forestry Leadership Coalition  
Threats to Western Private Forests  
Drafting Committee**

**Protocols**

**I. Purpose**

The Western Forestry Leadership Coalition (WFLC) has undertaken the *Threats to Western Private Forests* strategic initiative in partnership with the US Forest Service (USFS) Pacific Northwest Research Station and Western Wildland Environmental Threats Assessment Center (WWETAC) as part of continuing efforts to meet its mission of promoting science-based forest management that serves the values of society and ensures the health and sustainability of western forests. WFLC is a coalition of the state foresters of the western states and Pacific islands as well as the western US Forest Service (USFS) regional foresters, research station directors, and the USFS Forest Products Lab director. The initiative has engaged key stakeholders through a series of workshops to explore and synthesize threats to the health and sustainability of private forests in the western US. With the first round of workshops complete, a Drafting Committee has been formed to produce a consensus report. The report, along with policy briefs developed by participants and partners, will be distributed to key policy makers at all levels of government to facilitate the implementation of recommendations to address barriers to maintaining private working forests.

**Drafting Committee Scope**

The Drafting Committee will draft a consensus report to be approved and accepted by the WFLC Executive Board. This report presents as an opportunity to materially influence the future health and sustainability of western private forests through the coordinated actions of land management agencies, industry, and individual private landowners. The report will be distributed to key policy makers at all levels of government, including Congress, the US Forest Service, the US Department of Agriculture, the US Department of Interior, western governors, tribal governments, and state forestry, fire, wildlife and land management agencies. It will be used by federal agencies to drive research agendas and by state forestry agencies as they set forest management and landowner assistance priorities.

The Drafting Committee will work collaboratively to develop a report that achieves the following outcomes:

- Effectively synthesizes the results of the workshops by addressing the region-specific issues expressed during the first part of the initiative.
- Utilizes Drafting Committee expertise and relevant information from outside of the group to articulate long-term threats to western private forests.
- Proposes consensus recommendations appropriate for western state foresters and others to pursue as they seek to address the articulated threats.
- Aims to gain the acceptance and endorsement of workshop participants, all Drafting Committee members, and final approval by the WFLC Executive Board.

Because the audience will be “interested, informed decision-makers,” the report will be written in a manner that promotes understanding and action on the part of the reader.

## **II. Drafting Committee Composition**

The Drafting Committee will be composed of experts who bring different and relevant perspectives to the initiative. The WFLC has sought to bring together Drafting Committee members who are knowledgeable on how natural, economic, and social trends interact to influence private forests and forestry. Moreover, the WFLC has sought to assemble a group that can represent the expertise and interests of various perspectives including:

- State forestry agencies
- US Forest Service
- Other state and federal agencies
- Local government
- Industry
- Land owners
- Tribes
- Academics
- Conservation organizations

Some members of the Drafting Committee have multiple affiliations, interests, and areas of expertise. In addition, members provide biological, legal, regulatory, and operational expertise relevant to the issues under discussion.

## **III. Process and Schedule**

The Drafting Committee is scheduled to have three face-to-face meetings. Each meeting is vitally important for the building of a consensus product. All Drafting Committee members are expected to attend all meetings. As tasks are determined, sub-groups will likely want to work cooperatively over conference calls to meet project output timeline needs. The full Drafting Committee may also want to schedule regular conference calls to monitor progress, discuss next steps, and comment on drafts.

### **Meeting Schedule and Outcomes**

Meeting 1: August 12 – 13, 2009 (Portland, OR)

- Understand process and approve protocols
- Review workshop results and discuss approaches to integrating results
- Define additional research needs
- Develop outline, approach, and program of work

Meeting 2: October 7 – 8, 2009 (San Francisco, CA)

- Review first draft
- Refine outline, approach, and program of work for second draft

Meeting 3: November 18 – 19, 2009 (Denver, CO)

- Respond to comments by WFLC Executive Board and workshop participants
- Resolve any areas of disagreement
- Develop final draft for approval by WFLC Executive Board

A first draft for Drafting Committee review is expected by September 25, 2009. A second draft for review by workshop participants and the WFLC Executive Board is expected to be complete by October 30, 2009. A final draft of the report is expected to be complete by December 4, 2009 and will be made available to the WFLC Executive Board for approval at their fall meeting. The workshop participants and Drafting Committee members will be asked if they would like to be attributed in the final product with an appropriate designation for their involvement.

#### **IV. Roles**

##### **Drafting Committee Members**

Drafting Committee members will be expected to:

- Attend all face-to-face meetings;
- Adhere to the protocols adopted by the group;
- Meet deadlines for drafting and commenting on drafts;
- Proactively engage in collaborative problem solving to address the range of interests brought to the table; and
- Work with their own groups, organizations, and constituencies to understand and articulate their interests, to secure their on-going input, and, as appropriate, to build support for the final recommendations.

##### **Outside Experts**

Drafting Committee members can reach outside of the group to access expertise that is not represented by the membership itself. These outside experts can contribute to the product but will not participate in the consensus decisions of the group.

##### **Observers**

Meetings of the Drafting Committee will be by invitation only. Members of the Drafting Committee may bring a limited number of additional individuals as technical assistance with the *explicit agreement* of the WFLC Acting Executive Director. Additionally, a limited number of specific individuals may be invited to observe the meetings. Observers will be required to adhere to the same protocols and meeting guidelines (see below) that apply to members. Observers will be asked to refrain from speaking during the meetings; rather they should speak through Drafting Committee members. Members of the Drafting Committee may ask the facilitator to limit comments by observers and observers may not object to recommendations put forward for consensus adoption. Observers may provide feedback through a Drafting Committee member if desired.

## **Western Forestry Leadership Coalition**

The WFLC's role is as the convener and implementer of the *Threats to Western Private Forests* initiative and final product. The WFLC will facilitate the production of a consensus report, which highlights threats to private forestry in the western United States. The WFLC staff will pursue the development of recommendations according to the timeline set out by the WFLC Executive Board and will seek to meet the interests of the full WFLC membership. The WFLC staff will seek to ensure that the initiative's outputs are as relevant as possible to its membership – both state foresters and USFS members.

WFLC staff will also provide logistical support and coordination for the travel needs and meetings of the initiative. Key WFLC staff are:

Caitlyn Peel, Acting Executive Director: [cpeel@colostate.edu](mailto:cpeel@colostate.edu) / 303-445-4363

Dana Coelho, Program Manager: [dcoelho@fs.fed.us](mailto:dcoelho@fs.fed.us) / 303-445-4364

In addition to assisting the Drafting Committee as a WFLC staff member, Dana Coelho will also serve as a consensus member of the Drafting Committee with all the responsibilities and opportunities that infers.

## **Project Core Planning Team**

The Core Planning Team for this project includes Caitlyn Peel and Dana Coelho of WFLC, Jerry Beatty of the USFS Western Wildland Environmental Threats Assessment Center (WWETAC), Jamie Barbour of the USFS Pacific Northwest Research Station Focused Science Delivery Program, and Will Singleton of Singleton Strategies LLC. This project is a cooperative effort between the WFLC and the US Forest Service. Jamie Barbour and Jerry Beatty have been involved in planning the initiative from its conception and in considering how the initiative results might be integrated into their respective research programs.

Jamie Barbour, Program Manager: [jbarbour01@fs.fed.us](mailto:jbarbour01@fs.fed.us) / 503-808-2542

Jerry Beatty Director: [jbeatty@fs.fed.us](mailto:jbeatty@fs.fed.us) / 541-416-6583

## **Facilitation and Process Support**

Will Singleton, Principal of Singleton Strategies LLC, is a consultant who is providing neutral facilitation services and process planning to the initiative. In consultation with Drafting Committee members, Will Singleton will assist with agenda development, convening, facilitation and drafting of the meeting summaries and final report. He will also work between meetings to ensure that the work product meets deadlines and that full agreement is reached wherever possible.

Will Singleton, Principal: [will@singletonstrategies.com](mailto:will@singletonstrategies.com) / 303-895-7570

## **V. Discussion Guidelines and Approach**

### **General Approach**

The Drafting Committee members will approach their deliberations as collaborative problem-solvers seeking to produce consensus concepts and/or recommendations that address, insofar as possible, the practical needs and interests of all participants. As necessary, the group will work jointly to educate and build understanding regarding the participants' values and interests related to the issue; while also developing a baseline understanding of essential scientific, technical, legal, economic, and political information. All members agree to work proactively to meet the broad objectives of the *Threats to Western Private Forests* strategic initiative.

Collaborative problem-solving is most successful when parties agree that their major interests have been heard, considered meaningfully, that other participants have made every effort to address their interests in any final proposals, and that the final proposals accurately characterize any outstanding differences. The group will strive for consensus; for purposes of the Drafting Committee, consensus is defined, at a minimum, as “no objections” or as being able to “live with” an outcome, perhaps in light of how it fits into a larger whole.

In an effort to achieve the greatest degree of consensus possible, the group will work to build proposals by identifying, exploring and, as much as possible, satisfying all key interests. When agreement is not possible, the group will work to accurately and respectfully understand and document the different perspectives at hand. The facilitator will use a variety of techniques to calibrate and then reflect the actual levels of consensus achieved by the Drafting Committee.

If it is not possible to reach agreement on a specific recommendation, the Drafting Committee will exercise one or more of following options presented in the potential order in which the options would be exercised:

1. Drafting Committee members will make their best attempts to address the stated interests of each side. Those who object to a specific idea have the added responsibility to craft a solution that they believe will meet their needs as well as the meet the interests of the group.
2. The Drafting Committee may decide to leave out the disputed idea or recommendation if only one or two participants support it – in other words, recommendations that fail to achieve “critical mass” may be left out.
3. The recommendation or area of dispute will be put to the WFLC Executive Board for their determination about its relevance to the initiative, the WFLC Executive Board will respond with their recommendation on how to resolve the issue. The Drafting Committee may use the recommendation to address the dispute.
4. A narrative will be included in the report that highlights the discussion of the group and provides an explanation why full consensus was not possible.
5. Ultimately, each Drafting Committee member will have to decide if the final product is acceptable to him or her and will make the determination whether or not to associate their name with the report. It may be that the overall product has enough positive aspects that a specific area of disagreement is overshadowed by the report's positive attributes.

It is important for members to recognize that concepts may be discussed in an effort to craft recommendations that ultimately obtain broad support. Members may not expect to exclude concepts from being discussed. Members may work throughout the drafting process to find a recommendation that meets the consensus agreement of the group. It is also important for members to be proactive in their deliberations. If a concept or recommendation is not acceptable, members who object are expected to commit energy to finding a way to meet the needs of the whole group.

## **Ground Rules**

The Drafting Committee's protocols and interaction assumptions (proposed and to be ratified or modified at the first meeting) will follow a modified version of the "Chatham House Rule."<sup>1</sup>

Discussions are "off the record" insofar as no one will represent the Drafting Committee's collective views or positions without the agreement of the group itself.

Although it is expected that each person will be speaking on behalf of their organization, company, or agency, formal hats are off to the greatest extent possible. Individuals are encouraged to draw from both their personal and institutional experience/expertise in discussions.

Anyone attending is free to use the information in the group's deliberations but will not publicly represent the views of others present.

All members are encouraged in discussions to "explore without committing." This further frees up the group to explore potential solutions without viewing those explorations as formal proposals.

As pertains to specific discussions, members agree to:

- Disclose interests
- Listen fully to understand
- Look for ways to address not only your own interests but those of others as well
- Participate; share the floor; be concise
- Look ahead—acknowledge the past but don't rehash it
- Be explicit and factual—ask for clarification if confused
- Let expertise fuel, not constrain, creativity

---

<sup>1</sup> The Chatham House Rule is used worldwide to facilitate both free speech and confidentiality at meetings. Meetings may be held "on the record" or under "the Chatham House Rule". In the latter case, it may be agreed with the speaker(s) that it would be conducive to free discussion that a given meeting, or part thereof, should be strictly private. When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information or opinions disclosed to them, subject to two conditions. (a) Neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speakers, nor that of any other participant at that meeting may be revealed. (b) It may not be divulged that the information was received at that meeting.

## **Meeting Summaries, Drafts, and Final Report**

The WFLC staff and Singleton Strategies LLC will be responsible for preparing summaries of the meetings with an eye toward capturing key issues, conclusions, and agreed-upon next steps. Members of the Drafting Committee will have the opportunity to review and comment on draft meeting summaries prior to their being considered final.

All report drafts will be shared with the WFLC staff and Drafting Committee members. WFLC staff will engage the WFLC Executive Board and membership for review and approval of the final report.

## **Enlibra Principles**

These principles, developed for and adopted by the Western Governors Association as a basis for their policy development work, may be helpful for the Drafting Committee as it seeks to satisfy the objectives of this report. Members are encouraged to use these principles as they formulate recommendations.

- National Standards, Neighborhood Solutions - Assign Responsibilities at the Right Level
- Collaboration, Not Polarization - Use Collaborative Processes to Break Down Barriers and Find Solutions
- Reward Results, Not Programs - Move to a Performance-Based System
- Science For Facts, Process for Priorities - Separate Subjective Choices from Objective Data Gathering
- Markets Before Mandates - Pursue Economic Incentives Whenever Appropriate
- Change A Heart, Change A Nation - Environmental Understanding is Crucial
- Recognition of Benefits and Costs - Make Sure All Decisions Affecting Infrastructure, Development and Environment are Fully Informed
- Solutions Transcend Political Boundaries - Use Appropriate Geographic Boundaries for Environmental Problems

**Western Forestry Leadership Coalition**  
Threats to Western Private Forests Drafting Committee  
Marriott Portland City Center, Rogue Room  
August 12-13, 2009

**Draft Agenda**

---

**Objectives**

- Orient Drafting Committee members on process to date
- Review and approve protocols
- Develop an outline for Drafting Committee report
- Develop a detailed workplan/timeline for completion of report

**Wednesday, August 12**

8:00 am *Continental Breakfast will be available for participants*

8:30 Agenda Review

8:45 Member introductions

9:15 Review of process to date

10:00 Review of draft protocols for Drafting Committee

10:30 *Break*

10:50 Approval of draft protocols with changes as necessary

11:10 Discussion of the objectives of the initiative, key issues, and DC task

12:15 pm *Lunch*

1:15 Review of workshop results – highlight key issues

3:15 Discuss approach to report

4:15 Sum up results of day one and discuss day two

4:30 Adjourn

**Thursday, August 13**

8:00 am Opening and thoughts from day one  
*Continental Breakfast will be available for participants*

8:30 Potential outline for report

9:30 Review of outline and DC skill set

10:00 *Break*

10:20 Develop work plan and timeline

11:40 Review workplan, outline, assignments and next steps

12:00 pm Adjourn

*Drafting Committee members are asked to plan their travel to facilitate attendance at the full meeting. Participation in the entire meeting is critical. Please plan to arrive in Portland on August 11, the day before the meeting, and depart no earlier than 2 pm on August 13.*

Threats to Western Private Forests

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone</b>
Ann Walker	Western Governors Association	awalker@westgov.org	303 623-9378 x109
Brian Kernohan	Forest Capital Partners	bkernohan@forestcap.com	208-859-2364
Bruce Goines	US Forest Service, Rural Community Assistance	bgoines@fs.fed.us	707-562-8910
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
Jamie Barbour*	USFS, Pacific Northwest Research Station	jbarbour01@fs.fed.us	503-808-2542
Jerry Beatty*	USFS, Western Wildland Environmental Threats Assessment Center	jbeatty@fs.fed.us	541-416-6583
Jim Paul	Oregon Department of Forestry, Private Forests Division	jpaul@odf.state.or.us	503 945-7206 □ 503 931-0483
Mo Bookwalter	Northwest Connections	mo@northwestconnections.org	406.529.8386
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
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 Western Private Forests - Drafting Committee  
August 12-13 DRAFT Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:**

***Drafting Committee Members***

**Ann Walker** – Western Governors’ Association and private land owner

**Brian Kernohan** – Forest Capital Partners

**Bruce Goines** – USFS Region 5 Rural Community Assistance

**Dana Coelho** – Western Forestry Leadership Coalition

**Don Motanic** – Intertribal Timber Council

**Ed Smith** – The Nature Conservancy and private land owner

**Faye Stewart** – Commissioner, Lane County OR

**Gregg Servheen** – Idaho Department of Fish and Game

**Jim Paul** – OR Dept of Forestry Private Forests Division

**Mo Hartman** – Northwest Connections, Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition

**Ralph Their** – National Association of Conservation Districts

**Sarah Leiman** – Private land owner in Oregon

**Susan Rich** – New Mexico Forestry Division

**Will Putnam** – Tanana Chiefs’ Conference

***Project Team***

**Caitlyn Peel** – Western Forestry Leadership Coalition

**Jamie Barbour** – USFS PNW Research Station

**Jerry Beatty** – USFS Western Wildland Threat Assessment Center

**Will Singleton** – Singleton Strategies LLC - Facilitator

**Outcomes/Decisions:**

- The Drafting Committee (DC) accepted protocols with some minor changes to clarify the purpose of the process. (DCMtg1\_Protocols.pdf)
- The DC developed an outline that went into some detail on the introduction, paper length and format. (“Report Outline” whiteboard)
- The DC members volunteered for various tasks identified below (“Working Groups” whiteboard)
- The Western Governors’ Association (WGA) Forest Health Advisory Committee should be asked if they are willing to review a draft of the report so that the interests represented on that committee can have input on the report.

**Actions/Tasks:**

<b>Name/s</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Task</b>
Dana	ASAP	Create online collaborative workspace
All	ASAP	Contribute materials to online workspace that discuss value of private lands as information for introduction
Will Singleton	ASAP	Doodle a survey on best time for a regular bi-monthly conference call
Will Singleton	ASAP	Bring DC members who did not attend up to speed on

and Dana		the meeting and key developments
Brian, Dana, Susan	Friday 8-21 with Wednesday conference call	Develop a table of “drivers” and their corresponding threats and impacts. Some impacts may have more than one driving/underlying cause. Task group should draw from the threats identified in the workshop summaries.
Don, Ann, Ed, Bruce	Thursday 8-27	Draft an introduction that discusses the value of private lands. Use Caitlyn as a WFLC resource
Will Putman	Friday 8-28	1/2 page description of AK’s special conditions
Will & Project Team	Monday 8-31	Draft work plan that includes dates for major outputs to share during first conference call
??	??	Collect case studies (e.g., MT low interest loans)

### Next Meeting:

The project team is working to schedule a conference call for all drafting committee members to discuss progress every two weeks. The first conference call will cover the following objectives:

- Review of drivers – DC members will comment on the table of drivers/symptoms
- A draft introduction – DC members hear the task group’s approach
- Develop and agree on next steps to draft the threats section of the report

The next face-to-face meeting of the Drafting Committee will be October 7-8 in San Francisco, CA. Please make arrangements to be at the meeting on October 7 by 8:30 AM and depart after noon on October 8.

### Draft Report Outline:

Report Outline: DC members agreed that the report should not be more than 25 pages in length. Posted online, it can have links embedded in the text as necessary to allow the reader to dig deeper. The DC also discussed developing a more interactive website based on the printed report. The outline will be a logical framework – with an intro followed the problems and their corresponding solutions – and is provided in draft form below.

Executive Summary – 1 page

- A. Introduction – 3 pages – The value and importance of private forests in the West
- Context – Numbers (% of lands, % of water from private lands, % near urban growth boundaries, etc.). How the west is different from other regions of the U.S.
  - What makes private forests valuable?
    - o Wildlife habitat
    - o Recreation
    - o Economic and other values
  - Why should you care about private forests?
    - o State a vision/goal, desired end condition
    - o Public interest – ecosystem services
    - o Reaction to the past – we have learned that you pay now or pay later

- Why the status quo is unacceptable – what will private forests look like if we maintain current practices
  - The values that drove current conditions – the heritage of Western lands
- B. Threats / Drivers – 10 pages – the big problems that shape private forests
- Economic
  - Natural
  - Regulatory
  - Social
- C. Solution Framework – 5 pages
- D. Special Conditions – The places that are special because they are different or because they demonstrate some essential themes:
- Alaska
  - CA
  - Central Plains/Urban Forestry
  - Pacific Islands

### **Discussion Summary:**

*Drivers as a focus of the DC report* – The Drafting Committee quickly decided that the report should focus on the underlying causes of threats to private forests. The group discussed what some of these drivers might be and individually wrote down the relationships between a driver and a set of impacts. In the end, the DC sought to have a task group create a table that delineates the relationships between drivers and their symptomatic threats and impacts. Part of the identified challenge will be to trace the driver to a high enough level without having the definition be so broad as to lose its meaning in the report. For example, “trade liberalization” or “Chinese coal power plants” might be examples of “drivers” that do not end up being meaningful for the report. The group defined drivers as: *No higher root cause of problems, involving large-scale impacts.*

Some of the DC members distilled the drivers down to some very broad categories:

- Globalization/Trade Liberalization – This could be a cause of economic stress
- Climate Change – This could be a primary driver of ecological stress
- Population Growth / relocation – This could be the primary driver of inconsistent social values and social license disconnect

*Report Qualities* – The working group discussed what essential qualities the ultimate report needs to have. The report should:

#### Format / approach

- Be short – not get into minutia – to maximize readership
- Integrate with the Web – it may not even need to be a traditional report, could be a dynamic web-based resource that address specific needs in a more focused way
- Be written with “tare sheets” oriented towards specific actions (need to determine constituencies that could use these focused materials)
- Seek viral quoting in media

- Be accompanied by a presentation so that the message can be delivered to people in person at conferences and other venues

### Making the case

- Make the case for the public value of western private forests – consider how farmers got the Farm Bill and mimic that approach
- Articulate a vision
- Make reference to ideas included in Jared Diamond’s book *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Succeed or Fail*
- Emphasize that private land owners hold the public trust and have a sense of stewardship – find ways to reward stewardship
- Understand that threats may be better framed as opportunities
- Identify constituencies with common interests and use that to propose solutions
- Consider this report as a western extension of the efforts of the National Alliance of Forest Owners
- Provide clarity on what we value in working forests – trees in the ground – first

### Threats

- Focus on underlying threats that could bring permanent changes to the landscape and review means of reversing those threats
- Reflect a hierarchy of threats – severity, immediacy, and scale – regional and overarching threats – identify cross-cutting problems that impact large numbers of people and make the broad case for forest values (ecosystem services)
- Consider words carefully – “threats” may be too anthropogenic or negative, “risks” or “opportunities” might say what we mean better
- Think through threats and impacts – too often we turn to specific solutions without looking at the bigger picture and considering unintended consequences
- Identify measurable outcomes for recommendations (e.g., Montreal Process Criteria Indicators, state forest resource assessments)

*Identified Themes from Each Regional Workshop* – Attendees of the workshops were asked to reflect on the main themes discussed at each of the exploratory workshops. This was intended to get some ideas flowing – this section does not substitute for referring to the workshop summaries.

### Central Rockies

- Public lands policy and its (often unintended) impacts on private lands
- How to help private landowners hold onto land in the face of pressures to subdivide and use for different economic purposes
- Absentee owners manage their lands for different purposes/values
- Focus on smaller parcel sizes – 40 ac
- Non-existent infrastructure for forestry
- Water scarcity
- Venn diagrams included more on ecological threats than other workshops
- Region is grappling with changed societal values and altered social license

## Northern Rockies

- Decline of forest products industry
- It was an Idaho centric discussion – extra care should be taken in the report to include Montana
- Change in industrial timberland ownership and use
- Recreational use of lands is free for the user – no way to manage the resource or glean economic value from land's use
- Checkerboard ownership
- Extensive discussion of TIMOs and REITs
- Movie star ranches and charismatic land owners – Ted Turner came up a lot

## Alaska

- Subsistence forestry is practiced on much of the private lands
- There is a development gulf within Alaska – Anchorage is a modern city while many villages are more like developing economies
- Lack of transportation infrastructure, long distances
- Forestry is different in the South East than it is in Central
- In Central – there are two different areas, boreal and coastal
- 98% of private lands are owned by native corporations
- Urban elite and others in lower 48 are the constituency for maintaining vast AK wilderness – they like to know that AK is there
- There is the potential to use biomass energy to provide basic needs of villages
- WUI pressures are concentrated around Anchorage and on the Kenai Peninsula

## Plains

- Community and urban forestry is a major focus
- Invasive species are a threat – salt cedar
- There can be high emotion/conflict because agriculture is the accepted land use
- Agroforestry is practiced – forests can be important tools on the farm
- Extension (education, landowner outreach) is important
- Ecosystem services provided by forests are the basis for urban forestry that has made plains habitable

## P/NW

- Ownership increasingly going to TIMOs and REITs, uncertain outcome
- Forestry means diversifying portfolio to get the most economic value from the forests – consider other values to avoid conversion to non-forest use
- "Anchor forests" should be the priority for conservation and sustainable management
- Technology/saw mills are driving supply – they are often built for smaller tree diameters and larger diameter trees/logs lack a place to be milled
- Discussion of how to monetize ecosystem services
- Already a lot of planning and collaborative work has been done to look at threats/solutions to private forests – they should inform report

**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 30<sup>th</sup> 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 – 30<sup>th</sup> 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 30<sup>th</sup> 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 – 30<sup>th</sup> 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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone</b>
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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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, to 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

**Western Forestry Leadership Coalition**  
**Threats to Private Western Forests**  
**Drafting Committee Meeting Three**  
November 18-19, 2009

**Location:** Marriot City Center – 1701 California St – Denver CO  
**Meeting Room:** Colorado G-H

**Objectives:**

- Review most recent draft and give comments
- Bring clarity to the drivers section
- Consider reorganization to make intro much smaller
- Communication plan review and action items
- Review the process from here to final draft

**November 18, 2009**

---

**7:30 a.m.**                    ***Breakfast***

**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

**9:10 a.m.**                    **Comments from the WFLC Executive Board**

A draft of the report was shared with the Executive Board. The DC will consider the comments and changes suggested by WFLC so that the report can be as effective as possible with its core audience. DC members will be given an opportunity to consider the implications of the comments and what actions/if any are necessary.

**10:10 a.m.**                    ***Break***

**10:40 a.m.**                    **Drafting Committee Member Comments**

Comments from each DC member will be solicited. Now is your chance to make sure that the report meets your needs, says what it should say in the right way. Specific actions will be recorded for agenda planning and future steps.

**12:00 p.m.**                    ***Lunch – Members are on their own***

- 1:15 p.m.**                    **Actions to improve the report**  
Based on comments from the morning, the DC will break into subgroups to make the changes necessary to the report. The morning session will define the specifics of this part of the day.
- 3:30 p.m.**                    **WFLC Communication Plan**  
WFLC will review their plans for distributing and maximizing the impact of the report. This will include the additional/complimentary products that will be produced with and following the report. DC members are asked to actively engage so that this process can meet their expectations while also observing the constraints of WFLC and its membership.
- 4:30 p.m.**                    **Review of agenda for Day Two**
- 4:45 p.m.**                    **Adjourn**

*Dinner for working group members is being sponsored by the Western Governors' Association and Council of Western State Foresters. Please join us for drinks and dinner starting at 6:30 pm at Bistro Vendome – 1420 Larimer St – Denver CO.*

## **November 19, 2009**

---

- 7:30 a.m.**                    **Breakfast**
- 8:00 a.m.**                    **Review of Day One and agenda for the remainder of the meeting.**  
**8:30 a.m.**                    **Workshop Participant Comment and Finalization Process**  
The DC will review dates for the rest of the process, needed outputs, assignments and deadlines. The discussion will clarify when and how workshop participants will engage. The schedule will also review the last steps of the DC to sign on to the consensus report.
- 10:00 a.m.**                    **Break**
- 10:15 a.m.**                    **Additional Improvements**  
This time will be reserved for additional improvements or discussions that come up during the comments on Day 1.
- 11:00 a.m.**                    **Review of work plan, upcoming dates, and next steps**
- 11:30 a.m.**                    **Adjourn**

Threats to Western Private Forests

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone</b>
Mo Bookwalter	Northwest Connections	mo@northwestconnections.org	406.529.8386
Dana Coelho	Western Forestry Leadership Coalition	dcoelho@fs.fed.us	303-445-4364
Tom Jacobs	Mid America Regional Council	tjacobs@marc.org	816-474-4240
Brian Kernohan	Forest Capital Partners	bkernohan@forestcap.com	208-859-2364
Sara Leiman	Private Landowner	bsleiman@peak.org	541-847-5590
Don Motanic	Intertribal Timber Council	donmo@teleport.com	503-282-4296
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
Caitlyn Pollihan*	Western Forestry Leadership Coalition	c.pollihan@colostate.edu	303-445-4363
Will Putman	Tanana Chief's Conference	will.putman@tananachiefs.org	907-452-8251 x3373
Susan Rich	NM Forestry	susan.rich@state.nm.us	505-345-2080
Gregg Servheen	Idaho Fish and Game	gservheen@idfg.idaho.gov	208-287-2713
Will Singleton*	Facilitator	will@singletonstrategies.com	303-895-7570
Susan Stein	USFS, Cooperative Forestry	sstein@fs.fed.us	202-205-0837
Ann Walker	Western Governors Association	awalker@westgov.org	303 623-9378 x109
Rachel White*	PNW	rachelwhite@fs.fed.us	503-808-2082

## WFLC Threats to Western Private (Working) Forests Report Finalization Timeline

Friday, November 20	Will	Send out email with schedule and make calls to people who did not attend meeting
Saturday, November 21	Will and Dana	Send reformatted recommendations and “envision success” sections to the drafting committee to review during the November 24 conference call
Tuesday, November 24 <b>3 PM Mountain</b>	ALL DRAFTING COMMITTEE	Regularly scheduled conference call at 3 PM Mountain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of results of third DC meeting to make sure that those who missed are aware of how the sign-off process will work;</li> <li>Review recommendations for final approval</li> </ul>
Monday, November 30	Rachel, Dana and the Rapid Responders	A revised draft of the whole report is sent to the drafting committee. DC members will have a very short period to review the report. <u>We ask that all block off time on Tuesday morning to review the report.</u>
Tue, December 1: <b>2 PM Mountain</b>	ALL DRAFTING COMMITTEE	Written concerns are due to be sent to Dana Coelho – This should be: issues you cannot live with in the report.
Tue, December 1: <b>3 PM Mountain</b>	ALL DRAFTING COMMITTEE	Conference call to give final sign off on the report. The call will cover: Can you live with the report? If not, why and how can it be fixed?
<b>COB</b> Tue, December 1	WFLC	Report moves forward without objection
Wed, December 2	WFLC	Report is sent as “pre-work” for review by WFLC Executive Board
Wed, December 2	WFLC & DC	If necessary, DC members can share the draft with their constituencies to make sure that sign-on is cleared
December 14 – 16	WFLC	WFLC Membership is updated and gets to discuss report
December 16	WFLC Executive Board	WFLC Executive Board considers adoption of the report
Early January 2010	WFLC	Formatted PDF version of the report is sent to the Drafting Committee for their sign-on as authors
Early January 2010	ALL DRAFTING COMMITTEE	Drafting Committee members sign on to report at their discretion
January 2010	WFLC	WFLC sends PDF version with Drafting Committee sign on to work shop participants for their sign on
Tuesday, January 12 <b>3 PM Mountain</b>	ALL DRAFTING COMMITTEE	Conference call to discuss additional products and next steps.
Mid-January 2010	Workshop Participants	Deadline for participant sign on
Late January 2010	WFLC	Final report is printed

**WFLC Threats to Western Private Forests  
Super-Brief Drafting Committee Meeting Summary  
November 18-19, 2009**

**Attendees:**

Ann Walker*	Brian Kernohan*	Dana Coelho	Don Motanic
Gregg Servheen	Jim Paul*	John Perez-Garcia	Mo Bookwalter
Susan Rich	Susan Stein	Tom Jacobs	Will Putman
Sara Leiman	Rachel White		
Caitlyn Pollihan	Will Singleton – Facilitator		<i>*Day One Only</i>

**Objectives:**

- Review Executive Board comments and give DC comments to 10/30 draft
- Bring clarity to the drivers section
- Consider reorganization to make report briefer and better
- Review draft communications plan
- Develop timeline for final production of report

**Rapid Responders:** These individuals agreed to be on call for quick response and review of specific sections between 11-19 and 11-30.

Threats/Drivers Section: Brian Kernohan & John Perez-Garcia

Executive Summary: Susan Rich

**Changes to the Report:** Drawing from the comments of the Drafting Committee and the WFLC Executive Board, break out groups revised recommendations and advised Rachel White and Dana Coelho on how the report should be improved/revised. The breakout groups covered four major strategies for improving the paper:

- Shorten and revise the drivers section: edit and clarify the central conclusions
- Clarify and integrate the term and concept of “working forest”
- Shorten and tighten the entire report
- Identify and highlight 4 – 5 key messages

“Instructions” on how to achieve these objectives were conveyed, discussed, and then given to Rachel and Dana to be integrated into the report. Changes were also noted during the discussion by Rachel and Dana. They expressed comfort with their ability to change the report as discussed and the drafting committee expressed their confidence in Dana and Rachel and their gratitude for all the work that is entailed.

Some additional changes/improvements– (others may have been noted by Rachel and Dana):

- Reformat the recommendations to reflect an awareness of the “actor” and the actor’s capabilities. (ie WFLC members should, WFLC staff should, WFLC should encourage XXXX to)
- Verbs should be added to the headings of the recommendations

- Headings of recommendations should be put into the Executive Summary with some supporting language
- Increase ease of navigation
- Unify use of terminology
- Include more on types of land owners and include pie charts in the Intro
- Create a definitions side-bar
- Vastly improve diagrams or discard
- Include narrative on the charge of the Drafting Committee, its actions, and the larger TWPF process

Word edits, track changes, and written comments on the 10/30 draft should be sent to Dana as soon as possible. The specific changes may no longer be valid because of the expected significant revisions to the report.

**Draft Communications Plan:** WFLC distributed and discussed their proposed communications plan. The plan will be augmented as the report is finalized. WFLC staff expect to incorporate next steps to implement the report in its 2010 work plan. The DC drew the distinction between the audience for the report (WFLC Membership) and for other products. Other products would be simplified and targeted. A conference call was scheduled for January 12, 2010 at 3:00 PM Mountain to discuss next steps and a communications strategy inclusive of WFLC and partner roles.