

Communities and Forests

The newsletter of the Communities Committee of the Seventh American Forest Congress

Volume 1, Number 1

Fall 1997

Sharing the vision

Welcome to the premier issue of *Communities and Forests*, the newsletter of the Communities Committee of the Seventh American Forest Congress. This newsletter was created to link Communities Committee members and provide a forum where Committee members and others working for local natural resource stewardship can discuss common issues, help each other identify resources, and develop a national voice for community forestry.

The Communities Committee is a diverse group of approximately 200 people who believe local stewardship of natural resources is critical to both forest ecosystem health and community well-being. We are urban foresters, environmental activists, private forest landowners, civil servants, timber workers, professional foresters, forest industry representatives, academics, and researchers. Committee members also are diverse and geographically dispersed, living and working in communities from Puerto Rico to Alaska.

This unusual collection of people came together at the Seventh American Forest Congress, a 1996 gathering of over 1,500 Americans convened to set the direction for forestry in the next twenty years. Unlike all previous forest congresses, this one was attended by

continued on page 8



Senator Larry Craig (R-ID) and Jack Shipley, Chair of the North Applegate Watershed Protection Association, sport the Applegate Partnership's "No They" buttons at the May 22 workshop on community forestry. Article on page 2.

Making our mark in Washington, DC

Although it's not yet a household name, the Communities Committee's influences are being felt in Washington, D.C., where Committee members are working with Congress, national land management agencies, and national interest groups to raise awareness of and dispel myths about community-based resource stewardship.

The Committee's first major national events were held in November 1996, when Gerry Gray and Maia Enzer of American Forests organized a series of "talking sessions" on community-based forestry. The talking sessions were attended by Congressional staffers, federal and state agency officials, national environmental groups, and private forest and forest industry representatives.

In presentations to these groups, Committee Chair Lynn Jungwirth (Watershed Research and Training Center) and steering committee members Jonathan Kusel (Forest Community Research) and Leah Wills (Plumas Corporation) stressed four factors they deemed critical to community forestry: an open, inclusive, and transparent decision-making process; stewardship, a reciprocal relationship between communities and forests; reinvestment, to help restore and maintain the capacity of both natural and social systems; and accountability and learning achieved through an all-party monitoring system.

In January of this year, Lynn Jungwirth and Committee member Mary Mitsos (Pinchot Institute for Conservation) were named to the Forest Service Chief's

continued on page 2

Contents

National policy	1, 2
Committee briefs	3
Member profile	4
Community conversations	5
Resources	6, 7

Mark, continued from page 1.

Collaborative Stewardship Team, which has submitted recommendations to Chief Dombeck.

Also in January, Senator Craig (R-ID) asked the Communities Committee for comments on his proposed public lands bill. The steering committee responded that the Communities Committee had adopted a policy of not commenting on specific legislation, but offered to hold a workshop on community forestry for the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which Craig chairs. This workshop was held in May 1997 (see article below).

In June, the Communities Committee was again asked for feedback on legislation, this time the proposed Quincy Library Group legislation, a bill that would require the Forest Service to follow the QLG's land management prescriptions on the Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in California. The QLG reportedly submitted this legislation in frustration after the Forest Service refused to consider its recommendations. The Communities Committee's Executive Committee responded with a letter reiterating its policy of not commenting on area-specific legislation but also wrote. "Community-based approaches to public land management merit Congress' active support, whether they are done legislatively or administratively." The letter also summarized some of the concepts of community-based forestry.

Teaching the legislators

In an unprecedented educational workshop on May 22, the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee sat down with community and interest-group representatives to talk and learn about community-based forestry. At the request of Senator Larry Craig (R-ID), Chair of the subcommittee, the Communities Committee helped organize a workshop strikingly more interactive than traditional Congressional hearings.

In addition to Senator Craig and Congressional staff, workshop participants included six members of the Communities Committee, a grassroots activist from Plumas County, California, and representatives of the Timber Producers Association of Michigan and Wisconsin, the California Nevada office of the Wilderness Society, the American Farm Bureau, and the Pilchuck Audubon Society. Observers sitting beyond the immediate roundtable were also given an opportunity to speak and ask questions.

The Communities Committee panelists were: Lynn Jungwirth (Watershed Research and Training Center); Jonathan Kusel (Forest Community Research); Carol Daly (Flathead Economic Center); Wendy Hinrichs-Sanders (Lake States Forestry Alliance); Dan'l Markham (Willipa Alliance); and Jack Shipley (North Applegate Watershed Protection Association). These panelists emphasized the themes of stewardship, open process, reinvestment, and all-party monitoring. They stressed the interdependence of economic, ecological, and social needs, both local and national. They also pointed out that there are no cookbook community forestry prescriptions, as management solutions are unique to specific communities and specific ecosystems.

"Community-based forestry is not about subverting environmental laws. community forestry is about a meaningful role for a local voice, local knowledge, local experience in a decision-making process about natural resources. It is not about local control."

The other panelists expressed interest in community-based approaches, tempered by some concerns. They discussed examples of community-based conservation that they felt had caused problems, and identified risks associated with community-based approaches. Louis Blumberg of the Wilderness Society called community-based land management "an untested and risky model of decision-making" that could cause resource damage. Neil Dion, referring specifically to the Quincy Library Group in Plumas County, California, expressed a concern that "local consensus groups, especially in small communities, are essentially controlled by the political strength of a few well-placed individuals." Dion is an environmental activist in Plumas County.

Overall, however, the interest group representatives agreed collaborative groups are an excellent means of keeping valuable knowledge in the community, and through collaborative efforts people can learn to have more respect for each other and can build trust. They also stressed that community involvement should be about making valuable input, not about having control; community efforts should not subvert environmental laws; and goals should be honestly and clearly stated.

The interest group's concerns are consistent with Communities Committee tenets. As Lynn Jungwirth noted, "community-based forestry is not about subverting environmental laws. Community forestry is about a meaningful role for a local voice, local knowledge, local experience in a decision-making process about natural resources. It is not about local control."

Senator Craig asked several questions that led to discussion among the participants, including: How can scientific information be incorporated into community-based approaches? What attempts are being made to integrate community-based interests with national interests, and have these been successful? and, How can federal land management agencies better incorporate local, community-based interests into their decision-making processes?

Several panelists suggested that education, flexibility, and maintaining an accessible, inclusive decision-making process were ways to incorporate science into community-based forestry. Community representatives suggested that all-party monitoring of resource management may be the most practical way to incorporate the interests of national groups in community-based forestry. Getting agencies to involve local

continued on page 8

Committee Briefs

Research

How are community well-being and ecosystem health linked? How have other communities implemented community forestry projects and programs? What are the needs and concerns of different communities living in and around forests? These are some of the questions Communities Committee members have asked, and in May 1996 the research and information subcommittee was tasked with finding some answers.

Ann Moote (Water Resources Research Center) and subcommittee chair Jonathan Kusel (Forest Community Research), surveyed community forestry projects across the country. They found examples in rural areas, in towns, in inner cities, and on Native American reservations. Some involved industry; many involved state or federal land management agencies. All involved local residents who work and live in and around forests.

The subcommittee selected 16 diverse cases for further research and documentation. Case study research began in 1997 with site visits and interviews. For each case, researchers are identifying methods and tools used and community members' evaluations of their effectiveness. They are also documenting the importance of community-forest relationships. The collection of case studies will be available in 1998.

Urban-rural linkages

The subcommittee on urban-rural linkages is exploring the similarities and differences between rural and urban community forestry. At the November 1996 steering committee meeting in Baltimore, members toured urban forestry sites, learned about environmental justice issues in urban communities, and engaged in a roundtable comparing community forestry in rural and urban settings.

To their surprise, urban and rural

community foresters have found they have much in common. Both urban and rural communities are concerned with issues of community building, forest stewardship, and helping youth make connections to the land. Rural and urban foresters alike struggle to understand storm water runoff and micro-climates, and to identify ways to make forestry work for the community. And in both urban and rural areas, the community forester is just as likely to be a concerned citizen working on his or her own time as a paid professional.

Led by Communities Committee Chair Lynn Jungwirth and Sandra Hill, Washington D.C. State Forester, the urban-rural linkages subcommittee presents a "united front" for community foresters. So far this year they have written op-ed articles for newspapers and forestry newsletters and presented their shared concerns to Congressional representatives, in September, Lynn Jungwirth and Genni Cross (California Releaf/The Trust for Public Lands) are making a joint presentation on urban-rural community forestry linkages at the 8th National Urban Forestry Congress in Atlanta.

Executive committee

At its May meeting in Savannah, Georgia, the Steering Committee selected a seven-person Executive Committee to respond to issues that arise between steering committee meetings and develop an operating structure for the Communities Committee.

In one of its first actions, the executive committee responded to Senator Craig's request for a letter stating the Community Committee's position on the Quincy Library Group Bill (*see Making our*

mark, page 2). The executive committee is also working to expand the diversity of the steering committee. Committee members' input is encouraged; please send comments to Lynn Jungwirth at Box 356, Hayfork, CA 96041.

Executive committee members are: Carol Daly (Flathead Economic Center), Maia Enzer (American Forests), Sandra Hill (Government of the District of Columbia), Lynn Jungwirth (Watershed Research and Training Center), Jonathan Kusel (Forest Community Research), Mary Mitsos (Pinchot Institute for Conservation), and Betsy Rieke (Natural Resources Law Center).

Communications

Want to know more? The communications subcommittee, working closely with the Forest Policy Center at American Forests, collects and distributes news articles, announcements, and national policy updates on topics related to community forestry. To receive this information via e-mail, send a request to Maia Enzer at menzer@amfor.org.

This fall, additional information will be posted on the Communities Committee World Wide Web site (<http://www.tcoe.trinity.k12.ca.us/wsc/wafccc.html>). You can also check in with other Communities Committee members on our new e-mail discussion list! See "*Stay in the loop*" on page 8 for subscription information.

Communities and Forests is published by the Watershed Research and Training Center for the Communities Committee of the Seventh American Forest Congress. The purpose of the Communities Committee is to focus attention on the interdependence between America's forests and the vitality of urban and rural communities. Subscriptions are available free upon request.

Contributors:

Christine Cain

Maia Enzer

Mary Tess 'O Sullivan

Ann Moote, Editor

Lynn Jungwirth, Committee Chair

Communities and Forests

Communities Committee of the

Seventh American Forest Congress

Box 356, Hayfork CA 96041

530-628-4206 (phone), 530-628-5100 (fax)

Member Profile

Rosemary Romero

I am a Partner and President of Western Network, a non-profit organization based in Santa Fe, New Mexico. We assist individuals, agencies, and communities in resolving disputes, making decisions, and planning for the future. Our tools include facilitation, mediation, strategic planning, community visioning, leadership development, and publications. Most of my work is in the western United States and involves people from multiple cultures wrestling with natural resource issues.

Often in the public involvement work I do, people want to know who I am, who I work for, and where I am from. These are important questions, because people want their facilitator or mediator to understand what they are saying and reframe it in a way that does not take away from them or dilute their point, but helps clarify the issue.

I am a native Santa Fean, and though I have lived in the same Santa Fe neighborhood my entire life. I also spent every weekend, summer, and holiday of my childhood on my family's ranch near San Ildefonso. Our ranch was surrounded by pueblo land and access required that we respect the protocol of our pueblo neighbors, and we were never denied their help. I feel grounded in my northern New Mexico community and my role as a bicultural person who can understand the issues and concerns of indigenous people because of my experiences.

I know that community doesn't happen without two critical elements, time and energy, so I try to donate time to community mediation programs and serve on the boards of local organizations. The time and energy I give comes back to me in the form of a better community. As a San Ildefonso friend once said to me, "when you are invited to come share in a feast day, it's not just to eat food. You are invited to bring your breath of life, which helps create more life and more breath." So sharing of yourself is a breath of life for you and others. This to me is what community is about.

Because of my understanding of indigenous issues, a good portion of my work is helping agencies in public involvement processes. Often Hispanic communities don't participate in the dominant culture's types of public involvement, and my role is to try to figure out ways to bring people of diverse opinions into public policy processes. If some are not comfortable speaking out or sharing their opinions, then we need to think of ways to involve those people that are appropriate for them.

One process I developed and use in forestry cases is Community Resource Mapping. The CRM process utilizes several steps, including assessing the community's potential for collaboration, surveys, interviews, visioning, and eventually mapping people's uses of the forest adjacent to a community. The mapping allows people to see how the whole community is using an area and where there are potentials for conflict. Mapping by seasons is important because people's forest uses change seasonally. For example, in the fall someone may be picking piñon, a local nut used for eating, and this may conflict with

another use, such as birding. I use mediation as a means to get people to work through these conflicts.

The mapping gives a voice to communities that don't normally participate in Forest Service meetings or other agency public involvement processes. I have developed a memorandum of agreement with the regional Forest Service office that says they will incorporate much of the mapping into the 10 year management plans that are currently being revised.

In August, Rosemary Romero was awarded the Al Gore Hammer Award for her work improving the conversation between the Forest Service and communities.



Western Network was encouraged to organize a New Mexico roundtable prior to the Seventh American Forest Congress because of our reputation as a neutral organization. The roundtable happened to be scheduled at a critical time—two environmentalists had just been hanged in effigy over logging injunctions and emotions were running high. Not only had the injunctions prevented logging, they had barred communities from gathering wood for heating homes and cooking. Many people saw the roundtable as a potential means to talk with each other and to their credit, many showed up.

It was truly one of the most diverse roundtables initiated by the Congress. About sixty people were in attendance, including loggers, environmentalists, Native Americans, writers, Forest Service and other agency representatives, and community members interested in forestry issues. I think people came away hopeful that we could continue these kinds of conversations in the future in order to resolve the conflicts.

At the national Congress, participants were asked to join committees in order to further the work of the Congress. To me, the Communities Committee had the most potential and was where I could best contribute my skills, as it seemed one of its missions was to create dialogue with grassroots communities.

This is the Communities Committee's challenge—finding a way to reach out to other communities and bring their voices into the national dialogue. It is very difficult to translate a local community perspective into national policy and not have its meaning lost in the process. In this, the Committee is challenged with the same struggle with representative democracy as our nation—how to get the local perspective into the national arena. What makes sense to me is to solidify local community perspectives as much as possible and build from that.

Community Conversations

Members' news and views

In telephone conversations last March, April, and May, Communities Committee members gave the steering committee feedback on community forestry issues they are grappling with, and on the Committee's progress to date and the direction it should be taking in the future. Approximately 65 members discussed their perspectives and concerns in telephone conversations with steering committee members. Their comments are summarized in this issue's Community Conversations.

Common concerns

Topping the list of concerns from every region of the country was a need for more education, information, and tools for community forestry. Community foresters want tangible, real-world models they can follow, better access to technical and scientific information, and technical assistance for people doing hands-on work. Committee members are concerned that citizens, particularly landowners, don't know what their forest management options are and don't know where to find out. They are also wondering how to motivate people to *want* to know more about forestry alternatives.

Economic issues are also a major concern for Committee members. Communities around the country are asking how they can diversify their economies to become less dependent on traditional timber production, how to keep forest capital in the community, and how to address economic downturns due to the decline in traditional forestry. In particular, they want help on stewardship contracting, marketing green products, and dealing with tax laws that favor timber harvest over other management options.

Improving communication and collaboration among diverse forest interests is another common need echoing around the country. Communities Committee members want more open and streamlined communication with government agencies, improved communication between urban and rural communities, and more minority involvement in forestry. Several members mentioned a desire for more networking among community foresters.

Regional issues

Some of the issues raised by Committee members were unique to their region of the country. For instance, in Alaska there is much divisiveness between environmentalists and foresters over appropriate management responses to a devastating spruce bark beetle infestation. In the Pacific Northwest, committee members are struggling with salmon and anadromous fish recovery. Members from this region are also wondering how to achieve forest sustainability and "real" forest stewardship, and how to make forest restoration work pay.

Committee members in the Southwest are seeking to diversify their economies by identifying markets for small-diameter trees and juniper. They are also very aware of the need to include diverse cultures and interests, such as indigenous cultures and recreationists, in dialogues about forest management.

In the South, a major concern is the recent preponderance of chip mills. These mills are typically owned by people from outside of the communities they operate in who encourage clear-cutting of nonindustrial private forest lands and take raw resources out of the communities.

Many committee members in the Midwest, Northeast, and MidAtlantic are from urban areas, and they stressed the need to teach urban people about their ecosystems and infuse these concepts into land use planning. They also see a need to teach both urban and rural people about their interdependencies, and to address environmental justice issues.

Committee purpose and direction

Overall, members like the direction and activities of the Communities Committee to date. Those who had read them felt the Communities Committee's draft mission, ethos, and vision statements represented their values and concerns. Members were virtually unanimous in their suggestions for improving the Communities Committee: they want networking, peer learning opportunities, and a voice on policy issues.

Most Committee members want the Communities Committee to help make information and tools more widely accessible. Specifically, the Communities Committee could produce concept papers on specific issues, serve as a clearinghouse or lending library, and offer direct technical assistance to communities and individuals.

Committee members criticized the steering committee for its lack of communication to date. They suggested the Communities Committee develop and support networking forums, such as coalitions, a member database, and a newsletter. They thought communication among Committee members could be improved by developing an e-mail network or listserv, and by posting information on the Communities Committee World Wide Web page. Some committee members would also like the Committee as a whole to provide a structure for regional meetings.

Lobbying was a third way Committee members thought the Communities Committee could help them, "bringing our voices to the front of national policy." Many members were pleased with the Committee's activities at the national level.

This page is devoted to dialogue among Communities Committee members and reports from regional meetings. Members are invited to offer their perspectives or raise questions on issues facing communities and forests today. Send your comments to: Communities and Forests, Communities Committee of the Seventh American Forest Congress, Box 356, Hayfork, CA 96041.

Resources

Communities and Forests will update you on Communities Committee activities, but what about other community forestry news and resources? There's plenty of information out there and much of it is free! Here are some of our favorite sources. Send us yours for future issues!

World Wide Web sites

Seventh American Forest Congress.

Many Voices - A common Vision. Looking for inspiration? This is the place to go to refresh your memory of the collective vision formed at the 1996 Seventh American Forest Congress and find out about follow-on activities occurring around the country. Frequently updated, this site includes the Congress newsletter covering committee activities and state and local news. (http://www.yale.edu/forest_congress/)

Community organizing & resource management tools.

Rogue Institute. It's not just for Oregonians—the Rogue Institute's Web site, like its newsletter, covers topics of interest to community foresters everywhere, including articles on green certification, stewardship contracting, non-timber forest products, watershed restoration, monitoring, community assessment, and collaborative planning. Lots of information on the Applegate Partnership. (<http://id.mind.net/~roguinst/>)

Partnership Handbook. Want to form a collaborative partnership, but don't know how? Here's a step-by-step guide to building a community-based conservation group. It covers forming and maintaining partnerships, group planning and decision-making, and ways to overcome common stumbling blocks. The reference section will tell you where to find related books and manuals, organizations, and agency programs, and links will take you to some available on the Web. (<http://ag.arizona.edu/partners>)

Sustainable Communities Network. When completed, this site will offer a wealth of practical information on topics like community organizing, building a sustainable economy, natural resource protection, and community governing. It already provides good case studies, links to related organizations and Web sites, and resource lists for some of these topics. (<http://www.sustainable.org/index.html>)

Conservation-based Development. Organized as an online magazine, this site is dedicated to balancing the needs of community, environment, and economy, with an environmental bent. You'll find interesting case studies of community-based conservation projects, resource materials, and guides. (<http://www.onenw.org/cbd1>)

Civic Practices Network. This extensive and extremely well-organized site has something for everyone. For the field worker, there are case studies, tools, and guidebooks on coalition building, community visioning, strategic planning, conflict resolution,

fundraising, social research, and more. More philosophical types will find brief synopses, insightful essays, and entire books on topics like communitarianism, discursive democracy, and civic society. Links to 50 affiliates, many with extensive Web pages of their own. (<http://www.cpn.org>)

Agency programs, grants, and information

State & Private Forestry - Cooperative Forestry. Reflective of this agency's schizophrenic nature, the USDA Forests Service State & Private Forestry site is not on the "official" Forest Service home page. Look here first for current, detailed information on grants and other agency programs for landowners and urban and community forestry, plus daily updates on Congressional activities. The members' directory provides links to professional, industry, and environmental forestry associations. You'll find links to other useful forestry sites as well. (<http://willow.ncfes.umn.edu/coop/coop.htm>)

EPA's Office of Sustainable Ecosystems and communities. OSEC is the home of EPA's Community Based Environmental Protection (CBEP) programs. These folks have put together an impressive compilation of basic science and "how-to" guides on ecosystem science, climate change, effective communication sustainable community indicators, developing economic and cultural profiles, nature-based tourism, green marketing, value-added processing, and brownfields. This agency's grant programs are also described here; the case studies will give you an idea of who gets them. Take a look at the CBEP and OSEC News Online newsletters for new funding opportunities, upcoming conferences and workshops, book reviews, and other current information relevant to community-based environmental activities. (<http://www.epa.gov/ecocommunity>)

Legislative news

Thomas. Want to know what that Quincy Library Group legislation really says? You'll find it here, along with all other legislation introduced by the 103d, 104th and 105th Congresses. You'll also find the Congressional Record, committee reports, and historical documents like the Federalist Papers and the Constitution, and can track down your Congressional representatives here. Very user-friendly—it's much simpler to use than any gov does or law library. (<http://Thomas.loc.gov/>)

Bibliographies

Urban and Community Forestry Materials Guide. Skip the library search—this site lists just about every information source on urban and community forestry, including bulletins and fact sheets, newsletters, journals, reference books, audio visual aids, computer software, and more. No links to other Web sites, unfortunately. (<http://www.ag.uiuc.edu/~forestry/guide/index.html>)

Newspapers and magazines

Chronicle of community. Communities Committee members will love this triquarterly magazine, which features detailed case studies, philosophical discussions on the meaning of community, and commentary on community-based activities in the western U.S. Recent contributors have included Communities Committee members Betsy Rieke (Natural Resources Law Center) and Thomas Brendler (National Network of Forest Practitioners). \$24/individuals, \$33/institutions from Northern Lights Research and Education Institute, P.O. Box 8291, Missoula, MT 59807-8219, 406-721-7415, email: SBVMontana@aol.com.

High Country News. This popular biweekly covers a range of natural resource issues in the American West, from an environmental perspective. Good coverage of state and national policy developments, including communities' struggles to manage resources for multiple interests. Free on the World Wide Web at <http://www.hcn.org> or \$28/individuals and public libraries, \$38/institutions, from High Country Foundation, Box 1090, Paonia, CO 81428, 800-905-1155.

American Forests. A monthly magazine directed at foresters and environmentalists, *American Forests* frequently features articles on collaborative resource stewardship, urban forestry, and related topics. \$30/year or \$3/issue from American Forests, PU Box 2000, Washington, DC 20013, 202-955-4500.

Special edition: the November 1997 issue of American Forests magazine is devoted exclusively to community forestry!

Books, reports, and manuals

Watershed Partnership Guides. These are an excellent series of short (6 to 14 page) guides on building local partnerships, leadership and communication, creating a watershed database, conflict management, and putting together a watershed management plan. Free on the World Wide Web at <http://www.citic.purdue.edu/Catalog/WatershedManagement.html>, or \$2 each from the Conservation Technology Information Center, 1220 Potter Drive, Room 170, West Lafayette, IN 47906, 317-494-9555.

Building Effective Partnerships for City Trees. Another outstanding resource on building collaborative partnerships, this handbook includes guidelines for working with and through municipal government to affect public policy as well as sections on assessing the urban ecosystem, designing meetings, facilitation, conflict resolution, and planning. \$10 from the Citizen Forestry Support System, P.O. Box 2000, Washington, DC 20013, 800-323-1560.

Pulling Together: A Land Use and Development Consensus Building Manual. Originally written for local government officials, *Pulling Together* is ideal for anyone struggling to improve

participation and communication in planning, design a decision-making process, manage conflicts, improve meetings, and implement collaborative plans. This lengthy manual includes case studies and sample materials. \$30 from the Program for Community Problem Solving, 915 Street, NW, Suite 601, Washington, DC 20005, 202-783-2961.

Seventh American Forest Congress publications

Many Voices... A Common Vision. This periodic newsletter provides brief activity updates on the six committees (Education, Legacy, Policy, Research, Management, and Communities) working to carry forward the vision developed at the 1996 Forest Congress. News of activities at the state level—such as state forestry roundtables and forest committees—is also covered. If you're not already getting this, you should be! It's free from the Forest Congress Information Center, 205 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06511, 203-432-5117 and at http://www.cis.yale.edu/forest_congress.

Seventh American Forest Congress Final Report. If you weren't there and want to know what all the hype is about, this report will clue you in. It describes how and why the Congress was developed, the roundtable process used to foster discussion, development of the collective vision, and what exactly is contained in that vision. Available free from the Office of the Seventh American Forest Congress, 205 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06511, 203-432-5117, and on the World Wide Web at http://www.cis.yale.edu/forest_congress.

Increasing Our Knowledge of America's Forests. Just out—the draft Summary Report of the Research Committee of the Seventh American Forest Congress. Communities Committee members will be particularly interested in its focus on cooperation and relationship-building among forest researchers, those who use the information researchers develop, and all other forest stakeholders. The Research Committee also calls for creation of independent, non-profit research councils made up of scientists and client representatives. The research councils would be responsible for monitoring the quality of science, setting an applied research agenda, and advocating increased funding for forest research. Free from the Forest Congress Research Committee, 320 Bray Hall, SUNY/ESF, One Forestry Drive, Syracuse, NY 13210, 315-470-6534.

Forthcoming

General Report and Handbook. In addition to the Summary Report described above, the Research Committee is planning a *General Report* that will expand on its ten recommendations for forest research. As a first step toward engaging forest stakeholders in forest research, the Research Committee is also developing a *Handbook* to guide roundtables and collaborative groups in four to eight hour dialogues about the recommendations. The *Handbook* and *General Report* will be distributed to all state and local forest roundtables and "key producer and user groups, such as the natural resource management agencies, industry, small woodland owners, and environmental organizations."

Vision, continued from page 1

grassroots Americans who spoke on behalf of the people who live and work in forests.

Local communities typically have little say in management decisions made for the public and industrial forests they live and work in. As a result, they all too often see their natural resource base and profits made from its development exported to the federal treasury or large industries based elsewhere. Similarly, local communities tend to find their voices drowned out in the debates among federal agencies and national interest groups over the best ways to manage forests for the future.

At the same time, repercussions from a lack of adequate resource stewardship are borne primarily by local communities. In both urban and rural areas, local communities are often left to deal with the residual waste remaining after government or industries have depleted the resource base. These abandoned industrial sites and vacant lots are known as "brownfields." Watershed restoration and brownfield clean-up are tasks often left to locals, who usually lack the resources to deal with them.

The Communities Committee is working to address these and other issues facing rural and urban communities who want more input to local resource management, by sharing our vision of local resource stewardship with the media, policymakers, and each other. You can get involved by contributing to this newsletter and by joining the dialogue on our new e-mail discussion list. We also encourage you to share your copy of this newsletter with friends and colleagues.

Teaching, continued from page 2

people earlier and share information more openly was said to be essential to federal decision-making processes.

Senator Craig also asked for opinions on the Forest Service policy of rotating district rangers every few years, to keep them from developing a bias toward the community. Workshop participants agreed this policy is very disruptive, and leads to loss of valuable indigenous knowledge, trust, and Forest Service credibility with communities.

In closing, Senator Craig asked, "What would you do legislatively to further community-based efforts?" Responses included: make the Forest Service more accountable for its actions; involve the public earlier; make legislation flexible and adaptive, not rigid and over-arching; and make sure legislation is based in good science. Ms. Jungwirth made the point that communities may not know what would make good legislation, and that is why it is crucial for local groups, national groups, and the government all to work together.

Stay in the loop!

To be added to the mailing list for this newsletter, contact Mary Tess O'Sullivan at the address below or at 916-628-4206. To join the Communities Committee's listserv (e-mail discussion list), send an e-mail message to Majordomo@ag.arizona.edu. Leave the subject line blank, and in the body of your message write: subscribe community.

Mission Statement

The purpose of the Communities Committee is to focus attention on the interdependence between America's forests and the vitality of rural and urban communities and to promote: improvements in political and economic structures to ensure local community well-being and the long-term sustainability of forested ecosystems; an increasing stewardship role of local communities in the maintenance and restoration of ecosystem integrity and biodiversity; participation by ethnically and socially diverse members of urban and rural communities in decision making and sharing benefits of forests; the innovation and use of collaborative processes, tools, and technologies; and recognition of rights and responsibilities of diverse forest landowners.

Communities and Forests
Communities Committee of the
Seventh American Forest Congress
PO Box 356
Hayfork, CA 96041