INTRODUCTION - CARL WILMSEN

In every obstacle there is opportunity. To every opportunity there are limits. Beth Rose Middleton’s and David Correia’s columns in this issue of Regeneration! illustrate these statements well. Both authors write of historically disenfranchised groups, Mountain Maidu people of California and Hispano people of mountain communities in northern New Mexico, who are trying to participate more meaningfully in natural resource management as a means of maintaining their cultures and lifeways.

As Middleton explains, the Mountain Maidu have an opportunity to regain management authority over lands that belonged to their ancestors through the process by which Pacific Gas and Electric Company is divesting some of its lands in the Sierra Nevada mountains. A consortium of Maidu groups has submitted a management plan, but they must overcome notions of their lifeways, cultures, and environmental management traditions being things of the past, as well as fears that, if given the opportunity, they would engage in undesirable land uses (i.e. build a casino).

The opportunity open to Hispano residents of the El Rito area was to collaborate with Forest Service scientists in an ecological study of grazing allotments on adjacent national forest lands – lands which were historically under the jurisdiction of their communities. Their request for a participatory research project, Correia relates, was denied, however, because Forest Service officials feared that their self-interest in grazing would render the results of the study suspect. The limits of graduate student research came into play as well, as Correia had to leave the area to accept an academic job in Maine. He regrets not having created a project continuation plan with the community.

Middleton’s and Correia’s case studies both show that the questioning of a group’s motives and environmental legitimacy is a potent tool for reinforcing existing relationships of power, but that the group’s themselves have tools for continually making progress toward self-determination.
Growing up as a person of color in rural northern California, and then going to college in the University of California system, I became very concerned about the disconnect between contemporary Native peoples’ efforts to gain access to and a voice in land management, and land managers’ general perception of Native people as a community of the past, with neither rights to nor knowledge of natural resources. My dissertation research is focused on Mountain Maidu resource management initiatives in the northeastern Sierra Nevada.

Highlighting the Maidu Summit response to the Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) land divestiture process, this article shows how easy it is for natural resource managers to ignore historic disenfranchisement and limit Native people’s role to consultation on cultural resources, rather than seeing Native people as natural contemporary partners in land management. The Summit offers an example of an inclusive effort (composed of federally recognized and unrecognized Maidu people) to assert a claim to these lands.

Lands and Lakes
Plumas County is characterized by large mountain valleys and steep, forested canyons that have been and continue to be stewarded by Mountain Maidu. Prior to European contact, Big Meadows was home to at least nine distinct Maidu villages. In 1900, Big Meadows was still 25,000 acres of meadow and timber, irrigated by numerous springs and creeks and crossed by the north fork of the Feather River. Leaving Big Meadows, the river dropped 4,350 feet in 74 miles down a canyon into Oroville. Three metropolitan investors and a young engineer saw opportunities for power development, and announced plans for hydroelectric facilities in Big Meadows, Butt Valley, and Humbug Valley in 1901. In 1902 they formed Great Western Power Company, which became part of PG&E in 1930. Big Meadows was already under the ownership of private ranchers and Maidu allottees, so they had to first acquire the lands.

Beginning in 1887, under the General Allotment, or Dawes Act, Mountain Maidu were receiving Indian allotments, or 160-acre parcels that were meant to introduce and encourage private property ownership and agricultural enterprise. The Bureau of Indian Affairs granted trust patents to allottees, restricting sale of allotments for 25 years, unless the Indian owner was deemed “competent” by the Indian Agent to sell before that time. Although one objective of this trust patent policy was to protect Indian landowners from being coerced into selling their parcels to land speculators, the Indian Agent had the authority to sell the allotment lands on behalf of the allottees, and he sold the majority of the allotments in Big Meadows, Mountain Meadows, and Humbug Valley to power and lumber companies before the trust period expired. Federal and local statutes also protected large private interests like Great Western Power by authorizing condemnation for power site development. Under the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat., 1083), Great Western Power initiated condemnation proceedings in Plumas County Superior Court in 1902, and acquired title to Indian allotment lands in the project area. By fall of 1903, Great Western Power workers were already
clearing sites and digging tunnels.

As early as 1922, total gross revenues to Great Western Power Company were $7.2 million, with the majority coming from electric energy generation and sales. The Maidu occupants of Big Meadows, Butt Valley and the Feather River Canyon saw none of this revenue, and instead suffer ongoing displacement, depletion and elimination of plant, riparian, and other resources, and mass destruction of cultural sites.

**Pacific Gas and Electric Company**

PG&E is one of California’s largest landowners, with an influential history of resource development in the Sierra Nevada foothills. According to Nicholas Valey’s 1986 History of the Feather River Canyon, PG&E’s hydroelectric generation system is “the world’s largest privately owned utility system,” and a PG&E timeline notes that the company owns 68 powerhouse and 174 dams throughout California. The majority of these facilities harness water flowing from the Sierra Nevada Mountains to generate electricity used in homes and business in the Central Valley and California’s coastal and southern metropolitan areas. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), a consumer advocate and watchdog over private telecommunications, utility, water, railroad, and public transportation companies, regulates PG&E.

In the late 1990s, California’s largest private utilities (PG&E and Southern California Edison) underwent utility de-regulation, divesting themselves of their power generating facilities and purchasing electricity wholesale. In a complex drama with players including out-of-state utility conglomerates such as Enron and Reliant Energy, de-regulation was unsuccessful, and PG&E and Southern California Edison were paying high prices for electricity that was not always available, and passing these rates on to citizen ratepayers.

In 1999, PG&E proposed selling 140,000 acres of land associated with their hydroelectric facilities to re-coup some of their lost revenue. PG&E filed for bankruptcy in 2001, and, as part of the 2003 settlement agreement with the CPUC, the 140,000 acres of land in question will be divested to private and public entities for conservation and public benefit purposes, under the oversight of the Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council. Originally named the PG&E Environmental Enhancement Corporation (EEC), the Council is charged with creating land management plans for these 140,000 acres, and transferring the lands to entities capable of implementation. Of this acreage, 38,094 acres are located in Plumas County (including Humbug Valley and land surrounding Lake Almanor/ Big Meadows).

**Who is Missing?**

According to the settlement agreement between the CPUC and PG&E, membership of the Stewardship Council governing board would include representatives from PG&E, the CPUC, the California Department of Fish and Game, the State Water Resources Control Board, the California Farm Bureau Federation, and three public members named by the CPUC. In response to comments on the structure of the Council, membership was augmented to include a representative from the California Resources Agency, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Association of California Water Agencies, the Regional Council of Rural Counties, the California Hydropower Reform Coalition, the Trust for Public Land, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates, the California Forestry Association, and a joint liaison from the federal Department of Agriculture- Forest Service and Department of Interior- Bureau of Land Management. According to the Settlement Agreement, “This board ensures that all of the key constituencies are represented in the development and implementation of the land conservation plan” (2003).

When the Council began meeting in 2004, there was no representation of Native American interests, and no talk of adding a Native representative. When the Council began holding public meetings around the state to develop the public benefit and conservation priorities for each parcel, Native attendees stood up...
and demanded to know why they had no voice on the board determining the fate of these lands, which encompass over 221 square miles in over 22 counties of Native Californian homelands. The Council responded by inviting Larry Myers of the Native American Heritage Commission to join the Board. In addition to adding Myers to the Council Board, the Council engaged in formal consultation with recognized tribes. However, in a November meeting with Maidu Summit representatives, Stewardship Council representatives emphasized that they wanted to divest the lands to consortia that “have already collaborated with each other and work together already.” The Council would not divest lands directly to federally recognized tribes for fear of future casino development. Rather, they preferred to work with consortia that could demonstrate the ability to manage for public and conservation goals. These priorities created an ideal place for the Maidu Summit to emerge and apply for lands.

The Maidu Summit
The Maidu Summit was initiated in 2003 in response to increased national homeland security following September 11, 2001. Noting the need for Maidu homeland security, the Maidu Cultural and Development Group (MCDG) and Susanville Rancheria convened a Summit of 11 Maidu groups, including non-profit organizations, unincorporated community groups, federally recognized rancherias, and petitioning aboriginal tribal governments. Members are Big Meadows Cultural Preservation Group, Greenville Rancheria, Plumas County Indians Inc., Roundhouse Council Indian Education Center, Maiduk Weye, Stivers Indian Cemetery Association, Susanville Rancheria, Tasmam Koyom Cultural Foundation, Tsi’Akim Maidu, United Maidu Nation, and the MCDG. The Summit is governed by consensus, and coordinated by MCDG staff Lorena Gorbet.

The Summit responds to activities of federal and private landowners that threaten Maidu sites. At issue is the ability of a federally unrecognized tribe (Mountain Maidu), with neither a centralized governing body nor a common land base, to protect, perpetuate, and enhance culturally important natural resources, as well as the unique Maidu knowledge that is linked to the traditional use and management of these resources. The Summit links active, contemporary cultural preservation with resource management, as members convene against the odds of attempted genocide to re-assert their ties to place, culture, and one another.

Since its formation, the Summit created a 10-point resolution to protect Homer Lake, a site used for training Indian doctors. The resolution called for the Lassen National Forest to block vehicular access to the site, and, in 2005, the Forest responded by erecting road barriers. Summit participants also created a resolution and participated actively with citizen’s groups to oppose the construction of a thermal curtain in Lake Almanor that would threaten Maidu burial sites. In summer 2006, Summit members passed a resolution to seek lands from the PG&E Stewardship Council as restitution for the ongoing cultural disruption posed by hydroelectric development. Since that time, Summit members have been meeting regularly to discuss Summit governance and land management priorities.

The Land Management Plan
With seed funding from the indigenous, non-profit funding organization Seventh Generation, the Maidu Summit contracted with member Farrell Cunningham and several sub-contractors to compile an extensive land management plan for assuming oversight of lands in Big Meadows, Humbug Valley, and Butt Valley. The plan includes a cultural background, maps of the area, and site-specific discussions linking the Stewardship Council’s land management goals with Summit member’s cultural, community, and landscape goals for the parcels, and specific plans for implementation. The Summit goals for the lands emphasize traditional environmental stewardship, educational opportunities, and opportunities for cultural strengthening, preservation, and exchange.

The Summit has partnered with the Native American Lands Conservancy (NALC), a multi-tribal, multi-regional, non-profit land conservancy formed in 1997 to “protect and preserve sacred landscapes important to Native American people.” The NALC
focuses on landscapes that are vital to cultural identity, historical continuity, and contemporary healing from intergenerational trauma due to the historic and contemporary impacts of colonialism. Through a formal MOU between the Summit and the Conservancy, the Conservancy will hold the conservation easement on the lands the Summit receives until the Summit attains non-profit status.

**Current status**
After Summit member and federally recognized tribe the Greenville Rancheria bound and copied the document, the Maidu Summit submitted their Land Management Plan in June 2007 as a proposal to the Stewardship Council. The Summit will now await the Council’s decision on who will be the next owner of these lands. The plan represents a collaborative effort of recognized and unrecognized Maidu to gain a role in management and governance of natural resources in their homeland. It also represents an opportunity for the Stewardship Council to return some California lands to their long-term stewards, with the security of encumbrances developed in a public planning process.

**Sources**

“1,000 Men to Work at Big Meadows.” Plumas Independent. Vol. XVIII, No. 35: June 7, 1911.


Great Western Power. Annual Report to Stockholders. 1922.


In early May of 2004, I was sitting in a coffee shop just north of the plaza in Santa Fe, New Mexico. It was my first day conducting research on forest conflicts in New Mexico, a topic that eventually would become my dissertation. I was there to interview one of the most prominent environmental activists in New Mexico. I was nervous because during the 1980s and 1990s, he almost single-handedly shut down the forest-products industry in New Mexico. In return for his efforts, his life was threatened, his likeness burned in effigy, his office targeted by pipe bombs. By the end of the 1990s, he had even become a pariah in some environmental circles. Forest conflicts in New Mexico are entwined with the long history of conquest and injustice to the Native American and Hispanic populations in the region. The expropriation of Spanish and Mexican land claims following the Mexican-American war, and the entrenched poverty of Hispanic communities in the region since that expropriation, remain a volatile political issue in the state. Throughout the interview, however, I was amazed to hear him continue to dismiss this history. “What’s done is done,” he said. “It’s all of our land now,” he argued. The Hispanic traditions are quaint but “they’re a thing of the past.”

It was a fascinating interview for me because earlier that day I had interviewed a land grant activist who had spent his entire adult life fighting against the Forest Service—the agency that came to control the lost land grants. In addition, he fought against commercial timber operators who profited from their relationship to the Forest Service; during the 1990s, he fought against the same environmentalist I interviewed at that coffee shop. They differed, of course, these two men, in the way they argued for one kind of environmental ethic over another. They criticized each other’s motives and interests. They disagreed on just about everything. But what was most remarkable was how similar they described the Forest Service—so similar it seemed as if they compared notes before talking to me. They blamed the Forest Service for serving the interests of corporations; for ignoring the interests of local communities and ecologies; for lacking commonsense in the administration of the forest. The environmentalist called the USFS “inscrutable,” and the land grant activist called it “impenetrable.” Both men described an agency that had slowly ground them down, destroyed the alliances they had constructed and disrupted the organizations they led. It was a memorable day.

Seven months later, when I arrived in the small village of El Rito, New Mexico in December of 2004 to begin long-term research, a group of livestock permittees approached me and suggested that I could help them in dealing with the Forest Service. At the 2005 CFRF workshop in California, Isaac Suazo, my community partner, and I described our project. We proposed a study in which livestock permittees, two New Mexico state university agricultural extension agents, and myself would engage the Forest Service in a project to compare grazing impacts on three study plots on two livestock allotments in the El Rito District of the Carson National Forest. The Forest Service has done little ecological research on the impacts of grazing on national forests in the region, yet year after year...
The questions we have struggled with in our efforts to implement a participatory ecological project relate to the politics of inclusion, the divide between scientist and citizen, and defining acceptable forms of scientific knowledge.

they have blamed small-scale livestock permitees for overgrazing. In May of 2005, I contacted the District Ranger to set up meetings to discuss the project and involve range conservation staff. I had mentioned the planning previously to her. She appeared interested, particularly because the District was, for the first time, preparing Environmental Impact Statements for each allotment. The District Ranger was concerned about her ability to devote staff time to write the EIS and was pessimistic about defending an EIS in court. The Forest Guardians, a Santa Fe-based environmental organization, had already indicated, both to me and to the El Rito District, that they would litigate every EIS on the Carson. It appeared to Isaac and myself that perhaps we had successfully stumbled into a participatory project with what most considered a most un-participatory agency.

We were wrong. In early 2006, the District decided not to allow staff to participate in the study. They offered only to include the study findings in the “public comment” section. Following the decision, the permitees elected to delay the study (they agreed that Forest Service participation was critical and thought perhaps we could change their minds). The delay added to the already vexing political and practical problems of doing participatory research with bureaucratic land management agencies. But the delay was just the first of many problems. The next unanticipated problem was related to my temporary status. In March of 2006, I accepted a position at the University of Maine at Farmington. The job, and relocation that it required, delayed the project even further. I’m not sure why that was an unanticipated problem. It seems pretty obvious to me now that I had to leave sometime. At the 2006 CFRF workshop in Montana, I discussed the personal dimensions of doing participatory research and the difficult ethical questions that arose for me when I became the source of additional delay. The point I made at the time was that I had spent so much time developing relationships and making commitments that I never even considered how I would go about leaving the area. Leaving felt like a violation of trust. For many people in Vallecitos, it was a violation of trust. I suppose, for convenience sake, I ignored the concern because I thought I’d just find a job in the area (that’s not an easy task in the American Southwest, with few Universities and even fewer geography departments). Nonetheless, I failed to incorporate those concerns into my research.

I was still committed to the project, however, and spent time this academic year staying in contact with Isaac, the Forest Service and potential collaborators. The plan was to complete the fieldwork on the project this July and August. In May of this year, I called Isaac to discuss research plans. That phone conversation transported me back to the coffee shop interview of three years earlier. Isaac told me of his increasing frustration. He and his wife, Annabelle, were tried of fighting the Forest Service. They felt overwhelmed leading the grazing association. The battles with the Forest Service had ground them down and destroyed the alliances they had slowly built with other allotments. Over the winter, they decided to sell all of their livestock permits to another permitee in the area (the word “permittee” is one of those brilliant bureaucratic inventions: Annabelle’s family traces their heritage to the original settlers in the valley. They grazed animals on the ranges in the area long before the Forest Service “permitted” them to do so). They were done raising livestock and, therefore, were done with the project.

For the past few weeks, as I prepare to return to New Mexico, I’ve been thinking about the trajectory of this project and the politics of participatory research in New Mexico. The literature on participatory research often highlights the successes, the empowerment, and the transformations within the context of the thorny politics and stiff constraints of doing participatory research. I’ve been thinking about three issues and would like to discuss them within a different kind of context: the context of a failed participatory project (or, at best a stalled project). There are three points
I’d like to briefly discuss. The first relates to dealing with land management agencies that manage the lands of conquered people (repeatedly the Forest Service has been described to me as an occupying force in New Mexico. One of the characteristics of an occupying force is its ability to outlast opposition). The second issue relates to negotiating inclusion and collaboration among people who may be very well acquainted with fighting bureaucracies that tend to conquer rather than collaborate. The third issue relates to the ethics of conducting research in a place like New Mexico.

The first point, the problem of negotiating and legitimizing inclusion with the Forest Service can be illustrated by an exchange at a public meeting in Vallecitos, New Mexico in August of 2005. The Forest Service hosted a public meeting to discuss the future of timber production in Vallecitos. In 1948 the Carson established a special timber unit in the area as a means to offset the economic hardships of grazing reductions. Most of the 60 or so people at the meeting were livestock permitees concerned that any change in timber policy on the Unit would also mean a change in grazing policy, a frequent pattern on the District. At the meeting, the District Ranger began by saying that, “The decisions that are made [here] are not done locally,” She continued by telling the attendees “it’s a hard sell for the Forest Service. There are some strong feelings, people who’ve been involved… from the Forest Service are very skeptical we can overcome all these hurdles.” When a local resident wondered what exactly those hurdles were and why the Forest Service would want to get rid of the unit, the Ranger replied that timber production had become “a focus point for environmental groups” and years of costly litigation had convinced many in the Forest Service that a local production economy could never serve its intended purpose.

The exchange made clear a critical point in participatory research design. Specifically, collaboration at the local level in El Rito required the participation of Forest Service staff facing the dilemma of balancing multiple agendas and reconciling a series of policy imperatives—all of which contradicted the goals of a participatory research agenda. In other words, beyond questions of power, the question of bureaucratic position is critically important and ultimately beyond the ability of local resource users in New Mexico to account for. The questions that we have struggled with in our efforts to implement a participatory ecological project relate to the politics of inclusion, the divide between scientist and citizen, and defining acceptable forms of scientific knowledge. I’m concerned with participation at the local level and the limits to institutional acceptance of participatory research that constrain non-institutional forms of participatory research. This is a key methodological distinction because unlike participatory research methods or development projects initiated by institutions such as NGOs or the United States Forest Service, a different set of problems, or suspicions, can arise when resource users themselves suggest the methods of analysis that will codify the contours of resource distribution. In the case of the Forest Service, a lack of data on grassland conditions was preferable to knowledge of grassland conditions produced in collaboration with livestock permitees. For the Forest Service, knowledge is supposed to be imposed on resource users, not acquired in collaboration. To do it otherwise places in stark relief the power relations the Forest Service seeks to obscure behind slogans like “caring for the land and people.”

The second issues related to dealing with the “occupying force.” The Carson National Forest currently administers a grant program in which local groups can propose collaborative community-based economic and ecological projects. Throughout our efforts a number of District staff suggested our project should be proposed to this program. Our group decided that to propose the study to this program would require sacrificing any chance at real collaboration. It became clear to many in our group that the proposed participatory study produced anxieties for the Forest Service at multiple scales. At the local level, the study would require that range conservation staff give up the power to declare ranges
overgrazed based on visual inspection. At the Forest-wide level, the proposal would mean that policy-making could not occur in its current top-down form, but rather would emerge from a collaborative process based on environmental science. In other words, many of the permitees considered the collaborative program a disciplinary, not participatory, mechanism.

The last methodological concern relates to the ethics of participatory ecological research. In our project, the participatory research design for the collection of quantitative data provided an effective alternative to the ‘count whatever you can see’ tendencies in the history of bureaucratic range monitoring on the El Rito District. Despite the obvious improvements our methods provided as compared to the methods historically and currently utilized by range conservation staff—we were unable to persuade them to adopt a research design that included permitees in the collection and analysis of data. The District Ranger argued that any results would be tainted and indefensible in an appeal or court case regarding the Environmental Impact Statement (under any scenario, she pointed out, other than one in which the study resulted in policies that negatively affected the permitees). I don’t have the space here to consider this claim—dissertations could be written. She was right, however, to suggest that this would become an issue if our study became a rationale for grazing policies on the District. This raises another concern—specifically regarding the legal context of participatory methods in environmental science. Within the institutional structure of grazing management on the Carson National Forest, authority is diffused along a clearly established hierarchy. Challenges or defenses to that authority exist only in as much as they don’t challenge the structure of policy-making. This cuts both ways. Effective environmental challenges to Forest Service policies and practices on the El Rito District have long started with the assumption that Forest Service scientific staff are the only legitimate authority relative to ecological function on the District. For example, a recent lawsuit by the Forest Guardians succeeded, after almost 15-years of litigation, to shut down an extremely controversial timber sale. The Forest Guardians used Forest Service studies of Hebert Squirrel habitat and ecology as the foundation for a challenge to current timber sale patterns. This lawsuit relied on Forest Service science, and as such further legitimized the location of scientific expertise.

Our study, however, could have relocated scientific authority.

The politics of participatory research in New Mexico require navigating a minefield of historical, racial and bureaucratic dimensions. Each decision cascades down through these various dimensions. When I hung up the phone with Isaac I wasn’t really surprised. I was just thinking about the Forest Service and the only thing I could summon were words like “inscrutable,” and “impenetrable.”

**FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE COMMUNITY FORESTRY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE:**

[www.cnr.berkeley.edu/community_forestry](http://www.cnr.berkeley.edu/community_forestry)
Participatory Video

Insight is a UK/France based organization pioneering the use of Participatory Video as a tool for empowering individuals and communities.

Insight’s Participatory Video methods value local knowledge, build bridges between communities and decision-makers and enable people to develop greater control over their own development and the decisions affecting their lives. Participatory Video enhances research and development activity by handing over control to the target communities from project conception through to implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

“Insights into Participatory Video: a handbook for the field”

This 125-page booklet is a practical guide to setting up and running PV projects. It draws on experience in PV in several countries. Helpful tips for the facilitator clarify how to use video to encourage a lively, democratic process.

For more information: http://www.insightshare.org/

Review Process:
Methodology for Revision of FSC-US Standards.

The Forest Stewardship Council has initiated the process to revise the set of FSC regional standards that cover forests in the U.S. FSC-US is gathering feedback on the process and draft methodology to revise the regional standards. This summer, FSC-US will be holding informational meetings to brief members and stakeholders on this standards revision process, as well as other FSC happenings.

For more information on this process or to register for a meeting in your area see: http://www.fscus.org/standards_criteria/revision_methodology.php

31 States Target Global Warming

31 states representing more than 70% of the U.S. population announced that they would measure and jointly track greenhouse gas emissions by major industries.

State officials, along with some industrial groups and environmentalists, say the registry is a crucial precursor to both mandatory and market-based regulation of industrial gases that contribute to warming. All agree that the most important part of the new registry is subjecting emissions statistics to third-party verification unlike a Bush administration program that does not require verification.

For the full article: http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-greenhouse9may09,0,912253,full.story?coll=la-home-nation

Keeping Up With Congress

The website RuralUS.org tracks active legislation up for consideration by the House and Senate that affects rural areas in the United States. It also provides a profile of each US Representative and legislations they have authored.

The website requires a short registration process to access the information.

For more information: www.ruralus.org/
**Job Announcements**

**Outreach for Southwest Idaho Woody Biomass Coordinator Position**

SAGE Community Resources, in partnership with the Idaho counties of Adams, Boise, Gem and Valley will be hiring a woody biomass coordinator. This coordinator will work to stimulate the growth of the woody biomass value added industry in Southwest Idaho.

A successful applicant will need a strong background in forestry, the wood products industry and have a background and understanding of economic development principles including grants. The position will be advised by a board of representatives from the four counties. Each county will designate a commissioner and a forest products representative or a person with a strong business background.

For a complete job description: [http://www.sageidaho.com/CurrentJobOpportunities.htm](http://www.sageidaho.com/CurrentJobOpportunities.htm)

---

**Publications**

**OSU study: Salvage logging, replanting increased Biscuit Fire severity**

The Biscuit Fire of 2002 burned more severely in areas that had been salvage logged and replanted, compared to similar areas that were also burned in a 1987 fire but had been left to regenerate naturally, a new study concludes.

The analysis, one of the first to ever quantify the effect of salvage logging and replanting on future fire severity, was published in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, a professional journal, by scientists from Oregon State University and the Pacific Northwest Research Station of the USDA Forest Service.

For more information: [http://www.forestrycenter.org/headlines.cfm?refid=98969](http://www.forestrycenter.org/headlines.cfm?refid=98969)

---

**Assistant Professor Human Dimensions of Ecosystem Management Department of Forest and Wildlife Ecology, UW Madison**

The Department of Forest and Wildlife Ecology invites applications for an academic-year, tenure-track faculty position at the rank of Assistant Professor in the Human Dimensions of Ecosystem Management with emphasis on forests and wildlife. Candidates should have research interests in one or more of the following areas: community forestry; collaborative and participatory resource management; social aspects of ecosystem management; social drivers and consequences of landscape change; risk perception and analysis in conservation; impacts of changing societal trends on the values and uses of forests and wildlife; state and non-state governance concerning ecosystem management, endangered resources, or sustainability.

For a complete job description: [http://www.earthscan.co.uk/ProductDetails/mcs/productID/769/](http://www.earthscan.co.uk/ProductDetails/mcs/productID/769/)

---

**Forests, People and Power The Political Ecology of Reform in South Asia**

Edited by Oliver Springate-Baginski and Piers Blaikie

More and more, participatory approaches to forest governance and management are replacing intensive scientific exploitation but how successfully have they been implemented? This is the most thorough assessment of the success and failure of participatory approaches and an indispensable benchmark to those concerned with forest management worldwide. Focusing on Asia, this book is based on research spanning all levels, from households to key policy makers, the findings of which are already having real impact on the ground.

For more information and to order online: [http://shop.earthscan.co.uk/ProductDetails/mcs/productID/769/](http://shop.earthscan.co.uk/ProductDetails/mcs/productID/769/)
**BEES 4.0: Building for Environmental and Economic Sustainability**

The BEES software is free and provides a powerful technique for selecting cost-effective, environmentally-preferable building products. Version 4.0 is now available and is aimed at designers, builders, and product manufacturers. It includes actual environmental and economic performance data for 230 building products.

Download for free or find ordering information at: www.bfrl.nist.gov/oae/software/bees.html

**Close to Slavery: Guestworker Programs in the United States.**

The Southern Poverty Law Center has released a report titled “Close to Slavery: Guestworker Programs in the United States.”

In his 2007 State of the Union Address, President Bush called for legislation creating a “legal and orderly path for foreign workers to enter our country to work on a temporary basis.” Doing so, the president said, would mean “they won’t have to try to sneak in.”

Such a program has been central to Bush’s past immigration reform proposals. Similarly, recent congressional proposals have included provisions that would bring potentially millions of new “guest” workers to the United States.

What Bush did not say was that the United States already has a guestworker program for unskilled laborers — one that is largely hidden from view because the workers are typically socially and geographically isolated. Before we expand this system in the name of immigration reform, we should carefully examine how it operates.

For the full report and article: http://www.splcenter.org/legal/guestreport/index.jsp

Author Mary Bauer, Director of the Southern Poverty Law Center, appeared on Democracy Now to discuss the report.

You can watch the interview at: http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=07/03/15/1352220

**Climate Change 2007: Mitigation of Climate Change**

The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has released its third in a series of reports on climate change. The report, a summary of a voluminous study by a U.N. network of 2,000 scientists, showed the world has to make significant cuts in gas emissions through the development of biofuels, increases in fuel efficiency, the use of renewable energy like solar power, and a host of other options.

For the full report: http://www.ipcc.ch/SPM040507.pdf

**Community Forestry Resource Center Newsletter**

The Summer 2007 edition of CFRC’s newsletter “Community Forestry Connections” is now available online. This edition features articles on sustainable forestry tax incentive programs, invasive earthworms, the FSC Family Forests Alliance, woody biomass harvesting and more.

The newsletter is available to download at http://www.forestrycenter.org/library.cfm?refid=98889

**Cross-boundary Coordination among Private Landowners to Achieve Landscape Management Objectives**

This paper is an overview of findings from an Iowa State University and University of Wisconsin-Madison cross-boundary coordination project in SW Wisconsin and NE Iowa.

For the full paper: http://forest.wisc.edu/facstaff/rickenbach/cross-boundary-summary.pdf
**Forest Service Report: Compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act**

The Forest Service has released a new summary guide on FACA (Federal Advisory Committee Act) entitled USDA Forest Service Collaborative Planning Activities: Compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

The FACA regulates Federal agency establishment or utilization of a group to obtain consensual advice or recommendations. FACA defines when such a group can be considered an advisory committee and the process necessary for its formation and proper functioning.

For the full report:
www.partnershipresourcecenter.org/resources/training/collaborative-training/faca-summary-guide.pdf

---

**Forest Stewardship Council Pesticide Policy - Updates**

FSC’s guidance and procedure documents on the 2005 revisions to the FSC Pesticides Policy were circulated for stakeholder comments. These comments were integrated into the revisions and the FSC Board recently approved both documents.

FSC Pesticides Policy: Guidance on Implementation:
http://www.forestrycenter.org/library.cfm?refid=98833

FSC Procedure: Processing Pesticide Derogation Applications:
http://www.forestrycenter.org/library.cfm?refid=98832

For more information on use of pesticides in forestry see:
http://www.forestrycenter.org/pesticides.cfm

---

**TIMOs & REITs: What, Why, and How They Might Impact Sustainable Forestry**

Forestland ownership patterns can have a significant impact on the long-term continuance of large tracts of forestland as diverse natural forests. In recent years, there has been something of a perfect storm impacting forestland ownership. Increased demands for liquid capital for core operations, rising Wall Street pressures to improve returns, and a realization that many timberland assets have been undervalued have combined with an increased willingness by the financial sector to invest in forestland. This combination has caused millions of acres to change hands from large integrated forest product companies to investment management vehicles such as TIMOs (Timber Investment Management Organizations) and REITs (Real Estate Investment Trusts).

For the full report:
www.dovetailinc.org/reports/pdf/DovetailTIMOREIT0507jw.pdf

---

**FSC Controlled Wood Standard: What It Is and What It’s For**

The Forest Stewardship Council’s (FSC’s) revised “FSC Controlled Wood” standard came into effect for FSC chain-of-custody certified primary wood product manufacturers on January 1, 2007 and will become effective for secondary manufacturers January 1, 2008. This article explains the origins of the “Controlled Wood” standard and its requirements.

For more information: www.forestrycenter.org/library.cfm?refID=98951

This year marks the twentieth anniversary of the United Church of Christ landmark 1987 “Toxic Wastes and Race in the United States” report. As part of the celebration, the UCC commissioned a new study, “Toxic Wastes and Race at Twenty, 1987-2007: Grassroots Struggles to Dismantle Environmental Racism,” led by environmental justice scholars Robert D. Bullard (Clark Atlanta University), Paul Mohai (University of Michigan), Robin Saha (University of Montana), and Beverly Wright (Dillard University of Louisiana). The new report is the first to use 2000 census data, a current national database of commercial hazardous waste facilities, and Geographic Information Systems to count persons living nearby to assess nationally the extent of racial and socioeconomic disparities in facility locations. It also examines racial disparities by region and state, and for metropolitan areas, where most hazardous waste facilities are located.

This new report finds that people of color now make up the majority (56%) of those living near the nation’s hazardous waste facilities. Where facilities are clustered, people of color make up over two thirds (69%). The report also enumerates the accomplishments of the environmental justice movement, focuses on current high profile environmental justice cases (such as the one in Dickson, TN, that has been getting coverage by CNN, ABC, and the Washington Post), and provides policy recommendations for federal, state, and local governments, NGOs, and industry.

The report can be found at the following web sites:

www.ejrc.cau.edu/TWARTFinal.htm

The State of America’s Forests

The Society of American Foresters published The State of America’s Forests, a report that presents data and information from a variety of sources on multiple aspects of our nation’s forests, including conservation, harvesting, ownership, recreation, biodiversity, and many others. In the report’s introduction, former USDA Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth says, “The purpose of this report is to provide a complete and realistic assessment of the nation’s forests that can help stakeholders as they consider the issues and trends affecting forest management and use.”

The report is available for download at: http://www.safnet.org/aboutforestry/index.cfm

Sustainable Bioenergy: A Framework for Decision Makers

A recent U.N. report on bioenergy stated that biofuels such as ethanol can help combat climate change and create jobs for the rural poor, but the benefits may be offset by serious environmental problems and increased food prices. The report said bioenergy represents an extraordinary opportunity to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. But it warned that rapid growth in liquid biofuel production will make substantial demands on the world’s land and water resources at a time when demand for both food and forest products is also rising rapidly.

To view the 707 documents currently available in the Library section go to:

www.fao.org/Participation/bibdb/retrieval/index.asp

Newly received FAO publications:


To view the 218 methods, approaches and tools currently available in the Field Tools section go to:

www.fao.org/Participation/ft_find.jsp

Highlights:

Participatory Communication Planning: this method provides a systematic and rational framework for communication planning for development.

Participatory Rural Communication Appraisal (PRCA): this method gathers information in order to understand the situation affecting the people with whom communicating Natural Resource Management in Agriculture (NRMA) is needed.

Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA): this is a tool aimed at involving communities in an in-depth examination of their vulnerability, while empowering and motivating them to take appropriate action.

Stages of Group Development matrix: this tool is used to identify the development stage of a group with reference to a five stage development process - and the most appropriate options to operate more effectively.
LESSONS LEARNED

To see the Lessons Learned items currently available in the Resources area, go to:

www.fao.org/participation/lessonslearned.html

Use of participatory methods for active involvement of all partners in communication, Challenges for the application of participatory methods in communication for development, based on the results of an inter-institutional expert consultation workshop organized by FAO and GTZ (German agency for technical cooperation), published in Del Castello R., Braun P.M., Framework on effective rural communication for development, FAO and GTZ, Rome (Italy), 2006.

LINKS

To view the 226 websites and organizations currently available in the Links section go to:

www.fao.org/Participation/ow/links.asp

Huairou Commission: The Huairou Commission is a global coalition of networks, institutions and individual professionals that recognize the value of grassroots women’s local development knowledge and create opportunities for it to be shared among grassroots groups, policy makers, advocacy groups and institutions. Currently, the network focuses its joint efforts on five campaigns: Governance, AIDS, Disaster, Land and Housing and Peace Building. Huairou is investing in the collection, generation and distribution of grassroots knowledge.

Sustainable Livelihoods Research Group (BCID): Based at Bredford Center for International Development, the Sustainable Livelihoods Research Group has completed several research projects on Africa focusing on institutional aspects of development and community-driven approaches. Working papers, research briefings and other publications are available for download.

CONFERENCES & WORKSHOPS

AUGUST 2007

10th Annual Southeast Watershed Roundtable
August 1-3, 2007
Braselton, GA

Celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Southeast Watershed Roundtable. To mark this occasion, the Southeast Watershed Forum has partnered with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and an eight-state planning team to present, “Sustaining Our Water Infrastructure Through Watershed-based Approaches.”

For more information: www.southeastwaterforum.org/roundtables/default.asp

Rural Sociological Society Annual Meeting
August 2-5, 2007
Santa Clara, CA

“Social Change and Restructuring in Rural Societies: Opportunities and Vulnerabilities.” The 2007 annual meeting of the RSS provides an excellent opportunity to advance the state of knowledge about rural social change, and to make that knowledge more accessible and useful to practitioners and policy-makers.

For more information: www.ruralsociology.org
Sierra Nevada Alliance Conference  
*August 3-5, 2007*  
*Kings Beach, CA*

The goal of this year’s conference is to explore what sustainability means for Sierra conservation. More importantly, what must be done to ensure the desirable Sierra qualities remain for future generations.  
For more information: www.sierranevadaalliance.org

**International Union of Game Biologists Congress**  
*August 13-18, 2007*  
*Uppsala, Sweden*

The IUGB encourages the exchange of scientific and practical knowledge in the field of game and wildlife management, the broad field of game biology and international cooperation in game and wildlife management. The aim of the conference is to create a bridge among scientists, wildlife managers and authorities and those studying the human dimensions of wildlife management.  
For more information: www-conference.slu.se/iugb2007/

**Ecological Society of America Annual Conference**  
*August 5-10, 2007*  
*San Jose, CA*

This year’s meeting will address fundamental questions such as: What ecosystem attributes are to be restored, conserved, or preserved? How should these priorities be informed by ecological research? How can we assess the effectiveness of restoration?  
For more information: www.esa.org/sanjose/

---

**September 2007**

**American Fisheries Society Annual Meeting**  
*September 2-6, 2007*  
*San Francisco, CA*

Thinking Downstream and Downcurrent: Addressing Uncertainty and Unintended Consequences in Fish and Fisheries. At the interface between the Sacramento-San Joaquin River drainage and the Pacific Ocean, San Francisco provides an outstanding venue to think about managing whole ecosystems, advance your professional networking, and to keep current on emerging ideas in fisheries science and management.  
For more information: www.fisheries.org/sf/

**Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies Annual Conference**  
*September 16-21, 2007*  
*Louisville, KY*

This conference will feature a special Plenary Session focused on state agency responses to the challenges of climate change impacts on fish and wildlife resources and panel discussions that will highlight approaches and strategies that state fish and wildlife agencies need to consider in order to address potential impacts and challenges associated with climate change on a variety of natural resource issues.  
For more information: www.fishwildlife.org/annual-meet.html

---

**October 2007**

**National Land Conservation Conference**  
*October 3-6, 2007*  
*Denver, CO*

Come to the largest gathering in the country for conservation leaders. Join more than 1,700 land trust professionals, volunteers, board members, public agency staff, attorneys, appraisers and land conservation advocates at this four-day conference.  
For more information: www.lta.org/training/index.html
The Annual International Conference on Soils, Sediment and Water
October 15-18, 2007
Amherst, MA

Expediting and Economizing Cleanups, this conference’s theme, will be supported by the development of a strong and diverse technical program in concert with a variety of educational opportunities available to attendees. Live equipment demonstrations will augment the exhibition section which brings real-world application to the technical theory and case studies which will be presented in the platform sessions. Focused workshops will provide attendees with the type of practical application information which will impact their job performance immediately.

For more information: www.umasssoils.com/

Geological Society of America Annual Meeting
October 28-31, 2007
Denver, CO

One of GSA’s core missions is to advance the geosciences in the service of humankind. In keeping with that mission and GSA’s motto, Science, Stewardship, Service, GSA has tied its 2007 Annual Meeting program to the themes of the International Year of Planet Earth.

For more information: www.geosociety.org/meetings/2007/index.htm

Community Matters 07
October 23-25, 2007
Burlington, VT

The Orton Family Foundation, PlaceMatters and partner organizations bring together citizens, elected officials, practitioners, innovators and tool providers to learn, share, and seed innovation in place. Join to engage in discussions about land use planning and community development in small cities and towns.

For more information: www.communitymatters.org

Society of American Foresters 2007 Annual Conference
October 23-27
Portland, OR

More than 2,000 forestry and natural resource professionals will gather to exchange ideas, share professional expertise, and learn the latest technology and research to help them work more effectively. The conference will benefit foresters and natural resource professionals from a variety of sectors.

For more information: www.safnet.org/natcon-07/index.cfm

North American Lake Management Society (NALMS) 2007 International Symposium
October 29 - November 3, 2007
Orlando, FL

This year, NALMS and the Florida Lake Management Society invite you to join us for the 2007 NALMS Symposium. The State of Florida is a leader in lake-related research and restoration efforts. The Florida Everglades is the site of the largest environmental restoration project ever attempted. It is in recognition of these on-going efforts that the 2007 NALMS Conference theme of “Understanding the Science of Lake Management” was selected. The Symposium will emphasize scientific aspects of lakes and use of scientific concepts to make sound management decisions.

For more information: www.nalms.org
**November 2007**

**Annual Conference on Ecosystems Restoration and Creation**  
*November 1-2, 2007*  
*Plant City, FL*

The Annual Conference provides a forum for the nationwide exchange of results of the latest scientific research on restoration, creation, and management of not only freshwater and coastal systems but total ecosystems including upland and transitional areas.

For more information:  
www.hccfl.edu/depts/detp/ecoconf.html

**December 2007**

**5th International Conference of Critical Geography Imperialism and resultant disorder: imperatives for social justice**  
*December 3-7, 2007*  
*Mumbai, India*

We invite you to join us, the International Critical Geography Group, for the Fifth International Conference of Critical Geography in Mumbai, India at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences. The purpose of the conference is to provide an informal forum for politically critical discussion and debate. The primary and overarching theme of the conference will be about imperialism and social justice and their social (political-economic-cultural) and environmental (socio-ecological, physical) aspects. Representatives of political organizations, unions, and social movements will be invited to address these inter-related issues.

For more information:  
www.5thiccg.org

**January 2008**

**Connecting People, Participation and Place: An international conference of participatory geographies**  
*January 14-15, 2008*  
*Durham University, United Kingdom*

Participatory approaches to research, learning, action and change have in some ways become a new orthodoxy in social and environmental science disciplines, voluntary sectors, statutory agencies and community-led organizations across the world. The development of conceptual insights, creative techniques and radical practices is exploding. At the same time participatory approaches are highly contested and debated, and are profoundly affected by the environments, social settings and institutional webs in which they are embedded. This conference will showcase original and collaboratively produced contributions to theory, practice and social/environmental change which focus on the relations between people and places.

Please send OFFERS OF PARTICIPATION, with an abstract or summary of ideas/plans, by 31st August 2007 to rachel.pain@durham.ac.uk

For more information:  

**March 2008**

**American Society for Environmental History**  
*March 12-16*  
*Boise, ID*

Agents of Change: People, Climate, and Places Throughout Time

For more information:  
http://www.aseh.net/conferences/current-conference
April 2008

Association of American Geographers
Annual Meeting
April 15-19
Boston, MA

You are invited to join the AGG for the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers in Boston, Massachusetts, at the Marriot Copley Place and Westin Copley Place Hotel.

Please check the website for additional information and call for papers:

http://aag.org/annualmeetings/2008/index.htm

Give to CFRF

Please consider making a gift to the Community Forestry Research Fellowship and help us train a new generation of scholars, policy makers, and community practitioners in making more just and equitable natural resource management practices.

www.cnr.berkeley.edu/community_forestry/giving