Every now and then something comes along, grabs us by the shoulders and forces us to pay close attention. The two columns in this issue of Regeneration! by Sara Breslow and Juliet Christian-Smith do just that. In her discussion of Salmon habitat restoration in Washington’s Skagit Valley, Breslow suggests that the idea of community is naïve and even counterproductive. Noting that scientific findings in fisheries and hydrogeomorphology have become part of the discourse of conflict in the Skagit Valley, she suggests that researchers are part of the local and regional context through which the conflict over salmon recovery takes place. Local knowledge draws on and incorporates scientific knowledge, just as scientific knowledge draws on and incorporates local knowledge. In short, science and local knowledge are interdependent, as Louise Fortmann has written elsewhere, albeit within a set of uneven relationships of power. A goal of community forestry and participatory research is to foster a new, more egalitarian, kind of interdependence between science and local knowledge.

Yet, the deployment of labor is implicated in the interdependence of science and local knowledge. While Breslow’s habitat restoration volunteers, whose work she describes as one of the more participatory pieces of watershed restoration efforts, are blissfully unaware (and/or perhaps captured by enthusiastic idealism) of the conflict over salmon habitat restoration, Christian-Smith’s professional restoration crews have a more jaded view. Presumably volunteers already accept the basic concepts they are operationalizing on the land (who would volunteer for something with which they did not agree?), and their contribution is considered participatory because they are not paid. Paid workers, on the other hand, do not necessarily whole heartedly embrace the work they are doing, and their work is not considered participatory because of the very fact that they are being paid. What does our approach to participation in community forestry mean for the value we place on volunteer versus paid labor? One’s participation – access to knowledge, contributions to knowledge, contributions of labor or material or political resources – is circumscribed differently whether one is a volunteer, worker, scientist or something else. What we consider participatory, as well as the lines we draw between science and local knowledge on the one hand, and scientists and “the community” on the other, are means through which power operates to produce current social arrangements, current watershed restoration practices, and the outcomes they produce on the land.
The 2005 CFRF Fellows

We are pleased to announce the recipients of the 2005 Community Forestry Research Fellowships.

Undergraduate Assistantship

Professor David Padgett & student Juan Salter, Tennessee State University, Dept of History, Geography & Political Science, Synthesizing Community Forestry and Public Health: A Black History/Urban Forestry Walking Trail, Nashville, TN

Undergraduate Internship

Julee DeHose, New Mexico Highlands University, Pictures of Apache Land, Cibecue, NM

Judy DeHose, Northland Pioneer College, Pictures of Apache Land, Cibecue, NM

Calvin McCargo, Morgan State University, North Avenue and Hilton Street Business and Community Task Force Temporary Garden Project, Baltimore, MD

Masters

Chad Allen, Florida State University, Department of Geography, Biodiversity Conservation and Socioeconomic Conflict: Saving Jobs and the Red-Cockaded Woodpecker, Liberty County, Florida.

Masters - con’t


Pre-Dissertation

Gabriel Cumming, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Department of Ecology, Debating the Future of a Forest Community: Land-use Discourses in Macon County, NC.

Vanessa Mazal, University of Washington, Department of Anthropology, Water Planning Processes in Acequia Watersheds in Northern New Mexico: a Participatory Institutional Ethnography, Northern New Mexico.

Dissertation

Damayanti Banerjee, University of Wisconsin – Madison, Department of Sociology & Rural Sociology, Between the Rivers: Reconstructing Natural and Social Histories of Struggle, Land Between the Lakes, Kentucky.

Dissertation - con’t

Sharon Baskind, Rutgers University, Department of Anthropology, Scenic Landscapes and Conservation Easements: Common Interest in Private Lands in San Juan County, WA. Sharon was a pre-dissertation fellow in 2004.

Vanessa Casanova, Auburn University, School of Forestry & Wildlife Sciences, Rural Livelihoods and Commodity Chains: An Analysis of Pine Straw in a Southeast Georgia Community, Toombs County, GA. Vanessa was a master’s fellow in 2002.

David Correia, University of Kentucky, Department of Geography, Making the forest a factory: the nature of sustained yield forestry in New Mexico, El Rito, New Mexico.

Susannah McCandless, Clark University, Graduate School of Geography, Building Community Equity in the Forests of Vermont, Addison County, VT

Beth Rose Middleton, UC Berkeley, Environmental Science and Policy Management, “We were here, we are here, we will always be here:” Steps to a Political Ecology of Identity in a Contemporary Mountain Maidu Community, Plumas County, CA. Beth Rose was a pre-dissertation fellow in 2004.
I recently completed a small survey of volunteers who offered their time and energy on two cool and drizzly Saturday mornings to plant ocean spray, mooseberry, Nootka rose and other native trees and shrubs on the banks of the Skagit River, the largest river draining from the Cascade Mountains to the Puget Sound, located in the north-west corner of Washington State. The volunteers’ good-natured work constitutes one of the more participatory pieces of the enormously complex and passionately contested effort to restore the hydrological and ecological functions of river systems – and thereby salmon habitat – currently taking place in the Pacific Northwest. The replacement of domesticated crops and invasive species with native plants (often including spruce and cedar saplings) along rivers and stream banks has multiple intended effects: among them, to control erosion, provide food and shelter for wildlife, shade and cool the water, and, eventually, topple in and create pools and other hiding places for fish. This particular planting took place at one of the most visible sites in the County across the river with the farmland to the West, farmland that earns its reputation as some of the best agricultural property in the world due in part to its former life as an estuary. The location was strategically chosen to demonstrate to a wider audience that habitat restoration can be nice to look at, that it can be enjoyable, and that it works. The broadest purpose of these plantings is to build community and political support for salmon-recovery efforts in the Valley. The organizers have their fingers crossed, tightly, that the new plants keep growing.

While community forestry is ideally concerned with sustaining forest-based livelihoods and the alleviation of poverty and injustice (Glasmeier and Farrigan 2004), the irony with writing an article about my research on the social dimensions of salmon habitat restoration for the CFRF newsletter is that few livelihoods directly dependent on forests are implicated in the reforestation of riparian habitat deemed critical for the recovery of fish. Furthermore, the major land use in the lower Skagit basin is, in fact, still conventional forestry. Yet while in the 1990s debates here raged around spotted owls and logging, today they center on salmon. And salmon habitat restoration does implicate two other resource-based livelihoods: namely, fishing and farming.

Many people in the Valley fish for sport, but those who fish in the river for a living tend to be members of one of the three local Indian tribes: the Swinomish, Upper Skagit and Sauk-Suiattle. This is because in 1974 a supreme court decision upheld treaties signed in 1855 that reserved the rights of Western Washington tribal members to fish in all “usual and accustomed fishing places”, which generally meant in the rivers or at the rivers’ mouths, and “in common with the citizens of the United States”, which was interpreted to mean that Native Americans here are entitled to fifty percent of the harvestable fish returning to these places. A little known but remarkable fact is that in order to ensure that these rights were maintained, in 1974 Western Washington tribes were made co-managers with Washington State of the State’s fisheries. Hence, another rationale sometimes cited for salmon habitat

The question is not how to sustain and equitably distribute forest resources; it is how forests-to-be might impact the livelihoods of fishermen and farmers, not to mention the intrinsic “health” of the fish, river and watershed.
restoration is to protect the resources that tribal livelihoods and fishing rights depend on. Tribes are themselves rehabilitating streams and estuarine areas on reservations and the neighboring river systems that bear their names, such as the Skagit, Stillaguamish, Snohomish, and Nooksack rivers.

Farmers, however, tend to be skeptical of salmon habitat restoration efforts. With a current population of about 109,000 Skagit County is facing a projected 40 to 50% increase in population in the next 20 years, spelling disaster for the open spaces of farmland that have earned the Valley a reputation as the Shire between the gathering forces of Mordor – i.e. Vancouver, BC to the north and Seattle to the south – if aggressive growth management is not effected quickly. In addition to the pressures of development and globalization, farmers worry that increasing environmental regulations and efforts to restore “fish habitat” – on what farmers consider to be private, arable land – will threaten the economic viability of farming in the Valley, and end a way of life that some families have known here for more than four generations. Resentment toward habitat restoration among agricultural landowners likely began about 10 years ago when the county was attempting to meet the State’s growth management requirement to institute protection plans for areas critical to wildlife, such as the 6 runs of Skagit Chinook salmon currently listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Ever since then the County has battled local tribes in court, over if, and how wide, reforested buffers along fish-bearing streams should be for the protection of salmon.

While the County’s buffers plans are being debated and therefore neither implemented nor enforced, the focus of restoration efforts in the County has shifted to the estuaries, which most fisheries scientists and restorationists here view as the limiting factor in the river’s potential production of Chinook salmon. Estuarine restoration entails the breaching or setback of dikes and levees and the modification of tidegates to allow the regeneration of estuarine habitat behind the dikes. Farmers tend to be less than happy with these plans for delta restoration, however. As one farmer puts it, there is a line in the sand, and the line is the dike. Some farmers fear that estuarine restoration projects will compromise their century-long work to keep salt and unwanted water out of their fields and drainage systems. Some fish advocates, on the other hand, are still hoping to revegetate fish habitat along the banks of some of the drainage ditches and sloughs, home to recently discovered populations of Chinook fry. Farmers argue, however, that vegetation would make it difficult to manipulate the dredging machinery used to clear debris and buffers would therefore compromise the ditches’ drainage function and the arability of the land. Thus, in contrast to more conventional community forestry case studies, in this lowland, largely agricultural part of the County, the question is not how to sustain and equitably distribute forest resources; it is how forests-to-be might impact the livelihoods of fishermen and farmers, not to mention the intrinsic “health” of the fish, river and watershed.

To make matters more complicated, and painful, the fact that the fishermen at stake are largely descendants of the Valley’s original native inhabitants, and the farmers at stake are largely the descendants of white settlers, is not lost in this debate. In my interviews I consistently hear references to the settlement era; to the back-breaking labor of great grandparents who cleared the land, dug the ditches and hand-built the dikes; to the sighting of the strange white fence that signified the presence of the new concept of private property; to disparaging comments about “primitive” Indian fishing methods and how they would have limited the historical catch; to proud remarks about Indian precursors to modern gillnetting technology, etc. Some have urged me to analyze the debate in terms of race: to what extent is farmers’ resistance to habitat restoration efforts a racist response to the growing power of the tribes to reclaim management of local resources?

On its surface, salmon recovery in Washington State looks like a
poster child for community forestry principles. In contrast to the typically prescriptive federal approach to endangered species protection, the State is currently implementing a “groundbreaking”, bottom-up strategy to address its ESA listings of various fish species through collaboration with agency, tribal, and community entities. The group coordinating efforts in the Puget Sound region is careful to point out that their strategy is about “more than fish” and includes “supporting sustainable growth and prosperous timber, fishing, recreation and agricultural economies”. Several legislative acts empowered and funded watershed groups composed of local stakeholders to spend the last five years drafting ESA recovery plans that will be handed to the responsible federal agencies next month. Due to local hostilities, however, the Skagit Valley never developed a community-based recovery plan. Instead, biologists at the local State fish and wildlife agency and tribal research center made a last-minute stab to quietly draft a Skagit plan in time for the June deadline.

Despite the ongoing conflict over salmon habitat restoration, the largely urban volunteers at the Mount Vernon park planting parties seemed surprisingly unaware of the historical, social or political contexts in which their work was taking place. One of the survey questions on the questionnaire that nearly all of the 60 volunteers completed asked, “What do you think are the main ways salmon habitat restoration affects society, if you think it does?” Most responses explained, rather broadly, that restoring the health of the river would benefit the health of humans, or that restoration raised awareness in society about environmental problems. Only three respondents had more specific things to say: “it has many conflicts with development”, “important for tribes”, and “keeps the fishermen happy.”

While I have tried to explain how watershed restoration stretches the meaning of “forestry” relative to conventional understandings of “community forestry”, the heterogeneity and mutual incomprehension among social groups implicated in restoration here makes the idea of “community” seem naive if not counterproductive. A basic goal of my research is therefore to raise awareness among multiple communities about the very existence of each other and why they may hold divergent perspectives about restoration. One of the “groups” that I have made a particular effort to reach out to in this respect is the one I consider closest to home: other researchers. In contrast to the way that we are often differentiated from a “community” vested with “local knowledge”, in the Skagit case I think it is more realistic to view researchers as members of the local or at least regional social context. One of the most noticeable characteristics of the salmon habitat restoration movement in the Puget Sound region is its heavy reliance on research in the natural sciences. Fisheries scientists and hydrogeomorphologists constitute an epistemic network of sorts, and their conclusions are repeated in such mantra-like phrases in meetings and conferences that at times the movement exhibits a scientistic quality. The minimal attention to the social complexity of salmon recovery at these “expert” events has been striking. Therefore, when it was my turn to present my work to roomfuls of fisheries students and climate scientists, I decided to introduce the ideas of community forestry and participatory research rather than deliver the usual research talk. You could say that in striving toward local empowerment and sustainability, I have been trying to work both in, in consultation with local Skagit residents, but also out, by engaging researchers, whose future work will impact this place and these people, in discussions about expert elitism, the validity of local knowledge, and the relationships between social inequality and environmental problems.

Yet while I feel it is important,
working “out” takes time away from working more deeply “in” and like other CFRF fellows, I am typically anxious about whether I am sufficiently practicing the principles of community forestry and participatory research in my own field work. After reviewing these principles for this article, I am reminded that I am not particularly focused on questions of poverty and injustice. And I am not primarily working with the most marginalized communities in the Skagit Valley. Just by the numbers, Native Americans fare far worse than the average Skagitonian, with an on-reservation Indian poverty rate of 36% compared to a county-wide rate of 11% in 1999. Yet as Brinda Sarathay puts it so aptly in her Winter 2003 Focus article, “There are people at stake and there are stakeholders...” While tribal fishermen are at stake, here the tribes are also clearly powerful stakeholders. The most marginalized Skagit community is likely one I have had no professional interaction with: the migrant farm workers who I occasionally see bundled up and bent over between rows of tulips and nursery trees near a tell-tale row of small, colorful cars parked along the country roads. They are also planters, and also indigenous, but in their case far from their homes in Chiapas and Oaxaca, Mexico. I and others wonder what these Zapotec and Triqui speakers think about the conflict over salmon habitat restoration. Are they aware of the controversy? Could they be the people truly at stake, but with little to hold onto, in decisions about fishing, farming, forestry and development in the Valley? After writing this article and posing these questions, I wonder if I should now redirect my research toward listening in particular to their concerns.

References
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Voices from the Field:
But what do you do?
Dealing with sticky questions and situations
J. Christian-Smith, CFRF ‘04

I recently returned from nine months “in the field.” While this explanation of my absence was accepted easily by fellow graduate students, other friends and family less intimately involved with academia were wholly nonplussed—“In the field? What do you mean?” they asked. The response that I was conducting fieldwork was greeted by blank looks and the disconcerting question, “But what do you do?” This is a question that social science researchers sometimes shirk since detailing the intricacies of participatory action research, in-depth interviewing, or grounded theory may not be considered the most interesting topics for small talk. Yet, explaining what exactly we do while we are “in the field” is critically important, not only to communicate the purpose of our work, but also to learn from each other’s experiences.

One of the only books that I have come across to comprehensively describe the actual process of fieldwork is Paul Rabinow’s Reflections on fieldwork in Morocco (University of California Press, 1977). Rabinow writes candidly about his sometimes boring, often hilarious process of conducting fieldwork. Here, I do not have the space to give a similarly comprehensive description of mine, but I would like to discuss some of the ways in which my fieldwork has continuously re-worked assumptions and prior conceptions that I brought with me into the field. My field experience thus far has consisted of in-depth interviewing, participant observation and attendance at many community and watershed related meetings, manual labor on a watershed restoration project, and assisting in the coordination of a 4H youth program centered on watershed
I was surprised to find the intensity of emotion related to restoration efforts and the survival of certain fish species. This experience has encouraged me to examine restoration using the expectations of the individuals involved, rather than my own, often ecologically-biased criteria.

Setting up the in-depth interviews has been more of a challenge than I initially expected. While my first approach was to telephone people based on a parcel map of the watershed, I quickly realized that this was less than ideal since the area of California where I work is known for a certain suspicion of outsiders, and the issues that I was interested in have been a source of contention in the past. Thus, I opted for the snowball strategy, starting with contacts that I had already made in the area and building to encompass a diverse group of interests. One method I found particularly helpful was at the end of an interview to ask the interviewee to recommend other people to talk to, particularly people who might have a different point of view.

My experience working on a restoration field crew also questioned some of my initial assumptions. I originally thought that members of the work crew would have very positive attitudes towards restoration. Eventually, I learned that many of them had misgivings about their work including ethical quandaries related to mitigation projects, the feasibility of bringing back an ecosystem, and the damage that was caused simply through their activities which, in the particular project I was working on, consisted of removing invasive vegetation from highly erosive riparian areas and using herbicides. Mitigation projects provide a sizable funding source for restoration yet have been almost completely ignored by major studies of restoration, including the National Research Council’s study and the recently released NRRSS study. Tracking down the multitudes of privately funded restoration projects is often time-consuming or considered outside the scope of research. Indeed, my own research had for the most part ignored mitigation, now I am working on compiling some of the larger mitigation projects conducted in my study region.

I was also surprised that the crew that I worked with consisted of mostly white, middle-class women (not at all what I expected to find). I discovered that this was related to the particular contracting organization, which had made a commitment to professionalizing its workforce, raising issues of a skilled vs. unskilled workforce and racialized labor. There are many different types of labor, and laborers, that are included under the umbrella of restoration—including heavy equipment operators and vineyard workers--these workforces illuminate stratification within the restoration industry in regard to citizenship, ethnicity and gender. As the restoration industry becomes further professionalized, these issues have enormous intellectual and pragmatic interest. My research now seeks to explore the political economy and labor relations that underlie the industry to a greater extent.

Finally, the 4H watershed education project that I am involved with has allowed me to interact with a larger community of individuals. Many 4H families are also involved in agricultural production, which has provided a different perspective on the philosophy and practice of restoration. The process of fieldwork has been incredibly iterative. Everyday in the field an interview or a new citation would make me think about my research in a different way. Becoming comfortable with this shifting sea has been a challenge. However, I have come to realize that pretending that I am standing on solid ground does not make the shifting stop; it only makes me less responsive to the movement.
Outreach Foresters in Alabama: Serving Minority Landowners

This article is reprinted with permission from the Alabama Forestry Commission “Forestry Outreach” publication.

Since 1999, in order to implement the plan to better serve and reach minority landowners, the Alabama Forestry Commission has hired or identified four foresters to work primarily with minority and underserved landowners. Each of the Commission’s administrative regions has an outreach forester assigned to it. The vision of the Commission’s outreach programs is to “engage underserved landowners in enhancing the forest resources in the state by increasing participation, understanding, and trust through a focused outreach effort by technically competent professionals.” The real purpose of the Outreach Foresters is to help identify underserved landowners. Once identified, they help bridge the gap to bring these landowners into our normal program delivery system.

The AFC has partnered with federal, state and local community-based organizations as well as private land management companies to create innovative opportunities for landowners to improve their farm/forestland operations. The Outreach Foresters achieve this objective by attending social and local events such as Federation of Southern Cooperatives’s annual meeting, career fairs and other opportunities where they interact with local communities and congregations and share the mission of the AFC and their availability to help deliver forest assistance to landowners.

They visit schools in their regions and interact with minority students. These students are not only encouraged to apply to attend Alabama Forestry Camp, Alabama A&M University’s Summer Forestry Apprenticeship Program, Alabama’s forestry technician schools, but also AAMU, Auburn and Tuskegee Universities to study forestry and related subjects.

The results of the AFC outreach efforts are compiled in monthly reports prepared by the regional outreach foresters. Since implementation of the outreach program, over 1,000 minority landowners have been identified and added to the database. These same landowners have participated in seminars, tours, and other activities. In 2001, a two-day bus tour was held for minority landowners. The group toured several managed properties around the state including stops in Wilcox County, the Federation of Southern Cooperatives in Sumter County and properties in

...continued on the next page

John Wesley Bell, Jefferson County

I used to have some land for lease in Dallas County. I let a farmer row crop the land down there since I reside in Jefferson County. During the time the land was being farmed the deer population grew. The deer moved in on my land and consequently the farmers stopped wanting to lease it.

Around that time, a timber consultant suggested I plant some seedlings on the place instead of just letting it go dormant. Not long afterwards I heard about the AFC outreach forester for the Southwest region, LaKedra Byrd. She helped me find out about how to qualify land for the TREASURE Forest Program.

Well, I did my homework. I saw that it was a good idea to plant trees. Right now I am proud to say to people, “My small trees are growing; my food plots are looking good for the wildlife. I have reserved some of my land for wetland management and planted areas for wildflowers and hardwoods.”

I feel like I am well on my way to becoming a proud TREASURE Forest landowner.
Outreach Foresters in Alabama con’t

Tallapoosa counties. Aside from the bus tour, ten additional forestry tours were held in conjunction with Tuskegee University and Alabama A&M University.

Another task of the Outreach Foresters is to assist landowners in the development of forest management plans and TREASURE Forest certifications. They provide information and assistance in cost share and other rural assistance programs, as well as being a resource for information on training activities being held across the state that may be beneficial to underserved and minority landowners.

“Outreach is not only about trees and tree planting; it is how to sell timber, what to look for, and what to expect. It’s about agro-forestry, silvopasture, and many other things. Outreach is about sharing and helping landowners carry out their responsibility for keeping the forest healthy and beautiful to protect our environment.”

-Elliott Salter, Crenshaw County

During the 2001-2002 year, outreach efforts provided assistance to 418 minority landowners. This included 227 new contacts and the development of 52 TREASURE Forest plans. The new assists consisted of 60 cost share cases, 20 plow and burn cases, 43 assists with southern pine beetle infestations. Approximately 39 of the new TREASURE Forest plans were done on new contracts. As a result of these efforts one landowner was certified in the TREASURE Forest program and 23 became involved in the Master Foresters Program. Outreach foresters attended over 250 meetings with landowners and sent out over 706 information packages. Due to the work of the outreach foresters over 40 landowners expressed an interest in leading peer learning experiences and in the past years seven have hosted training sessions on their property.

***

For more information on the Alabama Forestry Commission and their Forestry Outreach Program, contact Gus Townes, Jr. Executive Assistant, Alabama Forest Commission, P.O. Box 302550, 513 Madison Ave., Montgomery, AL 36130-2550 or (334) 240-9320. For more information online go to: www.forestry.state.al.us

CFRF
Faculty News

Highlights from the Bolle Center for People and Forests

On March 7, 2005 at The University of Montana, the Bolle Center organized a panel of diverse people to discuss the USDA US Forest Service’s recently adopted new National Forest Management Act (NFMA) regulations governing land and resource management planning on the national forests. The panel was entitled: The U.S. Forest Service Planning Rules: What They Mean, Why They Matter?

Jill Belsky, Director of the Bolle Center served as moderator. Panelists included: Pam Gardiner, Director Ecosystem Assessment and Planning, USDA Forest Service, Northern Region; Martin Nie, The University of Montana, Associate Professor of Natural Resource Policy; Julia Altemus, Montana Logging Association; Timothy Preso, Attorney, Earthjustice; Bob Wolf, Retired, Congressional Research Service; Jack Ward Thomas, The University of Montana, Boone & Crockett Professor of Wildlife Conservation, Former Chief, USDA Forest Service.

The panel was also shown on Missoula Community Action Television Sunday, May 8 from 11pm-2am and again on Tuesday, May 10 from 10pm-1 am. The 2005 planning regulations are available at: http://www.fs.fed.us/emc/nfma/index2.html. Comments about the panel can be found at http://forest-policy.typepad.com/
I am working on a series of oral history interviews with tribal elders of the Karuk Basketweavers and Karuk tribe to collect traditional ecological knowledge related to cultural burning and management of non-timber forest products in the sandbar willow communities on the lower Mid-Klamath River. My study includes conducting experimental trials to study the effects of pruning versus burning on the willow morphology. I recently participated in a workshop in Oregon at the Penny Stew Stewardship area and worked with the local Fire Safe council to improve fuels treatments to account for cultural values and wildlife habitat.

I am also working on setting up a tribal demonstration area to implement community-based forestry restoration practices based on TEK and cultural environment management practices. I also work with the USFS management as well as other tribes or tribal organizations in NW California on collecting, preserving, and maintaining Traditional ecological knowledge and sustainable management of Non-timber forest products.

In April I attended the National Network of Forest Practitioners’ Week in Washington with my community partner. We met with congressional staff, NGO’s and others on issues related to policies (Healthy Forest Restoration Act, Tribal forest protection act).

Stephanie Gripne has been selected by The Environmental Leadership Program (ELP) for a prestigious two-year fellowship (for more information go to: http://www.forestry.umn.edu/spotlight/Stephanie_Gripne.htm.) Stephanie has also published an article on grass-banks in the journal Rangelands. (For more information see the article section of this newsletter.)

Jake received a Doctorate in Geography at the University of California, Berkeley (2002) . After receiving his doctorate, he held the Lang Postdoctoral Fellowship at Stanford University and was also a Lecturer there in the Department of Cultural and Social Anthropology. He is now Assistant Professor of American Studies and Anthropology at the University of New Mexico and is currently on leave as a Ciriacy-Wantrup Fellow in the Department of Rhetoric at the University of California Berkeley. He is co-editor of the recently published edited volume entitled Race, Nature and the Politics of Difference (Duke 2003) and has written extensively on questions of nature, culture and politics in the US and abroad. His book Understories: The Political Life of Forests in northern New Mexico (Duke University Press, forthcoming) explores the cultural politics of nature, race and nation amidst violent struggles over forest resources in northern New Mexico. His current research takes a close look at the discourses of a critical natural history, through an exploration of the culture and politics of bees. By attending to their characteristics and tendencies he explores how beekeeping has helped remake discourses of modern citizenship and populations and served as archetype and archive for the formation and reproduction not only of social taxonomies and hierarchies but also concomitant political erasures and possibilities.

Don has recently accepted a position as Assistant Professor in the Department of Geography and Planning at California State University - Chico.
**CFRF Alumni News**

**Brinda Sarathy**  
(CFRF '02 & '03)  
bsarathy@nature.berkeley.edu

Brinda received a 2005 Environmental Policy & Conflict Resolution Fellowship from the Morris K. Udall Foundation. Each year the Foundation awards Ph.D. dissertation fellowships to two students whose work is in the areas of environmental public policy or environmental conflict resolution. Recipients must be in the final, writing year of their Ph.D. work.

**Heidi Ballard**  
(CFRF '01 & '02)  
hballard@nature.berkeley.edu

Heidi Ballard received her Ph.D. in Environmental Science, Policy and Management at University of California, Berkeley in December 2004. Currently she is working on a participatory biodiversity monitoring manual for forest managers to help them better include stakeholders in monitoring programs across the country, sponsored by the National Commission on the Science for Sustainable Forestry. She is also working with the Ford Foundation Community-Based Forestry Demonstration Projects to examine the role of ecological monitoring in community-based forestry projects around the U.S. In the fall of 2005 she will be starting a position as Visiting Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies at Oberlin College in Ohio, and is very excited to be teaching again!

---

**Community Announcements**

**Wallowa Resources Program Explores Local Issues**

A unique natural resources program taught entirely in Wallowa County will be offered this fall by Oregon State University College of Forestry and - Extended Campus. The Wallowa Resources Field Program, runs from Sept. 12 to Nov. 17.

This field studies program is designed for either undergraduate students or professionals who wish to study community-based forestry and natural resources in a region that’s working to manage its forests, grasslands, rivers and ecosystems in a sustainable manner. Instructors will include resource and conservation professionals, community leaders, land managers, and scientists. Students will live in Wallowa County.

For more information: http://ecampus.oregonstate.edu/online-degrees/wallowa

**National Forest Foundation Community Assistance Program**

The NFF established the Community Assistance Program (CAP) to promote the creation of locally-based forest partnerships which seek to build economic and environmental sustainability. The NFF CAP provides “start-up” grants in the $5,000 - $15,000 range, as well as basic tools and guidance, to enable newly-forming “grassroots” community groups to play a more active role in the sustainable management of nearby National Forests and surrounding communities.

For more information, application procedures and contact information: http://www.natlforests.org/consp_05_cap.html

*See the next page for more community announcements...*
**FELLOWSHIP OPPORTUNITIES AT MONASH UNIVERSITY, AUSTRALIA**

**Monash Regional Australia Postdoc. Fellowship**

The Monash Regional Australia (MRAP) is seeking a suitably qualified applicant to undertake a project entitled: “Local and Regional Food Chains: Prospects for Rural Sustainability.” The proposed research aims to produce an assessment of the prospects for local and regionally-based food chains to improve farm viability and promote broader rural sustainability. For more information: www.arts.monash.edu.au/affiliates/mrap/research_.html Or contact: Dr Jacqui Dibden, Research Fellow: Jacqui.Dibden@arts.monash.edu.au. The closing date: 6/30/05.

**Monash University Fellowships**

Potential applicants with wider research experience may be eligible for a Monash Fellowship. Applications for these five-year Fellowships are invited from researchers outside Monash University, in any discipline, with normally not less than two and not more than eight years of post-doctoral research experience and with demonstrated research outcomes at an international level. For more information: www.monash.edu.au/research/academics/funding/information/monash/monash-fellowships.html

**Monash University Faculty of Arts Fellowship**

The faculty is seeking an early career researcher to undertake research in areas of identified research strength or emerging research potential. Prospective Fellows must be outside Monash University undertaking research in Arts, Humanities and Social Science disciplines, be no more than five years beyond the date of the granting of their PhD and have demonstrated potential to achieve research outcomes at international level. For more information: www.arts.monash.edu.au/research/staff-funding2005/artspdf/index.html or contact Ms Rosalind King, Business Development Manager: ros.king@arts.monash.edu.au The closing date for applications is June 30, 2005.

---

**NEW INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT WEBSITE**

The US Forest Service is pleased to announce their new website for Invasive Species Management. The National Invasive Species Issue Team developed the website as a communication tool to showcase the invasive species work of the USDA FS. The website will serve as a portal to access invasive species program information at the national, regional, forest and district levels. This project was a priority action item in the National Strategy and Implementation Plan for Invasive Species Management.

To visit the website please go to: http://www.fs.fed.us/invasivespecies/
**Job Announcements**

**Youth In Focus Seeks Executive Director**

Youth In Focus, a non-profit intermediary organization dedicated to supporting under-represented youth and adult allies to engage in youth-led action research, evaluation, and planning as a means to achieve social justice, is searching for an Executive Director.

The Executive Director provides the overall staff leadership for Youth In Focus, and is the position ultimately responsible for the quality of its programs and operations. The Executive Director’s time is divided between the Oakland, CA and Central Valley offices each week. This position also requires travel outside the region for conferences and meetings roughly once a month. Applications are due by July, 15th.

For more information and specific instructions for applying: www.youthinfocus.net/volunteer.htm.

**Forest Guild seeks Community Forestry Program Coordinator**

The Forest Guild is seeking a Community Forestry Program Coordinator to develop, manage and implement projects in the Southwest. The program focuses on forest restoration, rural community stability, and local economic development. Current projects are in multiparty monitoring, forest restoration techniques, landscape-scale restoration planning, and youth education. Applicants must have a Masters degree in natural resources and 3-5 years professional experience, as well as skills in project management, fund raising, writing and communication and an affinity for working with people in forest-dependent communities.

For more information and specific instructions for applying: http://forestguild.org/employment.html

The first review of applications will begin June 13th.

**University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service - Assistant Professor Position**

Areas of program responsibility include general forest management, regeneration and management of pine and mixed forests. The incumbent will have applied research responsibilities including existing forest research projects at the SW Research and Extension Center and will implement forest education programs targeting 4H and other youth. Emphasis is placed on encouraging reforestation on harvested lands, generating interest in regeneration planning prior to harvesting, reforesting unproductive forest areas, fostering better management of existing forests, and improving timber marketing practices.

Qualifications: Ph.D. required; at least two degrees must be forestry degrees from an accredited forestry school. Experience with emphasis in southern pine management is highly desired.

For more information and how to apply: www.uaex.edu/Other_Areas/jobs/Jobs_detail/N07021.asp

**Sonoran Institute Job Opening**

The Sonoran Institute has a job opening for a full-time Project Manager for Adaptive Management and Regional Ecosystem Monitoring in Tucson, AZ. The Project Manager is responsible for increasing land management accountability for priority conservation sites in the Sonoran Desert through data sharing, partnerships, and adaptive management. S/he will plan, implement, and monitor activities of the adaptive management and regional ecosystem monitoring project. Encouraging effective adaptive management and policy change for improved conservation of the Sonoran Desert region is the primary focus of the Project Manager’s work.

For more details and how to apply visit: www.sonoran.org/about_us/si_job_opportunities.html
June

9th North American Agroforestry Conference - Moving Agroforestry into the Mainstream  
June 12-15, Rochester, MN

The conference consists of 2 days of sessions and one day of field tours. The sessions will address various topics relevant to agroforestry on both national and international levels, panel discussions that focus on policy issues, successes and new directions.

More information: www.cinram.umn.edu/afta2005

International Symposium on Society and Resource Management  
June 16-19, Östersund, Sweden


Community Forests in the United States: Possibilities, Experiences, and Lessons Learned  
June 16-19, Missoula, MT

This conference will explore issues in community forest establishment, governance, management, and use. It will include: Changes in Timberland Ownership, Community Outreach, Partnerships, Funding for Acquisition, Governance, and Long-Term Management. It will focus on options for localities that wish to purchase and manage forestland, rather than on the much broader realm of Community Forestry in general. Co-sponsored by the Bolle Center for People and Forests.

More information: www.communitiescommittee.org

Forest Products Society 59th International Convention  
June 19–22, Québec, Canada

More information: www.forestprod.org/confam05.html

International Conference on Forest Vegetation Management  
June 20-24, Corvallis, OR

Topics to be considered at this conference include: understanding the nature of competitive interactions, identifying treatment need, and selecting suitable and effective management or treatment options.

For more information: http://outreach.cof.orst.edu/icfvm/index.htm

“Being in the World, Living with the Land”  
The 6th Biennial Conference of ASLE (Assoc. for the Study of Literature and the Environment)  
June 21-25, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR

More information: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~smcfarla/index.html

July

2005 Northeastern Forest Soils Conference  
July 18-21, Logan County, WV

More information: Mary Beth Adams (mbadams@fs.fed.us; 304-478-2000)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Community Involvement Conference  
July 12-15, Buffalo, NY

This annual conference brings together public participation and community involvement professionals from across all EPA programs, as well as their local, state, federal, and tribal partners. Conference presentations are designed to emphasize the process of public participation and community involvement by focusing on techniques and approaches used in EPA’s national and regional community involvement programs.

For more information: www.epancic.org/2005/overview.cfm
Conferences & Workshops

**JULY**

**Soil and Water Conservation Society**  
*July 30-August 4, 2005, Rochester, NY*

The conference will focus on: Managing Landscapes for Environmental Quality, Assessing and Communicating the Effectiveness of Conservation and Environmental Programs, The Growing Debate Around Water Use, Consumer Demand and Policy Effects on Agricultural Resources


**AUGUST**

**Rural Sociological Society’s 68th Annual Meeting**  
*August 8-13, Tampa, Florida*

More information: http://ruralsociology.org/annual-meeting/index.html

**Forests in the Balance: Linking Tradition and Technology. XXII IUFRO World Congress**  
*August 8-13, Brisbane, Australia*

More information: http://iufro.boku.ac.at/

**Community-based Integrated Watershed Management: Participatory Action Research for Community Based Natural Resource Management**  
*August 15-30, Thailand*

More information: www.iirr.org/ict09.htm#cbnrm2004

**A Future Beneath the Trees: An international symposium on non-timber forest products, community economic development and forest conservation**  
*August 25-27, Victoria, B.C., Canada*

More information: www.ntfpconference.ca

**SEPTEMBER**

**Managing Forestlands Sustainably: Workshops in Ecological Forestry**  
*September 8-9, Bemidji, MN*

More information: www.osiny.org/conservationforestry/mn_forestry.htm

**Managing Forestlands Sustainably: Workshops in Ecological Forestry**  
*September 13-14, Kingfield, ME*

More information: www.osiny.org/conservationforestry/me_forestry.htm

**Ecotourism in the United States**  
*September 14-16, Bar Harbor, ME*

The International Ecotourism Society and Bar Harbor Chamber of commerce are hosting and organizing the first national conference on Ecotourism in the U.S. It will bring together top experts and practitioners to discuss a broad range of issues surrounding ecotourism practices in the United States and to develop an action plan promoting the U.S as an ecotourism destination.

For more information: www.ecotourism.org

**Minority Environmental Leadership Development Initiative (MELDI) National Summit on Diversity in the Environmental Field: Thirty-Five Years After Earth Day, Where Do We Go From Here?**  
*August 28-30, 2005, Ann Arbor, MI*

The conference will bring together leaders of environmental NGOs, government environmental agencies, deans/chairs of academic environmental programs, corporate environmental units, and students for a national conversation about diversity in the environmental field.

For more information: http://www.sitemaker.umich.edu/meldi
Conferences & Workshops

October

National Land Conservation Rally 2005
*October 14-17, Madison, WI*

More information: www.lta.org/training/rally.htm

Society of American Foresters National Convention
*October 19-23, Fort Worth, TX*

The SAF annual convention will feature scientific sessions and technical field workshops.

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

November

28th Annual Applied Geography Conference
*November 2-5, Washington DC*

There will be sessions focused on natural resources and rural topics. Conference registration fees ($100/$40 students) and the AV request form must be submitted along with the abstract. Expression of intent to submit a written paper must be made at this time, on the AV request form.

For more information: www.appliedgeog.org/html/main.htm

Community-Based Collaboratives Research Consortium National Conference
*November 17-19, Sedona, AZ*

The conference will showcase and evaluate research on the environmental outcomes and effectiveness of community-based collaborative processes. It also will feature interactive training workshops for and by community collaborative groups.

For more information: www.cbcrc.org/2005%20National%20Workshop.htm

International Institute of Rural Reconstruction:
Community-based Integrated Watershed Management
*November 28 – December 16*

For more information: www.iirr.org/ict09.htm#watershed

Forest Restoration in the Eastern United States:
A Conference to Focus on Public and Private Forest Lands
*November 10 - 12, 2005, Black Mountain, North Carolina*

This conference will provide the opportunity to learn more about restoration issues and restoration projects in the region, about cutting-edge developments in the field, share knowledge and ideas, and get skills and information to take back home. With workshops, group discussions, field trips, and other activities, the gathering will help build a deeper understanding of restoration forestry, and help create opportunities for working together.

For more information: www.ForestCoalition.org or call 828-252-9223.

February 2006

Managing Forestlands Sustainably: Workshops in Ecological Forestry
*February 21-23, Newton, GA*

More information: www.osiny.org/conservationforestry/ga_forestry.htm

March 2006

Association of American Geographers 2006 Annual Meeting
*March 7-11, Chicago, IL*

Paper submission deadline: October 13, 2005
www.aag.org
Publications by CFRF Fellows


Other Publications

Building Better Rural Places
August 2004

This is a guide written for anyone seeking help from federal programs to foster new enterprises in agriculture and forestry in the United States. The guide addresses program resources in community development, sustainable land management, and value-added and diversified agriculture and forestry. It can help farmers, entrepreneurs, community developers, and conservationists, as well as private and public organizations both for-profit and not-for-profit. The guide can also help communities identify resources to reduce the risk of wildfire, support commercial use of small-diameter material and woody biomass, and expand renewable energy alternatives.

To obtain a free copy, please contact ATTRA, the National Sustainable Agriculture Information Service, at P.O. Box 3657, Fayetteville, AR 72702; 1.800.346 9140; 406.494.2905 (fax); or mdebbier@ncat.org. In addition, it can be downloaded from ATTRA website (attra.ncat.org/guide). A Spanish translation of Building Better Rural Places being developed and should be available in 2005.

Living on the Edge: Wildland Fire Management Laboratory Manual

Designed to provide students with information on fire ecology, wild land fire management, prescribed burning, and the expanding role of the fire manager in the wildland/urban interface, the Living on the Edge: Wildland Fire Management Laboratory Manual has been written and reviewed by instructors in 6 different schools of forestry across the US. Hands-on exercises offer students a laboratory environment to apply their knowledge, including their understanding of the wildland fire manager’s role in the wildland/urban interface.

By Andrew Londo, PhD, RF, Associate Professor of Silviculture in the Department of Forestry at Mississippi State University (MSU) and Brian Oswald, PhD, CF, Professor of Fire Ecology, Silviculture and Range Management at the Arthur Temple College of Forestry at Stephen F. Austin State University.

To preview contents or order copies, visit www.wildfirelab.com or call, toll-free: 1-866-INFO-ITM. ISBN 0-9762175-0-3, Paperback (coil bound) with 2 CD-ROMs, $96, Published May 2005.
**Other Publications**

**Historical book: “North American forests and forestry; their relations to the national life of the American people”**

A 1900 publication by Ernest Bruncken can be found online: http://cdl.library.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/chla/chla-cgi?notisid=AFE2862

**Issues Confronting Family Forest Owners In the 21st Century**

An assessment of the current political, ecological and economic challenges facing family forests. A copy can be found online: www.affoundation.org/news/issues_confronting_family_forest_owner.pdf

**Journal of the Community Development Society**

The Journal of the Community Development Society, Volume 35, No. 1, is a special issue focused exclusively on entrepreneurship in rural development. This is a great compilation of rural entrepreneurship writings. For more information, email CDS@AssnOffices.com or go to www.comm-dev.org

**A Landowner’s Guide to Building Forest Access Roads**

This guide applies to low-speed forest roads with a 12-foot-wide running surface that are needed only temporarily or only during certain times of the year. Recommendations in this guide cover basic planning, construction, drainage, maintenance, and closure of such forest roads. The recommendations incorporate best management practices, which are designed to reduce non point-source pollution, as can occur during road building.

A copy can be found online: www.na.fs.fed.us/spfo/pubs/stewardship/access-roads/accessroads.htm

**National Forest Foundation Partnership Guidebook**

The issues around the management of public lands are not simple. The problems and solutions have become so complex that agency employees and partners often cannot achieve success working alone. Bringing in partners to collaborate on solutions to sticky problems often results in better ecological, economic and social outcomes. Furthermore, partnerships increase the ability of both the Forest Service and partners to accomplish their respective missions, goals and objectives.

The purpose of this guidebook is to help both Forest Service employees and current and potential partners better understand partnerships and the tools and guidelines each need to consider when entering into and maintaining a partnership.

For more information and to download a copy: www.natlforests.org/partnership_guidebook.html

**Profiles From Working Woodlands: Exploring Forest-based Enterprises in Western Massachusetts**

This book is a series of case studies that explore economic options for sustainably developing the small private forest ownerships of the region. The case studies were developed and written by Susan Campbell for MWI in 2003 and follow products from the stump through primary and secondary processing, and eventually to the retail market.

The cost of this book is $15 which includes shipping and handling. Purchasing information, as well as a free PDF of this publication is available at: www.massachusettswoodlandsinstitute.org.