

APPENDICES TO THE STATUS OF COMMUNITY-BASED FORESTRY IN THE UNITED STATES:

A Report to the U.S. Endowment for
Forestry and Communities

SURVEY

U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities/Consortium for Community Forestry (CCF) Survey on Community-Based Forestry (CBF) Initiatives Across America

Introduction/Invitation

The Consortium for Community Forestry is researching community-based forestry (CBF) in the United States as part of a project for the U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities (the Endowment). This research aims to identify and understand the rich variety of CBF initiatives, including community-owned forests. To this end we are requesting a lead organization with every CBF initiative complete the following survey. In addition to the survey, a few new CBF case studies will be developed. This body of work will be used to identify opportunities for the Endowment and other CBF funders to advance community-based forestry through their foundation grant-making programs.

Your participation in this survey is very important. A final CBF report will be available on the Endowment's website. A public database of CBF initiatives will be available on the Trust for Public Land website. This information will contribute to numerous opportunities to fund and advance CBF activities across the U.S. The overall field of CBF is a complex suite of projects, organizations/agencies and experiences. This survey is an attempt to capture a broad sense of how the CBF field is progressing. If some part of this survey seems unfamiliar skip over it. You may want to collect certain information before entering this survey including a 100-word description of your CBF initiative and acreages of forest land important to your initiative (e.g. federal, state, community-owned, leased, easements held, private, etc.). If you do not complete this survey in one session you may exit and re-enter it from the same computer. Click on 'Save and Next' at the bottom of the page before exiting. It will take approximately 20-30 minutes for you to complete this survey. Please note that some questions are required and the survey will not advance without an answer.

If you would like further information about Community-based Forestry Initiatives, please click here.

Every CBF organization that completes this survey will be entered into a Participation Award drawing for \$1000. The drawing will be on May 15, 2008.

Thank you for your effort and time on behalf of the U.S. Endowment and the Consortium for Community Forestry.

Part A: CBF Initiative Contact, Community and Organizational Information

The information in this section will be included in the public, updateable CBF data base stored on the Trust for Public Land website unless you opt out at the end of this section.

1. CBF Initiative Information.

CBF Name:
CBF Address:
City/Town:
State:
ZIP/Postal Code:
County:
CBF Website:
CBF Phone Number:

2. CBF Initiative Current Lead Organization Contact Information.

Participating Community(s):
Approximate Population of Above:
Home/Lead Organization:
Are you a 501(c)(3) Non-profit? Y/N:
Contact Person:
Email Address:

3. Person completing this survey, fill out if different than the above contact person.

Name:

Organization:

Email Address:

4. Has your group or project worked in a formal partnership or collaboration?

(formal includes organized, multi-organizational, meets regularly, decision-making body, including advising and providing recommendations to other legal bodies)

- Yes
- No, skip to question 7

5. If yes, for what purposes? Check all that apply:

- Land acquisition
- Land management
- Forest products research and development
- Forest-based job development and training
- Non-timber forest product development

Other purposes for collaboration, please describe:

6. Please identify types of participants in the above mentioned group, check all that apply:

- Forest products industry
- Federal agency
- State agency (including Soil & Water Conservation Districts)
- Tribal agency
- Local government
- Educational institutions (including Extension agent)
- Private business
- Environmental/conservation non-profit
- Economic development non-profit
- Individual
- Private forest owner

Other types of participants, please describe:

7. Has your group or project worked in a non-formal partnership or collaboration on CBF issues or worked with additional groups to those identified above? Please list these groups, by name, with which you primarily work on CBF issues.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.

8. Have you had or are you currently having a case study done on your CBF Initiative? If yes, please provide the following information.

Author:

Title:

Date:

Document location:

9. Please provide a short description including the main goals and objectives of the CBF Initiative (approximately 100 words):

10. Part A is the Only Information to be included in the TPL Public Database. If you do not want this information included, please click below. The information will be used for analytical and statistical purposes.

Please Do Not Include

Part B: Organizational History of Lead Organization

The information from this section will be used for analytical and statistical purposes.

1. Years engaged in CBF activities:

- 0 - 1
- 1 - 3
- 3 - 5
- 5 - 9
- 9 - 15
- 15+

2. Average annual operating budget (over the last 3 years):

- \$0 - 50,000
- \$51,000 - 100,000
- \$101,000 - 250,000
- \$251,000 - 500,000
- \$501,000 - 1,000,000
- \$1,000,000+

3. Number of full-time paid employees:

- 0
- 1 - 2
- 3 - 5
- 6 - 9
- 10 - 13
- 14+

4. Average number of funding source(s) over the past 3 years:

- 0
- 1 - 2
- 3 - 5
- 6 - 9
- 10+

5. List your top 3 funding sources of the last 3 years:

1st
2nd
3rd

6. Does your CBF Initiative have earned income? If yes, please fill out the following 3 questions (7-9).

- Yes
- No

7. Annual CBF related gross earned income for last reported year by source? (enter number only)

Timber harvest/sales \$
Stewardship contracting \$
Consulting \$
Business venture(s) \$
Other source(s) \$

8. For other source(s) of earned income above, please describe:

9. How many years have you earned income?

- 1-3
- 3-5
- 5-8
- 8+

10. Do you have a Strategic Plan in place?

- Yes
- No

11. In terms of expenditures, what are your top 3 programs?

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd

Part C: Forest Resource Information

The forest land of interest in this question is the total forest resource base that you consider supports your community. This may include public and private land you access for forest-related economic activity or the forest land in your defined community(s) or region.

The information from this section will be used for analytical and statistical purposes.

1. Forest land ownership and management control, enter approximate number of acres or zero if it doesn't apply or leave blank if you don't know.

- Federal land
- State land
- Tribal land
- Private industrial land
- Private non-industrial land
- Community-owned municipal land
- Community-owned county land
- Community-owned non-profit land
- Community leased (municipal, county, non-profit) land
- Community holds conservation or working forest easement(s) (municipal, county, non-profit)
- Other form(s) of land tenure

2. For other form(s) of land tenure above, please describe:

Part D: CBF Methods & Activities

The information from this section will be used for analytical and statistical purposes & to develop a typology of CBF activity.

For the following questions, please identify which methods your CBF Initiative either currently employs, expects to employ in the next 1 - 5 years or expects to employ in the future (more than 5 years). You may check several boxes. If no boxes are checked for a method it will mean that your group does not now and does not intend in the future to pursue this approach to CBF. So please check all boxes that apply.

1. Community Forest Ownership/Tenure, this includes any forest owned and/or managed for public purposes by municipal or county government or a non-profit:

	Currently employs	Next 1-5 years	5+ years
Community-owned forest land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community-leased forest land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community holds conservation or working forest easement(s) of forest land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community uses other form of tenure arrangement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other form(s) of tenure arrangements, please describe:

2. Policy - may include policies on how public land is managed or policies such as land use effecting private lands:

	Currently employs	Next 1-5 years	5+ years
Seek to influence passage of CBF related federal laws or policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seek to influence passage of CBF related state laws or policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seek to influence passage of CBF related local laws or policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seek to secure funding and implementation of federal laws to assist with CBF activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seek to secure funding and implementation of state laws to assist with CBF activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seek to secure funding and implementation of local laws to assist with CBF activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other policy approaches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other policy approaches, please describe:

3. Education:

	Currently employs	Next 1-5 years	5+ years
Conducts an active public education program promoting CBF activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides curriculum and/or classroom support to local schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conducts an active landowner education program promoting CBF activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Offers capacity building and/or other training for forest related work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other educational approaches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other educational approaches, please describe:

Business Development Methods:

For the following Business Questions please identify CBF activity(s) (may be your organization or others involved in your CBF initiative) that includes starting a business or supporting a business development strategy that helps the community currently capture the forest value stream, will seek to capture the forest value stream in the next 1 - 5 years or will seek to capture the forest value stream in the future (5+ years). You may check several boxes. If no boxes are checked for a value stream it will mean that your CBF Initiative does not now and does not intend in the future to pursue capture of this value stream as part of its CBF activity. So please check all boxes that apply.

4. A wood products forest value stream:

	Currently captures	Next 1-5 years	5+ years
Biomass	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Small diameter timber/under-utilized species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Saw timber	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Veneer timber	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Value-added wood business	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other wood product value stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other wood products value stream, please describe:

5. A tourism/recreational forest value stream:

	Currently captures	Next 1-5 years	5+ years
Outfitter/guide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hiking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fishing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hunting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Camping	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cultural tourism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ecotourism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other tourism/recreational value stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other tourism/recreational value stream, please describe:

6. A non-wood products forest value stream:

	Currently captures	Next 1-5 years	5+ years
Mushroom harvest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floral greens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Herb collection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grazing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other non-wood value stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other non-wood products value stream, please describe:

7. An ecosystem services forest value stream. Your work related to ecosystem services may produce a direct impact/benefit (business created, payments made to forest owners) or indirect impact/benefit (existing businesses/forest owners benefit). Please check all that apply.

	Currently captures direct	Currently captures indirect	Next 1-5 yrs direct	Next 1-5 yrs indirect	5+ yrs direct	5+ yrs indirect
Carbon credits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fish habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wildlife habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Biodiversity protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water quality & quantity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other ecosystem value stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other ecosystem services value stream, please describe:

8. Stewardship related forest value stream:

	Currently captures	Next 1-5 years	5+ years
Public land contracting (services, stewardship, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manages collaborative process for public land stewardship contracting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wildlife protection and/or management planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Watershed assessment, management planning, and/or monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mitigation and reclamation of mined land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wildfire planning and/or management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ecological monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community-based wildfire management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ecological/restoration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other stewardship activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other stewardship activities, please describe:

9. Other approaches to CBF you have employed or intend to employ in addition to those listed above, please describe:

Part E: Challenges & Resource Needs

The information from this section will be used for analytical and statistical purposes. Check all boxes that apply.

1. Which of the following challenges have you faced? For CBF initiatives that undertake multiple CBF approaches or multiple phases such as acquisition and management, we are seeking a general overview of challenges you faced along the way or face now and your sense of their difficulty.

	Major Challenge	Moderate Challenge	Not a Challenge
Financial support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technical support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Forest owner support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Forest industry support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
US Forest Service support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local government support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State government support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Business support (Chamber of Commerce & other business groups)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental/conservation organization support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Networking support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other challenges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other challenges, please describe:

2. How supportive of CBF have you found public policy?

	Very Supportive	Moderately Supportive	Not Supportive
Federal policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

3. Name the organization or individual that has provided the most important technical assistance to your CBF Initiative?

4. Identify and rank your financial needs:

	High	Medium	Low	N/A
Business capital, small loans <\$25,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Business capital, large loans >\$25,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Venture capital (large equity investors)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Small local equity investors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General operating support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Capital to purchase forest land and easements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gap financing for community forest deals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funding to support youth natural resource program(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other financial needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other financial needs, please describe:

5. Identify and rank your technical needs:

	High	Medium	Low	N/A
Business technical support (e.g. biomass, wind)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Business planning support (e.g. business, financial & marketing plans)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community ownership models	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Model legislation & policies for advancing CBF	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Group facilitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educational materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Policy education support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scientific/analytical support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Networking support (policy/business)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Peer to peer networking support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GIS/computer/database support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leadership training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other technical needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For other technical needs, please describe:

You have now completed our CBF Survey. Thank you very much for your participation. You can find the Community-based Forestry Initiative survey information on the Trust for Public Land website when they are final. The U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities will also post a final report on its website.

COMMUNITY-BASED FORESTRY IN RURAL AMERICA:

A Classification and Typology

Nils Christoffersen and Don Harker

Wallowa Resources

The Community Forestry Consortium (hereinafter referred to as the Consortium) conducted a nationwide survey to assess and map the breadth and diversity of community-based forestry (CBF) in the U.S. The core partners to the Consortium developed the survey instrument and the underlying definitions of CBF. They brought their collective experience and knowledge of CBF in the U.S. to this task. The final survey benefited from a test-run of the instrument with a broader set of CBF leaders.

The web-based survey (“Survey Monkey”) was sent out to over 2,400 distinct e-mail addresses. This distribution was built from the participants or memberships of diverse CBF-related organizations and projects including: Forest Guild, National Network of Forest Practitioners, Community Forestry Research Fellowship, Ford Foundation Community Forestry Initiative, Communities Committee of the Seventh National Forest Congress, National Forest Foundation, American Forests, The Trust for Public Land, and other networks and resources. Several organizations posted the link to the survey on their websites. This provided an opportunity for unaffiliated groups to participate. Over the course of the 12-week survey period, several electronic announcements were sent out to encourage participation.

The survey captured information on location, acreage (where appropriate), goals, models of ownership and use rights, institutional arrangements and capacity, revenue and other forest value streams captured by communities, benefit sharing, level of community participation, types of resources and forest management structures, and dominant social, economic and ecological strategies, among other attributes. Not all respondents met the Consortium’s definition for a CBF. However, the variety of responses was important to understanding the CBF movement in the U.S.

The Consortium recognizes the limitations of a web-based survey in reaching certain audiences who do not have access to or make regular use of the Internet. The low response rate from Tribal Nations and Hispanic Land Grant organizations is particularly noted. A targeted effort to capture the breadth and depth of CBF activity within Tribal Nations and Hispanic Land Grants should be considered. A select few CBF entities opted out of participation due to political considerations relevant to the formation and structure of the U.S. Endowment.

The survey focused on community-based forestry within rural areas. Given the diverse nature of CBF initiatives in

the U.S., and the diverse spatial scales across which different organizations operate, this focus had its own definitional challenges. The Consortium partners recognize that urban community-based forestry often shares similar broad values and goals. However, rural community-based forestry typically addresses the management of forest stands for diverse goods and services. Urban efforts are typically focused on the management of trees. Furthermore, within urban ecosystems, CBF initiatives primarily focus on ecosystem services and aesthetic values. For several survey responses, the data identifying the “participating communities” and population sizes of a CBF initiative were insufficient to distinguish between urban and rural. In these cases, final classification was based on whether the initiative was addressing forest stand management or tree care along urban streets and in city parks.

Defining Community-Based Forestry

Practitioners and researchers have defined community-based forestry both internationally and domestically. The Consortium partners define CBF as follows:

CBF refers to the management of forested landscapes for community benefit.

Community benefit is defined by an aggregation of local social, economic and ecological values. CBF aspires to triple-bottom line accounting. Some level of community participation in management decisions is a central operating principle of CBF.

Community-based forestry is represented by a complex suite of activities, projects, and organizations that have many different goals based on local conditions. They are organized at different scales, in different geographies and within a variety of community cultures and conditions. They operate within a diversity of institutional and legal frameworks and represent various stages in organizational development.

All community-based forestry projects and organizations use some form of collaboration or partnership and operate under varying degrees of legitimacy and efficacy in the eyes of the community. Within any given CBF initiative, “communities of place” and “communities of interest” may be represented in a collaborative. In the end, tangible benefit streams from CBF to individual community members and the larger public influence the potential sustainability and success of each community-based initiative.

The Consortium asserts that the following processes are key attributes of CBF, although the form, structure, and degree of these attributes may differ between sites depending on the local and organizational context.

- Management of forested landscapes.
 - o Promote the stewardship of forested landscapes to provide a variety of forest products, employment, revenue, and ecosystem services, including: water quality and quantity, range, wildlife, recreation, aesthetic value, and carbon sequestration.
 - o Invest in the natural capital of these landscapes for the long term.
- Tenure of forested areas and access to its benefit streams.
 - o Secure local/community access and rights to the forest resource.
 - o Promote national, state or local policy initiatives that increase community influence over the forest resources, including timber, range, water, wildlife, and recreation.
- Benefit distribution — a broad range of community members receive value and benefits that support and reinforce community land management and economic development priorities.
 - o Retain, strengthen or rebuild the infrastructure for forest-based economic activity.
 - o Invest in community capital and develop business initiatives that capture one or more value streams from the forest resource.
 - o Compensate entities appropriately who bear the costs for social or ecological benefits.
 - o Generate benefits to public entities providing services to the larger community (including schools, libraries, etc.) and to underserved groups.
- Collaborative decision-making — inclusive and equitable civic decision-making capacity and policy frameworks that promote healthy, vibrant, and resilient forests and communities.
 - o Employ collaborative processes that promote community participation in forest management decisions.
 - o Promote policies and programs that enable community-based forestry initiatives to be successful.

The relative emphasis within any one initiative on any of the attributes listed above may change over time as the driving forces impacting their communities change, or the success of their efforts change, or as their capacity to address larger scale issues improves.

Classification

In the accompanying table, we classify the respondents to

the survey. The classification distinguishes (i.) CBF organizations or initiatives that meet the criteria listed above, (ii.) support organizations including academic institutions or agencies (local, state, and federal) that provide direct support to place-based CBF's, (iii.) state, regional or national networks for CBF or facets of CBF work (i.e. market access, business development, policy work, etc.), and, (iv.) community-owned forests.

As the focus of the Consortium's effort is local CBF initiatives (and their lead organization or their managing collaborative), this classification settled on an amalgamation of several types of organizations into the three other categories listed above. Our rationale for this amalgamation is based primarily on the type of service or actions that other organizations provide to existing or potential future local CBF initiatives.

A number of respondents to the survey fall into a category termed "community-owned forests" which was reserved for efforts targeting local ownership, access or influence, without clearly addressing the broader spectrum of goals and activities inherent in our definition of CBF. Many land trusts were placed in this category – including those whose primary focus is conservation easements. Local government entities and other non-profits that currently own forested land (and/or easements to forested land) were also placed in this category. These organizations/initiatives provide a range of examples of community-forest ownership. They are not specifically named or mapped in the database generated with this study.

There is considerable variation in the list of "support" organizations in this classification. It includes national organizations such as American Forests, which provide policy and technical support to local CBFs. It includes universities, colleges and research institutions that support education, research, outreach, and policy efforts. It includes regional CBF organizations, which have similar goals and programs of work as local CBFs but operate at a higher spatial and political scale – typically with more than one local CBF. It also includes federal, state, and local government agencies, as well as other local non-profits that provide distinct services to CBF efforts but are not fully engaged in any one effort. Some entities classified as support organizations are membership organizations, but their membership may not be primarily place-based CBFs or their agenda may not principally seek to advance the place-based CBF agenda. An example of this type of supporting organization is the Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association.

Organizations were classified as "networks" if the network membership consisted primarily of place-based CBFs, and the network's goals were to advance some specific aspect of the place-based agenda. Networks operate through collective action at higher spatial scales relevant to the ecological area being managed, the political sphere that needed to be influenced, or the markets targeted to capture diverse value streams. One example of a "network" is the Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition (RVCC), whose core membership consists primarily of place-based CBFs in the Pacific Northwest. RVCC works through its members to coordinate

influence of federal policies related to forest management, and forest-based community and workforce development. Our Consortium appreciates that RVCC considers itself a Consortium and not a network. That type of distinction was impractical for our classification.

A few private “forest-based” for-profit enterprises responded to the survey. These enterprises are often a critical element of local CBF initiatives. In and of themselves, however, they do not constitute CBF. We included three of the respondents in our list of CBFs due to their local ownership or local benefit mission and their demonstrated commitment to social, environmental, and economic outcomes consistent with our definitions of CBF. Two larger forest industry respondents were not included. Given the paucity of respondents in this category, further research on “forest-based” for-profit enterprises and their role in supporting local CBF initiatives should be undertaken.

The organizations classified represent only those that responded to our survey. The total population size of CBF organizations in the U.S. is unknown. The 70 organizations classified in this exercise as CBFs is the single largest dataset known to the Consortium members. The classification of all respondents is limited by the extent of information provided by the organizations. Undoubtedly some re-classification will be required as more information on any particular entity is acquired. The classification and typology are created with a vision toward continual use and management over time. This work provides a platform for continuous population and refinement of an active database on CBF in Rural America that will be managed and administered by The Trust for Public Land.

Place-based CBF Typology

The more detailed analysis of all place-based CBFs was guided by a typology developed in advance by the Consortium partners and refined in the course of this project. This typology is only applied to projects and organizations that involve defined communities, have some degree of community participation in management decisions, and provide some benefit stream to communities of place.

Even while we acknowledge the shortcomings of any typology, we suggest a *tiered approach* within five categories as a way to organize the variety of projects and organizations while also reflecting the complexity of the field.

The purpose of this typology is to:

- Assist in organizing the database for exchange/communication between “like” organizations and projects;
- Facilitate the addition of new projects into the database; and,
- Identify the technical and financial support needed by individual projects and organizations.

I. Rural Community Context (represents the context

within which a CBF operates)

- * Forest-amenity communities
- * Nascent forest-rich communities
- * Forest-stewardship communities

II. Landownership

- * Private (individual, family, land trust)
- * Private investor-owned
- * Public (federal/state/county/local)
- * Tribal
- * Community-owned
- * Mixed

III. Capacity/organizational development

- * High capacity
- * Moderate capacity
- * New/emerging

IV. CBF methods/strategies

- * Forest tenure (land ownership, access rights, resource rights, etc.)
- * Business development/creating value
- * Policy
- * Education

V. Benefit capture and distribution

- * High value capture and distribution
- * Moderate value capture and distribution
- * Minimal value capture and distribution

I. Rural Community Context

With respect to this analysis of CBF activity in the U.S., the context within which rural communities function is captured by the degree of “forest reliance” or “forest richness” and the forest ownership patterns discussed below. All CBF initiatives will initially be categorized based on these two characteristics.

Forest-rich Communities

The forest-rich community typology builds upon the Carsey Institute’s community typology (see Rural America in the 21st Century: Perspectives from the Field), and upon the work already completed by the U.S. Endowment’s Board and staff. Forest-rich communities are those whose natural asset base is dominated by forests, either in total acreage or in tangible value streams. The forest-rich community typology uses the factors influencing forest-rich communities as a way to provide insight into which elements of community health the U.S. Endowment can expect to impact through its work within identified focal initiatives.

A goal for all place-based CBFs is to achieve greater social and economic stability through the promotion of forest stewardship for long-term sustainability of natural systems and the capturing of multiple benefits (goods and services) afforded by healthy forests. Given the wealth of forest-based assets, place-based CBFs anticipate significant contributions to their economies from forest-related activity. They strive to maintain appropriate forest products infrastructure (relevant

to their forested resource base) and sustain sufficient acres of working forest in private and/or public land to ensure a predictable timber supply. Their preferred economies benefit from a diversity of forest-related activities that include timber and non-timber products, value-added businesses, recreation and tourism, and ecosystem services. They seek to create and sustain living wage, high-skilled jobs, and the related facilities and equipment as part of the community infrastructure.

Globalization, technological innovation, and traditional economic development policies and programs have created disparities in opportunities between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. Nearly all forest-rich rural communities in the U.S. are in some form of transition today. Some are on trajectories towards an amenity economy, others remain in decline from the loss of forest industry jobs, while a third set is actively exploring a new community-based stewardship economy. Since the change is ongoing, the current categorization of communities is subject to change as events and local decisions unfold.

Forest-amenity Communities — These communities have embraced a new future reflecting the demand for real estate development over natural resource management and production. Amenity values driving development include recreational use, climate, scenic values, and, occasionally, “small town” values. The particular amenities do not really matter; the issue is whether people desire the land for some other use than production value and whether attitudes toward the land are impacting land use and management. The economies of these communities are wholly or mostly transitioned to other non-forest sectors. Economic opportunities in forestry often remain but the value streams are insignificant for the community as a whole.

Nascent forest-rich Communities — These transitional communities have significant forest asset values, but little infrastructure or capacity to convert these values into tangible benefits for the local community. These communities lack the amenity values to attract new wealth and investment. To the extent there is any capture of forest asset values (primarily wood products), it is captured by private and external enterprises. As local awareness of the potential value streams grows, organizations are formed to pursue opportunities for local benefit capture. Examples of these communities are found throughout the Southeast U.S.

Forest-stewardship Communities — These communities emerge in response to significant social, economic, and/or ecological change impacting their viability and preferred future. These communities historically had a significant portion of their economies derived from forest-related activity. That activity is declining and the infrastructure to support a timber-related industry is in decline or gone. Other economic opportunities may

or may not be immediately available or contributing to ongoing social and economic change. But these communities have made a conscientious decision to strive to sustain their culture, skills and employment in natural resource stewardship. Typically, these communities communicate mutual concern for the long-term health of the land and their own communities.

II. Forest Ownership Patterns

Ownership patterns as well as the availability and access to forest resources influence membership in the community-based forestry initiative. These patterns also affect the goals and methods of the initiative as well as the potential benefit streams and their distribution. The following ownership/tenure categories are identified for each CBF initiative. The patterns of ownership including dominant ownerships are identified. To the degree possible, the larger landscape ownership patterns are cross-referenced with the generation of benefits from each ownership category, including the value of products, direct and indirect employment, number of visitors and associated recreational or non-market values. A significant community-owned or managed forestland generates benefit streams relevant to the size of the community — it will not be categorized merely by the size of the acreage under ownership or management.

Private ownership (individual or family forest)

Private investor-owned forest

Public forestland (BLM, USFS, NPS, state, municipal or local government)

Tribal forestland

Community-owned

Mixed

Varying levels of access and influence available to community-based forestry initiatives typically characterize these ownership categories. Diversity in forest ownership patterns often provides greater resilience and opportunity to community-based forestry – generally maintaining access and benefits from some portion of the forested landscape when access and benefits change in some other portion.

III. Capacity and Stage of Development

Each lead organization, or the collaborative leading an initiative (or regional network), will have varying levels of experience, capacity and ability to mobilize resources for community-based forestry activity. Community-based forestry initiatives will be assigned to one of the following three (or four) categories based upon the following criteria: experience in community-based activity, diversity of projects and value streams captured, size of budget and staff, project accomplishments and impacts, creation and distribution of an earned income stream, and the ability to mobilize and effectively utilize capital and other resources.

- High capacity organization or initiative.
- Moderate capacity organization or initiative.
- New/Emerging capacity organization or initiative.

IV. CBF Methods

A variety of methods are used by groups to gain some level of influence or control over the forest resource in a particular place, including the capture and distribution of diverse benefit streams and leadership in long-term stewardship. Working collaboratively, engaging diverse members of the community, and building local consensus are crosscutting strategies employed in the implementation of diverse methods for specific place-based goals. The maturity, capacity and resources of the organizations involved and the perceived efficacy and acceptability of a method for a particular place or ownership pattern govern those methods. The following methods will be identified for each CBF initiative.

Forest Tenure — Any initiative that uses a form of land tenure to advance CBF (and sustainable forest management) will be identified under this category. This would include formal land ownership, long-term management agreements, conservation easements and conservation easements on private land. It would also include varying forms of co-management on public land, including those built around stewardship contracts.

Business Development — This category will identify initiatives that specifically use the creation of locally appropriate (in scale, cost, impact, etc.) businesses or business development strategies as a way to advance CBF. Within CBF initiatives, these businesses typically prioritize job creation and retention, fair wages, and benefits. A sub-set of this category would identify those initiatives that organize community investment and ownership in a significant forest business. This ownership may take varying forms including coops, employee ownership models, and LLCs.

Policy — Policy initiatives aimed at improving the influence of local constituents in county, state or Federal legislation and budget appropriations will qualify a CBF initiative to be identified under this category.

Education — A variety of educational approaches can be used to advance CBF, including workshops, demonstration forests, and collaborative monitoring. Collaborative monitoring engages the community in the learning process and helps build trust and relationships and also generates data and knowledge to inform future decision-making. A CBF initiative that uses any education approach will be identified here.

V. Benefit Capture

The diversity and extent of forest value stream capture is a critical element in assessing the maturity and capacity of any individual initiative. It speaks to the ability of the local economy to capture and circulate dollars in the community. A healthy and resilient community-based forestry initiative will

have a complex economic foundation. One can think about economies as analogous to ecosystems. They can be either simple or complex. Complex ecosystems and economies tend to be more resilient and stable than simple ones because of an inherent level of adaptive capacity. Complex local economies operate within local, regional, national, and global markets and are adaptive to shifts in competitive advantage, consumer preferences, and policy. Whatever the source of revenue (local, regional, national, or global), systems are developed to ensure the equitable distribution of benefits. Distribution mechanisms compensate for both actual and opportunity costs relevant to the benefit generation and motivate broad political and social support for the supporting strategies and policies.

The following three categories will be used to characterize a CBF initiative with regard to the local economy.

High Value Capture (complex local and regional economy) — is defined by a complex local economy with a variety of value streams being captured with multiple value-added businesses in the local value chain for each value stream. This economy has a variety of businesses able to capture revenue from the forest value streams and circulate dollars in the local economy. It is an entrepreneurial economy which can be defined as a robust, decentralized support network of communities, institutions, entrepreneurs, and businesses with the internal capacity to recognize opportunities, create enterprises, and build a resilient local economy that interacts with the regional, national, and global economies.

Moderate Value Capture (moderately complex local and regional economy) — is capturing more than one value stream from the forest and has some value-added layers in the value stream. This may be a recovering economy where the community ownership is strong and where actions are underway to recover from a major disruption leading to re-establishment of forest-related value streams. New value streams may be emerging and old value streams are re-established through new civic and private entrepreneurial initiatives.

Minimal Value Capture (simple local and regional economy) — is capturing few if any of the value streams from their forest. There are no value-added layers, and the community has few businesses with which to capture dollars for local circulation. This is generally a declining economy with an aging population, few entrepreneurs, and limited opportunities. A variety of value streams related to the forest remain untapped.

Wallowa Resources: An Illustration of the Typology

The community-based forestry initiative in Wallowa County includes diverse federal, state, local government partners, timber industry and environmental organizations,

landowners, forest contractors, livestock permittees and outfitters and guides. Wallowa Resources provides leadership in communication, coordination, planning, fundraising and implementation of priority activities.

Wallowa County's forested landscape is 75% federally-owned, 15% private investor-owned, and 10% family forest owned. In contrast, the private investor-owned forests generate 70% of the commercial timber (saw log and non-saw log) value stream, while the private family forests generate 20%, and the federal land only 10%. The non-timber benefit streams generating revenues in the County (including recreation, firewood, non-timber forest products, etc.) are harder to quantify due to lack of available data from private ownerships. Knowledge of local practices suggest that these benefits are fairly equally distributed between the ownerships (much of the federal forestland is inaccessible or in designated wilderness), but there is decreasing access to family forestland as ownership is sold to new residents or passed to non-resident inheritors.

Wallowa County is best described as a forest-stewardship community – actively working to avoid wholesale transition to a forest-amenity community. The forest sector was the dominant private sector payroll provider and largest county revenue earner over the last century. Today there are no large-scale saw mills remaining, wages have stagnated, and the median age and transfer payments are rising as retirees, second-home buyers and lone eagles replace multi-generational working families. However, the community-based forestry initiative is strong and working to build new forest-reliant jobs and businesses and redesign the economic contribution (albeit at a smaller scale) that the forested landscape (approximately 46% of total County land area) has always provided the County.

Wallowa Resources and the Wallowa County community forest initiative are highly complex – working

on all four core CBF methods (tenure and access, business development, policy and education). Wallowa Resources has developed a strong collaborative management process to influence management across the federal land — employing stewardship contracts and cooperative weed management strategies. In partnership with County Government, Wallowa Resources is now pursuing private forestland strategies, including conservation easements and the potential for community or County forest ownership. While their attention is focused on the land base and constituents within the County, they have developed strategic partnerships with regional, state and national networks to address social, economic and ecological issues at larger spatial scales. Today, the value capture is only moderate. Economic benefits are generated from forest operations and wood processing, as well as recreation, but with limited value added. The total value capture is also marginal (and still declining) on a per capita basis within the County. New business ventures provide opportunities to increase several value streams and generate increased social and economic capital.

Acknowledgements

While the lead authors accept all responsibility for the information and analysis presented in this report, we need to acknowledge the significant contributions of several members of the Community Forestry Consortium including John Bliss, Jason Gray, Martha West Lyman, Cecilia Danks, and Tony Cheng in the development of the typology and classification. If this effort has lasting value, it's in large part thanks to their critiques, advice, and guidance. We also want to thank members of the Advisory Committee who provided critical review and insights at various stages in the development of this document: Keith Bisson, James Daly, Maia Enzer, Anthony Flaccavento, Peter Howell, Ann Ingerson, Rodger Krussman, Mary Mitsos, Shanna Ratner, and Peter Stein.

TYOLOGY TABLE

Forest Context		CBF Name:	Methods						Forest Value Stream								
Mixed	Community Forest		Public	Private	Tribal	Business Dev.	Yrs Engaged in CBF Activity	Tenure/Management	Policy	Education	Maturity/ Capacity	Wood Products	Tourism/ Recreation	Non-wood Products	Ecosystem Services	Stewardship	Overall Value Stream
	X	Appalachia Sustainable Development				h	5-9		x	x	H	x			x		Mod
X		Applegate Partnership & Watershed Council				h	15+	x	x	x	H	x		x	x	x	Opt
	X	Arcata Community Forest				h	15+	x	x	x	H	x			x	x	Mod
		Big Spring Resource Conservation & Development		X		h	15+		x	x	M	x	x			x	Mod
X		Blackfoot Challenge		x		h	15+		x		H		x	x	x	x	Opt
	X	Blue Mountain Forest Partners (Sustainable NW)				n	5-9				N	x	x	x	x	x	Mod
		Blue Ridge Forest Cooperative		X		h	9-15			x	M	x		x	x	x	Opt
X		Brushwood Community Forest				h	15+				M						Mod
X		Central OR Prtnrshps f/Wildfire Risk Reduc.		x		h	5-9	x		x	H	x			x	x	Opt
	X	C-FAR = Community Forestry & Restoration				h	1-3	x	x	x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Opt
X		Chilili Land Grant				m	5-9		x		M	x		x	x	x	Mod
	V	Clearwater Basin Collaborative				n	0-1										Min
X		Community Smallwood Solutions, Inc.				h	3-5	x			M	x			x	x	Mod
	X	Cook County Sustainable Forestry Cooperative				m	9-15	X	X	X	H	X	X	X	X	X	Opt
X	X	East Quabbin Land Trust				m	1-3				M						Mod
X		EWEB Leaburg Forest, Eugene Water & Electric Brd				n	1-3	x		x	M				x		Mod
X		Farm Cove Community Forest		x		h	5-9	x		x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Opt
	X	Forestry Action Committee				m	15+		x	x	M			x	x		Mod
	X	Framing our Community		x		h	5-9		x	x	H	x			x	x	Mod
	X	Friends of the Finger Lakes National Forest, Inc.				m	15+			x	M		x	x		x	Mod
	X	Gifford Pinchot Task Force		x		h	3-5		x	x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Mod
X		Gila WoodNet				h	9-15		x	x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Opt
X		Greenleaf Forestry & Wood Products, Inc.				h	9-15	x	x	x	M	x		x	x	x	Mod
	X	GROWISER - Grande Ronde Overlook Wildflower Institute Serving Ecological Restoration		x		m	15+	x	x	x	H		x	x	x	x	Mod
X		Hayfork Basin				h	15+	x	x	x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Opt
		Healing Harvest Forest Foundation (Healthy Forest, Healthy Comm.)		X		h	9-15	x	x	x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Mod
	X	High Country Conservancy				m	1-3		x	x	M		x		x	x	Mod
	X	Hoke Community Forest				n	1-3			x	M						Mod
X		Kentucky Forestry Opportunities Initiative				m	5-9	x	x	x	M	x	x		x	x	Mod
	x	Keweenaw Community Forest Company		X		m	3-5	x	x	x	M	x	x	x	x	x	Mod
	x	Keweenaw Productive Forests.KLT				h	5-9				M						Mod
	X	Kootenai Forest Stakeholders				n	1-3				L						Min
X		Lake County Resources Initiative				x	3-5	x	x	x	M	x	x	x	x	x	Mod
	X	Largo Canyon Collaborative For. Restor. Proj.		X		m	5-9		x	x	H	x			x	x	Mod
X		Lemhi County Restoration Group				l	1-3		x	x	M		x				Min
X		Lomakatsi Restoration Project				h	9-15	x	x	x	H	x	x	x		x	Opt
	X	MACED (Mt Assoc. for Community Economic Dev.)				h	3-5			x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Opt

Forest Context			CBF Name:	Methods						Forest Value Stream					
Mixed	Community Forest	Tribal		Business Dev.	Yrs Engaged in CBF Activity	Tenure/Management	Policy	Education	Maturity/ Capacity	Wood Products	Tourism/ Recreation	Non-wood Products	Ecosystem Services	Stewardship	Overall Value Stream
	X	x	Malpai Borderlands Group	m	9-15		x	x	M		x	x	x	x	Mod
	X		Menominee Indian Tribe of WI	m	1-3		x	x	M	x		x	x	x	Mod
	X		Mountain Communities Fire Safe Council	n	0-1			x	N						Min
X			Mountain Parks Electric, Inc.	h	1-3				H						Mod
X		x	Mt. Adams Resource Stewards	h	3-5		x	x	M	x	x	x	x	x	Opt
	X		Newforest Institute Women's Earth Project	m	1-3	f	f	x	M	f	x	f	f	f	Mod
	x	X	North Coast Forest Conservation Initiative - The Conservation Fund/CA	h	9-15	x	x	x	H	x	x		x	x	Opt
	X		Northwest Certified Forestry	h	15+	x	x	x	H	x	x		x	x	Opt
X		X	Northwest Connections	h	9-15		x	x	H		x			x	Mod
	X		Palmento-Peartree Preserve	h	5-9	x	x	x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Opt
	X		Pinaleno Partnership - Gila Wtrshd Prtnrship	n	1-3				N					x	Mod
X		x	Pinchot Partners	m	5-9	x	x	x	H	x			x	x	Opt
	x	X	Pine Mt. Forest Opportunity Initiative	h	3-5				M						Mod
	X		Ramah Navajo Chapter Forestry	h	3-5				M					x	Mod
	x	X	Randolph Community Forest	m	9-15				M						Mod
	X		Redwood Forest Foundation, Inc.	m	1-3	x	x	x	M				x	x	Mod
	X		Southern Oregon Small Diam. Stewardship Collab.	m	3-5		x		M	x					Mod
	X	X	Suislaw Basin Partnership	m	9-15			x	M						Min
X		x	Swan Ecosystem Center	h	9-15	x	x	x	H	?	?	?	?	x	Min
	X	x	The Quivira Coalition	h	3-5	?		x	M	x		x		x	Mod
	x	X	The Watershed Center	x	15+	x	x	x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Opt
	X		Town of South Windsor	h	5-9	x		x	M	x	x		x	x	Mod
X			Uncompahgre Plateau Forest Restoration Project	m	5-9		x	x	M -	x		x	x	x	Mod
	X		Upper Deschutes River Coalition	m	3-5				M		x		x	x	Mod
X		x	Village of Ruidoso	x	5-9	x	x	x	H	x	x	x	x	x	Opt
X			Wallowa Resources	m	9-15		x	x	H	x	x			x	Opt
	X	x	Weaverville Community Forest - mgnd by community	m	5-9	x	x	x	M	x	x	x		x	Mod
	X		WET Partnership	m	5-9	x		x	M					x	Min

CASE STUDIES

1. Community-Based Forestry in a Forest-Reliant Community: A Case Study of Framing Our Community, Elk City, Idaho.
2. A New Business Model for Sustainable Forestry: A Case Study of Appalachia Sustainable Development and Sustainable Woods, Abington, Virginia.
3. Stewards of Their Forest Lands: A Case Study of the Klamath Tribes, Oregon.
4. Community Ownership and Equity: A Case Study of Little Hogback Community Forest, Monkton, Vermont.
5. Regional Networks Supporting Community-Based Forest Stewardship and Benefits: A Case Study of the Northern Arizona Partnerships.
6. A Regional Intermediary's Approach to Community-Based Forestry: A Case Study of Sustainable Northwest, Portland, Oregon.

PROFILES

1. Financing Community-Owned Forests: The Open Space Institute.
2. The West Grand Lake Forest Project: Integrating Conservation, Economic Development and Affordable Housing
3. Changing Land Ownership in New England: The Open Space Institute.
4. Community Forests on Public Lands: Weaverville Community Forest.
5. Timberland Investment Management Organizations' (TIMOs') Role In CBF: The Lyme Timber Company.
6. Restoring Forests and Building Tribal Economies: The Indian Dispute Resolution Center.
7. New Business Model: Tribal, Private Sector, and other Partnerships to Support Biomass Energy Production: Community Energy Systems, LLC.
8. The Opportunity of Carbon Credits for Low-Income Landowners: The Mountain Association for Community Economic Development (MACED).
9. Carbon Trading for Small Landowners in the Southeast: Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund.
10. New Business Model: Wood Products Distribution Center.
11. Regional Consortium for Wood Products Manufacturing: Sustainable Forest Futures.
12. A Regional Partnership: The Colorado Front Range Roundtable.
13. Massachusetts Woodlands Cooperative.
14. Opportunities for Community-Based Forestry in African-American Communities in the Southern U.S.
15. Opportunities for Woody Biomass-Based Development.
16. Land Area in Community Forests in the U.S.: A Preliminary Assessment.