

# The Pinchot Letter

*News from the Pinchot Institute for Conservation*

---

Fall 2000

---

## Institute to Facilitate Multi-party Monitoring and Evaluation of National Forest Stewardship Contracting Pilots

The Pinchot Institute will design and manage the multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and reporting process related to the established Forest Service Stewardship Contracting Pilot Program. The Pinchot Institute has had an involved history in promoting the idea of land stewardship contracts, through both policy research and demonstration projects. Based in part on the publication of an analysis on existing contracting authorities which facilitate land stewardship objectives<sup>1</sup> and the implementation of demonstration projects, Congress authorized the Forest Service to implement up to 28 stewardship end-results contracts within Section 347 of the FY 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act. These pilots were specifically designed to investigate ways in which the agency could accomplish various land management objectives in more creative, efficient, and effective ways. Specifically, these pilots were authorized to test several new authorities including: awarding contracts based upon best value, multi-year and bundled contracts, exchanging goods for services, receipt retention, and designation by description.

As part of the Pilot Program, Congress established requirements for a multiparty monitoring and evaluation process to determine whether the new authorities indeed granted the freedom and efficiency needed to address evolving new land eth-

ics. As defined, multiparty monitoring is a means of encouraging and supporting collaborative learning, while building trust among diverse interests. It provides a way to address the concerns of distant stakeholders, while attending to the needs of local citizens and engaging a broad audience in the lessons derived from a project. In its truest intent, multiparty monitoring/evaluation promotes effective and meaningful public involvement, from criteria development through the implementation phase of monitoring. Such efforts are integral to the adaptive management of our natural resources.

As part of its effort in meeting the needs of the agency and of Congress, the Pinchot Institute will work closely with a number of subcontracted regional partners, which collectively will oversee the implementation of the program. The program is structured into a three-tiered system, consisting of local, regional and national multiparty monitoring, evaluation, and assessment teams.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ringgold, P., *Land Stewardship Contracting in the National Forests: A Community Guide to Existing Authorities* (Washington, DC: Pinchot Institute for Conservation, 1998).

---

### *Inside*

**Expanded Certification Pilot Projects on State and Tribal Lands** p. 5

**Rethinking Fire Management Policy** p. 7

**IPF Proposals for Action: An International Agreement for Sustainable Forests** p. 8

**Seventh American Forest Congress: Time for a Pulse Check** p. 13

---

*Leadership in Forest Conservation Thought, Policy and Action*

EXECUTIVE OFFICE: 1616 P STREET NW, SUITE 100, WASHINGTON, DC 20036 202/797-6580 FAX: 797-6583 email: [pinchot@pinchot.org](mailto:pinchot@pinchot.org)  
GREY TOWERS NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK: MILFORD, PA 18337 570/296-9630 FAX: 296-9675 Web: [www.pinchot.org](http://www.pinchot.org)

Each team is structured as a collaborative unit, in which all participants have equal standing and equal weight in decision making. Participation on local teams is at the discretion of each pilot, but will promote broad involvement, including agency representatives, cooperating government agencies (including tribal governments), and the diversity of all local/distant interested groups and individuals. Each team will have unique functions in the implementation of the program, specifically:

**Local Team:** will be responsible for the collection and analysis of data necessary for project evaluation.

**Regional Team:** will be responsible for the synthesis of data from the local teams and ana-

lyzing the effects of regional conditions and circumstances effecting the success and outcome on pilot efforts.

**National Team:** will be responsible for assessing the program from a national perspective and collecting/summarizing information on (a) the development, execution, and administration of authorized contracts, (b) specific accomplishments resulting from efforts, and (c) the role of local communities in the development of contract plans.

In addition to the facilitation and coordination of the monitoring process, the Pinchot Institute will also be responsible for the development and implementation of evaluating and for disseminating results to the agency, Congress, and the gen-

### *About the Pinchot Institute*

The Pinchot Institute for Conservation is an independent non-profit policy research and education organization dedicated to leadership in natural resource conservation thought, policy, and action. The Pinchot Institute was dedicated in 1963 by President John F. Kennedy at Grey Towers National Historic Landmark in Milford, Pennsylvania, historic home of conservation leader Gifford Pinchot, to facilitate communication and closer cooperation among resource managers, scientists, policymakers, and the American public. The Institute continues Pinchot's legacy of conservation leadership as a center for policy development in support of sustainable forest management. Further information about the Pinchot Institute's programs and activities can be found at [www.pinchot.org](http://www.pinchot.org)

#### **Board of Directors**

Dr. Dennis C. LeMaster, *Chair*, West Lafayette, Indiana  
 Peter O. Pinchot, *Vice Chair*, Guilford, Connecticut  
 Hugh C. Miller, *Treasurer*, Richmond, Virginia  
 Ann M. Hanus, *Secretary*, Salem, Oregon  
 William H. Banzhaf, Bethesda, Maryland  
 Mary J. Coulombe, Washington, DC  
 Rolf Diamant, Woodstock, Vermont  
 Jane A. Difley, Concord, New Hampshire  
 Jackson F. Eno, Hartford, CT  
 James R. Grace, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania  
 Gerald F. Groszold, Winter Park, Colorado  
 John P. Guttenberg, Jr., Alexandria, Virginia  
 John Heissenbuttel, Washington, DC  
 John P. McMahon, Tacoma, Washington  
 John C. Oliver, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania  
 Richard L. Snyder, Milford, Pennsylvania  
 Dr. J. Gustave Speth, New Haven, Connecticut  
 Eryl P. Wentworth, Washington, DC

#### *Ex officio*

Dr. V. Alaric Sample, Washington, DC  
 Edgar B. Brannon, Milford, Pennsylvania

#### *Emeritus*

Dr. John C. Barber, Warsaw, Virginia  
 Dr. John Gray, Little Rock, Arkansas  
 Thomas Schenarts, Kennett Square, Pennsylvania

#### *Staff*

Dr. V. Alaric Sample, *President*  
 Nadine E. Block, *Research Associate*  
 Robert Breazeale, *Senior Fellow*  
 James W. Giltmier, *Senior Fellow*  
 Andrea Bedell Loucks, *Research Fellow*  
 Catherine M. Mater, *Senior Fellow*  
 Lori D. McKean, *Development Coordinator*  
 Dr. Char Miller, *Senior Fellow*  
 Mary K. Mitsos, *Director, Community-Based Forest Stewardship*  
 Ane al-Sayyed, *Staff Assistant*  
 William C. Price, *Research Fellow*  
 Jeff M. Sirmon, *Senior Fellow*  
 Susan M. Stedfast, *Director, Operations and Legal Affairs*  
 Dr. Harold K. Steen, *Senior Fellow*  
 Dr. Terence J. Tipple, *Senior Fellow*  
 Alma Villareal, *Intern*

eral public. Structured interviews and workshop deliberations will lay the initial groundwork for criteria definition, implementation and reporting. Semi-annual meetings, workshops and periodic reporting will be used to share valuable lessons learned and determine the usefulness of those authorities the program was set out to test.

The contract was officially awarded in July 2000 and is expected to last a total of 5-years, dependent upon adequate federal appropriations. For more information, contact Andrea Bedell Loucks at 202-939-3455 or [andreabedell@pinchot.org](mailto:andreabedell@pinchot.org)

# Achieving a Common Voice on Watershed Restoration

*Andrea Bedell Loucks*

In the US, as in much of the world, obtaining adequate water supplies and maintaining water quality will become one of the defining natural resource issues of the 21st century. Though the level of consciousness is slowly rising among the general public, the importance of forest ecosystems in maintaining and protecting these valuable water resources is often overlooked or taken

for granted. In many parts of the US, forested watersheds have become degraded by excessive timber cutting, poor maintenance and erosion control procedures, and various kinds of development. As the demand for domestic, agricultural, and industrial water supplies grows, the prevention of further degradation and the restoration of well-functioning systems within forests

is set to become essential in the daily management of our land base. To bring attention to the importance of restoring these valuable forested watersheds and to address existing issues/obstacles associated with implementing large-scale restoration efforts, the Pinchot Institute recently convened and facilitated a unique event on the Clearwater National Forest.

From July 10-13, over 60 participants from across the United States gathered in the



*Participants of the workshop at Clearwater National Forest last July, inspect a road obliteration.*



*Participants at overlook of a large-scale watershed project.*

Clearwater National Forest for a series of open dialogues specifically designed to explore the options and strategies for effective implementation of watershed restoration activities. These participants represented the breadth of perspectives including those of scientists, forest industry, conservation groups, community groups, and federal, state, local and tribal government. Through the development of an engaged and honest dialogue, the process of fostering a common understanding and continuous learning could begin and eventually influence the effective/appropriate implementation and monitoring of restoration efforts.

The objectives of the workshop were three-fold: (1) to provide a broad-based understanding of various restoration mechanisms; (2) to explore models others have used; and (3) to examine inherent obstacles to restoration activities and ex-

plore opportunities to overcome them. Unlike traditional workshops or training sessions, the Watershed Restoration Workshop consisted almost entirely of field-tours and in-field discussions, providing participants with an instant connection to the issues and providing a visual backdrop from which all interests could relate. Though hosted by the Clearwater National Forest, the event was not limited to those issues faced in this particular region. Rather, the Clearwater National Forest provided situations that were analogous to those issues faced throughout the country (e.g., road obliteration, streambank stabilization, the role/impact of fire, and wildlife habitat protection/restoration). By its close, the 3-day meeting resulted in a series of interesting and valuable dialogues, addressing such tough issues as how to face complex and integrated resource issues, how to overcome regulatory and financial boundaries, and how to enhance public outreach/edu-

cation and coalition building. By bringing opinion leaders into the field, initially perceived divisions in interest were overcome and what might have otherwise evolved into heated debate, quickly developed into earnest discussions deeply grounded in reality and understanding.

With this newly established understanding, participants capped the event with the development of a series of "next steps." These future steps identified during the closing session included:

- To continue networking among participants and forge new coalitions.
- To organize future "practical" workshops (similar to this effort) in other regions of the US.
- To seek increased funding opportunities (e.g., investigate the applicability of "escrow" accounts or provision of new money on a use-or-lose basis within the Forest Service).
- To begin a NEPA process dialogue among the range of interests (e.g., practitioners, EPA, Forest Service, OGC, CEQ, Fish and Wildlife).
- To begin formal exploration of solutions to administrative and policy bottlenecks.
- To pursue the development of economic incentives or a rewards program for successful efforts.
- To develop demonstration pilots for innovative watershed approaches (e.g., streamlined NEPA processes, new contracting procedures, programmatic approaches, multi-year funding, etc.).

Proceedings from the event are currently being formulated. If you would like more information on this event or would like to reserve a copy of the workshop's proceedings, please contact Mary Mitsos at 202-797-6582 and [mmitsos@pinchot.org](mailto:mmitsos@pinchot.org) —or— Andrea Bedell Loucks at 202-939-3455 and [andreabedell@pinchot.org](mailto:andreabedell@pinchot.org)

## Forest Certification Pilot Projects Expanded on State and Tribal Lands

*Will Price*

As part of its nationwide study of the applicability of certification on public forest lands, the Pinchot Institute is expanding its certification pilot program to include extensive state and tribal forest systems in the western and southern United States, to augment those already completed or currently underway in the Northeast and Lake States. Independent, third-party certification is one of several tools that shows significant promise for advancing sustainable forest management in the United States. Thus far, certification has been applied primarily on private forest lands, but significant opportunities exist for extending certification to the more than 250 million acres of federal, state, county, and municipal forest lands in the nation. A limited series of pilot demonstration projects has been initiated, involving state and county forest land in several locations in the northeastern United States.

There are substantial variations in public forest land systems in different parts of the country, in terms of social, political, economic, and institutional considerations as well as in biological and physical terms. A strategic approach is needed to guide the expansion of pilot demonstration

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on average sawtimber harvest 1985-1998. Source: Pennsylvania Bureau of Forestry, *A Calendar Report for Executed Contracts* ©1999.

<sup>2</sup> Mater, C., Sample, V.A., Grace, J. and Rose, G., *A Third-Party Performance-Based Certification: What Public Forestland Managers Should Know*, © *Journal of Forestry*, February 1999, pp. 6-12 (also available as a Pinchot Institute Policy Report by the same title, issued November 1998).



projects on public forest lands, addressing a broad range of situations with the most efficient application of time, effort, and financial resources.

The Pinchot Institute is facilitating the development and implementation of such a strategy by compiling information essential to initiating and completing certification pilot projects in targeted geographic regions throughout the US within the next year.

### **Building on the lessons from Pennsylvania**

At the start of this study, the Pinchot Institute facilitated what has become the largest and most ambitious application of independent, third-party certification on public forest lands, resulting in the successful certification of the entire 2.1 million-acre system of state forests in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania state forest system now represents a supply of approximately 45 million board feet annually in high quality hardwood to producers of certified wood products, domestically and worldwide.<sup>1</sup> An adequate and reliable supply of certified wood has been cited as one of the most critical elements in the development of a successful system of producers and retailers of certified wood products. The Pinchot Institute recently published a summary of the process and lessons learned from the Pennsylvania pilot project, as well as the Minnesota and Massachusetts efforts.<sup>2</sup>

A key objective of the pilot projects is to examine the new and additional issues that arise when certification is applied on public forest lands, such as how certification requirements can reconcile with forest management standards or direction given through statute or through management plans developed with broad public involvement. During the past year, the Pinchot Institute has made a substantial commitment of resources to laying the groundwork for a major expansion of forest certification pilot projects on state and tribal lands. State forestry agencies throughout the United States, but especially in the West and South, have been contacted about participating in pilot certifications. More than 30 tribal governments have been contacted, and the Pinchot Institute is continuing to coordinate closely with the Intertribal Timber Council to identify specific tribal governments well-suited to participating in pilot certifications.

### **Planned Activities**

At this time, four state forestry agencies have provided the Pinchot Institute with letters of intent to proceed with pilot certifications as a part of this study (see table below). In addition, 30 tribal governments have agreed to undergo the preliminary scoping evaluation that usually precedes a full-scale certification assessment, and four tribes have are so confident that the scoping on their forest lands will be successful that they have already indicated their intent to proceed with certification as part of this study.

<i>State forest systems:</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Washington	1,200,000
Maine	480,000
North Carolina	61,000
Tennessee	156,000
<i>Tribal forest systems:</i>	
Northern Cheyenne	105,000
Coeur d'Alene	26,000
Colville	614,000
White Mountain Apache	690,000
<i>Total</i>	<i>3,332,000</i>

If adequate funding can be secured to retain certifier organizations to carry out these assessments, it is expected that all of these projects will be underway before the end of 2000 and all will be completed before the end of 2001. The results of the pilot certifications, and a detailed examination of the ways in which independent, third-party evaluation was applied in the context of the different policy frameworks that exist in each state and tribal government, will be made available as a published report of the Pinchot Institute, electronically on the Pinchot Institute website ([www.pinchot.org](http://www.pinchot.org)), and in summary form as articles in professional journals and other publications.

For further information contact Will Price at 202-797-6578 or [willprice@pinchot.org](mailto:willprice@pinchot.org).

# Rethinking Federal Fire Management Policy

*Alma Villareal*

Journals from Lewis and Clark's expedition tell of a landscape smothered with smoke from nearby forest fires as the expedition made its way through what is now western Montana. Yet, Lewis and Clark's journals provide much more than a historical curiosity, they reveal the historical presence and importance of fire in the West. The never-ending pine forests that Lewis and Clark found in Montana and Idaho nearly 200 years ago were evidence of an ecosystem that had evolved alongside fire. Yet, the federal policy of suppressing fires in national forests, a campaign that began in the early 1900's in order to harvest more timber, effectively altered the composition and character of Western forests over the next 75 years and possibly forever.

Without fire to keep encroaching vegetation in check, smaller trees have grown unimpeded and forest tree-densities have soared. Some national forests currently report higher-than-average tree densities on as much as 50% of forest stands. With more of this smaller vegetation competing for precious resources in the dry climate of the Interior West, larger old-growth trees have become weaker and more vulnerable to disease and pests. A survey of the Lincoln National Forest in New Mexico revealed that round-headed pine beetles have infested 57% of Ponderosa pine stands. In the Deschutes National Forest, dwarf mistletoe disease infects 40% of its mixed conifer and Ponderosa pine. Needless to say, today's Western forests are much altered from the fire-resilient Ponderosa pine forests of the 1800's. In the Idaho Panhandle alone, an estimated 67% of the Ponderosa pine's natural territory has been taken over by fire-susceptible Douglas fir and mixed conifers.

The overaccumulation of thinner, fire-susceptible vegetation on 39 million acres of national forest has made the national forest system vulnerable

to large, catastrophic wildfires, a reality made all too clear with the tragic events in Los Alamos, New Mexico. Now officially known as the Cerro Grande Fire, the conflagration that consumed Los Alamos painfully demonstrated that federal fire management agencies are hard-pressed to deal with the tinderbox that the drought-stricken West has become. Cerro Grande started on May 4, 2000 as a prescribed burn near Bandalier National Monument. It was supposed to encompass 900 acres. Fifteen days and \$1 billion dollars in damages later, Cerro Grande had blazed across 48,000 acres and 280 homes. Lessons learned from the Cerro Grande fire indicate that federal fire management agencies must work more cooperatively and must develop interagency standards in order to combat wildfires more effectively. Sadly, inconsistencies between Park Service and Forest Service definitions of when emergency "contingency" resources (helicopters, bulldozers, firefighters) may be dispatched caused delays which resulted in more property damage and resource loss to the fire.

However, the destruction of the Los Alamos township, which is on the border of the Santa Fe National Forest, is indicative of the fire-risk posed to other Western communities. The growth of communities in close proximity to national forests has created a "wildland/urban interface" that poses new challenges to federal fire management agencies. Western forests may be attractive because of the scenic beauty and recreational opportunities that they offer, but a glance at a map of "frequent fire forests," those forests in which fires occur every 5 to 30 years, reveals that many counties in the Interior West are virtually superimposed on forests that periodically burn.

Unfortunately, federal fire management agencies don't always have the tools necessary to contend with fire risks associated with the wildland/urban interface. The Forest Service, for example, utilizes a simulation program known as the National Fire Management Assessment System (NFMAS). Each national forest uses NFMAS to determine allocations for presuppression and suppression resources. NFMAS works by first simulating a fire and then determining the difference in the value of forest resources before and after the fire. Generally, as presuppression costs

rise, suppression costs drop, and the damage to forest resources abates. However, those resources don't include buildings or property located in the wildland/urban interface. NFMAS only recognizes values for Forest Service lands. Fires that spread into other federal lands or into the wildland/urban interface are not taken into account. Thus, NFMAS significantly underestimates the true cost of firefighting and almost ensures inadequate firefighting resources in these populated areas.

Yet, there does seem to be some light at the end of the tunnel. In April of 2000, the Forest Service released *Protecting People and Sustaining Resources in Fire-Adapted Ecosystems—A Cohesive Strategy*. Written as a response to a GAO report spotlighting the threat of catastrophic wildfires in the West, the Forest Service's strategy lays forth an aggressive effort to treat and thin 40 million acres of forest in the Interior West by 2015. Some concerns voiced by those outside of the Forest Service charged that the agency would merely concentrate on treating acres at low-risk for fire, since these areas would be least costly to treat. However, the Forest Service's strategy outlines a commitment to prioritize high-risk areas, for these areas pose the largest threat to neighboring com-

munities and typically consume the most suppression resources. The strategy also realizes the need for interagency standards for fighting fires and the mandate to employ a larger "ecosystem management" approach to addressing the fuels problem. Perhaps the most progressive of the plan is the drive to integrate social science with fire science. A recognition of the unique problems of the West's wildland/urban interface and a renewed commitment to involve community stakeholders in forest restoration efforts forms the most visionary basis of the Forest Service's efforts.

Although the results of the Cerro Grande Fire were tragic and, to some extent, preventable, federal fire management agencies need not allow the mistakes of the past to hinder efforts to circumvent tragedies in the future. The proliferation of communities along the wildland/urban interface simply attests to the fact that people continue to be fascinated with nature. The citizens of Los Alamos learned all too well the effects of a federal land management policy that emphasized merchantable timber over ecosystem values. Perhaps the wildfires racing across the West will form the crucible that produces a new stewardship ethic and respect for the nation's forests. Only the ashes will tell.

## IPF Proposals for Action: An International Agreement for Sustainable Forests

Nadine Block

In 1997, the UN Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) recommended 147 Proposals for Action to the international community, to address a range of forest problems at the global level. In developing the Proposals, the IPF was mandated to "pursue a consensus and formulate...actions in order to combat deforestation and forest degradation, and to promote the management, conservation, and sustainable development of all types of forests."<sup>1</sup>

The Proposals for Action represent progress and considerable consensus toward the advancement of sustainable forest management worldwide. The international community, including the U.S.,

has agreed to implement the 147 Proposals in some manner consistent with national political, social, and economic limits. Countries involved have been urged to undertake a systematic assessment of the Proposals in the context of their national forest programs and national policy frameworks in a coordinated manner, with the participation of interested persons.

Although the participants in the IPF process are not legally bound by the Proposals, there is a world political obligation to give effect to the IPF Proposals. The Proposals contain measures to be taken at the international and national levels. There are few indications in the IPF report regard-



ing the means by which countries should implement the Proposals nationally. There is, however, the recommendation that countries prepare an assessment of the Proposals against domestic forest-related policies, programs, and priorities. The goal is that through such a process, the Proposals will be integrated and internalized by the cooperating nations so that country-specific action toward forest sustainability may be taken.

A recent report by the Global Forest Policy Project (GFPP) criticized the lack of action to date by the United States in implementing the Proposals for Action. In particular, the report highlights the lack of leadership in addressing the Proposals, and the lack of inter-agency communication. Furthermore, the report suggested that there is strong opinion among forest owners that the U.S. is already managing its forests well and does not need to change much. The report states, "...While the state of U.S. forests and forest management has significantly improved over the last half-century, there are still well-documented, serious problems that need attention. And in an increasingly inter-related world community, where the U.S. should be demonstrating leadership, it is essential for the U.S. to respect international agreements like the IPF Proposals, which the United States officially and publicly pledged to implement."<sup>2</sup>

As part of its ongoing program in *Institutional and Policy Change to Implement Sustainable Forestry*, the Pinchot Institute recently became involved in a cooperative effort with the Interagency Coordinating Team on Sustainable Forests (ICTSF) to organize the U.S. response to the IPF Proposals for Action.

The Pinchot Institute identified a number of linkages between the Proposals for Action and another ongoing effort, that of the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators. The goal behind the Montreal Process was to advance the development of internationally agreed criteria and indicators for the conservation and sustainable management of temperate and boreal forests at the national level. The Montreal Process was engaged in by the U.S. and 12 other nations, which collectively represent 90 percent of the world's temperate and boreal forests. The seven Criteria and 67 Indicators that came out of this process constitute a set of conditions and variables which, when

measured over time, provide an account of forest conditions in a given country.

In 1998, a group of stakeholders formed the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests, as a forum to share information and perspectives that will enable better decision making in the U.S. regarding sustainable forests.<sup>3</sup> The initial focus of the Roundtable has been to implement and promote utilization of the Criteria and Indicators of the Montreal Process as a means of measuring national progress towards achievement of this goal. The Roundtable's participants include federal, state, and tribal governments, as well as academic, industry, environmental, and professional organizations.

It is the expectation of those involved in the Roundtable that improving the quality and cohesiveness of information available to policy makers will result in more informed, and therefore, improved public policies as well as public- and private-sector forest management decisions.<sup>4</sup> To further that goal, the Roundtable sponsored a series of technical workshops in the spring of 2000 in order to assess the state of knowledge and available data related to each of the Criteria and Indicators.

The Pinchot Institute has participated in the work of the Roundtable, including the Technical Workshops, in order to facilitate coordination of the Criteria and Indicators with the IPF Proposals for Action. The Proposals for Action are oriented towards institutional frameworks, such as programs and policies that address forest management. As such, there is considerable overlap with

---

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests on its fourth session. Feb. 11-21, 1997.

<sup>2</sup> W. E. Mankin, Global Forest Policy Project. United States Country Report on Implementation of the U.N. IPF Proposals for Action. March 19, 2000.

<sup>3</sup> Charter for the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests. Feb. 24, 1999.

<sup>4</sup> Roundtable on sustainable Forests. Summary of Information on the Technical Workshops. Dec. 17, 1999.

Criterion 7 of the Criteria and Indicators, which examines the legal, institutional, and economic framework for forest conservation and sustainable management. The Pinchot Institute developed a crosswalk that illustrated these linkages, which highlights the opportunities for coordination. As considerable progress is being made towards implementing the Criteria and Indicators, this coordination offers promise for implementing the Proposals for Action.

For more information about the Pinchot Institute's project on implementing the IPF Proposals for Action, please contact Nadine Block at (202) 797-6585 or [neblock@pinchot.org](mailto:neblock@pinchot.org).

## Recent Developments in European Forest Law Examined

Dennis LeMaster

Thirty (30) European countries enacted new forest laws or substantial revisions of existing laws during the period 1990-1998. The reasons for this change, as well as descriptions of the new or revised forest laws, are presented in a recent publication of the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations (IUFRO) titled *Forging a New Framework for Sustainable Forestry: Recent Developments in European Forest Law*. It is a collection of 35 reviewed papers edited by Franz Schmithuesen, Peter Herbst, and Dennis LeMaster, and is one of the World Series publications by IUFRO.

Two general causes for the unprecedented change are identified: (1) the transition of Eastern European countries to a market economy, and (2) the response of Western European countries to "changing economic conditions, new social demands, and (the desire for) more political participation of interest groups and citizens at local and regional levels." The "new social demands" are based on recognition of the need for forests to provide for both present and future generations

and their "multifunctional capabilities in terms of economic productivity, environmental values, and aesthetic qualities."

Thirty-three (33) of the papers contained in *Forging a New Framework for Sustainable Forestry* are in English, and two (2) are in German. Most of the papers in English are translations of papers written in another language, usually the official language of the country whose forest law is the subject matter.

The papers were assembled through the work of the IUFRO Research Group on Forest Law and Environmental Legislation (6.13.00), chaired by Franz Schmithuesen and co-chaired by Peter Herbst. Two symposia were held in Ossiach, Austria, the first in June 1998 and the second in September 1999. The subject of each was the experiences of Eastern European countries with their new forest and environmental laws. After these papers were compiled and edited, they were augmented by papers assembled by Franz Schmithuesen, professor of forest policy and economics at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich, Switzerland. (Note: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology is usually referred to by its acronym, ETH, taken from the German version of its name.)

Eight trends are identified among the new forest laws of Europe. (1) Sustainable forest management is a public expectation; anything less is objectionable. (2) The objectives of the new laws are more diversified, recognizing forests as sources of "multifunctional renewable resources." (3) Forestry administrative authority is increasingly decentralized, and increasing opportunities exist for public participation in decision making in policy implementation. (4) Forest regulation is used as an instrument to protect forest areas from exploitative practices, but financial incentives are increasingly used to compensate forest owners for performance of specific tasks that are in the public interest. (5) Informational instruments, such as public education programs and technical assistance programs for forest landowners, are growing in use. (6) Forest policy development and implementation is a collaborative effort, and the emphasis is "to support" forest landowners both public and private. (7)

Silvicultural regimes should be "close to nature," and the use of clearcutting is substantially constrained. (8) Budgeting of public funds for forestry is much more programmatic with objectives specified, progress monitored, and financial incentives available.

Obviously, many of the trends in European forest policy are comparable to trends in North America. But there is much more to be learned from a close reading of the 35 papers. For example, there is strong commitment among virtually all the countries to sustainable forestry and environmental protection. Furthermore, there is a lack of awareness of the difference between policy development and policy implementation, especially among the Eastern European countries. Finally, the author on recent Ukrainian forestry legislative developments admits that, in his judgment, the forestry sector in his country was simply not ready for a major transition, that "mechanical transfer of market regulators to the Ukrainian economy . . . can have negative impacts."

*Forging a New Framework for Sustainable Forestry* will be useful to analysts interested in comparative forest policies. Its reading will reveal many commonalities and differences among European forestry and environmental laws, which could be systematically structured for scholarly analysis and further research. The addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses of the authors contained near the end of the document provide many useful sources of information.

*Forging a New Framework for Sustainable Forestry* is a good read. While the translations are clumsy in places, their reading is well worth the time and effort for the perspectives they offer.

*Dennis LeMaster is Professor and Head of Purdue University Department of Forestry and Natural Resource, and Chair of the Pinchot Institute Board of Directors. You may order a copy of the book discussed in this article by writing to: IUFRO Secretariat, Seckendorff-Gudent-Weg 8, A-1131 Vienna, Austria. Tel.: +43-1-877 01 51; FAX: +43-1-877 93 55; or via email: iufro@forvie.ac.at; website: <http://iufro.boku.ac.at>.*

# Of Politics and Chiefs

*Char Miller*

When Jack Ward Thomas became the Clinton Administration's choice to replace Dale Robertson as chief of the Forest Service in 1993, forest supervisors and administrators disapproved of the politics of his selection. Because Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Espy, had elevated him over career forest managers and the "senior executive service," it appeared that Thomas had been selected for reasons external to the organization. "With all due respect," wrote 70 forest supervisors the president, "we oppose this course of action," for it would "set a precedent for all future administrations..." Far better to adhere to what these supervisors claimed to be the traditional approach for selecting a chief, in which only internal, professional qualifications mattered.

But leadership selection has long been politicized. No one appreciated the significance of this more than Thomas. He acknowledged his debt to this contentious past when in his discussions of the Forest Service's agenda he evoked the agency's controversial founder, Gifford Pinchot. Although Pinchot claimed that the agency must insulate itself from outside political pressures, he also undercut these assertions when one of his successors did not conform to his well-defined sense of the agency's mission; by so doing, he helped establish the complicated heritage surrounding Thomas's contested ascension.

## Behind the Throne

This tradition's origins can be traced to the carefully managed conclusion of Pinchot's tenure. Fired in 1910 for insubordination, he urged agency staff to remember that "the work of conservation, to which they were devoting their lives, was greater than any one man or any administration, and should be carried on despite all obstacles." He was gone, but they must keep the faith.

They could more easily do so because Pinchot and others worked behind the scenes to insure that Henry Graves, a close friend, would become the second chief. This made for a smooth transition and allowed Pinchot to remain a force in the agency, giving rise to a complex relationship between it and the first ex-chief.

His was not an every-day presence. After 1910, Pinchot threw himself into electoral politics, yet he regularly gave advice on matters small and large. In 1914, he was called in to squelch a personnel dispute. More publicly, he chastised Graves and staff for establishing a closer alliance between public forestry and timber companies. Shocked when the agency released a report that he believed was a "whitewash of destructive lumbering" and compromised the public interest, he argued that such accommodation meant capitulation.

A series of Pinchot-inspired dust-ups with Graves only intensified when William B. Greeley became the third chief in 1920. The almost decade-long struggle between these men turned on different constructions of the Forest Service's professional ideals, social significance, and political agenda. As Greeley put it: Pinchot "saw an industry so blindly wedded to fast and destructive exploitation that it would not change. I saw a forest economy overburdened by cheap raw material. Mr. Pinchot saw a willful industry. I saw a sick industry." And when they fought over these positions, they gave no quarter, making them more alike than they might have been willing to admit.

The third Chief was not Dead On Arrival. Adept at challenging Pinchot's claims to define the profession, Greeley reshaped public foresters' sense of their duties, especially by establishing a cooperative relationship with industry. His deft handling of a series of legislative initiatives that ultimately produced the Clark-McNary Act, which Pinchot stoutly opposed, demonstrated that the new chief also knew how to work the political process to his advantage.

This had ramifications for the agency's internal culture: Greeley's perspectives muted other voices. The most striking example of this was Raphael Zon. A Pinchot ally, he was eased out of

the Washington office to the Lakes States Forest Experiment Station. With the Society of American Foresters hewing to the non-regulatory line of the Greeley-led Forest Service, Pinchotites felt isolated. By the late-1920s, disillusioned with the American Forestry Association, rarely asked to write for professional forestry publications, Pinchot felt cut off from the world he had helped create; he even stopped attending meetings of the Society of American Foresters. Greeley had uprooted the founder.

This did not stop Pinchot from slapping out at his antagonist. Periodically, he testified in Congress against some of Greeley's legislation. He also wrote a stinging preface to, and financed the publication of, George P. Ahern's *Deforested America* (1928), a savage critique of the timber companies' environmental depredations. The "[l]umber industry is spending millions of dollars to forestall or delay the public control of lumbering," Pinchot claimed, "which is the only measure capable of putting an end to forest devastation in America. It is trying to fool the American people into believing that [it] is regulating itself."

From distant St. Paul, Zon roared his approval—"Bravo! At least there are two militant voices raised against the camouflage spread about the practice of forestry by private timber land owners." Yet he doubted their angry voices would become anything but "a cry in the wilderness."

Still, Pinchot fought on against the self-congratulatory posture of the contemporary leadership of the American forestry movement, and was delighted when Greeley resigned in April 1928 to become executive secretary of West Coast Lumbermen's Association. About Greeley's years as chief, Pinchot was emphatic: his administration had been "pitiful." With his "malign influence" removed, "the foresters [are] returning to what they had known all along was the right point of view." However self-satisfied, this claim gave Pinchot hope that foresters now would embrace his conception of their work.

For his part, he reactivated his membership in the important Washington chapter of the Society of American Foresters, once again pressed the case of national regulation of private forestry practices,

and cheered on R.Y. Stuart, Greeley's successor. The "time is ripe for a great advance in forestry in America," he wrote his professional colleagues, urging them to reject the "counsels of overcaution, inaction, and delay, and turn to the aggressive pursuit of clear cut objectives" that would put "an end to forest devastation."

Of primary concern was "public control of the axe," Pinchot reaffirmed; it is "our central problem." Pleased that Ferdinand Silcox, who became chief in 1933, shared his views, he applauded Silcox's liberal faith in forestry's social obligations. Comforted and reinvigorated, Pinchot was eager to restore the Forest Service's embrace of the public good.

#### After Life

There has never been an ex-chief quite like Gifford Pinchot. Only his death in 1946 stopped his long, often combative, association with the Forest Service, and even then supporters such as Raphael Zon posthumously used his name to rally support for or opposition to shifts in agency policy. Fifty years later, Jack Ward Thomas regularly invoked Pinchot during his energetic attempts to sharpen its commitment to the principles of Ecosystem Management. These changes would catapult the Forest Service back to its rightful place at the forefront of the environmental movement; being on the cutting edge, Thomas asserted, was "our birthright, our heritage, and our destiny." But that avant-garde status could only be reclaimed if the service recovered what he called "the Pinchot thrust of leadership."

*Char Miller is professor and chair of history at Trinity University in San Antonio and is a Senior Fellow at the Pinchot Institute. This essay is drawn from his article, "Chiefly Politics: Contested Leadership in the USDA Forest Service," published in the Earth Day 2000 issue of the Electronic Green Journal <<http://egj.lib.uidaho.edu/egj12/index.html>*

#### Perspective

## The Seventh American Forest Congress: Time for a Pulse Check

*V. Alaric Sample*

The Seventh American Forest Congress, held in Washington DC in February 1996, was the culmination of a two-year effort involving more than 6,000 individuals all across the United States. Unlike in the previous six Forest Congresses, the first of which was held in Washington in 1905, the vast majority of participants in the Seventh American Forest Congress were not natural resource management professionals. Most were average citizens, from many different walks of life, brought together simply by a shared interest and sense of concern for the future of forests and forestry in this country.

Seldom, if ever, has such a number or diversity of citizens come together to collectively articulate their vision for the future of our forests, and to develop basic principles by which they wish to see these forests conserved and cared for. Therein lies the great value of the Vision and Principles that emerged from the Forest Congress, along with the fact that participants wisely chose not to become mired in the specific forest policy controversies of the moment, but to focus upon enduring values that can provide continuing guidance to policymakers and natural resource managers in the ongoing ebb and flow of issues.

As such, the Forest Congress Vision and Principles can also serve as a sort of yardstick against which to evaluate trends in forests and forestry since the Forest Congress took place. Do today's forest conditions and practice of forestry look more like—or less like—those described by participants in 1996 as their vision for the future? Are the trends during this past five years lead-

ing closer toward—or further away from—the principles of sound forest conservation and stewardship articulated in the outcome of the Forest Congress? While it may be difficult to quantify any of these changes, five years is enough time for us to begin seeing whether we are at least headed in the right direction.

### **What Forest Congress Vision and Principles did—and did not—support**

The Seventh American Forest Congress Vision and Principles addressed forests and forestry in a general way, but also provided particular guidance for forestry on both public and private lands. Some of the principles were broadly endorsed in the Forest Congress voting system of green (support), yellow (not ready to support, but also not opposed), and red (opposed). A few proposed principles were considered but overwhelmingly rejected. As with legislative history, important insights can be gained by looking not only at what ultimately emerged as policy, but at what ideas were proposed and subsequently not adopted, particularly if the margin was large.

For example, there was broad support for the statement that people's actions should ensure an open and continuous dialogue is maintained and encouraged among all parties interested in forests (G=88%, Y=7%, R=5%), suggesting strong and widespread support for forest managers maintaining and enhancing inclusiveness in discussions leading to decisions affecting forests. Similarly, there was strong endorsement for the principle that differences in goals and objectives of public, private, and tribal forest owners are recognized and respected; forest owners, including the general public, recognize and embrace both the rights and responsibilities of ownership; all forest owners acknowledge that public interests (e.g., air, water, fish and wildlife) exist on private lands and private interests (e.g., timber, recreation) exist on public lands (G=75%, Y=15%, R=10%). The diversity of forest land ownership in the US is unique in the world, whereas other countries forests tend to be either overwhelmingly publicly-owned or overwhelmingly privately-owned. This principle implicitly acknowledges the value of this diversity of forest ownership, and of the multitude of different goals and objectives that result. It also recognizes that there

are responsibilities that go along with rights of forest landownership, with private interests to be addressed on public lands and public values to be protected on private lands.

Among those principles given consideration at the Forest Congress and overwhelmingly rejected were ensuring no logging on public lands (G=4%, Y=5%, R=91%), and no road construction or reconstruction on public lands (G=5%, Y=5%, R=90%). In spite of a strong emphasis on ecological sustainability and good land stewardship, there was little support for an outright and total ban on either of these activities on public lands. Great care was taken in interpreting the Vision and Principles to not read too much, or too little, into the statements but to take them only at their intrinsic face value. For example, it would be erroneous to interpret these principles as indicating Forest Congress participants support for logging or road construction on all public lands. The response on these principles indicates only that participants felt that commercial timber production and road construction/reconstruction should continue to have a place on public forest lands, but is silent on the questions of how much or where? Again, Forest Congress participants chose not to attempt to resolve specific current issues, but to convey certain societal values as a basis for forest policies intended to endure over the longer term.

### **Examining actual trends in the context of the Forest Congress outcome**

Now, five years after the adjournment of the Seventh American Forest Congress and the publication of its Vision and Principles, it is fair to ask ourselves as a nation whether the management of our forests is tending closer toward, or further away from, the societal values that the Forest Congress helped articulate. During this intervening five years, a number of new initiatives have been undertaken on both public and private forest lands, and several identifiable trends have developed.

Most prominently, timber harvesting on federal public lands has continued to decline to a quarter of the average level during the previous three decades. Management emphasis on these lands has shifted to restoring watersheds damaged by



past logging and roadbuilding activities, preventing further degradation of water quality and habitat for salmon and other aquatic species, and supporting the recovery of other animal and plant species whose populations have declined to the point where their simple survival is in question.

But continued market demand for the roughly ten billion board feet of timber that had been harvested annually from these lands has increased the harvest pressures on private forest lands, particularly in the US South. The resulting effects on nonindustrial private forest (NIPF) lands have prompted new calls for government regulation of forest practices on private lands, especially in some of the South Central states where permits have been issued for new chip mills with large appetites for wood fiber. Federal and state environmental regulatory agencies have taken another look at impacts on water quality, and are considering new restrictions on forest management practices.

Forest industry, through efforts such as the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI), has responded by taking steps to increase wood supplies from private lands, but to do so in ways that are more environmentally sensitive than ever before. Adherence to SFI standards has brought about broad-based improvements in forest management practices on forest industry timberlands, and the recent endorsement of independent, third-party review as an essential component of SFI is an expression of confidence by forest products companies that they can and will continue to publicly demonstrate improvement in the management of their forests.

Extension of SFI standards to the nonindustrial private forest lands from which US forest industry draws much of its timber supply has been more problematic for these companies, reflecting the conundrum of NIPF management that has bedeviled the forestry community for a century. With the help of both public and private landowner assistance programs, some of the very best examples of sustainable forest management can be found on NIPF lands—but also some of the very worst. How to bring the management of all NIPF lands up to the most basic standards of sound forest management and good land stew-

ardship, without resorting to the blunt instrument of regulation, will continue to be one of our greatest challenges in fulfilling the Vision and Principles from the Seventh American Forest Congress.

One area in which trends over the past five years have clearly been contrary to the Forest Congress Vision and Principles is the loss of forest land. One of the principles with majority support calls for us to ensure that land area covered by forests is maintained and potentially increased (G=53%, Y=25%, R=22%). In the decade leading up to the Seventh American Forest Congress, the National Research Council estimates that 5.6 million acres of forest—an area nearly twice the size of the state of Connecticut—was converted to developed land uses (an additional 4.4 million acres was converted from forest to cropland and pasture). With the unprecedented economic growth and low interest rates since 1996, the rate of essentially permanent conversion of forest to developed land uses likely is much higher.

Whatever the debate over which forest management practices are acceptable and which are not, the discussion is abruptly mooted when woodlands disappear beneath parking lots. And the values these forests represent for watershed protection, wildlife habitat, recreation, and wood disappear with them—permanently. Understanding the factors aggravating this trend toward forest conversion, and then mustering the political will to do something about them, will be essential to a future for forests and forestry that is consistent with the vision articulated by participants in the Seventh American Forest Congress.

### **Making good on our initial investment**

The Seventh American Forest Congress was a remarkable set of events in the history of forestry in the United States. Out of the seemingly endless controversy over apparently intractable issues in forest protection and sustainable management, there emerged a broad-based working consensus that was refreshingly short on rhetoric, and encouragingly long on practical, common-sense approaches to finding solutions. Whether we can capture the value from the enormous investments of time, effort, and money that went into the Forest Congress will depend upon diligent and timely follow-through.

Immediately after the Forest Congress, groups of individuals organized themselves to ensure that the necessary steps are taken to implement the Vision and Principles, in terms of forest policy, management, research, and education, and to keep local communities continuously involved with national-level efforts.

The time has come for a status check. What changes have taken place in each of these major areas? Are current trends in these areas favorable or unfavorable relative to the directions established in the Vision and Principles? What are the critical steps that remain to be taken? What barriers and challenges have been encountered, and what will it take to overcome them? As in the Forest Congress itself, this status check should be done not just by resource management professionals, but should involve a reasonable cross-section of average citizens who share a practical concern and interest in the future of forests and forestry.

The diversity of financial support for the Seventh American Forest Congress is testament to the genuine commitment of dozens of charitable foundations, corporations, and individuals to forging a new consensus on sustainable forest management. Continued cooperation of this kind, albeit at a far more modest level, will be necessary to make good on that initial investment, and ensure that we as a nation continue to move steadily down the pathway toward our common vision of forest conservation and sustainable management.

*V. Alaric Sample is President, Pinchot Institute for Conservation in Washington, DC.*



## Become a Pinchot Institute Associate

The Pinchot Institute is pressing continuously toward a vision of well managed forests, providing a full array of resource values and ecological services, and sustaining both natural and human communities. Through policy research, education, and technical assistance, the Pinchot Institute is continuing Gifford Pinchot's legacy of conservation leadership, promoting the protection and management of forests "for the greatest good, for the greatest number, in the long run."

You can be part of this continuing legacy by becoming a Pinchot Institute Associate. Your tax-deductible contribution of \$100 or more provides critical support for the programs of the Pinchot Institute, and also brings you news of these activities through *The Pinchot Letter*, new releases of Pinchot Institute policy reports and discussion papers, and notices of upcoming Pinchot Institute workshops, seminars, and conferences of interest. Without the benefit of an endowment to provide current operating support, annual contributions help make it possible for the Pinchot Institute to continue serving as a source of timely, factual information in support of improved forest conservation.

You can also become an Associate through your Combined Federal Campaign contribution to the Pinchot Institute (CFC #1010). If you would like more information about contributing to the Pinchot Institute through CFC, please contact Susan Stedfast at 202-797-6580 or at [ssstedfast@pinchot.org](mailto:ssstedfast@pinchot.org).

# The Rebirth of the Milford Experimental Forest at Grey Towers

*Peter Pinchot*

In the summer of 1999, the Pinchot family, the Pinchot Institute, and Grey Towers staff started a collaboration to recreate the Milford Experimental Forest, an active research program on the Pinchot family land adjacent to Grey Towers in Milford, Pennsylvania. The 1,400 acres of the Milford Experimental Forest is immediately adjacent to 13,500 acres of Pennsylvania State Forest and State Game Lands. This block of almost 15,000 contiguous acres is itself surrounded by another 10,000 acres of large, privately owned parcels, which insulate it from nearby subdivisions.

This fall, the Pinchot family will finalize a conservation easement on their 1,400 acres, which will both prevent any future development of the property and guarantee that it will be permanently accessible for research. We will transfer the development rights to the Natural Lands Trust, a large regional land trust in the Philadelphia region. As part of the easement, we will also transfer the right to carry on scientific research and

ecological restoration on this land to a non-profit organization, possibly the Pinchot Institute.

Almost a century ago, in 1901, James Pinchot, the father of Gifford Pinchot, and the principle founder of the Yale School of Forestry, established the Milford Experimental Forest as part of Yale's Summer School of Forestry. For 25 years, until Yale moved its summer training facility closer to home in Connecticut, the focus of research was on developing the silvicultural knowledge needed to reestablish a second-growth forest on the abandoned farmlands surrounding Milford. Although there are few remaining records from this period, James Pinchot's writings suggest that research projects included determining the most efficient spacing for pine and hardwood plantations, testing different thinning regimens to produce the largest volumes of timber, and studying the light requirements for saplings of different species.

Since Yale left Milford, there has been virtually no forest management on the lands of the Pinchot estate. The forest consists mostly of oak-hickory stands established by natural succession after pastureland was abandoned in the late 1800's. The limited, rocky soils of the Pocono Plateau and the lack of silvicultural management have produced a landscape that is anything but a legacy to the good forest management preached by Gifford Pinchot and his successors. Given the lack of past forest management, what should the new research direction be for this forest? What values should we bring to bear in managing this landscape? And most importantly, what meaning can this forest have for the Pinchot family, the Pinchot Institute, the Forest Service at Grey Towers, and the Milford community? The best place to start answering these questions is to consider the socio-economic and ecological changes sweeping through the Pocono region.

MAP

### **Community Forestry in the Poconos**

As with many other demonstration projects of the Pinchot Institute, Pocono communities are every bit as dependent on the economic value of natural resources as the communities surrounding western National Forests. The wildness and rugged beauty of the landscape, abundant access to fishing, hunting, boating, and hiking, clean rivers and streams, and proximity to New York City and Philadelphia have made recreation and tourism the dominant industry of the Poconos. Over thirty percent of the land is owned by state and federal agencies, mostly in blocks ranging from 5,000 to 15,000 acres. Hunting clubs and large private landholdings make up another third of the land.

However, during the last three decades, much of the remaining land has been developed into large subdivisions, some with thousands of lots, to serve the huge demand for second family homes. The Poconos have become the fastest growing exurban region in Pennsylvania, with demographic projections suggesting a doubling of the population in the next two decades. The result has been increasing forest fragmentation, threats to water quality in the Delaware and its tributaries, and sprawl which undermines the wild beauty of the region. There is a growing public awareness, especially in the business community, of the need to conserve the wildness of the landscape in order to sustain the tourism-based economic prosperity of the region.

Given this context, the Milford Experimental Forest will initially focus on three areas of research: 1) how to involve public and private landowners in community stewardship of the forest and water resources of the region, 2) how to restore species and ecological functions that have been eliminated from this landscape through human use, and 3) how to define sustainable uses of the landscape that can support a viable recreational economy.

### **Stewardship on the 15,000 acre Forest Block**

In a recent meeting, Jim Grace, the Pennsylvania State Forester and Pinchot Institute Board member, proposed that Grey Towers, the Bureau of Forestry, the Game Commission, and the Milford Experimental Forest meet two times a year to dis-

cuss collaborative management of this block of forestland. As part of this collaboration, Ed Brannon proposed that the regional Service Forester, Tim Carr of the Bureau of Forestry, draft a Stewardship Plan for both Grey Towers and the Milford Experimental Forest. In addition, the Milford Experimental Forest and the Bureau of Forestry have already identified adjoining lands on which to restore old growth forest conditions.

### **Managing White-Tailed Deer in a Fragmented Landscape**

The first project of the Milford Experimental Forest is to bring the overabundant white-tailed deer population back into balance with its forest food source. Virtually no forest management or restoration projects are possible without restoring the forest understory, which has been virtually eliminated by deer densities close to 40 deer per square mile.

In 1999, we began a program to monitor the impact of deer at the Milford Experimental Forest and to reduce their numbers. We carried out a deer pellet analysis to get an estimate of their density and found around 38 deer per square mile around Grey Towers. We established permanent vegetation sampling points to monitor the impact of deer browsing on the forest understory. We found almost no tree regeneration making it above the deer browse line in these plots. In the fall we organized a controlled hunt and harvested 20 deer, of which 12 were does and 8 bucks. We established a check station where we gathered demographic data on the deer including age, weight, antler size, and whether or not the does were lactating. The deer we harvested were small, further evidence of a degraded habitat.

This summer we have organized a hunting club and we are doubling the number of hunters for the fall hunt. We are building an experienced and dedicated group of hunters who understand their role as ecological stewards of the forest ecosystem. The hunters are also helping to spread the word about ecological deer management throughout the community.

This fall Dr. Grace Wang, who teaches Forest Policy at Penn State, will begin a three-year research project on community-based deer manage-

ment, funded in part by the Forest Service, Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry. She will survey landowners to explore their attitudes about deer and their willingness to take part in efforts to manage the deer herd. In the next two years, Grace Wang will help us shape an effective community process for encouraging landowners to participate in a landscape-scale deer management program. We hope this will emerge as a consensus-based project, with the Milford Experimental Forest, Grey Towers, the Pinchot Institute, the Bureau of Forestry, and the Game Commission and other partners providing scientific and social expertise to make the process workable.

### **Restoring the American Chestnut**

A century ago the American chestnut was one of the most prolific and economically important trees in the Appalachian forest, extending up to the Poconos and southern New England. The chestnut blight eliminated the chestnut as a canopy tree and relegated it to a life as a root sprout that repeatedly grows up and dies back when it is re-infected by the blight. The chestnut is a charismatic species that evokes strong interest in many landowners and could be an important focal point for developing an interest in ecological restoration. This summer we are mapping and assessing the health of all the native chestnuts that still exist in our forest. Next year we will build small fences around these trees to protect their root sprouts from deer browsing, so we can keep the local genome viable in our forest. In future years we will begin reintroducing both American chestnuts that have some blight resistance and Asian-American hybrids that are fully blight-resistant. We also plan to establish a greenhouse at Grey Towers to work on propagating chestnut seedlings and clones.

Peter Pinchot is Director of the Milford (PA) Experimental Forest and a member of the Pinchot Institute Board of Directors.

## **Summit Explores Future of Recreation on the National Forests**

Recreation on the National Forests provides extraordinary value to the nation in many ways: direct enjoyment by people visiting special places on the forests and grasslands, economic benefits, community jobs and expanded human potential through conservation education and volunteerism. It is important that we attain these benefits, while at the same time we live within the limits of the land.

As an agency, the US Forest Service, over the past year, has been working the last year on developing a three-part Natural Resource Agenda to guide its programs into the 21st century. Within the last year it expanded its energy on a fourth part: recreation. Chief Mike Dombeck called for a high-visibility and collaborative effort throughout the country to examine some of the critical issues affecting the future of the Forest Service Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness program with a broad cross section of stakeholders. The Pinchot Institute was called upon to help design, facilitate and convene the various parts of this process.

Initially, on October 20, 1999, a national gathering of interest groups was held in Washington, DC to react to a Forest Service draft national strategy. This strategy outlined six major areas for action. Working groups were formed that corresponded to the presented areas and ideas were offered for adjusting and "tuning up" the Forest Service draft strategy. The Pinchot Institute designed and facilitated a "regional summit" process and a total of 14 regional follow-on summits were held around the country. At these regional gatherings participants representing a broad cross section of stakeholders discussed, from an external perspective, whether or not they felt the Forest Service was on target with

their recreation agenda and offered suggestions on ways to improve it. Participants included environmental organizations, the recreation industry, multiple use values, legislators, federal, state, tribal government, and recreationists themselves.

On May 17th representatives from each regional summit traveled to Washington, DC and helped prepare for a June 12th feedback session to the original October 20, 1999 Recreation Summit participants. During a facilitated session each region reported their findings and then identified top issues and recommendations for the June meeting. A concluding clear message expressed at all summit meetings was a strong desire by the attendees to "keep the collaboration" going.

The Forest Service took comments and through the summer and will soon finalize the new Recreation Strategy that will guide Agency management of Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness program on the nation's National Forests.

For further information contact Dick Patterson, Forest Service Recreation staff at 202-205-1358.



## Pinchot Institute Receives Grant for Visitor Facility at Grey Towers

MILFORD—The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation has awarded the Pinchot Institute for Conservation a \$400,000 grant for development of a new visitor facility at its ancestral home, Grey Towers National Historic Landmark in Milford, Pa.

The grant will contribute to the larger, \$18 million historic renovation of Grey Towers currently underway as a cooperative effort of the Pinchot Institute and the Forest Service. Grey Towers has served as the home of the Pinchot Institute since its dedication by President John F. Kennedy in 1963. The \$400,000 will be used toward a visitor reception facility, pedestrian walkways and lighting.

"We are thrilled to have the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a partner in this project," said Al Sample, president of the Pinchot Institute. Ed Brannon, director of Grey Towers, added, "Gifford Pinchot made tremendous contributions to transportation in the Commonwealth when he was governor. His home at Grey Towers is the ideal place to share that history with the American public."

Pinchot, founder and first chief of the USDA Forest Service, served as Pennsylvania's governor from 1923-27 and 1931-1934. He was responsible for paving more than 20,000 miles of rural roads in the Commonwealth to "get the farmer out of the mud." Interpretive displays in the visitor reception area will enable the public to appreciate Pinchot's significant contributions that changed not only the face of transportation but the complexion of society. Many original "Pinchot roads" are still in existence today, including Old Owego Turnpike in Milford.

The Pinchot Institute and the Forest Service, stew-



ards of Grey Towers, will continue to try to raise the remainder needed to complete the Visitor Services Phase of the project, estimated at \$4 million. An active campaign including a groundswell of local support is underway to raise a 50/50 federal-state match to complete the project.

"This is the most logical and cost-effective way for the Commonwealth to participate in this significant project," said Dennis LeMaster, Chairman of the Pinchot Institute Board of Directors. "This contribution from the Commonwealth to the Pinchot Institute will allow the state to capture the full economic value of the federal investment and will further strengthen the longstanding partnership between the Institute, the Forest Service, the Pinchot family and now, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

When the historic renovation is completed and Grey Towers reopens to the public in the fall of 2001, the Pinchot Institute will operate a new on-site conference facility, hosting workshops, seminars and programs that focus on the Institute's mission.

For more information on the project and on fundraising and investment opportunities, call Lori McKean, development coordinator of the Pinchot Institute at Grey Towers at (570)296-7349.



## Pinchot Institute Welcomes New Staff Assistant

The Pinchot Institute is pleased to announce the recent hiring of Ane al-Sayyed as the Institute's new staff assistant. Ane's responsibilities will include compiling and editing our newsletter and other publications, handling internal and external communications, organizing conference

logistics, and providing general office support. She is a 1998 graduate of Hollins College, now Hollins University. While at Hollins, Ane studied Religion and Political Science with a concentration in the History of Islam. She interned with Amnesty International, as well as received many grants in order to travel and study in the Middle East. Upon graduation, Ane received a Fulbright Scholarship through the Qastal Conservation and Community Development Project, located in Qastal, Jordan. There she worked with her mentor in an archeological environment, as well as studied Arabic at the British Council. The project also provided English and Business training to those from the community who worked with QCDDP. While in Jordan, Ane met her husband. They reside in Northwest Washington, D.C.



# National Coalition on Non-Federal Forests Releases Report

A recently released report, "A National Investment in Sustainable Forestry: Addressing the Stewardship of Nonfederal Forestlands through Research, Education, and Extension/Outreach," addresses the needs of America's nonfederal forests and forest landowners, and recommends actions to be taken. The report was prepared by the National Coalition for Sustaining America's Nonfederal Forests, which was a product of the February 1999 Forestry Summit hosted by the National Association of Professional Forestry Schools and Colleges (NAPFSC) and the USDA Cooperative States Research, Education, Extension Service (CSREES). The National Coalition was formed of representative stakeholder organizations and groups who agreed to work together to develop a national direction and strategy for advancing the sound stewardship and management of nonfederal forestlands. The Pinchot Institute participated in the Coalition and the preparation of this report.

The report stresses, "To ensure that our nation's nonfederal forests remain productive and sustainable in the future, a much greater investment of resources is needed in research, education, and extension/outreach directly related to the management and stewardship of these nonfederal forestlands." The Coalition's report presents a roadmap for action to conserve and sustain these forests. To order copies of the report, contact Terri Bates at (703) 538-1134 or [bates-stasny@erols.com](mailto:bates-stasny@erols.com).

## Upcoming Events

September 5-October 30, 2000 The Northwest Connections Field Semester, Swan Valley, MT. For more information see [www.northwestconnections.org](http://www.northwestconnections.org)

September 18-20, 2000 Fragmentation 2000—A Conference on Sustaining Private Forests in the 21st Century, Annapolis, MD. For more information contact Terri Bates at (703) 538-1134.

October 5-6, 2000 Yale School of Forestry Centennial Celebration, Grey Towers Historical Landmark, Milford, PA. For more information contact Lori McKean at [lmckean@pinchot.org](mailto:lmckean@pinchot.org).

October 20-21, 2000 Board of Directors Meeting Grey Towers Historical Landmark, Milford, PA. For more information contact Ane al-Sayyed at (202) 797-6580.

October 25-29, 2000 National Network of Forest Practitioners Annual Meeting Fairlee, VT. For more information contact Wendy Gerlitz at [wgerlitz@nnfp.org](mailto:wgerlitz@nnfp.org).

November 16-20, 2000 Society of American Foresters 2000 National Convention, Washington, DC. For more information contact Madelaine Morgan at (301) 897-8720, ext. 109.

February 5 — March 2, 2001 8th Workshop on Community Based Management of Forestlands: Policy Frameworks for Enabling Successful Community Based Resource Management Initiatives, Honolulu, HA For more information contact Jeff Fox at (808) 944-7248

## Recent Articles by Pinchot Institute Staff:

Miller, Char, ed. 2000. *Western Water: A High Country News Reader*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.

Miller, Char. 2000. "Chiefly Politics: Gifford Pinchot and Contested Leadership in the Forest Service." *Electronic Green Journal*, Issue 12.

Miller, Char. 2000. "The Greatest Good: A Photographic Essay." *Journal of Forestry*: p. 37-41.

Miller, Char. 1999. "Grazing Arizona: Public Land Management in the Southwest." *Forest History Today*: p. 15-19.

Stedfast, S.M. 1999. "Regulatory Takings: A Historical Overview and Legal Analysis for Natural Resource Management." *Environmental Law* 29(4): 881-937.

Block, N.E. 2000. "Credentialing and Accreditation Programs: Taking the Forestry Profession to the Next Level." *Journal of Forestry* 98(4): 18-22.

Snow, D. and Van de Wetering, S. (eds.). 2000. "A Conversation with Mary Mitsos: Exploring Community Forestry from Washington, DC, to the Rural West" *Chronicle of Community* 4(1): 38-42.



The Pinchot Letter  
*News from the Pinchot Institute for Conservation*

### Fax / Mail-in Response Form

- ☐ I would like to receive The Pinchot Letter via e-mail
- ☐ I would like to continue receiving the printed version of The Pinchot Letter by mail
- ☐ I would like to include my friend or colleague on your mailing list to receive The Pinchot Letter, I will fill in their mailing information below
- ☐ I would no longer like to receive The Pinchot Letter, please remove my name from your mailing list.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Company \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Fax \_\_\_\_\_

Additional Remarks/Comments/Suggestions: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Please fax to: 202-797-6583

or

Mail to  
Pinchot Institute for Conservation  
1616 P Street, NW  
Suite 100  
Washington, DC 20036

*Thank you for your time!!*

---

# PINCHOT INSTITUTE

## FOR CONSERVATION

---

1616 P Street NW, Suite 100, Washington, DC 20036  
[www.pinchot.org](http://www.pinchot.org)

Combined Federal Campaign  
The Pinchot Institute participates in  
the Combined Federal Campaign as  
1010. All gifts are tax-deductible.