Regeneration!

Newsletter of the
Community Forestry Research Fellowship Program

Volume 1, no. 1 Summer 2001

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to Regeneration!, the newsletter of the Community Forestry Research Fellowship Program. The purpose of the newsletter is to keep fellows and their academic advisors and community partners informed about each other's doings and whereabouts, serve as a forum for initiating dialogues and the exchange of ideas, announce upcoming events, and report on items of interest to members of the CFRF network. In this inaugural issue you will find many columns and features that I plan to have as permanent parts of the newsletter. Particularly, Nancy Menning launches the "Focus" column with her thoughtful discussion of the disjuncture between the rhetoric of community empowerment and actual practice. The "Voices from the Field" column will feature commentary on the experiences fellows and their community partners have in conducting participatory research. In this issue Laurie Yung opens the forum with her candid reflections on the challenge of adapting a model of ideal participatory research to the realities of the field situation.

Others features you will find in this issue include news about CFRF fellows, job and meeting announcements, and other items of interest. These features depend on you for their content. So, if you have an item of interest to the CFRF network, please send it in. Regeneration! will be published twice a year, so start thinking about what you might want to include in the winter newsletter. Also, if you have any suggestions or ideas for columns, features, or improvements to the newsletter, please let me know. Thank you, and enjoy!

Carl Wilmsen Editor

2001 FELLOWS

CFRF welcomes the 2001 fellows to the program. This year's fellows are:

Heidi Ballard, Predissertation, University of California, Berkeley. "Harvesting Impacts on Floral Greens in the Pacific Northwest: A Multi-Scaled, Participatory Approach."

Shannon Brawley, M.A., University of California, Davis. "Cache Creek Nature Preserve Tending and Gathering Garden."

Andrew Finley, M.A., University of Massachusetts, Amherst. "Assessing Private Forest Landowners' Attitudes Towards, and Ideas for, Establishing Forestland Cooperatives in the North Quabbin Region of Massachusetts."

Stephanie Gripne, Predissertation, University of Montana. "Can Watershed Restoration Provide an Economically Sustainable Industry to the Bitterroot Watershed Community?"

Jim Hamilton, Predissertation, North Carolina State University. "Hispanic Labor Issues in North Carolina's Christmas Tree Industry: Employer and Laborer Perspectives."

John Isom, Predissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison. "Conceptions of Home: Place, Community, Identity and Environment in the Mattole River Valley, Northwestern California."

Candy Lupe, M.A., Northern Arizona University. "Seeing Four Decades of Change in the Wetlands of the Black River Watershed."

Thomas McCoy, M.A., Southern University. "Spatial Exploration of Environmental Equity Issues: Forested Green Belts in the City-Parish of Baton Rouge."

ANNUAL WORKSHOP 2000 REPORT

The Community Forestry Research Fellowship Program (CFRF) held its fourth annual workshop from October 4 to 8, 2000, at the Ghost Ranch Conference Center in Abiquíu, New Mexico. Forty people attended the workshop including fellows, academic advisors, community representatives, steering committee members, and several invited guests.

The substantive portion of the workshop opened with John Bliss facilitating a session for exploring the major themes in community forestry in the United States. Workshop participants wrote down their ideas concerning the principles, values, and themes of community forestry as well as its opportunities and challenges on index cards and then orally presented these to the entire group. A post-workshop analysis of the ideas presented revealed three major underlying themes: 1) a central goal of community forestry efforts is preserving local ways of life, 2) communities need access to resources to maintain a particular way of life, and 3) communities need meaningful participation in decisions affecting the magnitude and direction of economic, social and cultural change. It is notable that there were relatively few comments dealing specifically with the environment. Evidently the concerns of the CFRF workshop participants were focused on social, economic and political issues.

The three themes were evident throughout the workshop. For example in his presentation on minority issues in community forestry Rodney Stone, Forest Service Liaison at Southern University, noted that there are proportionally fewer minorities in the natural resource professions, that oftentimes there is only token minority representation on advisory boards and that this creates an "illusion of inclusion," and that agendas for natural resource management do not necessarily include the needs and aspirations of minority communities.

The three themes were evident in the presentations the fellows made as well. All of the presentations dealt with conflict over resource management in local situations to a greater or lesser extent. Thus, questions of access and participation were key questions in the case studies presented. In addition, the theme of preserving ways of life ran through many of the presentations and was a central issue in some.

In addition to the three broad themes identified, more detailed concerns became apparent during the workshop as well. For example, three main points emerged from a panel discussion with small loggers operating in northern New Mexico: 1) small loggers need technical assistance with all aspects of marketing, 2) they need technical assistance in increasing the value of their products (i.e. producing grade lumber) as well as in maintaining consistent quality in their production; and 3) they need assistance in adjusting to working with small diameter logs.

Field Trip to Truchas

On Saturday the entire group went on a field trip to Truchas, New Mexico, to view firsthand the thinning work that La Montaña de Truchas, a community-based organization headed by Max Cordova, has been doing on national forest

lands. After visiting two sites on the national forest, the group returned to La Montaña's headquarters for a lunch of traditional New Mexican food. After lunch, several speakers addressed the group. Community activist Santiago Juarez began with a moving presentation about the legacy that speculation in land grants in the late nineteenth century has left for contemporary northern New Mexico communities. Other speakers talked about rural economic development in northern New Mexico, and one spoke about the alienation from the natural world she sees among residents of urban areas.

Perhaps the most memorable talk was that given by local community activists Kay Matthews and Mark Schiller who addressed the group about problems they see with the way philanthropic organizations fund projects in northern New Mexico. They argued that foundations frequently fund projects in the region that work at cross purposes to one another. They asserted that many environmental groups whose campaigns often result in actions that prevent local communities from engaging in their traditional livelihood activities are funded by the same foundations that fund community development programs in those same communities. They also argued that often there is a lack of transfer of technical expertise to people in local communities so that funded programs do not build local capacity for managing ongoing projects or for developing and implementing future projects. This presentation stirred some lively discussion and certainly gave the CFRF workshop participants a taste of the politics surrounding land use and resource management issues in northern New Mexico.

FOCUS

Romanticizing the local: Comments on community

by Nancy Menning
(dissertation fellow, 1998)

While ecological results "on the ground" are often identified as the ultimate test of the success of place-based collaborations, some might argue that "community" is the more important of the two terms that make up the phrase "community forestry." Ford Foundation staff member Mike Conroy, speaking of the Foundation's forestry programs at the 2000 International Symposium on Society and Resource Management, noted that Ford is not interested so much in forestry per se. Rather, the Foundation's main focus is on alleviating poverty and injustice.

The Ford Foundation's emphasis on alleviating poverty and injustice, as well as the term "community" itself, suggests something of what community forestry is all about. Community forestry seeks to improve the lives of local community residents. Most community forestry efforts work to increase the involvement and influence of local communities in decision-making processes affecting the forested landscapes in which they live and make their livings. In seeking to alleviate poverty and injustice, community forestry advocates are cognizant that too often impoverished human communities live adjacent to rich natural resources. Thus community forestry efforts often have a decidedly place-based focus, and seek to reconfigure power relationships among local and non-local interests, to the benefit of local communities.

Community forestry falls within the broad category of locality-based policies discussed recently by Louis Swanson (2001). Swanson notes that locality-based policies – "the wide variety of policies and programs that require significant participation by local stakeholders"

(p. 2) – are increasingly popular. He argues for a critical evaluative eye, however, noting that the political legitimacy of locality-based policies "may rest on the romantic rhetoric associated with community and democracy" (p. 19). "A major concern here is to not romanticize local society, particularly notions of community, simply because of a strong national predilection to celebrate community" (p. 3).

In the summer of 2000, my own concerns about the rhetoric of "community" prompted me to contact nine other current and former CFRF fellows for their reflections on community forestry. I transcribed extended phone interviews for five of those nine fellows (Todd Bryan, Jonathan London, Jeremy Madsen, Kurt Spreyer, and Laurie Yung); I had less intensive conversations or email exchanges with the others. Our discussions focused on (a) our understandings of local and non-local power relationships in our research settings; (b) our perspectives on our own motives as well as the intentions of community forestry generally with respect to the involvement and empowerment of local communities; and (c) our self-critical reflections on naïve or romantic images of community forestry, its intent, and its potential to further real change in specific places.

Four broad themes emerged from the interviews: the function of place in integrating local and non-local dimensions of the community forestry setting; community forestry's intent with respect to place, community, and the local; the unique value of the local in place-based collaboration; and introspective reflection on nostalgia, romanticism, and naïveté in our work in communities. In the following paragraphs I summarize the core content of our conversations and reflections on these four themes. Italicized quotes are drawn from the transcribed interviews.

1. Community forestry settings have local and non-local dimensions. Community forestry emphasizes the human communities "adjacent to" forests. Yet "local" areas always exist in the context of – and in relation to – broader scales, especially in an era of increased globalization. The language of community, locality, and place cannot lead us to ignore larger, non-local scales; we need to understand the local within the broader context of interrelationship. *"At the specific, local scale, there is a reality to the ecological conditions and to the social relationships and to the historical patterns and sediments that are laid down. So, there definitely is a local reality. It's just that the story doesn't stop there.… [Place is] the setting for interaction. Place is where the global forces play themselves out and are also contested"* (Jonathan London).

2. Too often, a disparity exists between the rhetoric and actuality of local empowerment in community forestry. Within the context of gridlock between environmental and commodity interests and a broad societal trend toward deliberative democracy, community forestry seeks to empower local voices. The rhetoric of community forestry speaks of advocacy on behalf of local forest workers. However, corporate managers (rather than local workers) often represent commodity interests in collaborations. A similar argument can be made about the relative participation of paid staff of environmental organizations as opposed to local – unpaid – environmentalists. *"[T]he people who are involved are people who have been empowered on one level or another in the past. It's not the local working class people.… [W]e haven't really seen too many new people come out of the woodwork to get involved"* (Jeremy Madsen).

3. Local people bring more than a clichéd local knowledge to place-based collaborative efforts. While experience in place does not necessarily convey knowledge of ecological processes, locals generally know where things are, what has happened, and what might (or won't) work. They bring much more than that, however.

Locals bring place-based identities and attachments to place. The forest worker also brings their livelihood, their connection to labor and work, and their image to the table. While the community forestry movement builds on the positive image of the forest worker, forest workers often lack the kind of status and role in community forestry efforts that would be sufficient to counterbalance the legal and political power of environmental interests or the economic power of commodity interests.

4. Place-based collaborations may actually mitigate against naïve romanticism about community. Community forestry researchers – and community members themselves – are susceptible to the society-wide predilection to romanticize community. Sustained engagement in a collaborative process, however, can challenge such images. *"[C]ommunity forestry as a process can actually be a very healthy way for a community to process its romantic vision of itself, and reshape its own identity and come to a better understanding of its identity. I think, in some ways, that is one of the most powerful things that it can do"* (Kurt Spreyer).

In conclusion, I encourage community forestry researchers and advocates to guard against an uncritical romanticism about communities without stifling their commitment to what some might see as idealistic aims. *"[Romanticism is] a danger and an important caution, but it doesn't invalidate work toward empowering local communities"* (Laurie Yung). The themes summarized above suggest a focus for that work on behalf of empowerment. Specifically, we must conceptualize the struggles over forest practices in our various settings as being more than simply battles between environmental and corporate interests. A lost voice is that of the forest worker, whose interests are not fully represented by either environmental or corporate stakeholders. Such workers bring more than local knowledge and experience; they bring identity, attachment, and commitment, as well as their connection to work itself. In *Uncommon Ground* Richard White notes that work may be destructive or restorative of nature, even simultaneously both; nevertheless, work is important "because work itself offers both a fundamental way of knowing nature and perhaps our deepest connection with the natural world" (p. 174). A place-based effort such as community forestry should take this "deepest connection" seriously. Our challenge is to articulate its importance persuasively.

References

Swanson, Louis. 2001. "Rural policy and direct local participation: Democracy, inclusiveness, collective agency, and locality-based policy," *Rural Sociology* 66(1):1-21.

White, Richard. 1996. "Are You an Environmentalist or Do You Work for a Living?" pp. 171-185, in *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, edited by William Cronon. New York: Norton.

VOICES FROM THE FIELD

Some Lessons from Participatory Research

by Laurie Yung
(predissertation 1999, dissertation fellow 2000)

Tailoring participatory research (PR) practices to specific community contexts sometimes reveals gaps between real and ideal PR. Instead of viewing these gaps as constraints, we might see honest exploration of the reality of on-the-ground participatory projects as a way to further the dialogue about the different ways

researchers can embrace participatory ideals and practices.

While linear spectrums tend to oversimplify and obscure nuances, perhaps envisioning participatory research (PR) along a continuum can be useful. On the far left of such a spectrum lies traditional positivist, expert- and hypothesis-driven research (clearly not participatory). At the far right is ideal PR, research which is driven by community members who formulate research questions and goals, collect and analyze data, and disseminate information towards social change, in collaboration or consultation with an academic.

Positivist, expert-driven research — Ideal participatory research

As a graduate student working to integrate the principles of PR into my research, I found myself both inspired and intimidated by the ideal PR model. While community priorities have influenced my research agenda, and dialogue and mutual learning have characterized my relationships with community members, I found myself falling short of the high-minded goals of PR. Community members were not collecting data, and there was no formalized group or existing organization through which my project was institutionalized into the community, and through which social change might occur. I wondered where my project fit on the participatory spectrum and agonized about how to push it further toward ideal PR.

My initial challenge was the disconnect between descriptions of PR processes in the literature and the character of the communities I live and work in. In community forestry the implied unit of participation is the community, or community members. But who is the community? And who can represent the community in a participatory process? Much of the literature on PR, especially that which drew on Third World experiences, seemed to describe a fairly homogenous, monolithic community. If I were working with a narrowly defined community of interest, mill workers in Libby, Montana, for example, I might be able to identify established organizations like unions that could represent the interests and priorities of this group. Many communities of place, however, are diverse, and people in these communities have different livelihoods, values, priorities, classes, ethnicities, and interests. In some communities, collaborative groups have pulled together people from many different circumstances and perspectives, and created an organization able to negotiate consensus for a diverse whole. In the absence of such a group, PR is challenging.

PR practitioner Chataway (1997) asks “how does one involve the collective when divisions among local actors inhibit their collaboration?” (p. 757) During my research, many people validated my own understanding of resident communities as diverse and somewhat contentious. One woman described how she often gets calls from nonresident journalists who want to know what the community thinks about a particular natural resource controversy. She is constantly amazed that people think her community can be characterized in such a monolithic fashion. As she put it to me, "walk down Main Street and then through a few neighborhoods and you'll get as many opinions as people you talk with."

If communities of place are conceived of as homogenous and difference is obscured, certain people are left out or marginalized by participatory research. One way out of this conundrum is to acknowledge diversity and choose to work with the most marginalized group. But there was no obviously oppressed group of people in my communities. Instead, different people possessed and lacked different kinds of power. Formulating a clear social change agenda where there is no obviously marginalized group is challenging.

Conceiving of communities as heterogeneous complicates the participatory researcher's decision about whether or not to work with an established community organization or group. Many PR practitioners argue that research is easier to facilitate and more likely to result in social change if it is conducted through existing organizations. However, in a polarized community, working with an existing group can align the researcher in ways which are detrimental to the research process. Chataway describes her experience, saying that

> in a fractionated community, I was told numerous times that if I had come into the community under auspices of any one group, the other groups would not have participated in the research. Paradoxically, because I was not invited, I was more welcome. However, because the research was not under the auspices of one group it always remained my research rather than generating community ownership. (p. 760)

I have found myself in a similar situation. In fact, I recently had a community member tell me I had done a good job with my research. When I asked how she knew that, she responded "you've talked with all different kinds of people and you haven't pissed anybody off." Clearly, inclusiveness was an important criteria of good research in her mind.

In a diverse community, ideal PR might demand that the researcher organize community members into a collaborative group. In some cases, where the community is receptive and the researcher possesses the requisite facilitation skills, this is a viable option. Unfortunately, the necessary elements for this kind of organizing did not seem to be present in my study site. A collaborative effort had occurred less than 10 years earlier and, after two meetings with a professional facilitator, the group exploded into personal attacks and resentments that resurface to this day. A more recent partnership between certain conservationists and ranchers is currently very low-key because participants fear the backlash they experienced as part of this earlier effort.

The question of who participates in a PR process is critical. While formalized participation is often necessary to ideal PR, I have found that in some contentious, polarized communities inclusiveness may demand less formalized participation. In the absence of formalized participation, I sought other ways to make my project more participatory.

I decided to meet individually with 10 people, including federal land managers, ranchers, conservationists, and community leaders, who I informally called my community consultants. I did this prior to my main data collection phase so that I would have the opportunity to integrate their suggestions into the research process. I asked each of them what they wanted to learn about their community, what kinds of questions to ask people, who I should talk with, and how to create a dialogue about research results. (While I asked most people I interviewed during my preliminary research phase what questions I should be asking and who else I should talk with, these meetings addressed these questions in much more depth.) People responded to these questions in very different ways, and embraced my advice-seeking to various degrees. As much as possible, I integrated suggestions into the sample, the interview questions, and plans for future dialogue. Upon one community member's advice, I began to attend the meetings of two community groups that seemed to span diverse interests.

I also considered publishing short articles in the newspaper, relaying some of what people were describing in interviews and providing contact information so a broad range of community members could give me feedback. While this may have produced the desired dialogue, several people told me that I would compromise my ability to conduct future interviews, since people would perceive me as a journalist. I abandoned this idea, but it may have potential in other situations.

A number of small but important opportunities presented themselves. I was asked to do secretarial work (minutes, files, errands) for the low-key rancher/conservationist group I attend, and may be able to do additional work for this group in the future. County officials are exploring ways to utilize research results in a growth management effort. I've been asked to conduct statistical analyses on survey data community members gathered last year, and may teach interview methods to a group of young people beginning a community history project. All this I offer free of charge (after all, think of the countless hours people in these communities have offered me free of charge). Although engaging with community groups at this level at the beginning of the project might have enabled research priorities and activities to be institutionalized within and guided by the community, the time it took to build these relationships prevented that and the problem of aligning with a particular group made it undesirable.

While these activities certainly don't add up to ideal PR (they may not even come close), they offer important opportunities for dialogue and may lead to more collaborative research in the future. Getting beyond the guilt of not complying with a strict and specific participatory model from the outset of my research was key to my embracing the spirit of participatory research, which I see as dialogue and mutual inquiry, power and information sharing, and research which is relevant and beneficial to communities. Acknowledging that PR is not easy and that one size may not fit all communities helped me to open my mind to many different participatory possibilities. Envisioning PR on a continuum may recognize the real world challenges of implementing PR ideals and provide some room for imagining many kinds of PR.

Perhaps the biggest lesson I learned, and what I see as the greatest challenge and opportunity, is that PR evolves in unpredictable and uncontrollable ways. PR requires a flexibility that is rarely built into graduate programs, research timelines, and limited funding. It is often difficult to predict specifically and exactly how a project will be participatory until years after its completion. Relationships with community members and organizations change over time and community needs change.

Hopefully, individual PR projects become more participatory over time. Participation is dynamic, unpredictable, and emergent. But that doesn't mean it's entirely out of our hands. As researchers we can encourage participation by building relationships with different community members, by making ourselves available to different organizations, and by being open to the many ways we might collaborate with people. Most of all, we can work toward reciprocal, egalitarian relationships of mutual learning and dialogue with everyone we interact with. Power differences will not disappear in our communities nor in research relationships, but we can work toward power sharing and research that embraces local people as experts. By infusing the spirit of PR into small, every day interactions, we establish the kinds of relationships that open the doors to more participatory work in the future.

References

Chataway, Cynthia. 1997. "An Examination of the Constraints on Mutual Inquiry in a Participatory Action Research Project," *Journal of Social Issues* 53(4):747-766.

FELLOW NEWS

Recent Graduates

Mary Hobbs, Dissertation Fellow 1997. Graduated 2000, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Astrid Jirka, MA Fellow 1998. Graduated 1999, School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont. Astrid is currently living in St. John, USVI, where she has been working as an ecotour guide at a local elementary school and was recently hired as a Visitor Use Assistant to the Virgin Islands National Park.

Jonathan London, Dissertation Fellow 1997. Graduated 2001, University of California, Berkeley. Current director of Youth In Focus, Davis, California.

Jeremy Madsen, MA Fellow 1999. Graduated 2000, University of Oregon.

Nicholas Martin, MA Fellow 1998. Graduated 1999, University of California, Berkeley. Nicholas has been working in Zuni Pueblo as manager of the Sawmill Enterprise which he helped the Tribe start when he was a fellow. He is now handing the manager role off to a tribal member.

Madeline Ostrander, MA Fellow 1999. Graduated 2000, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Sissel Waage, Dissertation Fellow 1997. Graduated 2000, University of California, Berkeley. After finishing a consultancy with the Packard Foundation, Sissel is now working as Director of the Sustainability Research Group at The Natural Step (www.naturalstep.org).

COMMUNITY PARTNER NEWS

Mae Burnett, Watershed Projects Supervisor, White Mountain Apache Tribe, Arizona. Together with Jonathan Long (dissertation fellow 1999), Mae delivered the Rudy Grah Lecture on Forestry and Sustainable Development at the University of California at Berkeley in the January, 2001. Mae and Jonathan discussed the riparian ecosystem restoration program of the White Mountain Apache tribe in a talk entitled "Giving Breath to Streams: Restoration on White Mountain Apache Tribal Lands."

Eva Harris, Forest Landowner, Canyon City, Oregon. Eva is deeply involved in many efforts in her community to help resolve environmental conflicts. These include working with the Forest Service and a local conservation organization on forest and community health issues, helping facilitate a project of The Nature Conservancy on public lands, and applying her conflict resolution skills to a local environmental controversy. In April Eva joined a group of sixteen people in Prineville, Oregon, to attend the three-day workshop entitled "Accelerating Cooperative Riparian Restoration and Management" sponsored by the interagency (BLM, Forest Service) National Riparian Service Team (NRST). This session was specifically targeted for agency management at the community level. The goal of the workshop was to give participants the tools to address the requirements of the Endangered Species and Clean Water acts. These tools are intended to help workshop participants work within their communities to break the traditional gridlock and to bring community members into the discussion in a non-confrontational manner with benefit for both community and riparian health.

Leah Wills, Community Projects Coordinator, Forest Community Research, Taylorsville, California. Leah presented a lecture entitled "Upstream Watersheds" for the California Colloquium on Water at the University of California at Berkeley in November, 2000.

ADVISOR NEWS

Recent Publications

Jill Belsky. 2000. "The Meaning of the Manatee: Community-Based Ecotourism Discourse and Practice in Gales Point, Belize." In *People, Plants and Justice: Conservation and*

Resource Extraction in Tropical Developing Countries, edited by Charles Zerner. New York: Columbia University Press.

Aregai Tecle, with D.E. Rupp. 2001. "Stochastic Precipitation-Runoff Model Water Yield From a Semi-Arid Forested Environment." In *Risk, Reliability, Uncertainty and Robustness of Water Resources Systems*, edited by Janos Bogardi and Zbigniew W. Kundzewicz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Julia M. Wondolleck, with Steven L. Yaffee. 2000. *Making Collaboration Work: Lessons from Innovation in Natural Resource Management*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

ZUNI SAWMILL ENTERPRISE

While a CFRF fellow during the summer and fall of 1998 Nicholas Martin helped start the Sawmill Enterprise at Zuni pueblo in western New Mexico. The first two years of the enterprise were focused on serving the building needs of the Reservation community. This was a significant benefit, providing several jobs and increased tribal capacity in forestry and business management. However, acting primarily as a community service project always left the financial viability of the enterprise independent from Tribal or grant support a bit questionable. Consequently, a major focus of the past several months has been on designing and marketing uniquely Zuni specialty products, for example vigas with traditional carvings and designs, to sell as higher-value items to contractors and architects in the custom home markets in Albuquerque, Santa Fe, and Taos. This strategy is designed to complement and support the local community's needs, since the demand for lumber there is strong. Most Tribal members build their own homes and add on as their families expand; the housing stock is short and sub-standard and the population growth rate considerably higher than the national average. In addition, there is a tradition of home-building for the Shalako holiday, the culmination of Zuni's yearly religious cycle, which the sawmill serves as well.

The sawmill is now also getting heavily involved in the wildland-urban interface fuels reduction/small-diameter timber thinning work that is everyone's concern in the region these days. The tribe has established a partnership with the Forest Service (Cibola National Forest) to do a thinning pilot project this summer, a service contract with an embedded timber sale (one of these hybrid contracting authorities that a lot of folks are experimenting with). In the future the tribe will have status with Cibola as a national stewardship contract pilot project, and will be using that, along with plugging into some of the abundant grant money now available, to create a permanent seasonal Zuni thinning crew. The crew will work with Cibola for fuels reduction treatments on National Forest lands over the next several years. Much of that National Forest land is part of Zuni's aboriginal territory, so these projects allow the tribe to reclaim a greater role as land stewards in areas of economic and cultural significance.

Another significant benefit of the Sawmill Enterprise is that it has enabled the tribe to put together a thorough-going forestry program. In the past it relied on federal agencies to fulfill this function.

NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

The Community Forestry Research Fellowship Program announces two new programs for minority undergraduate students: a summer internship program, and a student assistantship.

Summer Internship
The summer internship program funds minority undergraduate students at any U.S. university or college to work for six weeks during the summer with grassroots organizations on community-based forest management issues.

Participating students will learn firsthand about grassroots, community-based efforts to build sustainable relationships between communities and their adjacent forests; gain hands-on experience in community-based forest management; work with communities on real issues of relevance to them; help local organizations build capacity for community self-determination.

Student Assistantships
The student assistantship program funds minority undergraduate research assistants to work directly with faculty on their community forestry research projects. Scholars at any U.S. university or college who are engaged in social science, economic, or natural resource research that deals directly with or is explicitly relevant to community forestry policy and practice in U.S. forest communities may apply. Funds may be used to support a student (expenses plus a stipend) to assist with research in a community during the summer, or to pay a stipend to a part-time student assistant at the faculty and student's home campus for a period of one academic year (nine months).

For more information and application procedures and deadlines visit the CFRF website at http://www.cnr.berkeley.edu/community_forestry/

UPCOMING EVENTS

Panel Discussion on Community Forestry

A panel discussion entitled "Challenges and Opportunities in Community Forestry" will be held on Saturday, August 18, 2001 at the Rural Sociological Society's annual meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Panelists include: Cecilia Danks, Watershed Research and Training Center, Hayfork, California; Eva Harris, Forest Landowner, Canyon City, Oregon; Mary Hobbs (CFRF dissertation fellow 1997), USAID; Ajit Krishnaswamy, Director, National Community Forestry Center, Boston, Massachusetts; Jonathan London (CFRF dissertation fellow 1997), Youth in Focus, Davis, California .

For more information on the meeting and how to register visit http://www.ruralsociology.org/.

National Network of Forest Practitioners Annual Meeting

The NNFP annual meeting will be held September 8-11, 2001, in Hoopa, California. Keep an eye on their website www.nnfp.org for details.

NEW BOOK

A new book which features the proceedings of a collaborative workshop held by American Forests in Bend, Oregon, in 1998 was published this year in March. It is entitled *Understanding Community-Based Forest Ecosystem Management*, and is edited by Gerald J. Gray, Maia J. Enzer, and Jonathan Kusel. It is available from Haworth Press (http://www.haworthpressinc.com/). Workshop papers were published simultaneously in the *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, volume 12, numbers 3/4 and volume 13, numbers 1/2.

REFURBISHED WEBSITE

The Community Forestry Research Fellowship Program has updated its website. It now includes announcements about upcoming events, a space to post job and other opportunities, descriptions of community forestry efforts around the country, and a link to a discussion bulletin board. The bulletin board is intended to facilitate communication between fellows who may want to "compare notes" or seek advice about prickly issues in conducting their research, as well as to offer a place for discussion on topics of burning interest (perhaps some of the ideas presented in this newsletter). Check it out at www.cnr.berkeley.edu/community_forestry/

JOBS

White Mountain Apache Tribe, Arizona

Full time/permanent position that is responsible for managing the Fish and Wildlife Management Department of the Wildlife & Outdoor Recreation Division, and for directly supervising underlying wildlife, fisheries and sensitive species (T&E) programs and staff.

Position reports directly to the W&ORD Director, and will direct and/or assist in the development of related resource management programs and plans, and will actively participate in the development of an integrated tribal resource management working group and accompanying data-base management system. Position is further responsible for management and timely and accurate administration of department budgets, resource management plans, P.L. 638 contracts, annual reports and other associated administrative functions.

Position requires minimum of Masters Degree AND five (5) years comparable supervisory/management experience in ecosystem management (preferably with an emphasis on aquatic ecology) with an established resource management agency. Duties demand strong organizational, leadership and communication (written/verbal) skills and ability to work in a team-work environment in developing resource management plans and programs.

Ecosystem management on this Reservation, the ancestral homeland of the White Mountain Apache Tribe, revolves around watershed-based assessment, planning, and management actions to promote healthy ecosystems, including the native assemblages of fish, wildlife, and plants, and their sustainable use. The Reservation includes diverse ecological communities, including Sonoran desert scrub, pinyon-juniper woodlands, extensive ponderosa pine and mixed-conifer forests, hundreds of miles of perennial cold and warm water streams, and a diversity of wetland habitats. The Position will be responsible for helping to ensure the sustainability of biological resources, as part of integrated and progressive ecosystem management by numerous tribal programs, with technical and funding support from Federal agencies operating through the trust relationship to the Tribe.

For more information contact:
Jon Cooley, Director, WMAT Wildlife and Outdoor Recreation Division (520) 338-4385, jonc@cybertrails.com
Applicants need to apply to the Tribal Personnel Office (520) 338-4346 x. 275.

Alliance of Forest Workers and Harvesters
Coordinating Director

The Alliance is a multicultural, membership-based, independent non-profit organization established in 1997. The Alliance promotes environmental, social, and economic justice. Members include people from Latino, SE Asian, Native American, and European-American communities who make their livelihood from non-timber forest activities in Washington, Oregon, and California. Non-timber tasks include contract work such as tree planting, fuels reductions, restoration; and non-timber forest products harvesting of wild mushrooms and other edibles, medicinals, and floral greens (ferns, salal, boughs, moss, etc.).

The Alliance is a young grassroots organization developing its organizational structure. Current structure consists of a Board of Directors composed of forest workers and harvesters reflective of the membership and an interim coordinator. A grantwriter is currently on retainer, and an office has been established in the Willamette Valley in northwest Oregon. A program assistant and contracted accountant will largely cover office support and professional accounting duties.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Fundraising
* Self-initiate or cooperate with grantwriter to identify potential grantors and secure funding for Alliance efforts
* Coordinate production of grant proposals and reports
* Coordinate program to increase organizational funds through membership and organizational contributions or projects.

Organization Management
* Oversee all Alliance programs, staff and contract relationships. Coordinate oversight with Board of Directors
* Ensure quality implementation of the Alliance's action plan
* Develop budgets, administer funds and cooperate with Board to provide fiscal oversight

Organizational Development & Technical Assistance
* Oversee evaluation of the Alliance's programs and projects and integrate evaluations into future actions
* Maintain and initiate strategies to expand multicultural and multilingual leadership development
* Grassroots membership recruitment and development. Promote development and integration of geographically based chapters and issue caucuses
* Engage directly and coordinate mentoring for membership to represent forest worker and harvester issues in public dialogues
* Develop collaborative partnerships with forest issue stakeholders
* Maintain and initiate working relationships with peer organizations committed to social change
* Coordinate Alliance gatherings

Policy
* Monitor developments, regionally and nationally, of issues of concern to forest workers and harvesters
* Work with membership to author policy positions and deliver presentations on significant policy issues
* With membership and partners, represent the Alliance in policy arenas

Outreach and Communication
* Cooperate with membership to increase forest worker and harvester visibility among funders, journalists and policy makers
* Conduct site visits/meetings (individually and with Alliance members) to areas where forest workers live and work, and regions designated for Alliance recruitment and retention efforts
* Develop and coordinate outreach mechanisms including newsletter, slide presentation, brochure, flyers, and other publications

QUALIFICATIONS

Candidates for the position should have:

* Ability to motivate others, and to work as part of a team in building consensus and compromise
* A working style characterized by diplomacy, flexibility, and a good nature is essential
* Demonstrated commitment to ecological, economic, and social justice in worker development
* Experience and demonstrated success in a position of responsibility in a grassroots organization
* Ability to work creatively with a multilingual and multi-class membership, which includes a high proportion of traditionally disenfranchised workers
* Ability to balance a diverse set of tasks under tight deadlines
* Ability to attend to detail and maintain focus on broader vision
* Demonstrated ability to raise and administer funds from a diversity of sources and to build and maintain successful relationships with grantors
* An ability to understand research methodology and process
- Willingness to occasionally be present in the field with forest workers and harvesters, and, if possible, to participate in forest tasks in order to understand forest work systems and conditions

SALARY

The salary range is around $ 30,000, depending on experience and qualifications.

LOCATION

The Alliance currently has an office in Eugene, Oregon. We prefer the Executive Director to be located in the Willamette Valley, but will consider other circumstances.

TO APPLY

Send cover letter, resume, list of references, writing sample and salary expectations to:
(Applications may be submitted by post, fax, or email.)

Alliance of Forest Workers and Harvesters
POB 12110
Eugene OR 97440
FAX: 541-434-6675
E-mail: alliancefwh@qwest.net
Phone inquiries: 541-342-6146

The position will remain open until a qualified applicant is hired.