

Benefits of community-based forestry in the US: lessons from a demonstration programme

C.M. DANKS

University of Vermont, 153 S. Prospect St., Burlington, VT 05401, USA

Email: cdanks@uvm.edu

SUMMARY

Community-based forestry (CBF) in the US involves a diversity of activities that can occur on public or private lands, and extends beyond land ownership and management into the processing and marketing of forest products and services. Like CBF in many other parts of the world, it shares the interdependent goals of achieving ecological health and social well-being. Actual benefits achieved through CBF are not yet well documented in the literature. This paper illustrates the diversity of CBF activities in the US through the participating projects of the Ford Foundation's Community-Based Forestry Demonstration Program and examines programme outcomes with attention given to the conditions under which benefits accrue to poor and marginalised people. The discussion reflects on the importance of looking at institutional change as well as project level benefits when assessing environmental and social outcomes.

Keywords: community forestry, participatory forestry, USA, livelihoods, poverty

Bénéfices de la foresterie à base communautaire aux USA: leçons d'un programme de démonstration

C.M. DANKS

La foresterie à base communautaire (CBF) aux USA comporte une diversité d'activités pouvant s'exécuter sur terre publique ou privée. Elle s'étend au delà de la possession et de la gestion de la terre jusqu'au marketing des produits et des services forestiers. Comme la CBF dans de nombreuses autres régions du monde, elle se porte vers les buts interdépendants d'obtenir une écologie saine et un bien-être social. Les bénéfices réels obtenus par la CBF ne sont pas encore bien documentés. Cet article illustre la diversité des activités de la CBF aux USA avec les projets participant du programme de démonstration de la foresterie à base communautaire de la Fondation Ford, et examine les résultats du programme avec une attention particulière portée aux conditions permettant que les bénéfices parviennent aux personnes démunies et marginalisées. L'analyse réfléchit à l'importance de prendre en compte le changement institutionnel ainsi que le niveau projeté des bénéfices au moment de l'évaluation des résultats environnementaux et sociaux.

Beneficios de la gestión forestal comunitaria en Estados Unidos: resultados de un programa de demostración

C. M. DANKS

La gestión forestal comunitaria (CBF, por sus siglas en inglés) en Estados Unidos incluye una diversidad de actividades que pueden desarrollarse en tierras de propiedad pública o privada, y se extiende más allá de la propiedad y gestión de la tierra para abarcar el procesamiento y marketing de productos y servicios forestales. Igual que en muchas otras partes del mundo, el CBF compagina los objetivos interdependientes de lograr la salud ecológica y el bienestar social. En los estudios por escrito, no se ha documentado todavía los beneficios logrados por el CBF, y este artículo destaca la diversidad de las actividades de CBF en Estados Unidos por medio de los proyectos que participan en el Programa de Demostración de Gestión Forestal Comunitaria de la Fundación Ford, y examina los resultados del programa en lo que se refiere a las condiciones en que las personas pobres y marginadas puedan acceder a los beneficios. El estudio considera la importancia de tener en cuenta el cambio institucional a la hora de evaluar los resultados ambientales y sociales.

INTRODUCTION

Community-based forestry (CBF) in the US, like community forestry elsewhere in the world, varies considerably depending on the local institutional, cultural, political and ecological context. As discussed further below, CBF

initiatives may differ in form and activities pursued, but share a common goal of enhancing local involvement in forestry to promote social well-being and ecological health. CBF in the US differs from many forms of participatory forestry found in the global South in that there has been less emphasis on legally devolving forest management rights to community-

level entities. Without a national legal framework for CBF, diverse forms of CBF have arisen that generally seek to improve ecological stewardship and to support forest-based activities and enterprises that contribute to community goals. CBF activities often promote increased community participation on public lands, capacity-building and collective initiatives among private landowners, and in some cases, community acquisition of forest land (Donoghue and Sturtevant 2008).

Identifying and quantifying the full range of benefits from CBF, and understanding to whom they accrue and under what conditions, have been fundamental research questions regarding CBF around the world (e.g. Edmunds and Wollenberg 2003, Larson *et al.* 2007, Springate-Baginski and Blaikie 2007). Of particular interest to scholars, funders and practitioners are the impacts of CBF on the most vulnerable portions of the population especially poor, marginalised people, who are often disadvantaged ethnic and racial minorities as well as women and children (Fisher *et al.* 2008). While there has been considerable attention to describing CBF in the US and even discussion of its potential for alleviating poverty, the documentation and analysis of benefits, especially those that might accrue to poor and disadvantaged people, are relatively scarce (Charnley and Poe 2007, Glasmeier and Farrigan 2005, McDermott 2009a). This paper seeks to contribute to understanding the benefits of CBF in the US by reviewing the outcomes of the Ford Foundation's Community-Based Forestry Demonstration Program. The nationwide CBF Demonstration Program, which ran from 2000 to 2005, sought to represent a diversity of US CBF activities among its 13 community participants, and it placed special emphasis on promoting sustainable livelihoods and understanding the outcomes resulting from these activities. The paper addresses the following questions: What benefits resulted from these projects, who benefited, and under what conditions did benefits accrue to low income and marginalised people?

In this paper, the nature of CBF in the US is introduced as a diverse set of activities pursuing similar overarching goals, methods and benefits, despite varying contexts and types of communities. Forest land ownership, which contributes to the diversity of CBF activities observed, is briefly discussed. The paper then describes the Ford CBF Demonstration Program, reports on specific outcomes achieved by the participating organisations, and focuses on the benefits which have accrued to low income and marginalised people. The discussion addresses the conditions under which benefits are most likely to reach the poor and marginalised and the importance of looking at institutional change outcomes in addition to project level benefits.

In this paper, the phrases 'low income and marginalised people' or 'the poor and marginalised' will be used to refer to disadvantaged individuals and groups who live in or near poverty or who are marginalised in the US due to race, class, ethnicity, gender or disability. This wording is chosen to capture the intent of both President Clinton's Executive Order on environmental justice (Clinton 1994) and the USDA Forest Service's term 'underserved'. "Underserved

individuals, groups, populations, or communities" are those "that the Forest Service has not effectively protected, supported, or promoted in the delivery of programs and services on a fair and equitable basis" (USDA Forest Service 2000:33). Similar to the Executive Order, it specifies that "the underserved have been minority groups (including American Indians or Alaska Natives), persons below the poverty level, and persons with disabilities", and in some cases women (USDA Forest Service 2000:33-34).

Data and analysis contributing to this paper came from a diversity of sources. The summary of the general nature of CBF in the US was drawn largely from a comprehensive analysis of CBF research in the US carried out by the author in which a database of approximately 200 reports, papers and books from 1990-2007 was compiled, coded and updated in 2008. The analysis of the Ford CBF Program outcomes draws on the author's multiple roles with the programme and uses data collected by both herself and colleagues. The author was a member of the Colorado State University-based research team that conducted research and analyses of Ford CBF Demonstration Program from 2004 to 2006 involving field work in multiple sites. In addition, she conducted an evaluation of the Pennsylvania State University-based research component for the Ford Foundation, and, at the beginning of the five year programme, participated as a community partner in her capacity as research programme director for one of the community groups in the Demonstration Program. Data from multiple sources were generally concordant and therefore were combined in the tables; the reports documenting outcomes are cited together at the end of each table.

This paper is not intended to be a definitive report on the results of the Ford CBF Demonstration Program. Space does not allow for a comprehensive and nuanced discussion of the many programme outcomes and implications (see Ballard *et al.* 2008, Cheng *et al.* 2006, Fernandez-Gimenez *et al.* 2008, Korten and Wyckoff-Baird 2005, and Wyckoff-Baird 2005). Several specific cases are analysed in much greater detail in this issue (see Brighton, Diop and Fraser, McDermott). Moreover, many participants with varying and valid perspectives may interpret or emphasise the data differently. This research was guided by the principles of community-based participatory research in which researchers work with community groups as partners (Stoecker 2005, Stringer 2007), however the interpretation and all errors are the responsibility of the author.

COMMUNITY-BASED FORESTRY IN THE US: GOALS, ACTIVITIES AND BENEFITS

Common goals, diverse activities

In recent years, several articles and books have described community-forestry relationships (e.g. Donoghue and Sturtevant 2008, Lee and Field 2005) as well as the emergence and prospects of community-based forestry in the US (e.g. Baker and Kusel 2003, Brendler and Carey

1998, Charnley and Poe 2007, Glasmeier and Farrigan 2005, Gray *et al.* 2001a). While all of these authors take a national view of what constitutes CBF, and several of them look abroad to understand the US models in an international context, they vary somewhat in the breadth of activities they include as CBF and therefore the approximate dates when CBF emerged in the US. For those authors that place more emphasis on CBF as collaboration between communities and government agencies with regard to public forest lands, CBF is considered a part of collaborative resource management as it has emerged in the western US in the early 1990s (e.g. Charnley and Poe 2007, Glasmeier and Farrigan 2005, Weber 2000). Baker and Kusel (2003) look further back and note the “historical antecedents” to current forms of CBF, such as community-owned forests, which can date back centuries in the US (e.g. Gonzales 2003, McCullough 1995). When one considers indigenous land management, CBF can date back millennia (Abrams and Nowacki 2008, Blackburn and Anderson 1993). This paper takes an inclusive view of CBF in the US that encompasses public and private lands, eastern and western landscapes, urban and rural communities, as well as forest management and forest products. This inclusive view is drawn not only from the diversity of representations of CBF in the literature (e.g. Baker and Kusel 2003, Gray *et al.* 2001b, Kusel and Adler 2001), but also from observation of the emerging community of practitioners who recognise their common attributes and goals and are increasingly working together (e.g. American Forests n.d., Communities Committee of the Seventh American Forest Congress n.d.;

Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition n.d.; Yellow Wood Associates 2000).

In this paper, the term ‘community-based forestry,’ or CBF, includes a variety of activities that share certain goals and methods, which are summarised in Table 1. Central to CBF is the role of the community as participant in and beneficiary of forestry activities. In CBF, communities generally share in decision-making and benefits; they contribute resources, labour and knowledge to managing forests and utilizing forest products; and they do this with the joint goals of achieving social well-being and ecological health (Danks and Fortmann 2004). The nature and degree to which each of these components is present in a given CBF initiative can vary considerably. For example, regarding decision-making, communities can completely own the forest and control all management decisions, or they may contribute meaningful input to a government or private sector forest manager. Some CBF efforts emphasise participation in forest management, while others focus more on the utilisation of forest products through value-added processing and marketing. While such an inclusive description of CBF risks rendering the term meaningless, CBF can still be identified by the combination of interrelated goals and methods used to achieve them. In fact, the methods employed – such as promoting inclusive participation, fostering forest-based business opportunities, and restoring forest ecosystems – are often viewed as value-laden objectives themselves, not just means to achieve their overall social and economic goals. This integration of goals and methods is evident in how CBF practitioners

TABLE 1 *Goals and methods of community-based forestry in the US*

Overarching goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological health and sustainability • Community well-being and resilience • Meaningful role for local communities and forest workers in forest management planning and decision-making
Methods	<p>Work collaboratively</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote participatory, inclusive, transparent and fair processes • Establish forums for information-sharing and shared decision-making between community and relevant federal or state agencies • Work through partnerships that span public and private lands and institutions <p>Emphasise equity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite and seek consensus among diverse stakeholders • Encourage the participation of and address the needs of marginalised community members including low income, ethnically diverse and/or racial minorities • Accept local knowledge as contributing to scientific management <p>Build capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build capacity of both community and agencies for collaborative management • Help small-scale, private forest landowners to retain and sustainably manage their forests • Develop networks locally, regionally and nationally to address issues of scale that affect economic viability and political action <p>Create livelihoods and sustain ecosystems through for-profit enterprises</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance opportunities for community members to implement restoration and sustainable management of forest ecosystems and urban landscapes • Support local, small-scale, forest-based enterprises that contribute to community well-being • Utilise sustainably produced timber and non-timber forest products to generate revenue and jobs that help achieve both ecological and social goals

Sources: Synthesised from diverse sources that are based on the input (interviews, co-authorships and programme documents) of CBF groups nationwide, including Baker and Kusel 2003, Gray *et al.* 2001a, Wyckoff-Baird 2005 and field research.

describe their own work. For example, when a group of CBF practitioners and action researchers assembled for a week in Bend, Oregon in 1998 to begin to document their efforts, they defined CBF in terms of both “critical dimensions” and “pathways” (Gray *et al.* 2001a:21).

Community in CBF in the US

The ‘community’ in CBF can vary considerably. In the United States, forest communities that participate in CBF can be commuter exurbs or remote, rural towns surrounded by national and industrial forests. They also include communities of forest workers who may not reside immediately adjacent to the forest in which they work. Urban neighbourhoods and cities can also participate in community-based forestry. In fact, in the US, the phrase ‘community forestry’ most often refers to urban forestry. Due in part to the urban connotations of the term community forestry in the US, the term community-based forestry was chosen for this paper to include both the urban and rural contexts and to emphasise the role of community as both actor and beneficiary. What these communities often share are economic and cultural ties to the trees and forests that surround them (Danks 2008).

‘Community’ is a loaded word with many common, sociological and political meanings which have been explored in greater depth by other authors with regards to community-based resource management (e.g. Agrawal and Gibson 1999, Flint *et al.* 2008, Li 1996). The term ‘community’ can conjure up positive, politically useful images of caring, neighbourly, democratic collaborations among equals. However, both participants in and scholars of CBF are well aware of the internal inequities, conflicts and enduring divisions related to class, ideology, race, ethnicity, age, gender, family history and old-timer vs. newcomer status that can impede collaboration in any community. In many cases, CBF efforts seek to directly address and overcome such internal differences by seeking broad consensus and collaborative action on common ground issues (e.g. Sturtevant and Lange 2003). Conversely, CBF initiatives do not always include the full diversity of the community they seek to aid or represent (McDermott, this issue).

Ownership and governance of forests in CBF in the US

Fifty-six percent of forestland in the US is privately owned, 42 percent is owned by federal and state agencies, and 2 percent by local government (calculated from USDA Forest Service 2007). CBF activities can occur on all of these types of ownership. In many parts of the world, CBF seeks to devolve many of the rights and responsibilities for management, if not outright ownership, to local communities (Fisher 1999). In the US, while increased community participation in decision-making, implementation and benefits of forest management on public lands are clearly objectives of CBF, assuming full ownership of federal and state forests has not been a consensus goal. Most advocates of CBF emphasise that “public lands should remain public”

(Lead Partnership Group n.d.). The main innovations regarding governance of public forests in the US employed in CBF are informal collaborative groups, formal advisory committees and enhanced public participation processes that bring together community members of diverse perspectives with agency experts and decision-makers in a deliberative process that guides forest management decisions (Koontz *et al.* 2004, Weber 2000, Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000.) Private property rights are held dear in the US, and CBF initiatives that deal with private land are careful to respect the rights of landowners. That said, there have been some innovative projects to allow stewardship of federal forests by local communities as well as many community-based efforts to purchase private forest land as community forests (Belsky 2008, Davies *et al.* 2008).

Benefits sought through CBF in the US

Just as it is not easy to separate goals from methods because they are both value-driven among CBF practitioners, it is not easy to neatly separate social, ecological and economic goals and benefits sought through CBF. While forest land preservation may be a part or even the main purpose of some CBF efforts, some form of subsistence or commercial use of the forest is often part of what distinguishes CBF from other local land conservation efforts. Economic activity is developed both to achieve the goal of community well-being and to help fund ecological goals. For example, many CBF proponents view the profitable and efficient use of underutilised species, sizes and grades of woody material as a way to achieve ecological goals by making restoration economically viable (e.g. RVCC 2005, Vermont Family Forests 2003). CBF efforts often promote social entrepreneurship and small, community-scaled businesses to enhance social benefits from forests (Broussard *et al.* 2008, Danks *et al.* 2003). They often seek to sustain local forest-based livelihoods by creating new job opportunities in areas such as fuels management, forest inventory and assessment, landscape restoration and processing of forest products. These economic activities are chosen in large part to enhance the ecological conditions and functions of the forest. The Vision and Values statement of one CBF group phrased this integration of economy, society and ecology as follows:

“We value and support those who refuse to sacrifice the long-term good of the land for the good of the people, or the good of the people for the good of the land, who seek to find a new path which honors and sustains both.” (Healthy Forests, Healthy Communities n.d.)

Therefore, the benefits listed in Table 2 are artificially divided into social, economic and ecological categories to show the breadth of benefits sought. The term ‘largely’ in the category heading is intended to acknowledge that the benefits are not restricted to the categories in which they are listed. A healthy ecosystem, for example, provides many valuable social and economic benefits.

Note that Table 2 represents benefits sought, not

TABLE 2 *Benefits sought through CBF in the US*

Largely environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions and biological diversity • Protection of ecologically important places and species • Ecological sustainability in forest management
Largely economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic viability of restoration activities, sustainable management and forest-based businesses • Sustainable livelihoods including high quality, forest-based employment • Provision of private goods (e.g. timber, firewood, mushrooms) and/or ecosystem services (e.g. clean air and water, carbon sequestration, visual and spiritual amenities)
Largely social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reductions in conflict and increase in social harmony • Cultural survival, identity and vitality • Landownership retention and traditional access rights to forests • Healthy families and options for youth

Sources: Synthesised from diverse sources that are based on the input (interviews, co-authorships and programme documents) of CBF groups nationwide, including Baker and Kusel 2003, Gray *et al.* 2001a, Wyckoff-Baird 2005 and field research.

necessarily achieved. Documenting the types of benefits actually achieved and to whom they accrue is important to understanding the effectiveness of CBF in addressing its many goals. While there is some documentation of the many benefits of urban forests (e.g. McPherson *et al.* 2005, Nowak and Dwyer 2007), and of the impacts of public forest management on local communities and workers (e.g. Charnley *et al.* 2008, Moseley and Reyes 2007), there is relatively little literature reporting on benefits resulting from community-based forestry activities in the US, particularly in rural areas. The CBF literature has often emphasised description and process features of these new collaborative efforts rather than outcomes, in part because many CBF efforts emerged in the 1990s and their long term goals of ecological health and community well-being could not be realised in the short term (Conley and Moote 2003, Fernandez-Gimenez *et al.* 2008, Koontz and Thomas 2006, McDermott *et al.*, in press). While low income and marginalised families are often the intended beneficiaries of CBF projects, reports on the outcomes they actually realise through CBF are extremely limited.

The Ford Foundation has been concerned with understanding how CBF can be a strategy to address poverty and inequity by promoting sustainable rural livelihoods and governance structures that provide fair access to forest resources (Ford Foundation 1998). The experience of the Ford Foundation's CBF Demonstration Program, described below, can provide insights into the nature of benefits from CBF in the US and the conditions under which those benefits reach poor and marginalised people.

FORD FOUNDATION COMMUNITY-BASED FORESTRY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Since the mid-1970s, the Ford Foundation has supported community-based forestry in over 20 countries as one strategy to address the environmental degradation and inequity which contribute to poverty (Ford Foundation 1998). In the mid-1990s, Ford Foundation program officers drew on their international experience as they explored, guided and supported new community-based forestry efforts

emerging in the US (Danks 1997). They developed the CBF Demonstration Program as a multi-faceted effort to fund practices on the ground, to foster capacity-building and peer-learning, and ultimately to derive lessons that could be shared nationwide. Among the issues that this programme was intended to explore were the abilities of CBF to "improve rural livelihoods and revive rural communities,... restore and maintain ecosystem health, ... reduce the polarization ...[and] establish a 'radical middle' that could recast the debate altogether" (Campbell 2005:ix). Thirteen community partners were selected from over 100 applicants to represent much of the geographic, cultural and institutional diversity of community-based efforts nationwide (Table 3). These groups were funded from 2000 to 2005 to work on the ground in their communities and to share their learning with each other. In addition, a collaboration of individuals from national non-profits served as 'managing partners' to facilitate peer learning and provide organisational support. The organizational support and networking opportunities provided by the managing partners were major components of the programme (Korten and Wyckoff-Baird 2005). In a third component of the programme, two university-based teams of researchers were engaged to study these CBF efforts and their implications.

Collectively, the 13 community groups chosen to participate in the programme reflect much of the diversity of CBF activities in the US. They include projects on federal, municipal, tribal and private forest lands. While most are based in the rural communities they serve, they include one urban forestry group, one urban-based partnership of rural forest businesses and a multistate alliance of forest workers. Some participating groups are fairly new and work almost exclusively on CBF, while others are longstanding community-development or forestry organisations that have recently added CBF to their programmes. While contexts may differ between sites, they often shared similar approaches. For such varied groups as the Watershed Research and Training Center, which works in a remote, former timber town in the west, and D.C. Greenworks, which works in the urban centre of the nation's capital, a major focus has been building a 'green collar' (Durning 1999) workforce through training, contracting and business

TABLE 3 *Community participants in the Ford Foundation CBF Demonstration Program*

Community partner	Land ownership	Project focus and activities
Alliance of Forest Workers and Harvesters (AFWH), California & Oregon	Largely public, also private and tribal	Promotes environmental justice, multicultural understanding, improved work opportunities, worker-friendly policies and participation in decision-making for culturally diverse and often mobile forest workers.
D. C. Greenworks, Washington, D.C.	Urban private and public	Seeks to empower low income urban communities to improve their environments and provide economic opportunities through programmes such as 'green collar' job training, tree-keepers, and environmental design and installation.
Federation of Southern Cooperatives/ Land Assistance Fund, (FSC), Alabama	Private	Conducts outreach and training and develops cooperative initiatives that help African-American landowners access the resources needed to retain land ownership and develop sustainable forest-based businesses.
Healthy Forests, Healthy Communities (HFHC), Oregon	Public and private	Supports a network of small producers of sustainable forest products; seeks to grow markets, enhance capacity of local entrepreneurs and inform federal policies that affect development of community-based forest products companies.
Jobs and Biodiversity Coalition, (JBC), New Mexico	Public and private	Seeks to develop consensus on and secure resources for forest restoration and sustainable forest-based businesses that rely on products of restoration.
Makah Tribal Forestry, Washington	Tribal	Promotes awareness, education and inventory of non-timber forest products to support ecological and culturally sensitive forest management.
North Quabbin Woods (NQW), New England Forestry Foundation, Massachusetts	Private	Seeks to revitalise the local economy based on sustainable use of forest resources, including recreation, tourism, woodworking and other value-added manufacturing.
Penn Center, South Carolina	Private	Preserves local culture, empowers African-American communities and contributes to land retention and sustainable livelihoods by supporting community conservation and development of forest-based products and enterprises.
Public Lands Partnership (PLP), Colorado	Public	Engages a diversity of stakeholders in discussion and projects to manage conflict, promote collaboration, and influence public forest management to improve forest health and local economies suffering from the decline of the timber industry.
Rural Action (RA), Ohio	Private	Conducts outreach, capacity-building and research activities to support the cultivation and marketing of medicinal plants and other forest products to contribute to sustainable livelihoods among the rural poor.
Vermont Family Forests Partnership (VFFP), Vermont	Private	A partnership among 3 non-profits (local, state-wide, and national) to produce replicable models of forest ownership, management and marketing that are ecologically sustainable and economically inclusive.
Wallowa Resources (WR), Oregon	Largely public, also private	Facilitates community planning processes, designs and implements forest and watershed restoration projects, and developed a for-profit sawmill to manufacture and market the products of forest restoration.
Watershed Research and Training Center (WRTC), California	Largely public, also private	Conducts job retraining, market development, land management planning and youth activities; developed a forest business incubator to create sustainable jobs in an area experiencing economic distress due to the decline of the timber industry.

incubation. Others such as the Alliance of Forest Workers and Harvesters and the Vermont Family Forest Partnership strive to enhance the pay and conditions for forest workers.

At least 10 of the 13 community partners have focused on the development and nurturing of independent, small businesses, be they community-owned sawmills, furniture makers, goat

producers or non-timber forest products harvesters. Eight groups have been engaged in the development of networks and other collective efforts among landowners, workers and or small forest-based businesses. These associations, cooperatives and networks worked collectively to overcome economic and political limitations of their work due to issues of scale, remoteness, and a history of marginalisation. Examples of such collective efforts include the Healthy Forest, Healthy Communities wood products partnership and the Roots of Appalachia Growers Association of ginseng producers fostered by Rural Action.

BENEFITS OF CBF: INSIGHTS FROM THE FORD DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

All participants in the Ford Foundation CBF Demonstration Program were involved in documenting and assessing the outcomes and implications of this programme. The community partners conducted self-assessments with the help of the managing partners; the managing partners captured lessons learned and best practices across multiple sites; and the research teams collected additional primary and secondary data to address some of the broader issues about the conditions under which CBF can achieve its multiple goals. Input from clients, community members, staff and board members were solicited through site visits, interviews, and focus groups. Among the many questions examined by all three sets of programme participants – community groups, managing partners and researchers – were: what benefits resulted from CBF, and to whom did they accrue? The outcomes reported below are derived from all three sets of inquiry.

It was not feasible to collect uniform or even comparable outcomes data from all 13 project sites, despite considerable efforts to do so. The community groups were chosen to represent diversity and were too different – in socioeconomic and political contexts, in length of engagement in the community, in chosen interventions, in geographic scope, in nature of partnerships, in organisational capacity, in supplemental funding, in forest ownership and governance structures, and many other respects – to provide meaningful comparisons or generalisations across the 13 sites. For this reason, the outcomes and benefits data are reported below in broad categories (Tables 4 and 5), but are not condensed and summarised across the entire programme. The detail provided in these tables is intended to give a flavour for the kinds of CBF activities pursued in the US.

Many accomplishments

The groups participating in the CBF Demonstration Program can claim many accomplishments over the five years. Community partners had significant local impacts in retraining workers, reinventing forest-based livelihoods, and building local capacity to cope with changing economies. Table 4 lists just a sampling of their diverse achievements and also provides some description of the specific kinds of

CBF activities undertaken by the community partners.

Environmental outcomes included both direct project implementation, such as forest restoration, fuel reduction and tree planting, and the promotion of sustainable practices among community members and the wider public. As noted in Table 1, the fostering of diverse for-profit enterprises is a strategy employed by many CBF groups in the US to replace declining extractive industries, address livelihood issues, and restore damaged ecosystems without depending on government subsidies. Several CBF groups trained community members in new job skills and many helped to launch and support new and existing forest-based businesses. The efforts of these CBF groups to address environmental and economic needs by building consensus and mutual understanding led to reported increases in community cohesion and hope for the future among community members.

Sustainable livelihoods are among the benefits sought through CBF (Table 2), and the outcomes in Tables 4 can be viewed in terms of how they contribute to that objective. Frameworks for understanding rural livelihoods emphasise that sustainable livelihoods depend not simply on income, but rather on combination of: 1) assets and capabilities of both individuals and their communities, 2) activities which generate income and provide subsistence, and 3) access to those assets and activities as mediated by institutions, social relations and organisations (Ellis 2000, Sunderlin *et al.* 2005). Many of the outcomes cited in all three categories of Table 4 – environmental, economic and social – contribute to sustainable livelihoods by building the assets and capabilities of community members through training (human capital), community cohesion (social capital), grants (financial capital), and ecosystem health (natural capital) and by developing the businesses and other income generating activities in which they could employ those assets.

Who benefited?

Many of the CBF efforts helped their communities by making it possible for people to earn a living, retain ownership of land and restore damaged forest ecosystems. Local residents and forest workers involved in these projects contributed to the vitality of their communities both through the economic multipliers of their spending and the talents shared through community service. These increases in local economic activity and community capacity resulting from the CBF projects facilitated by the community partners were cited as benefits by community members, but were often hard to quantify. The clearest and easiest to document benefits are those that went directly to project participants and those that occurred on lands managed or treated through CBF efforts. For example, 80% of HFHC businesses reported increased business after joining HFHC (Wyckoff-Baird 2005). It is not clear, however, if these efforts helped to develop and sustain the small, forest-based business sector more broadly in their region or who among the beneficiaries might be poor families or minority-owned businesses.

A number of benefits accrued directly to low income

TABLE 4 Examples (not exhaustive) of the outcomes in the Ford Foundation Community-based Forestry Demonstration Program

Largely environmental	Implemented restoration and treeplanting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WRTC, WR and PLP made possible the implementation of field projects to restore ecosystem health by providing matching funds, project planning and/or consensus needed to get work done on public lands; together they made possible restoration treatments on over 57,000 acres by 2004. • D.C. Greenworks planted 160 street trees, 98% of which were still living and being cared for in 2005; participants in their Treekeepers programme adopted another 100 trees.
	Promoted sustainability through guidelines, monitoring and outreach
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VFFP developed, promoted and followed rigorous sustainable forestry standards for forest management in their region; over 8000 acres were managed under those standards in 2004. • RA worked with Ohio state officials to address ginseng poaching more effectively. • AFWH developed and implemented a mushroom monitoring programme to ensure sustainable harvest and inform policy. • VFFP, NQW, FSC and Penn Center helped private landowners to understand and access technical assistance for sustainable forestry practices on their land through direct outreach.
Largely economic	Trained workers to engage in sustainable forest-based occupations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.C. Greenworks trained 80 horticultural workers. • NQW trained 17 people in ecotourism. • WRTC trained 48 forest workers and contractors. • JBC supported the training of 92 people in the Forest Service's southwest firefighters' programme.
	Supported development of new and existing local forest-based businesses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VFF, HCHP and NQW developed brand identity that has helped to secure orders and, in some cases price premiums. • JBC fostered the growth of 10 new businesses which use the products of restoration thinnings, creating over 20 jobs with pay above local alternatives. • HFHC's small grants programme provided 23 mini-grants for peer-learning visits, prototype development and market research. • D.C. Greenworks developed an in-house business to hire its training programme graduates to install green roofs and rain gardens. • VFF, HFHC and RA supported local entrepreneurs by developing connections between producers and purchasers of forest products, attending trade shows, and developing market awareness. • Penn Center, Makah Tribal Forestry, RA, and WRTC worked with non-timber forest product harvesters to develop collective approaches to share information and decrease business risks related to inventorying, harvesting, processing and/or marketing non-timber forest products.
Largely social	Reduced conflict and fostered sense of community
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JBC and PLP have helped define common ground and overcome longstanding divisions among those who support forest utilisation versus forest protection. • Through individual contact, group workshops and other events, AFWH reduced conflict and fostered greater understanding among forest workers and agency personnel separated by race, culture, language, location, and potentially conflicting uses of the forest. • NQW helped new and estranged community members get to know each other through engagement in project activities. • WR guided a countywide planning process that emphasised inclusion and transparency and is credited with strengthening the community. • AFWH, JBC, PLP, WR and WRTC led monitoring efforts which reportedly contributed to increased trust, respect and mutual understanding
	Provided youth opportunities to develop skills, knowledge and options
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSC, WR and WRTC started summer youth camps and outdoor school activities emphasising sustainable resource management. The WRTC camp serves 90 children per year. • WRTC organised and trained field crews of young adults in forest restoration and trails maintenance. • JBC involved local youth in forest monitoring. • D.C. Greenworks trained urban youth in landscape and gardening skills and helped young entrepreneurs set up a rain barrel business. • The Makah CBF initiative held five 'wildcrafting' sessions for 68 middle school students on the cultural value, economic uses and sustainable harvesting of local non-timber forest products.

Sources: Drawn largely from Wyckoff-Baird (2005) supplemented by Cheng *et al.* 2006, Fernandez-Gimenez *et al.* 2008, McDermott 2009a, programme documents and field research.

families, ethnic minorities and other marginalised groups as a result of these CBF activities. Table 5 gives some examples of these benefits, organised according to the livelihoods framework of individual and collective assets, income-generating activities and institutionally mediated access (Ellis 2000, Sunderlin *et al.* 2005). Because direct participants in CBF projects tended to receive the greatest benefits, poor and marginalised people were most likely to benefit when they were identified, invited and otherwise specifically targeted by CBF efforts for inclusion in decision-making, capacity-building and income-generating activities. In many cases, CBF groups did not keep records of participants by race, ethnicity or income level so many of the outcomes mentioned in Table 4 also benefited the poor and marginalised in their communities.

The list in Table 5 was drawn from efforts to quantify impacts at the project level and may not reflect the importance of CBF activities for individuals and households. A qualitative study of two project sites by Sturtevant (2006) yielded additional household level benefits. For example, from the jobs created through the WRTC's forest business incubator that assisted 128 clients of which 30 became active businesses, benefits described in interviews included:

“one said he was eating better, many reported they are getting better health and dental care, and others said they had savings accounts for the first time in their lives... Many mentioned they could get loans or mortgages for the first time; one single mom of four said her job kept her from losing their house...” (Sturtevant 2006:133)

Direct livelihood benefits were not the only ones important to the poor and marginalised CBF participants interviewed. Because the Alliance of Forest Workers and Harvesters seeks to improve livelihoods of and mutual understanding among mobile, multicultural forest workers throughout the Pacific Northwest, their work directly focuses on low income and marginalised families who might not live near the forests in which they work. One member commented that the Alliance's work in “creating community, without community of place, promotes cultural pride,” and another noted that “[the Alliance] helps its membership by empowering us, giving us hope” (Sturtevant 2006:119-120). Empowerment and pride may be considered aspects of social capital and therefore ‘assets’ that can contribute to sustainable livelihoods. Such benefits, however, are valued in themselves by many CBF participants, and not just as instrumental contributions to achieving livelihood goals.

Because Table 5 emphasises documented benefits that accrue directly to the poor and marginalised and not to the general population, it does not fully represent the valuable ecological outcomes from which the poor, as well as other community members, may benefit. Low income and marginalised forest workers and harvesters may depend more than other community members on healthy forest ecosystems for their livelihoods, and at the same time, enjoy the full range of amenities and ecosystem services derived from a healthy ecosystem. Some forest restoration efforts did

specifically target low income families. For example, a fuels reduction programme coordinated by the WRTC in a remote, low income forest settlement improved forest health and reduced the risk to residents of losing their homes to wildfire.

Under what conditions are benefits of CBF most likely to reach the poor and marginalised?

While many valuable outcomes were documented, it was difficult to develop cross-cutting conclusions about the conditions under which benefits were more likely to accrue to low income and marginalised people. The diversity represented by the 13 community partners made it difficult to draw robust conclusions about how impacts were achieved across multiple sites. Moreover, five years is long enough to make some significant advances and contribute to the livelihoods of project participants, but may not be long enough to achieve some important goals such as reductions in poverty rates or changes in land ownership patterns. Even when quantifiable outcomes such as number of jobs created or number of forest acres restored were recorded, it was not always clear which factors contributed to the success of these efforts.

Much of the work of the community partners did not focus on the direct delivery of services to the neediest in the community. Had it been, quantifiable benefits might have been more clearly evident at the project level. Rather, the community partners tended to focus on putting the pieces in place for a new, more just system of forest ownership, management and production that could lead to revitalised communities and healthy ecosystems. Whether they were building consensus on public land management, starting a forest cooperative or supporting small forest enterprises, community partners spent much of their time reaching out to individuals, seeking agreement, connecting people with each other, collecting data, sharing information, engaging agency personnel and even drafting proposed legislation. When their efforts did focus on providing direct services to the poor and marginalised, they emphasised training, self-help, community-building and empowerment – efforts that build assets and promote resilience, but may take longer to generate concrete benefits.

Despite these constraints, some observations can be made regarding the conditions under which poor and marginalised people are likely to benefit from CBF. Whether it was helping to access existing resources or encouraging participation in innovative projects, the community partners found they had to give extra attention to incorporating the poor and marginalised. Language barriers, direct costs, lost work time, perceived risk, perceived benefits, and meeting style or cultural preferences related to group interactions could all inhibit participation by low income and marginalised community members. Mini-grants, mileage compensation and scholarships were important for many of the groups to encourage the participation of low income community members in workshops, policy meetings and peer learning opportunities. In addition, when the AFWH

TABLE 5 Examples (not exhaustive) of livelihood related benefits realised by low income and marginalised people through the Ford Foundation's CBF Demonstration Program

	<p>Developed personal and organisational capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSC helped African-American landowners negotiate for themselves with loggers to obtain fair deals. • AFWH helped minority and low income forest workers to develop and express their voices, even when English was not their first language, enabling them to give presentations to USFS officials, legislators, conferences and the press. • WRTC provided staff, space and logistical support to incubate community efforts into functioning organizations, including the Nor-El-Muk Tribal Office and a senior citizens' low income housing project. • Penn Center lent staff and other support in the establishment of the Lowcountry Landowners Association that provides technical assistance to the largely low income, African-American residents of the island. <p>Provided forest ownership options for low income and marginalised groups</p>
Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VFFP piloted a model for collective forest ownership that reduced the barriers (initial cost, risk and management expertise) for low income families to become forest landowners. • FSC and Penn Center offered technical assistance and forest-based income strategies to enable low income, African-American landowners to retain ownership of their land. <p>Sustained and reinforced cultural identities and sense of community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Makah project incorporated inventory and management strategies for traditional non-timber forest products into timber-oriented forest management planning. • By creating alternative income strategies that helped local residents retain land ownership, the Penn Center helped to sustain the distinctive Gullah community of the Sea Islands. • D.C. Greenworks brought together inner city residents, who were largely low income minorities, through tree-planting and shared meals, building relationships which led to additional community development efforts.
	<p>Created new employment and business opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JBC nurtured the growth of one Hispanic-owned and one female-owned business, as well as several owned by low income entrepreneurs; about half of the employees of these were Hispanic. • PLP facilitated a 4 million board foot timber sale that was sold to two local mills and a Hispanic-owned firewood business. • WRTC incubated new forest-based businesses which created over 45 jobs in a high poverty area; most of the jobs went to low income workers, many of whom were Hispanic. • WRTC directly employed 20 seasonal fulltime workers on fuels reduction crews, most of whom were from low income families. • RA enabled low income ginseng growers to generate supplemental income by providing rootstock and market connections.
	<p>Included low income and marginalised groups in decision-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFWH facilitated the participation of low income and marginalised harvesters of non-timber forest products in monitoring, policy discussions and permit setting processes. • RA helped local, low income ginseng growers to change laws governing ginseng harvest and theft. • WR included the Nez Perce Tribe as a full partner in watershed planning and sought to ensure their input on resource management projects. • WRTC coordinated efforts of low income landowners to plan and coordinate fuels reduction treatments with the US Forest Service.
Access	

Sources: Drawn largely from Wyckoff-Baird (2005) supplemented by Cheng *et al.* 2006, Fernandez-Gimenez *et al.* 2008, McDermott 2009a, programme documents and field research.

held trainings, they needed to employ translators in multiple languages to allow the Cambodian and Spanish speaking workers to participate. They also worked to offer alternative formats and pacing for group gatherings that accommodated diverse cultures. A number of the CBF groups reached out through traditional community channels and events such as soccer games, potlucks and farmers' markets, which differed significantly from the 'call a meeting and they will come' approach which typifies legally-mandated public

participation processes.

To engage people living at or near poverty levels, decreasing the risk of new opportunities was at least as important as capacity-building efforts to enhance the individual skills and organisational infrastructure. Capital, especially, low cost, low risk capital, is also a constraining factor. For example, when VFFP developed a collective model that significantly lowered the cost of forest ownership, they found that they needed to reassure interested, low income

families through home visits that this model could work for them. VFFP ultimately developed a no cost loan and buy-back policy to lower the risk of ownership (see Brighton, this issue). In another case, a no interest loan from the WRTC enabled a new medicinal plants processor to pay harvesters up front to cover the costs for permits and travel costs before rather than after herbs were delivered. Changing the timing of payments in this way significantly enhanced participation by low income harvesters.

While inclusive, participatory processes at all levels are highly valued goals of CBF, engaging the poor and marginalised in leadership and decision-making has been a challenge for many CBF initiatives. While the interests of poor and marginalised people extend beyond income generating activities, economic constraints and family obligations may make it especially difficult for them to dedicate time to collaborative processes and community boards. The enhanced outreach efforts described above were often successful in getting participation in specific projects, but only occasionally did they result in new representation of and leadership by the poor and marginalised in broader decision-making over the long term. A notable exception is the work of the AFWH in getting low income and marginalised forest workers themselves, as well as their concerns, included in national level panels and policy discussions.

At the same time, many participants in CBF initiatives realised that building the capacity of community members to engage in existing economic and political systems had limited value. Staff, board members and project partners expressed this concern in group interviews. It was, after all, the existing political and economic system that contributed to local poverty, forest degradation and social conflict. Many CBF practitioners split their time between implementing local projects on the ground that piloted new models for community-forest relationships and working at the regional and national levels to develop markets and change policies that affect forest communities. Both ecosystems and economies work at broader scales than the human, place-based communities involved in these CBF efforts. If at larger scales, policies and market incentives work against community values and benefits, one is unlikely to see community-level benefits without systematic change at those broader scales.

Institutional change through CBF?

If significant, sustainable benefits accrue not from individual projects but from institutional change, then the question changes. Rather than ‘what benefits did forest communities, especially the poor and marginalised among them, realise from these five-year projects?’, perhaps the important question is ‘what institutional changes did this programme achieve that ultimately benefit poor and marginalised people?’ This question highlights the third element of the livelihoods framework – the institutions that mediate access to the assets and activities vital to sustainable livelihoods. There is some evidence that the groups in the Demonstration Program have made some noteworthy institutional changes,

even over the short span of five years. Most significantly, CBF groups have changed how many forest management issues have been framed and addressed from ‘jobs versus environment’ and the accompanying tools of litigation and protest, to ‘healthy forests, healthy communities’ which emphasises the interdependence of economy, ecology and community and relies on the tools of collaboration and partnerships. As the concluding chapter of *Growth Rings*, the comprehensive report by the managing partners on the CBF Demonstration Program, noted, “...the remarkable innovations across the five-year implementation phase of the Demonstration Program represent an emerging paradigm shift away from previously dominant practices of forest management” (Wyckoff-Baird 2005:191). The author continued that although a new CBF paradigm has not yet taken root, “...the nature of the conversation about natural resource management has changed at virtually all levels of the discussion, whether among forest landowners, between rural stakeholders..., or within state and federal agencies.” Even the former Chief of the US Forest Service had come to view community-based stewardship as the future of forestry (Bosworth and Brown 2007).

The CBF groups in the Demonstration Program have reframed the discussion and made steps towards institutional reform in at least three ways: 1) by providing on-the-ground examples of forestry activities that enable both local residents and visiting policymakers to envision a new kind of forestry that sustains both human and natural communities, 2) by developing new forums of discussion and policy access, from local collaborative groups to congressional hearings in Washington, D.C., and 3) by bringing new voices, perspectives and data to both new and existing forums and policy discussions. They achieved these innovations not just through individual projects in their local communities, but by identifying and working with other local initiatives and national groups working on similar issues. Urban forestry supporters have been connected to each other and active nationally through groups like the Alliance for Community Trees. More recently, the Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition (RVCC) has grown from the policy work at Sustainable Northwest and several national level organisations. RVCC, which includes many of the CBF Demonstration Program community partners among its active members, has developed briefing papers through consensus and has grown the capacity of community forestry practitioners to work strategically with congressional representatives on issues of importance to forest communities.

The clearest national policy outcomes that CBF advocates have achieved in the US have occurred through relatively modest additions or changes in legislative wording, budget appropriations and agency directives which encourage collaboration between agencies and community stakeholders and direct resources to community-oriented forestry activities. Some of the federal policies and legislation that community groups in the CBF Demonstration Program have influenced include the Secure Rural Schools Act which allocates a portion of Forest Service funds to

projects prioritised by communities through Regional Advisory Committees, the National Fire Plan which requires collaboratively developed community wildfire protection plans, and the 2008 Farm Act which includes new funding for community-owned forests. CBF practitioners and their concerns are now regularly included in top level policy discussions regarding national forest lands. For example, representatives from AFWH were invited to give testimony to congressional committees on immigration rules for forest workers (Smith 2008), and the director of the WRTC was asked to suggest priorities for economic stimulus funding (Jungwirth 2009).

In some cases, the work of these grassroots groups to solve local problems has had positive benefits well beyond the participating communities. One example is new federal forest contracting authority that engages and benefits communities and workers. A group of western CBF groups, including several of those in the CBF Demonstration Program, coordinated with a national non-governmental organisation in pushing for stewardship contracting options on federal land that they hoped would benefit local workers, increase local input on projects and provide for multiparty monitoring (Danks 2003, Davies *et al.* 2008, USDA Forest Service n.d.). Their efforts resulted in national stewardship contracting legislation that has benefited communities as far away as Vermont, where the Green Mountain National Forest has undertaken a major stewardship contracting initiative.

While the CBF Demonstration Program contributed to broader institutional change both through the strength of the local programmes developed and the connections among peers that it fostered nationwide, such change was not well captured by the assessments of programme outcomes (and therefore not represented in its own table in this paper). The 13 community partners were competitively chosen based on project proposals that focused on the interventions designed for the communities that they served, be they place-based communities or the participating forest workers, landowners and businesses of a specific region. Most of the assessments by the community, managing and research partners appropriately focused on the project level outcomes for the target communities. Many of the policy reforms, however, were achieved through activities and partnerships that spanned multiple scales and actors, many of which were not part of the Demonstration Program and were supported by separate funds. Moreover, it is difficult to demonstrate that the policy reforms have yielded measurable benefits to low income and marginalised people in the communities of the 13 programme partners.

The institutional reform activities that required many of the community partners in the CBF Demonstration Program to travel and work with partners outside of their home communities were driven primarily by the desire to remove barriers and to create the conditions for success for their local initiatives. As revealed in group interviews, they started to work in regional and national venues to address issues that they found they could not resolve at the local level, usually because the resources and decision-making authority resided at higher levels. The director of the WRTC commented, “We

didn't set out to change the world; we set out to change our communities” (Sturtevant 2006:125). They expected their reform efforts would bear fruit locally. They would likely concur that while institutional change is clearly an important outcome to capture, such change should eventually result in ecological and social benefits at the community level. Conversely, successful local models have been instrumental in promoting institutional change by demonstrating new options and influencing policy reforms at the national level. For example, field tours which brought congressional staff to forest communities and introduced them to CBF activities were instrumental in generating understanding and gaining support for CBF policy recommendations. As the community partners found, and livelihoods frameworks suggest, institutional reform and local interventions are interdependent and both are required to achieve CBF goals.

Institutional change that promotes community involvement in forestry does not necessarily benefit the poor and marginalised. Studies of CBF in the global South have shown that decentralisation and devolution of forest management to local communities may in some cases harm the poor and marginalised people who depend most on forests, but lack the resources and political power to influence their management (Edmunds and Wollenberg 2003, Larson *et al.* 2007, Kumar 2002, Springate-Baginski and Blaikie 2007). These observed impacts were due to a number of reasons including the closure of *de facto* open access forest resources upon which the poorest residents might depend, community-based governance practices that favoured the local elite, or costs of participation that outweighed the benefits. In the CBF Demonstration Program, negative impacts on the livelihoods of the poor were not documented, in part because CBF tended to open up forest access, albeit modestly, rather than limit it. Moreover, most community partners and the managing partners paid particular attention to addressing the challenges to participation by poor and marginalised people. Should community-based forestry practices become institutionalised more broadly in the US without attention to the needs of the poor and marginalised, negative impacts could easily occur. For example, if federal contracting on public lands were limited exclusively to local communities, then the mobile forest workforce, which is often composed of low income and marginalised workers in the US, could lose some job opportunities. When that issue arose in recent years, CBF groups working collaboratively at the regional and national levels responded by defining and demanding high quality work conditions that provide greater benefits to forest workers nationwide, be they local or mobile (RVCC 2006). Such collaborations were possible because the groundwork had been laid to engage low income and marginalised forest workers in policy discussions, despite the economic and cultural challenges to participation.

CONCLUSION

The groups and projects included in the Ford Foundation CBF Demonstration Program span the breadth of CBF activities in

the US. Analysis of these projects provides insights into the kinds of benefits realised by CBF in the US and the conditions under which benefits reach the marginalised and the poor. A number of positive local outcomes were documented during the five year programme, including newly planted trees, forest restoration treatments, retrained workers, forest-based businesses, forest land ownership and retention, social cohesion, options for youth, and increased participation in decision-making. Benefits were more likely to reach the poor and marginalised when CBF groups conducted enhanced outreach activities and developed strategies that reduced the risk of participation. CBF groups were also successful at achieving some institutional reforms. Working collaboratively, CBF groups have raised visibility for the issues affecting forest communities and workers at regional and national levels and have successfully implemented a number of policy reforms. Ultimately, institutional changes should still achieve the overarching goals of CBF, that is, should still result in measurably healthier forest ecosystems and human communities than would occur in their absence. Evidence for such change is present – for example, conflict has been reduced, jobs have been created, and forest restoration projects have been implemented – but on a fairly limited scale relative to the need. It may be, as has been found in studies of community forestry in Asia, that “the space of local forest management is larger, ...[but] it is not yet large enough to make a difference to their livelihoods” (Edmunds and Wollenberg 2003:166)

The CBF Demonstration Program offered several insights into providing benefits for poor and marginalised people. Both in project outputs and in the broader project of institutional change, the ability of the poor to benefit depends in large part on the extent to which pro-poor objectives are emphasised and traditionally marginalised people are involved. If new collaborative processes only invite prominent leaders among traditionally recognised stakeholders, e.g. the timber industry, influential business owners and national environmental groups, while forest workers and low income landowners are left out, then the overarching goals of CBF cannot be achieved. If training and technical assistance are offered generally to all workers and landowners without outreach specifically targeted to marginalised groups, then poverty and environmental degradation may continue among the people and forests of those communities. These issues of inclusion are important not just for CBF project implementation, but for how citizen organisations, agencies and legislators develop policies and practices that affect the sustainability of forests and forest communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the intellectual insights and hard work of all participants in the Ford Foundation's Community-Based Forestry Demonstration Program, especially Lynn Jungwirth, Barbara Wyckoff-Baird, Jeffrey Campbell, and the CSU research team and its leaders

Anthony Cheng and Maria Fernandez-Gimenez. Similarly, the author thanks IASCP panel coordinators Melanie McDermott and Kate Schreckenber, editor Alan Pottinger, editorial assistant Ken Brown, and the anonymous reviewers for all of their insights and assistance. This research was funded in part by the Ford Foundation.

REFERENCES

- ABRAMS, M.D. and NOWACKI, G.J. 2008. Native Americans as active and passive promoters of mast and fruit trees in the eastern USA. *Holocene* **18**(7): 1123-1137.
- AGRAWAL, A. and GIBSON, C. 1999. Enchantment and disenchantment: the role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Development* **27**(4): 629-649.
- AMERICAN FORESTS. n.d. Forest Policy. Accessed at <http://www.americanforests.org/resources/fp/> on May 22, 2009.
- BAKER, M. and KUSEL, J. 2003. *Community forestry in the United States: learning from the past, crafting the future*. Island Press, Covelo, CA.
- BALLARD, H.L., FERNANDEZ-GIMENEZ, M.E. and STURTEVANT, V.E. 2008. Integration of local ecological knowledge and conventional science: a study of seven community-based forestry organizations in the USA. *Ecology and Society*. **13**(2).
- BELSKY, J. 2008. Creating community forests. In DONOGHUE, E. and STURTEVANT, V. (eds) 2008. *Forest community connections*. Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- BLACKBURN, T. and ANDERSON, K. (eds). 1993. *Before the wilderness: environmental management by native Californians*. Ballena Press, Menlo Park, CA.
- BOSWORTH, D. and BROWN, H. 2007. After the timber wars: community-based stewardship. *Journal of Forestry* **104**(July/August):271-273.
- BRENDLER, T. and CAREY, H. 1998. Community forestry defined. *Journal of Forestry* **96**: 21-23.
- BRIGHTON, D. 2009. Incorporating social equity in conservation programs in the Northeastern US. *International Forestry Review* **11**(2): 197-206.
- BROUSSARD, S., CHENG, A., and DANKS, C. 2008. Community-based forestry as social entrepreneurship. *Colorado State University Extension Bulletin* #5, 2 pp.
- CAMPBELL, J. 2005. Foreword. In: WYCKOFF-BAIRD, B. 2005. *Growth rings: communities and trees: lessons from the Ford Foundation Community-Based Forestry Demonstration Program, 2000-2005*. The Aspen Institute, Washington, DC: pp. vii-ix.
- CHARNLEY, S. and POE, M.R. 2007. Community forestry in theory and practice: where are we now? *Annual Review of Anthropology* **36**: 301-336.
- CHARNLEY, S., DONOGHUE, E.M. and MOSELEY, C. 2008. Forest management policy and community well-being in the Pacific Northwest. *Journal of Forestry*

- 106(8): 440-447.
- CHENG, A.S., FERNANDEZ-GIMENEZ, M., BALLARD, H., BROUSSARD, S., DANKS, C., DANIELS, S.E., MCDERMOTT, M., SEIDL, A.F. and STURTEVANT, V. 2006. Ford Foundation community-based forestry demonstration program research component: final report. Available at: http://warnercnr.colostate.edu/frws/cbf/docs/ford_research_report_final_2006.pdf
- CLINTON, W. 1994. Executive Order 12898: Federal actions to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations. *Federal Register*: 59(32): 7629, February 11, 1994.
- CONLEY, A. and MOOTE, M. 2003. Evaluating collaborative natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources* 16: 371-386.
- COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE OF THE SEVENTH AMERICAN FOREST CONGRESS. n.d. Accessed at: <http://www.communitiescommittee.org/> on June 1, 2009.
- DANKS, C. 1997. Developing institutions for community forestry in northern California. *Rural Development Forestry Network*. 20a(Winter 1996/97): 4-23.
- DANKS, C. 2003. Community-based stewardship: reinvesting in public forests and forest communities. In: BOYCE, J.K. and SHELLY, B. (eds). *Natural assets: democratizing environmental ownership*. Island Press, Covelo, CA, pp. 243-260.
- DANKS, C. 2008. Institutional arrangements in community-based forestry. In: DONOGHUE, E. and STURTEVANT, V. (eds). *Forest community connections*. Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- DANKS, C. and FORTMANN, L. 2004. Social forestry: forest and tree tenure and ownership. In: *Encyclopedia of Forest Sciences*. Elsevier Ltd, Oxford.
- DANKS, C., GOEBEL, M., STEER, K. and MCKINLEY, G. 2003. Recreating natural resource-based businesses: sustaining the land and communities in the US New Northwest. In: WAAGE, S. (ed.) *Ants, Galileo and Gandhi: designing the future of business through nature, genius and compassion*. Greenleaf Publishing, Ltd., Sheffield, UK.
- DAVIES, B., GEFFEN, M., KAUFFMAN, M. and SILVERMAN, H. 2008. *Redefining stewardship: public lands and rural communities in the Pacific Northwest*. Ecotrust and Resource Innovations, Portland, OR.
- DONOGHUE, E. and STURTEVANT, V. (eds.) 2008. *Forest community connections*. Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- DIOP, A. and FRASER, R. 2009. Social, economic, and political capital in Alabama's Black- Belt region: A community-based forestry approach to poverty alleviation. *International Forestry Review* 11(2): 186-196.
- DURNING, A. 1999. *Green collar jobs: working in the New Northwest*. Northwest Environment Watch, Seattle, WA. 114 pp.
- EDMUNDS, D. and WOLLENBERG, E. 2003. *Local forest management: the impacts of devolution policies*. Earthscan, London.
- FERNANDEZ-GIMENEZ, M., BALLARD, H., and STURTEVANT, V. 2008. Adaptive management and social learning in collaborative and community-based forestry organizations in the western USA. *Ecology and Society* 13(2): 4. [online] <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss2/art4/>
- FISHER, R. 1999. Devolution and decentralization of forest management in Asia and the Pacific. *Unasylva* 50(4): 3-5.
- FISHER, R., VER, C., MAHANTY, S. 2008. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Poverty Reduction in Forests: tenure, market, and policy reform*. RECOFTC, Bangkok, Thailand.
- FLINT, C., LULOFF, A. and FINLEY, J. 2008. Where is community in community-based forestry? *Society and Natural Resources* 21: 526-537.
- FORD FOUNDATION. 1998. *Forestry for sustainable rural development*. Ford Foundation, New York.
- GLASMEIER, A. and FARRIGAN, T. 2005. Understanding community forestry: a qualitative meta-study of the concept, the process, and its potential for poverty alleviation in the United States case. *The Geographical Journal* 171(1): 56-69.
- GONZALES, P. 2003. Struggle for survival: the Hispanic land grants of New Mexico, 1848-2001. *Agricultural History* 77(2): 293-324.
- GRAY, G., ENZER, M. and KUSEL, K. (eds). 2001a. *Understanding Community-Based Forest Ecosystem Management: An Editorial Synthesis*. American Forests, Washington, D.C.
- GRAY, G., FISHER, L. and JUNGWIRTH, E.J. 2001b. An introduction to community-based ecosystem management. In GRAY, G., ENZER, M. and KUSEL, K. (eds). *Understanding Community-Based Forest Ecosystem Management*. Food Products Press, Binghamton, NY. pp. 25-34.
- HEALTHY FORESTS, HEALTHY COMMUNITIES. n.d.. Our Vision and Values. Available at: <http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/forests/hfhc/HFHC%20VisionValues.pdf>.
- JUNGWIRTH, L. 2009. Testimony before the US House of Representatives Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, hearing on "The role of federal lands in combating climate change," March 3, 2009. Available at: http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/quick-links/resources/Testimony/Jungwirth_Testimony_3-3-09.pdf.
- KOONTZ, T.M., STEELMAN, T.A., CARMIN, J., SMITH, K., ORFMACHER, K., MOSELEY, C. and THOMAS, C.W. 2004. *Collaborative environmental management: what role for government?* Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- KOONTZ, T.M. and THOMAS, C. 2006. What do we know and need to know about the environmental outcomes of collaborative management? *Public Administration Review* 66(Supplement 1): 111-121.
- KORTEN, A and WYCKOFF-BAIRD, B. 2005. *Staying power: using technical assistance and peer learning to enhance donor investments*. Aspen Institute, Washington, D.C.
- KUMAR, S. 2002. Does 'participation' in common pool

- resource management help the poor? A social cost-benefit analysis of joint forest management in Jharkhand, India. *World Development* **30**(5): 763-782.
- KUSEL, K. and ADLER, E. 2003. *Forest communities, community forests*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, MD.
- LARSON, A., PACHECO, P., TONI, F. and VALLEJO, M. 2007. The effects of forestry decentralization on access to livelihood assets. *The Journal of Environment and Development* **16**(3): 251-268.
- LEAD PARTNERHIP GROUP. n.d. Principles of Community-Based Forestry. Accessed at <http://www.sierrainstitute.us/Media/lpgprinc.pdf> on May 22, 2009.
- LEE, R. and FIELD, D. (eds). 2005. *Communities and forests: where people meet the land*. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR.
- LI, T. 1996. Images of community: discourse and strategies in property relations. *Development and Change* **27**: 501-527.
- MCCULLOUGH, R. 1995. *The landscape of community: a history of communal forests in New England*. University Press of New England, Hanover, NH.
- MCDERMOTT, M. 2009a. Locating benefits: decision-spaces, resource access and equity in US community-based forestry. *Geoforum* **40**(2): 249-259.
- MCDERMOTT, M.H. 2009b. How US community-based forestry distributes benefits. *International Forestry Review* **11**(2): 207-220.
- MCDERMOTT, M., MOOTE, A. and DANKS, C. In press. Institutional Barriers to Collaboration and Strategies for Success. In: DUKES, F., FIREHOCK, K. and BIRKHOFF, J. (eds) *Community-based collaboration: making sense of a socio-ecological movement*. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, VA.
- MCPHERSON, G., SIMPSON, J., PEPER, P., MACO, S. and XIAO, Q. (2005). Municipal forest benefits and costs in five us cities. *Journal of Forestry* **103**(8): 411-416.
- MOSELEY C, and REYES, Y.E. 2008. Forest restoration and forest communities: have local communities benefited from Forest Service contracting of ecosystem management? *Environmental Management* **42**(2): 327-343.
- NOWAK, D.J. and DWYER, J.F. 2007. Understanding the benefits and costs of urban forest ecosystems. In: KUSER, J.E. (ed.) *Urban and community forestry in the Northeast*. Springer, New York, NY, pp. 25-46.
- RURAL VOICES FOR CONSERVATION COALITION (RVCC). n.d. Accessed at <http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/rvcc> on May 22, 2009.
- RVCC. 2005. Community-based forestry perspective on woody biomass: briefing paper. Available at: <http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/quick-links/resources/rvcc-issue-papers/RVCC%20Biomass%20Issue%20Paper.pdf>.
- RVCC. 2006. Workforce and labor issue paper: forest worker issues are forest health issues. Available at: <http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/quick-links/resources/rvcc-issue-papers/Workforce%20and%20Labor%202006.pdf>.
- SMITH, D. 2008. Testimony before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands House Committee on Natural Resources oversight hearing on The Piñeros: Reviewing the welfare of workers on federal lands, September 16, 2008. Available at: http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/quick-links/resources/Testimony/AFWHfinal_testimony_9_12_2008.pdf.
- SPRINGATE-BAGINSKI, O. and BLAIKIE, P. (eds) 2007. *Forests, people and power: the political ecology of reform in South Asia*. Earthscan, London.
- STOECKER, R. 2005. *Research Methods for Community Change: A Project Based Approach*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- STRINGER, E. 2007. *Action research*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- STURTEVANT, V. 2006. Appendix F: Recreating communities, opportunities and benefits: case studies of the Alliance of Forest Workers and Harvesters and the Watershed Research and Training Center. In: CHENG, A. et al 2006. Ford Foundation Community-Based Forestry Demonstration Program research component: final report.
- STURTEVANT, V. and LANGE, J. 2003. From 'them' to 'us': the Applegate Partnership. In: KUSEL, K. and ADLER, E. 2003. *Forest communities, community forests*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, MD.
- SUNDERLIN, W., ANGELSEN, A., BELCHER, B., BURGERS, P., NASI, R., SANTOSO, L. and WUNDER, S. 2005. Livelihoods, forests, and conservation in developing countries: an overview. *World Development*, **33**(9): 1383-1402.
- USDA FOREST SERVICE. 2007. 2007 RPA Resource Tables, Table 2 Forest land area in the United States by ownership, region, subregion, and State. Accessed at <http://fia.fs.fed.us/program-features/rpa/> on May 3, 2009.
- USDA FOREST SERVICE. n.d. Stewardship contracting: collaboration. Accessed at <http://www.fs.fed.us/forestmanagement/projects/stewardship/collaboration/index.shtml> on Sept.8, 2006.
- USDA FOREST SERVICE. 2000. *USDA Forest Service Interim Strategic Public Outreach Plan* FS-665. Washington, D.C.
- VERMONT FAMILY FORESTS. 2003. Conserving our forests and our community: a report on VFF research and demonstration projects 2001-2002. Available at: <http://www.familyforests.org/research/documents/DemoReport0102.pdf>.
- WEBER, E. 2000. A new vanguard for the environment: grass-roots ecosystem management as a new environmental movement. *Society & Natural Resources* **13**(3): 237-259.
- WONDOLLECK, J. and YAFFEE, S. 2000. Making collaboration work: lessons from innovation in natural resource management. Island Press, Covelo, CA.
- WYCKOFF-BAIRD, B. 2005. *Growth rings: communities and trees: lessons from the Ford Foundation Community-Based Forestry Demonstration Program, 2000-2005*. The Aspen Institute, Washington, DC.
- YELLOW WOOD ASSOCIATES. 2000. *What is community forestry and why does it matter?* National Community Forestry Center, Northern Forest Region, St. Albans, VT.