



Roundtable on Sustainable Forests

A Partnership for the Future

Transitioning to the Future: Reflection and Direction Meeting Summary

November 5, 2010

Meridian Institute, 1920 L St NW, Washington, DC

On November 5, 2010, the Core Group of the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests (RSF) convened a meeting in Washington, D.C. to discuss the future direction of the RSF and its Work Plan for 2011. Core Group participants were joined by participants of the RSF Communications and Outreach Work Group (COWG) and invited speakers. Nineteen participants met in person, and were joined by four additional participants on the phone. The [participant list](#) and the [agenda](#) for the meeting are posted on the RSF website (<http://www.sustainableforests.net/>).

The meeting objectives were to:

- Understand trends and issues that defined the role of the RSF and shape the future role of the RSF
- Clarify the leadership path and direction of the RSF
- Outline and clarify the content of the FY 2011 Work Plan.

Welcome, Introductions, and Opening Remarks

The meeting began with a welcome from the RSF co-chairs: Joel Holtrop and Jim Hubbard, US Forest Service and Richard Brinker and Jim Finley, Sustainable Forests Partnership. Speaking on behalf of the RSF Co-chairs, Jim Finley noted the importance of the day's discussion for setting the RSF's path moving forward. He reminded the group that forest and natural resource managers have the knowledge, experience and the capacity to take the long-term viewpoint when addressing the challenges ahead. He also noted that communities are fundamental to sustainable forests and economies and, therefore, the national-level discussion needs to be brought back down to the community level, and vice

versa. Additionally, in anticipation of his retirement from academia and the RSF in 2011, the Co-chairs recognized the contributions of Dr. Brinker to the RSF.

Evolution and Accomplishments of the RSF

Ruth McWilliams, Catamount Lodge and Forest LLC, and Eric Norland, USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), gave a presentation on the evolution and accomplishments of the RSF to date. Participants were provided in advance with:

- A [chronology](#) of the RSF major events (as of October 2010)
- The [letter](#) from the National Association of State Foresters (NASF) and other forest stakeholders on forest inventory and assessment. The letter (dated March 11, 1998) called for the US Forest Service to collaborate with public and private entities to help them report on the state of the Nation's forests more accurately using the framework provided by the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators (C&I) through a process like the RSF.
- An [overview](#) of the history of dialogue related to US Government commitment to sustainable forest/resource management.

Ms. McWilliams began the presentation with a history of the RSF. She explained that the RSF began as a self-chartered group, not as a federal advisory committee. The RSF was started with the idea that stakeholders can be prodders at the national level and encourage use of the C&I as a framework to accomplish work at multiple scales (including on the ground) as the RSF works to encourage the implementation of the C&I as a common national framework. The group's leadership is shared between the US Forest Service and other organizations and its work has been accomplished through a Core Group and working groups. The Technical Work Group was responsible for helping to assess the state of the Nation's data on forests and other technical issues addressed in the National Report on Sustainable Forests. The COWG has played and continues to play a key role in informing and engaging the forest stakeholders in the dialogue about sustainable forests through the RSF website and other outreach opportunities. The RSF has spent significant time on the data, indicator, and report aspects of its work, using national meetings and other venues to broaden and deepen the process. Additionally, the RSF has had influence beyond sustainable forests in the US. It has had an impact on the other resource roundtables (e.g., rangelands and water), as well as on international processes.

Dr. Norland continued the presentation with an overview of the niches the REF fills as well as the aspirations for the group. A [copy of his PowerPoint presentation](#) is available on the RSF website. The RSF has traditionally served as the keeper of the vision for the C&I for the framework on sustainable forests. In this role, the RSF is able to provide legitimacy for federal and state agencies that use the C&I as well as a space for shared learning and networking in a non-Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) body. Finally, the RSF

promotes shared leadership, where RSF participants are able to take lessons back to their spheres of influence.

Dr. Norland noted, however, that the RSF process has not succeeded in engaging representatives from all forest sectors, including local, county, and state governments and environmental and conservation organizations. Also lacking as outcomes from the RSF process, is the use of the C&I by all federal agencies with forest responsibilities for measuring progress towards managing lands sustainably, as well as greater use of the C&I at national and sub-national levels. In addition, critical issues brought to discussion through the RSF process, such as a possible national policy for sustaining the US's forests and implementation and actions related to the Sustainable Forests Action Strategy (SFAS), were not measurably advanced through the RSF process. Finally, Dr. Norland noted that he would like to see the RSF process more effectively leverage financial resources to support champions and projects on the ground.

Following the presentation, participants were given the opportunity for questions and discussion. One participant asked for elaboration on the suggested need for increased funding in support of RSF activities. Dr. Norland explained that the US Forest Service has been a steady and dependable source of funding and there has been funding from other organizations, such as the US Geological Survey and other USDA agencies (including NIFA). While participants of the RSF have tried to shop around a grant proposal in the past, the timing was poor and their efforts unsuccessful. A participant suggested that while there has been interest in fundraising, there needs to be a specific and discrete outreach and fundraising strategy. It was also mentioned that the recent national elections will likely have an adverse effect on RSF funding.

One participant observed that, thus far, most of the focus of the RSF has been on sustainable forest management of public lands; while management practices on private lands have been largely unmentioned. The government can engage private landowners through education and extension, as well as regulation, which is less cost-effective. It was proposed that the RSF needs to focus on its roots and try to reach private landowners through education. Another participant noted that, while education is the best approach over the long run, the capacity to provide that education is lacking in some areas. For example, in New York, the people working on the ground either haven't been trained, don't have time, or have retired early.

Finally, a participant reminded the group that the Montreal Process is still an experiment. It is the only international agreement of its kind which is voluntary and non-binding. People are still watching the Process closely to see if a voluntary approach can make more progress than a binding one. It was also noted that, outside the US, most forests are publicly owned. The US is unusual for the amount of forest land privately owned.

Sensing and Feedback: An Overview of Responses to Recent RSF Survey

Sarah Walen, Meridian Institute, provided a report on the sensing activity recently completed for the RSF. Ms. Walen spoke with 15 Core Group participants about the mission, objectives, work themes, and the value of the RSF, and the proposed activities for 2011. A summary of these discussions was provided in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Walen began by noting most people continued to think the RSF's mission was germane. Some interviewees suggested that perhaps there should be a shift towards increasing the RSF's role in creating effective shared learning and dialogue. Interviewees valued the forum provided by the RSF and would like to see the stakeholder engagement become broader and more diverse. Some interviewees suggested that the RSF provide a venue for discussing more controversial issues. Interviewees agreed with the four themes of the RSF, though some saw some redundancy between themes.

Ms. Walen reported that many interviewees saw the SFAS, the release of the 2010 National Report and the statewide forest resource assessments and strategies as potential areas of focus for the RSF in 2011. Interviewees also saw the 2011 International Year of the Forest (IYOF) as a good opportunity however they pointed out that leadership is needed from the US Forest Service before they can find the RSF's role.

Participant Observations and Reflections

Following Ms. Walen's presentation, one participant noted that people are really focusing in on the summary and synthesis in the National Report. The National Report is making the data streams more routine, even though people still struggle with using the data. The participant saw community and urban forestry as an important topic area for the RSF. The all-lands approach, of which community and urban forestry is a part, is garnering a lot of interest and energy. The RSF could bring a lot of new stakeholders into this space.

Another participant reiterated the importance of the statewide forest resource assessments and strategies. The RSF process could take some of the momentum and energy around these reports and use that to help to broaden the use of the C&I, by leveraging participants' influence in their own spheres. The RSF should, this participant thought, continue to build on the products it's participants have already developed, such as the SFAS, the National Report, and the statewide assessments, with a focus on the sub-national level.

The World is Changing – How Might the RSF Change?

Graham Cox, Audubon New York, Nadine Block, Sustainable Forestry Initiative, Colin Donohue, National Network of Forest Practitioners, and Michael Washburn, Washburn Consultants, presented overviews of what they saw as the changes in society, science, and technology influencing forests. Each then discussed how these changes provide opportunities to shape the direction and activities of the RSF.

Mr. Cox began by noting all the areas that have changed since the RSF began. These include the political climate; the stakeholders involved; the role of NGOs; forest management technology and the number of foresters on the ground; communications; the forest industry and shared land; the forest profession and the rise of forest ecology; the US Forest Service; new alliances; new markets; certification; agroforestry; urban and community forestry; land use; the global economic downturn; and quality of life indicators. Mr. Cox recognized that sustainable forestry is now framed around climate change, energy, green building, biofuels, etc. As a result, new forest organizations have changed the way they talk about forest. Finally, Mr. Cox mentioned that the RSF website is the ‘seventh hit’ when one searches for C&I on Google; he thinks that the RSF should become the ‘first hit’ and the primary source for information on the C&I.

Ms. Block continued the presentation by reporting some of the changes that she has witnessed. Ownership changes have been profound and have significantly changed the landscape. New markets have emerged and development has changed the way it impacts the landscape. Corporate social responsibility has grown and private sector tools have become important drivers. The US Forest Service’s release of the 2003 National Report on Sustainable Forests has shaped the role that NASF and other stakeholders looked for the RSF to play. Because sustainability is such a broad goal, the RSF has been pulled in many directions. However, Ms. Block affirmed that the trends speak to the need for good data and the data’s use in determining what our forests have supported.

Ms. Block saw several key questions for the RSF:

- Has the RSF accomplished its goals?
- What can the RSF do that is unique?
- Who should be involved?

Ms. Block answered the first question by saying that the RSF has only partially achieved its goals. The RSF process needs to continue to focus on collecting and reporting on data, collaborating on collecting and reporting, and making the data provided meaningful. While the C&I is a good framework with which to examine the data, it is not the only one. Scale is a critical issue that needs further exploration; a lot of things can get masked by national data. Ms. Block mentioned the Western Forestry Leadership Coalition report “Threats to Western Private Forests” as a good use of data on a sub-national scale. She recommended the use of

leading environmental indicators to raise the profile of these issues, the same way leading indicators are used to determine economic health. On the unique value of the RSF, Ms. Block focused on the RSF's role collecting and using data. She pointed out that there are other groups working on sustainability in other realms. Finally, Ms. Block noted that the RSF has been a good open forum thus far. When thinking about who should be involved, she thought that not every group needs to be at the table if they don't want to be. Ms. Block mentioned forest managers, environmental NGOs, universities, and policy people using the data as missing stakeholders.

Ms. Block made the case for a more limited role for the RSF. She reiterated that the RSF should focus on the data and not try to do everything related to sustainability. When deciding on the future role of the RSF, future work should be placed firmly in the context of what has been done thus far. Not everyone needs to be under the tent all the time.

Next, Mr. Donohue discussed some of the challenges and opportunities for the RSF. In the areas of current RSF activity, Mr. Donohue saw a significant challenge to the RSF in helping to connect the national-level reports and data to the work foresters and land managers are doing on the ground. As data collection becomes more routine, the RSF will have the ability to look at changes over time. However, this data needs to be visible, accessible, and relevant to people and their decision-making. Additionally, Mr. Donohue noted that, as a result of parcelization, landowners cannot be reached one-on-one any longer. Looking forward, the RSF needs to find new, creative ways to put out information and reach these groups. University and high school students were also noted as key groups to engage with the RSF's data.

Mr. Donohue then recognized some areas into which the RSF process could expand. Biomass and carbon both provide interesting opportunities for the RSF. Additionally, water and jobs are both large issues, which provide the RSF the opportunity to create a lot of ripple effects, if handled in a robust way. On these issues, the RSF needs to provide a greater, positive leadership role. As the RSF considers expanding into any of these areas, Mr. Donohue urged participants to build on the work done on the C&I already. For example, a framework for sustainable forestry in the US should relate to the state forest resource assessments and policy, such as the Farm Bill.. Greater outreach to Natural Resources Conservation Service in regards to forest management practices will be required to achieve this.

Finally, Mr. Donohue argued the RSF needs to expand its communication and outreach capacity. While the COWG has always had its place in the RSF, the work of the COWG now needs to be stepped up and broadened. As one of its areas of focus, data should be made more broadly available and the linkages between the data and policy should be highlighted. The National Reports should be getting more media attention, especially since biomass and other new issues are raising the profile of forest resources, particularly amongst environmental NGOs. The IYOF and the 2012 Farm Bill were mentioned as specific opportunities for communications and outreach to stimulate interest around sustainable

forestry. Mr. Donohue also noted that the RSF should consider developing some energy around an alternative name for the Montreal Process C&I in the US to foster a more direct domestic connection with the C&I, such as the US Sustainable Forest Indicators.

Dr. Washburn finished the series of presentations by discussing the value of the RSF as a forum. He mentioned that participants often forget about the value of the sense of community the RSF creates and the value of trust and communication as tools to navigate tough issues. When the RSF was created, this was one of the initial areas of focus, but not the only one. While the RSF discussions rarely deal with on the ground problems in sustainable forestry, Dr. Washburn saw this as an important potential role. The RSF can use the relationships it has built to address problems such as climate mitigation and collaborative restoration. The group was cautioned, however, that as discussions move beyond the C&I to more divisive issues, it will become more difficult to keep people engaged.

The group was then given the opportunity for questions and to begin the discussion of the role of the RSF moving forward. Several participants agreed that there needs to be a greater emphasis on communications. The National Report, the SFAS, and the IYOF all provide opportunities for greater communications capacity, once a clear message has been developed. The RSF also has the ability to highlight success stories, as well as foster and develop more of these success stories. One participant agreed that how we refer to the Montreal Process C&I for application on the domestic front should be reexamined.

Several participants noted that the RSF should have a greater focus on on-the-ground work and sub-national levels of government. One participant suggested that the RSF should scale back the number of national meetings in order to preserve resources for this work and to hold regional meetings. Another participant emphasized the need for engagement and partnerships at the sub-national level. The RSF should look beyond just foresters and try to engage state and local level departments of water and environmental protection. One individual suggested that the RSF can play a particularly valuable role connecting governments to one another.

Participants also talked about other groups of stakeholders to engage in the RSF. The group was cautioned that it can be problematic to not bring new voices to the table. One participant suggested recreation groups, youth, and other non-traditional folks are important to engage. Both the upcoming White House report on America's Great Outdoors (<http://www.greatoutdoorsamerica.org/campaign>) and new technology were mentioned as ways to engage these groups. Specifically, TechSoup (<http://home.techsoup.org>) was referenced as a resource as the RSF considers new technology. It was also suggested that the RSF will not be able to get the environmental NGOs to the table as long as it continues to discuss active forest management.

Additional areas of focus for the RSF were suggested. Participants suggested insects, invasive species, climate change, energy security and its impact on sustainable forests, and forests 'on the edge' as potential areas. One participant reminded the group that the 2010

Report speaks to a list of other issues, already on the table, which the RSF can offer some attention. Another participant cautioned that, as a part of the decision to widen or focus the RSF's scope, thinking about what goals are realistic will be critical. Finally, one participant noted that there is still a substantial lack of data for the social, economic, legal, and institutional indicators in Criteria 6 and 7 – much of which will be costly to acquire. He suggested that the paucity of data could be lessened cheaply through citizen science, which has the added benefit of engaging the public in stewarding the resource.

Additionally participants noted that:

- Sustainability is a growing trend, both in regards to forests and other areas.
- While the most recent election showed the volatility of federal agencies, the RSF should focus on the value it can add and not this volatility.
- Certification is one way but not the only way to prove people are doing things sustainably.
- Voluntary programs, as promoted through the NASF Stewardship Handbook for Family Forest Owners, are also valuable.

Small Groups Report Back

Participants were divided into two small groups to explore how key issues influencing forests, and other insights from the earlier discussions, might help to shape the future of the RSF: its activities, direction, role, and the niche it might fill. Following these discussions, both groups reported back to the full plenary.

The first group reported that the RSF participants serve as the C&I vision keepers and ambassadors of the data and framework provided by the C&I. There need to be champions who have dedicated time to this. The federal government and the US Forest Service need to fully embrace and use the C&I data as well. This group also supported renaming the Montreal Process C&I to something more accessible to domestic practitioners. There continues to be a need to make the C&I understandable in plain English and communicate better how they can be used. Spreading lessons learned is an important related task for the RSF.

The first group also reported on the importance of recognizing regional differences and the need for flexibility when applying the framework provided by the C&I. The group suggested revitalizing the regional roundtables as a way to embrace the differences and to continue to explore ways to apply the C&I under different circumstances. The difference in the scale of application was raised as an important consideration.

This group also explored other issues and areas of focus for the RSF. They suggested applying the C&I to invasive species, biofuels, and water. Data gaps were also mentioned as

an area to be explored. The group reiterated that the RSF has developed a set of tools over time and attention should be given to their application at multiple scales. Additionally, management matrices were offered as a potential tool for the RSF to explore to help address the challenge of applying the C&I at different scales. The group also noted that the RSF should develop its own criteria and indicators to monitor its own success.

When prompted by Ms. Walen, several participants offered their opinions on whether one of the goals of the RSF should be to facilitate changes in sustainable forest management 'on the ground'. One participant noted that, if convincing the government to hire someone to make change happen on the ground is within the RSF's purview, this might be an appropriate goal for the RSF. Another participant observed that the RSF would have to practice consensus building leadership more carefully and astutely to achieve such action, in order to avoid being perceived as becoming command and control.

In their report back, the second group focused on the National Report and outreach and communication during their discussion. The group recognized that there is an unrealized aspiration for vetting the RSF's National Report. The Report needs to be accessible and used to inform decisions and management. To achieve this, the group recognized that regional or local meetings may be necessary, as well as tying the content of the Report to different critical trends and issues, like water, fire, bark beetle infestations, and green infrastructure. "Forest to Faucets" and Forests on the Edge were cited as specific opportunities to help people use the RSF's data to understand the water issue. The group suggested leveraging the efforts of the US Forest Service to engage other federal agencies. They also suggested taking advantage of low hanging fruit, such a National League of Cities meeting in Denver, CO in December, where Secretary Vilsack will be attending a panel on urban agriculture. Attending more conferences like this will help to connect with and build champions working on sustainable forest management, a critical need for the RSF.

The group also stressed that there is a lot of work to be done to better communicate the RSF's work. The RSF needs to communicate in language that everyone understands and post its activities and work online to reach a broader audience. A clear outreach strategy should also be developed, which outlines who to target and how to reach them.

Following the second small group's report, the full plenary began a discussion on the reports and their reactions to them. Several participants offered thoughts on the scope and focus of the RSF. One participant supported expanding the scope of the RSF process to help pull together different related efforts in other resource areas, like water and rangelands, into an integrated, common sense picture. Another participant cautioned that the RSF process cannot and should not try to hitch onto everything. However, they suggested that individual RSF participants could serve as cross-pollinators and work in some of these other areas personally. It was also suggested that it would be important to update the RSF COWG outreach strategy to track this work and look for opportunities to coordinate it with RSF activities. One individual further cautioned that COWG participants have a limited amount of time to commit to the RSF and the group should be mindful of how much is subscribed to

them. Additionally, while the RSF has relied heavily on the COWG, Core Group and other RSF participants have an obligation for action as well. Honing the outreach strategy and identifying priorities were suggested as a way to increase the likelihood of action.

The group expressed a diversity of opinions on the role the US Forest Service should play in setting priorities for the RSF process. Several participants observed that, in view of the fact that the US Forest Service supplies the primary source of funding for the RSF, they should be consulted when determining the future role of the RSF to ensure that the RSF's work is useful to them. Adding to the RSF work plan a more explicit focus on the all-lands approach to land management was suggested as an easy way to complement some of the current priorities of the US Forest Service. One participant suggests that this is a particularly opportune time for RSF leadership to engage and/or meet with US Forest Service leadership, since there is a lot of turnover right now. Another participant cautioned that the US Forest Service may not want to weigh in too heavily on the RSF work plan and priorities, to preserve and honor the diversity and breadth of leadership for and participation within the group.

One individual observed that there has conventionally been a stakeholder input process on the full draft of the National Report, and suggested that it may now be time for the RSF to foster input on a selection of key issues and trends identified in the Report.

At the close of the discussion, Dr. Finley observed that, while there is a need to continue clarifying the direction of the RSF, he had not heard anyone suggest that the RSF process should be disbanded.

Outlining the 2011 RSF Work Plan

Ms. Walen oriented participants for the discussion on the 2011 RSF Work Plan with a brief review of a document titled, [Summary of Work Plan](#), dated 11/04/10. After reviewing the accomplishments of the RSF in 2010, she talked about potential opportunities shaping the work of the RSF in 2011, including the SFAS, IYOF, Statewide Resource Assessments, the release of the final 2010 National Report, and collaboration with other resource roundtables. Ms. Walen then provided an overview of a tabulation of potential RSF activities, organized by the four thematic areas historically guiding the work of the RSF, compiled over the last year based on previous input from RSF participants on the Work Plan.

Participants discussed the four themes which have historically been used to guide the focus of RSF activities:

1. Reporting and Monitoring Progress Toward Sustainable Forests
2. Coordinating with Related National Data and Indicator Efforts
3. Fostering Sustainable Forest Management through the Application of the C&I
4. Engaging the Broader Community of Forest Stakeholders at Multiple Scales.

One participant suggested that the RSF refine its purview and focus its efforts on the first and third areas of activity. Another individual proposed that the fourth theme be modified to specifically include outreach using the Web 2.0 social networking tools the RSF hopes to utilize more actively in the future. Along similar lines, it was suggested that implementing the C&I at sub-national scales be made explicit in this theme. Several participants noted that the four themes were sound, but not all the themes deserve equal weight or attention. In this light, it was suggested that the second theme be modified to read “Monitoring” rather than “Coordinating with” Related National.... Another individual noted that a lot of time was spent scoping these themes out, and did not see the need to make any changes. After some additional discussion, the group generally agreed to preserve the four themes to organize future RSF activities. It was suggested that the potential RSF activities identified during the meeting be categorized within the themes.

Participants also discussed some specific ideas for RSF activities.

SFAS - It was explained that the SFAS was a stakeholder effort to interpret the results of the 2010 National Report and their attempt to develop a collection of recommendations based on that report that could be accomplished by stakeholders cheaply and within a period of two years. One participant noted that, while some of the pieces of the SFAS might be appropriate for the RSF to take on this document was not meant to serve as a substitute for the RSF Work Plan. The authors of the SFAS hoped that stakeholders whose area of work or individual passion aligned with one of the recommendations would find other stakeholders with similar interests to accomplish the recommended action. One participant suggested that the SFAS not necessarily be an area of emphasis in the Work Plan, but that it continue to be a potential area of RSF interest and stakeholder activity.

Collaboration with Other Resource Roundtables - One participant recognized the importance of on-going coordination between the different resource roundtables, while another participant did not think this should be an area focus for the RSF.

Release of the Final 2010 National Report - In addition to continuing to explore how the National Report could be used to inform policy and sustainable forest activities ‘on the ground’, one individual suggested that the National Report could be an important entrée into working with others on some of the critical issues facing society such as the need for secure energy supplies and clean water. Another participant agreed that the RSF needs to find a couple of tangible actions related to the National Report moving forward.

2011 IYOF - Participants talked about the importance of the 2011 IYOF and how it might relate to the RSF Work Plan. Some were concerned by how little information was available about this event, activities around the event, and whether and how much coordination there was around these activities. That said, a participant saw one potential role for the RSF as an organizer, connecting the dots between what others are doing around the IYOF. It was recognized that, because the RSF is not the organization responsible for planning the IYOF

and is reliant upon others to plan the event, it is harder to establish an appropriate role and related activities for the RSF.

Roles for the RSF – In their discussion about the Work Plan, participants continued to clarify their ideas about appropriate and realistic roles for the RSF. In addition to serving as an organizing entity and a dot connector, some participants saw a role for the RSF as a think tank on sustainable forest issues. The group also grappled with the concept of advocacy in the context of RSF activities, and came to view that the RSF might serve a limited and judicious role as an advocate. Participants also highlighted the need for individuals to take on responsibility to drive the RSF's work.

Participants also made the following suggestions for changes and additions to consider as the Work Plan for 2011 is finalized:

- Add to the existing outreach strategy a focus on encouraging and facilitating government-to-government interaction on sustainable forests
- Contribute to the dialogue and discussion around a national policy for sustainable forest management, and potentially develop a policy statement on this.
- Consider reinvigorating regional roundtables to explore how the C&I can be adapted for use in different regions.
- Find ways to take advantage of the Statewide Forest Resource Assessments and Strategies.

2011 RSF Work Plan Activities

Participants drew from earlier discussion to identify a selection of specific activities for the RSF in 2011:

- Host a national meeting on the release of the 2010 National Report. The meeting would feature presentations from the authors and possibly other stakeholders about the data, with a potential focus on how the data informs critical issues, such as climate, water, energy, and the Farm Bill. This meeting would be held in Washington, DC.
- Host a national meeting on the State Forest Resource Assessments and Strategies, focusing on how individual states are using their assessments in developing their resource strategies, and on whether and how much the C&I were utilized as the data organizing framework. Key preparation would include a cross-walk on how the assessments correlate with the C&I, likely produced by Guy Robertson and Sherri Wormstead. This meeting would take place outside of DC.
- Work with Dr. Robertson, US Forest Service, to plan for the roll out of the 2010 National Report. Consider as part of the role out:

- A media event where non-US Forest Service RSF participants could be a part of a panel talking about the report and its utility.
- Host or contribute to a briefing for Congress on the 2010 National Report with key stakeholders, which would highlight the connections to jobs, energy, etc.
- Declare 2011 as the year of RSF outreach (with link to IYOF)
 - Build on the tools that have been established (LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter) and move forward on plans for a social media strategy.
 - Consider smaller venues to highlight success stories, the assessments, and the reports through outreach and communications, bringing other stakeholders into the process as a result.
 - Connect with the Big 7, National Association of Counties, and other sub-national governmental groups.
 - Update the outreach strategy to include both short- and longer-term goals.
- Update and/or redesign the RSF website.
 - Consider the possibility of providing dynamic data delivery.
- Utilize the RSF listserv more effectively and regularly for sharing information on sustainable forests with stakeholders.
- Consider revitalizing the regional roundtables.
- Develop a document that reflects the work the Western Governors Association has already done, to increase buy in that part of the country.

Participants volunteered for the following tasks:

2010 National Report Roll-out:

- Mr. Donohue offered to assist Dr. Robertson in planning for the roll out for the 2010 National Report.
- As a part of this roll out, Ann Walker offered to work on setting up a media event with a Governor.
- Richard Guldin noted that there may be funding available from the US Forest Service for the Report roll out.

State Resource Assessments:

- Michael Buck and Keith Argow will look into a meeting about the State Assessments that was held last year and whether this may happen again.
- Dr. Robertson offered to work with Ms. Wormstead to develop a cross-walk between the State Assessments and the C&I.

Communications and Outreach:

- Andrea Bedell-Loucks offered to help with developing a five year plan for an RSF outreach strategy.

- Rich Guldin indicated that, pending the results of this work, there might be a possibility of working with the consultant responsible for redesigning the Montreal Process website to redesign the RSF website.

Connection with International Arena

- Dr. Guldin offered the possibility of the RSF participating in some way in the International meeting of the Montreal Process Working Group in the southern US.

IYOF

- As a potential tribute to the IYOF, Mr. Donohue offered to work with others on developing a film clip about the importance of forest to people. Dr. Finley offered to coordinate with key individuals engaged with the Indicator 44 work, including Maureen McDonough on a story telling piece.

When finalizing the Work Plan, one participant suggested adding columns for the responsible person and the timeline for completing the task.

Strategy for Continued Leadership

The group was delighted to hear that Michael Buck, NASF representative, is considering serving as a co-chair of the RSF on behalf of the NASF. Mr. Donohue inquired about the process of joining the Core Group and asked to be considered as a participant.

Next Steps

- Meridian will schedule a Core Group call to review the content of the 2011 RSF Work Plan based on the discussion at the November 5 meeting of the Core Group.
- Meridian will send an e-mail to the RSF listserv reminding stakeholders of the communication tool provided by the listserv and inviting them to submit information to disseminate via the listserv.
- Meridian will post materials from the meeting to the website and produce a summary of meeting highlights in approximately 2 weeks. They will do their best to utilize the SharePoint site when distributing the meeting summary.