

# **Final Report from the 2007 National Landcare Workshop**

The Inn at Virginia Tech  
Blacksburg, Virginia  
October 1-3, 2007

## **Executive Summary**

This report provides an overview of the 2007 National Landcare Workshop held at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Virginia on October 1-3, 2007. The Workshop brought approximately 90 people together to learn about and help guide the direction of the landcare movement in the United States and beyond (see participant list in Appendices).

Key goals identified for the Workshop included:

- Developing a strategy for moving forward collectively
- Identifying marketing strategies for the landcare concept and practice
- Gaining commitments of support and action for future steps

Besides presentations about and examples of successful landcare groups (see the Program in Appendices), three work sessions brought forward many thoughtful comments and suggestions from participants. The first work session focused on the added value of landcare and generated discussion about the opportunities that landcare provides. The second work session identified priority areas for action within the categories of landcare groups, agency roles, supporting partner roles, and overall growth of the landcare movement. The final work session encouraged participants to organize discussions that generated strategies for advancing landcare goals.

Participants strongly endorsed the value of landcare and developed strategies and actions designed to strengthen the landcare movement and provide support for landcare groups. A few workgroups are continuing to implement those strategies and actions. These are:

- Toolkit for New Landcare Groups
- Measuring and Communicating Success/Progress of Landcare Groups
- Carbon and International Landcare Linkages
- Forest Landcare

Finally, a coordinating group based upon the conference organizing teams agreed to continue meeting and oversee these efforts.

## **Next Steps**

The Landcare Center agreed to compile the workshop presentations and the group discussion summary and post the proceedings on the web as appropriate. The Landcare Center will follow-up

with the speakers, sponsors, and participants with requests for continued help and contact information for any new workgroups that may emerge in the months ahead.

Participants were asked to review the material in the Landcare Reference Manual and send comments to David Robertson at the Landcare Center (landcare@vt.edu). David agreed to reactivate the U. S. Landcare site and link it to the LandcareCentral.org site. The coordinating group will develop a means of periodic communication among themselves; one potential web-based tool would be a “social networking” site as suggested by Extension Specialist Jonah Fogel.

Coordinating group members agreed that capacity building organizations are needed as the landcare movement grows. Members agreed that the Landcare Center can serve as a model of the type of regional supporting organization needed; it was selected as the most logical place to accept donations in the immediate future. Rich Duesterhaus volunteered to draft a proposal regarding the relationship between the coordinating group and Virginia Tech and the Landcare Center is encouraged to develop a charter that allows for leadership and participation by local and national partners. A Landcare Alliance, which includes the three national signatory organizations and other key partners, is also being encouraged to develop a charter.

## **Building and Supporting the Landcare Movement**

A strategy and action session used an Open Space process in which Workshop participants were invited to co-create the agenda and host their own groups to plan strategies and actions.

Participants were able to work on the following topics:

- Toolkit for New Landcare Groups
- Branding Landcare as a National Movement
- Differentiation and Coordination of Landcare and Landcare-like Groups
- Urban Landcare
- Getting Agency/NGO Support
- Energy, Biomass and Landcare Groups
- Forest Landcare
- Measuring and Communicating Success/Progress of Landcare Groups
- Carbon and International Landcare Linkages
- Who is Not Here That Should Be?

Landcare Toolkit
------------------

Items to include in Toolkit:

- Skeletal framework
- Template
- Suggestions on how to generate interest
- Information on relationship building

- Budget planning
- Visioning exercises
- Success stories
- Press kit
- Answers to potential questions
- Identify key people
- Explain what Landcare can do for you
- Explain why Landcare is different
- Include recommendations such as:
  - Know some first steps
  - Know the community
  - Landcare is different everywhere
  - Develop specific goals
  - Identify common interest areas to form partnerships
  - Listen well
  - Seek commitment from partners
- Suggest why a community may want to form a group
- For the visioning process, provide a facilitator
- Utilize the Extension's science-based knowledge and tools
- Tie toolkit to land grant universities, partner with them
- Give information about landowners making money off their property
  - Business planning/marketing
  - Connect to regional reps
- Identify clear goals

Branding The Landcare Movement
--------------------------------

***Why brand Landcare?***

- Grassroots is key
- Issue resolution framework
- Hands logo is 85% recognizable in Australia
- National logo, but flexibility for local logo
- Connect measure, rules to logo – principles & balance
- Stimulates thoughts – “World LandCare collaborative”
- Triple Bottom Line – logo/branding – challenge is vulnerability

***How should we move forward?***

- From Catawba LandCare & Grayson LandCare successes = symbol
- Test template from Catawba & Grayson
- Link their info to website (LandCare Central) – links to other LC networks
- As LandCare grows at local level (1 county LC – multiple county LC) how does name/logo represent this growth??
- Needs recognizable spokesperson – Robert Redford, Harrison Ford, Barbara Kingsolver, Ward Burton, Michael Pollen, Robert Kennedy, Bill Moyer, etc.

- Is National logo transferable? – People receive caring hands logo well!
- Use networking to promote it – peer to peer communication, exponential growth by word of mouth, through various organizations, i.e. Land Trust, conservation networks, etc.

## Differentiation and Coordination of Landcare and Landcare-like Groups

- Landcare is one piece of a large “second generation” environmental movement, it is cooperative conservation
- Possible urban-rural linkages between Landcare groups and existing urban groups
- Development of relationships will mean defining areas of commonality amongst exiting possible partners and Landcare
- Private sector & Landcare – is there some mutual learning that could take place to enhance efforts of Landcare and other groups?
- Need to have mutual benefits established – do not get wrapped up turf battles
- Need to clarify Landcare objectives
- Landcare center should define a set of landscape level goals to determine where groups may run into competition and where they might find opportunities for cooperation
- Landcare could share its message with existing groups so that those groups could carry Landcare message forward

## Urban Landcare

### *What benefits do Urban Landcare groups provide?*

- Need to focus on the triple bottom line – two of the three are easy to provide but the economic part is a bit tricky
- Landcare could provide assistance with maintaining and increasing property values
- Social benefits
- Economic Opportunities
  - Certification of lawn care product providers
  - Orchards
  - Developer bonuses for leaving open space
  - Tree removal and salvaging
  - Tax benefits
  - Stormwater management – rain barrels, porous surfaces

- Have Neighborhood Associations become Landcare groups – they can implement the list above which would help get funding and support
- Public Utilities may be willing to provide funding
- Engage willing citizens in a neighborhood to work on projects and use as an example to encourage other neighborhood groups

**Action Items**

- Learn more about Australian Urban Landcare groups
  - Connect cities to outlying Landcare groups (e.g.. Roanoke – Catawba & Grayson County)
  - Form alliances
    - Farmers Markets
    - Greenspace movement
    - Land Trust Alliance
      - Check out their annual conference which consists of 2 days of training on topics such as conservation easements, working with landowners, peer-to-peer training
      - They already have a national network - we may learn from their model
- Check out the Urban Ecology Institute
  - Add this topic to the list for National Landcare meeting ideas
  - Meet with local jurisdictions to see if there is support for Landcare

**Challenges**

- How to engage the suburbs?

<b>Getting Agency/NGO Support</b>
-----------------------------------

Group leader: Faye Cooper

Goal: To get the sustained support of the state and federal agencies and NGOs that have a stake in the landcare movement.

General discussion/needs/observations:

- Landcare Center can play a major role in outreach to partners/stakeholders
- Facilitator(coordinator) role essential to communicate with partners
- Make use of technology (web) for outreach (e.g., tap into VA Extension web)
- Need to identity roles of partners**
- Need for overall educational outreach
- Need for coordination among state and federal agencies for better delivery of services via Landcare structure.

Potential actions:

- Identify “champions” within agencies/NGOS (e.g., all who participated in workshop)
- Link landcare web sites with agencies
- Prepare presentations/materials for outreach (Landcare Center)
- Make presentations to partner organizations at “annual meetings” and other gatherings (Landcare Center, champions and others)
- Hold national landcare conference inviting representatives from all entities (create more champions)
- Develop marketing plan (Landcare center and partners)

**Conclusion:** A plan for outreach/education of partners needs to be a product of a strategic plan for landcare.

Energy, Biomass, and Landcare Groups
--------------------------------------

Group leader: Hal Brockman  
[hbrockman@fs.fed.us](mailto:hbrockman@fs.fed.us)  
 202-205-1694

Energy is an issue that is on everyone’s mind from the household to the global concerns. Homeland Security and weaning the US from its dependency on foreign oil is one major driver. Global warming is another as is the rising cost to fuel houses and vehicles. Local Landcare Groups are in an ideal situation to impact energy use and production at the local level which can help influence policy, direction and use at the regional, State and National level.

**General Information:**

There are several current opportunities to get involved at the Group level with energy. Here are a few that were discussed:

- There have been a series of biomass grants issued by the USDA in concert with USDO I (US Department of Interior). Information on the current round of biomass grants can be found on the Federal Register web site.
- The USDA Rural Development currently has \$200M a year for grants to establish small local electric generation plants. The primary purpose of these grants has to be electric generation but other biomass uses can be included. The current versions of the US House passed Farm Bill and US House passed Energy Bill has considerable financial incentives for biomass grants and electric generation plants. The US Senate is currently working on both Bills.
- Fuels for Schools is an initiative to support local biomass generation plants. Many of these are used for steam generation for heating and cooling (cogeneration), some for electric generation and some for combinations. Their web site has useful information.  
<http://www.fuelsforschools.org/>

- One of the issues with using biomass for energy is the hauling distance. It can quickly become uneconomical if the raw product has to be hauled more than 20 miles for most biomass. The most efficient use of the product is to have multiple generation plants within a close range of the available raw product. This will have to be part of the planning process.
- Biomass energy production has been shown in parts of the country to be a wonderful community growth and support area. When schools, hospitals, or individuals can reduce or eliminate their energy costs, it raises the awareness of everybody around them. When the biomass comes from local sources, everybody wins. Creating a demand for biomass products increases the land and resource value and community support.
- US Forest Service National Forests have the opportunity to do Stewardship Contracts for management of a specific piece of land. The local group, in this case the Landcare Group, can do a contract with the USFS to do all of the management activities that the two parties agree to for a length of time, up to 10 years. At the end of this period, the contractor has to leave the forests in a minimum condition that equates to sustainable management. The contractor has to provide all the management activities agreed to and they get the value of any forest product that comes from this area during the contract period. The contractor has to provide all of the labor and resources necessary to complete the required activities. The contractor receives all raw products that come from these land management activities and can treat those as they desire.

#### **Funding for Energy Activities:**

1. As discussed above, there are grants available for biomass fuel plants. As information becomes more readily available, I will send it on to Jerry Moles so he can distribute it locally.
2. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has several programs that started in the 1986 Farm Bill, received large financial boosts in the 2002 Farm Bill and are poised to potentially double in available funds through the 2007 Farm Bill.

**EQIP** – Environmental Quality Incentives Program – EQIP may be funded at the \$2B a year level. It is being tweaked by Congress to be much more forestry friendly. Since the 2002 Farm Bill, we know that nation wide only 2.4% of the total funds have been approved for forestry practices. In Virginia, 4.38% of the total funds have gone to forestry. EQIP can be used for forestry practices on private and Federal lands. If the Landcare Group gets a Stewardship Contract on USFS lands, EQIP can pay 50% of the cost of all NRCS approved practices. This could include TSI, pre-commercial thinning, wildlife habitat improvement, riparian plantings and a host of other activities. The other 50% of practice costs would have to be borne by the contractor and can be in-kind, paid by partners, or through volunteer labor and technical assistance. If the Landcare Group does a Stewardship Contract with the USFS, the NRCS State Conservationist could contact their Chief to get a dedicated pot of funds for use on the National Forest. The rest of the State may not be happy if a local group asked for a large pot of funds from the normal State allocation for use on Federal lands. Using EQIP funds on Federal lands has been done in a couple of States already so it is not precedent setting. EQIP is readily available for use on private lands within the Landcare Group to establish biomass

plantings, such as warm season grasses, and improve existing forest lands for biomass and all other uses.

**WHIP** – Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program – WHIP can be used to establish and improve lands for wildlife habitat. WHIP funding can also be used on federal lands as well as private lands. Nation wide WHIP has been much more forestry friendly than EQIP, with 13.5% of the total funds. Virginia has approved 15.8% of their WHIP funds for forestry.

### **Technical Assistance for Energy Activities:**

We heard repeatedly that there was no funding to help support the Landcare Group activities, including technical assistance. Much of the local expertise is being donated by individuals or provided through State and Federal Agencies and the University. The 2002 Farm Bill has a provision for funding of technical service providers (TSP) for delivery of all Farm Bill programs. The NRCS or Farm Service Agency (FSA) can sign-up any qualified person as a TSP. In most parts of the country, this has been limited to engineering, agriculture and rangeland consultants. But forestry and wildlife management specialist qualify for the TSP program. When someone is approved as a TSP, they receive an agreed to amount to act as the official technical service provider to the landowner that has been approved for programs like EQIP and WHIP. The purpose for TSP is to help the understaffed USDA offices provide timely and expert assistance to landowners wanting to implement conservation activities funded through the Farm Bills. To find a local USDA Service Center, go to this web site: <http://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app> Applicants can go to or call the NRCS or FSA office and provide them with the information you will need to become a TSP. Here is the official TSP web site: <http://techreg.usda.gov/>

### **Funds from Activities:**

**Stewardship Contract** – A Stewardship project would have to be proposed by the local Forest Ranger and approved by the Forest Supervisor and Regional Forester. There are more than 40 existing Contracts within the 13 Southeastern States, including a current project on the Jefferson National Forest. Once the project is approved, the USFS will provide NEPA documentation for the project area. Then the Contract can be developed between the parties. Contracts can run from one to ten years.

All products that would come from the land under the Stewardship Contract would belong to the Landcare Group. The Group will have to determine the best use of these products. This could range from wood and other products for biomass energy production, wood to pellets that could be distributed for energy or sold locally or wherever there is a market. With the proper permits, non forest wood products such as medicinal plants, mushrooms, plant parts for arrangements, or any other available product, could be collected on this site as well as other parts of the National Forest and could belong to the Landcare Group for marketing. If the aesthetics and access is improved, this could be a nice location for ecotourism. If the wildlife habitat is improved and game is abundant, someone could start a hunting guide program. Most of these activities outside of the Stewardship Contract require a permit from the NF. All wood products should go to the best and highest use if possible. This may require some sorting yards

but could yield high value results. Wood for arts, crafts, furniture, and etc. could have a higher value than wood to be chipped for a cogeneration or electric generation plant. Wood with no other use could be put into pellets. The Group will have to determine if there is a need for funding of practices on these lands. EQIP and WHIP funding can provide 50% of the cost of the practices so the Group does not have to bear all the cost. In New Mexico, the USFS received \$2M in EQIP funding from the NRCS Chief's funds to help implement practices on the Federal lands. The Landcare Groups will have to decide how much funds could be spent annually, request a special pot of funds for this effort and get TSP and USDA employees to help implement these practices. EQIP \$ can be obligated to contracts which can be multiple years, up to 10. It will take much deliberation to determine how much could be spent. You do not want to request too much because any unused funds get returned to the federal treasury and are lost to the programs. All phases of a Stewardship Contract will have to be thought out very thoroughly to make it a big success for everyone concerned. For more information, please visit the USFS web site: <http://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/fm/stewardship/index.shtml>

**Wood Pellets** – These pellets could generate their own market. It is not unreasonable to consider that they could also be distributed to the landowners in the group or possibly within the local community at cost to generate low cost heat and reduce the oil, gas and electricity demands. This could create tremendous good will within the community. Any income would belong to the Group and used as the Group determines.

**Carbon Sales** – If the Group can get a series of small cogeneration or electric generation plants established that are fueled by biomass, the gas, coal, oil, and electricity savings are readily converted to carbon credits. The Group could be the aggregator of these carbon credits for all uses of biomass generated from the Stewardship Contract and maybe from landowners that also generate biomass. The carbon credits have a value on the Chicago Climate Exchange or possibly California Climate Exchange, and can be sold and traded. The sale could be annual and the price and amount could change as the use of biomass changes. The Group could use these funds to pay for anything that everyone agrees to such as conservation practices on private lands, facilitator(s), and technical assistance from consultants, Landcare parties, or as dividends back to the landowners in the Group. These decisions must be made at the Landcare Group level.

### **Next Steps:**

#### **Stewardship Contract:**

Put together a technical group that can look at the multiple phases and actions involved. Get the local USFS involved immediately. They have to approve all phases of the project and contract. They will also have to arrange for NEPA documentation on those lands. Since they own the top of most of the local watersheds, they should be partner in all activities. The parties involved will have to determine many things including:

- Areas of consideration for the Contract.
- Activities that all parties agree to be completed during the contract period.
- Determine where cogeneration or electric generation plants could be established and request funding for those plants.
- Arrange for financial and technical assistance to help implement practices.
- Establish sorting yards to sort the various wood products that come from the Contract.

- Create or improve existing wood utilization facilities to take advantage of the wood coming from the Contract.
- Determine a process for the Landcare Group and the local community to utilize the other products that may come from the Contract such as non-forest products like mushrooms, medicinal plants, pine tipping, improved aesthetics, improved wildlife habitat and a variety of other products.
- As the potential for the Contract proceeds, this list may grow considerably

**EQIP and WHIP:**

If the Landcare Group does get a Stewardship Contract, your local technical group will have to determine the amount of EQIP and/or WHIP funds that could be utilized on that area of federal lands. The request should go to the Chief of NRCS for a special pot of funds to help implement this Contract. Since the 2002 Farm Bill, the NRCS Chief has held a certain amount of all program funds to be distributed to special projects.

**Technical Service Provider:**

Contact your local USDA Field Office and get the local technical experts signed up so they can be paid to provide help to the Landcare Group and to local landowners to implement practices from the Farm Bill Programs.

Forest Landcare (Forest Landcare: Forest Tending, Forest Care)

Participants

Britt Boucher  
[britt@foresters-inc.com](mailto:britt@foresters-inc.com)

Gary Boring  
[Gary.boring@va.usda.gov](mailto:Gary.boring@va.usda.gov)

Jim Chamberlain  
[jachambe@vt.edu](mailto:jachambe@vt.edu)

Frank Garman  
[lsgarman@aol.com](mailto:lsgarman@aol.com)

Bruce Hull (reporter)  
[hullrb@vt.edu](mailto:hullrb@vt.edu)

Ruth McWilliams  
[rmcwilliams@fs.fed.us](mailto:rmcwilliams@fs.fed.us)

David Robertson  
[davidrobertson@vt.edu](mailto:davidrobertson@vt.edu)

David Richert  
[david.richert@dof.virginia.gov](mailto:david.richert@dof.virginia.gov)

Faren Wolter  
[fwolter@pecva.org](mailto:fwolter@pecva.org)

Harry Groot  
[harry@nextgenwoods.com](mailto:harry@nextgenwoods.com)

Forest Landcare services, sustains, and restores the forested green infrastructure that is increasingly fragmented by residential, retail, transportation, and urban development. From 1950 to 2000, the amount of private lands with at least one house every 40 acres increased from 5 to over 27%--this exurban land use pattern is becoming the norm that dominates our landscapes. The rate of forest fragmentation continues to increase. The challenges to sustain the ecosystem services—wood, water, nutrient recycling, carbon sequestration, scenery, solace—that flow from

these forests are acute, while threats from fire, invasives, and pests are growing. Yet, the capabilities to tend and care for this forest are eroding. This exurban forest that lies at the interface between urban and rural lands falls outside the scope of most service providers. The lawn-care, horticultural, and arboricultural services typically do not extend much beyond suburbia while the silvicultural, logging, and forestry services do not extend much beyond large forested tracts located near increasingly scarce wood processing facilities.

Emerging but sporadic evidence exists of demand from forest owners for these services, despite a great deal of evidence of the need. There also exists a lack of service providers trained to operate in this emerging landscape and take advantage of this emerging market. New tools, techniques, and management strategies are needed. The Southern Group of State Foresters in conjunction with the Southern Region of the US Forest Service have been actively promoting a “Changing Roles” program to help traditional forest service providers respond to the new opportunities. States around the country are looking for ways to help jump start this service industry so as to supplement declining forest economies and forest health. See: [http://www.interfacesouth.org/products/training/changing\\_roles.html](http://www.interfacesouth.org/products/training/changing_roles.html).

Our work group attempted to define opportunities and challenges and to suggest several responses to them.

### Challenges

- New forest owners don't have skill or understanding to manage forests.
- EQIP costshare money is one way to pay for professional management advice and service providers to restore forests, remove invasive, etc.
  - However, it is often insufficient
- Chicken and Egg: Building demand and capability to service it:
  - The demand for these forest landcare services is not well enough developed and/or not well enough understood to support a flourishing forest landcare service provider sector
  - Forest landcare service providers can't afford to develop new skills, purchase new equipment, develop new marketing strategies
- Traditional forester service providers talk to traditional forest service providers and say it can't be done; it is both difficult and threatening to think outside the box.
- Traditional regional forest processing facilities that create demand for traditional regional forest services, are losing business, relocating, or closing.
- Lack of business plans for forest landcare service providers
- Lack of business plans for forest landowners
- Lack of loans for equipment and risk taking behavior by service providers
  - Expensive insurance
- Lack of good examples and demonstration projects to show people

### Opportunities

- Stewardship plans provide landowners access to professional advice and service providers access to markets

- RC&D forester could offer “Stewardship plan implementation workshops” the first Saturday of every month in their region, building a cadre of coaches and demonstration projects
- Land owner coaching or mentoring one another after trained by a professional forester. Promote 'coached planning' using Landcare groups and give group participants an incentive to work together; we need to learn from the 'coached planning' experiences elsewhere.
- Offer of assistance with business plans and equipment loans for service providers willing to transition.
- Offer training sessions to landowners and service providers
- Have landcare groups host “forest walks” and forest landcare. Connect explicitly with the branded Landcare approach, having Landcare groups host walks and or training/services.
- Have landcare and other community groups invite forest landcare presentations
  - Have Frank invite Britt
- Purchase key equipment that could be owned by RC&D council and loaned to service providers and landowners
- Promote demand for local wood among architects, wood workers, and energy consumers (schools, etc) that would create a demand for the fiber coming off local forests. Connect service providers with emerging group-based efforts where service providers could/should be working with multiple landowners via collaborative/cooperative ventures like Landcare,
- Learn from the success of the Eastern Ozark Forestry Council (Faren Wolter will send info)
- Learn from Baltimore County Don Outen (Ruth McWillimans will send info)
- Use monies from recent USDA grants to VT and Blue Ridge Forest Coop to staff efforts to address opportunities and challenges

### Proposal

- Organize a series of workshops around the region that both create demand and capability.
- Audience
  - Landowners, land care groups, land trusts, neighborhood associations, cluster developments, other owners of exurban forest land
  - Service providers, forestry professionals,
  - Local officials, business advocates, land developers
  - Architects, builders, woodworkers
- Promotion and Advertisement
  - Local land care group mailing lists and neighbor to neighbor promotion
  - Jennifer Gagnon VA Forest Landowner list
  - Land trusts mailing lists
  - Environmental NGO mailing lists
  - RC&D Mailing lists
  - DOF mailing lists
- What message would attract landowners (who have many other things to do)?
  - “Avoiding the silent tax of forest mismanagement”
  - “Building forest value”

- “Sustaining your forests while using them”
  - “Keeping your forest forested, and making money doing it”
  - “Growing Forest Wealth”
  - “Forest Care”
  - “forest tending”
  - “generating cash and keeping forests in forest”
  - “Harvesting for cash without losing forests”
- Workshop Topics
    - Improving forest health and wealth through selective harvesting and timber stand improvement (Britt)
    - Harvesting strategies that sustain forest cover, soil stability, visual beauty, and wildlife habitat
    - How forest management sustains regional Green Infrastructure
      - Introduction to regional GI efforts
    - Converting pasture to forest (new landowners don’t have capacity to manage pasture land on their property)
    - Basic forest planning: how much firewood and lumber can I harvest while increasing the health and value of remaining forest?
    - Demonstration forest/harvest such as BRFC at current Montgomery County site.
    - Costs and cash flow from these types of operations
      - even if costs exceed cash flows for startups until economies of scale
      - scenarios of alternative futures: client growth, equipment changes, economies of scale, new markets
    - Equipment demonstrations
    - Prototype business plans
    - Marketing strategies and networking
    - Making connections between forest owners, forest service providers, and forest product consumers
    - Local markets for local wood
- Workshop Locations
    - Montgomery County (Gabbard, Gagnon, Hull, Robertson, Boucher, Groot)
    - Catawba Valley (perhaps locate workshop same as above) (Gabbard, et al)
    - Wytheville region (Richert)
    - Grayson region (Jerry?)
    - Culpeper Region (Faren Wolter)
    - Charlottesville region (DOF)
    - Kentland farms (David Robertson suggested Jim Burger)
- Workshop organizing and funding
    - Use VT grants to pay key service providers and workshop organizers to prepare brief materials and talks that could be used at each workshop. Compensate them for the time and resources.
      - Britt Boucher, Michael Lewis, Harry Groot, Christy Gabbard,....
- Access VT extension resources
    - Jennifer Gagnon, Sharp Logger, John Munsel.

## Measuring & Communicating Success of Local Landcare Groups

### Why measure and communicate success?

Topic includes:

- Marketing
- Measuring, evaluating, and reporting outcomes (triple bottom line outcomes) – e.g., sample water quality, profitability, etc.
- Using pictures (visual) of ‘what success looks like’ (e.g., fishing in stream)
- Changing estimated profitability (\$’s)
- Measuring empowerment at local level (social capital and capacity)
- Duplicating, spreading, transferring...need evidence to share with others
- Articulating objectives of Landcare goal
- Networking
- Clarifying and articulating Landcare principles (keep it simple)
- Differentiating using Landcare brand (e.g., logo, etc) – why brand? (private sector)

### Ideas for moving forward, including some proposed actions:

- Check Australia experience of measurement...participation (e.g., 40% participation participate), biophysical improvements (e.g, acres, change units of productivity), adoption of Landcare technologies or sustainable practices
- Consider hierarchy of measures – categorize measures (environmental, economic, social); check Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators...’triple bottom line’ success → communities
- Think about landscape scale measures (e.g., watershed, valley, etc.) vs. Landcare group determined measures
- Involve students...great projects for graduate students

### Proposed actions / next steps:

Note: be careful...who is developing and reporting measures?

**1<sup>st</sup>**—Work with Catwaba Landcare Group to develop and test measures; must communicate measures, progress, and lessons with landowner and Landcare group input

With Catwaba Landcare Group:

- ✓ Consider relationship between group’s goals and program goals (meshing of the two?)
- ✓ Perhaps use issue like water, and consider who can help—outside in’s (e.g., Extension, Forest Service, etc.); and facilitator...Christy as filter and link
- ✓ Establish listserve / social networking tool to network and communicate

**2<sup>nd</sup>**—Share report/results with audiences to understand different perspectives, motivations, etc. (e.g., landowners, businesses, municipalities, agencies, etc.), including:

- ✓ Federal agencies about relevance and use from their perspectives...e.g., EPA (Tom DeMoss), Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, etc.
- ✓ Regional groups...e.g., Western Virginia Water Authority, Counties, etc.
- ✓ Locals...people of the valley
- ✓ University...Virginia Tech (e.g., Ozzie regarding curriculum)

- ✓ Private sector...venture capitalists, lenders, etc.
- ✓ Municipalities (should be interested in landscape and market scale improvements; and collaboration with businesses)

Note: two-way street between groups and agencies, businesses, and others; need to find out what is the value of affiliating with Landcare

Note: Ruth McWilliams to e-introduce Christy Gabbard to Nick Shufro (PricewaterhouseCoopers)

3<sup>rd</sup>—Convene business sector roundtable

### Discussion Participants and Others Interested in Follow-up Steps:

<u>Name</u>	<u>E-mail Address</u>	<u>Telephone Number</u>
Christy Gabbard	<a href="mailto:cgunnels@vt.edu">cgunnels@vt.edu</a>	540-357-3744
Ruth McWilliams	<a href="mailto:rmcwilliams@fs.fed.us">rmcwilliams@fs.fed.us</a>	202-205-1373
Louise Buck	<a href="mailto:leb3@cornell.edu">leb3@cornell.edu</a>	607-255-5994
Jim Chamberlain	<a href="mailto:jchamberlain@fs.fed.us">jchamberlain@fs.fed.us</a>	540-231-3611
Courtney Kimmel	<a href="mailto:cekimmel@vt.edu">cekimmel@vt.edu</a>	
Bill Bennett	<a href="mailto:bill.bennett@dgif.virginia.gov">bill.bennett@dgif.virginia.gov</a>	
Bruce Hull	<a href="mailto:hullrb@vt.edu">hullrb@vt.edu</a>	
David Lowe	<a href="mailto:david@davidjlowe.org">david@davidjlowe.org</a>	617-277-2505
Jonah Fogel	<a href="mailto:jfogel@vt.edu">jfogel@vt.edu</a>	804-527-4234
Louise & Frankie Garman	<a href="mailto:lsgarman@aol.com">lsgarman@aol.com</a>	540-384-6129
David Robertson	<a href="mailto:davidrobertson@vt.edu">davidrobertson@vt.edu</a>	434-610-0491
Tom DeMoss		
Peggy Tadej		
Peggy Harwood		

Landcare International and Carbon Trading
---

#### Participants

David Lowe	<a href="mailto:david@davidjlowe.org">david@davidjlowe.org</a>	Eric Bendfeldt	<a href="mailto:ebendfel@vt.edu">ebendfel@vt.edu</a>
Ruth McWilliams	<a href="mailto:rmcwilliams@fs.fed.us">rmcwilliams@fs.fed.us</a>	Charlotte Hanes	<a href="mailto:clt@rphanes.com">clt@rphanes.com</a>
Tom DeMoss	DeMoss.Tom@epa.gov	Louise Buck	<a href="mailto:leb3@cornell.com">leb3@cornell.com</a>
Hal Brockman	<a href="mailto:hbrockman@fs.fed.us">hbrockman@fs.fed.us</a>	Peggy Tadej	<a href="mailto:tadej@narc.org">tadej@narc.org</a>
Ariela Summit	<a href="mailto:asummit@ecoagriculture.org">asummit@ecoagriculture.org</a>		
Peggy Harwood	<a href="mailto:pharwood@fs.fed.us">pharwood@fs.fed.us</a>		

Although the session's title centered on international linkages, most of the discussion focused around national Landcare in the U.S. Landcare International seeks a better understanding of how it can aid U.S. Landcare. Further thought and discussion on this point is encouraged.

#### Values of International Landcare to US Landcare groups

- Opportunities to learn from Australian experience
  - Structure, funding, projects & results, networks
  - Carbon trading mechanisms
- Empowerment from joining a global network – being part of something bigger

#### Action List

- Survey US groups' interests re. International links....?
- Establish a list of prospective Ambassadors or Champions and Advisors
  - Initial list included: Jim Mosely, Judy Johnson, Elizabeth Estill, and Barbara Kingsolver
  - Need to clarify responsibilities and expectations of these designated support roles
  - May need two types of support roles to operate at different levels of engagement
  - Landcare International can provide a model; David L. has insight on this process
- Develop a list of prospective corporate partners – international, national and local scales
  - Making the case for Landcare – how do we sell the idea
  - Business Roundtable
- Develop a target list of organizations with which to network to grow US Landcare
  - Send to David Lowe (volunteered, but David Robertson should be copied)
- List of events (conferences, forums) to attend to get the word out about Landcare – be opportunistic; we all can help out with this
  - leave flyers at strategic points at events, esp. if not comfortable engaging people in person
- Need to develop promotional materials highlighting:
  - Landcare principles
  - US examples
  - Vision & value
  - Web site and contacts
  - Who?: Landcare Center with 3 MOU orgs
- Carbon Trading: Need to explain the concept and opportunities
  - Outreach
  - Develop a plan for Landcare as an agent of technical extension and know-how; as a consolidator/aggregator of carbon credits; need to consider packaging (whole farm/forest economics, Best management practices - BMPs)
  - Learn from Landcare Australia, Landcare International, and World Agroforestry Center

- Need to make the case about Landcare to prospective corporate partners
  - Be strategic
  - Identify existing corporate Friends of Landcare
  - Multinational corporations – link to Landcare International
  - Local corporations for local/regional/US support
  
- National and state agencies and universities should initiate strategy dialog and collaboration
  - To guide local groups
  - Build awareness
  - Test information kits
  - Package services (such as carbon trading aggregation)
  - Share experience
  
- David L. will explore corporate social responsibility contacts through Ceres leadership

Other Comments:

- Coordinate efforts so as to avoid unnecessary repetition
- US Landcare Alliance of groups
  - Coordinated by Landcare Resource Center and 3 MOU agencies
  - Friends of Landcare
  - Private Sector – Google
  - Corporate Social Responsibility/Triple bottom line
  
- David L. will contact Ceres about list and ideas (Ceres is a Boston-based NGO that developed corporate reporting standards and has a strong corporate network; he knows the Exec. Dir. and COO.
  
- Examples: Bank of America, John Deere, Alcoa, Mars, Nautilus Fitness
  
- Keep Landcare and its programs apolitical - this keeps it safe from public perceptions, misunderstandings, and the influence of politicians and whims of changing administrations
- Develop or use existing business roundtable to build partnerships
- Develop success stories; place them in national news and newsletter outlets
- Linkages:
  - Recruit famous people to attract attention, energy, fun, and support
  - Musical heritage of the region – Blue grass, new grass (Nickel Creek?), etc.
  - Firm contacts: Dave Mathews (Charlotte Hanes knows him; local connections)
  - Sporting equipment such as Nautilus – local HQ; REI, etc. – leveraging appeal of nearby mountains, forests, park lands
  - Human health linkage – Integrate outdoors connections; mental health value of intact ecosystems, nature

Carbon Trading

- Need to quantify the added value to landowners – Return on Investment (ROI)
- Packaging with other benefits will be necessary to make it cost effective
  - Best management practices (BMP)
  - Cost sharing
  - Agroforestry (more specifically, Silva-pastoral systems – grazing livestock under well managed forest stands); selling thinned wood
  - Managing for woodlots and forests for carbon sequestration
- Landcare can provide technical services
  - To clarify the procedures and processes
  - Valuation of potentially tradable carbon assets
  - As aggregator of small carbon holdings to access carbon markets cost-effectively
  - International Landcare and Forest Service (Hal Brockman, others) can provide experiential guidance - technical and administrative advice

Who Is Not Here?
------------------

**Question(s): Who is not here that should be? Who should be here next time?**

Group leader: David Robertson

In different locales and regions of the country, different groups will need to be included, e.g., In the US West, there are specific groups that would need to be included.

Two groups were identified for which we might want to make an explicit effort to outreach and build positive working relationships and understanding early on:

- Developers and development community
- Agriculture lobby and agribusiness interests

Specific groups to include next time:

- Virginia Forest Landowner Education Program (VFLEP)
- Virginia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts
  - New director
- The Nature Conservancy
  - National and state levels
- Conservation Fund
- Chesapeake Bay Foundation

Types of groups to include next time:

- Local government
  - Staff
  - Virginia Association of Counties

- National Association of Counties
- Private interests
  - Corporations
  - Progressive ones
  - Goldman Sachs
  - Private capital funds
  - Archer Daniels Midland
- Media, marketing interests/specialists
- More landowners
  - Institutional landowners
    - Colleges, cities, firms, etc.
  - Conservation easement property owners
- Residents (non-producers) of rural areas
- Urban populations
- Land users
  - Hunting and fishing groups
  - Recreational users/groups
- Retailers serving recreational land users
- Consumers
- Representatives of a variety of groups

## Appendix A

### **Small group Session I: Landcare Networking, Value & Opportunities**

The first of three breakout group sessions was intended to allow participants an opportunity to meet and learn from one another about the value of Landcare and opportunities that Landcare provides. Four groups offered the following thoughts.

#### ***Why are people here? What are their hopes for the workshop?***

- Forge a direction
  - Tourism opportunities
  - General learning
  - Grow existing Landcare groups
  - Explore regional approaches
  - Networking
  - Explore public/private land connections
  - Learn about the connection between green infrastructure and Landcare
  - To get feedback and suggestions for projects
  - To get our successes off the ground
  - To learn about ways to get involved
  - Talk about Landcare and education – how to get children involved
  - To discuss water resource issues and sustainable stewardship
  - Get conservation groups involved
  - Extend Landcare nationwide
  - Local contacts for state and federal agencies and building a sense of place for the next generation
  - Take information to assist economic development through tourism and green infrastructure
  - Identify communication pathways
  - Start a Landcare group in the PEC region
  -
- Learning/building bridges/cross border collaboration opportunities
- Learn how DEQ can interact with Landcare to advance water quality goals
  - Interaction with watershed roundtables and advisory committees
- Better communication with community groups and citizens
- Learn about Landcare tools
- Collaboration between federal agencies and the public
- To ensure that US Landcare doesn't morph "Landcare" into something else, i.e. Landcare = pickle barrel
- To see evidence of support from others beyond Grayson County
- Help in getting local government on board
  - Money to support local rural effort
  - Green infrastructure
- Getting youth involved – 4-H
- To understand landowner needs regarding land care

#### ***What excites you about Landcare?***

- Gives a chance to bring people together
- Variety of issues can be dealt with
- Ecosystem service part
  - Triple bottom line
  - Reducing subdivisions within groups

- Gets back to what the local people want, grassroots dialogue. It's place based, not "what Washington wants, its what the locals want"
- Local ownership – bottom-up
- Long-term benefits
- The focus on water quality and sustainable practices
- Locally-led concept
- Value-added
- It is not one size fits all
- Model can be linked to other groups
- Ability to compensate landowners
- Common vernacular
- Present-day economics and conservation
- Collaboration elements
- New exciting form of communication
- Social learning
- Brings in new players
- Opportunities for innovation

### *What is the value of Landcare?*

- Having local people benefit from their own actions
- Economic value/human health connection
- Building consensus
- Community buy-in
- Awareness of other organizations' activities – prevents duplication
- Capacity building
- Chance for different types of people to work together; urban-rural, farer-non-farmer, landowner-non-owner
- Everyone must see the benefit in order for it to be successful
- Identity with common ethic
- Behavior change – social context perspective
- Group engagement
- Provides more lasting change
  - Engages the people who own the problem
- Gives local folks the capacity to make money
- Motivates communities!
- The democracy element
- Helps retain value (\$) locally, leverages local economies
- Promotes a better conservation ethic
- Gets the word out to a different clientele
- Helps sustain profit in small enterprise
- Revisiting Leopold's land ethic which focuses on local capacity
- Facilitators provide a neutral bridge
- Self-help ethic, grassroots based
- Triple bottom line = higher ground
- Catalyst for "new way of doing things" – Jeffersonian democracy
- Portfolio of successes
- Can train a lot of people within the community to do Landcare (not rocket science)
- Apolitical
- Environmental values approached in a different way/fresh approach that doesn't raise political conflict
- Needs money but large budgets/staff are not needed to be effective
- Keeps flow of information moving – agencies-farm-universities-others
- Comprehensive – holistic – organic (not just conservation)
- Simplicity of concept – problem solving by local people – locals decide how to structure
- Effectiveness – efficiency of coordinated approach to agencies
- Fun! Social networking – fellowship – common cause
- Positive peer pressure and reward to do the right thing
- Elevates the importance of forestry and rural landowners

- Connects individuals to a larger purpose
- People who would not otherwise participate in government are attracted to Landcare – it gets them engaged – a new form of governance
- Uses appropriate technology as a tool
- Landowners can learn about and access programs in a non-threatening way
- Helps raise awareness in politicians about real needs and value of small landowners

### ***What opportunities does Landcare provide?***

- Incorporate Landcare into community events (informational fairs, festivals, etc.)
- Provides social networking – becomes a community event itself
- Landcare in the U.S. should be uniquely American
- Better communication – gets the ‘uses’ and ‘thems’ together
- Education – everyone shares the same resources
- Funding potential – corporate foundation
- Connecting land management to land conservation
- Intergenerational discussion
- Opportunities for “lasting” change
- Relevance for government
- Chance to become organizational umbrella
- Systemic Ecosystem approach
- Allows the community to dream
- Bigger picture planning process
- Includes employment which offers stability in the community
- Local participation which can provide cultural change and change in opinions
- Land stewardship from the ‘ground up’
- Legitimizes local opinion
- Re-builds sense of community
- Investment in local communities and localities
- Can provide Landcare approach to other initiatives (energy, local gov’t, etc.)
- Gives large land owners multiple opportunities to support/sustain themselves

### **Landcare Vision and Goals**

Each participant was able to contribute to four breakout groups organized as follows:

1) Your needs: What can Landcare provide to meet your organization’s goals? What general roles can and/or should your organization play in meeting those needs? What tools/resources can you provide?

2) What does Landcare need from state agencies and other partners? What general roles can and/or should your organization play in meeting those needs? What tools/resources can you provide?

3) What is needed to support Landcare growth? Where might funding be found?

4) What are distinctive vision and goals for Landcare that would make it complementary, not duplicative, of other programs? What specific strategies and actions are needed to meet those goals?

***1) Your needs: How can Landcare help you meet your goals?***

- DCR
  - Involving landowners – bringing them to the table – to make water quality changes
- DGIF
  - stream restoration/water quality improvements
  - working with Catawba Landcare which created a non-threatening environment to work and communicate with landowners
- VT Fish and Wildlife
  - Working landscapes better wildlife habitat
  - Landcare is a way to engage people who care about wildlife with sound science and information about wildlife
- Virginia Department of Forestry
  - From plan development to on ground management actions
- Local Government
  - Offers form of communication and path to the public
- Retired Professionals
  - Clarity of vision, purpose, and symbol/logo
  - Organizational structure
- VT Political Science
  - Observing/participating
- DCR
  - How does Landcare know what our goals are?
  - Help articulate goals in a meaningful way to the community
- District Conservationist
  - Standing on success of agriculture best management practice programs (+ impacts for agriculture and environment)
  - Marketing triple bottom line
- VCE
  - Partner/tool awareness
  - Better communication of VCE role with Landcare
- Non-Profit (watershed-related)
  - Landcare group that can help mission for implementation of BMPs and river stewardship – sustain and improve watershed together
- Collection of Groups
  - Landcare model for other initiatives to improve and sustain environment (energy Landcare/low carbon diet)
  - Environment and community initiatives
- International Landcare
  - Work with Landcare entities

*Roles/Tools/Resources*

- Grant Funding
  - Can universities administer accessed \$?
- People
  - Ongoing interaction with Landcare
- Data/Information
  - Provide as resources such as programs, tools, databases
- Technical Assistance
  - Design, permits, construction, cost share
- Educational Resources
- NGO
  - Fostering administration/assist Landcare in building administration capacity (grants, 501(c) 3, etc)
  - Supply of Landcare indicators of success
- Harness state purchasing power
  - Buffer programs, sustainable forestry programs, bidding out services for group
- For-Profit Conglomerate
  - Start and house local businesses
- Forum for increasing communication nodes
  - Help us work better to communicate conservation to public (in terms of public values – economics, tourism, etc.)
  - Using economic engine to stand on conservation benefits
- Guild Effect
- Landcare Clearinghouse
  - Use for consistent message
- Landcare is motivator through flexibility
- Training Opportunities
- Facilitators
- Bring New Partners To The Table
  - Advisory committees, roundtables, etc.
- Seed Local Landcare Groups
  - Landcare can help agencies/local government market their programs/staff/resources

### *Meeting “Our” Goals*

- Reaching non-traditional partners
- Landcare helps track economic development successes
- Quilting together various programs, people, and resources from various organizations
- Landcare provides opportunities to cross-cut initiatives
- Monitoring metrics (success)
- Landcare is greater efficiency and efficiency of programs
- Landcare provides forum for multiple agencies to partner and accomplish multiple initiatives
  - Encourage government and academic entities to integrate
  - Web of activity connected
- Landcare helps reach target market in economic development and tourism
- Cost-share programs
  - Landcare can be a catalyst for getting cost share assistance to community projects

### *What can Landcare do?*

- Can help market “to the issue”
- Can increase agency funding to implement programs/retain staff
- Help public learn about emergent issues
- Can be a pilot/test site for agency initiatives, technology/tools (Ex. New BMPs)
  - This can help create and demonstrate success
- Aggregator of ecosystem services
- Peer-to-peer information, everyone can ‘hear’ their neighbors message (rather than from an agency)
- It is cultural change to meet everyone’s goals – it matches top-downs with bottom-ups
- It is a movement that is active and accomplishes things
- Change the way we measure success
- Help us make change to create an improves sustainable planet
- Provide a “sense of place”
  - Campus Landcare groups?
  - Landcare intern program
- Tools – provide web support, wiki’s etc.
- Can be laboratories for community based learning (youth and retirees mentoring each other)

### ***2) What do Landcare groups need from supporting partners? What tools and resources (grants, other assistance) can these partners provide?***

- Establish a resources network (NRCS)
  - This will depend on the direction of each Landcare group
- Extension can provide resources to fill the ‘gaps’
- SWDC – figure out the best route – information & \$ referral – Call Back!!
- Landcare needs an idea of where to go and agencies can clarify perspective
  - How to ask the right question
  - From the beginning involve...
  - Facilitator leads, not agencies
  - They can offer positive relationship reinforcement
- Triple bottom line – pride, profit, pleasure for managing land
- DOF – working ‘state forests’
- NGO (PEC) – community event planning
  - Facilitator/collaborative
  - Already a member of the community
- EcoAg (Inside the beltway), some scale issues
  - Bring larger Landcare groups together
- RCD – organize grant \$
- \$ - compensated facilitator
  - Grants
  - Locally generated
  - Phased approach
  - Neutral organization as a trainer
  - Mentor the facilitator
- Revolving loan fund - \*\*simple process
  - Configure grants and other funding to accommodate Landcare
- Outside-in opportunities – grants look for tripe bottom line and multi-objective outcomes
- Agencies lobby for Landcare
- Education, peer-to-peer exchange
- National conference, 2008
- Local business support
  - Economic development opportunities at the local level
- Landcare clearly defined for name recognition

- Banks could serve as ‘revolving loan fund’, esp. local based ones
- Communities as “incubators of change”, public policy change

### 3) *What will help Landcare grow?*

- A crisis may be needed to spark growth – this has been the case for other Landcare groups forming
- Education
- Get local groups together
- Make it personal
- Cannot focus on larger messages and issues – must be smaller focus points
- Eliminate layers – needs to be ‘flat’
- Embrace groups that are Landcare-like
- Stories spread easily – create a fact sheet early!! This will help prevent the spread of incorrect information
- Provide Landcare information at meetings of agencies
- Can’t make a roadmap though, it depends on the community
- Utilize the media – local newspapers
- Create a social non-threatening environment for people to meet with agency representatives for information-sharing
- Bring back the barn raising
- Include a cross section of different people – various sector representation, farmers and not-farmers
- Submit newspaper articles to local papers about success stories
  - Catawba Landcare got recognition by sending out an article in local newsletter, “Landcare Coming to a Forest Near You”
- Community Readiness
- Be proactive vs. reactive; building consensus vs. resolving conflict
- Long term goal – local groups can raise funds by taking a percentage of product sales
- Private funders could provide seed money – this may be possible only if it can be demonstrated that partnerships have been formed and successes have occurred
- Identify communities that may need Landcare, “You might need Landcare if ...”
- Also identify communities that are already doing it but not calling it Landcare – this will help brand the movement and give sense of a common cause
- Have an umbrella group apply for grants and disseminate to smaller groups
- Have the Landcare Center document success stories
- Use case studies to attract communities to Landcare
- In country exchanges - possible money generation if people pay to visit local Landcare groups
- Make Thanksgiving the official Landcare holiday because of the food and community connection
- Use smaller issues and messages to spread the word about Landcare; let people know this is not reinventing the wheel and it does not require an exhausting commitment
- Mass advertising does not work – it must be small and personal (G. County Landcare) – use word of mouth, invitations to local meetings
- Train local-based facilitators
- Host “This is Landcare 101”, add to green infrastructure sessions at other events
- Tell community members that Landcare is a tool
- Agencies roles – know about Landcare first then give contact information and basic information to community members

- Growth depends on collective energy – not just the efforts of one area such as agriculture or forestry
- Promote Landcare in cities! Focus on consumers
- Spread the use of the Landcare symbol to get more recognition
- Identify local champions (local service providers will know who these are)
- Rotate meetings around the county to allow more people to attend
- Target local service providers to work with local community
  - Ag Extension
  - USDA
  - Dept. of Forestry

*What resources might help?*

- Local service providers (those that have capacity)
  - RC&D
  - HAP
  - Farm Bureau
  - Ag. Extension
  - Landgrant universities
  - Conservation districts – may have facilitation training and more freedom in schedule
- Share joint access to resources – facilitators, joint funds, information, political leverage
- Wiki website indexed by region, focus area such as forestry, etc. (multiple people in support of this)
  - Have people add success stories
  - Landcare universities could be the starting point for this
- Need more Jerry Moles
- Have people work with him to learn about process and facilitation
- Utilize facilitators to understand community perspective and make agency linkages
- Funding can come from foundations, local business, and corporations (branding will be needed first as well as a set of principles) \*\*What steps would come first in the process of seeking funding?
- Look for forums and annual meetings to present on Landcare
- Community colleges may allow us to reach more people that plan to stick around the community
- Look at the Chicago Wilderness model (structure could be adopted by Landcare)
- Take advantage of existing organizations
- Build alliances

***4) What are the distinctive vision and goals for Landcare that would make it complimentary, not duplicative, of other programs?***

- Civic re-engagement – N.E. town meeting
- Sense of community
- Reconnect
- Garden of Eden
- Facilitator – circuit rider – traffic cop – encyclopedia – umbilical cords
- People – driven, people – started
- Place-driven
- Connecting with related groups – communicate
- Neighbor scale
- State/federal/local support – begin with corporate first – legitimacy, buy-in
- Local people believe in it
- Focus on resource issues

- Changing in people's perspective how people relate: building capacity – individual, community institutional
- Barriers down: resource reps as people
- Link LC with Thanksgiving
- Includes youth
- Well-tended garden
- Include consumers
- Includes climate care as adjunct – decentralizing energy, food systems, economies
- Prosperity
- “The Right Gear” – locals know
- Identify with something bigger – micro-macro

*What specific strategies and actions are needed to meet those goals?*

- Developing facilitators
- Building government support – state vision needed?
- National branding?
- Private sector support – begin with people first – business function – nautilus – involve locally
- Develop marketing in all places urban – tv show – broadened awareness – broader connections – target consumers too – by consumption you can be a partner

#### *Facilitator Qualities*

- Local
- Knowledgeable
- Organizer – BBQ
- Animator
- Conservation districts – business – RC&D – universities/colleges
- Who chooses? Local champions
- Developing facilitator – training – by doing – mentoring-Peace Corps/Americorps [like “County Stewards”]
- Define skill sets
- Host? C.O.G., NGO land trusts, regional council (PDC)

### **De-briefing Session**

Participants concluded the Summit with an evaluation and expressed gratitude and support for continued work. Specific items included the following:

#### **Positive features of the Summit**

- Networking
- Starting with stories
- Interactive work sessions with facilitators
- Facility
- Food

#### **Items to change about the Summit**

- Include a field trip
- Include more landowners
- Capture information in real time (laptops)
- Add in more fun! Square dance!
- Allow for more planning time
- Serve local wine

## Appendix B

### Participant List

A. Ozzie	Abaye	Associate Professor	Virginia Tech
Greg	Anderson	Water Monitoring Manager	VA DEQ
Sibel	Atasoy	Economic Development	Office of Economic Development
Julie	Aulrich		Institute for Environmental Negotiation
Adrienne	Averett	Senior Water Supply Planner	Department of Environment Quality
Russ	Baxter	Deputy Director	Department of Conservation and Recreation
Peter	Bella	Director Natural Resources	Alamo Area Council of Governments
Laura	Belleville	Regional Director	Southwest & Central Virginia Office
		Area Specialist, Community Viability	
Eric	Bendfeldt		Virginia Cooperative Extension
William	Bennett	Stream Restoration Biologist	VA Dept. of Game and Inland Fisheries
Dale	Black		
Gary	Boring	RC + D Coordinator	New River - Highland RC + D
Britt	Boucher		Foresters, Inc.
Danny	Boyer	President	Grayson LandCare
Hal	Brockman	National Program Manager	US Forest Service, Cooperative Forestry
Louise	Buck	Senior Extension Associate	Cornell University
James	Burger	Professor	Virginia Tech
Harold	Burkhart	Professor & Department Head	Virginia Tech
		Director, Planning & Economic Dev.	
Mark	Burrows	Assistant State Conserv. For Prog	Transylvania County
Kenneth	Carter		USDA-NRCS
Jim	Chamberlain	Forest Products Technologist	USDA Forest Service - National Agroforestry Center
Rebecca	Coleman	Senior Advisor	Congressman Rick Boucher
Faye	Cooper		
		Graduate Student at Virginia Tech	
Valerie	Cowden		Grayson LandCare
Krystal	Coxon	Watershed Field Coordinator	Department of Conservation and Recreation
Mary	Dail	Environmental Engineer, Sr.	VA Department of Environmental Quality
Thomas	DeMoss		US EPA Highland Action Program
Rich	Duesterhaus	Senior Advisor	NACD
Frank	Dukes	Director	Inst for Environmental Negotiation-UVA
John	Eckman	Executive	Valley Conservation Council
Jonah	Fogel	Community Viability Specialist	Virginia Cooperative Extension
J.		Deputy Director of Soil & Water Conserv.	
Michael	Foreman	Conservation Management Institute	Virginia Department of Conservation & Recreation
Christy	Gabbard		Virginia Tech
Frank	Garman		Catawba LandCare
Louise	Garman		Catawba LandCare
Robert	Giles, Jr.		
Tom	Greene	District Conservationist	USDA NRCS
Harry	Groot	CEO	Blue Ridge Forest Cooperative
Carola	Haas	Associate Professor	Virginia Tech
Cynthia	Hancock	District Manager	Skyline Soil and Water Conservation District
Charlotte	Hanes		

Peggy	Harwood	National Program Manager	USDA Forest Service
Bruce	Hull	Professor	Virginia Tech
Roberta	Jeanquart	executive director	National Association of RC&D Councils
William	Jenkins	Assoicate Director Highlands Action Program Liaison- MD	EPA-Region III
Paul	Kazyak		Maryland Dept Natural Resources
Mike	Kelly	Professor and Dean	Virginia Tech
Courtney	Kimmel	Graduate Student	Virginia Tech
David	Lowe		
Derek	Lyall	Project Manager	Office of Congressman Rick Boucher
Ken	McFadyen	Executive Director National Sustainable Development Coord	New River Community Partners
Ruth	McWilliams		USDA Forest Service
Gary	Mitchell	Design Engineering	Nautilus, Inc.
Susan	Mitchell	Design Engineering Consulting Director of Land Stewardship	Nautilus, Inc.
Jerry	Moles	Former Deputy Secretary of US Dept Of Ag	New River Land Trust
Jim	Moseley		Farmer
Ron	Nalley	Town Administrator	Town of Montreat
Spencer	Neale	Sr. Assistant Director	Virginia Farm Bureau Federation
Elizabeth	Obenshain	Executive Director	New River Land Trust
Ellen	Reynolds	Executive Director Co-Chair of the '25x'25 Initiative	Beagle Ridge Herb Farm and Education Center
Bill	Richards		Farmer
David	Richert	RC&D Forester	Virginia Department of Forestry
David	Robertson	Director, Landcare Center Tourism Development Specialist	Virginia Tech
Randall	Rose		VA Tourism Corporation
George	Santucci	Executive Director	National Committee for the New River
Stephen	Schoenholtz		Virginia Tech
Laura	Schweitzer	Director of Forest Policy Associate Dean for Engagement Conservation Management Institute	American Forests
Robert	Smith		Virginia Tech
Glen	Stevens		Virginia Tech
Ed	Stoots	Regional Forester	Virginia Department of Forestry
Ariela	Summit		
Peggy	Tadej	Director of Research and Grants	National Association of Regional Councils
O'Neil	Tate	Commissioner	Town of Montreat
Scott	Tate	Community Viability Specialist	Virginia Cooperative Extension
Taphne	Volinskus		Davis-Bourne Inn
Jeff	Waldon	Executive Director	Conservation Management Institute, VA Tech
Bill	Wilson		
Faren	Wolter	Land Conservation Officer	Piedmont Environmental Council

## Appendix C

### 2007 National Landcare Workshop **SCHEDULE OF EVENTS**

**Venue:** Virginia Tech Skelton Conference Center, Blacksburg, Virginia

#### **Monday, October 1**

12:00 - 1:15	Registration
1:15 – 1:30	Welcome & Opening Comments
1:30 – 3:00	Community Landcare - the Local Perspective (Session A)
3:00 – 3:20	Break
3:20 – 3:40	Landcare Center
3:40 – 5:00	Landcare Networking, Value & Opportunities (Workgroup Session I)
5:00	Announcements
6:30 – 8:30	Dinner

#### **Tuesday, October 2:**

8:15 – 10:00	Landcare in the United States & Beyond (Session B)
10:00 – 10:20	Break
10:20 – 12:00	Sustainable Landcare Systems (Session C)
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 2:00	Forest Landcare & Green Infrastructure (Session D)
2:00 – 2:20	Break
2:20 – 5:00	Landcare Vision & Goals (Workgroup Session II)
5:00	Announcements
6:30 – 8:30	Dinner

#### **Wednesday, October 3:**

8:00 - 11:45	Building & Supporting the Landcare Movement (Workgroup Session III)
11:45 – noon	Workshop closing comments

## Session A

### **Community Landcare: The Local Perspective** (Monday, Oct. 1, 1:30 – 3:00)

The purpose of this session is to provide an overview of local landcare initiatives being developed in Virginia and North Carolina and, based on local successes, to identify needs and opportunities for state and federal agency and NGO participation and support.

#### Introduction (5 minutes)

Faye Cooper: Introduce the topic, purpose, and speakers (set the stage)

#### Presentations

Beth Obenshain (10 minutes) - The Land Connection: Why is conserving land not enough to maintain working lands and an economically vital rural community? What is the role of land trusts in the landcare movement?

Jerry Moles - Grayson LandCare

Christy Gabbard - Catawba LandCare

Mark Burrows - Land-of-Sky and Montreat Landcare

(20 minutes each – 60 minutes total)

- describe respective community landcare initiatives, including history, structure and successes
- discuss goals, challenges and opportunities
- reflections on the future of landcare from a local perspective
- who are the vital partners?

#### Questions & Discussion (15 minutes)

## Session B

### **Landcare in the United States & Beyond** (Tuesday, Oct. 2, 8:15 – 10:00)

Introduction and overview of session – Rich Duesterhaus (moderator)

#### Part I: International Landcare

Two brief overviews of the progress of the International Landcare Movement and the opportunities for Landcare in the future.

Jim Moseley – Will share insights gained from his participation in International activities on how Landcare as a movement could benefit many countries.

David Lowe – Will provide an overview of international Landcare developments and thus offer a framework for the workshop participants to consider in developing local, state, regional, and national Landcare efforts.

#### Part II: Landcare in the United States

Bill Wilson – Will share some of the recent Landcare History in the U.S as well as how three organizations here in called MOU organizations each see the importance of building Landcare from the local level.

Ruth McWilliams – Will share USDA approaches over the last few years to cultivate Landcare and sustainable efforts throughout the USA.

Tom DeMoss – Will share an overview of the Highlands Action Program and how it can be an example of a regional Landcare effort.

#### Questions from the Audience (15 minutes)

## Session C

### **Sustainable Landcare Systems** (Tuesday, Oct. 2, 10:20 – noon)

The purpose of this session is to learn about the challenges and opportunities for implementing landcare practices on private lands in the United States, especially recent successes on the part of landcare partners in southwest Virginia who are developing integrated landcare systems for the sustainable production and consumption of food, fiber, energy, water, scenery and related natural resources.

#### Introduction and Overview (5 minutes)

David Robertson (moderator) - Description of session and introduction of panelists

#### Presentations (75 minutes)

Danny Boyer – Challenges and opportunities of sustainable land management in southwest Virginia

Britt Boucher – Economics and biology of whole-farm and area-wide landcare planning and management

Harry Groot – Blue Ridge Forest Cooperative (BRFC): a member-owned forest landcare business

Gary Mitchell – Grayson Natural Foods, LLC – owned by producers, processing and marketing premium products for producers

Taphne Volinskus – Economic development through eco and agri-tourism

Jeff Waldon – Creating sustainable landcare systems for Virginia and beyond

#### Questions & Discussion (20 minutes)

## Session D

### **Forest Landcare & Green Infrastructure** (Tuesday, Oct. 2, 12:45 - 2:00)

The purpose of this session is to illustrate opportunities and challenges of coordinating Landcare (LC) and Green Infrastructure (GI) efforts by examining a local example and situating it in a national context.

#### Introduction and Overview (5 minutes)

Bruce Hull – Managing the Green Infrastructure with LandCare. The confluence of two successful conservation strategies.

#### Presentations (10-15 minutes each, 45 minutes total)

Abi Convery – Illustrating GI using a New River Valley example, with emphasis on opportunities and challenges created by the forest care.

David Richert – Challenges and opportunities of creating the forest landcare industry needed to restore and sustain the Green Infrastructure. Examples of local efforts and the reasons behind them.

Harry Groot – Illustration of forest landcare management practices that care for and restore the Green Infrastructure: low impact harvesting, restorative forestry, removal of exotics, habitat enhancement, water protection, and more.

#### Response and Perspective (5 minutes each; 15 minutes total)

Bill Jenkins – The relationship between GI & LC. The role state government plays in setting the stage for local and regional land planning.

Peggy Tadej – Perspective gained from Landcare/GI projects involving Regional Councils the Landcare/GI Memorandum of Understanding.

Peggy Harwood – The role of federal and state government in setting the stage for local and regional land planning that provides the framework and support for successful local landcare groups.

#### A question or two from the audience (time permitting)

## Presenter Bios

**Danny Boyer** is a Soil Conservation Technician with the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service in Galax, Virginia and farm owner-operator. Danny has twenty-eight years experience in the Conservation field in planning and implementing conservation practices with particular emphasis on grassland management. He has extensive experience in planning, managing, and promoting intensive grazing systems and the installation of required infrastructure for efficient operation. Danny currently serves on a variety of boards and committees, as a resource and/or as a member. These are both internal and external to NRCS and involve many volunteer hours. Some of Danny's activities include having served on the Board of Directors of the Virginia Forage and Grassland Council, advisor to the Carroll Grayson Cattle Producers Association, Chair of the Grayson County Extension Leadership Council, Advisor for Galax High School Agricultural Council, past president of Grayson County Farm Bureau, Co- Chair of Grayson LandCare- Livestock Committee, Chair of the Crops Committee of Southwest Virginia Agricultural Association. Over the last few years, Danny has been involved with several case studies on the impacts, both economic and environmental, of Managed Grazing Systems, including Beef Stocker, Beef Cow-Calf and Grazing Dairies.

**Mark Burrows** is the Planning and Economic Development Director for Transylvania County, NC. He has been employed by the County since 1990 when he was hired as the County's first Planning Director. Prior to that he worked for the US Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, DC and US Congressman (now Senator) Bill Nelson from Florida. He has an undergraduate degree in Economics from Wake Forest University and a Masters in Environmental Studies from Duke University. Mark is very involved in his community and region and is a board member of Land-of-Sky Regional Council, AdvantageWest – a 23 county economic development organization and the Asheville Regional Housing Consortium. As a Land-of-Sky Board member and a planner, Mark was invited to attend the 2004 Queensland LandCare conference in Toowoomba, Australia. Subsequently, he has helped advocate the principles of LandCare in Transylvania County by helping the county create a Community Appearance Commission to address environmental issues related to accumulated junk. He has also worked with Land-of-Sky to promote the LandCare philosophy region wide. Mark enjoys the outdoors, often trout fishing, camping and hiking in the Pisgah National Forest (located 2 miles from his home) and is an avid mountain trail jogger. His wife, Betsy Burrows, teaches English at Brevard College and they have two teenagers who can now out jog him on the mountain trails.

**Faye Cooper** - For more than 27 years, Faye Crawford Cooper has worked in the field of land conservation and natural resource protection. In the 1980s serving as Director of Stewardship with the Virginia Chapter of The Nature Conservancy, she coordinated the protection and management of Conservancy-owned natural areas statewide. In 1990 she was a founding member and eventually the executive director of the Valley Conservation Council, a private land trust that promotes land use policies and conservation methods that protect the natural and cultural resources of the Shenandoah Valley region. More recently she served as the Shenandoah Valley regional manager for the Virginia Outdoors Foundation, a state supported land trust that promotes the conservation of open space and holds interest in conservation

easements on more than 400,000 acres of open space lands throughout the Commonwealth. Faye currently works for the VA Department of Conservation and Recreation serving as the Virginia Liaison for the Mid-Atlantic Highlands Action Program, an initiative launched in 2006 to build partnerships that conserve and restore the natural resources of the Appalachian highlands. Faye is a graduate of Randolph-Macon Woman's College and the University of Virginia.

**Christy Gabbard** works at the Conservation Management Institute where she plays a key role in development and management of projects related to land use and water quality. Current projects include a statewide Biomass Initiative, the development of the LandCare Center, Coordinator for Catawba LandCare, and the New River Valley Green Infrastructure project. Christy serves as Vice President of the New River Land Trust and is on the board of the New River Watershed Roundtable.

**Harry Groot** - CEO Blue Ridge Forest Cooperative, Inc. Involved in three SARE producer grants as a participant and provided oversight for two others working with the Virginia Association of Biological Farming. He has also had management responsibility for grants from the Alfred P Sloan Foundation, the Ford Foundation, Appalachian Regional Commission, and Virginia's Center for Innovative Technology. Mr. Groot, a registered Professional Engineer in Virginia and Ohio, spent the first 22 years of his career in engineering and management positions in industry, private practice, and public service. In private and public practice he completed competitiveness enhancement projects for over 150 manufacturers. In 1998 he founded Next Generation Woods, Inc., formerly an FSC certified producer. Mr. Groot has held the rank of Assistant Professor in the Virginia Community College system, served four years as Virginia's Director for the Consortium for Manufacturing Competitiveness, and has served on Virginia's Industrial Competitiveness Task Force. Mr. Groot and his wife operate a diversified family farm that has marketed value added agricultural and forest products since 1977.

**Bruce Hull** - Professor of Social Ecology in the Department of Forestry in the College of Natural Resources at Virginia Tech. Previously on the faculty at University of Melbourne (Australia) and Texas A&M University. Works towards collaborative conservation and advises public and private forest-focused groups, including the Model Forest Policy Program, Southern Group of State Foresters, Forest Issues Working Group, Southern Forest Roundtable, and the LandCare Center. He is author of numerous publications, including the recent book, *Infinite Nature*, by University of Chicago Press.

**David Lowe** has over 20 years of experience in international development, natural resource conservation, and public engagement in a wide range of institutional arenas including government, non-profit, education, and research institutions. He has served the USDA, USFS, USAID and US Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. In Kenya he directed the Indigenous Food Plants Program for the National Museums of Kenya, including extensive field research, and was Research Associate to the Director. More recently, David developed 100 field research projects worldwide as Program Director for Life Sciences at Earthwatch Institute over eight years. He currently consults for land and biodiversity conservation and energy efficiency causes closer to home in Boston. Of relevance to Landcare, much of David's work has focused on

collaborative and voluntary ventures—co-founding a student-run meal plan cooperative as an undergraduate; helping grow a rural Kenyan high school as a Peace Corps Volunteer science teacher; co-founding two ex-Peace Corps Volunteer groups; helping establish a semester abroad ecological research program in Madagascar; and following a 2004 US tour of Landcare in Australia and South Africa became a founding member of the Landcare International Steering Committee.

**Elizabeth Obenshain** - Since helping to start the New River Land Trust five years ago, Beth has worked with the Virginia Outdoors Foundation and the Virginia Department of Forestry to protect 19,700 acres in Virginia's New River region. She also serves as chairman of VaULT, the statewide organization of land trusts. Before working with the Land Trust, she had a 30-year career in journalism, starting at the Richmond Times-Dispatch and then retiring as an editor and editorial writer at The Roanoke Times. She lives on the family farm in Blacksburg and is now preparing for the farm's first timber harvest in over 60 years. She and a brother have placed a conservation easement on their great-grandfather's farm and historic house in Botetourt County.

**Ruth McWilliams** is a native of New York State. She was raised on a family-owned dairy farm along the St. Lawrence River in the heart of the Thousand Islands region. Ruth plus her husband and son continue to have family-related interests in northern New York, including a forest-based business inside the Adirondack Park. She earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Human Ecology from Cornell University in 1976. In graduate school she focused on public policy, obtaining a Master of Science degree in consumer economics from the University of Maryland in 1978. Since 1978, Ruth has worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture – working for 3 different agencies in 3 different mission areas (rural development, marketing and inspection, and natural resources). In November 1989, Ruth joined the Forest Service where she now serves as the National Sustainable Development Coordinator. Prior to her current assignment, Ruth worked for more than 10 years in Cooperative Forestry. Ruth's background and experiences give her a strong foundation and a broad, yet pragmatic understanding of Federal policies, programs, and practices related to sustainable development from varying perspectives.

**Gary Mitchell** is a life long resident of Grayson County, Virginia. He is a graduate of Virginia Tech, part-time beef cattle farmer, Vice president Grayson LandCare, and board member of Grayson Natural Foods, LLC.

**Jerry A. Moles** is the Consulting Director of Stewardship for the New River Land Trust. He also serves as the Chair of the Boards of the Blue Ridge Forest Cooperative and the NeoSynthesis Research Centre (Sri Lanka) and is a board member of the International Analog Forestry Network and of EcoEra, the owner of more than 2,000 hectares of pristine tropical forest in Costa Rica. In co-founding the NeoSynthesis Research Centre, he contributed to land management schemes now practices in 17 countries. Jerry guided the mediation between the timber industry and the environmental community over the implementation of the Endangered Species Act (spotted owl) in the NW 8 counties of California and was a founding board member of the Watershed Research & Training Center in Hayfork, California, a precedent setting example of community forestry in the midst of a major national forest. Jerry received his doctorate from Stanford

University (cultural ecology -- anthropology), taught at the Davis and Berkeley campuses of the University of California, Stanford University, and Pomona College and served as consultant to Save-the- Redwoods League on the creation of a master plan to protect the redwoods forevermore.

**Jim Moseley** was sworn in as the deputy secretary by Agriculture Secretary Ann M. Veneman on July 17, 2001. As the deputy secretary, Moseley oversaw the day-to-day activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, one of the largest and most diverse departments in the federal government. USDA's mission includes the management of traditional farm programs, private lands conservation, domestic food assistance, agriculture research and education, agricultural marketing, international trade, meat and poultry inspection, forestry, and rural development programs. Prior to this appointment, Moseley, an Indiana farmer with 32 years of hands-on farm experience, was the owner of Ag Ridge Farms, which specializes in grains, and managing partner of Infinity Pork, LLC, which raises hogs. Both are located in Clarks Hill, Ind. In recognition of his service and commitment to agriculture, he was voted the National Outstanding Young Farmer of America for 1982. Moseley was born in Peru, Ind. He holds a Bachelor of Science degree in horticulture from Purdue University in West Lafayette, Ind. Moseley has also served in a number of international roles most recently providing assistance to the Afghanistan government.

**David Richert** - Resource Conservation & Development Forester with the Virginia Department of Forestry, and offers technical forestry assistance to the 3 RC&D Councils in Western Virginia, including the New River-Highlands RC&D Council. David earned Master of Science and Bachelor of Science Degrees in Forestry at Virginia Tech during the 1990's, and started working for the Virginia Department of Forestry in 2005. Prior to his employment with the Virginia Department of Forestry, David was a natural areas steward with the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage for 3.5 years. David is a Certified Forester and an active SAF member with an interest in community forest management.

**David Robertson** serves on the faculty in the College of Natural Resources and Department of Political Science at Virginia Tech where he teaches graduate courses and conducts research and outreach projects on sustainable forestry and collaborative natural resource management. David has also served on the faculty of Boston University, Lynchburg College, International Honors Program, and Yestermorrow School. He works with a number of local and regional civic organizations including as a director of the Blue Ridge Forest Cooperative and the Greater Lynchburg Environmental Network and steering committee member of the Middle James Roundtable. David's international experience includes work in India, South Africa, Brazil, Tanzania, England and France. His publications appear in the popular, academic, and professional press. Since 2006, David has served as the director of the Landcare Center, working with numerous local, national, and international partners to build the capacity of the landcare movement in Virginia and beyond.

**Bill Wilson**, from Kinta, Oklahoma, was an officer of the National Association of Conservation Districts (NACD) for four years before being elected President. His experience at NACD goes back to 1994 when he was elected to represent Oklahoma on the NACD Council and later on the NACD

Board of Directors. He was elected president of the Oklahoma Association of Conservation Districts in 1994. He has served as a district official for the Haskell County Conservation District since 1980. Wilson is a founder and president of the National Watershed Coalition. He owns and operates a 650-acre cow/calf, horse and mule ranch in East Central Oklahoma. He is also a registered land surveyor in Oklahoma and Arkansas. He has worked many years to restore Dust Bowl era farm fields into productive pasture land. Conservation practices include grazing and nutrient management, tree planting, erosion control drainage structures, cross fencing, and sediment collection structures to improve water quality. Bill currently serves as Past President on NACD's Executive Board and has been asked to serve as NACD ambassador to the Landcare Movement.

**Bill Richards**, a Circleville, Ohio, farmer and former chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service is current co-chair of the '25 x'25 renewable energy initiative. He is an innovator in farm conservation systems and practices on his home operation as well as a spokesman for improved tillage practices. He serves as a guest lecturer at Ohio State University. He has written extensively about conservation tillage and related subjects for many national publications. He has created a unique partnership with wildlife groups and state and federal agencies on his Ohio farming operation.

**Taphne Volinskus** grew up with the proverbial path through the woods to Grandma's house in rural Tennessee. Her education has been life experience augmented with reading, surrounding herself with intelligent, educated people and an occasional class or seminar. Taphne has a can-do attitude and rarely accepts that something she believes in can't be done. She works to inspire the entrepreneurial spirit in others whether it is someone with a great picture book idea or a new downtown business. At this juncture of life, Taphne is one of the owner/operators of the Davis-Bourne Inn and Journey's End Restaurant in Independence, VA. Chairperson of Grayson LandCare's Tourism and Publicity and of the Town of Independence Special Events committee as well as a team member of the town businessman's association and the county tourism board, Taphne spends her "free" time networking and pulling together of resources and groups to improve Independence and, in turn, Grayson County. Taphne would love to find more time to hike, canoe, garden and write and loves to take the road less traveled.

## **The Facilitation Team**

The 2007 National Landcare Workshop was designed to be an interactive event with opportunities for planning collaborative next steps for the landcare partners. A team of professional facilitators will lead the workshop participants through a series of three workgroup sessions.

**Frank Dukes**, Ph.D., directs the Institute for Environmental Negotiation at the University of Virginia. He has worked at local, state, and federal levels on projects involving environment and land use, community development, education, and health. He founded the Community-Based Collaboratives Research Consortium and is co-founder and core faculty of the Virginia Natural Resources Leadership Institute. His *Resolving Public Conflict: Transforming Community and Governance* describes how conflict resolution can assist in strengthening democracy. He is also co-author of *Reaching for Higher Ground in Conflict Resolution*, which describes how diverse groups and communities can create expectations for addressing conflict with integrity, vision, and creativity.

**Adrienne Averett** is a senior water supply planner with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. She has undergraduate degrees in Fisheries Science and Geology from Virginia Tech and graduate coursework in Water Resources Policy and Planning. She has eight years of water resource management experience. Post-graduation, she spent four years at Virginia Tech as the project coordinator for the North Fork Shenandoah Instream Flow Study where she gained valuable experience in stream habitat modeling, water resource planning, and watershed management. Additional experience includes aquatic biology and habitat assessments for the Freshwater Mussel Conservation Center and the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Recently, she facilitated strategic planning environmental forums for the Greater Lynchburg Environmental Network (GLEN); meeting outcomes included expanded network partnerships and the formation of GLEN public relations and community sustainable development committees.

**Michael Foreman** is currently Deputy Director of the Division of Soil and Water with the Department of Conservation and Recreation. Previous to this, Mike was with the Department of Forestry for 21 years working in water quality and land conservation. Mike is a trained facilitator since the mid 1980's and currently teaches the leadership portion of the Virginia Natural Resources Leadership Institute. Mike holds a Master of Forestry degree from Duke University.

**Julie Aulrich** is a second year graduate student in University of Virginia's Urban and Environmental Planning program. She is currently working as a Graduate Associate at the Institute for Environmental Negotiation for the 2007-2008 academic year. She has an undergraduate degree in environmental engineering and has worked on a number of conservation projects throughout and after college. An interest in urban planning led her to Portland, Oregon where she worked for the City's Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI) for three years. Focusing on public involvement and participation in her role at ONI, she worked with many different community organizations to help clean up the Willamette River which runs through downtown Portland.

## Acknowledgements

The 2007 National Landcare Workshop was first proposed to the partners of US Landcare by the Virginia Landcare Leadership Team at a meeting in Washington, DC on July 20, 2007. A National Landcare Leadership Team was formed to help organize and support the workshop. Planning of the workshop has been a collaborative effort on the part of many individuals and organizations, a few of which are listed on the program cover and below.

The workshop organizers would like to thank the organizations identified on the cover and those listed below for the generous financial, staff, or other support they provided to make this workshop possible:

- US Department of Agriculture
  - Forest Service
  - Natural Resources Conservation Service
  - Rural Development
  - National Agroforestry Center
- Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
- Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
- Institute for Environmental Negotiation
- Virginia Soybean Growers Association
- Virginia Peanut Growers Association

Workshop organizers include:

- Rich Duesterhaus, National Association of Conservation Districts
- Peggy Tadej, National Association of Regional Councils
- Roberta Jeanquart, National Association of RC&D Councils
- Bill Richards, Richards Farms
- Tom DeMoss, EPA Highlands Action Program
- Peggy Harwood, USDA Forest Service
- David Lowe, Landcare International
- David Robertson, Landcare Center at Virginia Tech
- Jerry Moles, Grayson LandCare and New River Land Trust
- Christy Gabbard, Catawba LandCare
- Jeff Waldon, Conservation Management Institute at Virginia Tech
- Bruce Hull, Department of Forestry at Virginia Tech
- Faye Cooper, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
- Harry Groot, Blue Ridge Forest Cooperative
- Ozzie Abaye, Crop and Soil Environmental Science at Virginia Tech
- Abigail Convery, New River Valley Planning District Commission
- Stephen Schoenholtz, Virginia Water Resources Research Center

*Note: A final report will be prepared and distributed to all workshop participants. If you would like a copy of the report or any other information regarding the 2007 National Landcare Workshop or the landcare movement in general, please contact the Landcare Center at [landcare@vt.edu](mailto:landcare@vt.edu).*