

# Examining Washington's Working Forest Stakeholders

November 2, 2005

**Peter Nelson**

*Graduate Student*

Social Systems and Natural Resources  
College of Forest Resources/Evans School of Public Affairs  
University of Washington  
Box 352100  
Seattle WA 98195-2100  
[peter@u.washington.edu](mailto:peter@u.washington.edu)



University of Washington  
College of Forest Resources  
Northwest Environmental Forum  
Box 352100  
Seattle, Washington 98195-2100

Published November 2005

This paper is part of a series of discussion papers written to provide background information on salient issues identified as important by participants at the *Saving Washington's Working Forest Land Base* forum in November 2004.

## **Abstract**

The conversion of working forests to other uses has emerged as an issue in Washington forest policy. This paper: 1) identifies and broadly characterizes the primary stakeholders involved in the Working Forest Forum, 2) explores some of the values at stake in the forest conversion issue, and 3) advances a possible explanation for current collaborative efforts within the working forest conversion network.

## **The Stakeholders**

Stakeholders are defined as those with an interest, or stake, in the conversion of working forests. This paper focuses on the *primary* stakeholders involved in the conversion issue, those organizations and institutions that have been directly involved in forest policy in Washington. Stakeholders are groupings include: 1) Governmental natural resource agencies, 2) conservation-oriented organizations, 3) industrial private landowners, 4) non-industrial private landowners, 5) organizations that represent the interests of forest landowners, 6) financial institutions, 7) the University of Washington and other academic institutions, 8) Native American tribes, and 9) others.

## **Stakeholder Values**

Stakeholder values are defined as unique bundles of interests and concerns that are “at-stake” with regard to the conversion issue. Stakeholder values are categorized as those involving ecological, economic and social components. Ecological values include ecosystem components provided by working forests such as wildlife, biological diversity, and habitat, as well as ecosystem services such as water filtration, soil productivity, and carbon sequestration. Economic values include financial benefits provided by working forests that accrue to a range of individuals and institutions. Economic benefits are passed on to society in broader terms in the form of jobs and other values. There is also an economic motivation to *convert* working forests. Working forest conversion is partially driven by the significant economic benefits realized by landowners and other stakeholders who choose to capitalize on high real-estate prices and other development values. Social values are characterized as those that contribute to community or individual benefit from a non-market, non-ecological perspective. Social values include timber related jobs in rural communities, “rural lifestyle”, aesthetics, and recreation.

## **From Zero to Positive Sum?**

This section suggests a transition from a policy model based on conflict and zero sum calculations (i.e., winners and losers) to a new policy model based on collaboration and positive sum possibilities (i.e., gradients of winners). The section proposes that the conversion problem has prompted some adversarial stakeholders to consider collaboration rather than conflict. As a response to the overarching conversion threat, stakeholders undertake collaborative policy-making processes that seek to *re-frame* the conceptualization of traditional values and tradeoffs. The new model seeks to incorporate market-based compensatory mechanisms for the private provision of public goods.

## I. Introduction

The conversion of working forests to other uses has emerged as an issue in Washington forest policy. The issue now appears on governmental, non-governmental, and private agendas, and has driven the formation of the Working Forest Forum (Forum). Forest land conversion is driven by multiple factors, including growing populations<sup>1</sup>, changing demographics of Washington residents, unintended economic consequences of existing regulations, shifting forest land ownership patterns, and dramatic changes in land use values.

This paper seeks to examine how the conversion of working forests impacts the values of key stakeholders. The paper proposes that working forests provide a range of public and private values, or benefits, for a range of stakeholders. Thus, conversion of working forests to other uses can threaten certain stakeholder values. Yet, conversion can also bring benefits, financial and otherwise, to other sets of stakeholders. This paper seeks to explore the complex relationship between working forest conversion and stakeholder values.

With the belief that knowledge and understanding can lead to more efficient processes and outcomes within the Forum, this paper will address the following questions:

- Who are the key stakeholders in the working forest issue network?
- What types of benefits do working forests provide? What types of values are at stake due to the conversion of working forests?
- What is driving Forum collaboration on the conversion issue, and what are the implications of that collaboration?

This paper addresses these overarching questions through a three-part discussion. The first section identifies and broadly characterizes the primary stakeholders involved in the Forum. The second section explores some of the values at stake in the forest conversion issue, generally framed as social, economic, and ecological values within a public/private benefit context. Values surrounding regulations and private property rights are discussed in this section as well. As a conclusion (and a leaping off point for further discussion) the third section advances a possible explanation for current collaborative efforts within the working forest conversion network.

The paper will *not* attempt to assign particular values, interests, or positions to specific stakeholders, given the lack of primary data (i.e., surveys or interviews). Secondary data is employed to inform the discussion, in the form of the written proceedings of the November 2004 Forum meeting. Comments from participants characterize the sentiments and attributes of certain

---

<sup>1</sup> In the 1990's the population of Washington grew by over 800,000 (WACTED 2005). Population growth led to rising demand for land and urbanization in traditionally rural areas once dominated by working forests and agriculture lands. State population is expected to rise by one million over the next decade (Burrows 2000). As population grows and demand for urban uses increases, forest values in some places may drop dramatically in comparison to real-estate values. One report cites a ratio of over 100:1 between real-estate values and forest values in western Washington (Alig and Plantinga 2004). Washington has lost roughly 2 million acres of private forestland to non-forest uses since the 1930s. Between 1982 and 1997 roughly 260,000 acres of forestland were converted to non-forest uses, an average of approximately 17,500 acres per year. Between 1992 and 1997 an average of 21,000 acres of forestland were converted per year. (WADNR 2005).

stakeholders. In the future, if the Forum participants' deem it worthwhile, further investigation could shed more light on the particular values and interests of particular stakeholders. For now, stakeholders can identify their own values or others from the general discussion provided.

## II. The Stakeholders

Stakeholders are defined as those with an interest, or stake, in the conversion of working forests. Under this definition, all the residents of Washington could be considered legitimate stakeholders, as the conversion of forest land has the potential to affect all of us. Indeed, given the forces of globalization and the multiple socio-ecological dimensions of environmental problems, the conversion of Washington's working forests has the potential to affect people in other states and regions.

However, the focus in this paper will be on the *primary* stakeholders involved in the conversion issue, those organizations and institutions that have been directly involved in forest policy in Washington, and that for the most part have been involved in the Forum. Traditional groupings based on caucus type, as were used, for example, in negotiations over the State Forest Practices Act, are reflected here. A discussion of some relatively new actors to the network, the Timber Investment Management Organizations (TIMOs), is also included.

It should be noted that while grouping stakeholders can be useful, it can also be problematic. Grouping can provide us with a relatively simple way of discussing similar organizations and institutions involved in an issue. On the other hand, it can result in overly simplified portrayals of complex organizational missions and objectives; it is probably inevitable that not all organizations will fit cleanly into a particular sector. Recognizing these factors, we can, however, group stakeholders as follows<sup>2</sup>:

1. Governmental natural resource agencies as both landowners (i.e., Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and U.S. Forest Service, as well as administrators of natural resource policies and regulations (i.e., DNR and the State Forest Practices Act or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Endangered Species Act).
2. Conservation-oriented organizations that use a variety of methods (e.g., acquisition, litigation, education) to conserve natural resources and sustain Northwest communities.<sup>3</sup>
3. Industrial private forest landowners<sup>4</sup> across the state who generally manage working forests for financial values, but who also hold a range of other values.
4. Non-industrial private forest landowners (NIPFs)<sup>5</sup> across the state who may or may not manage forests for commercial purposes, and who hold a unique array of other values

---

<sup>2</sup> A complete list of Forum participants is available in Appendix C of the November 2004 Conference Proceedings (<http://www.nwenvironmentalforum.org/ForestForum/conferenceproceedings.pdf>).

<sup>3</sup> See Malone, "Conservation Organizations: What They Do and Why They Do It," another Forum white paper, for a more complete discussion of conservation organizations.

<sup>4</sup> Industrial timber interests control ~4.5 million acres of Washington forest land. (Creighton and Baumgartner, Oneil 2003, RTI 2003).

<sup>5</sup> Non-industrial private forest landowners (NIPFs) collectively own ~20% (3.1 million acres) of the forest land in Washington and supply 29.3% of the state timber harvest on a volume basis. (Creighton and Baumgartner, Oneil 2003, RTI 2003).

associated with their lands. NIPFs are often broken down into small and large ownerships.<sup>6</sup>

5. Organizations that represent the interests of forest landowners (e.g., the Washington Forest Protection Association and the Washington Farm Forestry Association).
6. Financial institutions, such as Timberland Investment Management Organizations (TIMOs), that manage timberland investments for an array of financial purposes.<sup>7</sup>
7. The University of Washington (UW) and other academic institutions with an interest in forest policy and sustainable forest management. The UW also has an interest in and intends “to play a key role in the policy transformation process required to strike a new balance” between competing values.<sup>8</sup>
8. Washington Native American tribes that own and manage significant amounts of forest land for a variety of purposes, and tribes that have historically used forestlands for various purposes. Tribes have been primary actors in most State natural resource policy issues.
9. Other stakeholders present at the Forum, including elected officials, non-aligned individuals and practitioners involved in forest management, and other non-resource-oriented government agencies with a stake in forest management.

### III. Stakeholder Values

For the purposes of this discussion, stakeholder values are defined as unique bundles of interests and concerns that are “at-stake” with regard to a particular issue. Issues often become conflicts when stakeholders perceive their values to be threatened or at risk, or alternatively, when stakeholders perceive opportunities to achieve benefits and enhance values.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Erickson and Rinehart, “Private Forest Landownership in Washington State,” another Forum white paper, for a more complete discussion of private landowners.

<sup>7</sup> Financial institutions, in the form of timberland investment management organizations (TIMOs), have rapidly grown in importance within forest policy systems over the last five to 10 years (as have other forest land investors such as Master Limited Partnerships and Real Estate Investment Trusts). According to one estimate, TIMOs and other institutional investors hold 8%, or some 9.4 million acres, of the investable timberland in the United States. Analysts predict that TIMOs and other institutional investors may acquire another 10 to 15 million acres in the forthcoming decade (Society of American Foresters (SAF) 2004). While a thorough analysis behind the emergence of TIMOs into the ownership environment is outside the scope of this paper, it appears that financial markets have reevaluated their perspective of forests as assets (SAF 2004), enabling the rise of a new ownership type.

TIMOs pursue two main types of investment models: separate accounts and closed-end funds. Whereas separate accounts tend to be managed for the long-term, closed-end accounts are typically held for a limited time period of 10 to 15 years before being sold off. One estimate is that one-half of all TIMO investments are closed-end (SAF 2004). In terms of forest fragmentation and conversion, it is the closed-end accounts that may exacerbate rates of deforestation. When TIMOs sell land they pursue the highest value they can receive, which will most likely be for development and real-estate. (Data indicates that 70% of properties sold by TIMOs are purchased by other TIMOs, with the other 30% going to other owner types.) (SAF, 2004). The rise in TIMOs has been a response to shifting economic conditions associated with timberlands. Even integrated forest products companies are now pursuing real estate development ventures and other “highest and best use” strategies when managing their land portfolios.

<sup>8</sup> Northwest Environmental Forum conference proceedings, p.6.

Values often compete within issue networks. Political processes, including those operating outside formal governmental systems (such as the Forum), seek to balance these competing values. The Forum has allowed stakeholders to voice their values, interests, and concerns associated with conversion. The following section attempts to capture and categorize some of those values as expressed in Forum discussions.

### **1. The “Triple Bottom Line”**

*“Finding such a balance is a complex task involving the analysis of tradeoffs across this ‘triple bottom line.’ Given the frustration with classic governmental processes and the stalemates of mediation and courts, innovative approaches are needed that focus the intellectual energies of the region’s best institutions to help leaders achieve such balance.”<sup>9</sup>*

The November 2004 Forum proceedings were reviewed to identify key values. For purposes of simplicity and discussion, stakeholder values are categorized as those involving social, economic, or ecological components. Another way of phrasing this is that working forests *provide* social, economic, and ecological benefits that people, organizations, and stakeholder groups’ value. As cited above in the discussion of stakeholder categories, grouping values into distinct categories has the potential to overly simplify complex factors and interactions, yet the “triple bottom line” is a meaningful and well understood conceptual framework for discussing values. The reader should be aware, however, that aspects of values can blur across lines, and that there is a dynamic interplay among the bundles of values.

### **2. Ecological Values**

Working forests provide ecological (conservation or environmental) benefits that may be impacted by working forest conversion. Washington has lost roughly 2 million acres of private forestland to non-forest uses since the 1930s. Between 1982 and 1997 roughly 260,000 acres of forestland were converted to non-forest uses, an average of approximately 17,500 acres per year. And the rate of conversion is increasing. Between 1992 and 1997 an average of 21,000 acres of forestland were converted per year. (WADNR 2005). The rate and extent of conversion represent a significant impact to natural resource values through the loss of forest land.

Broadly, these public benefits can be characterized as *ecosystem services*. These include ecosystem components such as wildlife, biological diversity, and habitat, as well as ecosystem processes such as water filtration, soil productivity, and carbon sequestration. The Cascade Land Conservancy characterizes the ecological values at stake in the conversion issue thus: “...830,000 acres of private land plus 375,000 acres of public land need to be in active forestry use to ensure the integrity of working forests in the central Puget Sound region. The fractionation and parcelization of forest land is the biggest threat to the working forest land base.”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Northwest Environmental Forum (NWEF) conference proceedings, p.3

<sup>10</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.5

Depending on the stakeholder, loss of forest ecosystem integrity may also threaten other socio-economic values.<sup>11</sup>

### 3. Economic Values

*“A healthy forest industry with sustainable practices is dependent on correct fundamentals: good economic conditions, open competitive markets, and long-term operating certainty.”* — Mike Mosman, Port Blakely Tree Farms<sup>12</sup>

*“Why should Weyerhaeuser Company maintain its timber holdings in Washington State? Weyerhaeuser Company is a publicly-traded company and as such has to generate a return on its investments for the shareholders.”* — Lynn Michaelis, Weyerhaeuser Company<sup>13</sup>

*“We estimate that about 800,000 acres of forest land in Washington have been acquired by institutional investors, amounting to perhaps 20-40% of west-side forests in Washington. Most of the land has been acquired from timber companies. New owners are driven strictly by financial returns, not generally by a need to put wood into a particular mill that they also own.”* — Clark Binkley, Hancock Timber Resource Group<sup>14</sup>

*“But I see that the State, in adopting more and more restrictive rules, has wronged many Small Forest Land Owners. Which leads to the question, “Do we need to focus on stewardship of the environment or stewardship of humanity?” When we fail to focus on the stewardship of humanity, we leave our children a poorer future.”* — Rick Dunning, Washington Farm Forestry Association<sup>15</sup>

*“How do we align private interests maximizing shareholder value with public interests maximizing long-term societal value? How do we monetize the higher level of ecosystem services produced under ecological forestry and create markets and policies to allow landowners to capture the value of their management?”* — Bettina Von Hagen, Ecotrust<sup>16</sup>

As evidenced by the above quotes, economic and financial benefits (and costs) are key drivers in the working forest conversion issue. There is a complex interaction between financial benefits and other socio-ecological costs. Where some stakeholders have much to gain financially through conversion, many stakeholders have much to lose, financially and otherwise. Stakeholders hold economic values that can be positively and negatively impacted by the conversion of working forests to other uses. The following section discusses some of these values and some of the implications involved in balancing these often competing sets of values.

Commercial management of working forests provides economic and financial benefits that accrue to a range of individuals and institutions. Economic benefits are also passed on to society in broader terms in the form of jobs and other values (discussed below in *social values*) provided through the active management of working forests. These economic values would be lost or diminished with conversion of working forests to other uses.

---

<sup>11</sup> See Swanson, “Centuries of Change in Pacific Northwest Forests: Ecological Effects of Forest Simplification and Fragmentation,” another Forum white paper, for a more complete discussion of working forests, conversion, and ecological effects.

<sup>12</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.10

<sup>13</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.12

<sup>14</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.31

<sup>15</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.9

<sup>16</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.25

Conservation and commercial management of working forests clearly provide economic benefits to individuals and society, but it is also clear that the potential benefits of conversion are driving the issue. Working forest conversion is partially driven by the significant economic benefits realized by landowners and other stakeholders who choose to capitalize on high real-estate prices and other development values. The relationship between high forest management costs and potential development benefits is driving current policy discussions on how to “bridge the gap” between development and forest values. As Bettina Von Hagen states above, successful solutions to the conversion issue may likely be those that can adequately compensate private stakeholders for the provision of public values provided by working forests.

Traditional natural resource policy conflicts involving actors from the private sector have often revolved around determining the proper balance between regulations that seek to ensure the provision of public natural resource benefits *versus* the preservation of private property rights. In order to ensure the provision of public goods from forest land, Washington has developed regulations that govern forestry operations.<sup>17</sup> These regulations can make forestry operations more costly, and can in fact act as a perverse incentive to convert forest land to other uses that leads to diminished public and private benefits. In addition, regulatory costs in Washington associated with Forest Practices may not be distributed equally among landowners; some landowners are more susceptible to government regulations in terms of costs and more limited in options than others. Regulatory burdens and unintended consequences of forest policies including the Forest and Fish Rules are having a significant impact on the decision-making of non-industrial forest landowners and may be exacerbating the conversion problem (Zobrist 2003, Oneil 2003).<sup>18</sup>

#### **4. Social Values**

For this discussion, social values are characterized as those that contribute to community or individual benefit from a non-market, non-ecological perspective. They could also be termed *non-ecological public values*.

Forum stakeholders stated that there is social value in keeping Washington's timber industry viable, arguing that the presence of the industry contributes to community well-being. That value is derived from the industry in general as well as from particular sectors of the industry. For example, one participant is quoted as saying: “It would become a tremendous social issue for the state to fail to recognize the value of keeping family-run tree farms on the land.”<sup>19</sup> This concept of the social value of commercial forestry operations was repeated in terms of a “social license” to practice forestry. Stakeholders point to this license as a means of granting and recognizing the social value that forestry brings to the state; license implies that society has recognized and values the benefits provided by the industry. An element of social value is measured in employment opportunities for local communities (which is tied to economic and financial values,

---

<sup>17</sup> See Nelson, “Current Land-Use Laws and Zoning: Impacts on Private Forestlands,” another Forum white paper, for a more complete discussion of the relevant laws and regulations.

<sup>18</sup> See Zobrist, “Economically Sustainable Working Forests: Financial Analysis Principles and Applications,” another Forum white paper, for a more complete discussion of the impacts of regulations on economic viability.

<sup>19</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.11

above). Stakeholders point to a relationship between rural jobs and community health — when skilled timber jobs depart a rural community, that community may suffer. Another aspect of social value was articulated as “rural lifestyle”; conversion of working forest land and the associated development has the capacity to completely alter the rural character of Washington.<sup>20</sup>

Recreation (which could also be considered an economic value in market terms) and aesthetic values are also cited by Forum stakeholders as social values. Recreation and aesthetic values can be impacted as conversion reduces the land base available for recreation or negatively alters people's perceptions of landscapes.<sup>21</sup> Historic and cultural values are also considered by stakeholders to be at risk under working forest conversion, as is the value of working forests as buffers to growth and development.

#### **IV. From Zero to Positive Sum?**

*“We have all been through the timber wars with its battles over timber harvests and habitat. This complex issue is now overshadowed by the rate of land conversion. We are no longer warring about management regimes; we are now worried about conversion to non-forest uses.” — Gene Duvernoy, Cascade Land Conservancy<sup>22</sup>*

*“Industry is moving away from the old model that was more about adversarial positions. Today the answer lies in finding balance among disparate interests. In the past, the focus was on issue positions — today we want to talk about interests looking for common ground.” — Colin Moseley, Green Diamond Resources Company<sup>23</sup>*

*“Our traditional view of Washington's working forests needs to be re-examined and modernized to better reflect changing economic and societal realities.” — Dean B. Bruce Bare, UW College of Forest Resources<sup>24</sup>*

*“The irony is that we are not that far apart in finding ways to manage private forests that serve both private interests and build long-term societal wealth” — Bettina Von Hagan<sup>25</sup>*

*“There is increased recognition that, for conservation to be sustainable, we need to pay for it.” — Colin Moseley<sup>26</sup>*

*“Forest productions of wood, paper, or fuel are priced in the market. Any risk of environmental damage subject to litigation is included only as a cost. What's missing? Non-market values such as clean air and water, aesthetics, and habitat are only in markets as costs whether from good stewardship or regulations. There is no market compensation for producing these benefits.” — Bruce Lippke, UW College of Forest Resources<sup>27</sup>*

---

<sup>20</sup> See Lippke and Mason, “Implications of Working Forest Impacts on Jobs and Local Economies,” another Forum white paper, for a more complete discussion of interactions between working forests, jobs and communities.

<sup>21</sup> See Murray and Nelson, “How the Public Perceives Forestry (and Why It Matters),” another Forum white paper, for a more complete discussion of public perceptions.

<sup>22</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.5

<sup>23</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.7

<sup>24</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.5

<sup>25</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.25

<sup>26</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.7

<sup>27</sup> NWEF conference proceedings, p.23

The statements above suggest a transition from a policy model based on conflict and zero sum calculations (i.e., winners and losers) to a new policy model based on collaboration and positive sum possibilities (i.e., gradients of winners). A discussion point is the possibility that the *conversion problem* has prompted some adversarial stakeholders to consider collaboration rather than conflict.

The traditional *tradeoff scenario* was discussed earlier — a values laden battle involving regulatory goals, the provision of public goods, and private property rights. This adversarial model pitted public values against private values through confrontational political negotiations. One could argue that the old model provided stability over the past several decades, with stakeholders relying on tried and true policy approaches — for example, the negotiations over the Forest and Fish Rules with the classic partitioning of stakeholders, interests, and positions.

The emergence of working forest conversion on issue radar screens, however, is prompting change. The conversion problem rises to the surface with threats to forests, threats to the industry, and threats to rural jobs and values. Stakeholders are forced to reconsider past models and positions with the admission that the old model may be ill equipped for today's challenges. There is a recognition (even from stakeholders who had been loathe to discuss regulation) that regulatory burdens and costs may be having unforeseen consequences on widespread social and ecological values through the conversion of working forests. As a response to the overarching conversion threat, stakeholders undertake collaborative policy-making processes that seek to *re-frame* the conceptualization of traditional values and tradeoffs. The new model seeks to incorporate market-based compensatory mechanisms for the private provision of public goods. The pursuit of market-driven policy mechanisms such as incentives, banking systems, and tradable development rights, for example, may allow stakeholders to pursue policy solutions without compromising existing values. Although it is impossible to say what specific direction the model may take, it is clear that a consideration of how diverse values impact policy outcomes will be incorporated.

## Literature Cited

Alig, R.J. and Andrew J. Plantinga. 2004. Future Forestland Area: Impacts from Population Growth and other Factors that Affect Land Values. *Journal of Forestry* 102 (8): 19-24(6).

Burrows, T. 2000. Is the GMA Really Managing Growth? *Seattle Daily Journal* and *djc.com*. Accessed online in September 2005: <http://www.djc.com/special/environment2000/gma.html>.

Creighton, J.H. and David M. Baumgartner. *The Changing Face of Family-forest Owners in an Urbanizing Environment Washington State, USA*. Department of Natural Resources, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

Oneil, E. 2003. *Impacts of the Forest and Fish Rules on Small Forest Landowners in Eastern Washington: Some Key Consequences from Riparian Zone Case Study Analysis*. Master's thesis, College of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Rural Technology Initiative. 2003. Fact Sheet #26: Washington State's Forest Regulations: Family Forest-owners' Understanding and Opinions. College of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Sabatier, P.A. 1988. An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the role of Policy-oriented Learning Therein. *Policy Sciences* 21:129-168.

Society of American Foresters. 2004. Investors Increase Timberland Holdings: Eight Percent of "Investable" US Forestland Held by Investment Managers. *The Forestry Source*, December 2004. Accessed online in September 2005: [http://www.safnet.org/archive/1204\\_ownerships.cfm](http://www.safnet.org/archive/1204_ownerships.cfm).

University of Washington, College of Forest Resources. 2004. Saving Washington's Working Forest Land Base: Breakthrough Strategies for the Future, Conference Proceedings and Workshop Recommendations. Accessed online in September 2005: <http://www.nwenvironmentalforum.org/ForestForum/conferenceproceedings.pdf>.

Washington State Community, Trade and Economic Development Growth Management Program. Discussion Paper No. 3. Accessed online in September 2005: <http://smartgrowth.wa.gov/papers/03nr.doc>.

Washington State Department of Natural Resources. Overview of Washington's Forest Legacy Program. Olympia, WA. Accessed online in September 2005: [http://www.dnr.wa.gov/htdocs/amp/forest\\_legacy/intro.html](http://www.dnr.wa.gov/htdocs/amp/forest_legacy/intro.html)

Zobrist, K. 2003. Economic Impacts of the Forests and Fish Rules on Small, NIPF Landowners: Ten Western Washington Case Studies. Rural Technology Initiative, College of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.