

APPENDIX A

Research Questionnaire

NRCan Incentives/Deterrents for Afforestation/Reforestation Questionnaire

1) Name of Agency: _____

2) Type of Organization:

- Municipal Government or Planning Area
- Regional/County Government
- Provincial/State Government
- Federal Government

- Environmental Non-government International
- Environmental Non-government National
- Environmental Non-government Regional
- Environmental Non-government Local

- Other (describe) _____

3) Location (state/province/country): _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ email: _____

URL: _____

4) Contact Person: _____

5) Briefly describe your A/F program: _____

Number of conservation easements: 5.1) _____ completed
5.2) _____ in progress

6) Who is targeted by your A/F program?

- Large corporate businesses
- Cooperative groups
- Individual land holders

- Word of mouth
- Mail outs
- Electronic media
- Promotional inserts in magazines, newsletters, etc.
- Links to other popular programs
- other

14) Is the program accepted by members of the community?

- yes
- yes with reservations
- no

15) What do you consider the key aspects of the delivery mechanism; is there a secret to your success? (describe briefly)

16) What role do volunteers play in your A/R incentive program and how important are they to success of the program?

17) Do you work in partnership with other agencies on A/R initiatives?

Yes No Who? _____

18) What roles do each of the partners play? _____

19) Have you mirrored or adopted A/R incentive/deterrent ideas from other programs?

No Yes – describe: _____

20) How could your Incentive/deterrent Program be strengthened?

21) Comments or clarification? _____

-
-
- 22) Would you be willing to be part of an Incentive Testing project?
- 23) Are there reasons or benefits for ERIN & partners to seek further detailed information on this program? Yes No
If yes, what aspect? _____

BACKGROUND

The Canadian Forest Service of Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) is undertaking an extensive assessment of the potential for a large-scale private land afforestation effort in Canada to contribute to our commitments under the Kyoto Protocol. As part of this Feasibility Assessment of Afforestation for Carbon Sequestration (FAACS) initiative, NRCan hired ERIN Consulting and its partners CJB Environmental in Quebec and Ecoindustrial Solutions in Vancouver to conduct an assessment and evaluation of afforestation and reforestation incentives in Canada and the United States.

In order to carry out this assessment, we are interviewing some of the conservation agencies across Canada and the United States who are known to use conservation easements or other covenants to help achieve their goals. At the same time we are identifying policy and other kinds of deterrents that act to reduce private landholders afforestation/reforestation efforts. By understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the various incentives currently or historically used by government and non-government agencies, it will be possible for the Canadian government to develop an effective afforestation/reforestation program.

We appreciate your contribution to this important endeavor and thank you for your time.

APPENDIX B

Contact Database

Entry No.	1 Organization Name	2 Organization Type	2.2 Jurisdiction	3.1 Location	3.2 URL	3.3 Phone	3.4 Fax	3.5 Email	3.6 Address	4 Contact Name
1	Ontario Woodlot Association	ER	P	Ontario	www.ont-woodlot-assoc.org	(888) 791-1103 (613) 258-0110	(613) 258-0207	info@ont-woodlot-assoc.org	275 County Road 44, R.R. #4, Kemptville, On,	
2	Environment Canada National Ecological Gifts Program	FG	F	Headoffice in Gatineau	http://www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/ecogifts/intr_o_e.cfm	(800) 668-6767	(819) 953-3575	ecogifts@ec.gc.ca	National Ecological Gifts Program Secretariat, Environment Canada, 351 St. Joseph Blvd, Gatineau, QB, K1A 0H3	
3	US Department of Agriculture Forest Service - Forest Legacy	FG	F	Washington, DC	www.fs.fed.us/spf/coop/programs/loa/flp_coord.shtml			rcooksey@fs.fed.us	201 14th St SW, Yates Bldg. C5-45E, Washington, DC 20250	Rick Cooksey
4	Natural Resources Conservation Service	FG	F		www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/farm_bill/2002	202.720.1067				Leslie Deavers

5 Briefly describe your A/F program

5.1 A/F CEs completed

5.2 A/F CEs in progress

6 Who is targeted by the program?

7 What types of incentives/deterrents?

Federal assistance through competition grant to ? Projects through individual states who prepare a plan. The state has a review panel. Program started in 1990-92

Voluntary - technical support and financial assistance to eligible landowners to address wetland concerns on private lands

State Forestry Agencies

Grants to and through state forestry agencies. Funded at \$6.5M level - 39 states involved. Including Alaska and Hawaii. 90% are conservation easements. Looking for arrangement planning. Perpetual easement - because is significant investment on behalf of American Public. needs to be done in a strategic way

8 How monitored, administered, enforced?	9 Incentive/deterrent documents	10 Measures of Success	11.1 Program Targets (for success)	11.2 Success Achieved	12.1 Resources- financial	12.2	12.3 Resources- #
						Resources- volunteers	# paid
						# paid	employees
Early on, they set up a monitoring system to describe the outputs and outcomes including how effective at preserving. States not in the program, may not feel they need it (large % of land is crown land) or just aren't interested	Yes. Check on website - see implementation guidelines - overview of the program, 2001. Forest Legacy Program National Report	A, Other: starting to monitor the amount of acres related to specific public benefits - getting management planning successfully	O = Must be a forest stewardship plan in place - helps them see the need to get professional assistance in management		\$65M		12 (approx at federal level)

12.4 Resources- in kind contributions

12.5 Resources- used other

13 Best marketing approaches

14 Is the program accepted by the community?

15 Key aspects of delivery/ secrets of success

16 What role do volunteers play & how important are they?

17 Partner agencies?

at the state level is 1 coordinator. 95% of funding goes into projects

W, L, O = some of the individual states have all of the above, US Forest Service only uses website and word of mouth and sponsors public conferences and workshops.

Y, R, N - Depends on the region (all of the above)

Grass roots driven at the state level because they approve the projects but federally administrated. Lands are approved at high standard - Federally dictated and used by all agencies in land transfers and paid for by the Fed Program as well as the administration and of the land transfer

No really like scouts, etc but some of the smaller land trusts use volunteers - many of them are (several thousands)

We work as an intermediary between government and individuals to accomplish easements, etc. Piggyback with Stewardship Management Program; through states and through ENGOs such as Nature Conservancy; Conservancy Fund of Arlington; Trust for Public Land, San Francisco.

18 What roles does each partner play?	19 Have you based program incent/dets on others?	20 Suggested improvements to strengthen program	21 Comments/clarification	22 Willing to participate in IP testing?	23 Should ERIN investigate further?	Other notes or input from interview
Help private individuals get involved, stewardship planning	We are viewed as a pioneer - other programs using easements but different to the Forest Legacy	Have just gone through major evaluation of the program - revised guidelines about money. Were spending \$\$ loosely controlled (max flexibility)	Congress demanded more federal oversight. More policies needed to be put in place - project selection process with a National Panel with State Representatives set up criteria to rank each and every project. Checks and balances. Because of federal involvement, some bureacracy delays	Y	need to understand federal overseeing and control while recognizing the local interests, concerns and fears	

5	Islands Trust Fund	EL	R	BC	http://www.islandstrust.bc.ca/	Interviewee: (250) 335-1155 Office ph: (250) 405-5176	Interviewee: tlaw@islandstrust.bc.ca Other Contact: aneudorf@islandstrust.bc.ca	Suite 200 - 1627 Fort Street Victoria, BC V8R 1H8	Interviewee: Tony Law (Local Trustee) Other Contact: Ardice Neudorf (ecosystem specialist; acting manager)
6	Central Okanagan Parks and Wildlife Trust	EL	R	BC	http://www.centralokanaganfoundation.org/parks-wildlife-trust.html	250-769-4541 (250) 861-6156		#217-1889 Springfield Road., Kelowna, B.C. V1Y 5V5	Frank Williams
7	Comox Valley Land Trust Society	EL	L	BC	http://communitythings.com/cvlt/	(250) 337-1929 (250)339-5855	cvlt@uniserve.com interviewee: swp@mars.ark.com	P.O. Box 3462 Courtenay, BC V9N 5N5	Shirley Ward, President

50
As one of British Columbia's leading conservation trusts, the Islands Trust Fund works with island communities to protect special places by encouraging, undertaking, and assisting in voluntary conservation initiatives within the Islands Trust Area. Specific tools that we use to protect natural habitats and cultural features include Conservation Covenants; Land Donation; Land Purchase; and Public Education. There is a local trust committee for each island or group of islands designated as a local trust area by regulation under the Islands Trust Act. Each local trust committee has three members - two locally elected trustees, and one Executive Committee member who serves as Chairperson. A local trust committee is responsible for land use planning and regulation for its area of jurisdiction. As such, its responsibilities include preparation and adoption of Official Community Plans, rural land use bylaws, zoning and subdivision bylaws, regulation of soil removal and deposit, and authorization of permits under Part 26 of the Local Government Act.

IL

- Recent changes to this Islands Trust Act allow for property tax exemption certificates for those who get a conservation covenant. This can be a 60% tax reduction.
- BUT the landowner must WANT to do it first! Most landowners have lived on their property for several years and to see that it is protected. Personal attachment. Tax incentives, alone are not enough.

Established by Central Okanagan Foundation in 1991. It is a registered charity. Facilitates preservation of natural areas and parks in the Central Okanagan. The Trust can receive outright gifts of land, and can help facilitate the registering of covenants on land to create a living legacy. Cash gifts may be designated to assist with grants and expenses that help preserve sanctuaries and parks. The Central Okanagan Foundation holds an endowment for the Trust. Any one can contribute to this fund in any amount at any time. The COF also holds several other endowment funds, where the Central Okanagan Parks & Wildlife Trust is the beneficiary.

IL

2 incentives mainly: 1) the desire to preserve land and 2) the charitable donation tax receipt (income tax incentives)

Small Land Trust Program – purchase and/or place covenants on private lands. Currently working on a large scale covenant for a track of land owned by Hancock (industrial forestry company) (Cumberland Forest Covenant)

Usually small parcels of land (20-30 acres) with the exception of the large corporately-owned piece of land that they're currently working to get a covenant for.

IL (with exception of one CG)

They have a rigorous annual monitoring program. Photos. Comparative records. Any violations of covenant or land management criteria are immediately followed up. (this work is contracted out)

What is Conservation Covenant?
<http://www.islandstrustfund.bc.ca/howtoprotectlands/conservationcovenants.htm>

A
 B (including land donations)
 C

Under the Act they have to produce a 5 year plan including a Strategic plan with targets. E.g. to protect additional 5% of significant ecosystems identified in their regional conservation plan.

A = >554ha protected, B = >\$5.2million donations of land/cash, C = 50 protected areas to date.

All contributions go directly to conservation (since staff are paid by local taxes). Don't keep track of \$/y

4
 Not directly. Several volunteers work with them through other conservation groups/local gov agency partners.

They have an annual inspection program (inspect the land they own and the land they covenants for. Performed by volunteers, or sometimes they hire it out. Also conduct an inventory of flora/fauna for a baseline document from which they can evaluate the site each year.

A
 C

Do not set targets. They respond to requests.

A = 12 land donations so far
 C = 9 members of the board

0

9

Annual monitoring program with reporting. Report to partners and landholders. Currently working on building up an "enforcement fund" (so that they won't take a covenant, unless there is 1000\$ available for enforcement)

A
 C

They work on a year-to-year basis, depending on resources. This year they're hoping to complete 3 covenants, and the 1st phase of the Cumberland forest.

A = # of acres protected
 C = 110-120 members

Estimated that it costs approx \$10,000 to place a covenant on a piece of land (plus a lot of volunteer work!)

0

40-50

photos, artwork (for fundraising activities)

W, M, E, L

Y

1) their legislative mandate backing them up
2) paid staff
3) a lot of people care about the islands and want to see them protected
4) the fact that they form partnerships with so many different groups when working on a land acquisition, covenant/etc.
5) The importance to them, of developing strong relationships with landowners.
Understanding their wishes and goals and aligning them with those of the land trust.

They are very critical, however the Islands Trust Fund maintains more of a coordinating role with other conservation agencies/partners. No one volunteers directly for the Islands Trust Fund.

Conservation groups, government agencies (local, provincial) regional districts, etc

land mainly, and any transfer costs of the donated land

W, E, O - displays at events; some public talks; through the Okanagan Foundation, they get some additional exposure

Volunteer donations. They have some very significant gifts.

- Assume responsibilities as directors.
- Conduct land inspections (on land they own; land they hold covenants for)
- Inventories of flora and fauna (baseline doc)
- Finding sites that need to be protected (if they locate a site with environmentally sensitive areas, they take a cold call approach)

Central Okanagan Foundation; Member of the Land Trust Alliance of BC

legal / technical advice (naturalists, etc); office equipment; furniture

E, P (newsletters), O - Information table at community events

Y - CVLT is not as well known as they would like. They are well-respected in the community; cordial relationships with governments (partnerships with Courtenay and the regional district...hold covenants on 1 city park and regional district land that will soon become a park)

A none-controversial/confrontational approach. Try to find common ground with all partners/stakeholders; look for ways in which they have shared goals.

VERY MUCH; they do everything

Big covenant partners are the Cumberland Community Forest Society & White Bay Forest Society. Other land trusts such as The Land Conservancy; Nature Trust of BC; local stewardship groups, individual naturalists.

<p>Depending on the project. Different partners manage the protected lands, depending on the agreement that is made. Some partners hold lands, some hold covenants.</p>	<p>Inspired by the San Juan County (USA). Another group of islands. Have a tax on real estate transactions that's put towards land acquisition. If someone sells their property, a percentage goes to a land bank. (They're jealous of San Juan!)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continual work on teaching people about the values of their land. - Being more strategic – they have done some ecosystem mapping and are becoming more selective about which lands need protecting; which are most helpful for maintaining connectivity and ensuring so much of each ecosystem is protected on each island and therefore which lands to prioritize. 	<p>Works like an NGO but is attached to local government through legislation. This is a unique feature of this land trust. A strength: they have a connection with local land use authorities!</p>
---	---	--	--

<p>Advisory; some promotion</p>	<p>Yes, in the beginning they worked closely with the Nature Trust of BC, The Land Conservancy, Turtle Island Group in Salmon Arm. (the land trust model is used similarly across the province)</p>	<p>A part-time employee</p>	<p>He wanted to add that we should be looking at municipal covenants. There are hundreds of such covenants that are held by municipalities that are NOT inspected. He highlighted the importance of site inspections to maintaining ecological integrity of sites and that if they don't have the time to do it, they should hire members of trusts elsewhere, who are qualified to do it.</p>
---------------------------------	---	-----------------------------	--

<p>Technical expertise (e.g. Project Watershed, supports CVLT through their mapping expertise)</p>	<p>The Land Conservancy has been their "mentors"</p>	<p>More effective fundraising; Formalizing or strengthening partnerships with other groups (e.g. looking at formal amalgamation with Project Watershed)</p>	<p>There needs to be more incentives for landowners with large tracts of land to want to preserve it!! (stronger economic incentives) There also needs to be more monitoring incentives! (munis/regional districts do not generally monitor the lands on which they hold covenants.)</p>
--	--	---	--

8	Denman Conservancy Association	EL	L	BC	http://www.denmanis.bc.ca/conserv/	250 335 2868		millen@island.net	Box 60 Denman Island, B.C. V0R 1T0	John Millen
9	Cowichan Community Land Trust Societ	EL	L	BC	http://www.island.net/~ccit/	250-746-0227	250-746-0227	ccit@island.net	#6 - 55 Station Street Duncan, British Columbia, Canada V9L 1M2	Ann Archibald, Executive Director
10	Nature Trust of British Columbia	NGO Provincial?	P	BC	http://www.naturetrust.bc.ca/index.html	604-924-9771 ext 224		madair@naturetrust.bc.ca	#260 — 1000 Roosevelt Crescent North Vancouver, B.C. V7P 1M3	Mary Ann Adair, Habitat Ecologist
11	Thousand Summers Environmental Design	Other - private company	L	BC		250 479 7900		thousandsummers@shaw.ca	Saanich, BC (rural municipality of BC)	Dean Rebneris

Running for 12 years. They have 3 main programs: 1) raising funds and acquiring land; 2) education/stewardship – encouraging landowners to get voluntary land surveys (currently inactive); 3) acquiring covenants (working on their first right now).

They own 1 piece of land – covenant held by Islands Trust
They manage 2 other nature reserves that are owned by the Islands Trust.

1 - Working on their first covenant now. IL (156acre parcel on Morrison March)

On Denman Island the main incentive is community interest in seeing forests maintained here. Individuals also value their privacy, quiet and seclusion, thus wanting to maintain the forest. The very large minimum lot sizes required in our Official Community Plan on much of the forested land on the island discourages subdivision and the associated land clearing. This is an integral part of an intentional Community strategy to maintain natural ecosystems.

Owners of larger blocks, say 100 + acres, who do log their forests, often say they need cash to pay taxes. The Assessment Authority considers the highest and best use of all land on Denman to be residential, despite its zoning for silviculture or its inclusion in the Agricultural Land Reserve, (which also limits subdivision). The recent introduction of abatement of (tax) assessments on land which has been dedicated to conservation (under the Islands Trust) should be a big help in getting more land-owners to commit to maintaining their forests. However this program only recognizes existing forests or established natural ecosystems

A registered non-profit charitable organization dedicated to the conservation and protection of natural areas in and near the Cowichan Valley Regional District, British Columbia, Canada. Do public outreach to educate landowners about the opportunities to protect land and assist landowners in the process.

currently hold 4 covenants

working on 2-3 covenants

don't target people. It is a sensitive topic b/c it is often done as part of estate planning. Just educate people and get them to approach the CCLT with ideas to protect their lands.

The main disincentives for conservation covenants is the costs (time and \$\$) of getting them. Perception of the lost of land value.

Land trust organization: owns thousands of hectares outright ("fee simple") and thousands on a long term lease with the provincial crown (MWLAP). Holds covenants on small percentage of lands. (only 1000 ha)Writes management plans for all of its properties. Started with an Endowment from Pierre Trudeau (\$10million in 2004 dollars).

Target different land owners, depending on the scientific decision to protect a certain piece of property. Based on maximizing the biodiversity results (satisfying their mandate to protect habitats, ESAs, etc) for the given amount of effort. They are strategic in their property selections.

Incentive: 2 extremes: 1) For dry, rare grassland ecosystems, there has been some ingrowth of trees. So they will be working to harvest those / prescribed burning. This is becoming a hot topic among land owners. 2) for the purpose of protecting a range of forest stand structures (ages), not only old-growth stands. Disincentive: legal red tape; your property value changes (e.g. property tax goes up if you change from agricultural classification to forest; also changes if you place a covenant on your property)

Private company involved in community reforestation and environmental restoration with a focus on Private Landowners for 10 years. Undertake small scale projects in neighbourhoods. (lots of stream restoration...have their own nursery. Also collaborate with university students (do research; volunteer tree planting, etc)

projects are typically 2-5 acres big (100-500 trees/shrubs planted)

IL

"economic rationalization" - eg supplying landowners with firewood (reduce the cost of firewood)

They participate in some monitoring (plan to have consistent monitoring once they attain their first covenant) for covenants held by other groups (ie Islands Trust).

do not formally track measures of success (C = can" ~200 members)

no targets, they "do what we can"
A: Manager of 134-acre Lindsay-Dickson forest (acquired by Islands Land Trust)
 · Purchased key 6acre parcel near Chickadee Lake (2000)
 · Acquired the 10-hectare Inner Island Nature Reserve (1992)
C: Through education programs, 130 people have undertaken to be Stewards of their land on Denman

0

varies ~ 120

Monitored on a yearly basis, starting with a baseline report. Take annual inventories (human/natural disturbance, flora, fauna, etc)

on a project to project basis.
 A
 C

Hold an annual strategic planning session where they set targets (not available)

A: >3000ha protected
C: ~370 land stewards in the valley

membership fees, donations (no exact figure)

1 or 2

all board members are volunteers. Many from the community. Exact number unknown.

A major reason why they hold so few covenants is the intensive amount of monitoring and associated costs involved. (legal expenses, costs of baseline reporting). They only accept donated covenants. That is, \$ from the landowner to help cover covenant costs (therefore most often corporate landowners participate)

A
 B

A: More than 17,000 hectares of ecologically significant land has been purchased and protected; also oversees the sustainable management of 40,000 additional hectares through long-term leases of Crown land.
B: for each property they develop a management plan including rules for access, recreation, etc. They are alerted to most infringements on these rules.

9

not sure. Many!

A - track the survival of trees after 5years
 B - qualitative willingness of volunteers to want to continue

no defined targets. Currently working with municipality to expand their scope to the larger commons.

4

average 12

Technical / legal expertise by island residents.

E, P (newsletters; adverts in local paper)

Y - 20% of the island population are members! Very well accepted.

Dedicated volunteers

Extremely important! While they contract some jobs out, pretty much everything is done by volunteers (fundraising; advertising; etc)

The Land Conservancy; Nature Conservancy of Canada; Provincial government agencies.

expertise, staff time from the regional district (mapping), some planting supplies.

Market themselves though their projects.
W, P - quarterly newsletter

Y

on-going local presence ("a fixture in the community")

DFO, Prov Gov (Habitat Conservation Trust Fund); local conservation groups, cowichan tribe, etc

Being really clear with landowners what is involved with donating land/placing covenants on land. Aligning our objectives with theirs. Ensuring their "rules" are clear regarding allowed use of the lands.

Volunteer stewards are coordinated through land managers

Tons!! Depending on the piece of land. Ducks Unlimited; Provincial Gov (MWLAP); Canadian Wildlife Service; Nature Conservancy; local groups, etc etc. Some projects, at the broader landscape level, have more than 30 stakeholders participating.

no

W, M, E

Y

Local, simple, on-the-ground

Lakes Community Development Group; Todd Creek Watershed Society; Prospect Lake Community Group

Help with fundraising;

TLC / Nature conservancy have coached us

Working on getting younger people involved.

advisory; consult with the larger agencies continually; help with writing proposals, etc

The Land Trust Alliance of BC's standards and practices for land trusts.

Core funding to allow them to maintain a strong community presence. Currently a lot of staff turnover b/c of the uncertainty year to year. Would be nice to have some assurance so that they can maintain relationships with landowners.

Education

Guided by: Urban Forest Stewardship Initiative (Capital Region District); Garry Oak Ecosystem Recovery Team

Externally - support for forest retention (better tree bylaws; tax incentives for forested lands)
Internally - recognition of natural values...

12	Whatcom State Conservation District (participating in Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program [CREP] with the US Dept of Ag	ER	R	WA	http://www.whatcomcd.org/ http://www.fsa.usda.gov/dafp/cepd/crep.htm	350.354.2035 ext 115	350-354-4678	GBoggs@whatcomcd.org	6975 Hannegan Road, Lynden, Washington 98264	George Boggs, District Coordinator, Co-chair of local CREP committee
13	North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources - Division of Forest Resources	PG	P	NC	http://www.dfr.state.nc.us/index.htm http://www.dfr.state.nc.us/starting/starting_incen tives.htm http://www.dfr.state.nc.us/tending/tending_legacyoverview.htm http://www.dfr.state.nc.us/tending/tending_legacyfaq.htm			mark.megalos@ncma-il.net	1616 Mail Service Centre, Raleigh, NC 27699-1616	Mark Megalos
14	Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Forest Bureau	PG	P	IA			(919) 733-2162 ext. 254	john.walkowiak@dnr.state.ia.us		
15	Virginia Department of Forests	PG	p	VA				michael.foreman@do f.virginia.gov		John Walkowiak, Iowa DI Michael Foreman

<p>Through successful voluntary landowner participation, the CREP program removes livestock and agricultural activities from the riparian area of salmon-bearing streams. The sites are planted with native trees and shrubs for a contract period of 10-15 years. Improved salmon habitat, cooler, cleaner water and financial enhancements to the landowners for removing the area from production are the results of this program. This is a voluntary program that is the result of a contractual agreement between the State of Washington and United States Department of Agriculture established in 1998.</p>	<p>currently 110 contracts</p>	<p>IL</p>	<p>state pays costs of planting/maintenance for 10-15yrs; landowner commits to lease their property to gov for 10-15 yrs and receives 200% property rent (often out values ag production revenue, so they're all for it)</p>
--	--------------------------------	-----------	--

<p>We offer host of technical assistance to private landowners within the state. We have a large workforce (600 +) housed in separate county offices(100counties and 13 district offices) who conduct fires control and forest management activities for 700,000 private landowners who own 1 acre or more of forested land. We prepare over 6440 forest management (351,902 acres) and reforestation plans annually and reforested over 85,691 acres. Prescribed burning of 61,242 acres. Programs of interest: Forest Development Program- Reforestation program; Forest Legacy-Land Protection program via conservation easements. Payments are made for the purchase of development rights.</p>	<p>CG, IL - NC Forest Landowners Assoc., Forest Landowners Assoc, NC FOrEst Association, many smaller county associations 19 active across 100 counties, NC Farm Bureau, Association of Consyultant foresters, Sociaety of American Foresters, Industrial LForestry Landowner Assistance Programs, Private Natural Resource Consultants.</p>	<p>Incentives: Tax breaks, Reforestation Cost share assistance, Technical assistance, Management planning, Recognition, Education, Low-cost Seedlings grown by our own nurseries. Forestation services not available from private sources, Prescribed burning services, free management and reforestation planning. Deterrents: Lack of resources. Minimal Cost share funds, a Timber dominated focus, Lack of markets for low quality trees, extremely high land prices, urban sprawl and higher , better uses for land than forestry, a lack of zoning, a movement away from the land, increased population and demands for greater aesthetic value of the forest, COnfusing regulations, Low return and high risk investment relative to other alternatives, erosion of the econmic infrastructure within rural communities traditional based on low-wage manufacturing</p>
---	--	--

<p>Iowa's conservation easement program is the standard USFS Forest Legacy concept of protecting private working forests via conservation easements. We hire an independent appraisal and offer the land owner 50-75% of the development value as ok'd by USFS forest legacy applications.</p>	<p>Private woodland owners are our main target - but also private landowners who have ag lands that can be converted back to trees.</p>	<p>Incentives involve state and federal cost-share (50-75 percent); conservation seedlings sold at costs of production and technical assistance. for Overall protection we are now dealing with conservation easements throught the USFS Forest LEgacy program that pays 50-75% for development rights. Deterrents: Higher ag prices</p>
--	---	--

We also have an extensive service forestry program where state DNR foresters offer technical assistance to Iowa's 55,000+ private woodland owners who control 92% of our forest. We offer cost-share programs and conservation seedlings from our State Forest Nursery at costs of production (\$.25-\$.45/tree) focusing on native species of trees and shrubs. We average 4 million seedlings and 10,000+ acres of reforestation annually.

<p>federal partners do an annual review (15 yrs)</p>	<p>exhaustive data base of sites, trees/shrub species planted, costs, etc</p>	<p>Program allows for up to 10,000 stream miles in WA.</p>	<p>~500 stream miles under contract.</p>	<p>3 (more 0 - jobs are bid on my during peak contractors. times like spring planting)</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>Internal and external assements, Annual reporting system, USFS Forestry and Analysis unit annual surveys of the forest health and stus within the state boundaries, ENGO's assessments.</p>	<p>A, D, E - acres of reforestation, prescribed burn acreage, Plan numbers, plan requests, acres impacted, GSP of Forest industry and associated industries.</p>	<p>Increased sales of seedlings from state nursery, decreased loss of forested acreage(NC was among the top 5 states in forest loss in the 1994-2000 period). Individual Counties have projected targets on an annual basis.Increased numbers in all of the measures that we tract through our internal documentation system. Increased forest health and decreased loss to insect and disease.</p>	<p>DFR 's budget is roughly 33 Million annually with more than 40 % from federal and external reciepts</p>	<p>600 + employees in Forest Service</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Conservation efforts are monitored via sampel site visits</p>	<p>Successful stands of new trees, improved forests and conservation easements.</p>	<p>We look at 12,000 acres annually of new tree plantings; 13,000 acres annually of forest stand improvement and 300 acres annually in conservation easements.</p>	<p>Cost share is primarily all federal funds involving \$600,000 annually, and \$500,000 annually of state funds. All conservation easement is federal funds. Technical assistance is 70% state funded and 30% federal funded. State Nursery stock is sold at costs of production.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

W, M	R (farmers hate trees; but still a lot of participation by individual landowners.	Clientel is experienced with these types of (farm) programs already. (e.g. Dairy Nutrient Application Act - plant grass filter strips near streams to minimize nutrient entry into streams - educated locals; understand trees' roles; they knocked on doors and spread the word).	not really	Nootsack Salmon Enhancement Association; Regional Fish Enhancement Groups
------	---	--	------------	---

W. M. P. L. O - schools, one-on-one contact with landowner

Natural Resource Conservation Service; NC Cooperative Extension Service; NC Wildlife Resource Commission; Div of soil and water; US Forest Service

Marketing is complex - but efforts to boost tree planting involve local media, advertisements, radio spots, local meetings and workshops, one on one contacts and mass mailings.

USFS, NRCS, Farm Service Agency, IA Dept of Ag and Land Stewardship, Iowa State University Extension Forestry; IDNR Wildlife; Iowa's 99 county conservation boards, Resource Conservation and Development Areas (RC&DS); forestry contractors and consultants; and Iowa woodland owners associations.

<p>Regional fish enhancement groups get grants to do stream restoration that includes placing large woody debris, etc, which CREP does NOT fund.</p>	<p>CREP first started in Chesapeake Bay</p>	<p>Be able to offer additional practices (ie more than tree planting) such as constructed wetlands; filter strips; shrubs alone (more site specific applications).</p>	<p>Willing to come up and give a presentation.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>Natural Resource Conservation Service: C/S funds, technical assistance, partnering and program promotion NC Cooperative Extension Service : Education, publications, legal and tax advice and promotion NC Wildlife Resource Commission: technical assistance, promotion, partnering Div of Soil and Water : technical assistance , referral, promotion US Forest Service: technical assistance, promotion, Funding (National Pass through funds)</p>	<p>Our Forest Development Program is modeled after past federally funded programs that have gone by the wayside. Ours still exists because it is largely funded by industry via an assesment on primary production (puldwood and sawtimber). Although it hasn't been indexed to inflation since it's inception in 1978 - it is still a fairly successful program with low -overhead and popular support.</p>	<p>Increased political and popular support for forestry and the steps needed to sustain the viability of private forests(from tax incentives, markets, tax breaks and perhaps zoning of forest and agricultural areas so that the menace of urbanization could be checked. A separate carbon credit and economic system might rescue the private forest and provide the needed boost to manage,manipulate and protect the forests for future generations.</p>	
---	--	--	--

<p>Our district foresters are standard state service foresters used in other states.</p>	<p>Focused on specific watersheds - and if additional \$\$\$ to strenghten ups and downs of federal cost-share dollars.</p>
--	---

16	Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services	PG	P	FL	http://www.fl-dof.com/Conservation/forest_legacy/index.html			Kuestee@doacs.state.fl.us	Ed Kuester	
17	Conservation Fund	EN	F	VA		(415) 495-4014	FAX (415) 495-4103		TPL National Office 116 New Montgomery St., 4th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105	
18	Trust for Public Land	EN	F	CA	http://www.tpl.org/tier3_cd.cfm?content_item_id=10567&foeder_id=191				1175 ave. Lavigerie, bur. 420, Sainte-Foy (Québec) G1V 4P1	
19	Fondation de la faune du Québec	Provincial para-governmental organisation	Provincial/State	Quebec	www.fondationdelafaune.qc.ca	(418) 646-4906	(418) 643-7655	marcel.quirion@ria.qc.ca	Marcel Quirion	
20	Ministère de l'Environnement du Québec, Direction du patrimoine écologique et le développement durable	PG		Provincial/State	Quebec	www.menv.gouv.qc.ca/biodiversite/privete/terres-priv.htm	(418) 521-3907 ext. 4075	(418) 646-6169	wendy.giroux@menv.gouv.qc.ca	675 boul. René-Lesvesque E. 4e Étage, Boîte 21, Québec QC G1R 5V7
21	Association forestière Québec métropolitain	ER	R	Quebec	www.afqm.org	(418) 647-0909	(418) 524-4112	afqm@mediom.qc.ca	Véronique Rodet	
22	National Capital Commission	FG	R	Ottawa-Hull	www.canadascapital.gc.ca	(613) 239-5226	(613) 239-5336	mfourni@ncc-ccn.ca	Mario Fournier	
23	Agence régionale de mise en valeur des forêts privées outaouaises	ER	R	Quebec		(819) 827-5691	(819) 827-8505	agence.outaouaise@qc.aira.com	Luc Parent	
24	Ministère de l'Environnement du Québec, Direction du patrimoine écologique et le développement durable	PG		Provincial/State	Quebec	www.menv.gouv.qc.ca/biodiversite/privete/terres-priv.htm	(418) 521-3907 ext. 4347	(418) 646-6169	pierre.aquin@menv.gouv.qc.ca	675 boul. René-Lesvesque E. 4e Étage, Boîte 21, Québec QC G1R 5V7

Give financial aide to projects that are beneficial to wildlife

LCB, CG

Financial aide

Nature Reserve on Private Land. A landowner wishing to protect a natural habitat enters into a notarised agreement with the government lasting from 25 years to perpetuity which defines/restricts the potential uses of the site Distribute trees to population for planting (Mois de l'arbre et de forêts), Usually one tree per person but school groups can organise the planting of trees on chosen sites (up to 250 trees) Greening of school grounds (federal program) Replacement of trees on urban properties of the NCC

LCB, CG, IL

Tax reduction, no school taxes are paid on the designated property and the municipal taxes are reduced by 50% or more depending on the municipal services the property receives.

IL

Distribute free trees

Funding to wood producers for forestry practices including reforestation

LCB, CG, IL (must have more than 4 ha and be recognised as producers)

Cover 80% of the cost of the activity, Reimbursement of 80% of property tax

Visa Fiscal : donation of a property or of a servitude (provincial version of the ecological gifts program). Conservation servitude : attachment of restrictions to a property title associated to rights belonging to another property (fond dominant). For example such rights can be attached to a waterway (which is a property belonging to the government)

LCB, CG, IL

Visa Fiscal : Non refundable tax credits to the donor. Servitude : no incentives, purely on the will of people to protect their land in the future.

Receiving organisation must monitor it's project or risk having it rejected	Their web site, written documentation available at their headquarters	A, km of shoreline restored				
Game wardens have jurisdiction as with government reserves (this is not yet completely in place)	Their web site	A, C	No fixed target, as much land protected as possible	C = 9	1500-4000\$ per site	2
Not monitored or enforced	Their web site	# of trees distributed		1700 trees in 2004	Very low cost. Trees provided by the provincial government	Some work during the month of May.
Through their personnel, Tree planting contracts include a 2 year garanty on the survival of the trees				400 trees planted per year	120,000	1.5
Forestry advisor prepares a management plan (including reforestation), with the plan the owner can become a recognised producer, wil then make a request for funding for a particular activity such as tree planting, if accepted the work is done and a report of completion is filed, 10% are checked.	Yes. Can be sent by mail.	A	The targets are set in their 5 year plan (PPMV = plan de protection et mise en valeur)	Did not receive required financing to achieve their targets	990,000	2 full time, 14 forestry advisors by contract
Visa Fiscal : The beneficiary must respect the act of donation. This is verified by Revenue Quebec and enforced through fines. Servitude : Enforced through the Civil Code and can lead to legal proceedings.	Their web site. Also can check the Civil Code article 1177.	A, C	A = government has the goal of protecting 8% of the provences total area by 2007. C = None		MENV covers 75% of costs for the servitudes.	

M, E, O (Press conferences)	Y	Flexibility of the organisation and the use of simple, easy to understand contracts	RESAM, Forest agencies, forestry advisors, private companies
W, E	Y	Keep things clear with the landowner, Don't keep things hidden	ENGOS (such as the Nature Conservancy, DU, small local associations)
M, E, O (Press conferences)	Y	Well known, longstanding program	Ministry of natural resources of Quebec, schools
	Y	The 2 year garanty, plant native trees and vary the species	Community groups
O (flyers, forestry advisors propmote the program)	R (some conflict with agriculture)	The financing is key, without it their would be little accomplished. The forestry advisors are motivated to fid clients.	N
E, O (presentations, through conservation organisations)	Y	Involvement of the government in voluntary conservation has been a positive step. Have worked to develop tools that meet the requirements of the stakeholders.	Numerous conservation organisations such as DU, Nature Conservancy, Éconature, etc.

Receive funding from FFQ for their projects	Yes. They use the organisations already present, attach themselves to existing programs	Better integrate existing programs the different uses of forested land (wildlife habitat, wood production, Offer more services to owners not interested in wood production	y	
landowners wanting to protect a property, Management of the site may be ensured by a conservation organisation such as DU.	Based on servitudes. Many ideas came from the needs and requests of conservation organisations		The agreements must be voluntary, The property owner must be able to enforce the requirements of the agreement, the primary objective of the program is conservation	N
Ministry supplies the trees, Schools distribute trees to students and can plan special activities	N	Increasing the number of symbolic plantings on certain sites and increasing the number of group plantings	Y	Y
Donate trees	N	Greater ressources could allow to plant more trees and to monitor the natural areas. Are doing an inventory of natural areas to identify needs	Y	N
	N	More money	Y	Y
They are often the ones that get specific projects started. Enable the improvement of the tools by presenting the problems they encounter.	Yes. Took some ideas from Europe and the USA. The quebec Civil Code is unique but some aspects of the common law system were copied.	Greater financial resources to decrease the cost to the land owners. Greater resources allocated to the conservation organisations could increase the rate at which land is protected because they do most of the work in the field.	Y (but may not have time to do so, must be approved by boss)	Y

25	Ville de Gatineau	MG	L	Quebec	www.ville.gatineau.qc.ca	(819) 595-7340	(819) 595-7397	chabot.louis@ville.gatineau.qc.ca	25 rue Laurier, Gatineau QC. C.P. 1970 succ. Hull QC G8X 3Y9	Louis Chabot
26	Nature Conservancy of Canada - Quebec region	EN	F (P since a regional office)	Quebec	www.conservationdelanature.ca	(450) 242-3555	(450) 242-3555	wind@granby.net	1060 Université, Suite 210, Montreal QC H3B 4V3. Personal address : 591 Rosenberry, Sutton QC J0E 2K0	Louise Gratton
27	New Brunswick Federation of Woodlot Owners	ER	Provincial/State	New Brunswick		(506) 459-2990	(506) 459-3515	nbfwo@nbnet.nb.ca	180 St-John St., Fredericton NB E3B 4A9	Ken Hardy
28	New Brunswick Department of Natural Resources	PG	Provincial/State	New Brunswick	www.gnb.ca	(506) 453-8216	(506) 453-6689	bill.hamilton@gnb.ca	P.O. Box 6000, Fredericton NB E3C 2G6	Bill Hamilton
29	MAPAQ	PG	Provincial/State	Quebec	www.agr.gouv.qc.ca	(418) 380-2150	(418) 380-2163	sylvain.tremblay@agr.gouv.qc.ca	200 chemin Ste-Foy, Quebec QC G1R 4X6	Sylvain Tremblay
30	Prince Edward Island Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, Aquaculture and Forestry	PG	Provincial/State	Prince Edward Island	www.gov.pe.ca	(902) 368-6431	(902) 368-4713	bmbrown@gov.pe.ca	P.O. Box 2000. Charlottetown PE C1A 7N8	Brian Brown

They conducted a study describing the woodlands in the city, then modified their land management plan and are working on a new regulation which protects as conservation areas the best habitats and puts a certain control on development in the good and moderate quality habitats
Protect ecologically valuable land through purchasing, donations and servitudes

Best habitat designated for conservation. Development in good or moderate habitats requires an environmental impact assessment which can include mitigation measures such as tree planting and leaving some of the land wooded.

LCB (occasionally), IL (Mostly) Tax breaks to donors from both federal and provincial governments, they use the provincial program for Natural Reserves on Private Land and the federal government finances certain activities through a program for the stewardship of endangered species habitat

Federal program (forest 2020) : subsidy to offset cost of seedlings and preparation of the site.
Provincial program : cost share for silvicultural work including preparing sites, planting and plantation tending.

IL Fed : Subsidy. Prov : covers 80% of the cost of the activity, or 90% in the case of farmland reclamation.

7,2 million \$ in provincial funds go to afforestation, reforestation and early stand intervention

LCB, IL Fun 80 % of reforestation activities and 90 % of afforestation activities

Finance the planting of wind breaks and odour breaks on agricultural land.

Agricultural producers Covers about 70% of the cost (2000\$/km, 7\$/tree for wind break and 20\$/tree for odour break)

1. Forest renewal program : Subsidy to private woodlot owners for reforestation. 2. Forest Enhancement Program: Enhance non-clearcut technology.

IL The program (with 70% of the funds from the gov. And 30% from private money) funds the cost of treatments.

Enforcement of the regulation by the city and through the impact assessment procedure. Enforcement procedures are not yet in place as the regulation has yet to be passed.	Yes. Were sent by email, see documents.	A	A = 650 ha protected, 55 km ² designated for protection/integration (these are the areas requiring an EIA before development projects can be approved)	Regulation not yet in place	40 000 (spent on the descriptive study) - Budget for the future aspects is not yet determined	Undetermined
Project managers in each region, through local partners	Y, through Kathleen Provost at the regional office (514) 876-1606 x 225	A	Putting together a plan with performance indicators to better target habitats in different natural areas and move beyond simple surface areas.		49 million for Canada	14 in Quebec, over 100 in Canada
Fed : commitment as to the period of time the land must remain forested. Prov : Administered by the marketing boards, assessments of the sites to make sure they are up to the criteria before the money is released, informal commitments only.	Y. Provincial program will be emailed or faxed.	C	No specific targets other than to use all the funding within the fiscal year. There are waiting lists for the provincial program.		650,000	160 - 200 in season
Through the marketing boards. Verbal commitment that they have a time frame consistent with forestry. 10-20% of the work is monitored by the forest rangers for compliance to criteria.	Y, sent by email	A	No target. Have been criticised for this. Full budget spent every year.		7.2 million \$ total, 521 000 to afforestation (ceiling of 750 000 never yet reached)	2 man-years at the government, 25 full time at the boards and 145 man-years for labor.
Managed and monitored by the departments regional offices. Must be a verification that the work was done before the money is given.	Yes. All information is on the web site.	Km planted.			2003 = 320000, 2004 = 401700	2
Forest renewal program delivered directly by government staff (technical advice, seedlings, incentives for planting management, operational coordination). Monitoring by the government. There is a commitment (contract) to keep the land forested for 15 years following planting.	Y. Brochure will be sent by post.	land owner satisfaction and success of plantations		900 ha/year, 2,5 million seedlings/year	980000	8,5 + 5 (nursery) + 2 (support)

1500 trees to plant annually	O (public consultation, press)	R		Tree Canada Foundation, Community organisations, Association of residents
	E, M, O (posters, flyers, fundraisers)	Y	Keeping close personal relationships with landowners, donors and financial partners	Several conservation organisations (For example : Centre de la nature du mont St-Hilaire, CIME)
	W (no marketing needed as they have a waiting list)	Y	They have long history of delivering programs and a good track record. Commitment to the landowners that er their members.	NRCan (2020), Provincial government, member boards.
Landowners dedicate the ground	W, O (marketing boards have newsletters)	Y	Marketing boards are important. Must have good relations with the owners at a grassroots level. No long term commitments.	marketing boards and the Federation of woodlot owners
MRNFP (department of natural resources can supply trees.	W, P	Y	Meets a need. Good results for the cost.	MRNFP, MENV, Agriculture Canada
Seedlings	W, P, print media	Y	Longstanding program. Financially advantageous to the landowner. Direct delivery means they can put effort where needed.	N

Received 10 000 \$ from Tree Canada Foundation, Association of residents plants trees, chooses location and species	They looked at what was being done in other cities.	Adequate financing to put the program into action. Go into greater detail and precision as to the description of the woodlands on their territory.		Y	N
First contact with landowners and management of the properties	The whole organisation is based on the concept of the Nature Conservancy in the USA.	Better financial incentives for landowners. Eliminate property taxes on land protected by non-profit organisations.		N (not interested in afforestation)	Y
NRCan : Funding and coordinate the criteria for their program, Province : Funding and jointly work on criteria. Both governments monitor their programs. Boards : they are the hands on delivery agents.	Not much. Looked at Quebec that has a similar history.	More funding (there are waiting lists), Potential to broaden criteria to plant more diverse species (they don't currently plant hardwoods and some would like to).	Farmland reclamation is funded at 90%, capped at a yearly maximum. This part of the program is target specific to old abandoned field sites to improve on wood supply. There could be better coordination with agriculture as they plant trees in some old fields while in other areas new fields are being created.	Y	Y
The federation of woodlot owners does the liaison with the boards.	The program is the offshoot of a federal/provincial program from which the federal gov. Pulled out.	Could probably grow more wood with more money or could lower rates and get more done but competition with crown rates and other issues can complicate things.		Y	N
coordination, planning, financing (from the federal gov.)	Yes. The use of windbreaks goes very far back.	More money, More free trees from MRNFP, More advertising	This program is highly appreciated and has a real impact. There are positive impacts for biodiversity as it creates habitat for wildlife such as birds and insects.	Y	N
	N	More landowner involvement, more education/awareness, By dealing with all private landowners.	The forest renewal program is mostly softwoods. The forest enhancement program is complementary. It includes partial plantings, enhancement plantings, lower of seedlings, requires a forest management plan and covers more species such as hardwoods and non timber species. Funding is different and based on flat fees that usually cover 2/3 of the cost. Delivery from the private sector. They are reviewing their overall policy and are likely to go towards a system based on the enhancement program with private sector delivery.	N (But interested in learning more about it)	N

31	Nanaimo Area Land Trust	EL	L	BC	http://www.nalt.bc.ca/index.html	250-714-1990	gail@nalt.bc.ca	#8 140 Wallace St. Nanaimo BC V9R 5B1	Gail Adrienne, Executive Director
32	BC Ministry of Forests: Woodlot License Tenure Program	PG	P	BC	http://www.forest.gov.bc.ca/ht/woodlot-program.htm	250-387-8317	dave.haley@gems2.gov.bc.ca or jd.haley@shaw.ca		Dave Haley, Woodlot License Forester, MoF Resource Tenures & Engineering Branch
33	Washington State Forest Legacy Program	PG	P	WA	http://www.dnr.wa.gov/ht/docs/amp/forest_legacy/intro.html	360-902-1102	forest.legacy@wadnr.gov	P.O. Box 47014, Olympia, WA 98504-7014	

Active in promoting the responsible stewardship of land in the Nanaimo region ("Land protection"). This work is being done in partnership with different levels of government, and non-governmental organizations.

4 (always in cooperation with another "co-covenanter" organization).

A woodlot license is a legal agreement between the Forest Service and the license holder that grants exclusive rights to manage and harvest Crown timber within the woodlot licence area. Woodlot licences are awarded through an advertised, competitive application process. The most suitable applicant is determined by evaluating the following info: 1) education and personal experience relevant to managing a woodlot licence; 2) amount and quality of private forest land that the applicant is proposing to include in the woodlot licence and 3) commitments as to how the woodlot licence would be managed if the applicant is successful ("management intent").

>800 woodlot licences currently held.

One of the program's objectives is "to increase the amt of private forest land under sustained yield management, and to improve the productivity of that land".

Actively acquires conservation easements to protect multiple use forestlands for the benefit of this and future generations. Legacy funding has been used to purchase the development rights to permanently protect water quality, forest resources, habitat, and social values and commercial timber options on landscapes that would otherwise revert to non-forest use.

Lands identified for acquisition include private working forests slated for development. The program generally acquires the interest in land through purchase of conservation easements. The parcels may remain in the original ownership, be moved to other private ownership or to public ownership. The landowner is paid up front by the Legacy program for the development rights. Legacy parcels continue forest commodity production, and non-commodity values such as healthy riparian areas, important scenic, cultural, fish, wildlife and recreation resources and other ecological values. Parcels are identified because they improve landscape management options for habitat, water quality and timber production.

LCB (forestry companies); CG (shareholder groups that have bought shares in a land); IL; and crown lands

1. Density bonusing - developers with large amount of property can keep 1/4 of it and have it rezoned for more, smaller parcels, and gift the remaining 3/4 for protection. Revenues remain approximately the same but more land is protected.

2. Covenants

3. \$\$ - land agreements always negotiated based on fair market value

4. good will - landowners want to protect their lands

IL

1. Access to Crown land timber - ability to make \$ off the sale of that timber

2. (potential) Harmonization of provincial and federal laws so that if you achieve one status (ie provincial managed forest status) you automatically achieve another (e.g. Revenue Canada's tree farm status)...less red tape! In other words if you are a licence holder and have managed forest status, that should be proof enough that you qualify for tree farm status.

3. Protection of the land (for some landowners). Although many would like some form of compensation (balancing act between making \$ off your forest for your children, or protecting it for ecological values)

4. some tax incentives (e.g. reduction of taxes if you have managed forest status..provincially) but this differs regionally.

annual monitoring program. 1 NALT person and 1 "co-covenanter" do the evaluation (some contract \$ to do this)

only add up their acres protected when they're called and asked for it.

set short and long term contracts

receiving some core funding from the city. More donations coming in, with more project successes reported.

1-4; 1 contract position

varies seasonally. Hundreds over a year, but some are just one-time volunteers.

District staff do informal monitoring (surveys; regeneration assessment; annual reports).

More recently, Compliance & Enforcement Branch have more tools to work with (fines, penalties)

ha private/crown land in tenure ;# ha reforested.

Annual total cost for '01-02 was \$4.4 million. Divided by # of licences (811) = \$5,425/woodlot (=29% of stumpage billed from woodlots, so contributes \$10.6million net revenue to the province)

currently in an expansion phase of the project.

- size of licences will double
- increase # of licences
- criteria will slightly change

- >520,000 ha in tenure
- many licence holders have Forest Stewardship Council or American Forest and Paper Assoc Sustainable Forests Initiative or 14001 Certification

provincial tax money?

6 regional forest offices and 40 district offices

many

time; donations; legal expertise; surveyors

media approaches them. (CBC, local channel, newspapers) yes very much

collaborative approach; being professional; non-confrontational; maintaining their autonomy (declined offer for office space at the city); very credible, good board essential

local, regional, provincial, federal government; local groups

W, newspaper adds *mostly when a tenure is up for bidding* Yes, from 95-01 average 6 applicants per advertised tenure.

Gives the private land rich/cash poor individuals the opportunity to get involved and learn about sustainable forest management (including planning; harvest; reforestation; mgmt of non-timber); participants take large ownership of their practices! (become involved...not just a logger for the crown!) very big role. Federation of BC Woodlot Associations created the BC Woodlot Product Development Council, which placed a self-imposed fee on licence holders (25c/m³) which is used for product development, finding better markets, etc. Promotion, extension,

Federation of BC Woodlot Associations mostly

Often, these groups think up projects and ask the NALT to get involved. Sometimes form coalitions with partner groups.

Turtle Island Earth Stewards (first land trust in BC); TLC came to their AGM last year. All of their programs are adaptations of others'.

increase public and government awareness and financial support.

see 16

seems to be unique in Canada/U.S. They have received inquiries from Saskatchewan and some states to mimic the programme.

Harmonization of prov and fed laws (see 7).; increase the incentives for small land owners; Canadian certification has to be cheaper to get, and market premium needs to be paid for certified wood; need to give land owners something **in between** LOG or PROTECT options

very enthusiastic about this topic...cautions about over-promoting afforestation, and creating benefits to landowners for it, while ignoring those who just protect the land (should equalize the incentives for both). We can call him anytime about this.

Yes.

34	Trees Ontario (Forest 2020)	PG, FG	P	Ontario	www.treesontario.on.ca	1-800-387--790 (416)493-4608 (416) 493-4565	jamesf@oforest.on.ca	c/o Ontario Forestry Association Suite 107, 200 Consumers Road, North York, ON M2J 4R4	James Fieldhouse
35	Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation	PG	P	MB	www.mhhc.mb.ca	(204) 724-0075 (204) 784-4359	stornblo@mhhc.mb.ca	200 - 1555 James St, Winnepeg, MB R3H 1B5	Shane Tornblom
36	Saskatchewan Environment, Resource Stewardship	PG	P	SK					Conrad Olson
37	US Department of Agriculture Forest Service - Programs, Policy and Communications - Carbon Credits	FG	F	Washington, DC			mbmurphy@ss.fed.us		Michael Murphy
38	Tree Canada Foundation	EN	F	Ottawa, On	www.tcf-ca.ca	(613) 567-5545 567-5270	jmonty@treecanada.ca	220 Laurier Ave West, Ottawa, ON K1P 5Z9	Jeff Monty

<p>Early pilot stage - selecting owners to participate in Ontario. 62 applications, not including properties under conservation authorities. 12,000 ha</p>	<p>12,000 ha, 62 applications</p>	<p>IL</p>	<p>2020 program differs from province to province - prairies to be planting only planting hybrid poplars. In Ont planting a mix, taking into account landowner objectives</p>
<p>Use forestry to add to value of land for wildlife habitat</p>	<p>130 agreements and approx 25,000 acres in easements plus 10,000 acres owned by MHHC</p>	<p>IL - rural in scope. 90% to residents, 10% to non-residents of the area</p>	<p>Woodlot management - to maximize returns to owners and rural communities. Conservation Agreements have largely replaced purchases. Technical support provided and have developed local sawmills and markets for value-added wood forests products - on-farm extension. Carbon Credits not considered - trees are supplied for some afforestation through Indian Head and other commercial nurseries. Focuses on agriforestry opportunities with wildlife habitat conservation objectives.</p>
<p>Solicit people to donate easements or buy easements</p>		<p>IL</p>	<p>Focused on natural landscapes to protect, natural values. Sask Ag - easements on Ag land, tendered sales to protect natural values (cannot clear break or drain). Timber can be harvested sustainably - when paid easements or donated - conservation oriented but tailored to meet landowner needs managing the land</p>
<p>easements etc are very small component of amorphous federal programs, largeley delivered through state gov't and ENGOS. Congress is debating approaches. IN a state of flux. Private woodlots, limited attention. Debating what new legislation would do to both private and public lands. Will email some info. Some woodlot programs from Ag side and some from forestry side. Carbon credits might make the difference re keeping land together rather than fragmented forest holdings (seem to be major problem for states). Carbon sequestration - public good by converting farmlands back to forest lands (e.g. Mississippi basin back from soy beans to forest). Some public utilities working with private land holders to claim carbon credits. Have private organizations working as facilitators e.g. Nature Conservancy, DU, Environmental Defence Leage, to bring landholders and opportunities for carbon credits together. US Wildlife Service -has 50,000 acres in ownerships and easements</p>	<p>50,000 acres in ownership and easements</p>	<p>IL</p>	<p>A = Ag accrues related to environmental agreement (conservation ? Through grants not a form for ? # yes, B = Forestry - gives grants to forest landowners through state gov'ts - poorly funded and little used, C = promoted on the good management (sustainable)</p>
<p>Make trees available to groups to plant but don't get into easements in urban areas or private lands</p>		<p>CG, IL</p>	<p>Do support enhancements that would be through easements. Part of Green Plan - over 7 years</p>

Discussion in 2000, First trees planted in spring 2004	Check brochure and application on website. Canadian Forest Service is preparing a website on the 2020 program	80% of trees surveyed after 1 year. Carbon in soil pre and post planting, tree measurement. Some scientific plots to be designed				
Informal annual visits by staff and aerial surveys periodically. Program originally under Forestry branch and funded by conservation department. Now moving to agriculture department		A, C, Other - level of update on various programs. New applications for easements reviewed by a multidisciplinary board before being approved	Limited by funding from North American Waterfowl Managment Plan and Endangered Spp programs		3 permanent and seasonal. 5 field staff monitor	none
Maintain a registry with database, have a working committee developing monitoring standards - no obligation under the legislation to monitor in pooled resources to monitor - conservation easement act	See website for brochure and factsheet	A, C, D, Other - public perception and political acceptance. Compare to land purchase costs	approx 25% of landscape protected from loss of natural enduring features	1,000,000 approx per year	1 paid employee	Resource pooling with NGO's and partnerships
Help monitor on the national scale re carbon sequestration - large scale and gross. Influx - had a voluntary reporting process is being revised with guidelines. - through underwriters ? Approach. Independent reviewers. The SAE reviewers. Not gov't inspectors	will be emailing	control of GHG emissions. Get down to 1990 levels of emissions	Carbon sequestration and easements woven through many programs. Carbon credit related target not ? Only for GHG			
spot checks		A, Other - no of school greends with sponsors	370 M trees target. Have 77 M so far.	Have 77 M trees planted to date	\$75 M orig in Green Plan. \$25 M went to feds, provincial split	mainly volunteers, 1300 orgs

		W - only a pilot. Attending woodlot management conferences and talked about program. Conservation authority promotes and other partners and contracted tree planters and others where no conservation authority in place	At present there is no provincially funded tree planting on private land, so this program is quite well accepted by landowners. RPF (registered professional foresters) have to approve each project to be hired by Trees Ontario	Mainly focusing on farmland that has been taken out again - large machinery	NRCan, Conservation Ontario
sweat equity re tree planting, etc	Conservation Districts often local partners and contribute logistical support	W - through conservation districts and land reps, P, Other - brochures, attend ag days, fairs, testimonials	Y - strong support from clients and agricultural gov't and ENGOS	Interpersonal skills of corp staff very NB All easements in perpetuity - replaced purchase - economically makes no sense to do otherwise. Municipalities can appeal to review board if they don't like the new easement but board does not accept appeals on basis of perpetuity Changed to easement from buying the land	local conservation districts and ag producers groups
are accepted but doesn't apply usually		W (most NB), M (on focus basis but with little reaction), E, P, L (SWF - promote the easement program as part of their overall program), Other - web sites, conventions, farmshows	Y - LV, LI (some)		DU, NCC, Nat Sask, Urban parks - especially Mewasin Valley Authority
		Mostly through utility industry because they're concerned about their environmental habititing	unknown	planting trees 1. They have been seen as good citizens 2. USA has volunteers and want to show will? 3. In future likely to become mandatory to give GHG Carbon credits may rise in value (speculation)	Many states and ENGOS, Nature conservancy, Environmental Defence League
	300 municipalities, 40 groups/year	W, E (website) Other - PSA's	leaders in innovation (related to climate change). Followers = program is well known and accepted through Green Streets program	flexibility. Match peoples passion to have trees. Match corporate needs. Know what turns their crank. Acces to other green funds	schools, private land holderst, municipalities, companies - have talked a bit with DU about habitat but not easements

<p>NRCan will have research scientists as well as Trees Ontario reg prof. foresters to do auditing; Conservation Ontario or local program delivery org is responsible for success of the planting</p>	<p>15 yr arrangement because landowners ? Longer and at 15 yrs trees are growing fast - cannot cut down for 15 years</p>	<p>if cost to landowners \$550 was less, would get more people interested. Would like to be able to order trees ahead.</p>	<p>Trees Ontario role is to coordinate the partners (NRCan, conservation authorities, nurseries)</p>	<p>Y</p>	
<p>local CDs and Ag producers groups help deliver the woodlot program and push political buttons</p>		<p>some form of addition of financial incentives would be useful to help cash strapped farmers. MHHC is restricted in the kinds of lands it can work on by terms dictated by their funders (e.g. NAWMP, Delta Water Fowl Foundation, End. Spp programs - large parts of province not touched.</p>	<p>working on ways and means of strengthening the forest management of farmers - most forests are in decline. Are considering some form of certification program.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y - example of working together with gov and private concerns through crown corp answering to a review board that includes most stakeholders in the program. 80% of the easements have mortgages on them</p>
<p>DU & NCC - are actually the major players. Gov't no longer has the people to run the field program. Gov't keeps the overall database and records for legal reasons</p>	<p>Basically doing own thing but suspect most agencies trying to save natural landscapes</p>	<p>Concerned about strength of legislation once the land changes hands - needs strengthening. No challenges yet</p>	<p>easements in perpetuity are tough for RM's to accept. The federal taxation benefits for ecological donation is VERY unweildy and has weakened the process. 6 yrs, 1st plus 5 yrs</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y - integration of gov't and NCC, DU easement programs quite interesting</p>
<p>want to test alternative Methods to land - fix it shut down or fund alternatives such as planting</p>		<p>Have new leg going - check material being emailed - new legislation may help</p>	<p>USDA has many programs from Ag side not likley and others from forestry side - most easements etc related program through ENGOS. At present the USDAFS have much land under fee ownership and have some easements but not their preference. Rent out the land for carbon credits is an option. Easements are dangerous because they are permanent. Real hodge podge of approaches because of different situations or regional and local basis. In Maine, much more comfortable with easements, more involved with large forests for commercial purposes. 200,000 acres of easements to prevent subdivision. Must be used for sustainable forestry meeting standards of a certification program - preliminary case in Massachusetts.</p>		<p>Yes - need to determine if USA federal system has any good aspects re integrating with state gov't and ENGOS. Not too likley because they officially are targeting at reducing GHG not at sequestering carbon. The ENGOS are more interested in developing the sequestration program because helps their conservation mandate</p>
	<p>not really. We are pioneers - multilingual and national</p>	<p>A - more innovating partnerships. B - working more closely with others - better networking. C- only 3 workers</p>	<p>Clean air and public and carbon certificate are based on size of plantation. Volunteers contribute for the credit. Mostly for non consumptive coservation use and ?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Download annual report from website</p>

39	Comité de bassin versant de la rivière Chaudière (COBARIC)	ER	R	Quebec	www.cobaric.qc.ca	(418) 389-0476	(418) 387-7060	cobaric@globetrotter.net	700, rue Notre-Dame Nord, Ste-Marie QC G6E 2K9	Hubert Lamontagne
40	Nova Scotia Nature Trust	ER	Provincial/State	Nova Scotia	www.nsntr.ca	(902) 425-5263	(902) 429-5263	jenniferp@nsnt.ca	P.O. Box 2202, Halifax NS B3J 3C4	Jennifer Pinks
41	Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources	PG	Provincial/State	Nova Scotia	www.gov.ns.ca/natr/forestry/	(902) 893-5699	(902) 893-6102	scbrown@gov.ns.ca	P.O.Box 68, Truro NS B2N 5B8	Steve Brown
42	Nature-Action Québec	ER	Provincial/State	Quebec	www.nature-action.qc.ca	514-347-1825	450-441-2138	sbachand@sympatico.ca	C.P. 434, St-Bruno QC J3V 5G8	Susanne Bachand
43	Association of Sustainable Forestry	ER	Provincial/State	Nova Scotia	www.asforestry.com	(902) 895-1179	(902) 893-1197	riaggas@asforestry.com	P.O. Box 696, Truro VS B2N 5E5	Rebecca Aggas
44	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service	FG	F (P since a regional office)	Maine	www.nrcs.usda.gov	(207) 990-9100	(207) 990-9599	susan.arrants@me.usda.gov	967 Illinois ave., Bangor ME 04401	Susan Arrants
45	Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration - Shelterbelt Centre	FG	F	SK	www.agr.gc.ca/pfra	(306) 695-5154	(306) 695-2568	foxh@agr.gc.ca	Indian Head, SK	Howard Fox, Manager

Promote environmentally sound and integrated management of resources in a watershed

All users of water in the watershed (farmers, municipalities, companies, governments, etc.)

Technical, education, financial, etc. Adapted to each individual case. Tree planting usually funded to 70% by the MAPAQ with the balance coming from the landowner or from an environmental financing program.

Protect land donated to them or through conservation easements. Also have a small pilot program (5 acres) for reestablishment of the natural forest on a site. They often have old cutovers and other non-forested land on the properties they protect which they allow to return to a natural state.

IL

Small income tax deduction for ecological gifts.

For every m³ of wood purchased the registered purchaser must spend 3 credits on silviculture (for those acquiring more than 5000 m³). This is spent on land types (private, industrial or owned by purchaser) in the proportion of the origin of the wood purchased.

LCB

The program is law. The purchasers must spend the determined amounts on silviculture.

Plant native vegetation to create wildlife habitat in urban settings

LCB, Municipalities

Motivated by reduced maintenance costs and improved image as an environmentally sensitive corporation.

Silviculture program that includes tree planting. Also deliver Forest 2020 program in NS.

IL

Completely reimburse cost of planting in both cases. The money comes from the government.

Cost sharing for tree planting that aswers to a resource concern such as decreasing erosion

IL

Cost sharing for forestry practices (generally covers 50-75 % of cost)

Creating, transferring shelter and forestry technologies

IL - agriculture primarily and some ecological areas

Effective tree plantings on ag land. Have done much research on shelterbelts, agroforestry technology. Incentives through provision of hardy trees for agroforestry. Shelterbelts are BMPs. Free of charge to landowner, rather than \$\$ incentive

The commitments are ensured by the signing of a watershed contract (voluntary contract signed by the stakeholders with an action in mind). Monitoring uses environmental performance indicators determined before the action is put in motion.	N. A guide for their action plan will be available next spring.	A, C, 5 waterways with buffer zones				
Stewardship program. The legal contacts for the protection of the properties includes the monitoring of the sites. This is done through their staff and volunteers.	Y. Will send them by post. Also information on web site.	A	A = 2500 acres protected		5	100
Standards are set by the government and a sample of the jobs are checked by the field staff. The credits for the work are pulled from the registered buyer if it does not meet the standards.	Y. Everything is on the web site.	B	B = compliance is ensured by law.	Paid by the wood buyers.	22	
They follow the whole process from beginning to end and train maintenance crews/contractors and supervise them so that the ecological landscaping concepts are adhered to.	N. Some information on web site. There will be more in the future.	B, C				
Work with landowners and contractors to deliver the program. They monitor sites and there is a minimum time the sites must stay in a productive state.	Y. Will send an information package by post.	A	Forest 2020 = 140 ha. Provincial program = 230 ha planted.		150000 for each program	1
Works by contract which will include a minimum time frame. Also must be implemented according to government specifications. Annual status review. Program run from the local field offices.	Y. Will send me information by email.	A, C	No targets other than to use up allocated funds.	The entire cost share program for farmers and landowners is of 9 million \$. Only a part goes to tree planting.		
Keep track of stock being moved. But has been little tracking of survival or effectiveness of the planting		A, B, C, D.	- 8000 people get trees. Don't measure efficiency of plantings but are working on that. Much tougher than the smaller 2020 Forestry program. Thinking of carbon credits	8000 people get trees	\$2.5 M	65 none

	W, M, E, P, L, O	Y	They bring the major stakeholders together so that they can correct the major problems involving water in the watershed.		Forest producers and the Forest agencies
Total resources (most in kind) valued at around 500 000\$	W, M, P, O (media releases, campaigns)	Y	Positive public relations. Need a good presentation to get landowners to donate land.	Very important. Contributions in kind as experts in science, law, computers, etc. The board of governors is volunteer.	Provincial government, Nature Conservancy, small ENGOS
	O (program is law)	R	Good network of silviculture contractors.		Some work with the federal government.
	W, E, L	R. Interest is growing.	Must be convinced and convincing. Must understand that there is a lot of education to do.		N
	M, P	Y	Work closely with landowners, professionals and contractors to deliver the program.		Y. The governments.
	M, E, P, L, O (Public announcements on radio)	Y	Every county has a field office with people that are well known in the community.		Y. Maine Dept. Of forestry and USDA Forest service.
Landowners take on responsibility for all the planting and maintenance	W, M, L. Program has bene operating for 100 years. Mailouts used for additional trees after initial planting. Others - field days, extension programs, fairs, etc.	Distribute 5 M trees annually. Has been as high as 12m	Awareness is pretty general - generation to generation. Tree planting is still relevant, despite changing soil conservation needs, but increasing demands for conservation (wildlife habitat). Have been supplying stock for the 2020 program.		Partnerships with government and conservation groups in MB, SK, AB and Peace River of BC, ag extension groups, county systems (AB)

Financial and technical support	N			Y	Y (Suggest contacting private woodlot owners and farmers)
Government provides technical support and expertise. ENGOS fundraise and provide local expertise	Y. Many working models taken from land conservancies in the USA which are larger and much older.	Increase fundraising abilities in the province.		Interested but time/resources are limited.	N
	N (but not sure as he wasn't there when the program started)	Match the treatments with their wood supply model by controlling how much effort goes into specific treatments. However, changes to the program are difficult because it is law and must be modified by parliament.	The buyers can also pay the government directly rather than do silviculture.	N. Program doesn't really include afforestation and it could be complicated to add a new silvicultural treatment to the list.	Y
	Yes. Based on a program she started with the Fondation de la Faune du Québec and the City of Montreal	Public education and awareness could be improved. Help of the media (newspapers, television) in this regard would help.	Would like to see the results of our project/questionnaires.	Y	N
Source of funds	Taken some administrative ideas from the other registered wood buyers.	More marketing of the program to increase awareness		Y (depends on what is required)	N
State delivers its own program (FLEP) and they try to make the two programs match. Consult with forest service for aid in management of the resources.	N	Greater outreach and greater staffing.		Interested but does not have the authority to answer.	Y
Forestry 2020 - PFRA supplying genetic stock (commissioning growers to produce the planting stock). Partners do the coordination of planting and extension to the farmers, watershed basin conservation (e.g. White Mud watershed association)	Have exchanges with China, etc. Found some hardy tree strains, ad hoc approach, in ? Have similar centre, with more facilitative role	Moving from prairie to more national basis working across Canada especially in research role and technology transfer. Removing the financial barriers.	Technology for planting e.g. weed control is the #1 barrier to people planting trees. Need for weed control. Provide plastic mulch - 800 m total length minimum to people planting. \$4 M from Climate Change action Plan to develop 2.7 M in ?. Very low cost to PFRA who supplies plastic.		GreenCover Canada - payment towards planting and a ten year commitment to keep in conservation condition. But not very attractive For Planting Trees. Pilots for a type of conservation easement. E.g. RM Weyburn - tax incentive if had field shelterbelt on your land.

46	Greencover Canada							
47	Environment Canada National Ecological Gifts Program	FG	F	Ontario	www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/ecogifts	(819) 994-6687		Manjit Kerr-Upal
48	Nature Conservancy of Canada - National Office	EN	F	Ontario	nature@natureconservancy.ca	1-800-465-0027 (416)932-3208	110 Eglinton Ave W, Suite 400, Toronto ON, M4R 1A3	Alyson Grose, National Director Land Securement Practices
49	Managed Forest Tax Incentives Program	PG	P	Ontario		1-800-387-0790		Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources Bev Campbell

Payment towards planting with a ten-year commitment to keep in conservation condition.

Encourages private landholders to donate ecologically important land or a partial interest in land to registered conservation organization/agency. Enforceable under provincial or territorial legislation. In return the donors get an income tax benefit

325 (as of 2003) CE's. 24,058 hectares. Concentrated in ON and BC with significant numbers also in Prairies (71% of EG in Prairies are easements)

103 (as of 2003)

National Charity - preserving ecologically significant areas through purchase, donations and easements to protect Canada's biodiversity

1.73M acres across Canada as of 2003

Private woodlot owners prepare forest management plan - submit and seek to qualify for 75% tax break on municipal taxes

1.5 M acres involved - 9,300 properties

IL (others are not excluded)

Donors receive a donation receipt for the fair market value of their ecological gift that can be applied against 100% of their annual income for calculating tax benefits. To get the tax benefit: 1. Must be certified as ecologically important/eco-gift. 2. EC approves recipient of the donation. 3. Fair market appraisal.

IL. Varies across the country. Larger land holders are of most interest. Landscape features of high biodiversity value. Funding from corporate businesses and large forestry groups

Getting an interest in land so not providing an incentive. Appeal to desire to preserve ecological values. Can appeal to business sense - may end up with a retirement nest egg - opportunity to work with professionals. Trying to look after places already important and in decent shape

IL

land owners generally enter to gain tax break. While working with professional foresters get more interested in learning about and managing their forest

Operates through provincial legislation so has to visit the land at least once per year. Easements are in perpetuity. Landowner can also donate to government agencies

Annual report 2003

A, B, C, Other - work with over 100 charities and governments. Continuously interacting and receiving feedback

no quantifiable targets. Purely voluntary to meet demands of income tax act.

10 across Canada

Monitoring of properties at regional level. Policies, procedures, stewardship and focus - out of national office. Science re: site selection at regional and national basis. CDCs contribute to some of the science

A, B, C, D, Other- more sophistication re representation of species and ecol. Funders - percentable of leverage - people like to get communities represented most for \$\$ spent

Targets set to protect certain aspects of the ecosystem in a defined period

\$50M revenues

130

MNR conducts the audits, deals with the landowners and collect the plans - pass on to municipal taxation people with make adjustments to tax assessment

A, B, C -

Directed at forest management, not afforestation. Minimal government cost

The Conservation recipients bear the risk of managing the land.

Ecogifts is too small to really track in Federal Govt financials

W, E, Other - handouts, pamphlets, posters, tax scenarios

Y

Program started in 1995 as a result of outcry of the recipient environmental community - they felt a program of this kind was needed.

see accepted list

Donated lands make up 10-15% of the revenue

W, P, Other - newsletter/mag - large fundraising action both at national and regional levels. Customising to different potential funders.

Y - some difficulty in BC - land trusts ? - competing and cloudin the picture re NCC marketing

have national strategies e.g. direct mail campaign. Regional delivery not much at national level

Frequently work with DU and provincial governments, Feds, other Land trusts

W, M

not really that popular where land taxes are minimal. Some landowners find process too complex or confusing

Some confusion because of constrand reorganizations and changing woodlot management objectives. Incentive is primarily financial - 1. Tax break, 2. Economic benefits of management

prov gov depts (taxation assessment), municipal govns, Ont Fed of Agriculture

		<p>May be beaucroatic but landowner needs to protect themselves to get fair treatment - EC certifies the fair market value. EC ca find a recipient if they fail to ?</p>	<p>Have Appraisal Review Panels - panel for each region - AT, QB, ON, Prairies/north, Pacific/yukon.</p>	<p>y</p>	<p>Not intended as method to sequester carbon, mostly for ecological purposes. Would like copy of final report</p>
<p>assistance with funding, science infor, sharing stewardship duties, managemnet procedures</p>	<p>Looked at TNC in US re rise of science and moving from ontario to national scope.</p>	<p>Mapping with the planning and program development - lag time to implement. Funders less interested in doing the planning.</p>	<p>Was difficult to get \$\$ for long term stewardship. Best approach through an endowment - use the interest to fund O and M. Difficult to get finding for endowments - part of the planning to programs. Justify the endowment especially on conservation easements. Endowment funds - can be done at the project level as well as difficient levels right up to the national endowment fund.</p>		
<p>MG - forwards reduced tax notice, OFA - does public education around MTIP and Ont Woodlot Assoc does education and services to MFTIP - prepared our directory</p>		<p>just reviewing - tax incentives insufficient to encourage participation where land values low - northern on. Inconsistent tax valuations sometimes minimize tax incentive.</p>	<p>Prog satisfy multiple objectives and uses of the forest - some landowners hire consultatn to do plant, reducing educational value</p>	<p>y - understanding their process which does or does not work depending on who you talk to</p>	

APPENDIX C

Document Database

Doc No.	Authors	Publish Year	Title	Book/Periodical Title	Publisher	Printing location
1	Reedy, H.	2003	Exploring Options for Aggrega.		Canadian Forest Servic.	
2	Reedy, H.	2003	exploring Options for Aggrega.		Canadian Forest Servic.	
3	National Sinks Table	1999	Sinks Table Options Paper. L.		Environment Canada, I.	
4	Kowalski, J. (ed)	2000	Climate Change Handbook for		Chair in Environmental University of Saskat	
5	Jacobs, J.	2000	Indianapolis Greenways Plan .		Indianapolis Greenway .	
6	Forest Stewardship Council of Canada		Comparative Analysis Table - .		Forest Stewardship Co .	
7	Unknown	2000	Conservation Easements S&W Report, Summer/Fall 2000		Ontario Woodlot Assoc .	
8	Environment Canada	2003	The Canadian Ecological Gifts .		Environment Canada, (Gatineau, QB	
9	Gallagher, M.	2003	Conservation Easements: Vol: Shoreline Vol 16. Oct 2003		Citizens for a Better Ea Virginia	
10	Nelson, N & Fowler, L	Date unknown	A Primer on Conservation Eas.		College of Environmenl .	
11	Best, C. & Wayburn, L.	Date unknown	Conservation Easements for F Coast Redwood Forest Ecology & Ma .			
12	USDA Forest Service	2003	Forest Legacy Program Implei.		USDA Forestry Service .	
13	USDA Forest Service	2001	Forest Legacy Program Natio .		USDA Forestry Service.	
14	Environment Canada	2002	The Ecological Gifts Program (brochure)		Environment Canada	
15	Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation	2004	A Landowner's Guide to Cons Fact Sheet		Government of Manitoba	
16	Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation	2003	Annual Report 2002/2003		Government of Manitoba	
17	Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation	Date unknown	Wealth in Woodlots - a landow .		Manitoba Agro Woodlo .	
18	Subak, S.	2003	(article in Replacing carbon lost from for Climate Policy 130(2003) 1-17		Elsevier	
19	Environment Canada	2003	The Ecological Gifts Program .		Government of Canada .	
20	Interior and Related Agencies subcommittee	2002	Investigative Report Summary: US Forest Service Forest Legacy Prc	USDA.		
21	Denhez, M	2003	Giving Nature its Due. Tax Tre	Sustaining Wetlands Issues Paper, Nc	North American Wetlan	Ottawa, On
22	Twolan-Strutt, L	1995	Wetlands and Woodlots	Sustaining Wetlands Issues Paper, Nc	North American Wetlan	Ottawa, On
23	Denhez, M	1992	You Can't Give it away. Tax a:	Sustaining Wetlands Issues Paper, Nc	North American Wetlan	Ottawa, On
24	Sheehy, G	1993	Conserving Wetlands in Mana	Sustaining Wetlands Issues Paper, Nc	North American Wetlan	Ottawa, On
25	Bond, W.K., Cox, K.W, Heberlein, T., Manning	1992	Wetland Evaluation Guide. Fir	Sustaining Wetlands issues Paper, Nc	North American Wetlan	Ottawa, On
26	Attridge, I.C	1997	Conservation Easement Valu	Report No. 97-1	North American Wetlan	Ottawa, On
27	Silver, T.M., Attridge, I.C., MacRae, M., & Cox.	1995	Canadian Legislation For Con	Report No. 95-1	North American Wetlan	Ottawa, On
28	Kulshreshtha, S., & Knopf, E.	2003	Benefits from Agriculture and .	Report Prepared for AAFC Shelterbelt .		Regina/Saskatoon,
29	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	1997	1997 Report of the PFRA She .		Prairie Farm Rehabilita	Indian Head, SK
30	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	1998	1998 Report of the PFRA She .		Prairie Farm Rehabilita	Indian Head, SK
31	Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration Inve	1999	PFRA Shelterbelt Centre Res.		Government of Canada	
32	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	2000	2000 Report of the AAFC-PFF .		Prairie Farm Rehabilita	Indian Head, SK
33	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	2001	2001 Report of the AAFC-PFF .		Prairie Farm Rehabilita	Indian Head, SK
34	Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration Inve	2001	PFRA Shelterbelt Centre Res.		Government of Canada .	
35	USDA Forest Service	2003	USDA Forest Service Forest L .		USDA Forest Legacy P .	
36	USDA Forest Service	2004	Forest Legacy Program Progr.		USDA Forest Legacy P .	
37	North American Wetlands Conservation Council	2004	North American Wetlands Cor .		North American Wetlan .	
38	Environment Canada	2003	Ecological Gifts Donors		Environment Canada E .	
39	Natural Resources Canada	2003	Forest 2020/Greencover... Aff	News Files - Articles from Western Wc	Canadian Forest Service.	
40	Environment Canada	2004	Donation and Income Tax Scenarios		Ecological Gifts Program	
41	US Department of State	2002	US Climate Action Report 2002		US Department of State, May 2002	
42	US Department of Agriculture	2004	US Agriculture and Forestry G	Technical Bulletin No.1907	Global Change Pogram Office, Office of the	
43	Cressel, M	2004	NRCS Releases Self-Assessn	NRCS News Release	US Department Of Agri	Washington, DC

44	US Department of Agriculture	Date unknown	Forestry Incentives Program Fact Sheet	US Department Of Agriculture Natural Resc
45	US Department of Agriculture	2002	Forestry incentives Program.	US Department Of Agri .
46	US Department of Agriculture	2002	Wetlands Reserve Program K Farm Bill 2002	US Department Of Agriculture Natural Resc
47	Kays, J	2004	Alternative Income Opportunit Journal of Extension, Vol 42 No.2	.
48	US Department of Agriculture	2002	Wetlands Reserve Program P Farm Bill 2002	US Department Of Agri .
49	Environment Canada	2004	Who Can Receive an Ecogift? Ecological Gifts Program	Environment Canada E .
50	Environment Canada	2003	Ecological Gifts Program Intro .	Environment Canada Ecological Gifts Progi
51	Environment Canada	2004	What are the Tax benefits? Ecological Gifts Program	Environment Canada Ecological Gifts Progi
52	Environment Canada	2004	Application for Appraisal Revi Ecological Gifts Program	Environment Canada Ecological Gifts Progi
53	Evergreen	2004	About Us Evergreen	
54	Green Legacies	Date unknown	Green Legacies - A Donor's Guide for B.C.	Green Legacies
55	Hillyer, A. & Atkins, J	Date unknown	Gifts of Land or Covenants: T Green Legacies - A Donors Guide for	Green Legacies
56	Tree Canada Foundation	2004	The TCF Climate Change Program	Tree Canada Foundation
57	National Agroforestry Centre	2004	What is Agroforestry?	National Agroforestry Centre, University of I
58	USDA Forest Service	2002	Forest Enhancement Program .	USDA Forest Service
59	USDA Forest Service	2004	Forest Legacy Program Protec .	USDA Forest Service
60	Natural Resources Conservation Service	2004	Conservation Security Program: Self-Assessment Workbook	US Department Of Agriculture Natural Resc
61	National Agroforestry Centre	2000	Working Trees for Carbon: Windbreaks in the U.S.	National Agroforestry Centre, University of I
62	National Agroforestry Centre	2003	Publications and Informational Materials	National Agroforestry Centre, University of I
63	Natural Resources Conservation Service	Date unknown	Information for Farmers, Ranchers and other Agriculturral (Ag) Produ	US Department Of Agriculture Natural Resc
64	National Agroforestry Centre	2004	Forest Farming	National Agroforestry Centre, University of I
65	National Association of State Foresters	2004	Home page	National Association of State Foresters
66	National Agroforestry Centre	2004	Special Applications	National Agroforestry Centre, University of I
67	New Zealand Minstry of Agriculture and Forest	Date unknown	Forestry Sings and the Kyoto Protocol	Government of New Zealand
68	Pollution Probe	2002	Forests and the Kyoto Protoc Probe Forest Carbon Management W	Pollution Probe
69	Government of Canada	2003	Designing a Greenhouse Gas Offsets System for Canada	Climate Change Canada
70	Government of Canada	2002	Forests and Agriculture Carbo Canada and the Kyoto Protocol	Climate Change Canada
71	Delegates from Australia, Canada, Iceland, Jap	Date unknown	Submission on Guidelines regarding Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol	
72	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change	2000	Special Report on Land Use, Land Use Changes and Forestry. Sumr	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Chang
73	Hillyer, A and J. Atkins	2000	Greening Your Title: A Guide to Best Practices for Conservation Cov	West Coast Environme Canada
74	Hillyer, A and J. Atkins	2004	Giving It Away: Tax Implications of Gifts to Protect Private Land	West Coast Environme Canada
75	BC Ministry of Forests		Woodlot License Program - Brochure	BC
76	Nawitka Renewable Resource Consultants	1999a	Carbon Sequestration Aspects of an Afforestation Program in British	Submitted to Joint Forest Sector Table/Sink
77	Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program	2004	CREP Operating 05-07 Decision Package	Prepared by State of Washington CREP Cc
78	Greater Vancouver Regional District	2002	Lower Seymour Conservation Reserve Management Plan	GVRD
79	Greater Vancouver Regional District	2002	Watershed Management Plan	GVRD
80	Rose, R and P. Morgan	2000	Guide to Reforestation in Western Oregon	Oregon Dept of Forestr Corvallis
81	Horsfall, L	2004	Word Doc explaining the Land Trust Alliance of BC's structure, programs, initiatives	
82	Sylvis Environmental	2003	British Columbia AgroForestry Strategic Plan 2003-2008	BC Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisher
83	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change	2000	Special Report on Land Use, Land Use Changes and Forestry Outlin IPCC	
84	Pollution Probe	2002	Forest Carbon Management Probe Forest Carbon Management W	Pollution Probe
85	Boehm, M	2003	Afforestation on the Prairies - .	Agriculture and Agrifood Canada
86	DeMarsh, P	1999	Potential for Afforestation on Private Woodlots in Canada	Submitted to Joint Fore Fredericton, NB
87	North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service	Date unknown	Woodland Owner Notes - Plar .	North Carolina State U .
88	Fleming, C.	2003	Landscape-Level Conservatio .	The Wilderness Society .
89	Giammusso, M.R.B.	2002	A Summary of Federal Land C .	Prepared for the North .

90	Tyrchniewicz, E., Gray, R., Holzman, J., & Tyr	1999	Assessing Policy Options for Reducing Deforestation Due to Agricult	Prepared for the Joint Forest Sector Table/
91	Szwaluk, K	Date unknown	Tree Planting and Conservation Delivery Organizations, Programs at	Manitoba Forstry Association
92	Williams, J., & Griss, P.	1999	Design and Implementation Options for a National Afforestation Prog	Prepared for the Joint Forest Sector Table/
93	ArborVitae Environmental Services & Woodriss	1999	Estimating the Carbon Seque.	Prepared for the Joint Forest Sector Table
94	Robinson, G.C., Peterson, E.B., Smith, S.M., a	1999	Estimating the Carbon Sequestration Associated with Reforestation i	Prepared for the Joint Forest Sector Table
95	US Department of Agriculture	2001	US Agriculture and Forestry G.	.
96	Northern Forest Alliance	2004	Funding the Future of the Nort.	Northern Forest Alliance
97	South Carolina Department of Natural Resourc	Date unknown	South Carolina Forest Legacy .	South Carolina Department of Natural Resc
98	Trees Ontario	2004	Forest 2020 Plantation Demor .	Trees Ontario
99	Trees Ontario	Date unknown	Trees Ontario Foundation	Trees Ontario
100	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	2003	Agriculture and the Environment - Air: Climate Change	Government of Canada
101	Climate Change Saskatchewan	Date unknown	Take Action: Agro-Producers	Climate Change Saskatchewan
102	Canada at the World Summit on Sustainable C	2002	Sustainable Development Action - Canadian Success Stories	Canada at the World Summit on Sustianabl
103	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	Date unknown	Agroforestry and Shelterbelts Best Management Practices. Growing	Climate Change Action Fund Agriculture Av
104	Fairchild, G	2000	Can Agricultural soils reduce (Atlantic Chapter Newsletter, Soil and \	SWCS - Atlantic Chapter
105	Kort, J. & Turnock, R.	Date unknown	Annual Carbon Accumulations in Agroforestry Plantations. An AgriFc	Agriculture and Agrifood Canada
106	Natural Resources Canada	2003	The Forest 2020 Plantation D Backgrounder	Natural Resources Canada
107	Carolinian Canada	Date unknown	Strengthening Incentives for Conservation	Carolinian Canada
108	University of Saskatchewan Communications	2004	Planting Trees Focus of New UofS Ag Research Chair	University of Saskatchewan
109	Health Canada	2001	List of Funding Sources Climate Change and Well Being: A po	Health Canada
110	Climate Change Saskatchewan	Date unknown	Saskatchewan Greenhouse G Climate Change Saskatchewan Editio	Climate Changes Saskatchewan
111	Bartlett, S.	2001	Bright Future for Hybrid Popla Innovation Fall 2001 Vol 8	Canada-Saskatchewan Agri-Food Innovatio
112	Davis, R.	2004	Fourth Quarter Report, Tiger Hills Conservation District	Tiger Hills Conservation District
113	Canadian Cattleman's Association	2003	Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Program for Canadian Agriculture	CCA Stewardship
114	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	2003	Greencover Canada - For Sus The Business Link - Serving Alberta;s	Government of Alberta
115	Ryan, S	Date unknown	Is there anything that trees Can't do?	Canadian Federation of Agriculture
116	Daynard, T.	Date unknown	Agriculture and Kyoto - an Update	Ontario Corn Producers Association
117	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	Date unknown	Shelterbelts and Climate Change	Government of Canada
118	Alaska Department of Natural Resources	2004	Forest Legacy Program	Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, ,
119	State of Rhode Island Department of Environm	Date unknown	Forest Legacy Program	Rhode Island Department of Environmental
120	Alabama Forestry Commission	2004	Alabama Forest Legacy Program	State of Alabama
121	Best, C.	2002	California Forest Legacy Program expands statewide	California Forest Stewardship Program
122	US Forest Service	2004	Mobile-Tensaw Delta: Phase Forest Legacy Program 2004 Project	US Department of Agriculture
123	Northern Forest Alliance	2003	Links to Northern Forest Alliance Members	Northern Forest Alliance
124	Tillamook Rainforest Coalition	2003	Healthy Forests, Healthy Stre: Protect the Tillamook	Tillamook Rainforest Coalition
125	Maryland Environmental Trust	2002	Forest Legacy Program	Maryland Environmental Trust's Land Cons
126	Winrock International	Date unknown	White River Carbon Offset Project	Winrock International
127	Winrock International	Date unknown	Entergy Carbon Storage Measurement Project	Winrock International
128	Winrock International	Date unknown	EPRI Collaborative Carbon Initiative	Winrock International
129	Winrock International	Date unknown	Cinergy Services Carbon Sequestration Project	Winrock International
130	Winrock International	Date unknown	Carbon Sequestration M&M in Lower Mississippi River Valley	Winrock International
131	Winrock International	Date unknown	Measurement for Carbon Market opportunities in California	Winrock International
132	Winrock International	Date unknown	Entergy Trees Restoring the Economy and Environment	Winrock International
133	US Environmental Protection Agency	2004	EPA Funds Available for Forestry Projects. State Foresters, Landow	Environmental Protection Agency Report F
134	Brockman, H	2004	Forest Land Enhancement Program, Briefing Paper	USDA Forest Service
135	Natural Resources Conservation Service	2004	FY-2004 Conservation Program Allocations to States	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Ser

136 Nix, S	Date unknown	The Latest Forestry Assistance About - Forestry	About Inc
137 Harrison, A. & Johnson, J.	2004	Veneman Launches Partnership with Pennsylvania to Improve Quality of Forests	Farm Service Agency
138 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	2003	Forest Legacy Program in Wisconsin	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
139 Quick, J. & Johnson, J.	2003	USDA Announces Sign-up for Hardwood Tree Initiative to Restore upland Forests	Farm Service Agency
140 National Sustainable Agriculture Information System	2001	Forestry Incentives Program (FIP) Offers cost-sharing for tree planting	National Sustainable Agriculture Information System
141 US Fish and Wildlife Service	2004	Partnerships with States: Tools for Helping Communities and Landowners	US Fish and Wildlife Service
142 US Fish and Wildlife Service	2002	Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances for Non-Federal Land	US Fish and Wildlife Service
143 Land Trust Alliance	Date unknown	Guide to the Forest Legacy Program	Land Trust Alliance
144 Western Pennsylvania Conservancy	2003	Forestland Conservation Program	Western Pennsylvania Conservancy
145 Interagency Wildland Fire Communications Group	2004	Forest Legacy Program	Interagency Wildland Fire Communications Group
146 The Conservation Fund	2004	WV Forest Legacy Program	The Conservation Fund
147 National Sustainable Agriculture Information System	2001	Forest Legacy Program authorizes the USDA Forest Service to Purchase Private Land	National Sustainable Agriculture Information System
148 North Carolina Forest Service	2001	North Carolina's Forest Legacy Program	North Carolina Forest Service
149 Utah State University Forestry Extension	Date unknown	Conservation Easements and Forest Legacy	Utah State University Forestry Extension
150 The Trust for Public Land	2004	Forest Legacy Program	The Trust for Public Land Federal Program
151 Virginia Department of Forestry	Date unknown	Frequently Asked Questions: Virginia Forest Legacy Program	Virginia State Government Department of Forestry
152 New Mexico Forestry Division	Date unknown	Introducing the New Mexico Forest Legacy Program	New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources
153 Michigan Department of Natural Resources	2004	Forest Legacy Program	Michigan State Government Department of Natural Resources
154 Idaho Department of Lands	2004	Idaho Forest Legacy Program	Idaho Department of Lands
155 North Carolina Division of Forest Resources	2004	Forest Legacy Overview	North Carolina Division of Forest Resources
156 Washington State Department of Natural Resources	Date unknown	The Washington State Forest Legacy Program	Washington State Department of Natural Resources
157 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	Forest Legacy Program. To All Iowans interested in our state's forest	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
158 Indiana Department of Natural Resources: Division of Forestry	2004	Forest Legacy Program: Questions Commonly Asked about Indiana's Forest Legacy Program	Indiana Department of Natural Resources
159 California Resource Management and Forestry	Date unknown	The Forest Legacy Program	California Resource Management and Forestry
160 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	2004	Forest Legacy Program	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
161 Florida Division of Forestry	Date unknown	Forest Legacy is Coming to Florida...	Florida Division of Forestry - Conservation and Forestry
162 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	2003	The Forest Legacy Program in Wisconsin	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
163 Delaware Forest Service	2003	Forest Legacy Program	Delaware Department of Agriculture
164 Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Date unknown	Forest Legacy Program	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
165 Iowa Department of Natural Resources	2001	Iowa Forests and Prairies Resources - A Plan of Action for 2001 - 2010	State of Iowa
166 North Carolina Forest Service - Division of Forestry	2003	Financial Incentives	North Carolina Forest Service
167 North Carolina Forest Service	1999	North Carolina's Conserving North Carolina's Forests: Assessment and Plan	North Carolina Forest Service
168 North Carolina Division of Forest Resources	1991	Becoming a Forest Steward in Forestry Leaflets	North Carolina Forest Service
169 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	Cost-Share Programs Available for Private Landowners in Iowa	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
170 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	Forest Land Enhancement Program. Iowa State Priority Plan	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
171 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	General Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
172 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	How to Plant a Tree (or hundreds of trees)	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
173 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - State	2002	Successful Tree Planting	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
174 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - State	2002	Grass and Weed Control for Tree and Shrub Planting	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
175 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	Forested Riparian Buffers	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
176 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	Qualifying for Financial Assistance Through the Conservation Reserve Program	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
177 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	Economic Benefits of Forested Riparian Buffers	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
178 Iowa Department of Natural Resources	Date unknown	Qualifying for the Conservation Reserve Program's Bottomland Hardwood	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
179 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	Bottomland Timber Establishment on Wetlands Initiative	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
180 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	Conservation and Environmental Benefits of Bottomland Hardwoods	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
181 Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Forestry	Date unknown	The Environmental Benefits Index Formula (EBI)	Iowa Department of Natural Resources

182	Natural Resources Conservation Service	Date unknown	Environmental Quality Incentives Program	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
183	Natural Resources Conservation Service	Date unknown	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
184	Natural Resources Conservation Service	2003	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Pro Farm Bill 2002	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
185	Natural Resources Conservation Service	2003	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Pro Farm Bill 2002	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
186	Natural Resources Conservation Service	2003	Wildlife Habitat Incentive Prog Farm Bill 2002	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
187	Natural Resources Conservation Service	Date unknown	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program - Fiscal Year 2001 Accomplishments	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
188	Natural Resources Conservation Service	Date unknown	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program State Programs	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
189	State of Michigan	2003	Forestland Expansion Supplement - FY 04 Michigan Wildlife Habitat	State of Michigan
190	State of Michigan	2003	Existing Forestland Improvement Ranking Supplement - FY04 Michigan	State of Michigan
191	State of Michigan	2003	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program FY04 Cost-Share List	State of Michigan
192	Natural Resources Conservation Service	Date unknown	Minnesota Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
193	State of Minnesota	Date unknown	Minnesota Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) State Plan Ex	State of Minnesota
194	State of Vermont	Date unknown	WHIP Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
195	State of New Hampshire	2004	FY 2004 New Hampshire - WHIP Approved Practice List, Practice List	State of New Hampshire
196	State of New Hampshire	2004	New Hampshire Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program - Final 2004 Report	State of New Hampshire
197	Natural Resources Conservation Service	2003	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Pro 2003 Annual Report - Montana	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
198	Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Wildlife	2003	Shelterbelt Program - A cost-share program of the Iowa Department	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
199	Grundberg, B	Date unknown	Forest Carbon Management: Will Alberta Landowners Participate	Presentation by AGFOR Consulting
200	GERT Technical Committee	2002	Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Trading Pilot (GERT) Final Report	GERT Technical Committee
201	Griss, P.	2002	Forest Carbon Management in Canada: Final Report of the Pollution Probe	Pollution Probe
202	Federation of BC Woodlot Association	2003	Cashing In on Carbon Credits Feasibility Assessment of Afforestation	Federation of BC Woodlot Associations and
203	Watkins, M. & Hilts, S.	2001	Land Trusts Emerge as an Important Conservation Force in Canada.	University of Guelph
204	Ottaway D. & Stephens J	2003a	Nonprofit Land Bank Amassed	Washington Post, Sunday May 4, 2003
205	Stephens, J. & Ottaway, D.	2003a	How a Bid to Save a Species	Washington Post, Monday May 5, 2003
206	Stephens, J. & Ottaway, D.	2003b	Nonprofit Sells Scenic Acreage	Washington Post, Tuesday, May 6, 2003
207	Ottaway D. & Stephens J	2003b	Landing a Big One: Preservation	Washington Post, Tuesday, May 6, 2003
208	Ottaway D. & Stephens J	2003c	Land Trust Alliance Rewriting	Washington Post, Saturday, October 25, 2003
209	Stephens, J. & Ottaway, D.	2003c	Developers Find Payoff in Pre	Washington Post, Sunday, December 21, 2003
210	Stephens, J. & Ottaway, D.	2004a	IRS to Audit Nature Conservation	Washington Post, Saturday, January 17, 2004
211	US Internal Revenue Service	2004	Treasury and IRS Issue Notice	Press Release, June 30, 2004
212	Nawitka Renewable Resource Consultants	1999b	Carbon Sequestration Aspects of an Afforestation Program	Canada's Submitted to Joint Forest Sector Table/Sink
213	Canadian Boreal Initiative	2003-2004	About Canada's Boreal	Canadian Boreal Initiative
214	Bryan, Roger	2001	New Partnership for Sustainable Woodlot Management	Alberta Government
215	The Pacific Forest Trust	2002	The Pacific Forest Trust	The Pacific Forest Trust
216	SaskPower		Old Man on His Back	SaskPower
217	SaskPower		Ducks Unlimited	SaskPower
218		2003	The Trust for Public Land	2003 Annual Report
219		2004	Forest 2020 Demonstration Plots and Assessment	Natural Resources Canada
220	Alberta Pacific Forest Industries Inc.	2002	Poplar Farms	
221	McKenney, D.W.	2004	A Canadian Afforestation Model (CFS-AFM) (including wood, carbon	Natural Resources Canada
222			Conservation Ontario	
223			Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
224	Ontario Power Generation Inc.	2000c	Reforestation	Environment & Community
225	Boyd, James/Caballero, Kathryn/Simpson, David	1999	The Law and Economics of Habitat	Discussion Paper 99-32
226			Standards and Accounting for Carbon Sequestration and Terrestrial	Environmental Defense
227	Land Trust Alliance		Contact Information	Land Trust Alliance

228 Rainforest Alliance
229
230 Foreman, J. Michael
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273

Sustainable Forestry
2003 Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, Factsheet
2000 Virginia Forest Legacy Program Assessment of Need

Rainforest Alliance
USDA Farm Service Agency
Virginia State Government Department of F

URL	Chapters, pages referenced	File Name
http://www.woodlot.bc.ca/pdfs/ca		1_NRCan Carbon Report.pdf
http://www.woodlot.bc.ca/pdfs/ca		2_NRCan Carbon Report appendices.pdf
http://www.ec.gc.ca/pdb/ghg/doc		3_EC_Carbon Sinks Options paper.pdf
http://www.csale.usask.ca/PDFDocuments/cchTitlePreface.pdf		4_CC Handbook for Agriculture 2000.pdf
http://www.indygreenways.org/news/masterplan/Introduction.pdf		5_Indianapolis Greenways Plan
www.fsccanada.org/word_doc/Comparative_Analysis_BorealCSF.doc		6_FSC_Comparative Analysis_Boreal.doc
www.ont-woodlot-assoc.org/sw_cons_eas.html		7_OWA_Conservation Easement article.pdf
http://www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/ecoq		8_EC_ecogift handbook.pdf
http://www.cbcs.org/SL%20Land		9_SL_Land Trust_Conservation Easements article.pdf
	pp 8	10_UofGeorgia_ce Primer.pdf
	pp 3	11_CRF_prodforest.pdf
	pp 43	12_USDA Forest Serv 2003 Forest Legacy Guidelines.pdf
	Executive Summary, p1	13_Forest Legacy Program National Report 2001_Executive Summary
www.cws-sfc.ec.gc.ca/ecoqgifts	brochure	hard copy brochure
www.mhhc.mb.ca	pp 43	hard copy brochure
www.mhhc.mb.ca	pp 28	hard copy document
www.mhhc.mb.ca	pp 10	hard copy document
www.sciencedirect.com	p 1-17	hard copy document
www.cws-sfc.ec.gc.ca/ecoqgifts	pp 25	hard copy document
	pp 1	hard copy document
	pp 54	hard copy document
	pp 24	hard copy document
	pp 56	hard copy document
	pp 28	hard copy document
	pp121	hard copy document
	pp 75	hard copy document
	pp 66	hard copy document
	Executive Summary, pp8	hard copy document
	pp 84	hard copy document
	pp 83	hard copy document
	pp 139	hard copy document
	pp 8	hard copy document
	pp 9	hard copy document
	pp 97	hard copy document
	pp 2	
www.fs.fed.us/spf/coop/program	pp 4.	website
www.terreshumidescanada.org/n		website
www.cws-sfc.ec.gc.ca/ecoqgifts/hb_don_e.cfm		website
http://hofc.cfs.nrcan.gc.ca/public		website
www.cfs-scf.ec.gc.ca/ecoqgifts/tax_e.cfm		website
http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globe	Chapter 4 - Policies and measur	hard copy document
Chief Economist	pp 164	42_US ag & forest greenhouse gas inventory.pdf
www.nrcs.usda.gov/news/releases/2004/cspassessmenttwkbk.htm		43_NRCS New conservation security

www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/fip/FIPfact.html website
www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/fip/ website
 . 46_USDA Wetlands Reserve program.pdf
<http://www.joe.org/joe/2004april/rb6.shtml> 47_Alternative Income Opportunities Needs of County Income Supplements from Woodlots_files
 48_FarmBill2002_General description.pdf
www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/ecogifts/receives_e.cfm website
www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/ecogifts/intro_e.cfm website
www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/ecogifts/benefits_e.cfm website
www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/ecogifts/process/applic_e.cfm
www.evergreen.ca/en/about/about.html website
http://www.stewardshipcentre.bc.ca/green_legacyes_web/index.as website
www.stewardshipcentre.bc.ca/green_legacyes_web/index.asp website
www.treecanada.ca/programs/climatechange/about.htm
www.unl.edu/agroforestry.html
www.fs.fed.us/spf/coop/programs/loa/flep/shtml
www.fs.fed.us/spf/coop/programs/loa/flp/shtml
www.nrcs.usda.gov
www.unl.edu/nac/brochures/wbcarbon/index/html
www.unl.edu/nac/pubs.html
www.nrcs.usda.gov/partners/for_farmers.html
www.unl.edu/nac/forest-farming.html
www.stateforesters.org
www.unl.edu/nac/special-apps.html
www.maf.govt.nz/mafnet/rural-nz/sustainable-resource-use/climate/sinks/climate-04.htm
<http://www.pollutionprobe.org/whatwedo/FCM/backgrounder3.pdf> 68_Probe_Forests and Kyoto_backgrounder3.pdf
www.climatechange.gc.ca/english/publications/offsets/kyoto.html
www.climatechange.gc.ca/cop/cop6_hague/english/forests_e.html
<http://www.meti.go.jp/english/topic/data/e90804jj.pdf> 71_Submission re Art6 Kyoto.pdf
<http://www.ipcc.ch/pub/srlulucf-e.pdf> 72_IPCC Special Report on LULUCF summary for policy makers.pdf
<http://www.wcel.org/resources/publications/default.cfm>
<http://www.wcel.org/resources/publications/default.cfm>

is Table - National Climate Change Process

mmittess

<http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/water/pdfs/lscrmgtplan0902.pdf>

<http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/water/watershed-management-plan.htm>

http://www.agf.gov.bc.ca/agroforestry/publications/documents/agroforestry_strategyplan.pdf

www.ipcc.ch/activity/srlu-out.htm

<http://pollutionprobe.org/whatwedo/FCM/backgrounder3.pdf>

Sinks Table

Sinks Table Afforestation Study #6: Assessing design and implementation options for a national afforestation program and Sinks Table, Canadian National Climate Changes Process.
and Sinks Table, Canadian National Climate Changes Process.

www.dnr.state.sc.us/wild.forlegacy/forlegacy/html	Brochure
www.treesontario.on.ca/main.html	
www.agr.gc.ca/policy/environment/air_03_e.phtml	website
www.climagechangesask.ca/Action-Agro.htm	website
www.wssd-smdd.gc.ca/sd-action/stories/agriculture_e.cfm	brochure/factsheet
vareness Program	
http://personal.nbnet.nb.ca/bccse/vol2no1.html	website
http://www.nrcan-rncan.gc.ca/media/newsreleases/2003/2003108a_e.htm	
www.carolinian.org/conservationprograms_greening_incentives.htm	
www.usask.ca/events/news/articles/20040128-1.html	press release - website
on Fund	brochure newsletter communication
www.jpccs.on.ca/biodiversity/ghg/mitigation/mitigation.html	
http://www.cbcs.org/alberta/search/display.cfm?Code=3105&coll=FE_FEDSBIS_E	
http://www.cfa-fca.ca/english/programs_and_projects/climate/prairies-shelterbelt.pdf	
www.ontariocorn.org/growing/as99art1.html	powerpoint presentation
www.dnr.state.ak.us/parks/grants/flp.htm	website
www.state.ri.us/dem/programs/bnatres/forest/flpinfo.htm	website
www.forestry.state.al.us/forestlegacyprog.htm	website
www.ceres.ca.gov/foreststewardship/html/callegacy.html	website
	factsheet
www.northernforestalliance.org/links.htm	
www.tillamookrainforest.org/TRC/Protect_the_Tillamook/Index.html	
www.conservemd.org/purchased/forestlegacy/	w
www.winrock.org/fact/facts/cfm?CC=5468	factsheet
www.winrock.org/fact/facts/cfm?CC=5459	factsheet
www.winrock.org/fact/facts/cfm?CC=5342	factsheet
www.winrock.org/fact/facts/cfm?CC=5265	factsheet
www.winrock.org/fact/facts/cfm?CC=5348	factsheet
www.winrock.org/fact/facts/cfm?CC=5412	factsheet
www.winrock.org/fact/facts/cfm?CC=5390	factsheet
S-765	
www.fs.fed.us/cooperativeforestry/programs/loa/flep.shtml	
www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/2004_Allocations/2004_Allocations.html	

<http://forestry.about.com/library/weekly/aa113098.htm>
www.fsa.usda.gov/pas/fullstory.asp?storyID=1612
www.dnr.wi.gov/org/land/forestry/legacy/state.html
www.fsa.usda.gov/pas/fullstory.asp?storyID=1479
www.attra.org/guide.fip.htm

www.lta.org/publicpolicy/flweb.htm
www.paconserve.org/rc/fcp-leg.html
www.rockymountainwildlandfire.info/grants/forest_legacy_flp.htm
<http://www.conservationfund.org/?article=2689&back=truehttp://www.cfda.gov/static/10676.htm>
www.attra.org/guide.fip.htm
www.ces.ncsu.edu/nreos/forest/legacy
http://extension.usu.edu/forestry/Landowner/taxes_easements%20and%20fr%20legacy.htm
http://www.tpl.org/tier3_cd.cfm?content_item_id=10567&folder_id=191
<http://www.dof.virginia.gov/mgt/faq-forest-legacy-prog.shtml>
http://www.emnrd.state.nm.us/FORESTRY/Legacy/legacy_brief.cfm
http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-10367_26307-76074--,00.html
<http://www2.state.id.us/lands/Forest%20Legacy/legacy-1.htm>
http://www.dfr.state.nc.us/tending/tending_legacyoverview.htm
http://www.dnr.wa.gov/hdocs/amp/forest_legacy/legacyhome.html
<http://www.iowadnr.com/forestry/aonr3.html>
www.state.in.us/dnr/forestry/legacy/legacy2.htm
<http://www.fire.ca.gov/ResourceManagement/ForestLegacyProgram.asp>
<http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/forestlegacy/index.html>
http://www.fl-dof.com/Conservation/forest_legacy/index.html
www.dnr.state.wi.us/org/land/forestry/legacy/state/html
www.state.de.us/deptagri/forestry/legacy/htm
www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/programapps/legacy2.html

www.dfr.state.nc.us/starting/starting_incentives.htm
www.ces.ncsu.edu/nreos/forest/legacy/assessment.html

www.iowadnr.com/forestry/costshare.html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/pdf/iowaFLEP.pdf
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/crp/html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/plant.html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/pdf/planting.pdf
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/pdf/weeds.pdf
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/riparian.html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/qualify.html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/bufferecon.html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/qualifybh.html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/bottomland.html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/consbenbh.html
www.iowadnr.com/forestry/crpebi.html

www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/equip

www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/

rvices

rvices

rvices

www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/accomplishments/2001whip.html

http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/WHIP_signup/WHIP_Stateprograms.html

rvices

rvices

www.iowadnr.com/wildlife/files/shelterbelt.html

www.gert.org

! NRCan

P A01

P A01

P A01

P A09

P A14

P A01

P A01

www.irs.gov/newsroom/article/0,,id=124485,00.html

is Table - National Climate Change Process

www.borealcanada.ca/about_boreal_e.cfm

[www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/\\$department/newslett.nsf/all/acc1002?OpenDocument](http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/$department/newslett.nsf/all/acc1002?OpenDocument)

www.pacificforest.org/homebody.html

www.saskpower.com/environment/initiatives/oldman.shtml

www.saskpower.com/environment/initiatives/ducksunlim.shtml

www.glfc.cfs.nrcan.gc.ca/feasibility_e.html

www.opg.com/envComm/C_planting.asp

www.rff.org

www.lta.org/findlandtrust/CA.htm

www.rainforest-alliance.org/programs/forestry/trees/activities/landscape-initiative.html

ORestry