

Colorado State University Libraries  
Center for Collaborative Conservation  
Seminar and Discussion Series

Transcription of The role of collaboration in stewardship contracting, 3/6/2012

Collection: Spring 2012

Title: The role of collaboration in stewardship contracting

Date: 3/6/2012

File Name: CCC\_2012\_Spring\_Mattor.mp4

Date Transcribed: November 2024

Transcription Platform: Konch AI

BEGIN TRANSCRIPTION

[00:00 - 00:08] So, this is what she's saying at the same time. So we'll look around library website. We actually have people on the slides but at the same time they will review this [unintelligible] sure. [laughs]

[00:13 - 02:24] Kathie Mattor: All right. Thank you, Joe. Thank you, Robin. And thank you all for coming. Today, I'm going to provide you with a presentation on some of the work I'm doing for my PhD research. And that is on Stewardship Contracting and Collaboration in the US Forest Service. And so just to kind of give you a little bit of a research background, you know, with the increase in sustainability efforts, forest practitioners and managers have identified that there's an urgent need to identify processes, which simultaneously address forest management needs as well as local community needs and broader community needs. In the, in the US, we've seen a shift towards collaboration over the past 20 years as a means for addressing that as a process that would allow us to meet the sustainability goals. But, there's a huge diversity of approaches to collaboration and a lot of site specific contexts which influence the use of collaboration and how it's applied to different processes. And so, that makes it very difficult to, to research kind of, what are the factors that influence the use of, of collaboration as well as what is the the role in the relationship between collaboration and the outcomes? Is there a direct role or not? And so, because of this, there really hasn't been broad, large scale research on collaboration efforts, because there isn't as, there isn't a defined population. And so, what I did was to stewardship contracting as a population of supposedly collaborative forest management efforts that are intended to reach both forest and community sustainability goals. So that's kind of why and where we're at. Well, what is stewardship contracting, you're wondering?

[02:24 - 04:37] Kathie Mattor: Well, it came about kind of the precursors to it, where there was a drastic reduction in in timber sales on our US forests in the late 1980s, early 90s. And part of those, the receipts from those sales went to doing forest restoration, whether it was habitat restoration, you know, fixing up trails or closing roads. And so with the decrease in timber sales, there was also a decrease in the available funding to do restoration work. And with the increase in the concept of ecosystem management, stewardship contracting came out of that as a way to combine service with timber contracts and as a means to fund doing restoration work. And so it was introduced as a pilot program from 1999 to 2002, received semi-permanent legislative status in 2003, and it'll go till 2013. And what it does straight from the legislation is allow the Forest Service and the BLM to perform services to achieve land management goals for the National forest and the public lands that meet local and rural community needs. It's a soft policy tool, which means that managers aren't required to use stewardship contracting. It's just another tool in the toolbox and provides a lot of mechanisms that were previously not allowed for them to use. The other thing is that the Forest Service Handbook, so the administrative law requires that collaboration is used at the beginning of the process and throughout the process. But it's not, as we'll see, not always the case, but we'll part of what I'd like to do is to figure out why. So very quickly, there's been a lot of broad scale research done on it. But most research, there's been programmatic level monitoring at the Pinchot Institute for conservation is hired on to do.

[04:37 - 06:42] Kathie Mattor: And basically every year they look, they do a phone survey of 20 percent of the sample of stewardship contracts to find out. Okay. Well, hey, what's going on with the public involved in it? And so this is what the data that I used that I'll present to you today. But the, the main thing on that is every year they provide a report, but it's more of a snapshot in time. And frequencies of hey, we had this many people say it was collaborative and there's no kind of comparison across regions or over time. So it's just kind of a snapshot. There's been quite a few case studies, but very brief. One page, hey, here's what we're doing. It's great. A lot of them are posted on the Forest Service link to the Forest Service website. So it doesn't provide the ability to compare across those efforts. And then there is a couple GAO reports done both on collecting data and public involvement over several years ago. So what we don't know is basically kind of what's the spatial and temporal distribution of these contracts? Who's using it? And how, how many acres are associated? What are those levels of collaboration across regions in years? What are some of the associated outcomes with stewardship contracting as well as community involvement? And so this first, this first bullet is basically what I'll focus on today. And then these following bullets of whether it's meeting its policy intentions, kind of what is what's the role of collaboration in that, and what makes collaboration tick, you know. What's the influence of collaboration in these processes? I'm going to be working on the next stage of my research.

[06:43 - 08:56] Kathie Mattor: So thank you to the center for Collaborative Conservation. I was able to attend four of the five regional stewardship contract meetings that Pinchot Institute does every year. And it's basically a lot of the practitioners from different regions of the area, both Forest Service community and NGO. And they sit and discuss, you know, kind of some of the challenges and, and what are the, you know, what are the accomplishments? And most of them did field tours. So it was a good networking experience providing a lot of insight into how is it working on the ground, how are people interpreting collaboration and stewardship contracting in time. So I'll provide a little bit of insight into that towards the end. And then a long time ago, I obtained data from the US Forest Service. Basically it provides, it was basically a list of names of the contracts, how many acres, when they were started, how and where, you know, where they were. And so I was able to create a data set to kind of get an idea of, all right, well, where is it being used and how often? And then I also receive data from the Consumer Institute for 2007 to 2010. And that provides all the majority of the data for their research, the survey questions [unintelligible] so we'll go into that. So jumping in just to get kind of a, an overview of like what's the state of stewardship contracting first provide you with. Some insight into the number of contracts across regions. So the US Forest Service and although it looks as though there would be a difference across regions, the dataset actually takes into account the number of forests within each region. And so there is no statistical difference across regions over the entire time frame because.

[08:57 - 11:24] Kathie Mattor: As for example, region ten has two forests within it. Region six has about 34. And so, across those averages, you don't have a statistical difference across those. But there was, as you can see, in kind of, in the, the size of the different colors, you can see that there was a huge increase in the number of contracts over time. Basically, it went from, just a second, 48 contracts from 1999 and 2002. So that was the pilot phase to 231, to, in 2003-2006 to 595 contracts in 2007-2010. So that's it, it's quite a large increase. We see the same thing in the Associated Acres across regions and over time, where there appears to be a difference. But taking into account the number of forests and the number of acres within those forests, there is no significant difference. And again, there was a huge increase over time. So that kind of sets the stage of okay, well, where are we with stewardship contracts and the use of those? For the rest of the presentation, I'll share with you some of the results of, of the collaboration. So within those areas that are using stewardship contracts, what, how are they using public involvement and what is the level of collaboration? So the first question that I was interested in from this survey, is respondents were asked to, to what degree would you consider community involvement in the stewardship contracting project to be collaborative? And so, as you can see here, there are quite a few differences with the darker purple being those that perceived it as collaborative and the lighter purple, less collaborative.

And so, we see that there, region eight has a very high level of collaboration, region nine and one and five have lower levels of perceived collaboration.

[11:24 - 14:00] Kathie Mattor: But they're all fairly high. They're all above 70%. Which makes you wonder okay, well, the handbook says it needs to be collaborative, and they're getting a phone call survey of hey, was it collaborative? So [laughs] what I wanted to do is look at a few more of the questions and see if the indicators of collaboration showed similar results. And so the first there's four indicators. The first thing, well who initiated it? And what you would, [clears throat] what I did was compared this to across regions over time and then compared it to, I tested it against the, the perceived level of collaboration. And so testing it against the perceived level, it indicated that those processes that were jointly initiated are considered to be more collaborative 93% of the time, so, [pauses] which makes sense. And then again, looking at the regions, you'll find that region eight had the highest number of jointly initiated processes. So, it does tie into that first graph. Region nine, five, and one had the highest levels of agency initiated projects. And there were significant differences between the years, but it jumped around and didn't make much sense with the data that I did have. So, as we all know, collaboration is basically a number of diverse interests working together. And so, that was the next indicator that I looked at was, well, how many interests are involved? So basically the survey questions, the phone interviews, they were asked to identify all of the people, different organizations that were involved. And so, there's quite a number of different groups that were involved. And so, I basically summed those up to create this variable and then compare those across the regions over time. And to that first question of their perception of collaboration, and found [clears throat] that there was a significant difference across regions.

[14:00 - 16:32] Kathie Mattor: And 7 to 9, including 7 to 9 interests, was. was the key that had the highest level, the I mean, the higher number that you went, it, it was more collaborative. But for some reason, [unintelligible] of 10 to 12, and probably because there is a limited number that actually used that, that had that many interests involved. And again, and so again, region nine had the highest number of, and region eight, both had the highest numbers of 1 to 3 interests being involved. And regions, region one actually had the most of the 7 to 9 interests. Also, then how is the community involved? What was the, what were they, how were they asked to be involved? And I'll get into some of the details on this in the next slide. Again, they were given a list of, of different ways that, that they could be involved, including planning and design, implementation, monitoring on that type of role. And again, I added those together to compare those across regions over time and to compare it to the collaboration. And again, 7 to 9 roles. So was, 7 to 9 was the magic number. We did see a difference across those with region nine having the lowest number of roles, 1 to 3. And region eight having the highest number of roles for the community. So it ties back into that, that first

slide. Well, what are they asking the community to do? There were four, overall there was 12 roles identified. There's four that stuck out. Um, the first being NEPA analysis. And that had no significant differences across regions because nobody thought that it was really all that important for the community to be involved in as far as the stewardship contract, and as far as, you know, they didn't think it made much difference in whether the process was collaborative.

[16:36 - 19:24] Kathie Mattor: Planning and design however, 94% considered the process to be more collaborative when planning and design is incorporated. Again, region eight had the highest. Region nine had the lowest. Implementation, 92% consider the process to be more collaborative when implementation role was incorporated. This increased significantly from 31% in 2007 to 52% in 2010. And there was again a significant difference across regions with region three having the highest and region nine with the lowest. And then monitoring. There were significant differences across regions here as well. Region six used it the most, region nine the least. And this again, it was, 94% considered the process to be more collaborative [unintelligible] as, as we would, we would expect. And so then the last indicator of collaboration that I looked at were the outreach methods. So how are, people were asked, let me give you the real, the question was what outreach efforts are being or have been used to get people involved in the project? And so I added to get these all together again. Looked at it over years, regions and levels of collaboration. And found that again, the level of collaboration rose with the number of outreach methods used. So the more outreach that was used, the higher the level of the perceived collaboration in, in these stewardship contracts. Again the, region three actually had the least number of outreach methods 1 to 3 or, or the most that used 1 to 3. Region six used 4 to 6 and region one used and 9 the most. And 95% considered the process more collaborative when 7 to 9 methods were used. So again, some of the ones that stuck out, uh, was personal contact.

[19:24 - 22:17] Kathie Mattor: This did not vary across regions. This was used fairly high. 67 to 77% of the time, personal contact was used as the mechanism. It didn't have, it had an 89% influence on the processes considered collaboration. And then, as we would hope, if they used a collaborative process, 95% thought that the process was collaborative [laughs]. Indicates, you know, some, some variation in definitions of collaboration, I would expect. And then field tours were used, also used as an outreach mechanism, so 90% considered the process more collaborative when field tours were involved. Well so then, taking a look at the data, I was able to, they also ask about the outcomes of the stewardship contract process as well as the outcomes of the community involvement. And so, I was able to look at these across regions over time. And then in relation to that first question on the perceived levels of collaboration. And so local jobs, 74% saw this as a benefit. There's a huge increase from 60 something percent to 80% from 2007 to 2010. And had some influence on

collaboration, had some influence on whether local jobs [unintelligible] is a benefit or not. On the ground work being accomplished, this did not vary across regions. The majority of people saw this as a benefit of stewardship contracting. It didn't vary over time. It was about 86% more likely if the process was collaborated. Another economic benefit is the greater opportunity to use local contractors, part of some of the mechanisms within stewardship contracting, allow for greater use of local contractors. And this didn't vary across region or time. It was about 87% more likely when the process was considered collaborative. Increased collaboration was 92% more likely when it was considered to be a collaborative process.

[22:17 - 27:23] Kathie Mattor: It did region, it did vary across regions, with region eight having the high, higher percent of outcomes. Region one having a lower. And then improved efficiency and effectiveness by combining the steward, the timber contracts and service contracts. It's intended to improve efficiencies and administrative efficiencies and effectiveness. But we saw only 74% considering this likely to happen as collaborative process. And this may be just because many people still consider it a new process. 89% saw that there is improved public trust when the process was collaborative. Did not vary across regions or over time. Um, and maybe the, one of the, the largest outcomes was specific project outcomes. And these have been in the annual Kensho reports has, has really stood out as you know, most people saying, yeah, this having on the ground work, you know, specific project outcomes, this was seen as the largest benefit. With 97 seeing this as a benefit overall and 99% considering it more likely when collaboration is used. So that's exciting. And the top three outcomes were actually habitat improvement, fuels reduction, and thinning. There is a laundry list of outcomes that were identified. But those were the three that, that came to the top. Well, what about community involvement? What are the benefits for, the perceived benefits for those? Broader understanding and consideration of diverse interests. This was significant across regions and over time. We saw 96% reporting this as a benefit in region three, 71% in region five. We also saw a significant increase from 2007 to 2010. And broader understanding and consideration of diverse interests is more likely to occur with collaborative processes. As well as improved trust and increased opportunity for public input. These are all about 90% more likely to [unintelligible] a collaborative process. Improved trust and increased opportunity for public input did not vary across regions, but saw a significant increase over time. We also saw an improved sense of project ownership and an increased support for the agency to be about 90% more likely, 89 and 90% more likely if the processes collaborative. There were significant differences across regions for project ownership with region 3 being 96% and region being 68%. And so, ties into some of the early, early [unintelligible]. The increased support for the agency did not, it was about 83% across all regions and over time. So basically, we have seen a dramatic increase in the number of stewardship contracts over time. They do vary, the levels of collaboration do vary by region, but not over time.

The definitions of collaboration also did not vary by region or across who is interviewed. Agency, contractors and community members were the three groups that were interviewed. But the indicators of collaboration did verify with that initial slide of the levels of collaboration. And so that included the who initiated the project, the number of interests involved, the number of community roles and the number of outreach mechanisms. And so this contributes to some of the literature on, on collaborative governance that will soon develop over the years. The benefits of stewardship contracts were high across all regions. People saw more local jobs.

[27:23 - 30:43] Kathie Mattor: They saw more work being accomplished on the ground that they otherwise wouldn't be able to accomplish. And some of the, the Forest Service folks that I've talked to said, yeah, you know, there is no other way that we would be able to get some of this work done because the, the timber, the smaller diameter timber is, there's no market for it, but they're able to supply that to the contractors through trading of goods for services. Contractors are able to sell that through non, non-timber markets. So, they [unintelligible] or creating energy or doing other, using it in other ways and other mechanisms. The stewardship contract mechanisms also provide a greater opportunity to use local contractors. There's the, the best value contracting mechanism allows them to not just go for the lowest price bid, but to actually look at the previous history of that contractor and the work that they've done. And whether it would meet their objectives for more sustainable management of the forest. And so otherwise prior to stewardship contracting, they were unable to, to use, kind of to pick and choose [unintelligible] related to those factors. There was improved efficiency to some extent, that was at 69%. Improved public trust and again, the meeting of specific project outcomes. It was the highest. Also, the benefits of community involvement were also high across all of the regions. Broader understanding and consideration of diverse interests, improved trust and increased opportunity for public input and improved sense of project ownership. There was, they did consider the public involvement to increase the trust in the agency, which in a lot of these areas is, which is, which is huge, because levels of trust have decreased in some areas to a huge extent. And so the four meetings that I attended last fall were very interesting. They are, there's three regional coordinators for five regions. And the coordinators themselves actually do not coordinate with each other. So different approaches were taken for each of the meetings that were done by different coordinators, which I'll, you know, worked out, worked out fine. From the discussions, I found that there was strong overall support and approval for the use of stewardship contracting, that as people use it, they became more familiar with it and more comfortable with it and their support grew.

[30:45 - 32:50] Kathie Mattor: And a lot of that is because it provides an opportunity for the agency to use tools that they otherwise wouldn't be able to. And it allows them to coordinate a lot of the

contracts or agreements are with larger organizations like the Wild Turkey Federation and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation. And so they're able to pull resources with organizations such as those. It also, because it has broad policy language and a lot of flexibility, it allows the, the tool to be used are more site specific so that it can be tailored to different biophysical and community, social relations or social situations. The challenge is, though, is that it is a complex program. You're basically combining a timber contract and a service contract, which are housed in completely different departments in the bureaucracy. So combining those two and bringing two different offices together creates some challenges in that sense. There's also widely varying interpretations of how it can be used. I saw some like, district rangers, which are more at the ground level. The Forest Service, [unintelligible] maybe some of them really get it and really want to use it. But the Forest supervisor just doesn't understand what the point would be. Or there maybe they may reach a barrier at the regional level, or it can be just the opposite. In fact, in the, the the eastern meeting that I attended was in Missouri and the regional, there's actually a stewardship contract coordinator for the Border Service and the, the coordinator there really got it, understood collaboration, was very gung ho.

[32:51 - 35:31] Kathie Mattor: But the folks on the ground, we went on a field trip and we were out on the ground and they were like, oh, yeah, it did, you know, we went to a blow down for a tornado damage. I was like, oh, yeah, we did, you know, a timber contract on this. And the coordinators turned over and said we have stewardship contract authority for this whole area that you did last year, and it hadn't even occurred to them to use that. You know, so just the use of the stewardship contract. And then as far as diversity of interest, they had a member of the Wild Turkey Federation and that was it for community [unintelligible] membership. So, but on the other hand, talking with them, they also have, they have a lot of public trust within the Forest Service in the area. And so collaboration may not be a necessary approach in that, in that area or for that forest or region to some extent, who knows? They have different approaches that may be necessary in different areas depending on, on the situation. And then related to differing interpretations, changes in leadership proved a great challenge in implementation of both stewardship, contracting and collaboration. Just because you have someone that's gung ho, they get transferred to a different area, which occurs quite a bit in the Forest Service. People get moved around a lot. And then you have someone new that needs to learn the roles, that may not understand the point, or it may, or it could be a community leader as well. So what does it all mean? Um, stewardship contracting is becoming a more familiar and well-liked tool as we've seen the increase over time. It does collaboration based on these results, it does appear to have played an important role in meeting the intentions of stewardship contracts. But different conditions like in context, like the influence, why there's, we see differences across regions whether it's used or not. And may play you know, different factors play a different roles in, in why it may not fit in all situations.

[35:31 - 38:09] Kathie Mattor: So further research is necessary. So based on, on this initial, the first phase of this analysis, develop these policy recommendations, there is a need for stewardship contracting. It plays a key role in some of the newer legislation that, let me start over. As we see more collaboration being used in more recent legislation, such as the Healthy Forest Restoration Act and the 2009 Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program, we're seeing an increased legislative use of collaboration within management. The CSA, the landscape, CSA programs, many of these use stewardship contracting within them. And we just haven't reached the stage as you can see, with the growth and the use and levels of collaboration we're seeing. Some folks told me, okay, well, we just haven't gotten there yet. We haven't ramped up in the use of stewardship contracting, and many people are just getting it now, so it's becoming a more familiar tool. So legislation needs to be extended beyond the 2013 deadline, I guess. I also recommend allowing or funding the meeting of the regional Poncho coordinators, so they can kind of develop more of a broad scale monitoring program, and they also need an opportunity to meet with agency leaders. The Washington office hasn't been, um, hasn't wanted to meet to discuss some of the recommendations and some of their findings that they have. And so I would recommend for, that there would be coordination with that. And also improve the national guidelines and training on stewardship contracting as well as on collaboration, because a lot of people have different definitions of what collaboration entails and how to, how to go about doing it. Granted it doesn't need to be specific to situations and it will vary. But, I think a large reason why we're seeing so much variation is because people don't understand it [unintelligible] and many are afraid to, to use it.

[38:12 - 39:59] Kathie Mattor: And developing these guidelines would prevent, you know, provide an opportunity for more consistent interpretations of the policy. One of the opportunities we have is to develop basic guidelines. For these monitoring, so future research on. Okay, well, what would the best template be for developing broad scale monitoring programs for these efforts and for similar efforts? Um, so we can get a better idea of what influences collaboration and really get a better picture of what's the connection between collaboration and those outcomes across multiple efforts. And then continued monitoring for stewardship contracts. And then my next step is to do a case study analysis to determine, to get an idea of what's what context. Get a better idea of some of these situations influencing in context [unintelligible] collaboration, understand key components and then better identify the influence it has on outcomes, stewardship contracts. So many acknowledgements, friends and family throughout this whole process and the Environmental Governance Working Group for many grants. Of course, the center for Collaborative Conservation. The Pinchot Institute for sharing their data, as well as the USDA Forest Service and Colorado Agriculture Experiment Station. Thank you. [applause].

[40:02 - 40:02] Speaker 1: Please, questions for Kathie.

[40:02 - 40:07] Kathie Mattor: Okay.

[40:08 - 40:18] Speaker 2: I'm, so I guess, I'm interested in the description of the [unintelligible] contract. [unintelligible] that it's voluntary. Is that correct?

[40:24 - 40:25] Kathie Mattor: That's correct.

[40:25 - 40:33] Speaker 2: So with that, do you think that's possible that [unintelligible] successful in [unintelligible].

[40:38 - 41:59] Kathie Mattor: Right. I think, well, yes and no. Yes, it has been successful because it can be identified as the tool that's good for that situation. Whereas, if it's forced to be used, it may not fit the circumstance. And, but on the other hand, no. We've had a limited number of contracts, 874 over an 11 year period. And so there has been talk within the administration about mandate requiring and making, you know, making stewardship contracting the way to go. And I think time [unintelligible] and Obama, the Obama administration was still collaborative [unintelligible] getting. And there's, a there's, it's a complicated issue because [unintelligible] back to receipts going back to the community from timber sales and uses. It's not going back to [unintelligible]. There's a lot of different perceptions.

[42:30 - 42:31] Speaker 3: [unintelligible] they were used to [unintelligible].

[42:56 - 46:58] Kathie Mattor: I don't know the specifics about of each of those [unintelligible] all of that, but. it's not just [unintelligible]. So it looks like in the next stage of research they're going to be trying to figure out what in the world [unintelligible] and I would appreciate it if you [unintelligible] current analysis. Some of those regions are very different and why they [unintelligible]. Or if you don't know that, what are some of the hypothesis that [unintelligible]. First of all, [unintelligible] at the meetings that I attended, I did find out that region 8 does actually inspire that [unintelligible]. The other thing that I was going to [unintelligible] region five, one of the forest in region five. So they kind of jumped on board in the stewardship contract. And there's a team of five, I think [unintelligible] forest that really got it and just it [unintelligible]. But they didn't reach out to the community. And so, we see, okay. A lot of work being done, but not including that [unintelligible]. And so those are two of the [unintelligible]. What I'm going to do for the second part of your question, let's say the interview folks from agency and communities [unintelligible] and look at [unintelligible] the institutional analysis developer [unintelligible]. Look at [unintelligible], what are the biophysical conditions and social

conditions and [unintelligible] Was their support from the folks above you and the agency? Of course, there service just reached out to communities and actively involved or not. [unintelligible] to work collaboratively with the Forest Service. But even though it will be individual case studies, I wanna develop more of a broader scale [unintelligible].

END TRANSCRIPTION