

Colorado State University Libraries
Archives & Special Collections
University Archives
Transcript of New beginnings in collaborative conservation

Item Metadata

Collection: Bridging the Gap Conference (10217/100299)

Creator(s): Warner, Ed, speaker

Title: New beginnings in collaborative conservation

Date: 2009 September

File name: BGCC_2009_Warner.mp4

Date Transcribed: 2024 November 5

Transcript Provided By: Echo Labs

BEGIN TRANSCRIPTION

[00:00:00] PRESENTER:

He figured out how to get natural gas out of the ground in Wyoming, but he did an amazing thing up there in places called Pinedale. And so he, I'm sorry, discovered the Jonah Field, my apologies, and then he helped commercially develop the Pinedale Field. And again, they are the third largest gas accumulation in the U.S. And some time ago, he's shifted from being a geologist to being a collective conservationist.

And so, he's been a great supporter of many, many organizations and many movements and is a really fine and big thinker in his own right about an area that he wasn't trained formally in, which is usually the case, and he learned by experience. And so, he's contributed a great deal to the field of collaborative conservation on his own, and I hope he continues to for a very long time. He holds two honorary faculty positions at CSU, and Department of Field Sciences and Cooperative Conservation.

He's published a number of things in geology and in collaborative conservation. He is a trustee and or director of the Denver Museum of Nature and Science, The Sand County Foundation, The Explorers Foundation, and he's a past trustee of The Geological Society of America Foundation and the American Geological Institute Foundation.

It is great pleasure that I'm going to introduce Ed, and he's going to speak to us today on New Beginnings in Collaborative Conservation. Ed, you're welcome.

(audience applauding)

[00:01:43] Warner Ed:

Good afternoon everybody. I hope that you're having as wonderful a time at this conference as I am. It's a, Robin's directorship has been a wonderful experience.

In the time she's here, she has grown the Cenex. In ways that astounded me. The fellows program that she's developed is absolutely marvelous. There are 17 CCC fellows, and all of you, I recommend going out and finding one of these fellows and having a conversation with them.

There are academic faculty fellows, there are practitioner fellows. How unusual is that? We actually have people who are practitioners, ranchers, who are fellows at this university, and of course, graduate students, who are studying the practices of collaborative conservation and I'm very proud of you.

You have met and exceeded my expectations. Please blush, it's quite all right.

(audience members laughing)

(clears throat)

Tuck your head, that's good.

(audience members applauds)

You might have noticed I've walked up here any notes. And you can also notice that there is no telephone presentation. I don't care to talk about processes like this from a slideshow.

When I think about a talk, I usually develop it over a period of time. In December, it was on my bicycle riding 25 miles a day.

One day I was out riding And I had a haircut appointment at the salon. But I was so wrapped up in thinking about these innovations in conservation that I ended up five miles beyond my turning point, which means I had to whip around and then go flat out because the worst thing in the world that I can imagine is missing an appointment with my hair dresser

(audience members laughing)

When I develop the talk, I gave a lot of thought to the origins and historical background of The Environmental Movement. And thank you Sally Collins, I don't know if you're still here or you've gone back to Washington, but you did that for me yesterday. And so, I realized that number one, someone's already spoken about that in elaborate And I thought really, really accurate manner. But also, that's like 15 or 20 minutes of talk that I don't have to give.

So, I want to instead scroll forward from the 1930s of John Muir and Aldo Leopold to the 1950s of The Rise of the Environmental Mannerism, Silent Spring and the early understanding that we were heading into trouble in the environment, and the approach and the tools that we used to try and advance environmental issues. I'm going to skip all over that and kind of scroll forward to the millennium. And I'd like to discuss this in kind of two concepts.

One which I really like and some, most of you probably read, and that is, I'm not going to talk about a tipping point, because I really do believe that we are at a point in history where we are changing the way we're doing business. And I believe that we are at a tipping point, and I think, I actually believe it was actually a few years ago.

But certainly, in this time frame that we are operating in right now, we are seeing some major changes in the way environment and conservation issues are approached. Secondly, I wanna start this off with a story that really stuck with me. About five years ago, Jackie, my wife, Jackie and I were at Fort Worth Zoo for a little celebration which was to celebrate and honor U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service biologists who were working in partnership with private landowners.

Now, what state did the union cause?

(unintelligible)

So, it was Texas. Why in Texas? The biologists of the Fish and Wildlife Service engaged in working on private lands. If you know the history of the Republic, the negotiation that brought the Republic of Texas into the Union included the federal government giving up the federal land, the public lands, to the control of the state.

There are virtually no federal lands in the state of Texas. The great parks like Big Bend had to be acquired with the permission of the legislature.

You cannot just create a refuge. If you're a biologist with the government, you just don't have millions of acres like you have in our West to work on. You can't ignore the issue of private lands. And what has developed there is this brilliant partnership between a federal agency and private landowners, starting with incredible suspicion on part of the landowners.

Now, there isn't any suspicion like this, certainly is, but we have seen this collaborative process moved people towards a process where they gained the trust between groups that used to be thought of as adversarial

(clears throat)

. At this, the celebration was Gail Martin, who was the Secretary of the Interior at the time, a whole bunch of biologists, the Governor of Texas, some NGOs. And, see Ted

(unintelligible)

Here? Ted?

Ted just walked out on me. Okay, I'm not gonna tell a Ted story then. But Ted's boss was there, Frank Krupp, of Environmental Defense. Now, I've got to tell you, that was Environmental Defense Fund, then it became Environmental Defense, and now it's Environmental Defense Fund again.

So, this particular period of history was only the Environmental Defense. And Frank got up and told this story, and I have paraphrased and repeated this any number of times. What he said was, "When we formed Environmental Defense, our motto, and our motto for 20-odd years was "Sue the Bastards." And what we discovered was the law of unintended negative consequences.

And I think that part of this tipping point is this expectation of good things happening from good intentions that has failed to materialize. What has actually happened is good intentions in many, many cases have led to negative consequences. For instance, if you sue, instead of money going on the land and solving your crisis, it goes into the courts, it goes into the lawyers, it goes into depositions. It does not go into environmental projects that might actually save the problem from becoming a crisis.

So, in this in my opinion, what happened over these years was that we had really important issues. We litigated it instead of operating cooperatively. We created enemies and created advocacy. And the net result was we had a worse environment to work with when these things got through the courts.

We actually postponed what we absolutely needed to do today because we were fighting over the righteousness of our positions.

(clears throat)

Considered what we have talked about here at this conference. A completely different model. A model that brings people together.

So, as an example of that, I'd like to talk just a little bit about a small project which I was the father, and a U.S. Fish and Wildlife biologist, and actually a PhD in rangeland ecologists at Colorado State University, Carl Hess and I developed about five years ago. It's called The Cooperative Safe-Rush Initiative. We have a crisis on the land in the West.

And part of that crisis is a lawsuit where certain environmental groups are advocating the listing of the Greatest Sage-Grouse. The Greatest Sage-Grouse is not a widget that lives on 20 acres.

It occupies a good deal of 200 million acres of 11 Western states and two Canadian provinces. The listing of a keystone species like this could have dramatic consequences as to the way we live.

The way ranches live on our land, the way public lands are managed, the way development, both real estate and energy and other human resource development is managed in the future. It could be a dramatic effect where instead of local decision making, it becomes national decision making. So, this is an interesting aspect of the way we operate. I'm not sure if anybody has actually talked about that.

Sometimes people are not brought together by a joint vision of an environmental crisis. Sometimes they're brought together by a real nasty legal threat. When I first thought about this, I didn't like it at all.

I'm kind of a pollinator. I want everybody to come together because the good people want to work together. But in fact, sometimes this kind of environment motivates people to take a different approach than they have in the past. So, what are the principles of a little conservation effort that is attempting to do stewardship and restoration on a good deal of 200 European acres?

First off, we discussed the stakeholders. And I've heard this discussed today, in at least one of the sessions.

And I heard somebody said, you cannot be careful about your stakeholders. If you've got to bring people together and you shouldn't be exclusive. Probably, everybody should have a chance at the table. And so, we decided that we were gonna bring every stakeholder together.

That meant that environmental groups who viewed energy companies as the enemy of the environmentalists were gonna be asked, come together and meet and sit down with energy companies. Energy companies, who are sick and tired of being sued, who feel over-regulated and feel their business is threatened, and that they have these giant targets on their back. Like one of my friends here, yeah, he became a friend, said something to this.

I mean, we have this target on our back, and the time is twofold. People are taking shots at us because they think we're the enemy, and secondly, they want our money because they think we got all the world. And so, you have this incredibly contradictory behavior towards a stakeholder group. Secondly, we had to be absolutely and completely transparent.

It doesn't work if you do this in secret. It's not fair to people who might wanna participate. And that is scary because when you're a startup organization, it's entirely possible that, someone who has an agenda, might want to squash you.

But we had to take that risk. And we did. Thirdly, we had to be fact-based. Everybody coming into this had to agree that even though we all have agendas, that we had to discuss it in a fact-based, scientific manner.

We had to apply ourselves in as objective a manner as we could. Fourthly, we would develop an egalitarian governance.

And that meant that everybody, every stakeholder group would have a seat at the table. Not just to participate, but in governance. And fifthly, we had a fundraising.

How on earth are you going to do this? We were incredibly fortunate. The Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies had just finished a 10-year study. Anybody want to read it, I'll send a PDF out to you.

It's 1,341 pages. The executive summary was 30 pages. When I saw that, I got hysterical. Obviously, wildlife biologists do not know what an executive summary means to a business person.

(audience members laughing)

But it's a fabulous study because they actually counted populations. They divided this up ecologically instead of politically or geographically.

They did a brilliant job. And when all was said and done, and this was vetted through the public process, they came to a couple of conclusions that really upset everybody involved. One was, they didn't have the management structure to actually go forward. It's a eleven on one life agency.

It's people that have their own policies and own laws and their own geographical positions. And how do you bring a bunch of a group like that together and actually create a management group? And they really were worried about that.

And then secondly, where was the money going to come from? They actually had considered going to Congress and asking for a half a billion dollars. Like my Italian uncle would have said, "Cut the Che c'entra." So, they knew that they needed to engage the private sector.

They knew that they needed a different kind of model. And so, when we approached them as this nascent operation, this what if, we all got together, they actually saw the value in a citizen-led initiative.

(clears throat)

The innovations

(clears throat)

That we talked about today for an approach to, goodness ecoregion and larger scale initiatives include some very interesting approaches. Bottom up, not top down. And so, WAPWA had already identified a whole bunch of local working groups.

And boy, I'll say, we've glomped onto that and we've helped to grow that. That way there are people working in Wyoming, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, and northwestern Colorado that have a vested interest locally. They are attached to the land.

They know the particular issues instead of something so broad-reaching that it cannot actually be dumbed down to application, it was bottom up.

(clears throat)

It also meant public-private partnerships, PPPs. If you were to go out and look at ranch land, this was another interesting aspect of Western lands that was brought up in one of the sessions that I heard. That's biodiversity is on private lands. And that was a false statement that I'm speaking up because we treat the land better and we get the government bureaucracies are nasty and don't do a good job.

And no, it's because the private sector acquired the water. That was part of the Homestead Act.

They acquired the bottomlands. They acquired all of the riparian habitat. They acquired basically winter habitat for a lot of species.

And then through the grazing permitting, acquired partial control of the uplands. So, basically in the West if you think about it, the state and federal agencies got the dry uplands, the poorly productive uplands, and the private sector got the good stuff. Now, it may be that the state and the feds control anywhere from 60 to 80% of the land in Nevada, or is it 90% maybe, and it's a lot of land. And yet, they don't control it in a way that works ecologically.

So, what you desperately need is public-private partnerships to make sure that this ecology is not, that you "unfragment" in other words, defragment the current land situation in a way that works both for, not both, three ways, for the agencies, for the private landowners, and for the animals and plants on the land. If you went out to places like western Wyoming, or western Colorado, and I've spent a lot of time in my life up there, and you went for a walk, you would find vast areas where the public lands and the private lands are chipper void.

And you can't tell where one ends and one begins. There are no fences.

One of the negative, potential negative consequences of listing your sage grouse might be to actually isolate lands because you're going to have totally different management requirements. And you might have to actually segregate them. It would increase fragmentation.

The opposite of what we all want out of this process. Incentives.

Why have we developed a culture where people living on the land are penalized for doing good work? For instance, and this is not necessarily universal, a rancher who has grazing rights may be the greatest steward of the land, and he may treat the public lands as well as he does his private lands. And yet, when a policy comes down to restrict grazing, for instance, because of drought, his neighbor who has chewed up his land, or the federal lands, so that when you walk between them, you see this incredible change, is treated exactly the same way as the good guy.

This is a terrific dilemma for us. When I listened to the carbon trade, the question occurred in my mind that I don't know how to solve this, but this is a big problem.

The guy who's done the good stuff in the same preserved his short grass prairie gets no benefit. The guy who has partially destroyed it regrows it and he gets money out of it. You're paying off the bad guys.

We need a system that pays off the good guys. And so, something like an Office of Ecological Services to me is some kind of miracle. My God, in goodness, government actually looking at alternatives ways of developing value for good practices, I mean this is just absolutely marvelous. What does it mean to us?

It means that, we ought to be looking at ways of incentivizing good practices on the land, so that the landowners actually benefit financially. All of you out there that have ranch, your friends know how little money they make, know what kind of threats they're under from development, from all forces.

The estate taxes, there's just endless threats upon large landscapes. We have to have tools. Non-development easements are a dramatic tool that has changed the way we've done business. There's another enormous, innovation to protect open lands and large landscapes.

But why do we have a philosophy in this country that, it's a good thing to grow cattle and make money, but it's evil to grow sage-grouse and make money? Why don't we have a system where people were paid to grow sage-grouse, to grow black-footed ferrets, to grow any number of key stone obligated species.

Why shouldn't we incentivize it? Read the ESA, there's nothing in there that says that profit is bad, that business is bad, that private ownership is bad, that private stewardship is bad. None of that exists. I wish my friend Michael Bean was here, another environmental defense guy, because if you know the story, Michael Bean read the ESA and decided that the way it was being regulated and managed was not necessarily the essence of the law and create the St. Harbor Agreement.

An enormous step forward. What an innovation that was. A legal framework so that private landowners could do stewardship with endangered species, but not lose their property rights.

Be protected. So that, something like the Norman Spotted Owl catastrophe, the loss of billions of dollars of private timber assets, won't ever happen again. Let's protect our private landowners and let's encourage them to do good work. So in the southeast, in the Longleaf Pine, a lot of slash, there's programs to incentivize nesting of red-cockaded woodpeckers.

The value of one of those nests is enormous. It blew my hair back when I saw the first numbers. And so, timber companies are actually gaining an economic benefit to protect that forest, to do selective harvesting, to do a whole lot of environmental stewardship that would not have benefited them without this.

And so, there's another enormously valuable tool. And it is not necessarily the same as an ecological service, but it's very, very similar. And so, it seems to me that we have different models of doing business.

So, Stacy, where's that, the big night ranch slide? Anybody identify this guy?

[00:26:52] AUDIENCE MEMBER ONE:

It's a prairie rattler. It's a big prairie rattler. Is Kevin Knight here? Oh, wait, hold on.

Joyce Berry, you're here. Do you remember? I crawled on my belly, I got up to within four feet of that guy, all I had was a fucking shoot digital camera. I did not have a big old telephoto.

That's taken from a distance of four feet.

(audience members Murmuring)

Why would I do that? Something that stupid.

(audience members laughing)

Because I understood the behavior of this animal. It was springtime, it was very cool, rattle snakes are

(unintelligible)

Creatures. He's not going to move very fast, all right. I'm not his natural prey.

He's interested in defending himself. So, we can create two different stories about this creature. This creature is the enemy.

This creature is evil. It's poisonous. We're afraid of it, right?

We want to destroy it. How many of us have seen people destroy snakes just because they're snakes? How many times was I on a geology field trip where there was a snake under a sage bush and I never told anybody because I knew they would chop it up into little pieces? And how many times did that snake actually injure somebody?

Not ever. So, our perceptions of who are enemies and who are our friends, I think are generally based on externalities, not on an infinite understanding of who those people are. I heard that in one of these sessions.

It's a funny thing. These people have been labeled as enemies.

We have created these mythologies that make us feel good, right? It's a great thing to trash somebody who's doing something bad, right?

It makes us feel like we're really good. But in fact, it leads to unintended negative consequences again and again.

And so, this creature eats rodents. Rodents, right?

Carry plague, rodents carry other diseases, hanta disease. Rodents actually are the problem. Shouldn't you be putting snakes in your yard?

Into your crawl spaces, right? Shouldn't you be honoring snakes?

Snakes are actually a really valuable part of the ecosystem. So, why fear a snake? Now, I didn't pick him up.

(audience members laughing)

I've been known to do that

(laughing)

In this case, I was surrounded by friends who already were mortified. And so, I decided not to show off any worse than I was already. So, that guy there actually can be viewed as an enemy or a friend.

And I believe that in virtually any circumstance, bar in a few ribbon, nasty exceptions. That's the way we can view, All of the people who are stakeholders in this adventure that we have, we can bring people together and we can cooperate, or we can continue fighting and we will continue to degrade the environment. And you know what?

That means that it's our fault. We've got to take responsibility here. We wanna continue the battle.

If we wanna take these very, very extreme physicians. For instance, I learned from Indy Burke, who unfortunately is no longer here to understand ecology, about the research that indicates that cattle, properly managed, actually can benefit short grass prairie. They can benefit mountain plovers. They need to be managed in very specific ways, but we're really smart and we can actually do that.

And we can actually imitate the ecology-free white man, since we don't have the bison, and we're almost certainly not, we can utilize this other herbivore in ways that are positive. And yet there are people out there that still take the position that cattle are the enemy of the land and every cow has to be removed.

Why are they stuck in their advocacy positions? And I believe it comes back to one of those methodologies that we discussed and decided to use at CSI, which is to be fact-based.

Not to get trapped in the illogic of a position that is no longer tempo. To go with the flow.

And that brings me to the other really simple but most important and probably extremely difficult tool in the toolbox. And it's not a tool like hunting, or like reseeding or like restoring the parent habitat, it's this big overarching tool. It's adaptive management. A few years ago, I had no idea why I

do this kind of dumb stuff, but I decided to read the management plan from the Europe Reclamations Glen Canyon area.

And I downloaded another thousand pages of stuff. What I discovered was of this called the Adaptive Management Plan for the Glendale Canyon Recreation Area, or something to that effect.

And what I second discovered was that they had written down a plan, published pages and pages, of very specific things to do. Then they had all of this agency comments, public comments, and then they had changes that were made. They worked on for eight years and it still wasn't done. What was adaptive about it?

They had a different idea of adaptation. What they meant was, they adapted the original widget here to a different looking widget over here.

They had made it, it was blue to begin with and now it's bluish gray. But it isn't adaptive management. Adaptive management is doing something and discovering that it's not working very well, I'm trying something else. It's generally actually that simple.

And yet, your laughing, it's the hardest darn thing, right? Why is it so hard? Well, if it's you, me, and two other neighbors, maybe it's not that hard. But when it's very large institutions, what I call bureaucracies, there's a human tendency to codify and concretize all behavior.

And so, we need need new tools that will help to free our academia, help to free government agencies, help to free businesses. None of those large organizations are free from this tendency.

So, you go to a business, I'm not going to criticize BOM or something like that. Business. You go to a business and you say, here's an idea, if you invest in offsite mitigation, we'll make sure you get credit, we'll do everything we can to get media attention, you gonna look like a hero. And they say, our stockholders don't want to spend our profits on that.

That's an institutionalized approach, right? That it is based on a belief system that may have worked at one time and may not be working as well right now.

It is not adaptive. And so, what we have to do is continually help people to think through these mythologies that us human beings seem to clung onto.

They give us comfort. They make life easy. Everything that we're doing here, in--

(unintelligible)

Why don't you put up the next slide, I had no idea why this slide is on that. Working together

(laughing)

In conclusion, if we don't continue to grow and change the way we do business, we will fall into this maladaptive condition. Cooperative collaborative processes are not the answer. The answer is to continue to find ways to improve the way we do things. To bring in all of our assets.

Know part of the reason collaborative processes are working with, better is because we're bringing in a lot of brain power that was left out. Business, private sector, NGOs, academics who used to have this silo mentality and now are going to do interdisciplinary studies.

I had to get that in

(laughing)

It's really about human adaptation to change. Anybody here who's been joking, my joke in life is the only unchanging principle in the universe is changed.

If we are not evolving, we're standing still. And the world isn't evolving around us.

And if we don't evolve with it, we may go extinct. And so, this idea of adaptive management needs to be broadly expanded and yet also shrunk down to very, very specific applications. So, it's as my friend Mike Jones has pointed out, it's like resilience. It's applicable on different dimensional levels.

From the largest scale processes down to absolutely small scale localized applications. That's the picture, right?

When people ask me for a picture, that's usually the picture I send them. I don't wanna poacher them myself. That's actually the oldest white rhino in Southern Africa. He was, this was two years ago, so he's now 43 years old

(clears throat)

He weighs about 5,000 pounds. And I was giving him oxygen and my other hand was actually not there to pet him.

It still counts as respirations. You have a pulse oximeter, you have the reversal drug in his ear. His eyes are covered up because when they're asleep, apparently they still can see and believe this, from the vets that it agitates them.

And if you see that black line around that enormous, gorgeous horn, we're getting ready to de-horn him. And that was a management tool because of poaching. I'm going back to Africa next Monday to work with the Southern African Rhinos Specialist Group that was created in 1984 by Conservation international team is housed in Bogorava, firms offices in Harare, Zimbabwe

(clears throat)

. And I'm bringing an argument back to the managers in this program. What we've seen is the poachers that shoot rhinos don't check them out to see how big their horn is.

This is thick thorn bush country, especially black rhinos. It's very hard to see them.

And so, they're shooting rhinos that have been dehorned. So, what you're doing is you're leaving an animal that normally is defended by his horn defenseless among his own kind, I know offensive, view over creatures. And yet you're not actually gaining the benefit that you hoped for.

It's time for adaptive management in the most bottom-up case of environmental intervention. Thank you all.

(audience applauds)

Yes, John? Yeah. Anybody have any questions? Could have said wore you out

(laughing)

Hey.

[00:39:35] AUDIENCE MEMBER TWO:

Do you have the name and number of

(unintelligible)

[00:39:41] ED:

It's genetic, runs in the family. Anyone Else?

[00:40:06] AUDIENCE MEMBER THREE:

(unintelligible)

[00:40:08] ED:

Good question. How does adaptive management work with very controversial issues like wolves? I would say that the real issue with these controversial issues is how we manage them. And not from an adaptive standpoint, but from an ecological standpoint.

[00:40:35] AUDIENCE MEMBER THREE:

(unintelligible)

[00:40:38] ED:

Right,

(unintelligible)

Okay, so how do we collaborate on very controversial species like wolves? My answer to that would be to develop management at local levels. Work with communities. What we will find is there are places where the adverse beliefs of people are going to make it almost impossible to do a good job.

We have to live with that. We live with human personalities and belief systems.

And so, in my opinion, if I were going to do something like this, I would find the places where I could bring the stakeholders together to do something positive and test a bunch of alternative models from ecological services payments for wolves. It might be more valuable to raise wolves than to raise cattle in certain parts of the country or sheep. Compensation programs.

How do you actually monitor compensation programs. People cheat, if you want to have good systems.

All of these are adaptive techniques. But if you, in my heart I know for sure, if you label some rancher the enemy of the environment because he has an experience that wolves have killed his sheep, you're not going to get anywhere, right?

You have to engage him in some kind of a different model that will conciliate his good will. You might actually find that in his heart that man loves wild things, including wolves. But he has been taught that it is against his best interests.

And so, he's following a path that may actually be a mythology. And the way to change that is not to beat him over the head with laws and regulations, not to threaten his livelihood, but to engage him in this alternative process.

Chris.

[00:42:46] CHRIS:

What are your thoughts on, how we-

(unintelligible)

[00:43:27] ED:

Did everybody hear that question? Or you'd like me to repeat it for about five minutes.

It's how do we institutionalize payments for these kind of services so that we have a long-term financial system. It's really a critical question. And it's one that I certainly will not be able to answer fully.

And also, whatever answer I give will come from my own framework in belief system. And so, I want to say right off the bat that what we need is collaboration to come up with these systems to test them and to see what works and doesn't work. Something that I think might work tremendously to try and answer your question specifically might actually fall flat on its face.

Some other program which I highly approve of, which is our tax incentive for non-development in wildlife easements in the state of Colorado may only have a short hand flux. It may not be permanent.

And it really is important. How do we get to these longer term funding? My answer coming out of business would be to utilize the marketplace.

Now we've already seen in the last year what can happen to a marketplace. So again, we can't have these mythologies. We have to think about this in a pretty objective manner. We're going to have financing cycles, right?

We see that all the time. Right now, anybody who works in philanthropy like I do knows that a whole lot of institutions have been hurt badly by the decline in their endowments. A whole lot of grantor groups are not getting grants because those grants are not available. Because of the lack of cash in these organizations.

Actress and Mrs. We're in a big crisis here this year. And to say that, well, the marketplace has failed us and therefore it's not the right thing to do, we ought to go and just get government money. Well, I don't know about the trillions of dollars that have already gone into other students, but I can tell you that I don't think there's a whole lot of money out there in the near term for this kind of thing coming out of government.

But what about developing schemes where you get leverage, where you get matching types of funds, where you get cooperation, say, from agency budgets supplemented by the private sector. So, that we don't have, not one of us has to do the entire job ourselves. Not the marketplace, not ecological services, not government agencies, not NGOs and foundations, not universities, but that we find ways to work more towards common goals. Because I think that there is no complete solution to this.

We live through crisis. I was in the oil and gas business. I was basically a natural gas exploration geologist. I lived through booms and busts.

There were days I thought I was rich, and tomorrow I was broke. You saw how fast things were all over, and unexpectedly.

And so, we cannot, I don't believe we could ever plan for a perfect future, and completely insulate ourselves from the vagaries of the natural world. But I believe that if we had a more integrated system, let me just throw out one idea.

Let's not think of carbon credits as a unique type of funding? What about bundling ecological services credits with carbon credits, right? There are people out there, I've talked to, that want to see packaged products like that.

So, maybe it's a rule idea. It's probably not going to cure everything, but it might bring funds into the marketplace for conservation purposes that we might not have otherwise.

[00:47:59] COURTNEY WHITE:

(unintelligible)

[00:48:22] ED:

That's Courtney White asking me another personal question in public.

(audience members laughing)

How do I measure the outcomes of my investments in philanthropy?

(audience members laughing)

First off, I'm not an institution. I don't have a public or private foundation. I'm an individual.

And so, the way I go about doing my investing in philanthropy probably is not a model that everybody wants to follow. But there is an answer to that, Courtney.

First off, I do try to be involved in every single investment that I make. This is not altruism, I'm not out there to write checks, you know, just because there's an obligation to do that.

This for me, to start off with, you've got to understand the philosophy, right? It's an investment.

My investments in Colorado State University are an experiment. That's the way I think about it. Does it mean that we get right every time?

That works every time? Of course not. I'm the risk-taker. So, failure is something that comes easily.

But there are a few metrics that I have come up with to at least get a sense of whether or not my investments are working and whether or not I wanna make future investments. One of those metrics is,

(clears throat)

have I grown the capacity of the group or institutions that I've invested in? Clearly you bring up the fellows, you've probably heard me say, I think that my investment in the Center for Collateral Conservation, even though it's very early on, is bearing remarkable fruit.

It's a worry because right now it's depending upon one remarkable woman. And so, how do we institutionalize this? Don't shake your head you are hearing staff. So, how do we institutionalize this so that we can have only to talk about these things.

Is it the marathon or passing the baton and relay race? Or what other model can we develop? And I'm really interested in that kind of thing.

I have made investments that were utterly and total failures. You can't imagine how discouraging it is to work in Africa, with gangster governments destroying all the good work, all the great intentions of people. It's a tough, tough thing to remain involved when there are so many horrible forces at work.

On the other hand, one of my criteria that I've developed is how well did the investments develop programmatically? And of course, one way is to measure things like the 17 fellows. Another way is to measure a program by its funding.

And so, I'll give you one very brief example. In my development work in the Geosciences Department here at Colorado State University, faculty came to me and convinced me that we needed a very high-tech laboratory, that we have a great tradition of teaching geology, but we had to expose our students to high-tech because they were going to go on and they needed these skills. In industry and in academia.

And so, I put up the money for the computers for a special analysis lab, and I'll give you the exact dollars. You'll never forget. I put up \$54,000 in cash to buy computers and things like that, oversized printers for maps.

The university put up the funds and rebuilt classrooms into a laboratory and supplied it with all of the office equipment and everything that they needed. And then the faculty And I went out and we had a contest to bring in software and database.

And this was 1999, so it's been over 10 years, and I can tell you that the donations of software and database easily exceed \$10 million. Well isn't, that's a metric for you. How did your initial investment grow that that seed concept?

Csi, which I put up very little funds for, put up some intellectual, two dozen brain cells, now operates in seven western states on about three million acres. It's got a multi-multi-million dollar budget. And it's bottom up.

So, so, it seems like that's, there's a metric for you as well. I'm not answering the question specifically, am I?

Because there's a different. There's different way of analyzing a lot of different types of projects.

[00:53:53] JEFF:

Now,

(unintelligible)

[00:53:59] ED:

Jeff, I beg your pardon.

(audience members laughing)

You know what? The light is behind you so I can hardly see your face. Hi Jeff.

[00:54:08] JEFF:

(unintelligible)

No.

(laughing)

Diabolical.

(laughing)

It's the right answer. Any other questions?

END TRANSCRIPTION