

Application Name: Clackamas Stewardship Partners Collaborative Governance

By: Clackamas River Basin Council

Offering Type: Federal Forest Collaborative

Application Type: Federal Forest Restoration Collaborative

OWEB Region: Willamette Basin

County: Clackamas

Coordinates: 45.292808,-122.332317

Applicant:

Cheryl McGinnis
PO Box 1869
Clackamas OR 97015-1869
(503) 303-4372 Ext.100
cheryl@clackamasriver.org

Payee:

Cheryl McGinnis
PO Box 1869
Clackamas OR 97015
503.303.4372 x100
cheryl@clackamasriver.org

Project Manager:

Robert Roth
18683 Joyce Ct.
Oregon City 97045
503-657-9112
robertrothcsp@gmail.com

Budget Summary:

OWEB Amount Requested: \$5,264
Total Project Amount: \$7,671

Administrative Information

Abstract

Provide an abstract statement for the project. Include the following information: 1) Identify the project location; 2) Briefly state the project need; 3) Describe the proposed work; 4) Identify project partners.

1.) Clackamas County, OR.

2.) Clackamas Stewardship Partners has conducted forest collaborative activities since 2004. Over the past 15 years there has been significant ant changes in membership, representation and staffing without consistent access to funding to to keep the organizational infrastructure components current and fully effective.

To ensure that CSP is robust and can effectively develop agreements it needs to to update its mission statement, evaluate and clarify its formal decision making / public comment development processes and design a new stakeholder identification and recruitment strategy including retention activities.

3.) CSP conducts 10 General Meetings a year in addition to 2 summer field trips in partnership with USFS. This proposal's workplan components will be incorporated into CSP General Meeting agendas with specific time scheduled for discussion and decision making. This project's schedule be distributed to members after the contract is finalized.

Related workplan information will be distributed to members well in advance of the General Meetings and meeting notes will document outcomes. The contracted CSP Facilitator will prepare materials for these discussions and host related activities during the General Meetings.

4.) Since CSP has a diverse stakeholder and individual membership much of the internal process and content will be internally generated by current members assisted by the contract Facilitator. External sources will be accessed such as Clackamas County government for specific information such as contact information for potential new Clackamas Basin stakeholders.

Location Information

What is the ownership of the project site(s)?

Public land (any lands owned by the Federal government, the State of Oregon, a city, county, district or municipal or public corporation in Oregon)

What agency(ies) are involved?

United States Forest Service regularly interact with CSP members and Facilitator in a variety of settings. CSP also interacts with the Clackamas Soil and Water Conservation District and Clackamas County government.

Private (land owned by non-governmental entities)

This grant will take place in more than one county.

Permits

Other than the land-use form, do you need a permit, license or other regulatory approval of any of the proposed project activities?

Yes

No

Racial and Ethnic Impact Statement

Racial and Ethnic Impact Statement

The proposed grant project policies or programs could have a disproportionate or unique POSITIVE impact on the following minority persons. (indicate all that apply)

The proposed grant project policies or programs could have a disproportionate or unique NEGATIVE impact on the following minority persons. (indicate all that apply)

The proposed grant project policies or programs WILL HAVE NO disproportionate or unique impact on minority persons.

Insurance Information

- Working with hazardous materials (not including materials used in the normal operation of equipment such as hydraulic fluid)*
- Earth moving work around the footprint of a drinking water well*
- Removal or alteration of structures that hold back water on land or instream including dams, levees, dikes, tidegates and other water control devices (this does not include temporary diversion dams used solely to divert water for irrigation)*
- Applicant's staff or volunteers are working with kids related to this project (DAS Risk assessment tool not required, additional insurance is required)*
- Applicant's staff are applying herbicides or pesticides (DAS Risk assessment tool not required, additional insurance is required)*

Additional Information

- This project affects Sage-Grouse.*

Problem Statement

Background

Provide an overview of proposed issue(s) to be addressed. Summarize the context and need for the Zone of Agreement and or need to create, formalize or update the organizational structure of the collaborative.

When Clackamas Stewardship Partners was established considerable member time and energy was devoted to creating and adopting mission statements and operations handbooks which describe decision making processes and membership expectations. Local organizations decided to participate because they were interested in positive collaborative approaches in contrast to conflicts and lawsuit alternatives.

Once CSP organizational components had been approved and implemented members tended to focus on timber sales, stewardship projects, public comment development, educational presentations, tours and seeking funding to cover staffing support and website expenses. These core collaborative activities motivate members to continue their participation.

Given diverse collaborative demands and limited member time, energy and Facilitator support, attention tends not to focus on maintaining / updating organizational infrastructure unless there are significant internal conflicts or external pressure. These trends also reflect limited financial resources and opportunities to support organizational updating activities.

Over time, the original CSP mission statement may not energize current or potential members and does not specifically mention urgent forest management challenges such as climate change. In an online communications environment securing attention and making immediate positive impressions are current gateways to potential collaborative involvement.

Collaborative decision making processes that make some members feel marginalized or do not fully represent members positions undercut collaborative roles and participation motivations.

Clackamas Basin natural resources are extensively utilized and individuals and organizations that want to become involved in managing these resources have multiple opportunities with public agencies such as the soil and water conservation district, watershed council, advisory committees and volunteer opportunities in addition to Clackamas Stewardship Partners.

Updating CSP's stakeholder recruitment and engagement strategy should be expanded to incorporate current member retention activities, identify strategic stakeholder representation gaps and related prioritized outreach plans.

Provide a brief history of the collaborative.

Clackamas Stewardship Partners is an established collaborative group of diverse stakeholders with the common goal of restoring ecological functions and economic conditions in the Clackamas River Basin. CSP works with the Forest Service on stewardship contracting and retained receipts projects that improve forest health and provide sustainable economic benefits. CSP's strength is in the broad knowledge and experience that its members bring to the collaborative process.

During most of 2005 and the first half of 2006 the collaborative group efforts focused on developing a system for identifying restoration priorities. Although not yet finalized, the criteria were used to assess Forest Service proposals for Stewardship contracts and resulted in two new stewardship

contracts.

In the fall of 2005, the Clackamas Stewardship Partners (CSP) finalized their charter, which included the following vision statement:

Enhance ecosystem health and economic viability of local communities within the Clackamas River Watershed. We are committed to a collaborative process that employs stewardship contracting and other innovative tools to meet restoration goals.

CSP was one of five groups nationally to be awarded the "Two Chiefs' Partnership Award" in 2008 by the Chiefs of the Forest Service and Natural Resources Conservation Service for conducting the collaborative processes necessary to recommend stewardship contracting projects on the Clackamas River Ranger District of the Mt. Hood National Forest.

In 2016, CSP members reviewed and provided public comments on the Forest Service's Goat Mountain Thin Preliminary Assessment and Hunter Integrated Resources Project / Proposed Action. and secured a \$20,000 Title II grant to support collaborative activities.

During FY 2017 - 18 CSP members provided extensive public comment on the N Clack Project Integrated Resource scoping process, Proposed Action for Aquatic Restoration in the Pacific Northwest and ARBO II Proposed Forest-wide Aquatic Restoration Proposal.

For FY 19 CSP members reviewed 17 submitted Clackamas and Sandy Basin Retained Receipts project proposals and produced prioritized funding recommendations at their February 13, 2018 CSP General Meeting. CSP members recommended that 17 westside Retained Receipts projects receive funding.

History

Continuation - Are you requesting funds to continue work on a previously funded Forest Collaborative grant?

Yes

No

Proposed Solution

Collaborative structure

Describe the collaborative's current structure including 1) frequency of meetings, 2) communication and decision making processes, 3) Membership guidelines, and 4) committee and sub-committee structure (if any).

1.) CSP has 10 monthly General Meetings scheduled per year.

2.) CSP members conduct informal communications between members between General Meetings by email and telephone. Agenda related information is distributed in advance to CSP members.
tours.

CSP Decision Making Process (Operations Handbook)

CSP decision-making process's purpose is to come to a decision that members can support following a respectful hearing of all concerns. CSP makes decisions using a process of modified consensus. Consensus is achieved when all voting members can support or, at minimum, live with a decision. Modified consensus extends the concept of consensus by defining how CSP members will proceed to identify and draft majority and minority decisions (e.g., reports, opinions, statements, recommendations) when there is an inability to reach consensus.

A. Reaching Consensus

As decisions are being made in full group, committee, or subcommittee meetings, voting members attending the meeting will be asked to indicate their support either by a show of hands or verbal confirmation. Each voting member in attendance has the ability to disagree with elements of decisions as they are being developed, but must offer a constructive alternative that seeks to meet the needs of all voting members involved.

Consensus on a decision about a project, recommendation, or action the group plans to take will be reached when all voting members attending the meeting can make one of the following statements about a decision:

- I agree with the decision and will publicly support it
- I agree with the decision but will refrain from publicly supporting it
- I can live with the decision (and will not disparage it publicly).

B. Inability to Reach Consensus

If the voting members are unable to reach consensus, the following actions will be taken:

- Areas of agreement and disagreement will be clearly recorded in writing
- Majority and minority reports will be written by members of the respective groups to address the areas of disagreement
- Majority and minority reports will include:
 - ? The name and affiliation of the lead author(s) and names and affiliations of all who agree with the report
 - ? A description of their proposal and the rationale used to develop it
- Majority and minority reports will be given to the Coordinator who will submit them together to the USFS for their consideration in their role as decision-makers for USFS-managed lands.

3.) Organizations and Individuals

The Clackamas Stewardship Partners aim to be inclusive to a diversity of interests. To become a member of CSP, an organization (through its representative or representatives) must:

- Agree to abide by the vision, desired outcomes of collaboration, and guidelines outlined in this Operations Handbook
- Commit to active, long-term involvement with CSP
- Commit to active participation in one CSP committee or subcommittee

- Attend three consecutive CSP general meetings

An organization that has fulfilled these requirements will become a CSP member following the adjournment of the third consecutive general meeting that the organization has attended.

Active, long-term involvement as a CSP member is demonstrated by representative(s) of an organization attending one CSP meeting (i.e., general, committee, subcommittee, or field trip) at least once every six (6) calendar months.

CSP members that do not demonstrate active, long-term involvement (defined in the previous paragraph) will lose their status as CSP members. An organization that has lost its status as a CSP member may regain it by fulfilling the original requirements to become a CSP member.

1. Voting Members

A CSP member that is so permitted by its own rules and regulations to vote as part of the CSP decision-making process is considered a voting member. Each voting member (i.e., organization) may cast one (1) vote when making decisions, regardless of the number of representatives that are actively involved with CSP.

If a voting member misses general (i.e., full group) meetings three (3) of the last four (4) calendar months, the voting member will be considered "inactive" (i.e., unable to vote) at the next meeting the member attends. An "inactive" member that attends two (2) consecutive meetings regains "active" status (i.e., is able to vote) at the beginning of the second consecutive meeting attended.

The roles of voting members are:

- Participate actively
- Be well informed of CSP's activities
- Provide input from each individual constituency
- Provide ideas or initiatives
- Provide technical resources
- Work towards common ground
- Treat other participants with respect
- Make decisions

4.) The CSP Budget and Human Resources Committee meets on as needed basis. Project Committee members meet as needed to discuss upcoming summer tours with USFS staff, potential CSP projects and discuss public comment development opportunities.

Describe how the current structure is meeting the needs of the collaborative. Provide one example of how the structure is meeting the needs of the collaborative and one example of how it could be functioning better.

The CSP Operations Handbook provides an overall framework to determine who is an active member, Facilitator roles, formal decision making processes and similar collaborative framework topics. It is accepted by participating members.

CSP has a clear public comment development decision making process that seeks consensus outcomes when possible but has a backup process for majority and minority reports. One issue regarding majority collaborative positions is that individual organizational representatives may have significantly different internal timelines and processes for arriving at formal positions. While some organizations authorize their representatives to take positions on specific positions other representatives representing units of government or other organizations have formal processes for arriving at official positions.

For Details Upload any documents you have related to the Forest Collaborative structure (i.e. description of the leadership structure, decision

making process, statement of commitment signed by collaborative members, memorandum of understanding, or bylaws)

Forest Collaborative Project Type

What type of Forest Collaborative project are you planning?

Zone of Agreement

Collaborative Governance

Explain the proposed approach the collaborative will use to develop a formal organizational structure or update the current structure, include specific activities.

Mission Statement Revisions - Discussions of the current CSP mission statement be scheduled for CSP General Meetings revisions will be recorded and the final revised consensus version will be formally voted on by CSP members at a General Meeting. After approval the revised mission statement will be loaded onto the CSP website and referred to in various communications including submitted proposals and public comments.

Decision Making Process Revisions - In preparation for potential revisions to CSP decision making processes the Facilitator will research other forest collaborative and similar organizations' decision making processes and will summarize this information for distribution before the following General Meeting when decision making will be a primary agenda item. Members will be asked to provide qualitative decision making process feedback in addition to technical comments.

After feedback and recommendations are compiled revised decision making models incorporating this feedback will be distributed to members before the next scheduled General Meeting. At this meeting members will be formally asked to reach a consensus agreement on any revisions.

The adopted revised decision making process will be employed by CSP members when there is need to provide formal content or similar activities.

After the revised decision making process has been utilized there will be a formal check-in at the next General Meeting to assess the revised process outcomes.

Stakeholder Recruitment and Retention Strategy Development - Before members begin discussion of expanding stakeholder recruitment and member retention activities the CSP Facilitator will survey OR and WA forest collaboratives to identify their membership distribution and recruitment approaches. these findings will be distributed to members in advance of the General Meeting when members will discuss the full range of potential members, current CSP member gaps and how to prioritized additional recruitment. Outcomes from this meeting will be compiled and presented at the following CSP General Meeting for discussion and approval.

A separate CSP General Meeting discussion will focus on member retention and related potential activities. Outcomes from this discuss will be incorporated into regular CSP activities.

Describe how success will be evaluated.

Since there are 3 collaborative governance proposal components each section will be evaluated separately based on the outcomes of related activities.

Potential mission statement revisions will be discussed at scheduled General Meetings and success will be determined by members reaching agreement on any modifications for both internal and external audiences.

If members identify specific shortcomings in CSP's formal decision making processes and agree to changes that make the processes more accurate and transparent this activity will be determined to be successful.

Since CSP stakeholder member retention and recruitment are ongoing activities success during this project term will be based on production of a prioritized stakeholder recruitment list with related outreach strategies. Members with Facilitator assistance will also identify activities that support current CSP member continued participation.

Wrap-Up

Project Management

Identify the project leaders, and partners, their credentials, and related experience.

Role	Name	Affiliation	Qualifications	Email	Phone
Proposal Submitter and Fiscal Agent Representative	Cheryl McGinnis - Executive Director	Clackamas River Basin Council	M.Business Administration and B.S. Education; Over 16 years non-profit management experience including program development, partnership development, volunteer leaders coordination and staff supervision.	Cheryl@clackamasriver.org	(503) 303-4372
CSP Contract Facilitator and Project Coordinator	Robert Roth	Clackamas Stewardship Partners Facilitator	BA and MA Political Science. Six years experience as Forest Collaborative Facilitator and seven years experience as Willamette Valley watershed council coordinator. Served on METRO's Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee and ODFW STAC	robertrothcsp@gmail.com	(503) 657-9112

If you are hiring a contractor describe how will the assistance provider be selected and who will provide guidance and supervision?

Not applicable.

Project Schedule

Provide the anticipated schedule for the project.

Element	Description	Start Date	End Date
Organize, facilitate mission statement activities	Discussions of the current CSP mission statement be scheduled for CSP General Meetings revisions will be recorded and the final revised consensus version will be formally voted on by CSP members at a General Meeting. After approval the revised mission statement will be loaded onto the CSP website and referred to in various communications including submitted proposals and public comments.	2/2020	4/2020
Evaluate / revised CSP decision making process	In preparation for potential revisions to CSP decision making processes the Facilitator will research other forest collaborative and similar organizations' decision making processes and will summarize this information for distribution before the following General Meeting when decision making will be a primary agenda item. Members will be asked to provide qualitative decision making process feedback in addition to technical comments.	5/2020	5/2020
CSP formally vote on any decision making changes.	After feedback and recommendations are compiled revised decision making models incorporating this feedback will be distributed to members before the July General Meeting. At this meeting members will be formally asked to reach a consensus agreement on any revisions.	7/2020	7/2020
CSP identifies and develops stakeholder plans.	Before members begin discussion of expanding stakeholder recruitment and member retention activities the CSP Facilitator will survey OR and WA forest collaboratives to identify their membership distribution and recruitment approaches. these findings will be distributed to members in advance of the General Meeting when members will discuss the full range of potential members, current CSP member gaps and how to prioritize additional recruitment. Outcomes from this meeting will be compiled and presented at the following CSP General Meeting for discussion and approval.	9/2020	10/2020
CSP discuss member retention activities.	At the November CSP General Meeting discussion will focus on member retention and related potential activities. Outcomes from this discuss will be incorporated into regular CSP activities.	11/2020	11/2020

Element	Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q3 2020	Q4 2020
Organize, facilitate mission statement activities				
Evaluate / revised CSP decision making process				

CSP formally vote on any decision making changes.				
CSP identifies and develops stakeholder plans.				
CSP discuss member retention activities.				

Budget

Item	Unit Type	Unit Number	Unit Cost	OWEB Funds	External Cash	External In-Kind	Total Costs
Salaries, Wages and Benefits							
			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Category Sub-total				\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contracted Services							
Contract Facilitator	Hours	145	\$33.00	\$4,785	\$0	\$0	\$4,785
Category Sub-total				\$4,785	\$0	\$0	\$4,785
Travel							
			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Category Sub-total				\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Materials and Supplies							
			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Category Sub-total				\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Equipment							
			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Category Sub-total				\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other							
CSP Member participation	Hours	98	\$24.56	\$0	\$0	\$2,407	\$2,407
Category Sub-total				\$0	\$0	\$2,407	\$2,407
Modified Total Direct Cost Amounts				\$4,785	\$0	\$2,407	\$7,192
Indirect Costs							
Federally Accepted 'de minimis' Indirect Cost Rate (up to 10%)	10%			Indirect Cost Total: \$479			
Total				\$5,264	\$0	\$2,407	\$7,671

* = OWEB funds excluded from indirect.

If the budget includes unusually high costs and/or rates, provide justification for those costs and/or rates.

If the budget identifies a contingency amount for specific line item(s) within the Contracted Services and Materials and Supplies budget categories, explain the specific reasons a contingency is needed for each line item. Contingencies are line-item specific and cannot be used for other costs.

Funding and Match

Fund Sources and Amounts

Organization Type	Name	Source Note	Contribution Type	Amount	Description	Status
Non-Governmental Organization	Clackamas Stewardship Partners	Clackamas Basin forest collaborative	In-Kind - Labor	\$2,492	CSP member preparation and participation in specific collaborative governance proposal activities described in schedule.	Pending
Fund Source Cash Total			\$0	Fund Source In-Kind Total		\$2,492

Match

Contribution Source-Type: Description	Amount
Clackamas Stewardship Partners-In-Kind - Labor: CSP member preparation and participation in specific collaborative governance proposal activities described in schedule.	\$2,492
Match Total	\$2,492

Do match funding sources have any restrictions on how funds are used, timelines or other limitations that would impact the portion of the project proposed for OWEB funding?

- Yes
 No

Do you need state OWEB dollars (not Federal) to match the requirements of any other federal funding you will be using to complete this project?

- Yes
 No

Does the non-OWEB cash funding include Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Funds?

- Yes
 No

Uploads

Bylaws: [CSP_Operations_Handbook_20111213_njp \(16\).pdf -](#)

Permit Page

Project Activity Requiring a Permit or License	Name of Permit or License	Entity Issuing Permit or License	Status
Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.

CLACKAMAS STEWARDSHIP PARTERS

OPERATIONS HANDBOOK

Revised December 13, 2011

I. OVERVIEW

This Operations Handbook describes the collaborative process employed by the Clackamas Stewardship Partners (CSP), a collaborative group of multi-party stakeholders that has been extremely successful in using stewardship contracting and other innovative tools to meet restoration goals in the 600,000-acre Clackamas River Basin, located on the south and southwest sides of Mount Hood, Oregon. The purpose of this document is to describe the organizational structure of CSP, the types of activities in which the group engages, and the collaborative decision-making process employed by CSP. This document is organized into the following sections:

- I. Overview
- II. Introduction, Vision, and Desired Outcomes
- III. Organizational Structure
- IV. Communication
- V. Decision-Making Process
- VI. Formation of the Clackamas Stewardship Partners
- VII. Definitions
- VIII. Statement of Commitment

The CSP Operational Handbook is a “living” document in the sense that it has evolved over time with the needs of the group. Many individuals and organizations have contributed directly and indirectly to this document. For example, the current version of the CSP Operations Handbook has had incorporated in it elements drawn from the operational guidelines of the Blue Mountain Forest Partners.

II. INTRODUCTION, VISION, AND DESIRED OUTCOMES

A. Introduction

The Clackamas Stewardship Partners (CSP) are a group of diverse stakeholders with the common goal of restoring ecological functions and economic conditions in the Clackamas River Basin. CSP was formed in 2004 to facilitate collaboration necessary for successful stewardship contracting implementation on the Clackamas River Ranger District of the Mount Hood National Forest. Stewardship contracting has enabled the Clackamas Stewardship Partners to promote approximately

1 \$6,000,000 of job-creating restoration projects in the Clackamas River Basin during
2 the five-year period 2006-2010, an annual average of \$1,200,000. During the past
3 three years, the Clackamas Stewardship Partners have recommended funding over
4 \$825,000 worth of restoration projects using retained receipts generated by
5 commercial timber harvest from second-growth forest stands on the Mount Hood
6 National Forest. Recommended projects have included improving and expanding
7 habitat for salmon and other aquatic species of concern, road repair and
8 decommissioning of unneeded roads, repair of sites damaged by inappropriate off-
9 highway vehicle recreation, enhancement of peregrine falcon nest sites, and
10 vegetation treatments to increase the production of culturally important huckleberries.
11 Additional areas of involvement for CSP include issues related to forest-wide road
12 decommissioning efforts and multi-party monitoring.

13
14 Reflecting its successes, CSP was one of five groups nationally to be awarded the
15 “Two Chiefs’ Partnership Award” in 2008 by the Chiefs of the Forest Service and
16 Natural Resources Conservation Service for conducting the collaborative processes
17 necessary to recommend stewardship contracting projects on the Clackamas River
18 Ranger District of the Mt. Hood National Forest.

19
20 B. Vision
21 Enhance ecosystem health and economic viability of local communities within the
22 Clackamas River Watershed. The Clackamas Stewardship Partners are committed to
23 a collaborative process that employs stewardship contracting and other innovative
24 tools to meet restoration goals.

25
26 C. Desired Outcomes
27 The desired outcomes of the collaborative process employed by CSP are:
28 • Restoration of healthy ecosystems and economic viability of local communities
29 within the Clackamas River Watershed
30 • Stewardship contracts implemented in the Clackamas River Ranger District
31 • Enhanced communication and trust between stakeholders
32 • Participants are able to handle disagreements with grace
33 • Members’ motivations and limits are identified
34 • Group is able to come to consensus on decisions
35 • Projects have multi-party monitoring
36 • Successes are recognized, recorded, and communicated
37 • Consistent program of work
38 • Diversity of interests working together

39

III. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

CSP is organized into two structural levels. Organizations and individuals, the first structural level, comprise voting and non-voting CSP members (organizations), the Coordinator, guests, and media. The term “full group” refers collectively to voting members, non-voting members, and the Coordinator. Committees (and associated subcommittees) form the second structural level of organization in CSP.

A. Organizations and Individuals

The Clackamas Stewardship Partners aim to be inclusive to a diversity of interests. New organizations are welcome to become members. To become a member of CSP, an organization (through its representative or representatives) must:

- Agree to abide by the vision, desired outcomes of collaboration, and guidelines outlined in this Operations Handbook
- Commit to active, long-term involvement with CSP
- Commit to active participation in one CSP committee or subcommittee
- Attend three consecutive general meetings of the full group of CSP members

An organization that has fulfilled these requirements will become a CSP member following the adjournment of the third consecutive general meeting that the organization has attended.

Active, long-term involvement as a CSP member is demonstrated by representative(s) of an organization attending one CSP meeting (i.e., general, committee, subcommittee, or field trip) at least once every six (1) calendar months.

CSP members that do not demonstrate active, long-term involvement (defined in the previous paragraph) will lose their status as CSP members. An organization that has lost its status as a CSP member may regain it by fulfilling the original requirements to become a CSP member.

1. Voting Members

A CSP member that is so permitted by its own rules and regulations to vote as part of the CSP decision-making process is considered a voting member. Each voting member (i.e., organization) may cast one (1) vote when making decisions, regardless of the number of representatives of the organization that are actively involved with CSP.

If a voting member misses general (i.e., full group) meetings three (3) of the last four (4) calendar months, the voting member will be considered “inactive” (i.e.,

1 unable to vote) at the next meeting the member attends. An “inactive” member
2 that attends two (2) consecutive meetings regains “active” status (i.e., is able to
3 vote) at the beginning of the second consecutive meeting attended.
4

5 The roles of voting members are:

- 6 • Participate actively
- 7 • Be well informed of CSP’s activities
- 8 • Provide input from each individual constituency
- 9 • Provide ideas or initiatives
- 10 • Provide technical resources
- 11 • Work towards common ground
- 12 • Treat other participants with respect
- 13 • Be honest
- 14 • Make decisions
- 15 • Staff the process
- 16 • Communicate with each other and constituents regularly
- 17 • Be responsible
- 18 • Voice concerns instead of opting out silently
- 19 • Provide local knowledge

20 21 2. Non-Voting Members

22 A CSP member that is not permitted by its own rules and regulations to vote as
23 part of the CSP decision-making process is considered a non-voting member. For
24 example, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is a non-voting member of CSP. Non-
25 voting members do not facilitate CSP and are not bound by what CSP decides.
26

27 The roles of non-voting members are:

- 28 • Offer resource information
- 29 • Share historical data
- 30 • Share contract-writing experience
- 31 • Share experience working with local contractors
- 32 • Utilize paid staff
- 33 • Responsible for NEPA if Federal member (e.g., USFS)
- 34 • Share technical resources and expertise
- 35 • Offer local knowledge

3. Coordinator

The primary function of the Coordinator is to facilitate the activities of CSP. The Coordinator may be directed by CSP to perform various combinations of the following tasks on an annual basis:

- Facilitate and provide snacks for monthly CSP meetings, prepare meeting agendas with input from CSP members, and track progress towards implementation of strategic plan
- Attend CSP committee meetings and record minutes
- Track retained receipts and goods-for-services and provide up-to-date information to CSP
- Develop meeting materials and packets, maintain documents, contact lists, and committee assignments, and provide record keeping for CSP
- Coordinate at least three field activities, including stewardship contracting and restoration project planning tours with USFS staff and CSP members
- Develop and manage a field monitoring volunteer and training program and lead monitoring field trips
- Implement monitoring protocols with CSP members and USFS staff and refine protocols as needed
- Coordinate with CSP to identify potential stewardship contracting sites using CSP criteria matrix to recommend to the USFS
- Provide CSP members with technical field assistance and leadership for planning and implementing recommended restoration projects
- Coordinate restoration project development needs, including project scope of work, budget requirements, implementation schedule, and timelines and provide to CSP
- Maintain the CSP e-mail list and CSP website
- Assist CSP strategic planning by identifying and initiating contact with probable grant sources, partners, and other resources
- Develop and submit grant proposals, complete all reports as required by funders
- Act as liaison between the various CSP stakeholders, media and other public or private interest groups
- Represent CSP at local and/or regional meetings;
- Work with the CSP to develop necessary outreach tools including newsletters and/or press releases
- Maintain active and productive participation of diverse group members through regular contact

1 4. Guests

2 The roles of guests are:

- 3 • Identify themselves and their motivation for attending
- 4 • Become educated on the activities of CSP, both generally and with regards
- 5 to specific topics of interest to the guest(s)
- 6 • Participate in a respectful and appropriate manner
- 7 • Listen
- 8 • Share experience(s) or expertise

9
10 5. Media

11 CSP members must agree in advance that members of media be allowed to attend

12 a CSP meeting (i.e., general, committee, subcommittee, or fieldtrip).

13
14 The roles of the media are:

- 15 • Be informed
- 16 • Report accurately about CSP, its members, and its activities
- 17 • Abide by guest rules

18
19 B. Committees

20 The overarching task of the three standing CSP committees--Budget and Human

21 Resources, Monitoring, and Projects--is to allow a smaller group of CSP members

22 and the Coordinator to focus on issues relevant to CSP and to deliver information,

23 syntheses, and recommendations about those issues to the full group for further

24 consideration. Committees are chaired and committee meetings are facilitated by

25 voting CSP members. If no voting member is able to commit to chairing a particular

26 committee, the Coordinator will assume the role of committee facilitator until a

27 committee chair is identified. Additionally, each committee may create and staff

28 subcommittees as needed. Because of their ad hoc nature, subcommittees are not

29 described below. At present, the Projects Committee is the only committee with a

30 subcommittee (Roads).

31
32 1. Budget and Human Resources Committee

33 The roles of the Budget and Human Resources (B&HR) Committee are:

- 34 • Provide a detailed internal accounting of each project approved by CSP
- 35 • Work with the full group, Monitoring Committee, and Projects Committee
- 36 to develop grant proposals as needed, including proposals for grants to fund
- 37 projects, monitoring, and the position of Coordinator
- 38 • Coordinate communications between fiscal agents and CSP
- 39 • Facilitate hiring and periodic review of the Coordinator

- 1 • Assign duties of the Coordinator to CSP members if no Coordinator has
2 been hired
3 • Periodically review the Operations Handbook, develop recommended
4 changes as needed, and present these recommendations to the full group for
5 review and approval
6

7 2. Monitoring Committee

8 The roles of the Monitoring Committee are:

- 9 • Monitor the implementation of stewardship projects approved by CSP
10 • Develop monitoring protocols and use these to monitor key variables pre-
11 and post-implementation for stewardship contracting timber sales and
12 related restoration work
13 • Work with the Projects Committee to identify desired monitoring activities
14 • Work with the B&HR Committee to develop grant proposals to fund desired
15 monitoring activities
16

17 3. Projects Committee

18 The roles of the Projects Committee are:

- 19 • Create and/or review proposals for “goods for services” and “retained
20 receipts” restoration projects to recommend to the full group for approval
21 • Use science-based principles to prioritize restoration goals and identify areas
22 and design projects to meet those goals
23 • Work with the Monitoring Committee to identify desired monitoring
24 activities
25 • Work with the B&HR Committee to develop grant proposals to fund desired
26 projects
27
28
29

1 IV. COMMUNICATION

2 3 A. Basic Rules of Collaboration

- 4 • If a participant does not agree with something that is going on at a meeting, that
- 5 individual must raise his/her concern or issue at the meeting
- 6 • If a participant identifies something that needs to be done, he/she needs to either do
- 7 it or identify a plan to get it done
- 8 • Everything said in meetings stays in meetings, except as necessary for
- 9 organizational participation
- 10 • Respect each other in meetings and outside of meetings
- 11 • Seek common ground
- 12 • One person talks at a time and participants are encouraged to be concise
- 13 • Make sure everyone has a chance to be heard
- 14 • No backroom lobbying or backroom deals
- 15 • The personal integrity and values of participants will be respected
- 16 • Stereotyping will be avoided
- 17 • Commitments will not be made lightly and will be kept; agreements will be honored
- 18 • Disagreements will be regarded as “problems to be solved,” rather than as “battles
- 19 to be won”
- 20 • Participants are representative of a broad range of interests, each having concerns
- 21 about the outcome of the issues at hand
- 22 • All parties recognize the legitimacy of the interests and concerns of others, and
- 23 expect that their interests will be represented as well
- 24 • Participants commit to keeping their colleagues/constituents informed about the
- 25 progress of these discussions
- 26 • Participants commit to stating interests, problems, and opportunities, not positions
- 27 • Participants will air problems, disagreements and critical information during
- 28 meetings to avoid surprises
- 29 • Participants commit to search for opportunities and alternatives; group creativity
- 30 can often find the best solution
- 31 • Participants agree to verify rumors at the meeting before accepting them as fact

32 33 B. Meeting Behavior

34 All participants will:

- 35 • Come to meetings prepared
- 36 • Respect the basic rules of collaboration (stated above)
- 37 • Voice concerns during meetings and take the time to resolve those issues
- 38 • Refrain from side conversations during the meeting

- 1 • Participants will make sure only one person speaks at a time – let individuals
- 2 finish their thoughts and then take a deep breath before responding
- 3 • Respect the facilitator and meeting agenda
- 4

5 C. Meeting Planning and Coordination

- 6 • General (i.e., full group) meetings are typically held on the 2nd Tuesday of each
- 7 month from 2:00pm - 4:30pm at the Mount Scott Fire Station, located 9339 S.E.
- 8 Causey Avenue, Clackamas, OR 97086
- 9 • The CSP Coordinator is responsible for facilitating and providing snacks for the
- 10 general meeting
- 11 • Meetings can occur as “business meetings”, conference calls, or field trips
- 12 • General meetings are open to the public
- 13 • Meetings where key decisions are to be made will be announced well in advance
- 14 (typically two weeks)
- 15 • Any preparatory materials for meetings will be sent out one week before the
- 16 meeting, and partners should commit to reviewing the material
- 17 • Meetings will be announced via e-mail and, for general meetings, on the CSP
- 18 website
- 19

20 D. Record Keeping

- 21 • Meeting minutes will be taken at each meeting and distributed electronically within
- 22 one week of the meeting; members will respond with comments and the final
- 23 minutes will be approved at the following meeting.
- 24 • Responsibility for taking meeting minutes is rotated among members on a monthly
- 25 basis
- 26 • Each individuals attending a meeting will be listed in the meeting minutes with
- 27 his/her affiliation clearly identified
- 28

29 E. Internal Communications Protocol

- 30 • The CSP e-mail list (clackamas-stewardship-partners@googlegroups.com) will be
- 31 used for ongoing communication with CSP members and other subscribers
- 32 • The CSP website (www.clackamasstewardshippartners.org) will be maintained for
- 33 storing and sharing information
- 34

35 F. External Communications Protocol

- 36 • Information about CSP will be made available to external stakeholders via the CSP
- 37 website and other venues as appropriate
- 38 • All efforts will be taken to ensure that CSP’s work remains transparent to external
- 39 audiences
- 40

V. DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The goal of the CSP decision-making process is to come to a decision that members can support following a respectful hearing of all concerns. CSP makes decisions using a process of *modified consensus*. Consensus is achieved when all voting members can support or, at minimum, live with a decision. Modified consensus extends the concept of consensus by defining how CSP members will proceed to identify and draft majority and minority decisions (e.g., reports, opinions, statements, recommendations) when there is an inability to reach consensus.

A. Reaching Consensus

As decisions are being made in full group, committee, or subcommittee meetings, voting members attending the meeting will be asked to indicate their support either by a show of hands or verbal confirmation. Each voting member in attendance has the ability to disagree with elements of decisions as they are being developed, but must offer a constructive alternative that seeks to meet the needs of all voting members involved.

Consensus on a decision about a project, recommendation, or action the group plans to take will be reached when all voting members attending the meeting can make one of the following statements about a decision:

- I agree with the decision and will publicly support it
- I agree with the decision but will refrain from publicly supporting it
- I can live with the decision (and will not disparage it publically)

B. Inability to Reach Consensus

If the voting members are unable to reach consensus, the following actions will be taken:

- Areas of agreement and disagreement will be clearly recorded in writing
- Majority and minority reports will be written by members of the respective groups to address the areas of disagreement
- Majority and minority reports will include:
 - The name and affiliation of the lead author(s) and names and affiliations of all who agree with the report
 - A description of their proposal and the rationale used to develop it
- Majority and minority reports will be given to the Coordinator who will submit them together to the USFS for their consideration in their role as decision-makers for USFS-managed lands and waters

C. Absence from Decision-Making Meetings

1 The following steps to address the absence of voting members from decision-making
2 meetings were modified from the Blue Mountain Forest Partners and adopted by CSP
3 on March 10, 2009:

- 4 • If a voting CSP member is unable to attend a meeting where a decision will be
5 made, the member will inform the Coordinator and/or committee chair(s) as
6 soon as possible
- 7 • Providing information to members prior to meetings is encouraged if a member
8 cannot attend the meeting but wants to share information or ideas
- 9 • If a decision is made that a voting member does not support at a meeting that
10 the member could not attend, he/she may try to get consensus on an alternate
11 version of the decision within one (1) week of the original decision-making
12 meeting
- 13 • The voting member trying to get consensus on an alternate decision must
14 provide the full group with a written electronic copy of the alternate decision via
15 the CSP e-mail list within one (1) week of the original decision-making meeting
- 16 • If consensus is reached on the alternate decision within one (1) week of the
17 original decision-making meeting:
 - 18 ▪ The alternate decision will immediately replace the original decision as the
19 new consensus decision
 - 20 ▪ The alternate decision will be appended to the minutes of the original
21 decision-making meeting and noted in the minutes as the new consensus
22 decision
- 23 • If consensus is not reached on the alternate decision within one (1) week of the
24 original decision-making meeting and the voting member wishes to submit the
25 alternate decision as a majority or minority report (whichever is applicable):
 - 26 ▪ The voting member responsible for the alternate decision must provide the
27 full group with a written electronic copy of the alternate decision via the
28 CSP e-mail list within one (1) week of the original decision-making meeting
 - 29 ▪ The steps described under Section V.B. "Inability to Reach Consensus" will
30 be followed
 - 31 ▪ The alternate decision will be appended to the minutes of the original
32 decision-making meeting and noted in the minutes of the original decision-
33 making meeting as the majority or minority decision (whichever is
34 applicable)
 - 35 ▪ The original decision will be noted in the minutes of the original decision-
36 making meeting as being the opposite report to the alternate decision
- 37 • If a written electronic copy of the alternate decision is not provided to the full
38 group via the CSP e-mail list within one (1) week of the original decision-
39 making meeting, the original decision will remain in force as the consensus
40 decision

VI. FORMATION OF THE CLACKAMAS STEWARDSHIP PARTNERS

In June of 2004, employees from the Clackamas River Ranger District of the Mount Hood National Forest made a presentation to the Clackamas River Basin Council (CRBC) to inform them about new stewardship authorities and the need for a collaborative process that involved local interest to implement the new authorities. At this meeting members of CRBC expressed an interest in becoming a collaborative group for the Clackamas River watershed because their members represented 21 different special interest groups within the County. CRBC requested that the USFS make another presentation after the Environmental Assessment (EA) was completed for the Cloak Thinning project so that they could prioritize watershed restoration projects to include with restoration thinning projects within a 2400-13 stewardship contract. This presentation was made in September of 2004.

In July of 2004, independently of the CRBC, the Agriculture and Forestry Sub-Committee of the Clackamas County Economic Development Commission (CCEDC) requested a USFS presentation on potential opportunities for forest biomass. Representatives from the Mount Hood National Forest Headquarters and USFS Region 6 Regional Office met with the group. Their interest at the time was to explore opportunities for creating an electrical co-generation facility in east Clackamas County utilizing forest biomass as the source of fuel. After meeting a couple of times with the group, and explaining the new Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) legislation, and Healthy Forest Restoration Initiative (HFRI) authorities, the group refocused their interest on stewardship contracting.

Following the July 2004 meetings, the Clackamas County Economic Development Commission Ag and Forestry Sub-committee requested a presentation by the Clackamas River Ranger District (the District) about stewardship contracting. The CCEDC was very interested in how they could help us move forward with a stewardship contract within the next 6 months with a focus on creating jobs in the rural portions of the County. After the District's initial presentations, the CCEDC began arranging and leading a number of other meetings to further their understanding of stewardship contracting. They invited members of the local timber industry and the Association of Oregon Loggers to meetings. Importantly, USFS employees participated in this learning process, but did not lead it. At this point in time (Fall 2004), this group wanted to become a collaborative group and, "get something done fast." The USFS and partner groups recognized that while they would like to see stewardship projects happen quickly, they needed a diverse representation of groups in order for the process to be successful.

1 Subsequently, in early November 2004, Ginny Van Loo of Clackamas County arranged a
2 meeting of groups within Clackamas County who had shown an interest in stewardship
3 contracting. Representatives of CRBC, CCEDC, Clackamas County Soil and Water
4 Conservation District, the timber industry, Oregon Wild, Bark, and a local business
5 owner attended this meeting. At this meeting the group arranged a working meeting with
6 the Clackamas River Ranger District to prioritize projects to include within Cloak
7 Thinning stewardship contracts during FY05.

8
9 On November 29, 2004 this group collaboratively prioritized a list of watershed
10 restoration and wildlife projects to include within a stewardship contract. They requested
11 that the District accomplish these projects by including them in a 2400-13T stewardship
12 contract associated with the Cloak Thinning project.

13
14 Over the next several weeks, several members of this group worked closely with the
15 Forest Service and the local environmental group Bark to make minor changes to the
16 Cloak Thinning project in order to avert an appeal. This group effort resulted in three
17 separate stewardship contracts that were advertised during FY05 and FY06.

18
19 During most of 2005 and the first half of 2006 the collaborative group efforts focused on
20 developing a system for identifying restoration priorities. Although not yet finalized, the
21 criteria were used to assess Forest Service proposals for Stewardship contracts and
22 resulted in two new stewardship contracts. The collaborative process started somewhat
23 tenuous at first, due to distrust and lack of familiarity with the process. To be successful,
24 the group formed a group charter, which included: desired outcomes from collaboration,
25 a common vision, a group structure, and a group decision-making process.

26
27 In the fall of 2005, the Clackamas Stewardship Partners (CSP) finalized their charter,
28 which included the following vision statement:

29
30 *Enhance ecosystem health and economic viability of local communities within the*
31 *Clackamas River Watershed. We are committed to a collaborative process that*
32 *employs stewardship contracting and other innovative tools to meet restoration goals.*
33
34
35

VII. DEFINITIONS

Unless otherwise noted, the following definitions have been taken from The Federal Register, Volume 76, Number 30, Monday, February 14, 2011, Proposed Rules, pages 8523-8525.

Collaboration. A structured manner in which a collection of people with diverse interests share knowledge, ideas, and resources while working together in an inclusive and cooperative manner toward a common purpose.

Connectivity. Pertaining to the extent to which conditions exist or should be provided between separate national forest or grassland areas to ensure habitat for breeding, feeding, or movement of wildlife and fish within their home range or migration areas.

Conservation. The protection, preservation, management, or restoration of natural environments and ecological communities.

Culmination of mean annual increment of growth. The age in the growth cycle of an even-aged stand at which the average annual rate of increase of volume is at a maximum.

Disturbance. Any relatively discrete event in time that disrupts ecosystem, watershed, community, or species population structure and/or function and changes resources, substrate availability, or the physical environment.

Ecological conditions. The biological and physical environment that can affect diversity of plant and animal communities and the productive capacity of ecological systems. Examples of ecological conditions include the abundance and distribution of aquatic and terrestrial habitats, connectivity, roads and other structural developments, human uses, and invasive species.

Ecological system. See ecosystem.

Economic system. The system of production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services including consideration of jobs and income.

Ecosystem. A spatially explicit, relatively homogeneous unit of the Earth that includes all interacting organisms and elements of the abiotic environment within its boundaries. An ecosystem is commonly described in terms of its:

- (1) *Composition.* Major vegetation types, rare communities, aquatic systems, and riparian systems.

1 (2) *Structure*. Vertical and horizontal distribution of vegetation, stream habitat
2 complexity, and riparian habitat elements.

3 (3) *Function*. Ecological processes such as stream flows, nutrient cycling, and
4 disturbance regimes.

5 (4) *Connectivity*. Habitats that exist for breeding, feeding, or movement of wildlife
6 and fish within species home ranges or migration areas.

7
8 *Ecosystem services*. Benefits people obtain from ecosystems, including:

9 (1) *Provisioning services*, such as clean air and fresh water, as well as energy, fuel,
10 forage, fiber, and minerals;

11 (2) *Regulating services*, such as long term storage of carbon; climate regulation;
12 water filtration, purification, and storage; soil stabilization; flood control; and
13 disease regulation;

14 (3) *Supporting services*, such as pollination, seed dispersal, soil formation, and
15 nutrient cycling; and

16 (4) *Cultural services*, such as educational, aesthetic, spiritual, and cultural heritage
17 values, as well as recreational experiences and tourism opportunities.

18
19 *Health(y)*. The degree of ecological integrity that is related to the completeness or
20 wholeness of the composition, structure, and function of native ecosystems existing
21 within the inherent capability of the land.

22
23 *Landscape*. A spatial mosaic of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, landforms, and plant
24 communities across a defined area irrespective of ownership or other artificial boundaries
25 and repeated in similar form throughout.

26
27 *Mean annual increment of growth*. The total increment of increase of volume of a stand
28 (standing crop plus thinnings) up to a given age divided by that age. In land management
29 plans, mean annual increment is expressed in cubic measure and is based on the expected
30 growth of stands, according to intensities and utilization guidelines in the plan.

31
32 *Monitoring*. A systematic process of collecting information over time and space to
33 evaluate effects of actions or changes in conditions or relationships.

34
35 *Multiple use*. The management of all the various renewable surface resources of the
36 National Forest System so they are used in the combination that will best meet the needs
37 of the American people:

- 38 • Making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or
39 related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic
40 adjustments in the use to conform to changing needs and conditions;

- 1 • Recognizing that some lands will be used for less than all of the resources; and
- 2 • Providing for harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources,
- 3 each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land, with
- 4 consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not
- 5 necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the
- 6 greatest unit output, consistent with the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960
- 7 (16 U.S.C. 528–531).
- 8 • Ecosystem services are included as part of all the various renewable surface
- 9 resources of the National Forest System.

10
11 *Resilience.* The capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while
12 undergoing change so as to still retain essentially the same function, structure, identity,
13 and feedbacks.

14
15 *Restoration.* The process of assisting the recovery of resilience and the capacity of a
16 system to adapt to change if the environment where the system exists has been degraded,
17 damaged, or destroyed. Ecological restoration focuses on reestablishing ecosystem
18 functions by modifying or managing the composition, structure, arrangement, and
19 processes necessary to make terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems sustainable, and resilient
20 under current and future conditions.

21
22 *Riparian Areas.* Geographically delineable areas with distinctive resource values and
23 characteristics that are comprised of the aquatic and riparian ecosystems.

24
25 *Risk.* A combination of the likelihood that a negative outcome will occur and the severity
26 of the subsequent negative consequences.

27
28 *Species of conservation concern.* Species other than federally listed threatened or
29 endangered species or candidate species, for which the responsible official has
30 determined that there is evidence demonstrating significant concern about its capability to
31 persist over the long-term in the plan area.

32
33 *Stewardship contracting.* (The following has been excerpted from the USFS brochure
34 “Stewardship Contracting: Basic stewardship contracting concepts” published in August
35 2009.) Stewardship contracting combines restoration activities on National Forest
36 System [and Bureau of Land Management] lands into contract or agreement packages.
37 Stewardship contracting provides the ability to:

- 38 • Bundle several contracts into one to treat a landscape
- 39 • Trade goods for services

- 1 • Retain receipts from forest products that need to be removed to meet restoration
- 2 objectives and apply the receipts to needed service work within the stewardship
- 3 project area
- 4 • Retain receipts and transfer them to another approved stewardship project [and, in
- 5 some cases, restoration projects not located on National Forest System lands]
- 6 • Use multiyear and multiple-year contracts and agreements up to 10 years in length
- 7 • Collaborate upfront and throughout project development and implementation with
- 8 government agencies, tribal governments, local communities, nongovernmental
- 9 organizations, and any interested groups or individuals
- 10 • Use Best Value contracting to evaluate contractors' proposals

11
12 *Sustainability.* Capability of meeting the needs of the present generation without
13 compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

14
15 *Sustainable recreation.* The set of recreational opportunities, uses and access that,
16 individually and combined, are ecologically, economically, and socially sustainable,
17 allowing the responsible official to offer recreation opportunities now and into the future.
18 Recreational opportunities can include non-motorized, motorized, developed, and
19 dispersed recreation on land, water, and air.

20
21 *System drivers.* Natural or human-induced factors that directly or indirectly cause a
22 change in an ecosystem, such as climate change, habitat change, or non-native invasive
23 species, human population change, economic activity, or technology.

24
25 *Timber harvest.* The removal of trees for wood fiber use and other multiple-use
26 purposes.

27
28 *Timber production.* The purposeful growing, tending, harvesting, and regeneration of
29 regulated crops of trees to be cut into logs, bolts, or other round sections for industrial or
30 consumer use.

31
32 *Viable population.* A population of a species that continues to persist over the long term
33 with sufficient distribution to be resilient and adaptable to stressors and likely future
34 environments.

35
36 *Watershed.* A region or land area drained by a single stream, river, or drainage network;
37 a drainage basin.

38
39 *Watershed condition.* The state of a watershed based on physical and biogeochemical
40 characteristics and processes.

VIII. Statement of Commitment

The following Statement of Commitment was approved by consensus at the CSP General Meeting held on December 13, 2011:

An organization (through its representative or representatives) affirms that its representative(s):

- i) has (have) read the CSP Operations Handbook;*
- ii) agrees (agree) to comply with the guidelines set forth in the CSP Operations Handbook;*
- iii) agrees (agree) to participate in one or more CSP committees (and indicates which); and*
- iv) identifies (identify) what organization the individual represents if other than him or herself.*

CSP members, please make a copy of this page, initial to indicate participation in one or more of the following CSP committees, sign, date, and return the completed copy of this page to the CSP Coordinator.

Budget and Human Resources Committee: _____ (initial if participant)

Monitoring Committee: _____ (initial if participant)

Projects Committee: _____ (initial if participant)

Printed Name: _____

Signature: _____

Organization: _____

Date: _____