Model Forest Landowners in Alabama: Are they Different from Typical Landowners?

John Schelhas
USDA Forest Service, USA
Robert Zabawa
Tuskegee University, USA

Family forests make up the majority of forest ownerships in Alabama. The public and private benefits of these forests can be enhanced with assistance from natural resource professionals. Yet only a small percentage of family forest owners have written management plans or make use of professional foresters. Community and social approaches to forestry try to address this gap by forming of forest landowner groups and initiating landowner-to-landowner extension programs. However it is unclear if these methods are reaching a larger group of landowners. Foresters have long been aware of a gap between the way they view forest land and the way it is viewed by many landowners. This gap is generally characterized as foresters emphasizing timber management versus landowners having multiple and diverse land ownership objectives. We hypothesize that there are even greater differences, and that the forestry community's idea of a model landowner may not fit well with the circumstances of m any forest landowners. If we understand the complex social and cultural differences between the forestry community's model landowners and typical forest landowners, we will be better able to take steps to increase the use of professional forestry assistance by family forest owners. We analyze representations of model forest landowners in landowner profiles in Alabama's leading forest landowner magazine—focusing on landowner characteristics, ownership objectives, values, and management practices, and compare these to empirical data from a random sample of forest landowners in two Alabama counties and other studies of forest landowners.

A Survey of Forestland Conservation Easements in the United States: Implications for the Management and Stewardship of Working Private Forests

Michael J. Mortimer, Jesse J. Richardson, Jr. and Jeffrey S. Huff
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA

A Survey of Forestland Conservation Easements in the United States: Implications for the Management and Stewardship of Working Private Forests. Abstract Conservation easements are increasingly popular land management tools for private landowners, government agencies and nongovernmental organizations in the United States. This particular legal mechanism typically restricts a landowner's development rights and may constrain other related property uses. While recent estimates of easement-protected land amount to nearly 2.6 million acres in 2000, no previous estimates of easement-protected forestland acreages exist. Additionally, no empirical studies address the management of U.S. forestland under easements at a national scale. Consequently, this study was designed to address three goals: inventorying total forestland protected, determining forestry restrictions commonly found, and estimating the impact of easements on private forest management and timber supply. Survey results reflect over 536 conservation organizations and 20 state agencies holding over 16,025 conservation easements on 4.9 million acres of all land types. Of these, at least 3,598 easements protect in excess of 2.5 million forestland acres. Restrictions on the flexibility of forest management tend to vary based on the protected property's forest resources. Additionally, the desires of the easement grantee also appear to influence the type and intensity of permissible forestry-related activities. Other observations demonstrate a lack of baseline forest inventories on easement properties, and a notable lack of professionally-developed management plans on working forest easements, both of which indicate areas for improvement in the easement development and implementation process.
The fragmented geographic nature of current forestland easements suggests that increased cooperation among conservation organizations and between suitable government agencies in locating potential conservation lands is warranted. Finally, existing forestland conservation easements appear to have little impact on U.S. commercial timber availability, although local or regional timber supply may begin to demonstrate some effects in the future, most likely in the Northeast.

Welcome to the ISSRM 2005 and Östersund

For many of us a good deal of thought and anxiety goes with making choices. In Sweden there is even a word for it – "beslutsångest" which roughly translates as "decision anxiety." You too will have this experience as you are forced to make some very tough choices among nine concurrent sessions in eight time slots. We tried to reduce your "beslutsångest" this year by restricting everyone to one oral presentation and by featuring nearly 100 presentations as posters. But our meeting is a bit shorter than others – only three and a half days and includes a half day field trip as well as five outstanding plenary speakers.

Actually we are pleased that you have such tough choices. More than 400 papers and presentations show the diversity and importance of the emerging discipline of social science applied to natural resource management.

We initiated the ISSRM 2005 with four goals:

1) To give the Scandinavian research and policy community a chance to learn more about the diversity of applied interdisciplinary research that is being done in North America and elsewhere in the world. The ISSRM provides a forum to present the most recent theoretical and methodological developments in applied social science research for managing natural resources;
2) To make it easier for Scandinavian scientists and students to meet those from around the world who are doing work in this area;
3) To build relationships between Scandinavian researchers and their counterparts outside the region; and
4) To give the international scientific community some understanding of the institutions, geography and the culture of Scandinavia to better appreciate how the region's unique natural and social features offer new opportunities to understand human behavior and resource management.

The ISSRM this year is truly an international meeting. Participants come from 35 countries and less than one third are from North America. We are pleased to discover more research activity and participation from the Nordic countries than we expected. We anticipate that this broadening of the ISSRM culture will lead to new insights, advances in the field and new partnerships.

We appreciate the very strong support from the Swedish resource management community, the tourism community and research foundations. We further appreciate support of Mid Sweden University, the City of Östersund, the County of Jämtland, and the Swedish Government. We are of course honored that His Majesty King Carl XVI Gustav is opening the Symposium and staying to attend the sessions on Thursday afternoon.

Thomas Heberlein
University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
Co-Chair ISSRM 2005

Peter Fredman
European Tourism Research Institute, Mid Sweden University, Sweden
Co-Chair ISSRM 2005

Previous Hosts of the ISSRM

1986 Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA

1988 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Urbana, Illinois, USA

1990 Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas, USA

1992 University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA

1994 Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado, USA

1996 The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, USA

1997 The University of Belize

1998 University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, Missouri, USA

1999 University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

2000 Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington, USA

2002 La Maddalena National Park, Sardinia, Italy

2002 University of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana, USA

2004 Colorado State University, Keystone Resort, Colorado, USA

2005 Mid Sweden University, Östersund, Sweden

Future Host

2006 Simon Fraser University, hosted at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

Organizing Committee

Co Chair: Thomas Heberlein	University of Wisconsin – Madison, USA Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
Co Chair: Peter Fredman	European Tourism Research Institute, Mid Sweden University, Sweden
Christina Frimodig	European Tourism Research Institute, Mid Sweden University, Sweden
Rosemarie Ankre	European Tourism Research Institute, Mid Sweden University, Sweden
Mats and Karin Ericson	Taiga Nature and Photo

Scientific Committee

Richard Ahlström	Mid Sweden University, Sweden
Tom Beckley	University of New Brunswick, USA
Joan Bentrupperbaumer	James Cook University, Australia
Marie-Louise von Bergmann-Winberg	Mid-Sweden University, Sweden
Richard Bishop	University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA
Annie Booth	University of Northern British Columbia, USA
Rabel Burdge	Western Washington University and IASNR, USA
Ana Dahlin Escola	Superior Agraria de castelo Branco, Portugal
Öje Danell	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
Riley Dunlap	Åbo Akademi University, Finland
Katarina Eckerberg	Umeå University, Sweden
Lars Emmelin	Blekinge Tekniska Högskola, Sweden
Göran Ericsson	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Umeå, Sweden
James Gramann	US National Park Service, USA
Leif Gustavsson	Mid Sweden University, Sweden
Wolfgang Haider	Simon Fraser University, Canada
Michael Hall	Otago University, New Zealand
Dawn Hill	University of Arizona, USA
Jafar Jafari	University of Wisconsin-Stout, USA
Bjorn Karltenborn	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Norway
Rick Krannich	IASNR & Utah State University, USA
Bengt Kriström	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Umeå, Sweden
Kreg Lindberg	Oregon State University, Cascades, USA
Mike Manfredo	Colorado State University, USA
Robert Manning	University of Vermont , USA
Leif Mattsson	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
Lisa Naughton	University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA
Robert Pettersson	European Tourism Research Institute, Sweden
Martin Price	Centre for Mountain Studies, Perth College, Australia
Ulrike Proebstl	University of Applied Life Sciences, Italy
Jarkko Saarinen	University of Oulu, Finland
Klas Sandell	Karlstad University, Sweden
Ketil Skogen	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Norway
Anders Szczepanski	Linköping University, Sweden
Stephen Wanhill	Bournemouth University, UK
Dan Williams	US Forest Service, USA

ORAL PRESENTATIONS 1

SESSION A 2

A1: Amenity Migration and Seasonal Homes 1 2

A2: Mountain Tourism 4

A3: Sustainable Tourism 1 6

A4: Ecoparks: Ecological Flagships for Increased Forest Value 8

A5: Crowding and Carrying Capacity 9

A6: Regional Resource Management in Australia 11

A7: Indigenous People and Natural Resources 1 13

A8: Conflict Management 1 15

A9: How Hunters Hunt: New Research Methods 17

SESSION B 19

B1: Amenity Migration and Seasonal Homes 2 19

B2: National Parks and Tourism 22

B3: Tourism and Regional Impacts 1 24

B4: Sustainable Forest Management 26

B5: Outdoor Recreation and ROS Planning 28

B6: Environmental Attitudes and Values 31

B7: Local Participation in Policy and Planning 34

B8: Bridging Borders: Methods for Effective Regional Development 37

B9: Human Dimensions of Wildlife 39

SESSION C 41

C1: More than Meets the Eye 1: Understanding Land Use Controversies 41

C2: Tourism and Environmental Change: Issues and Actions 43

C3: Sustainable Tourism 2 45

C4: Private Forest Management 47

C5: Landscape Visualization and Scenic Beauty 49

C6: Standards and Quality in European Protected Areas: Assessment of Needs 51

C7: New Directions in Resource Management 52

C8: Urban Nature Experiences 54

C9: Community Based Resource Management in Africa 56

SESSION D 57

D1: Amenity Migration and Seasonal Homes 3 57

D2: Indigenous People and Natural Resources 2 59

D3: Nature Based Tourism 1 61

D4: Notions of Sustainability: Range of Views across Canada and Europe 64

D5: Trends in Outdoor Recreation 65

D6: Parks and Protected Areas 1 67

D7: Wilderness Management 70

D8: Collaboration in Resource Management 72

D9: Values and Wildlife Management 75

SESSION E 77
E1: Amenity Migration and Seasonal Homes 4 77
E2: Recreational Fishing and Tourism 79
E3: Nature Based Tourism 2 82
E4: Fire Management 84
E5: Managing Sustainability in the Swedish Mountains 86
E6: Resource Economics and Valuation 1 89
E7: Sense of Place 91
E8: More than Meets the Eye 2: Understanding Land Use Controversies 93
E9: Hunters' Behavior 95
SESSION F 97
F1: Amenity Migration and Seasonal Homes 5 97
F2: Tourism and Regional Impacts 2 99
F3: Wildlife Tourism 101
F4: Multiple Use Forestry 103
F5: Outdoor Recreation Impacts 105
F6: Malaysian Borneo: Communities and Natural Resources 107
F7: Local Participation as Magic or Mistake? 110
F8: Stakeholders and Resource Planning 113
F9: Sustainable Resource Use 115
SESSION G 117
G1: Knowledge in the Context of Landscape 117
G2: Tourism, Economic Transition, and Rural Development 120
G3: Outdoor Recreational Experiences 123
G4: Race and Natural Resources in the United States 125
G5: Parks and Protected Areas 2 127
G6: Resource Economics and Valuation 2 129
G7: Policy, Planning and Conservation 131
G8: Agriculture and Natural Resources 133
G9: Scandinavian Wolf Management 136
SESSION H 138
H2: Wilderness Perceptions and Capacity Determinations 138
H3: Tourism Planning and Policy 140
H4: Community Based Forestry 142
H5: Trail Management and Recreation Quality 143
H6: Scandinavian Resource Management 145
H7: Urban Green Space 148
H8: Conflict Management 2 150
H9: More than Meets the Eye 3: Understanding Land Use Controversies 152

POSTER PRESENTATIONS 154
WILDLIFE AND FISHERY 155
OUTDOOR RECREATION 159
REINDEER 164
FORESTRY 166
TOURISM PLANNING AND IMPACTS 169
ISSUES IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT 171
PARKS AND PROTECTED AREAS 179
RESOURCE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT 184
INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT 188
NATURE BASED TOURISM AND ECO TOURISM 190
AGRICULTURE AND GENDER 192
Index 195