

NIFRMA Task H - A recommendation of any reforms and increased funding levels necessary to bring Indian forest land management programs to a state-of-the-art condition.

Recommendations

- H1. The trust oversight recommendations of both previous IFMATs should be further developed and implemented before the next IFMAT review.** When third party oversight is augmented by signed agreements between tribes and the DOI, based upon agreed obligations for both created through the planning process, the role of BIA can evolve out of the umpire/pitcher impasse toward that of technical service provider and facilitator of communication between Indian tribes and the federal government.
- H2. Increase Indian forestry funding by a minimum of \$112.7 million per year.** Increase annual base level funding by \$100 million (40 percent) to \$254 million—the amount we estimate necessary for a level of forest stewardship and timber production that would be consistent with Indian goals. Appropriate \$12.7 million to support education and professional training. A system of base and incremental funding should be implemented.
- H3. Increase staffing by 792 professional and technical forestry positions. An education coordinator will also be needed to oversee education and professional training as envisioned by NIFRMA.** Staffing replacement procedures need to be reviewed so that funded positions can be filled promptly according to a recruiting and retention strategic plan. Adequate compensation and relocation programs must be available.
- H4. The anchor forest concept should be supported and expanded.** Innovative tribal forest resource management techniques should be considered for appropriate portions of the federal forest estate. Benefit cost analysis of the unique leverages generated by Indian forestry is needed. We hypothesize that collaborative agreements such as anchor forests, TFPA, and stewardship contracting will result in valuable market and ecosystem benefits that more than compensate for investment.
- H5. The full implications of organizational and personnel changes within the BIA and the federal establishment should be examined** for their potential and immediate effects on trust responsibility and the sustainability of Indian forests.
- H6. Self-governance tribes should be able to develop tribal NEPA procedures** and associated code to replace BIA NEPA manuals and handbooks. This approach furthers self-determination and self-governance and would reward tribes for progress in integrated planning.

H7. A specific list of unfunded mandates should be drawn up and recommendations for their alleviation made and implemented.

H8. Control of trespass within tribal boundaries should be reviewed and strengthened.

H.9 Tribes should consider a desired-future-conditions based approach to forest planning. We note that a DFC is not a static state, but takes into account and makes provision for the dynamics of natural agents of change (fire, insects, disease, storms, and climate change).

H10. A regularly recurring state-of-the-resource report, including a protocol for continuing data acquisition with specific reference to the NIFRMA-mandated questions should be implemented jointly between BIA and tribal organizations such as the ITC. An IFMAT-type study of the Native peoples of Alaska and their forests is long overdue. Technical support for economic analysis, climate change adaptation, timber and non-timber forest products marketing, habitat and ecosystem enhancement, and forest planning and inventory are severely lacking undermining self-determination and integrated forest management.

