

## **Missouri Forest Resources Advisory Council**

### **Meeting Agenda, Wednesday, August 26, 2009**

LaCharrette & Nightingale Creek Rooms

Lewis & Clark State Office Building

10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Attendees: David Murphy, Lisa Allen, Brian Brookshire, Doug Enyart, Doug Wallace, Hank Stelzer, John Burk, Harlan Palm, Martha Clark, Gus Raeker, Paul Strong, Michael Brown, Peter Becker, Roy Hengerson, Steven Thurman, Richard Strickland, Fred Crouse, Shelby Jones, Scott Brundage, John Dwyer, Mike Huffman, John Fleming, John Tuttle, Mike Hoffmann, Steve Westin, Stuart Miller, Scott Totten, Wayne Lovelace, Steve Mahfood, Hank Dorst, Ed Keyser, Cheryl Wilbers

#### **1) Call to order**

#### **2) Welcome and Introductions**

David Murphy from the Conservation Federation of Missouri opened the meeting and welcomed attendees.

#### **3) Consideration and approval of minutes of 6/15/09 Meeting**

Minutes from the June 15, 2009 MoFRAC Meeting were approved.

#### **1) Common Forest Management Plan Format - Doug Wallace**

Doug attended a meeting on August 14 to go over the final draft. The plan and format were finalized. They are now at the point of getting the form into an electronic fillable and pdf forms. They will also develop a short instruction sheet for the form. When the form is finalized you will be able to move around the document. One addition that should be useful to landowners is a section in the glossary area with thirteen helpful internet sites that will be active. They will be able to pull up the electronic form and get additional information from the web sites. This format will meet federal and state requirements. They wanted one format that all state, federal, and consulting foresters could use to obtain critical information with minimal criteria for the landowner. This form can be used for tree farm, stewardship program and NRCS Forest Management 106 Activity Plans .

#### **2) BCAP (Biomass Crop Assistance Program) - Doug Wallace**

This is a new Farm Service Agency (FSA) program that will become operational this fall. Doug passed out a news release to give details and information from the FSA manual and a summary of criteria. There are basically two aspects to the program. Provide matching payments for selling biomass and pay for the establishment for setting up biomass crops. This will be a rental payment similar to CRP. Once an agreement is signed between FSA and a facility and funding through the program is provided, the facilities can begin accepting materials. The matching collection, harvest, storage and transportation (CHST) payments are paid at a rate of dollar for dollar payment up to \$45. Any entity that sells biomass materials will be able to get a biomass rebate/incentive payment for two years. If a qualified biomass conversion facility pays a producer \$30 per dry ton for biomass, the material owner or producer would be eligible for a matching payment of \$30 per dry ton from FSA. This payment will help offset the costs of CHST. The owner will need to go to

their local FSA Office to be approved for sale before the sale is completed. When they bring in their tickets the reimbursement process will start. There will be a certification process for the facility. Doug gave the individual running the program in Missouri Hank Stelzer's name. Hank will make contact.

Brian Brookshire would like to see a tracking system created of trained loggers. If a landowner is cutting smaller material and bringing to the biomass conversion facility he would need to be trained or certified. Doug Wallace stated that on the Implementing the Biomass Crop Assistance Program's Collection, Harvest, Storage, and Transportation Matching Payment Program on page 4 the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet from bottom it states that "If removed from nonindustrial private forestland, the eligible material collection and harvesting activities must be done according to a new or amended Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP), or other practice plan approved by the State Forester. FSP's need to be created or amended at no expense to the CCC."

Peter Becker said that the Forest for Fuels last newsletter had a simplified discussion regarding the facility from a producer. Hank Stelzer stated that there are two different types of eligibility. Only the producer bringing the biomass will get payment after he has been approved by FSA. The University would not get paid. The length of the program is two years. The payment will be made to the biomass seller but not the facility unless the product is sold to a qualified facility. John Tuttle stated that FSA is starting to hear from producers regarding BCAP. Peter said that the biomass producer and the company that purchases materials cannot be the same. For detailed information contact the FSA Office in Columbia.

Scott Brundage wanted an update on where we are in getting some biofuel plants for energy. He requested that at the next MoFRAC meeting someone be available to discuss torrefied wood, the activity that is going on, what is being paid for the wood, what the demand is and logging costs. John Tuttle estimated that harvesting woody biomass cost somewhere between \$12-17 a ton with another \$5 per ton cost for trucking up to a 50 mile radius. The landowner may want to be paid for stumpage which would add another \$1 or \$2 per ton. Most landowners and loggers are looking for an incentive. Wisconsin is doing biomass burning for boiler wood but currently they are not paying much a ton.

Scott said that MU is going green. The power plant is burning wood chips. Hank said the project has been approved to convert one of six boilers to a biomass boiler in January. The boiler will come on line in March of 2012. The Board of Curators has approved a \$65 million bond. MU will work with Brian to get loggers and manufacture facilities. This could be a 2 inch cube or chip but a fuzzy chip cannot be used.

Brian suggested that we ask Francisco Aguilar to attend the next meeting and give a presentation. They have completed a project on MDC land at Poplar Bluff on silviculture strategies. They found there are a lot of variables when harvesting biomass. It is complicated to come up with a general strategy.

Brian spoke with Associated Electric in Springfield last week. We now know more of what their requirements will be. The break off point is 4000 megawatts of production. Those under will be under federal criteria. Associated Electric will not be under a federal mandate. They have a

contract with wind now looking for a future with biomass. They would like to contract with a company or facility that is already producing and purchase from them. Torrified wood cost \$580 a ton and is not reasonable at this time. Associated Electric is cutting West Plains from their facility. West Plains is looking at natural gas to generate electricity. Dave Murphy said that individuals in biomass and cellulosic ethanol are competing.

Peter had heard that torrified wood would be \$70 to \$100 a ton. Brian said that is correct. There is a commercial producer in Oregon with a higher btu than coal so you can pay more for it. It is a great product with a commercial purchase price of \$70 to \$100 ton.

John Tuttle read that the City of Springfield is planning on building a facility to torrify their own wood. Brian thinks torrified wood has good future as things progress. The process may get better and the price may come down. Torrified wood can be used with coal power plants.

There is a lot of research being done at North Carolina State. There is quality there and commercial production is being done now. Steve said the City of Springfield has not released results of their test burner.

#### 4) **Forest Legacy Program - Steve Westin**

One function of this committee is a role in the Missouri Forest Legacy Program. The Forest Legacy Program is a national Forest Service Program that provides money to states to purchase conservation easements or threatened forest land. MDC got in the program due to Mike Hoffmann's efforts. Missouri is one of the last states to get in the program. States can submit up to three forestry projects every year. MO's first proposed project was in the LaBarque Creek watershed. The first LaBarque Creek tract was acquired with Forest Legacy funds as well as money from several partner groups. That tract contains over 2/3 of a mile of LaBarque Creek. Forest Legacy projects are ranked nationally after proposed. Congress can change the ranking. A second phase of the LaBarque Creek project was proposed the following year. In fed FY09 it was funded. The Legacy program requires a 25% non-federal match. That tract is no longer in the same ownership. We have the ability with concurrence of the State Stewardship Committee to shift the second round of funding to an alternative project in the same geographic area. There are currently three tracts on map you were given (a. b. c.) which are the potential focus of the money. Steve needs the concurrence of this group to potentially shift funds from the originally proposed site to alternate grounds. Money we do not use will revert to the federal government. A motion was called by Richard Strickland and seconded by Martha Clark. One of the yellow tracts on the map would become an addition to Labarque Creek CA. Traditional forest management is encouraged on the tracts. **Do not show maps to others.** Dave Murphy appreciates the confidence they have shown in this group. Scott wanted to know what is so special about this ground that tract #1 it is worth \$10,000 per acre. Tract #2 is \$9,000 an acre. Steve said this is dealt with in detail in the project brief. This is land in St. Louis, largely intact in a functioning watershed. The creek is biologically diverse and one of the best in the St. Louis area. Forest Legacy tracts are ranked based on three category. Category #1 is the importance of the project. In this case water quality and preservation of biodiversity are important factors. Category #2 is the strategic importance, how it relates to and enhances ongoing efforts in the vicinity. Category #3 is how threatened the tract is by development. The LaBarque Creek watershed is located right next to St. Louis and is easy commuting distance to downtown. It is the topography that has saved it

from typical subdivision development. It has high biological diversity and a sandstone bedrock rather than limestone. Dave said this tract is identified in the state Wildlife Action Plan as a Conservation Opportunity Area and is a unique area in our state. It happens to be in St. Louis which is unique also. Steve said the Nature Conservancy is also interested. Lisa said this is pricy property but strategic. Since the Department is looking at an outright purchase the appraised value will be paid. Ed Keyser was concerned with buying land in conjunction with the federal government. He agrees with the plan but is concerned with future management restrictions. Brian felt the committee was not in a position to take action today. Dave said this land deal needed immediate action. Lisa said this is the first step. After Stewardship Committee support it will need to be considered by the Realty Committee of the Department next week. We don't want to lose federal dollars. Several tracts are involved. The only likelihood of making this a success is to act quickly. \$2 million will come from MDC. We will need \$500,000 as the non-federal match and we are working with partners on this issue. If approved, a recommendation will be given to the Director. We are looking at late this year before it would go to the Conservation Commission for approval.

Steve said there are a lot of organizations intertwined in the effort to protect the Labarque Creek watershed. It has been identified as a high priority area and very important to the state. Dave mentioned the Wildlife Strategy and landscape. Lisa said the overriding objective would be to conserve all wildlife/habitats. The subcommittee drew attention to fact that it is strategically located between the two other parcels. Mike Hoffmann said the State Stewardship Committee had approved the original tract. Today we are asking if you are okay with shifting funds to other amenities which have the same threat of potential development. Are you okay with moving the funds?

Motion for – 20

Opposed – 0

Abstaining – 4.

Dave and committee would really appreciate if they did have more time to look at and discuss projects in the future if possible. There should be some sort of conceptional framing. He requested that all maps be given back.

Richard Stricklin said the Stewardship Committee was established for management plans. He would like to have someone discuss other responsibilities at a future meeting. The role of the State Forest Stewardship Forester Committee is to advise the State Forester regarding implementation of the Forest Stewardship program. The group is required to meet once a year minimum. No specified duties beyond that. The Forestry Legacy program uses the group as a sounding board.

## **5) 1000 Cankers Conference in St. Louis, Funding Assistance Request**

Harlan has been working with landowners with walnut in Missouri. He has pulled together emails regarding 1000 cankers disease and the walnut twig beetle. Both attack walnut trees. The disease for the walnut twig beetle has not been named yet. 1000 cankers disease is native to US and New Mexico and has been inconsequently there in the last 10-15 years. There is some evidence of it

expanding the range into Oregon/Washington. They expect it to be killing trees in Oregon in three years time. It has already expanded its range to east Idaho, Utah and the eastern slope of Colorado. The Colorado state entomologist have documented in the Rocky Fort River Valley in Arkansas. First evidence was in 2001. Two investigators have done a great job of informing the Colorado public. This is a fungal organism. A Colorado State research associate counted the number of beetles in a 2 ft.log and found approximately 2000. Insect vector, disease, host – to solve anything you must remove the host. One real risk is log moving, salvage, and shipping. It could already be in Missouri. This information is compliments of Mark Shawl who started with MO Dept. of Ag. Doug Ladue complimented him for pulling together a conference November 3 and 4 in St. Louis for Hammons, Lage, Loveless and landowners. They asked Larry Godsey of the University of Missouri to pull together a cost analysis. The disease kills/flags top of tree. He also asked Larry to put together a basis of what it is worth in lumber, nuts, log moving, and quarantine. Dave supports efforts with this conference. They are in need of money. He asks that each partner organization and agency look for any funds to offer support. You can report to Dave on funds. Support efforts to get some science. This could be the poster child for forest products in state. Missouri could stand to lose billions.

Doug questioned if we know if either disease or the vector have alternate hosts. Harlan said it has been limited to juglans liner major and juglans minor – starts with twigs but does not effect English walnut. Harlan asked if anyone had heard about it more then southeast Colorado. Send Harlan an email if you know anything more. It has overwintered in Colorado so Missouri winters will not stop the spread.

Mike Brown said APHIS has it on their radar screen for his agency and the Forest Service. The biggest issues are that it is unknown and there is no early detection tool. It is a member of the bark beetle family but has not been identified yet. The known native range is Arizona or Mexico. There is a lot of work being done trying to understand its pathway. Regulatory responses will probably be up to individual states. Dept. of Agriculture looks more to exotic or foreign. All states have regulator authority to put rules in place. The workshop is excellent but it is too early in to know specifics. Harlan stated that monitoring does not really offer much value. The emphasis needs to be on sanitation. We have to get rid of the hosts but how? We can't burn green trees. Can't use diesel or smoke. Mike Brown said we need to understand where it is and where it isn't. Very limited number of individuals are looking for and understanding it. Mike Hoffmann wondered without monitoring or putting up barrier, how do we not know it hasn't already passed through.

Mike Brown attended the National Walnut Council Meeting in Michigan. It is still possible for mills to import logs. They don't have to be debarked/heated. Why wouldn't Missouri and Indiana, with veneer mills, put a moratorium on inputting any walnut veneer logs from states where they could have been contaminated? When he left MO Dept. of Ag, Colin Wamlsey was exploring possibilities and implications of a state quarantine. Lots of factors need to be considered. Where is there the possibility it would be in the state. Where is the insect? Dave said the meeting will happen but needs financial help. It is in our own best interest to assist. He will check with members in the next three to four days before he talks to Doug Ladue. Everyone has a stake in this while it is still possible to do something.

**8) Status report on response to May storm damage to forest – Mike Hoffmann**

Mike Hoffmann reported that the initial evaluation on state land after the storm identified areas. Forestry received Commission permission to do a salvage harvest. Harvests have been in process for about two months in the Ozark Region and one month in the Southeast Region.

Approximately 39 sales are in process. There are 22 active sales others have been bid but sales have not yet started. They are harvesting 100,000 board feet a day with active sales. We have harvested three million board feet so far with a value of \$300,000. Bids ranged from \$25/MBF to \$200/MBF. The logging community has done a great job. The biggest concern is the market holding up. One tie buyer has put a quota on loggers on how much they will take. Some will not take pine. Sales are on Angeline and Sunklands in Ozark Region and Current River in Southeast Region. Logan Creek and Amidon are two separate sales. Southeast Region will start on Ketcherside Area on August 26. These sales have been sold on board feet volume and paid on what is hauled to the mill. Several of the central office staff are going to meet with staff on Southeast and Ozark Regions to do an internal audit. We have suspended other ongoing sales for the present time to get industry focused on what is out there. Before the storm, based on what we were getting on state land, we were averaging around \$150/MBF. After the storm, based on the mill tally, we are averaging around \$74/MBF.

Richard Strickland stated that small landowners are not in a position to compete with the Forest Service and MDC who are getting the best loggers and best prices. The small landowner ends up taking what is left over. The small landowner is probably not interested in stacking stuff in his woods and selling later and the small logger doesn't have the capability either. He requested that Lisa capture data on how the small landowner is affected by this and take this into consideration in the future. He felt the state is in a better position to stockpile and sell later than private landowner. He would like MDC to collect data on both ends and come up with a plan that assists state landowners. Mike Hoffmann said the concern about using up loggers is a good point. The price did go down but has come back. Some loggers that had quit or retired are coming back in business. Mike doesn't know what is happening on private land. John Tuttle said that industry does not want to see the wood laying on the ground. Industry at this point and time are working on borrowed money. Richard stated that the landowner is concerned they will flood the market. The private landowner is hurting but doesn't want to see the timber go to waste. Dave Murphy said that Shirley Shields sent letters to FEMA to get damage assistance. He feels this can and should be done. Ed Keyser said there are mitigating circumstances. The state and federal agencies are selling but not for the money but to sustain industry. When the markets pick up the private landowner will jump in and sell the resource but there is an exception with a catastrophe.

Brian Brookshire said that prices are all over the board. Markets need to take care of themselves. Let the timber be sold. Markets get messed up with too much government intervention.

John Tuttle is having trouble getting information for the Timber Price Trends report. If consultants hadn't sent in several price reports he would not have received any information for the last report. This was not a good enough sampling to give completely accurate information. Peter Becker would like to see the report distinguish between salvaged and non-salvaged. There is a difference in timber and salvage values. We need something published with fair market value.

Doug Wallace, after the storm on May 8, they tried to help private landowners but it was at the end of the year for their programs. They swept accounts and pooled money and came up with around \$900,000. There was a two week sign up period for two practices in an 11 county area where the major damage occurred. They received 271 applications. They had over 100 contracts approved for over one-half million dollars. The focus for that activity is finished. This fall there will be a new sign up for the EQIP Program. It is intended to have these particular areas be part of their funding. They will have a whole suite of practices available. Timing is bad and the funding is low. Dave will invite Francisco Aguilar to the next meeting. Email Dave, Sam or Scott if you have someone who could come and make a presentation.

Lisa Allen said that the biggest impact of the May 8 storm was on forest land that is privately owned. MDC is looking for ways to funnel assistance and funding support on storm damage. NRCS has been a big help but we need an emergency forest restoration program. She looked at the Farm Bill in the Forestry Title Program for emergency forest restoration and soon found out it is administered by FSA. Steve contacted State and Private Forestry but found out there is no money available. They do not see any opportunity of funding for any state with state government funding in upcoming sessions. She will be making a trip to Washington DC, in December if this is something this group can get behind there may be some key elected officials that could help us out – Jo Ann Emerson, Sam Gray, etc. Sam or Dave may already be working on this. Is this something we want to work on as a group on? She would like your feedback.

Richard Strickland thinks the group should advise the legislature by letters sent from some of the group. They should address the issue. The letter should request they pay 100% on planning and timber stand improvement, replanting on hardwood forests since the landowner will get no economic return. He would like to see this added to any recommendation the group submits.

Brian said Jo Ann Emerson's response will be there is no money. He doesn't know if programs exist but if we want to look at this particular program as a mechanism we can draft a letter under Dave's signature and let them suggest how we get funds. He talked to JoAnn Emerson and Christopher Bond. He thought they may both be interested. If we can identify particular language in the Farm Bill and identify strategy, they can tell us how to get the money. We need to draft a letter about programs available. It was the consensus that MoFRAC draft a letter to the congressional appropriation leaders.

Peter discussed the emergency money used for Katrina. Is there a way of shifting priorities of an existing fund. The great majority of landowners will not get a salvage harvest conducted. The forest will regenerate but not like before. There may be federal stimulus money available for biomass. Lisa asked Peter if he would suggest it would be worthwhile to have a subcommittee of this group. Peter agreed if there is enough agency agreement, landowner, etc. and timber will not be salvaged and the assessment is correct that the forest will regenerate itself.

Hank Stelzer said there are rural development grants for torrifed wood. Peter said there may be some USDA grants but the time line would be long. Lisa said USFS just announced money for stimulus grants available from federal aid and grant coordinators. The money could be available right now. Depending on the project Lisa would support.

Brian said that some of group may be aware that during the last legislative session he spent a lot of time with the Budget Committee suggesting projects. One of the projects both MFPA and industry is in favor of was small electrical generation equipment on a community by community basis that controls their own grid network. They could use the local wood industry as feedstock for their system. He worked with consulting firms to see how this could be constructed and met with Mark Heckler. They looked for a pool of money that might be out there but found none. He has all the information together. There is \$56 million dollars for energy conservation projects. There is no reasonable biomass market. They are trying to get together some reasonable strategies and working with communities to try to get support. Stimulus money is currently not available. Whenever he talks to states and elected officials he finds out the stimulus money will go into energy conservation projects. Peter said that from the stand point of future fire damage and forest management – remote sensing funding would be good – secondarily used for biomass and landowner assistance. Roll out as target basis.

Paul Strong said he discussed with USFS Larry Handly and he has an interest in trying to demonstrate, through a national map effort, the utility of technologies. They could agree with experiments with techniques.

Gus Raker saw an email on wildlife grant stimulus funds. One-half will be used on national forest grounds the other for state and private forest lands. He thought the deadline was late September. This may be something to check into.

Paul discussed Title 4 which has to do with ecological restoration tied to biofuel but is currently unfunded. Agencies are trying to develop proposals. They held a meeting a couple of weeks ago and decided to move forward with proposals in case funding becomes available. Some work will need to be done on national forests. Missouri was identified nationally as meeting criteria. The CROP program that started in 2008 has really helped MO.

Dave said that Missouri is the heartland of America. Energy solutions and job markets can be developed here. We can't afford not to capture information. We can use the information to make a case for reimbursement or grants. Dave will try to get someone from FSA to come to the next meeting to discuss biofuels funding.

Harlan Palm distributed a two page announcement regarding the fall Walnut Council Tour on September 26. Registrations are due by September 22. See attached.

## **9) Other items for discussion from the floor**

Lisa said the group should have received an email from John Fleming last week regarding an opportunity for groups and organizations to apply for some of the State and Private Forestry money available to partners. This is the third year for Forest Service competitive grants. State forestry agencies receive funding from Forest Service for Urban Forestry, Community Forestry, and Stewardship. Fifteen percent has to be competitively earned. Previously this has not been pushed out to partners. This year we thought partners could participate. There are three specific themes: Keeping Forests as Forests, Forest Health and Urban Forestry. Scoring is tied closely to the outline. Themes can be broad. Your pre-proposals need to be to MDC by September 15. MDC will have to the Forest Service by October 15.



The number one ranked project was written by Gus Raeker requesting a pool of funding to work with landowners who would like to put conservation easements on their property. It has been approved. Call B4 U Cut and EAB outreach and education efforts were approved. John Tuttle requested a cost share program to provide cost share incentives on BMP's which missed the cut off by one place. He rewrote grant and got a CIG grant proposals. Opportunities for private landowner incentives, urban, and forest health issues have done well. Grants can be done one of two ways – match required or you can do a partner match with MDC. There are also grants from the USFS stimulus money coming to Missouri. John Tuttle has been approved for a \$6 million Fuels for Schools project. The paperwork is final and John is ready to release the project. John Tuttle can answer any questions you may have. He is looking for six schools across the state. He will spend up to \$970,000 per school. The first goal of this grant is to provide energy savings to schools. Second goal is to provide a market for small diameter wood, and the third goal is to provide jobs. In Wisconsin a school which cost \$130,000 to heat before the project is now spending \$41,000. There may be public buildings that could benefit from a similar project. One reason we scored well on the project was our partnership with Mark Twain National Forest. Paul Strong and Dave Whittekiend are willing to partner with MDC. Paul said there is a companion project for several millions to subsidize wood, fire danger, etc. But it did not get funded. This may still be possible to do depending on where boilers are located. They will also compete against other national forests to have wood boilers for electricity. They should hear back this fall.

Lisa gave an update on Call B4U Cut. Since May we had 688 contacts resulting in sending packets to landowners for over 7,000 acres. This was advertized in the Conservationist. Steve said the next step would be to advertize in the Rural Missourian to reinforce our message. We want to continue with a consistent low level publicity effort.

Paul Strong gave an update of the May 8 storm damage recovery on the Mark Twain National Forest. They have a lot of infrastructure. Their roads are usually part of a county road system, private landowners all received substantial damage. They are still not quite finished with the storm cleanup. Also motorized trails, and concessionaries were the second priority. The third priority was access to damage to forested lands. Fourth priority is to decide if area of storm damaged timber is worth tax payer dollars to go through the planning process for a salvage sale. USGS was involved in the initial storm damage analysis. After assessment the FS did timber sale contracts on 30-50 acres at a time. They are continuing to do an ongoing analysis. One storm damaged area in northern Reynolds County will need to be reanalyzed. The Sink In experimental forest was damaged. Many long term experiments will have to be reassessed.

The role of the State Forest Stewardship Forester Committee is to advise the State Forester. The group is required to meet once a year minimum. No specified duties beyond that. The Forestry legislative program uses the group as a sounding board.

Shelby Jones reported that the Consulting Forester Association put together a workshop for professional consulting foresters on the casualty loss process. They have 50 slots. It will be held on October 21 in Jefferson City at the Conservation Employee Credit Union. Shelby will send an electronic announcement to Cheryl or Dave Murphy to attach to the draft of minutes in a week or so. John T will forward to me.

A biofuels development project is looking at Perryville for a building site. This would be a 25 megawatt plant. Smaller municipal projects seem to be the better fit. It is should be important for citizens to know that biomass products come from lands that are well managed.

Lisa suggested attendees look at development of biomass harvesting guidelines. They are voluntary and probably will remain voluntary. John Tuttle said you can't call it green energy unless you do BMP's in the woods. BMP guidelines usage is needed.

Scott Brundage said that sustainability needs to be done right. Brian suggested it come from wood lots that have a management plan. It is important to have a list of goals or list of things to be done next year or in five years. A harvest plan will be part of the management plan. Dave said this would be the first step coming for Doug and the committee.

Lisa said the group was formed because a lot of bioenergy facilities are coming into the state. The original vision of the group was that this type of coordination would happen. There will be confidentiality between the consulting forester and the landowner. When this group was formed it was hoped that it would serve as a collective body of advocacy. We need to think of what our priorities are for next year. We may need to be more aggressive than in the past. John Tuttle said we need a statement of what this group wants to do concerning green energy/woody biomass BMP usage and move it forward.

Scott said that last year when Gene Garrett was looking for support for the Learning Center at New Franklin they had breakfasts/luncheons, etc. looking for support. Are there various groups that we want to support. We need to have MoFRAC look at different groups. Gene Garrett will discuss at the December meeting. Scott is also working on stationary to send to Joann Orother so congressional staff will know MoFRAC. Lisa said MDC will pay for the letterhead listing all names. Hank said that MoFRAC is on record with a letter to the governor making it known that state aid to biomass should come with BMP's. Doug noted that the letter should go to legislation also. Maybe this fall would be a good time to send the letter.

Someone should come to meeting with a map of the state and spend 10 minutes every time –look for overlaps and graphic information - John Tuttle can assist with this. John can work with Mike Morris

Conservation stewardship program - first time private forest landowners are eligible to participate. Doug said that normal cost share rates cannot exceed 75% but can go higher if landowner is a beginning farmer or socially disadvantaged groups. If the landowner is in one of these groups assistance can be adjusted to 90%.

#### **10) Next meeting time, date, location**

Dec. 9 at MO Farm Bureau headquarters 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.  
Lunch will be provided at \$10 per person, payable on site.

#### **11) Adjournment\***

**12) HANDOUTS DISTRIBUTED AT MEETING**

- a. Handout #1 – BIOMASS Magazine – USDA to Begin Accepting BCAP Applications**
- b. Handout #2 – US Dept. of Agriculture – Implementing the Biomass Crop Assistance Program’s (BCA)’s Collection, Harvest, Storage, and Transportation (CHST) Matching Payment Plan**
- c. Handout #3 – FSA – BCAP – CHST Eligible Materials**
- d. Handout #4 – Walnut Council Tour Announcement**
- e. Handout #5 – MCFC Workshop Announcement**

# BIOMASS MAGAZINE

The World of B



From the July 2009 Issue

## USDA to begin accepting BCAP applications

Posted July 29, 2009, at 12:50 p.m. CST

USDA Farm Service Agency Administrator Jonathan Coppess today announced that biomass conversion facilities can begin signing up to participate in the Biomass Crop Assistance Program, which will help increase production of renewable energy. The program, authorized in the 2008 Farm Bill, provides financial assistance to producers who deliver eligible material to biomass conversion facilities and FSA will provide financial assistance to collect, harvest, store and transport eligible materials.

"This program will benefit producers, the developing biomass industry, the general public and the environment as we continue working to expand production and availability of renewable energy," Coppess said. "Owners of eligible material can receive financial assistance for delivering qualified biomass to conversion facilities that use biomass for heat, power, biobased products or advanced biofuels."

Biomass conversion facilities and material owners or producers should contact their FSA state offices or visit [www.fsa.usda.gov](http://www.fsa.usda.gov) for more information. FSA will begin accepting applications from biomass facilities interested in participating in the BCAP.

Once an agreement is signed between FSA and a facility and funding through the program is provided, the facilities can begin accepting materials. Producers who sell these materials can apply for matching payments under the collection, harvest, storage and transportation (CHST) component of BCAP.

The matching CHST payments are paid at a rate of \$1 for \$1 per dry-ton equivalent received from a qualified biomass conversion facility, not to exceed \$45 per dry-ton equivalent. A biomass owner is eligible to receive payments for two years. The purpose of the matching payments is to assist biomass producers with the CHST cost of delivering biomass to a qualified biomass conversion facility.

For example, if a qualified biomass conversion facility pays a producer \$30 per dry ton for biomass, the material owner or producer would be eligible for a matching payment of \$30 per dry ton from FSA. This payment will help offset the costs of CHST.

Biomass conversion facilities may become "qualified" by submitting a Memorandum of Understanding to the FSA state offices. The MOU generally provides the requirements for becoming a qualified biomass conversion facility. Once a facility becomes qualified, eligible material owners or producers who deliver biomass to that facility may be eligible to receive CHST payments.

Eligible material owners or producers, who market eligible material to a qualified biomass conversion facility, may apply for the matching CHST payment at their FSA county office. An application must be submitted before the eligible material is sold and delivered to a qualified biomass conversion facility. After the product is delivered, a producer must provide FSA with documentation of product quantity, quality and payment rate. County offices will validate payment requests with information in the county office and information provided under the terms of MOUs with the qualified biomass conversion facilities. CHST payments will not be authorized until after an appropriate environmental analysis has been conducted.

SOURCE: USDA

© 2009 BBI International



## BCAP – CHST Eligible Materials List

### BCAP –CHST Eligible Materials Definitions

Renewable biomass is defined for purposes of the CHST matching payment program to include the following:

(1) Materials, pre-commercial thinnings, or invasive species from National Forest System land and public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)) that:

- (a) Are byproducts of preventive treatments that are removed to reduce hazardous fuels, to reduce or contain disease or insect infestation, or to restore ecosystem health;
- (b) Would not otherwise be used for higher-value products; and
- (c) Are harvested in accordance with applicable law and land management plans and the requirements for old-growth maintenance, restoration, and management direction of section 102 (e)(2), (3), and (4) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6512) and large-tree retention of subsection (f) or

(2) Any organic matter that is available on a renewable or recurring basis from non-Federal land or land belonging to an Indian or Indian tribe that is held in trust by the United States or subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States, including: Renewable plant material (including feed grains, other agricultural commodities, other plants and trees, algae), and waste material (including crop residue, other vegetative waste material (including wood waste and wood residues), animal waste and byproducts (including fats, oils, greases, and manure), food waste, and yard waste).

Eligible Material is, for purposes of the CHST matching payment program, renewable biomass with the following exclusions:

- (1) Harvested grains, fiber, or other commodities eligible to receive payments under Title I of the 2008 Farm Bill;
- (2) Animal waste and animal waste-byproducts including fats, oils, greases, and manure;
- (3) Food waste and yard waste; or
- (4) Algae.

Biobased CHST product means a product, determined by the Deputy Administrator to be a commercial or industrial product (other than food or feed) that is:

- (1) Composed in whole, or in significant part, of biological products, including renewable domestic agricultural materials and forestry materials or
- (2) An intermediate ingredient or feedstock.

Biobased product does not mean commercially produced timber, lumber, wood pulp or other finished wood products.

Food waste means a material composed primarily of food items, or originating from food items, or compounds from domestic, municipal, food service operations, or commercial sources, including food processing wastes, residues, or scraps.

Yard waste means material composed primarily of yard maintenance, cleanup materials, or debris removal items, originating from residential, municipal or commercial yards, lawns, landscaped areas, or related sites.



## BCAP – CHST Eligible Materials List

| National Forest System and BLM Lands  |   |
|---|---|
| Federal Woody Resources   |   |
| Eligible  | Ineligible  |
| <u>Pre- &amp; Non-Commercially Valued Forest Materials (that WOULD NOT otherwise be used for higher-value products) including / 1:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest thinnings materials</li> <li>• Forest, harvest, and post-disaster slash (branches, tops, and disaster debris)</li> <li>• Hardwood chips</li> <li>• Softwood chips</li> <li>• Cutoffs</li> <li>• Bark</li> <li>• Tree and shrub species without timber, lumber, or wood pulp value</li> </ul> | <u>Commercial Forest Materials (that WOULD otherwise be used for higher-value products) including:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timber</li> <li>• Lumber</li> <li>• Wood Pulp</li> <li>• Any other finished wood products such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Mulch</li> <li>◦ Black liquor</li> <li>◦ Paper products</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| Non-Federal Land  |   |
| (including land belonging to an Indian or Indian Tribe that is held in trust by the United States)  |   |
| Non-Federal Woody Resources   |   |
| Eligible  | Ineligible  |
| <u>Renewable Plant Material including / 1:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees and Shrubs such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Forest thinnings materials</li> <li>◦ Forest, harvest, and post-disaster slash (branches, tops, and disaster debris)</li> <li>◦ Hardwood chips</li> <li>◦ Softwood chips</li> <li>◦ Cutoffs</li> <li>◦ Bark</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |   |
| Agriculture Resources   |   |
| Eligible  | Ineligible  |
| <u>Renewable Plant Material including:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feed grains / 2</li> <li>• Other agricultural commodities / 2</li> </ul> <u>Waste Material including:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crop residues / 3</li> </ul> <p>For example: corn stover, corn cobs, rice hulls, wheat straw and bagasse are eligible after the commodity crop is harvested from the plant</p> <p>Note: See endnotes at end of Table</p>                     | <p>Any crop eligible to receive payments, including loans, under List 8-LP par. 126 or 7-CN (Title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008), or an amendment made by that title, including, but not limited to:</p> <p><u>Grains, Kernels, Oilseeds, and other commodities such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Row Crops/Small Grain Plants</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Corn</li> <li>◦ Wheat</li> <li>◦ Grain sorghum</li> <li>◦ Barley</li> <li>◦ Oats</li> <li>◦ Cotton</li> <li>◦ Rice</li> <li>◦ Soybeans</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |



## BCAP – CHST Eligible Materials List

| Agriculture Resources (Continued)   |   |
|---|---|
| Eligible  | Ineligible  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Oilseed Plants</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sunflower seed</li> <li>○ Rapeseed</li> <li>○ Canola</li> <li>○ Safflower</li> <li>○ Flaxseed</li> <li>○ Mustard seed</li> <li>○ Crambe</li> <li>○ Sesame seed</li> <li>○ Any other oilseed</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Pulse Crops</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dry peas</li> <li>○ Lentils</li> <li>○ Chickpeas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Other Products</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Peanuts</li> <li>○ Sugar</li> <li>○ Honey</li> <li>○ Wool</li> <li>○ Mohair</li> <li>○ Dairy products</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For example: Hays and silage derived from the above Title I crops are ineligible because the commodity crop is not harvested from the plant</p> |
| Herbaceous Resources  |   |
| Eligible  | Ineligible  |
| <u>Renewable Plant Material including / 1:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forbs</li> <li>• Legumes</li> <li>• Grasses</li> <li>• Vines</li> <li>• Mosses</li> </ul> |   |
| Other Renewable Plant Material  |   |
| Eligible  | Ineligible  |
|   | <u>Algae including:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Algal-residue or by-products</li> <li>• Algal-derived oils</li> <li>• Lichens composed, in part or whole, of algae</li> </ul>  |

As of 7/14/2009

3



## BCAP – CHST Eligible Materials List

| Waste Materials   |   |
|---|---|
| Eligible  | Ineligible  |
| <p><u>Other Vegetative Waste Material including / 1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roadway maintenance cuttings</li> <li>Non-edible food processing waste such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corn cobs</li> <li>Corn husks</li> </ul> </li> <li>Non-edible plant processing waste and scraps</li> <li>Non-edible fats, oils, and greases derived from plants</li> <li>Wood waste such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Orchard, vineyard, and related woody waste renewable biomass</li> </ul> </li> <li>Wood residues such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wood mill waste and scraps including:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sawdust</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>Intermediately processed biomass derived from eligible sources such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pellets</li> <li>Briquettes</li> <li>Other processed or condensed renewable biomass</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | <p><u>All Animal Waste &amp; Animal Waste Byproduct including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grease</li> <li>Oil</li> <li>Fats</li> <li>Manure</li> </ul> <p><u>All Food Waste including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Domestic/residential/municipal food waste</li> <li>Other food service operations waste</li> <li>Edible food processing waste</li> </ul> <p><u>All Yard Waste Derived from Domestic, Residential, or Municipal Sources including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Municipal solid waste</li> <li>Construction and demolition waste or salvage products</li> <li>Leaves</li> <li>Grass</li> <li>Tree branches</li> </ul> |
| <p>/ 1 Renewable biomass derived from invasive or noxious species must be handled in accordance to <b>Executive Order 13112 of February 3, 1999 “Invasive Species.”</b> Hence, applicable CHST eligible materials cannot be collected, harvested, or transported during reproductive, or other, phases that may propagate their spread or establishment.</p> <p>/ 2 See ineligible agriculture resources for exclusions related any crop eligible to receive payments under Title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 or an amendment made by that title.</p> <p>/ 3 Per the Notice of Funding Availability published in the Federal Register on June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009, NOT more than twenty percent of the funds utilized under this Notice will be for matching payments to eligible material owners for the collection, harvest, storage and transportation of crop residue from commodities eligible to receive payments under Title I of the 2008 Farm Bill.</p> <p><a href="http://www.fsa.usda.gov/Internet/FSA_Notice/bcap_2.pdf">http://www.fsa.usda.gov/Internet/FSA_Notice/bcap_2.pdf</a></p> |   |



For: State and County Offices

**Implementing the Biomass Crop Assistance Program's (BCAP's)  
Collection, Harvest, Storage, and Transportation (CHST) Matching Payment Program**  
Approved by: Acting Deputy Administrator, Farm Program



**1 Overview**

**A Background**

BCAP was authorized by Title IX of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, as amended by Title IX of the Food, Conservation, and Energy of 2008 (2008 Act). BCAP:

- assists agricultural and forest land owners and operators with CHST of eligible material for use in CHST-qualified Biomass Conversion Facilities (BCF's)
- supports establishing and producing eligible crops for the conversion to bioenergy through project areas and through contracts on land of up to 5 years for annual/perennial crops or up to 15 years for woody biomass crops.

On May 5, 2009, the President directed USDA to aggressively accelerate investing in and producing biofuels which included a directive that the Secretary take steps to the extent permitted by law to expedite and increase producing and investing in biofuel development efforts. The biofuel development efforts include issuing guidance and support for CHST assistance for eligible materials for use in BCF's.

The Notice of Funds Availability (NOFA) for BCAP's CHST payments was published in Federal Register (FR) on June 11, 2009, and is available on FSA's BCAP web site at <http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/webapp?area=home&subject=ener&topic=bcap>.

**B Purpose**

This notice provides policies and procedures to implement BCAP's CHST Matching Payment Program.

| Disposal Date | Distribution  |
|---------------|---|
| June 1, 2010  | State Offices; State Offices relay to County Offices, State Forestry Agencies, State NRCS Offices, and State RD Renewable Energy Coordinators |

7-12-09

Page 1

## Notice BCAP-2

### 2 BCAP and CHST Matching Payment Program Overview

#### A BCAP Summary

BCAP is:

- administered by FSA on behalf of CCC
- comprised of the following 2 components:
  - BCAP's CHST Matching Payment Program
  - BCAP's Project Areas Program. (LANDUSE CHANGES & CONVERSION) DEC/SEP 10

Note: Future Federal Register publications and FSA directives will be published to support the BCAP's Project Areas Program.

#### B CHST Matching Payment Program Overview

The CHST Matching Payment Program will provide eligible material owners matching payments for the sale and delivery of eligible material to a CHST-qualified BCF. These payments will be available to eligible material owners at the rate of \$1 for each \$1 per dry ton paid by the CHST-qualified BCF to the eligible material owners, limited to a maximum of \$45 per dry ton and limited to a 2-year payment duration.

Note: One ton equals 2,000 lbs. The dry ton equivalent is the weight of the actual biomass with zero percent moisture. For example, 45.3 actual tons of biomass with an 11.6 percent total moisture content has a dry ton equivalent of 40.0 tons ((45.3 actual tons x (1 - .116)) = 40.045 dry tons.

Under the CHST Matching Payment Program, payments are available for eligible material owners with renewable biomass obtained from a variety of sources, including crop residues. However, not more than 20 percent of the total program payments to eligible material owners will be available for crop residues from those commodities that are also eligible to receive payments under Title I of the 2008 Act.

Notes: See 8-LP, paragraph 126 and 7-CN for Title I commodities that are ineligible for the CHST Matching Payment Program.

There are no other limits.

Under the CHST Matching Payment Program, no payments or other direct monetary benefits are available for BCF's except as provided by subparagraph 3 B.

## Notice BCAP-2

### 2 BCAP and CHST Matching Payment Program Overview (Continued)

#### C FSA's BCAP Web Site

The following general CHST Matching Payment Program information will be available through FSA's BCAP web site at

**[www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/webapp?area=home&subject=ener&topic=bcap](http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/webapp?area=home&subject=ener&topic=bcap):**

- summary of the 2008 Act's BCAP statutory provisions in bullet format
- BCAP Federal Register documents and BCAP notices
- current BCAP CHST Eligible and Ineligible Materials List
- downloadable BCF Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) template and attachments
- AD-1047
- national list of CHST-qualified BCF's
- press releases, fact sheets, etc.
- related BCAP documents
- summary of enrollment statistics when available.

#### D Eligible Material Requirements

The following rules apply to eligible material for CHST matching payments, as verified by the FSA County Committee (COC) or designees.

- The eligible material must be listed as eligible on the official BCAP CHST Eligible and Ineligible Materials List. The current BCAP CHST Eligible and Ineligible Materials List will be maintained on FSA's BCAP web site. Only materials listed as eligible material are eligible for payment.
- Any material which is sold or delivered:
  - to any facility that is **not** a CHST-qualified BCF, is ineligible for payment
  - before the eligible material owner applies for payments and is approved for payment using AD-245, page 1, by COC, is ineligible for payment.
- Eligible material must be harvested or collected from sites in the U.S. or U.S. territories. Eligible material not originating from the U.S. or U.S. territories, including the source material used by intermediate factories/facilities, is ineligible for CHST payment.
- Eligible material for which a payment has already been applied, approved, earned, or is subject to a scheme or device to circumvent program rules or requirements, is ineligible for CHST matching payment.

## Notice BCAP-2

### 2 BCAP and CHST Matching Payment Program Overview (Continued)

#### D Eligible Material Requirements (Continued)

- To qualify for the CHST Matching Payment Program, eligible material must be harvested or collected according to the following:
  - if removed from U.S. National forests or Bureau of Land Management (BLM) public lands, the eligible material collection and harvesting must be done according to all laws and regulations that apply to the Forest Service or BLM, including adherence with all necessary contracts or permits issued by the responsible officials

**Note:** Materials removed from other Federal lands is ineligible material and ineligible for payment.

- if removed from Tribal, State, and other local Government-owned land, the eligible material collection and harvesting activities must be done within all applicable laws, ordinances, permit requirements, and other environmental requirements of the Federal, Tribal, State, or local Government
- if removed from privately-owned land, including cropland, pastureland, rangeland, and forestland, the eligible material's collection and harvesting must be done within all applicable laws, ordinances, permit requirements, and other environmental requirements of the Federal, Tribal, State, or local Government pertaining to private land in that jurisdiction
- if removed from private cropland, the eligible material collection and harvesting activities must be done consistent with conservation plans required for highly erodible land (HEL) as determined by NRCS under Title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended
- if removed from nonindustrial private forestland, the eligible material collection and harvesting activities must be done according to a new or amended Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP), or other practice plan approved by the State forester. FSP's need to be created or amended at no expense to CCC
- if eligible material is removed from CRP contract acreage, the material must be harvested or collected under CRP's managed haying and grazing requirements according to 2-CRP, Part 13
- if removed from land enrolled under any other Federal, State, or local private lands programs, the eligible material must have been harvested or collected in full compliance with those program rules and requirements
- eligible material must be collected and harvested in compliance with Executive Order 13112, February 3, 1999 (64 FR 25).

**Walnut Council Tour**  
**Saturday, September 26, 2009**  
**Return pre-registration form by Sept 22**



The MO Chapter of the Walnut Council plans to have a short meeting at the Senior Center in Ashland, MO and then caravan to the properties of Wayne Porath and Steve Elder NW of Ashland. Please pre-register by 9/22 so that we can arrange adequate coffee, donuts, and box lunches.

Rain or shine, we will have lots of information and topics to discuss. Field tours on the Porath Farm will give you an opportunity to see a managed native stand of uneven aged walnut along a creek. We will see various Conservation Reserve Practices including edge feathering and initial progress in establishing a Savannah oak stand on south and north facing slopes. The nicest black walnut tree on the property will be accessed for its current value and projections after additional growth.

We will also tour an adjacent property, the Elder Farm, that has a walnut plantation established in 1990. Discussions will include variability in site suitability, crop tree selection, thinning, weed control, and appraisals / recommendations on harvesting some walnut in an adjacent stand of mixed timber.

As members and recipients of this tour announcement, please pass along this invitation to other landowners that may have an interest. Many of your neighbors have some native walnut on their property, but are not aware of the Walnut Council and how this organization can share information and advice in timber management. Bring them along!!!

Trailers will transport attendees between stops on the tour. Refreshments and a port-a-potty will be available.

**Schedule:**

- 8:00 – 8:45 Registration at the Senior Center in Ashland, MO
- 8:45 – 9:20 Welcome and short business meeting – Select date and location for the spring 2010 tour – Break before loading for short caravan to farms
- 9:30 – 9:45 Caravan to farms
- 9:45 – 11:45 Field tours and discussions
- 11:45 – 12:30 Catered box lunches, sodas, and water
- 12:30 – ? :?? More field tours and discussions

**Directions to the Ashland Senior Center:** Between Jefferson City and Columbia, exit off US Hwy 63 by taking Route M west into Ashland. Take the first left, Oak St, south to Tandy St and then right on Douglas Drive. The Senior Center is at 406 Douglas Drive.

**Herbicides Available for Ordering**

A list of herbicides and cost (includes tax) for Walnut Council Members is listed below. Prices are subject to change. Orders should accompany your meeting reservation that must be received no later than 9/22. Minimum order is 2.5 gallon of the following:

| <b><u>Product</u></b>                     | <b><u>Per 2.5 Gallon</u></b> |
|---|------------------------------|
| Pathway (= Tordon RTU)                    | \$87.00                      |
| Sim-Trol (simazine 42.8%)                 | \$62.00                      |
| Buccaneer Plus(=Roundup) (41% glyphosate) | \$78.00                      |

**Return this page for Pre-registration and Chemical Order**

**Walnut Council Tour Pre-registration by Sept 22**

Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Registration fee covers refreshments, lunch, meeting room facilities, and port-a-potty rental.

Walnut Council Members \_\_\_\_\_ @ \$10.00 each \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Non-Members \_\_\_\_\_ @ \$13.00 each \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Total due at meeting \$ \_\_\_\_\_**

Chemical order (specify product and gallons, note minimum order). Pay **at the meeting**.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Mail to:** Dennis Potter; 793 Hwy 240; Fayette, MO 65248-9765.

**Or return Email to:** palmh@missouri.edu

**From:** Shelby Jones [mailto:shelby942@embarqmail.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 25, 2009 11:56 AM

**To:** Tom Aley ; Art Suchland; Bill Calvert ; Bob Massengale; Bruce Vawter ; Clint Trammel ; Don Phillips ; Don Riggle ; Doug Enyart ; Dusty Walter ; Dwyer, John P.; Frank Meyers ; Fred Crouse ; Fred Fris; Gary Naughton ; Jason Deschu; Jeremy Wilson ; Jim Rocca ; Kerry Price ; Larry Battey ; Larry Lackamp ; Matt Arndt ; Matt Meyerpeter ; Max Schmollinger; Ralph Allison ; Randy Herberg ; Ron Lumb ; Royce Flowers ; Russell Schmidt; Sam Orr ; Scott Brundage ; Sean Penn ; Shane Morgan; Shelby Jones; Skip Mourglia ; Terry Cunningham ; Tod Kinerk; 'Brad King'

**Cc:** Larry Godsey ; John Tuttle; Mike Anderson ; Bradley King

**Subject:** Fall Meeting & Workshop

MCFA members: Please reserve **October 21, 2009** on your calendar for the Fall Meeting of Missouri Consulting Foresters Association. The meeting will be held in the lower level of the **Conservation Employees Credit Union; 2901 West Truman Blvd; Jefferson City, MO** from approximately 9:30 AM to 4:00 PM. A grill-your-own steak fry for MCFA members is being planned for the evening of Oct. 20, 2009 followed by a business meeting. Details are incomplete at present, but will be sent to all members as soon as possible.

The only cost to MCFA members will be for the steak fry and a catered lunch during the workshop. The workshop will be facilitated by Larry Godsey, MU Center for Agroforestry on the subject of **Timber Casualty Loss**. It will include discussion of cost basis calculation as an integral part of Timber Casualty Loss. Each participant will get the opportunity to work through exercises using "real world" examples and data. **Form T** and related federal tax forms will be discussed in detail and completed during the workshop.

This workshop is being developed primarily for **professional consulting foresters**. We have room for only **50** participants. MCFA members will have priority for registration. If space is available, we will open the workshop to other foresters. There will be a workshop registration fee for non-members. Continuing Education credits will be available for SAF certification. It coincides with the Fall MoSAF meeting on Oct. 7<sup>th</sup> in the Madison County area, but will be more technical.

With the recent wind and ice damage to timber stand in southern Missouri, this workshop offers an excellent opportunity for consulting foresters to upgrade their services in the areas of value and damage assessment as well as advising clients about the very complicated subject.

MCFA is developing and sponsoring the educational activity as a service to its members. Please consider attending.

More details will follow as soon as possible. If you have questions, please call me.

Shelby Jones, President