



**Missouri Forest Resource Advisory Council Meeting  
September 15, 2011 (10:00-3:00 pm)  
Conservation Employees' Credit Union Meeting Room  
Jefferson City, MO**

**MINUTES**

Wayne Lovelace called the meeting to order and introductions were made. The following were in attendance:

Lisa Allen, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Joe Alley, Mo. Society of American Foresters  
Bob Ball, Mo. Forest and Woodland Assoc. of Missouri  
Anastasia Becker, Mo. Dept. of Agriculture  
Peter Becker, Eastern Ozarks Forestry Council  
Scott Brundage, The Walnut Council  
John Burk, National Wild Turkey Federation  
Martha Clark, Mo. Community Forestry Council  
Mark Coggeshall, Mo. Nut Growers Assoc.  
Gene Garrett, Mo. Center for Agroforestry  
Roy Hengerson, Missouri Chapter of Sierra Club  
Steve Jarvis, Mo. Forest Products Assoc.

Shelby Jones, Mo. Consulting Foresters Assoc.  
Ed Keyser, Conservation Federation of Mo.  
Wayne Lovelace, Mo. Nurseryman's Assoc.  
Steve Mahfood, The Nature Conservancy  
Dave Murphy, Conservation Federation of Mo.  
Harlan Palm, The Walnut Council  
Kelly Smith, Missouri Farm Bureau  
Richard Stricklin, Top of the Ozarks RC&D  
Robert Stout, Dept. of Natural Resources  
Steven Thurman, US Army, Ft. Leonard Wood  
Jerry Van Sambeek, USFS Northern Research Station  
Collin Wamsley, Mo. Dept. of Agriculture  
David Whittekiend, USFS Mark Twain Nat'l Forest

Others in attendance:

Donna Baldwin, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Bob DeWitt, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Hank Dorst, Mark Twain Forest Watchers  
Dwaine Gelnar, Natural Res. Cons. Service  
Jason Jensen, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
John Heckman, Quail and Upland Wildlife Federation

Darlene Johnson, Natural Res. Cons. Service  
Bill McGuire, Bill McGuire Conservation LLC  
Rick Merritt, Mo. State Tree Farm Committee  
Tony Stafford, Mo. Dept. of Agriculture  
John Tuttle, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Brian Schweiss, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Adam Gresham, Senator Kehoe's Office  
Simeon Wright, Mo. Dept. of Conservation

**Minutes** – Wayne asked if anyone had changes to the minutes from June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting as sent prior to the meeting. With no further changes noted, Dave Murphy made a motion to approve the minutes. Richard Stricklin seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Peter noted that there as one set of outstanding minutes (December 2009) that have not been approved. Dave Murphy made a motion to approve the minutes. Scott Brundage seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

**By-laws Revision** – Martha Clark noted there was discussion at the June meeting about adding new members. She added that the bylaws list the membership, and perhaps it should be an appendix which would be more easily revised. She noted she will combine that change with the other bylaw

revisions and vote on all at the December meeting. She added two statements to Section C. Council Membership : “The Council shall be composed of members as listed on Appendix A (attached), which will be revised upon approval of new members,” and “Such entities shall submit a formal request for membership to the Council listing representative and contact information. This may be done electronically or by letter to any executive committee member.”

**Letterhead & Mailing Address** – Martha discussed the disclaimer at the bottom of the letterhead. Peter suggested adding the word “organization” after the word “member”. The group agreed. Martha also talked about the official mailing address. It’s been suggested that we use PO Box 180 (MDC), c/o Donna Baldwin, then she would forward to the Chair, but that requires a bylaws change. It would eliminate the need to change letterhead every time a Chair changes. Discussion ensued about MoFRAC getting their own PO Box but someone would have to be responsible for checking it frequently. Shelby Jones suggested we just use an electronic template (no printed letterhead) and this could be changed easily. The group agreed. Martha confirmed that we will leave the letterhead as is, and no change is needed to the bylaws.

The brochure also can be kept in electronic format and printed as needed (posted on-line). Scott Brundage asked about the cost to get the brochure printed, and Dave Murphy noted it wasn’t that expensive. Scott noted he’d be happy to get them printed, and made a motion that we get 1,000 copies printed. Jerry Van Sambeek reiterated that we need to get the brochure on the website, and most of us can print as needed. It would allow for easier updates too as members are added. Dave Murphy made motion to post online only, and Steve Jarvis seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**Webpage Posting Policies/Info** – Martha noted that anything that will be posted should go through and be authorized by the Secretary. When we post list of member and organizations, were leaving off contact information for individuals.

**Appoint Nominating Committee** – Wayne noted it will be time to elect officers for 2012 at the December meeting. He would like to appoint a standing nominating committee since this needs to be done yearly. Peter noted he did not agree with a standing committee, but prefers a new one each year. From that standpoint, Wayne appointed Dave Murphy, Steve Jarvis, and Scott Brundage. Elections will be held at the December meeting. Peter requested the committee come up with multiple candidates for each position, and that each nominee should make a statement of how they will further the goals of MoFRAC if elected.

**Biomass Resolution** – Peter noted that at the last meeting, MoFRAC tabled discussion on adoption of an official Biomass Resolution and his proposed additions. He summarized some proposed additions and resources/research reports he used to come up with those proposals, specifically 1) an addition to employ timber harvesters who are certified by the Missouri Master Logger Certification program, and 2) be awarded RECs commensurate with its overall energy conversion efficiency, from woods to power transmission line, with a full REC credit awarded for 60% efficiency or better, half credit for 40% efficiency, and linear pro-rating for intermediate values.

Comments were made by members and discussion ensued. MFPA and Farm Bureau noted they would have to abstain from voting. Wayne noted we need a motion to proceed with the addition. Bob Ball

made a motion to approve, seconded by Steve Mahfood. With only 3 opposed, the motion carried.

**Web Page Update** – Peter noted that not much has changed. At this time, we have relatively low traffic to the site. He suggested folks send documents to the Secretary for approval, and then the Secretary will forward it to Peter for posting. Martha asked about new charge to host website. Peter noted we will have to find a different hosting site. But our domain ([www.mofrac.org](http://www.mofrac.org)) was purchased so we can keep our web address. This will need to be done by February.

**TCD presentation/report** - Collin Wamsley/Simeon Wright gave a short presentation on this disease targeting black walnut:

- Walnut twig beetles enter trees and excavate galleries, fungus *geosmithia morbida* causes cankers.
- Multiple cankers produce girdling that seriously restricts movement of nutrients.
- Walnut twig beetles emerging from infested trees are contaminated with spores of *geosmithia* fungus.
- Tips for field diagnosis: look for patterns (if more than one walnut in an area suddenly declines or dies then investigate), look for scattered dead branches in the upper crown, especially where dried leaves are still attached, and look for vigorous sprouts below dead areas.
- Initial symptoms are subtle and easily confused with other problems.
- Summer: July/August - look for flagging, recently wilted branches and brown, dead leaves.
- Symptoms often progress down from upper crown, wilted brown leaves.
- TCD has been detected in native range of *Juglans nigra*.
- After finding a suspect tree – look for cankers and insects under the bark. At this stage you may not see the beetle in the trunk, but have to get a branch sample (at least 1" diameter)
- Cankers are initially in phloem. Be careful – you can miss young cankers by shaving too deeply.
- Reporting suspect trees – get location and photos; contact your local MDC office or MDA office; fill out on-line pest report form. Email form and photos and information to [forest.health@mdc.mo.gov](mailto:forest.health@mdc.mo.gov). Trained professionals should send samples only when definite symptoms or signs observed under the bark.
- Photos – include entire tree, leaves and symptoms – email to [forest.health@mdc.mo.gov](mailto:forest.health@mdc.mo.gov)
- MDC did survey work this summer with funds from USFS State & Private Forestry. They surveyed all state park campgrounds, public and private campgrounds based on FIA data. Did visual survey, photos and samples were taken. 62 public campgrounds, 18 private campgrounds, 20 other locations. Sample diagnostics by MDC – all negative.
- MDA visual survey for TCD - funding came from APHIS-PDQ. Focus on municipalities and wood processors. Samples taken when symptoms were observed. 54 counties, 154 sites, 20 samples. Sample diagnostic by MDA, MDC, UM-C labs. All negative.
- Tennessee – quarantined counties as of September 1, 2011 (6 counties with a 10-county buffer area).
- Virginia – found in Richmond in July 27, 2011 (2 counties quarantined plus City of Richmond).
- Pennsylvania – quarantined 1 county as of September 1, 2011.
- States known to have TCD: WA, OR, ID, CA, NV, UT, AZ, CO, NM, TN, VA, PA.
- States w/ TCD regulations: MN, WI, NE, KS, OK, MO, MI, IN, TN, NC, VA, PA.

- State Exterior Quarantines – regulated articles WTB and G. morbida; Juglans wood (nursery stock, propagative wood, green lumber, logs, chips, stumps, roots, branches, etc), non-coniferous firewood, strict prohibition (no treatment options, TCS regulated articles cannot move here under any circumstances at this time).
- State Exterior Quarantines Exemptions – nuts, nut meats, hulls, processed lumber (100% bark free kiln dried, squared edges), finished wood products (furniture, instruments, gun stocks, etc).
- National Framework: Response to TCD – a reference for state and stakeholders. Includes prevention, detection/monitoring, management, outreach/education, research. Completed and approved, being routed for signatures (USFS, USDA APHIS PPQ, NASF, NPB).
- Missouri TCD Action Plan. Outlines the importance of black walnut to Mo, outreach efforts, monitoring for TCD, how to detect, response to detection, stakeholder list.
- USDA-APIS-PPQ Methods development – CPHST (Center for Plant Health Science and Technology) – Virginia Tech: vacuum steam treatments for veneer logs; kiln treatments, methyl bromide treatments, establish head and cold tolerances for WTB and GEO (important for establishing treatment standards). Trap and lure development for WTB.
- Websites – [www.mdc.mo.gov/thousand-cankers](http://www.mdc.mo.gov/thousand-cankers) and [www.mda.mo.gov/plants/pests/thousandcankers.php](http://www.mda.mo.gov/plants/pests/thousandcankers.php)

Lisa Allen noted that some advocacy is needed by MoFRAC to leaders in the Department of Agriculture to voice our support for the funds that were appropriated to support an additional position in MDA to focus on TCD. Dave Murphy made a motion that MoFRAC send a letter to members of the Missouri Department of Agriculture to support funding as approved for TCD. The motion was seconded by Mike Brown and unanimously approved.

**How Can We Improve Production Forestry in MO?** - Steve Jarvis did a short presentation, and noted that improving forest health sustains rural communities. Healthy forest indicators: 1) stocking level 2) stand age 3) volume per acre 4) mortality and he showed charts comparing those 4 indicators on three ownerships (state, federal, and private). A recent survey (2010) by McClain Forest Products of 315 sawmills in southern Missouri showed they are operating at a 65% capacity due to lack of markets (5%), lack of stumps (30%), and lumber prices declined while stumps prices remained steady. He noted that improving forest health sustains rural communities. Conclusions: 1) Missouri's forests are growing but... 2) Missouri's forests are aging, 3) stocking levels are increasing, and 4) mortality is on the rise. What can MoFRAC do: promote forest health on all three ownerships; ensure a sustainable supply of stumps to sawmills to benefit rural communities.

Scott Brundage noted that many people who own timberland won't sell their timber, and we have to figure out how to reach private landowners – perhaps a one day conference/workshop? Richard Stricklin noted he felt we need more basic research - perhaps part of the cause is land fragmentation. Bob Ball noted we need to decide where we want to go with this...develop an action plan within the organization. Wayne noted that's an excellent suggestion and that we need to talk about this further.

**Prescribed Burn Council Update** - John Burk noted Missouri doesn't have a Prescribed Burn Council, and we are one of the few states that does not. He has been charged with developing that committee

and has drafted bylaws. They will have their first meeting in early December to elect officers and get council up and running. Wayne thanked Mr. Burk for his update.

Ed Keyser noted that while he's used prescribed fire as a management tool, it might be overused in some cases. He suggested that the Prescribed Fire Council include a statement in the bylaws that prescribed fire recommendations advise the landowner not only of the benefits of fire, but also the fact that any fire in hardwood forests may result in a decline in quality of trees/logs and lower profit in future log sales.

**NRCS Financial Assistance Benefitting Forestry** - Darlene Johnson and Dwaine Gelnar made a short presentation:

#### NRCS Conservation Programs Overview

- Based on Farm Bill as passed by Congress
- To enhance the long-term quality of our environment and conservation of our natural resources
- All voluntary enrollment
- Applicant(s) must meet ALL eligibility requirements of the specific program (land and applicant eligibility).

#### Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)

- Financial & technical assistance to install or implement structural & management conservation practices on eligible land
  - Address multiple resource concerns
  - Increase overall environmental benefits
  - Long-lasting environmental benefits
  - Encourage innovation
  - Apply 60% of funds to livestock-related conservation practices

#### EQIP in Missouri

- EQIP in Missouri since 1996
- FY11 EQIP (regular) as of 09-12-11
- Final allocation: \$19,557,360
- Obligated \$18,911,127
- Forest Land Use Fund Pools:
  - Allocation \$1,447,114 (10.1% of initial allocation)
  - Obligated \$1,374,480
  - Offers to all FY11 EQIP eligible forest apps

#### Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)

- Financial & technical assistance to develop urban, wetland, riparian & aquatic habitat areas
  - Encourage creation of high-quality wildlife habitats
  - Implement conservation practices that support wildlife populations of significance

#### WHIP in Missouri

- WHIP in Missouri since 1996
- FY11 WHIP (regular) as of 09-12-11

- Allocation: \$266,495
- Obligated: \$263,540
- FY11 WHIP forest practices contracted:
  - 718 acres forest stand improvement
  - 178 acres prescribed burning-woodlands
  - 62 acres woody cover control-wildlife

Other NRCS Programs in Missouri:

- Conservation Security Program (CSP)
- Conservation Stewardship Program (CStP)
- Grassland Reserve Program (GRP)
- Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)
- Farm and Ranchlands Protection Program (FRPP)

Wayne thanked Ms. Johnson and Mr. Gelnar for their presentation. Lisa Allen noted we are very fortunate in Missouri to have foresters with NRCS - we're the envy of other states.

**FSA/NRCS cost share rate for forestry practices** - Scott Brundage noted he's been on the Technical Service Committee for years. In the past, there wasn't near as much money for forestry practices. In those days, the number of requests coming in for forestry practices was funded by a fraction. In 2010, there were 3,500 applications with 1,510 contracts (less than half were funded). For 2011, 4,137 applications were received, 1,047 obligated. EQIP for forest land included 298 requests for nearly 2 million dollars – approximately 2/3 was funded. That leaves a lot of landowners going away empty handed.

Bob DeWitt gave the following information:

- Umbrella Statement – Comparing USDA cost-share to MDC cost share isn't akin comparing an apple to an orange, but more like comparing a standard peach to its fuzzless recessive-gened cultivar, the nectarine. The scope, the scale and the dynamic of the two sources of cost-share is significantly different and therefore could make the outcome of a similar change very different. That said, a similar MDC scenario with reducing cost-share is detailed below.
- Also important to note is that while MDC is often asked for input on USDA programs (and welcomes those opportunities), USDA must include many other sources of stakeholder input as well as internal operational considerations. While MDC believes and trusts that our contributions to USDA program development are valuable to USDA, no one should consider those contributions as "directing" those programs.

#### MDC's Cost-Share Reduction Experience

- In FY09, the economy took a significant downturn and MDC administrators attempted to make limited resources go further, including internal cost-share assistance monies. Leadership also theorized that lower cost-share reimbursement would allow a greater number of landowners to participate in the program, thereby increasing accomplishment and serving more public.

- MDC reduced Landowner Assistance Program (LAP) conservation practice cost-share to 50% going into FY10 (July 2009-June 2010). Prior to that point, cost-share had been approximately 75% for most practices in all geographies except for priority focus areas (PFAs) where it could be increased to approximately 90%.
- Significant comment was provided by staff that the reduced percentage would not accomplish the objective of reaching more landowners with the same funding due to the economically viable threshold having been crossed for many landowners to view program participation and practice implementation positively.
  - A similar point was made much more recently to JR Flores by PLS after a state technical committee meeting (a point supported by Forestry Division) that PLS opposed a reduction in cost-share specifically for those practices that typically require a contractor to complete, such as TSI, edge-feathering, glade and savanna restoration, etc. Cooperators in the eastern Ozarks as well as other forested sections of Missouri are low or limited income and cannot afford to pay a contractor additional money out of their pocket. Such a move would likely decrease the implementation of forest and other natural community restoration projects.
- The full impact of the reduced FY10 percentage is not entirely clear due to the continuing economic downturn (and increasing landowner thriftiness) and the fact that MDC also retracted funds (practices put on hold, not cancelled) allocated to landowner practices (that had not yet been initiated) in the fall of 2009. Approximately half of the 1.2 million FY10 LAP funding was not available for dispersal and not all of the remaining funding was paid out with only \$531,118 utilized.

○ YEAR	○ ALLOCATED	○ PAID
○ FY09	○ \$1,241,750	○ \$1,022,170
○ FY10	○ \$600,000 +/- ○ (\$1.2 Million)	○ \$531,118
○ FY11	○ \$1,019,400	○ \$661,012
○ FY12	○ \$ 1 Million +/-	○ ??

- In FY11 with \$1 million available for LAP funding and cost-share remaining at the 50% level, only \$661,012 was utilized. An approximately 100% increase in available funds only generated slightly more than a 24% increase in utilization.
- With a sluggish economy looming indefinitely into the future, in FY12 LAP cost-share rates were once again raised to approximate 75% reimbursement to the landowner. Full fiscal year impact is still unknown at this point, but some regions have already completely allocated their funding within the first fiscal quarter.

#### FY10 PLS Landowner Survey - Cost Share and Technical Assistance

A majority of landowners (62%) responding received MDC Cost Share, while only 39% received USDA Cost Share. And, only 28% hired a Conservation Contractor to assist with project implementation. Respondents indicated they would be more likely to complete a conservation project if they received cost share. While only 33% said that 50% cost share would suffice and only 26% said that 75% would

suffice, the percentage of participating landowners increases with increasing cost share, from 30% at 25% cost share to 90% at 75% cost share.

Based on first and second place rankings by landowners of 5 types of assistance provided, On Site Technical Assistance by an MDC staff ranked number one, with Financial Assistance (cost share) number two. Least important were Conservation Contractors and Equipment.

The results of this 2010 survey compare favorably with previous surveys in 2005 and 2008. A vast majority (over 90%) of landowners continued to be satisfied with the quality and timeliness of service provided. Written responses overwhelmingly praised staff that provided assistance to landowners. Wildlife management, forest management, and natural resource management were the 3 most requested services in 2007 and 2010.

Although Technical Assistance was considered the most important type of assistance to completing conservation projects, Financial Assistance appears to be a very important incentive, with 90% participating when cost share covers 75% of implementation costs. Although there were some suggestions for improving the Private Landowner Service program, the majority of landowners believed it to be a very helpful and successful program.

Scott Brundage made a motion for MoFRAC to consider reducing forest cost share practices from 75% to 65%. Wayne asked if we had a second. With none received, the motion ended.

**What Rules or Legislation Need Our Input with the State Legislature** – Wayne asked if anyone knew of issues MoFRAC needs to be aware of. Robert Stout noted that there may be a citizen initiative for renewable energy. Peter Becker noted that the Eastern Ozarks Forestry Council voted to join the Missouri Conservation and Environmental Alliance, and they will keep them informed of legislative issues which he will pass on to us. Dave Murphy reminded everyone that this is not an election year, and asked folks to keep in touch with returning legislators, adding it's a good time for education and building relationships. Bob Ball asked if there would be any support of a state forestry tax. Dave noted he didn't think it would stand a chance.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Party Woody Biomass Harvest Verification Update** - Scott Brundage reported the committee met 2 times since last meeting and have had numerous phone calls and email. They hope to have something to present at the next meeting for vote/approval. The goal is to have woody biomass harvested in a sustainable manner, and a process to verify it. The verification will check two things: 1) was the stand properly harvested, and 2) were the logging practices correct (water bars installed, etc.). Still working out the details on who would be the verifiers – have talked about consulting foresters being the logical ones. They have appointed sub-committee (Jarvis, Stelzer, Tuttle) that will come up with curriculum.

**Discussion on Agenda Topics for Future MoFRAC Meetings** - Bob Ball noted to give serious thought to future agenda topics. Send your ideas via email to Wayne, Bob, and Martha and they will compile a list. Bob went over some ideas:

- Opportunities for memberships in forestry related organizations in Missouri
- How do we determine who woodland landowners are? Can we get contact information?

- Are forestry partners prepared to assist in requests from woodland owners? Do we have the mechanism in place?
- A discussion on training needs for forestry personnel
- Selling woodland management
- Features and benefits of forestry practices
- What segment/category of woodland owners should we target first?
- MoFRAC outreach strategy
- Improving the marketing value of Missouri timber
- Potential woodland management articles and authors for Green Horizons;
- What is our role in educating woodland owners on the value of their timber
- How can we improve production forestry in Missouri?

Ed Keyser suggested an update on the FWAM Executive Director at the next meeting. Lisa suggested periodic updates from MDC's detail positions (forest products marketing and silvicultural standards).

**Meeting Dates for 2012** – Wayne noted it's time to set meetings for 2012. He reported that Farm Bureau has agreed to host meetings at their building in Jefferson City, which makes it more convenient and less expensive for everyone to buy lunch. Lisa Allen asked we check to see if they can provide microphones and speakers for the meeting room.

A few potential dates were discussed. Donna Baldwin will prepare a Doodle poll to see what dates work best. Conference rooms will be booked in advance.

**Roundtable Updates** -Robert Stout reported on the Trees for Joplin initiative. There will be a roundtable on September 23<sup>rd</sup> [later rescheduled for September 29<sup>th</sup>]. There is also a major watershed initiative to be announced by the Governor, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing process will be filed in a couple months.

Lisa Allen added that following the tornado in Joplin, donations of trees, money, and volunteers poured in. It quickly became clear that Joplin needed someone to coordinate all these efforts. MDC has secured USFS funding for a coordinator.

Gene Garrett noted that the Annual Chestnut Roast will be held October 8<sup>th</sup> at Forrest Keeling Nursery. Wayne invited everyone to attend.

With no further meeting business, the meeting was adjourned.