Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations
S&PF Numbers Reflect Hard Work

By the time you read this, the first session of the 106th Congress will be over and the funding picture for Fiscal Year 2000 will finally be completed. As has become the norm in recent years, Congress has had difficulty in completing the thirteen annual appropriations bills that fund all Federal discretionary programs on time. This includes the Interior and Agriculture Appropriations bills which fund the forest landowner assistance, forest health and fire protection programs important to the charge of the State Foresters.

The road for the Interior Appropriations bill has been its usual rough and tumble ride, but the State & Private Forestry (S&PF) programs under the USDA Forest Service weathered it fairly well.

Harrisburg Welcomes State Foresters for 77th Annual Meeting

The Pennsylvania Bureau of Forestry was the host of the State Foresters’ week long Annual Meeting in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania this year. Held in the last full week of September, the popular event drew close to two-hundred registered individuals who came to interact and learn about some of the issues important to the State Foresters that have developed over the past year.

USDA Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck gave the keynote address emphasizing that he is trying to position the Forest Service to be ready for the upcoming challenges in the next millennium. He reinforced that the Forest Service, recognized as one of the world’s leading forest managers, has an obligation to demonstrate that active forest management is compatible with forests, noting that a zero-cut policy would only serve to shift fiber demands to other regions of the world. Besides emphasizing his Natural Resource Agenda (roads, water, accountability & sustainability), Dombeck predicted that water concerns will be the centerpiece of forestry issues in the future.
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The Interior bill will provide a total of $202.5 million S&PF. This amounts to an almost $32 million increase over last year’s total and alone, marks a significant accomplishment in a budget year characterized by budget austerity (refer to Table 1 - page 3 - for a complete breakdown of FY ‘00 numbers).

There is one footnote attached to this year’s budget numbers. As part of the final budget deal reached between the Administration and Congress, a largely symbolic 0.38% across-the-board spending cut will be instituted to show a commitment to fiscal conservatism that the Republicans so desire. The President agreed to go along with the cut, as long as the Administration retains “maximum flexibility” to manage the cut. The numbers to follow represent pre-cut conference totals (do not reflect the across-the-board cut). We understand that the Administration will have broad discretion to implement the cut, but that no single line item in any agency should be cut by more than 15 percent.

State & Private Forestry
The S&PF programs of the Forest Service are broken down into three distinct program areas; Forest Health Management (FHM), Cooperative Fire Protection (CFP) and Cooperative Forestry (CF). All three areas will be receiving noticeable increases next year; FHM - 11% ($60.675 MM), CFP - 19% ($28.010 MM), and CF - 22% ($113.416 MM). This is a strong indicator of the increasing recognition and support for S&PF programs, particularly in light of a 1.5% overall decrease in the Forest Service’s operating budget.

Forest Health Management (FHM)
There are two programs under the FHM line-item, Federal Lands FHM and Cooperative Lands FHM. One program addresses forest health threats on Federal lands and the other engages entities outside of the green lines as forest health threats tend not to respect human imposed boundary lines.

This line-item group saw a healthy increase from $54.525 million last year to $60.675 million this year (NASF had recommended $66.325 million). For the first year ever, the Forest Service gypsy moth eradication program, Slow the Spread, will receive full funding. Earmarks include funding for Asian longhorned beetle treatment in New York and Chicago as well as money for the Vermont Forest Health Cooperative and a Forest Service impact study of pine beetles in the mountain west.
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**Forestry Programs Budget Results**

Forest Service Programs (Interior Approps)

($ in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State &amp; Private Forestry</th>
<th>FY '99</th>
<th>FY '00</th>
<th>FY '00</th>
<th>FY '00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest Health Management</strong></td>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>NASF</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Lands FHM:</td>
<td>37.325</td>
<td>40.325</td>
<td>40.325</td>
<td>38.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coop. Lands FHM:</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.200</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.400</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.850</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, FHM:</td>
<td><strong>54.525</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.725</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.325</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.675</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cooperative Fire Protection**


Volunteer Fire Assist: 2.000 2.001 10.000 3.250

Subtotal, Coop. Fire: **23.510** **33.510** **41.509** **28.010**

**Cooperative Forestry**

Forest Stewardship: 28.830 28.830 33.830 29.430

Stew. Incentives Prog.: 0.000 15.000 15.000 0.000

Forest Legacy: 7.012 50.012 50.012 25.000

Water Quality: - - 10.000 0.000

U&CF: 30.540 40.040 40.040 31.300

Econ. Action Prog.: 17.305 16.305 16.305 20.119

PNW Assistance: 9.000 7.000 7.000 8.000

Subtotal, Coop. Forestry: **92.687** **157.187** **172.87** **113.416**

Total, S&PF: **170.722** **252.422** **284.021** **202.534**

International Forestry: 3.900 3.500 3.500 3.500

Forest Service Research: 197.444 234.644 234.644 202.700

Other USDA Forestry Programs (Agriculture Approps)

NRCS Conservation Programs

Forestry Incentives Program: 16.325 25.000 6.325

RC&D Program: 35.000 40.000 35.265

CSREES Forestry Related Programs

RREA: 3.192 3.192 15.000 3.192


NRI: 119.300 200.00 119.300

---

1 A largely symbolic 0.38% across-the-board cut was agreed upon in final budget negotiations. It is unclear exactly how this reduction will be distributed across line-items.

2 The emergency spending bill included an extra $10 million for the Forestry Incentives Program for emergency reforestation needs. The funding will not be released unless the White House declares that the spending is in fact an emergency. The funds are not specifically directed to any one region of the country.
in the future and that education will be key to increasing public appreciation of the forests and the multiple values they provide.

**Issues Sessions**
Multiple issue sessions were held throughout the week touching on Federal forest land management, water quality, wildfire, carbon sequestration and forestland taxation.

**Federal Forest Land Management**
Oregon State Forester and NASF Federal Lands Committee chairman Jim Brown provided a summary briefing of the policy statement put together by his staff for the NASF Federal Lands Committee. The policy statement addresses the State Foresters’ take on six different Federal forest land management issues. These include Forest Service strategic planning, budget reform, road management, planning regulations, payments to states, and special projects such as stewardship contracting (For further information on these and other issues, please visit the NASF homepage at [http://www.stateforesters.org](http://www.stateforesters.org)).

**Water Quality**
Perhaps the most anticipated of all issues, time was spent during the water quality session to address the Environmental Protection Agency’s proposed rules addressing Total Maximum Daily Load and National Pollution Dis-
The National Association of State Foresters presented awards to current and former State Foresters, State Forestry agency staff members, and Forest Service staff at our annual meeting in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The NASF presents three different awards annually, the Former State Forester Award, the Current Achievement Awards, and the Lifetime Achievement Awards. The USDA Forest Service also presented the 1st Annual Franklin Awards which recognize outstanding achievement in the realm of Fire & Aviation Management at this year's awards banquet.

Former State Forester Award:
The Former State Forester Award is meant to honor and highlight the work each of these departing State Foresters have contributed to NASF and State & Private Forestry in general over their tenure. Fiscal year 1999 saw seven State Foresters either retire or move on to other career challenges.

- **Marvin Brown**, Missouri Dept. of Conservation
- **William Farris**, Iowa Department of Natural Resources
- **Chuck Gadzik**, Maine Forest Service
- **Christopher Jones**, American Samoa Territorial Forester
- **William Maxey**, West Virgina Division of Forestry
- **Richard Wilson**, California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection
- **Arthur Peterson**, Virgin Islands

Both Marvin Brown and Bill Farris served as NASF President during their careers. Farris was president in 1995, Brown served in 1997.

Lifetime Achievement Awards
These awards are given to individuals to recognize their enduring contributions to State Forestry throughout their careers. Two State Forester staff members were recognized in Harrisburg, one for his work in forest fire protection in Georgia, and the other for his work on forest health threats in Wisconsin.

- **Wesley L. Wells**, retired Chief of Forest Protection, Georgia Forestry Commission
  Wells was recognized for his 33 year career with the Georgia Forestry Commission, which covered many aspects of State forestry but which was significant for his contributions to fire protection. After several years as a service forester and work in wood utilization, Wells began work in fire protection in 1982. He was quickly recognized as a leader by his peers, serving on the National Wildfire Coordinating Group and was elected chairman of the Southern Fire Chiefs Prevention Team. Wells worked hard to get better exposure for Smokey Bear in Georgia, and innovated in areas including firefighter physical fitness. Wells is also a past winner of the USDA Forest Service Silver Smokey Bear award and the Georgia Forestry Commissions' Directors Award.

- **Al Prey**, Forest Health Coordinator, Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources
  Prey began his career with the Wisconsin Department of Natural resources over 40 years ago, and began his groundbreaking work in forest health protection in the mid 1960's. He was promoted to Chief of the Forest Pest Program in the Bureau of Forestry in 1983. He has worked on such forest pests and diseases as dutch elm disease, maple decline, oak wilt, and gypsy moth. His work has led to interagency and international efforts to respond to these threats in a coordinated way. He has served as a guest lecturer on forest health issues both in the United States and Europe. Al has also
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Cooperative Fire Protection (CFP)
The CFP line-item also consists of two programs [State Fire Assistance (SFA) and Volunteer Fire Assistance (VFA)], both extremely vital to the nation's ability to respond quickly and effectively to wildland fires. SFA money helps states build, maintain, equip and train state run wildland fire fighting teams. VFA money provides training and equipment for Volunteer Fire Departments across the country who typically provide first-response and are the first line of defense against wildfire.

Although SFA is slated to receive a nice $3.25 million increase in FY '00 to nearly $25 million, a good portion of that increase has been earmarked for special projects in Kentucky and Alaska. The VFA program saw one of it's largest ever bumps up to a total investment of $3.25 million, but unfortunately does not nearly reflect either the demand for the program ($24 million worth of grant applications last year), or the $36 billion full-time basis value that volunteer fire departments provide.

Cooperative Forestry (CF):
A total of six individual programs make up the CF line-item group. The Forest Stewardship Program, the backbone of the Federal landowner assistance programs, maintained a relatively flat level of $29.43 million, a $600,000 increase. The cost-share compliment to FSP, the Stewardship Incentives Program, was zeroed out for the second straight year. With Congressional support for the SIP at an all-time low, discussions have begun to revamp and modernize the cost-share component that encourages landowners to actively manage their forest lands.

The next two programs, Forest Legacy (Legacy) and the Urban & Community Forestry (U&CF) program, received increases far below expectations for this year. Legacy was initially slated to receive a small $3 million increase over last year, but some last minute budget negotiations at the end of the session led to a substantial increase (over 250%) for the program that seeks to keep a forested working landscape. The Forest Legacy program will be funded at a level of $25 million for FY '00. Unprecedented support for the program outside of traditional forestry circles, particularly from land trust groups, contributed to the large increase.

The program that brings forestry into the majority of American's lives, U&CF program received only a modest increase to $31.3 million with a $500,000 earmark for the upcoming Olympics in Salt Lake City.

The Economic Action Program (EAP) continues to be the legislator’s choice for special earmarking of forestry programs. Eleven earmarks have been identified in the conference report ranging across the country and with some with tenuous relationships to the EAP at best. Overall, the program will break the $20 million level, but vast majority of all of the increase is through earmarking, leaving the base program components at a flat funding level.

The Pacific Northwest Assistance program was funded at $8 million, down from $9 million last year, with $1.5 million earmarked for specific projects in Washington State.

Lastly, NASF initiated a drive for a new line-item under the CF group last year, the Watershed Forestry Initiative. Although the proposed program to assist landowners protect water quality did not receive funding in FY '00, interest and support is growing, and a reinvigorated
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served the Bureau of Forestry by teaching human relations and communications and working on new employee orientation. Prey has helped the Bureau develop a conservation plan for the threatened Karner Blue butterfly in an innovative HCP where the State will hold the HCP permit and assist landowners as well as taking steps to provide butterfly habitat on State-owned and managed lands.

**Current Achievement Awards**

These awards are also given annually to one or more deserving State Foresters, State Forester staff or other individuals. The recipient must have beneficially contributed to NASF and/or State Forestry in general over the course of the past year or two. Four individuals were recognized in Harrisburg.

1. **Susan Ford,** Urban & Community Forestry Coordinator, Region 2, USDA Forest Service

   Susan was recognized for her outstanding efforts as a program leader for Urban and Community Forestry in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, South Dakota, and Wyoming. She has brought tremendous energy to Urban and Community Forestry issues in the region, helping the State Foresters to plan for urban and community issues in their strategic plan and to put urban and community issues into context of the wildland-urban interface. Ford has helped plan and execute three Rockies/Great Plains Community Forestry Conferences, and is extraordinarily active in local tree and forestry issues in her home state of Colorado.

2. **Jim Papero,** Senior Forester, NY State Dept. of Environmental Conservation

   In May of this year, the Adirondack Park Agency unanimously approved the management plan for the 192,685-acre High Peaks Wilderness, culminating a four year effort by Senior Forester Jim Papero. The plan had been under development and considerable debate since the 1970’s, and Papero’s energy and dedication are credited with bringing together diverse groups and finalizing the plan. The wilderness includes seven peaks above 4000 feet in elevation, including Mount Marcy, the State’s highest at 5,344. Papero endured a great deal of controversy in developing the plan, including completing three “major rewrites” in the last six months of the process.

   - **Sharon J. Dolliver,** Chief of Forest Information and Urban & Community Forestry, Georgia Forestry Commission

     Sharon has been actively involved in Urban and Community Forestry in Georgia since 1976, when she served as Urban Forester for Atlanta. After a brief “respite” as a school teacher, Dolliver returned to the Georgia Forestry Commission in 1984 and has served in leadership roles for Urban Forestry and conservation education ever since. At the National level, she has served as a leader in several National Urban Forestry Conferences. In 1994, she was awarded the Urban Forestry Medal by American Forests and the National Urban Forestry Council. In 1999, Doliver received one of only five Gold Star Awards ever presented by Project Learning Tree for her efforts to improve conservation education.

   - **Don Artley,** Montana State Forester

     Artley has served as Chairman of the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) since 1996. NWCG keeps a demanding schedule of meetings and discussions to help ensure that fire fighting tactics, equipment, and training are kept at a high and uniform level for all agencies involved in wildfire fighting. Artley was praised by his colleagues on the NWCG for his “uncommon leadership and integrity… his
Slurry of Forestry Regulation Coming Down the Pipe: Water Quality, Forest Planning and Protection

The Clinton administration is approaching its final year in office with a renewed rule-making push, with three major forestry related regulations published for general comment over the past few months. Two of the proposed regulations are being put forth by the USDA Forest Service and deal with revisions to the National Forest System (NFS) planning regulations and roadless area policy. The other rule deals with water quality and the Environmental Protection Agency’s Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process.

All three rules have far reaching implications for future forest management and will likely influence silvicultural practices in the fifty states and U.S. territories.

Roadless Area Rule
A Notice of Intent was filed by the USDA Forest Service on October 19th (Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 201 pp. 56306-56307) formally announcing to the public the agency’s intention to pursue a protection policy of the remaining roadless areas on NFS lands. It is likely that the protection policy will manifest itself in the cessation of new road construction in the prescribed area. The Forest Service has promised extensive opportunity for public comment, setting up public meetings in each of the affected National Forests that make up the 192 million-acre National Forest System.

Estimates of how much land would be affected by such a rule depend upon the final definition of roadless areas. Estimates range from 40 to 60 million acres, or approximately 21-31% of NFS lands, the vast majority of which lies in the west. Conservative estimates put the acreage of affected timberland at 9 million acres.

The proposal has been greeted with open arms by many in the environmental community, with groups making comparing President Clinton to the 26th President and founder of the National Forests, Teddy Roosevelt. While public meetings hastily called to air the proposals have drawn many enthusiastic supporters, other groups with closer ties to the affected National Forests feel differently. Local communities and timber interests fear a further decline in their economies and way of life. Both the House and Senate have already held Congressional hearings that provided ample opportunity for a critical dissection of the issue and the agency.

For the State Foresters, the proposal raises a number of issues, including access to private or State land in-roadless areas and access for firefighting, not to mention the relationship between the roadless rule and planning rule also being proposed by the agency. More information on NASF’s position can be found in resolution 99-3, available on the NASF website (http://www.stateforesters.org/resolutions/res_99.html). Comments on the proposed policy are due December 20, 1999 (Forest Service news - http://www.fs.fed.us/news/19991013.html, http://www.fs.fed.us/news/19991025.html).

Planning Rule
Finally announced on October 5th (Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 192, pp. 54073-54112), the Forest Service moved forward into the final stages of promulgation on their new NFS planning regulations, which will guide development of new plans on all 192 million acres of National Forest. The proposed planning regulations are based on three years of comprehensive review by the USDA-chartered Committee of Scientists (http://www.cof.orst.edu/org/scicomm/index.htm). The changes call for a stronger planning emphasis on ecological sustainability, with economic and social sustainability, although important considerations, taking a secondary role.

National Forest planning has run into difficulty at many phases over the past twenty-three years since the National Forest Management Act laid the groundwork in 1976, particularly during the imple-
mentation phase. Part of the problem has stemmed from a planning process that many feel has not provided for adequate, meaningful, or timely public participation. Also, the planning process was sometimes poorly coordinated with the impact assessment requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The proposed rule is intended to remedy these problems.

Just about all interested stakeholders agree that revisions need to be made to the planning process, but differences arise on the best course of action. Questions have been raised by Congressional critics about the ability of the agency to redirect its mission through a rulemaking process, while others are criticizing the proposed rules for not setting strict performance standards for management to make the ecological sustainability requirements mandatory. Still others feel that, although there are some good points in the planning regulations, a legislative fix is more in order. The deadline to submit comments is January 4, 2000.

TMDL/NPDES Rule
The EPA has put forth perhaps the most controversial of the three rules highlighted here. On August 23, 1999 (Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 162, pp. 46011-46089) the agency released its long awaited guidelines for its Total Maximum Daily Load process (http://www.epa.gov/owow/tmdl/proprule.html). Coinciding with that release, the EPA decided to revise its National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process, the primary regulatory mechanism used by the agency to control point source water pollution sources. In the NPDES proposed rule, the EPA has proposed to redefine some silvicultural activities from a non-point source to a point source type of pollution, thus enabling federal regulation of forestry.

Although many fear that the rule will dramatically change the way forestry is practiced in the U.S., EPA officials say they will apply the new regulation only on a very limited basis and in very specific situations. EPA estimates put the number of affected landowners at somewhere between 300-600 landowners nationwide at a cost between $3-12 million for implementation across all levels.

Regardless, the proposed rule signals a change and serves as a wake-up call that forestry practices are coming under greater regulatory scrutiny. The State Foresters, many having primary responsibility for silviculture nonpoint source pollution control, have always believed in voluntary, incentive based approaches when addressing the forestry practices of the non-industrial private forest landowner. The State Foresters passed a resolution (99-12) at their recent Annual Meeting in Harrisburg, PA calling the proposed rule scientifically unjustified, highly disproportionate with regard to other land uses, and a radical departure from the historical interpretation and implementation of the Federal Clean Water Act (http://www.stateforesters.org/resolutions/res_99.html#99-12). The comment deadline is January 20, 2000.

What: Public Forum on TMDL Regulations
Where: Manchester, NH
When: December 14th, 1999
Contact: NEIWPCC (978) 323 - 7929
charge Elimination System permitting processes. Virginia State Forester and NASF Water Resources chairman Jim Garner introduced EPA officials who spoke and fielded questions from the State Foresters on the potentially far ranging silvicultural impacts to the non-industrial private forest landowner. A resolution was passed at the meeting outlining the State Forester’s take on the issue (http://www.stateforesters.org/resolutions/res_99.html#99-12).

The water quality session also provided an opportunity to showcase two State Forester driven initiatives; a proposed line-item for fiscal year to assist States and private landowners protect and improve water quality through forestry, and Maryland’s targeting of riparian forest buffer restoration.

Wildfire
This issue session focused on current efforts to better equip the general public to handle wildland fires (http://www.firewise.org) and prepare state and federal entities for quicker and more effective fire disaster response (Fire & Ice: The Roles of State and Federal Forestry Agencies in Disaster Management and Response — http://www.stateforesters.org/reports/Fire&Ice/index.html).

Carbon Sequestration
Moderated by Delaware State Forester and NASF Emerging Issues Chair E. Austin Short, a comprehensive panel broke down the confusing issue of carbon sequestration in three understandable sections for the audience. Richard Birdsey of the Forest Service broke down the science behind trees and their contributions to carbon sequestration. Bill Hohenstein of the EPA provided a summary of the politics as well as the current status of international negotiations over the motivating culprit, the Kyoto Protocol. And finally, representatives from the Environmental Defense Fund and the American Forest & Paper Association laid some of the differing viewpoints on the issue.

Forestland Taxation
Stan Adams, North Carolina State Forester and current NASF President, pooled an impressive team of forestland tax experts to discuss current efforts to encourage better forest management on non-industrial private forest (NIPF) landowners through the tax code. The State Foresters have adopted a policy statement that identifies and breaks out the various tax incentives/reforms beneficial to the NIPF landowner.

The combination of four outstanding field trips, twenty-two vendor displays and five issues sessions led to a highly successful meeting and provided testament to the hard work of the hosts. A hearty thanks is extended to Pennsylvania State Forester Jim Grace and his dedicated staff for a successful, enlightening and fun annual meeting.

**NEXT**

**Annual Meeting - 2000 NASF Annual Meeting**

October 1-5, 2000

Overland Park, Kansas

Contact: Bob Atchison

(785) 532-3310
White Oak (Charter Oak)

The State Tree of Connecticut is deeply rooted in early American history. *Quercus alba*, or white oak, was chosen as the state tree for its role in helping to establish Connecticut as one of the original thirteen colonies. In 1687, King James II of England sought to rein in the troublesome American colonies. When British troops came to Connecticut to retrieve the State's original Charter providing the basis for the State's government, colonists hid the document in the hollow of an at the time half-century old white oak to keep it safe. The significance of all this is that, among the original 13 colonies, only Connecticut maintained self rule up to the American Revolution. That tree became known as the Charter Oak and has been revered ever since.

Rumor has it that the Charter Oak was nearly 800 years old when the tree finally succumbed to a storm in 1856. It would be rare to find a specimen of the slow-growing, long-lived species today older than 600 years. One of the most abundant tree species in North America, white oaks can be found nearly contiguously from the Mississippi River basin eastward. It is one of dominant components of over thirty forest types, mostly thanks to its ability to persist for long periods of time in the understory (intermediate shade tolerance), its ability to respond well after release (recent disturbance), and its great longevity.

The tree itself is very attractive and often used as an ornamental because of its broad round crown and attractive burgundy-red fall coloration. Mature trees typically grow to heights of 100 ft and a diameter breast height of 8 feet! In the open, it is characterized by a short stocky bole with a wide-spreading rugged crown. In the Forest, white oaks develop a tall straight with a compact crown. A deep fibrous root system develops when older. The leaves are very characteristic of oak species with large horns and pink and green wattles that dangle grotesquely from a mouth filled with hideous, razor sharp teeth.

The tree is well known for its strong ability to attract wildlife. The acorns are a valuable, though somewhat inconsistent, food source. More than 180 different kinds of birds and mammals use oak acorns as good; among them are squirrels, numerous birds, deer, turkey, ducks and raccoons. White oak twigs and foliage provide adequate browse for deer populations. White oak wood is typically used as a fuelwood and for naval stores, but the higher quality timber is sought after for its lumber and veneer.

The white oak was adopted as Connecticut's state tree on April 16, 1947. The charter oak appears on the obverse side of the new quarter, part of the United States mints series of quarters for each State.

To learn more about the Grove of State Trees and the National Arboretum visit their website at: [http://www.ars-grin.gov/ars/Beltsville/na/collectn/state.html](http://www.ars-grin.gov/ars/Beltsville/na/collectn/state.html)

Or drop by the Arboretum for a visit:
United States National Arboretum
3501 New York Avenue, NE
Washington, D. C. 20002-1958
Tel: 202-245-2726 Fax: 202-245-4575
State Spotlight:

Idaho Department of Lands -
A Critical Partner in Handling the Douglas-fir Beetle Outbreak

By
Charlene Schildwachter
Legislative & Marketing Specialist
USDA Forest Service, State & Private Forestry

Winston Wiggins
Assistant Director
Forestry and Fire, ID Dept. of Lands

An ad placed in the Spokane, Washington Spokesman-Review on November 22, 1998, stated, “In forests all over north Idaho and eastern Washington, Douglass-fir trees are turning red and dying.” The ad, sponsored by the Idaho Department of Lands, the Idaho Panhandle National Forests, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Washington Department of Natural Resources, described the worst outbreak of Douglas-fir bark beetles in 50 years.

The outbreak was precipitated by snow, ice, and wind damage during the winter of 1996-1997. Fueled by the readily available supply of damaged trees, beetle populations exploded. The Idaho Department of Lands (IDL) and private forest owners were able to harvest several million board feet of dying timber, and treat hundreds of acres of affected land during 1997. At the same time the City of Coeur d’Alene managed a salvage operation on highly visible, and highly prized Tubb’s Hill. Unfortunately, when the Idaho Panhandle National Forests attempted to treat federal land in the area, they were stopped by a court order. By November of 1998, forests in northern Idaho were awash in red. Private lands were threatened. In an effort to control the threat, the Forest Service turned to the Department of Lands.

“Bark beetles don’t respect property lines,” notes Idaho State Forester Stan Hamilton. “They get started on a single land owner, but untreated, they'll spread indiscriminately. It's like a wildfire, only slower moving. Unchecked, a bark beetle epidemic, such as the one we've experienced, leaves a landscape of dead trees which are then susceptible to further devastation of an actual wildfire.”

“We knew this was going to be a front page issue,” says Bill Love, Forestry Assistance Bureau Chief for the Department of Lands in Coeur d’Alene. “We had two choices - let the Forest Service deal with it on their own, or seize the opportunity to talk to constituents as we’ve never been able to before.”

IDL sponsored four public meetings in partnership with the University of Idaho Cooperative Extension Service, the Forest Service, and the Idaho Forest Landowners Association. The strategy was effective in educating concerned
State Spotlight:

South Carolina Singled Out as National Model - Non-Regulatory Nonpoint Source Water Quality Programs Work

States have been working to reduce nonpoint source water pollution for many decades now. Some have adopted a regulatory approach, while others have gone with voluntary, incentive based approaches. In regards to silviculture, the State Foresters have long emphasized the use of voluntary, incentive based methods as the most appealing approach for the non-industrial private forest landowners who own the majority of forestland in the country.

The Environmental Protection Agency’s recent proposed Total Maximum Daily Load/National Pollution Discharge Elimination System rules have reinvigorated the debate over the best method. The agency is proposing to redefine silvicultural practices as point sources of water pollution, thus enabling the application of the regulatory NPDES permit. The fact of the matter is that significant improvements have been made and are continually being made to forestry nonpoint source (NPS) pollution prevention strategies. In 1982, forty states reported localized pollution problems from silviculture (primarily sedimentation), while in 1996 only 24 states reported the same problem. Many feel that the new EPA regulations are unnecessary, burdensome and will very unlikely improve the water quality concerns they set out to rectify in the first place.

South Carolina’s Voluntary Approach

One of the best examples of what states are doing to proactively reduce nonpoint source pollution associated with forestry operations is the ForestryCourtesy Exam Program of the South Carolina Forestry Commission. The Commerce Department’s National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has singled out the early warning program for recognition.

The Forestry Commission’s Best Management Practices foresters carry out the three essential components of the program; 1) routine aerial surveys of harvesting operations statewide, 2) on-site courtesy exams, 3) published reports of compliance with exam recommendations. The purpose of the program is to spot potential problems early in the process and make recommendations on site, thus encouraging cooperation and preventing source of pollution before they occur.

The program has proven highly successful. Data show that general compliance with harvesting guidelines has increased from an already high 84% in 1989 to 92% in the most recent survey. Compliance with reforestation guidelines has increased from 86% to 98%. And on sites where foresters have conducted courtesy exams, compliance is 99%.

In a letter to the South Carolina Department of health and Environmental Control Office of Coastal Resource Management, NOAA congratulates the agency on programs advancing the control of polluted runoff in South Carolina and cites the Forestry Commission’s courtesy exam program as a national model. “We have used the information your staff provided on your efforts with the South Carolina Forestry Com-

(SC Water Quality, page 16)
Idaho Beetles: Getting the Public Engaged, from page 12

non-industrial private landowners to the threat of Douglas-fir Bark Beetles and the treatments available. More than 500 people attended the meetings – over 300 in Coeur d’Alene alone.

More than 20 articles in the local and regional newspapers along with radio and TV ads helped keep landowners informed of the status of the epidemic, and the efforts to arrest it. “Sometimes it takes a crisis to get people’s attention,” says Love. “Well, we had their attention. It was a teachable moment. Our involvement offered a unique opportunity to speak with concerned and interested non-industrial private landowners.”

As a direct result of this information and education effort, Forest Health specialists from the Forest Service and the Department of Lands provided presentations to more than 50 community and civic organizations and on-the-ground assistance to more than 100 landowners. Pathologists and entomologists from the two agencies conducted five congressional field trips and provide critical scientific support assessing the problem and detailing the likely impacts of alternative responses.

“State and Private Forestry Program resources provided $46,900 to purchase and apply pheromone (MCH) treatment on non-industrial forest lands,” says Bill Boettcher, Director of State & Private Forestry for Regions 1 and 4 of the Forest Service. “Our Forest health specialists worked with state specialists to develop criteria to identify the private lands most at risk. They were instrumental in acquiring an experimental use permit allowing the use of the pheromone, which at the time was not registered by the Environmental Protection Agency.” Shortly after the treatment was completed, more than a decade of effort paid off with the certification of MCH for operational use. Senator Craig of Idaho was instrumental in completing the certification.

“This beetle attack is a symptom of a larger problem,” says Dave Wright, Supervisor of the Idaho Panhandle National Forests. “Our forests are out of balance. This epidemic provides us the opportunity to look at restoring those systems with a variety of management tools. Part of our proposed action includes planting over 1.7 million trees using historically resilient species like western white pine, larch, and ponderosa pine.”

Stan Hamilton agrees. “This was a classic example of cooperation between state and federal agencies and private landowners, to address a critical forest health problem.”
The Farm Bill, the piece of federal legislation authorizing most forestry and conservation programs at the federal level, is due for reauthorization in 2002. As a first step toward that reauthorization, the Department of Agriculture (USDA) held a series of five forums focusing on conservation issues affecting the nation’s forest, farm and ranch lands in October.

Held in five strategically chosen states, California, Colorado, Georgia, Oregon and New York, the forums were to provide an opportunity for landowners and stakeholders to participate in an open dialogue to identify numerous conservation issues and policy considerations. A total of 975 individuals attended the series, contributing 200 public statements. Of the 975, 115 persons represented Federal, State, or local elected officials.

Forestry issues garnered a good portion of the spotlight. With representatives like Fred Allen, Georgia State Forester, in attendance (see sidebar), present and future challenges facing forestry were laid out and identified.

- Forestland taxation relief in the form of a variety of tax credits/reductions — capital gains reductions, estate tax reductions, conservation credits and exemptions.
- Added assistance for conservation practices through cost-share programs such as the Stewardship Incentives Program and the Forestry Incentives Program.
- Increasing conversion of forestland to non-forest uses.
- Worsening forest health concerns that threaten the productivity and well being of the economy and the land.

Other issues raised throughout the series included landowner outreach, stewardship payments, conservation delivery/partnerships, resource protection, urban conservation, and private property rights.

A final conservation summit, where commonalties from all five forums will be brought together, is scheduled for December 7, 1999 in Des Moines, Iowa.

Georgia State Forester Fred Allen attended the Georgia regional conservation forum in Atlanta on October 27th to provide a southern perspective on the future forestry and non-industrial private forest (NIPF) landowner challenges. He primarily emphasized the economics and fragmentation pressures behind forestry on non-industrial lands, sustainability, and need for greater research and outreach. Excerpts from his written testimony are summarized below:

“The thirteen southern states have more than 200 million acres of forestland, of which nearly 70% is owned by the NIPF landowner. The South’s forest products manufacturing firms directly employ 660,000 individuals and indirectly creates 1.7 million jobs.”

“With an average tract size of 38 acres, the challenge for non-industrial landowners and for society at
large is how to work for a sustainable forest and yet work to supply the increasing demand for forest products.”

“At a time when the demand for forest products is increasing, the non-industrial landowner will be placed in a role of increased production and/or to shift lumber production offshore.”

“Without sufficient inducements to offset the costs associated with timber growing, landowners may choose to shift their land resources into other uses away from forestry and all the benefits derived from our forest.”

“Commodity and non-commodity values of the forest can be produced simultaneously.”

“The continued sustainability of all components of the forest is predicated upon the good health of existing and future forest stands.”

“Effective linkages between federal agencies, state agencies and researchers with the private forest landowner have never been more important given the implications of a global economy and the need for healthy environments. Outreach to landowners and the resources necessary to do so need to be increased.”

mission as a model for other states.” Currently, forestry activities are responsible for only 4 percent of the NPS pollution in South Carolina and that number is declining, proving that non-regulatory NPS programs work.

“We decided to do something proactive, not reactive, to prevent problems before they occur,” says Tim Adams, the Forestry Commission’s Director of Field Operations Support. “Some believe that non-regulatory programs won’t work. Our data show that they do.”

The NASF is currently conducting our regular and periodic review of state forestry best management practices. If current trends continue, the final report, due out summer of 2000, will show increasing progress in NPS pollution reductions from forestry operations.
Forestry Announcements

Canada Lynx Listing Postponed

A Heads Up: The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service has postponed the decision whether to list the Canada lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act until January 8, 2000. The final decision, pending the review of a recent USDA Forest Service report, has potentially have far reaching impacts on forestry operations in northern tier states from the Pacific Northwest to the Lake State to New England. Timber harvesting has been identified as a “predominant land use affecting lynx habitat.” At this point the decision is solely in the hands of the Fish & Wildlife Service.

Riparian Forest Guidelines for Landowners & Loggers

A handy new guideline handbook has been released with appeal to forest landowners and covering vital aspects of riparian forest management for wildlife. With chapters describing the importance of streamside management zones, dead wood habitat, and forest birds, fish and other wildlife, the publication provides principles and guidelines useful to anyone interested in riparian forests. This 30-page publication was developed in cooperation with the non-profit Forest Stewardship Foundation and is being distributed by the Montana State University Extension Service. To order a copy of this publication, contact the Montana State University Extension Publications office at (406) 994-3273.

Market Investment in Sustainable Forestry

A new report on sustainable forestry market investment has been released by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation in conjunction with The Pacific Forest Trust and Forest Trends. The report, *Opportunities for Investment: Capital Markets and Sustainable Forestry*, lays out an investment strategy to catalyze interest in the sustainable forestry sector with appeal to corporations, businesses, public agencies and individuals. With the burgeoning interest in public/private partnerships for forestland acquisition, which some State Forestry agencies have been involved in, the report provides a nice explanation of capital markets and motivations for investment in sustainable forestry. Copies of the report can be obtained by contacting the MacArthur Foundation at (202) 530-2020.

Website Spotlight: Wildland/Urban Interface

In order to better help landowners gauge the wildland fire risk to their homes, a website (http://www.firewise.org) has been designed and sponsored by the leading government and non-profit wildland firefighting entities in the country; USDA Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Fish & Wildlife Service, National Fire Protection Association and the National Association of State Foresters. It invites homeowners to gauge their risk of wildland fire by answering questions about construction, home placement and surrounding landscape. The site also offers tips to improve fire response, news on wildland/urban interface fire-related scenarios, and educational opportunities.
effort will surface again for FY ’01.

Forest Inventory & Analysis
Getting the Forest Inventory & Analysis program fully funded and implemented has been a priority of the State Foresters for more than two decades and it appears that significant progress has been made in FY ’00. Good management decisions cannot be made without timely and accurate inventory and monitoring information. With the help of a House Agriculture Subcommittee on Forests hearing on the issue back earlier this year to focus support, an increase of $5.25 million will be provided. These resources will greatly help the Forest Service and State Foresters meet the legislatively mandated inventory cycles established under the 1998 Farm Bill Research Title.

Agriculture Appropriations Bill
Besides the FSP and SIP, there is one other primary landowner assistance program, the Forestry Incentives Program (FIP). The FIP is jointly administered by the USDA Forest Service and the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, and implemented at the ground level by the State Foresters. This program is primarily a cost-share program, but unlike the SIP, monies are directed at assisting NIPF landowners defray the costs of making long-term investments in tree planting, forest stand improvement, and site preparation for timber operations.

The FIP, very popular in the southern states, will stay flat for fiscal year 2000 at $6.325 million. At first glance, this looks to be a decrease from last year’s level of $16.325 million, but $10 million of last year’s appropriation was marked as emergency spending in response to terrible drought conditions in 1998 that resulted in tree planting failures across much of the south.

Overall, the priority programs of the State Foresters fared quite well through the fiscal year 2000 appropriations process (refer to Table 1 for summary info). Numbers were not quite as high as NASF would have liked, but support for basic S&PF programs does appear to be growing in Congress right now. NASF will continue to work hard to ensure that forests are protected from fire, insects and disease and that forest landowners get the assistance they need.

Awards
encouragement of non-traditional approaches has fostered innovations which have lead to remarkable successes.” Artley, who has been with the Montana Division of Forestry since 1977, was named State Forester in 1992. He has been an active participant in NASF issues, including serving on the NASF Fire Committee.

Franklin Awards
Developed by the Fire & Aviation Management group under the State & Private Forestry branch of the Forest Service, four awards were given out to recognize different State programs in the battle against wildland fire. The four awards were shared by two agencies this inaugural year.

- Director’s Award - (top honor) - TX Forest Service (Jim Hull)
- Volunteer Fire Assistance - Arkansas Forestry Commission (John Shannon)
- State Fire Assistance - Texas Forest Service (Jim Hull)
- Federal Excess Personal Property - Arkansas Forestry Commission (John Shannon)
~ People on the Move ~

Robert Krepps Named New Missouri State Forester

Announced the first week in November, Robert (Bob) Krepps has been hired as the new State Forester of Missouri. He replaced Mike Hoffman who had filled the acting Forestry Division Administrator role since Marvin Brown departed in early September. Previously, Bob served as the program coordinator for the Department’s Urban & Community Forestry program. Prior to his arrival at the Missouri Department of Conservation, Bob worked for the USDA Forest Service for thirty-one years, most recently on the Kootenai National Forest in Montana as the Public Affairs/Planning Staff officer where he honed his communications skills. He brings a strong background in community/constituent relations to the position. Welcome aboard Bob!

New S&PF Associate Deputy Chief

Robin Thompson was named Associate Deputy Chief for the State and Private Forestry branch of the Forest Service on November 18th. The news announcing her official transition from the acting position is welcomed by the State Foresters, who have developed a strong working relationship with her over the past year. She brings an impressive background in budget matters from within the Forest Service. She has served the Forest Service for over twenty years holding the position of Director of Program Development and Budget in both the Washington office and region five, the Pacific Southwest. Thompson, and her husband, Clyde, the Deputy Chief for Business Operations for the agency, have a daughter, Ashley, who is ten years old. Thompson has a business administration degree from Marquette University.

The words of Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck sum up her appointment best, “Robin is a problem solver and coalition builder. She is a leader who consistently makes tough decisions required” of her job. The State Foresters are glad to have such a committed and capable person on the job.

Gordon Stuart to Lead NASF Water Report Task Force

Gordon Stuart, USDA Forest Service retiree, will once again lead the latest iteration of the NASF State Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Programs for Silviculture Survey is underway. The periodic progress report details the current status and effectiveness of forestry Best Management Practices implementation by State Forestry agencies across the country. Stuart, of Westbrook, Maine, has a Bachelor’s degree in forestry from the University of Maine (1960), a Master’s degree in forested watersheds from Pennsylvania State University (1962) and another Master’s degree in Forest Economics from Michigan State University (1983). He brings an extensive background in water programs that he gained while serving as a hydrologist on various National Forests in Kentucky, West Virginia, Wisconsin and New Hampshire. His experiences continued when he became the Regional Hydrologist for the east and moved into the Forest Service Washington office where he provided technical expertise and worked on water budget issues. The survey questionnaire is tentatively scheduled to be sent out in January 2000, with the final report due by the end of June 2000.
NASF Calendar

NASF Executive Committee
December 7-8, 1999 - Washington, DC
Contact: Stan Adams (NC), (919) 733-2162, ext. 202

Western Council of State Foresters
May 14-18, 2000 - Seattle, Washington
Contact: Jodi Luedecker, (360) 902-1324

Southern Group of State Foresters
June 4-7, 2000 - Macon, Georgia
Contact: Bob Lazenby, (912) 751-3480

Northeastern Area Association of State Foresters
July 15-18, 2000- Green Bay, Wisconsin
Contact: Gene Francisco, (608) 266-2694

2000 NASF Annual Meeting
October 1-5, 2000 - Overland Park, Kansas
Contact: Bob Atchison, (785) 532-3310

Publication and production of the Washington Update is supported by contributions from the National Association of State Foresters Foundation. For more information, contact Foundation President Gary Hergenrader at (402) 472-2944