



## Missouri Forest Resources Advisory Council Meeting

Conservation Employees' Credit Union, Jefferson City, MO

June 23, 2011

10:00 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

### MINUTES

**Welcome, Introductions, and Housekeeping** – Wayne Lovelace welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made. The following members were in attendance:

Lisa Allen, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Bob Ball, Mo. Forest and Woodland Assoc. of Missouri  
Anastasia Becker, Mo. Dept. of Agriculture  
Scott Brundage, The Walnut Council  
Martha Clark, Mo. Community Forestry Council  
Nate Goodrich, Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Steve Jarvis, Mo. Forest Products Assoc.  
Shelby Jones, Mo. Consulting Foresters Assoc.  
Ed Keyser, Conservation Federation of Mo.  
Harlan Palm, The Walnut Council

Clayton Lee, Tree Farm Committee  
Wayne Lovelace, Mo. Nurseryman's Assoc.  
Dave Murphy, Conservation Federation of Mo.  
Steven Thurman, US Army, Ft. Leonard Wood  
Jerry Van Sambeek, USFS Northern Research Station  
David Whittekiend, USFS Mark Twain Nat'l Forest  
Richard Stricklin, Top of the Ozarks RC&D  
Robert Stout, Dept. of Natural Resources  
Peter Becker, Eastern Ozarks Forestry Council

Others in attendance:

Bob DeWitt, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Hank Dorst, Mark Twain Forest Watchers  
John Fleming, Consulting Forester  
Justine Gartner, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Stuart Miller, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Phelps Murdock, Mo. Conservation & Environmental Alliance  
Mike Hoffmann, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
John Tuttle, Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Tammy Homfeldt, Mo. Forest Products Assoc.

**Minutes Read and Approved** – Wayne asked if anyone had changes to the March 10, 2011 meeting minutes. No changes were noted. A motion was made by Scott Brundage to accept the minutes as written; seconded by Ed Keyser, and the minutes were approved as written.

### Old Business

**Bylaws Revision** – Wayne Lovelace & Martha Clark reported we need to look at the bylaws for clarification on the way we can accept members and how they participate. Martha noted that according to bylaws, new organizations must submit a formal letter. We haven't received a formal letter from the following: Missouri Nut Growers Association, Missouri Show Me Chapter of the Soil and Water Conservation Society, Forest and Woodland Association of Missouri, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Missouri Association of Resource Conservation and Development Councils. She asked if anyone had received any of those and no one had. She noted that according to the bylaws, we can't vote on accepting them without this letter. Martha suggested that instead of naming members in the bylaws, list them in an appendix instead so it doesn't take a bylaw change to remove or add members. Dave Murphy noted it has become more complicated than the original intent. He asked how did the membership list begin - did we invite them? Mike Hoffmann noted he was part of developing the group that would eventually become MoFRAC. At development, MDC took lists of different organization and associations that we typically dealt with and invited them to an organizational meeting.

Robert Stout asked when committee was established, was intent to include all organizations that would be interested vs. individuals? Mike noted that the intent was to include representative from organizations. Robert said that it seems that if there is an interest expressed by an organization, whether email or in writing, it should be acceptable. Wayne agreed. Scott made a motion to accept the Missouri Nut Growers and the Forest and Woodland Association of Missouri. Dave Murphy amended the motion to include that we allow five organizations to participate if they choose to, and list them all. Martha noted it will be a revision to the bylaws at this time, but she will bring back a proposed revision to allow listing of member organizations as an appendix for future organizational members. Harlan Palm seconded the motion. With none opposed, the motion was approved.

**Role of MoFRAC** - Bob Ball noted the Council's discussion at recent meetings and ultimate support of the "BMP Biomass Resolution" and our comments to MDNR on the "Renewable Energy Standards Rule" raised a question internally as to the role of MoFRAC in reaching out to legislators, elected officials, and agency staff to influence outcomes. The council officers felt a discussion with the members is warranted to ensure we're all on the same page, now and in the future, about engaging in such activities. It's important to keep in mind that MoFRAC is not constrained by the definition of lobbying to preserve a 501(c)(3)'s non-profit status. Specifically, we are not a 501(c)(3) organization. From an organizational standpoint, MoFRAC is *not* a non-profit organization in any sense that would restrict our lobbying activities. Technically, MoFRAC was lobbying when we sent a letter to two state legislators because we expressed a view about specific legislation. In essence, we serve as "legislative liaisons" when we express viewpoints to legislators.

Although it would seem that expressing viewpoints on proposed legislation is not the same as trying to influence rulemakings and the promulgation of regulations, executive orders, litigation, or attempts to alter the enforcement of existing laws, the best time to influence a political outcome is in the initial drafting of the legislation. From the IRS standpoint, commenting on rule making is considered less noteworthy than commenting on legislation because law making preceded and dictated the extent of rulemaking.

We know at least one of our members is prohibited from pursuing any action beyond influencing the language in proposed legislation. Using our recent position on the Renewable Energy Standards Rule as an example, MoFRAC's opportunity to influence the need for sustainable wood harvest practices was limited to impacting the legislation and the possible need for specific rules.

Council Purpose and Function - from our By-Laws:

*Purpose:* "MoFRAC exists to facilitate communication among all who are interested in Missouri's forests to assure long-term forest health, productivity and sustainability."

*Functions:*

- The MoFRAC will serve as a sounding board or in an advisory capacity to agencies and organizations regarding forestry issues (e.g., *forestry policies, programs, operations, health, plans, or legislation*).
- The MoFRAC members will represent and express the full range of forest benefits and challenges, creating a proactive and productive forum for understanding and addressing forestry issues.
- The MoFRAC may support or sponsor workshops, meetings, tours, conferences or similar functions to promote awareness of forests and forestry issues.
- The MoFRAC may conduct fact-finding research, including surveys of members, landowners, the public or others to gather information and opinions related to forestry issues in Missouri.

**Question #1:** Do our existing by-laws permit us to influence outcomes? The first listed function is to 'serve in an advisory capacity'. Policies and legislation are named as examples of forestry issues on which MoFRAC could advise. Advice means making a recommendation regarding a decision or a course of conduct and therefore goes beyond merely listing choices. Simply gathering information and talking to one another during our meetings versus suggesting a course of action to decision makers like legislators and institutional leaders apparently complies with the *intent* of our by-laws. The phrase "will serve" clearly expresses an intended action.

We have considerable expertise and many years of experience assembled in MoFRAC. Should our goal be to actively elevate our profile so that legislators and others seek out and respect our advice for the betterment of our forest resources?

Question #2: Does a role of "suggesting a course of action to decision makers" present any problems or challenges to our members? Do we have any issues? If so, can those issues be resolved? Are you comfortable in using our stationary to express our views when your organization or agency name is listed? The state agency representatives (Lisa Allen, Robert Stout, and Anastasia Becker) stated they are clearly restricted from lobbying – each department has their legislative liaisons and they have to go through them. Dave Whittekiend noted that if the group decides to take a position on the federal level, he cannot represent that to congress. At a state level it's a little less restrictive.

Statement: If we can agree as a body that MoFRAC can influence outcomes in accordance with our by-laws, then we can proceed following courses of action similar to our resolution on biomass and our advisory approach to legislators and state and federal agencies.

During the meeting there seemed to be consensus that a legislative body falls within the definition of "organizations". Therefore, no change in the by-laws would be needed in reaching out to legislators. There is no question that preparing and distributing public information pieces to legislators and others is within the role of MoFRAC. There seemed to be consensus that responding to requests for information from legislators should, in most cases, be OK; however, the Missouri Ethics Commission regulates lobbying activity from state agencies and organizations and any outreach on our part could fall under their oversight.

MoFRAC Letterhead – Martha added that partner organizations are listed on the sidebar of our letterhead and asked if the group wanted to continue listing them? Richard Stricklin added that there is value in our members being listed on the letterhead, adding that when we are contacting legislators and other VIPs using our stationary, having the list of members clearly illustrates our partnerships and influence in forest resources of Missouri. Scott noted we have a brochure that could be updated and inserted into each letter, and the brochure describes who we are in more detail. Peter Becker suggested removing names from letterhead and using the brochure as described. Jerry Van Sambeek moved that we remove the names from letterhead and add a note at bottom that states our mission, views expressed, etc. Scott seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

Official MoFRAC Website & Logo – Bob Ball noted we currently have two MoFRAC websites – one at the Conservation Federation's site and a stand-alone site at [www.mofrac.org](http://www.mofrac.org). The group agreed we need only one website. Bob noted that if we choose our own stand-alone site, we will need a webmaster and there may be some operational costs involved. Peter Becker proposed CFM delete the MoFRAC pages on the CFM website and instead provide a link to mofrac.org. He added that all the files at the CFM site have been moved to new site. Scott made a motion to have one website, [www.mofrac.org](http://www.mofrac.org), and Peter will be webmaster. The motion was seconded by Martha, and unanimously approved.

Bob noted that we also need to vote on logo as shown on the MoFRAC brochure. A motion was made by Bob Ball to accept the existing logo. It was seconded by Dave Murphy, and unanimously approved.

Proposals on Supplying Biomass for MU Power Plant - Peter Becker worked with Hank to develop language for the RFP and distributed a handout. He reported it started with definitions of non-forest derived residues and forest derived residues. Item #6 specifies that forest derived residues processed offsite and not meeting the above criteria for non-forest derived residues are still considered forest derived residues. Also specifies criteria for acceptance of biomass derived from conversion of land use. Peter noted that MU took a critical leadership role to set these definitions. Once they knew about interest in sustainability standards, they understood the motivation. MU administration has agreed that BMPs will be required with the language being included in the contract. Peter reported bids were opened June 2<sup>nd</sup>, decision on July 29<sup>th</sup>.

## New Business

### Fire Risk Presentation Updates

USFS - Dave Whittekiend (USFS) reported that everyone is aware of the May 8, 2009, wind where approximately 113,000 acres were damaged. This has changed fuel conditions. Late in August last year, they had a fire in an area damaged by the storm that burned over 2 days. Fuel conditions and fire behavior were different, and it caused them to question some of the tactics we use, how we approach fire in blowdown areas. On another fire, they had a spot fire in a drainage that moved up with the wind and had large flame lengths. The fire moved quickly and released a lot of heat. They had to put sawyers ahead of dozers which is very inefficient and takes 2 times longer to construct the line. They are more closely monitoring fuel moistures - set out moisture sticks and also doing probes. As things get drier, it changes the way they will attack fires. Working around structures is also a concern – takes longer and puts fire fighters and homes at risk. Had some bad conditions this spring, and they brought in Type II team. Team developed strategies to approach. Incident Command is doing more size of fires, with a confine-and-contain approach. Managers are looking at maintaining fire lines, salvage and other opportunities to reduce fuel. Still have more sales to go – will get more aggressive on fuel reduction.

MDC - Mike Hoffmann reported that as we know, 83% of forest land is private owned in Missouri. USFS is more open to working “all lands” approach. MDC works closely with them and the National Park Service, and Ozark and Southwest Regions had pre-fire season meetings in their areas to address needs. In the Ozarks, the first change in fuel load followed the 2007 ice storm and fuel loads have increased from there. Dozers are in high demand. We have 13 remote automated weather stations (RAWS) that help us plan staffing and equipment levels. Fires are requiring more mop up and follow up work. Rural fire departments (RFDs) don’t have the heavy equipment it takes, so we are working closely with them. Marty Calvert, MDC forester in Marble Hill, put together maps for his area and met with local RFDs to plan attack for fires.

We are establishing a Prescribed Fire Council in Missouri and getting it moving. We had our first ten Firewise Communities certified, all within the Reddings Mill Fire Protection District in southwest Missouri. He also noted that a portion of the USFS Secure Rural School’s funding has to go to fire mitigation. Several billboards are posted on Hwy 44 about Firewise and fire prevention. We also have the Rural Forest Fire Equipment Center in Lebanon where we have two federal programs – Federal Excess Personal Property and the Fire Property programs. We provide equipment and vehicles for RFDs to build their capacity.

Peter asked about outreach and education activities in these areas. David noted they can provide news releases, but the newspapers choose what they will print. Mike noted MDC has provided defensible space brochures to be inserted in local papers. Lisa Allen agreed that more outreach needs to be done, adding that MDC has recently signed an agreement with the Top of the Ozarks RC&D for a communications specialist and hopes they can increase our outreach efforts.

**Missouri Conservation and Environmental Alliance** – Phelps Murdock joined the meeting and thanked everyone for the opportunity to attend. He noted he has been working on environmental issues for many years. He helped organize the recycling program in Kansas City. He also was chair of Bridging the Gap (BTG) for several years. He helped form the Heartland Tree Alliance and worked with Helene Miller, MDC Urban Forester in Kansas City.

He’s Vice Chair of Missouri Votes Conservation (MVC), a bi-partisan statewide organization that works to pass strong environmental laws and elect pro-conservation candidates in Missouri. MVC is affiliated with the League of Conservation Voters, a widely respected national organization that advocates for the environment through political channels. MVC has two arms – one is 501c4 can work on legislation; other side is 501c3 education fund. They will be doing more outreach to major markets to educate and put on interesting programs to teach issues. On political side, Missouri Votes Conservation encourages the right people to run for office. Other job is to encourage the proper submitting of policies for legislature.

Current members of the Missouri Conservation and Environmental Alliance (MCEA) include Audubon Missouri, Conservation Federation of Missouri, Missouri Parks Association, Sierra Club of Missouri, and the Green Building Council to name a few. They have hired a lobbyist. They have over 130,000 participating members in these partner organizations. They recognize the need for a more tiered level of membership. Right now it's \$3,500 each to participate, and smaller groups just can't do that. Hope to build a structure with different levels.

The MCEA is a coalition of diverse conservation and environmental organizations in Missouri. Their representatives meet regularly to coordinate their legislative priorities, to educate state legislators about issues of common concern that are impacting Missouri's environment, and to fund common lobbying efforts in Jefferson City. MVC founded the Alliance in 2007 to increase the effectiveness of the conservation community in the state. MCEA has become a powerful force in helping pass conservation legislation in Missouri.

Hope that MoFRAC will consider, as an organization, to participate at whatever level you can. For more information, visit [www.movotesconservation.org](http://www.movotesconservation.org).

**MoFRAC Position on Using Biomass for Energy** - Peter Becker noted that in the process of talking with folks, the point was made that there wasn't a clear understanding of what renewable energy credits are about. He gave a PowerPoint presentation on Why RECs Should Be Tied to Efficiency:

Straight from the Horse's Mouth

- The concept that there is plenty of 'wood waste' available to burn is not in line with reality.
- Standing timber is one of our nation's greatest resources and deserves to be respected as such.  
*Scott Hasekamp, General Manager, Missouri Mulch (Quoted in Waste Handling Equipment News 12/10)*

Road Map

- Renewable Energy Credits (RECs)
  - What they are
  - How they work
- Wood to Energy
  - Conversion efficiencies
  - Emissions
- Precedents for linkage
- Renewable Energy Credit (REC)
  - "a traceable certificate of proof that one megawatt-hour of electricity has been generated from one or more renewable energy resources" (HB613 definition)
  - Environmental "currency"
    - Has unique serial number to avoid double counting
    - Is valid in specific territory
    - Has real value – can be bought, sold, and traded
- How REC's work:
  - Certified, renewable power plants create RECs based on measured amount of electricity delivered to grid
  - RECs sold to or retained by utilities, separately from power
  - Utilities compelled by State to buy/hold RECs for certain percentage of annual electricity sales
  - "Fine" for non-compliance typically exceeds prevailing REC market price
  - Incentivize carbon-neutral, renewable energy by providing a production subsidy to electricity generated from renewable sources
- REC Represents
  - Environmental attributes
    - Renewable, sustainable energy
    - Reduced greenhouse gas emissions

- Tangible financial benefit, so,
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission requires utility to include these proceeds when passing costs of renewable energy to customers
- Subsidies and incentives for 20 MW biomass power plant
  - RECs: \$2-4 million/year
  - Energy Production Tax Credit: \$2 million/year
  - Investment Tax Credit: \$20-50 million of development costs reimbursed (in lieu of former)
  - Exemption from Carbon Allowances: \$5 million/year (not currently applicable in Mo.)
  - BCAP Fuel Subsidies: \$8 million/year (funding uncertain)
  - Mo. Wood Energy Production Credit: \$2 million/year
- Why is it important to support appropriate type of energy production from small wood?
  - Wood to Energy conversion efficiency varies with technology: Electric = 25% efficiency; Combined Heat & Power = 50% efficiency; Thermal = 75% efficiency. Efficiency = output/input.
- Wood emits more greenhouse gasses per electrical unit than fossil fuels: Natural gas = 1,200 CO<sub>2</sub> (lb/MWH); Coal = 2,200 CO<sub>2</sub> (lb/MWH); Wood = 2,900 CO<sub>2</sub> (lb/MWH).
- Carbon is not absorbed instantly. Atmospheric lifetime of CO<sub>2</sub> is 100++ years.
- Carbon is not absorbed instantly.
  - Excess emissions from smallwood create carbon debt
  - Regrowth of harvested forest removes atmospheric carbon over decades
  - Eventually, atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is reduced compared with fossil fuels
  - 3+ decades to erase carbon debt cf. coal-to-electric
  - Timeline of absorption matters!
- Not all RECs are created equal
  - New Hampshire has four REC classes
    - Class I held to higher emission standards
    - Required percentage of Class I increases annually
    - In-lieu-of payments for Class I higher
  - Massachusetts awards RECs according to overall efficiency of biomass energy production
    - ≥60% gets full credit
    - <40% gets no credit
    - 40-59% gets partial credit, prorated from 0.5 REC
    - 2.1 Council on Sustainable Biomass Production Standard for bioenergy greenhouse gas emissions
      1. It is generally agreed that cellulosic biofuels and biopower should, considered over the whole life cycle, reduce greenhouse gas emissions relative to fossil-based energy.

Peter noted that with this in mind, leads to the next discussion....

**Proposed Additions to MoFRAC Biomass Resolution** – Peter distributed a handout that included information discussed at previous MoFRAC meetings on the biomass BMP resolution consideration and MoFRAC’s endorsement of the biomass BMP manual. He noted that his proposed additions to the resolution, 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.

Wayne asked for input on how to approach these changes. Robert Stout noted the whole issue of efficiency is an important point, and is in keeping with intent of original proposition. This is something that he’s asked his staff to look at carefully and whether we can propose language/amendment to current language. The Public Service Commission has regulatory authority; DNR’s mandate goes to certifying fuels and source of feed stocks. He proposed we table that discussion for the next meeting. All were in favor. Peter asked if anyone had a question or comment at this time so he could bring information on that point to the next meeting. Wayne noted it will be placed on the next meeting agenda.

Dave Murphy asked if we should consider the master logger certification addition as it's a separate issue. Scott made a motion to accept the proposed addition, and Dave seconded the motion. Lisa expressed concern that we only have 8 master loggers now, but agreed that it would be a good catalyst to make folks become Master Loggers. Shelby noted that from the consulting forester's standpoint, he does not consider it to be practical with only 8 master loggers in existence now. Master Logger is a significant investment of time and money for loggers, so growth is very slow. Scott said this is a recommendation on a goal on what we think is appropriate and we favor this type of goal. Steve Jarvis noted MFPA would support it. The motion was then approved.

## **Program/Committee Reports**

**Woody Biomass Coordinating Committee** – Robert Stout reported he was given the task to review what other states with a similar regulatory environment do. Some exceptions (like Massachusetts) have stronger regulatory presence. He distributed a handout that summarizes programs of some other states – WI, VA, MN, and AR. He noted that in most states, regulators don't put together mandatory programs. What our state agencies (Ag, DNR, MDC) can do is to establish clear expectations of best practices and develop a set of standards and guidelines and ensure they are applied. Lisa will develop a *best practices fact sheet for biomass facilities* that clearly identifies all the issues and points to those BMPs. This fact sheet will incorporate all our values into the process.

Scott noted that it's been years since we've had the Missouri Department of Economic Development participate as part of this group. It would be nice to have their input. Robert noted that he has not had discussions with them, but he will try to make contact. John Tuttle added that their role is creating jobs and getting people into the state. Lisa agreed there would be some value for their logo on the publication. We should try to engage them.

**Third Party BMP Verification Committee** – Scott Brundage noted the committee met on May 11<sup>th</sup> at MFPA. Those at the meeting were Steve Jarvis, Hank Stelzer, John Tuttle, Tony Stafford, Josh Stevens, Shelby Jones, and Scott Brundage. One of the items discussed was the fact that we need enough certified foresters to handle verification, and the many entities who may be involved. Some will not pay attention to the guidelines, BMPS - all is on voluntary basis. Need to continue to pursue direction to set stage to get this done in a sustainable proper manner on a voluntary basis, and train third party verifiers. Verifiers need to be trained/certified. They developed a subcommittee made of Jarvis, Tuttle, Stelzer, to come up with a proposal. Ed asked for clarification on who would be certified. Scott noted it would be a professional (SAF certified) forester - you have to have 3 years experience to be certified.

Scott asked all to look at the audit form and send suggestions to him. Peter asked Scott to send the documents on email so folks can share with their contacts.

**Legislative Update** – Dave Murphy – session ended May 13<sup>th</sup>. No other report.

**Carbon Credits Update** – Steve Mahfood and Eric Peterson – no report

**FWAM Website** – Bob Ball was charged to put together a website committee. They drafted recommendations that went to the FWAM Board of Directors and the CFM. CFM has a grant from NRCS to help fund development of the site. Dave noted there is some money in the FWAM account to get this completed. Proposal was excellent.

## **Liaison Reports & Updates**

**Conservation Federation of Missouri** – Dave Murphy noted it has been an interesting year in terms of general assembly, lot of new members. We're made of 80 organizations so there is a lot going on at any one time. CFM just celebrated their 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Youth program continues to grow.

**Missouri Tree Farm Committee** – Tammy Homfeldt reported that the Tree Farm Committee recently held their annual

conference to honor the Tree Farmer of Year – Dave Murphy. Conference was a great success with 175 attendees. We currently have about 700 tree farms in the state (over 200,000 acres). FWAM is the new administrative home for Tree Farm.

**Missouri Department of Conservation** – Lisa Allen noted that after 1.5 years, we're almost fully staffed. Some programs are moving forward in private land and forest products arenas that she shared. We are getting ready to fill two detail positions 1) branding/marketing of Mo. Forest products 2) develop a manual for silvicultural standards for Missouri (need a broader document). Hope to kick off quickly - will probably call on same folks who developed Biomass BMP book. The branding/marketing position is MDA/MDC partnership, and this person will develop marketing strategies for Missouri forest products, and look at branding. Please share ideas with Lisa.

Missouri was successful in getting two USFS competitive grants – 1) enhancing sampling for Thousand Cankers Disease and the associated outreach and education efforts 2) SWRC&D grant to help with reduction of fuels and hazard mitigation in SWMO area. Will promote Firewise Communities. FYI – grant process will start earlier this year, information will be out around August 1<sup>st</sup>.

Joplin – tragedy. MDC provided chainsaw crews to clear debris. Now, several MDC staff getting request for trees. Reality is they won't be ready for some time. MDC is working with the National Arbor Day Foundation, the Missouri Conservation Heritage Foundation, and other local groups to start funding pools to fund trees down the road. Will meet later this week and talk to non profits to develop strategy to get containerized nursery in Joplin or work with Forest ReLeaf of Missouri to grow trees. Received requests now to make assessments on trees still standing to determine if they are safe. Seeing if we can develop an urban forestry strike team.

**Missouri Department of Agriculture** – Anastasia Becker updated on the thousand cankers disease surveys – 2 seasonal staff starting next week and they will work closely with MDC doing visual surveys in communities, high-risk sites, walnut plantations, forests, etc. Process of handling suspect material will follow USDA protocols to safeguard it. Other forest pest concerns: the exotic Asian long horned beetle was found by a private landowner in Ohio; this find, in addition to the citizen find of thousand cankers disease in Tennessee in 2010, reinforces the value of continued outreach efforts. Surveys for gypsy moth are being conducted by MDC and USDA; Ag is not able to participate this year due to lack of funding will be part of the efforts in 2012.

**Missouri Department of Natural Resources** – Robert Stout reported this was a big legislative session - managed to get the fee bill passed (it is still unsigned). He added that this has been the year of disaster responses. We had the New Madrid floodway breach, and two of our state parks and historic sites were inundated. Scour is impressive. DNR has been involved with the Army Corps of Engineers and working with them. From there, we had the Joplin tornado. They are trying to work through implications – hazardous materials and debris removal. Also looking at green building. Their response will be a positive. Now they are dealing with the Missouri River flooding, and this will probably go well into August. The Director is keenly immersed in all of these issues.

He reported that DNR is looking at RECs very closely and trying to get the right regulatory process in place - will keep everyone informed.

**U.S. Forest Service**- Dave Whittekiend noted that in FY10 they sold 25MM board feet of salvage. It's been a relatively disaster free year for the Mark Twain National Forester - advantage to being on high ground. They are doing stewardship contracting to exchange goods for services as a way to get work done. Several are ready to move forward – one with the National Wild Turkey Federation on the Cambridge Area in Poplar Bluff. They will do habitat work in exchange for forest products. Another is on the Cedar Creek unit and the stewardship contact with MU, they will get biomass material for their boiler.

They have been sending crews to Georgia, Florida, and Arizona to fight wildfire. So far it appears to be a busy year. Fires are impressive.



**Natural Resources Conservation Service** – Nate Goodrich reported that the most exciting thing is streamlining of their Technical Service Provider certification process. The national office has come up with some better ways for the process. Will be offering training next Wednesday for 16 folks. Had a buyout option for some employees to retire. Clayton Lee will be retiring July 30<sup>th</sup>. 2012 EQIP policies – no big changes.

**Open Floor** - Wayne thanked everyone for their reports and opened the floor for others. Hank Dorst showed an updated digital map of sourcing areas for biomass facilities in Missouri. He noted it shows where areas overlap. He added an Ellington circle to reflect Ameren's proposed 12.5 MW plant using sawmill residues, and another near Virburnum.

**Next Meeting** – Wayne noted the next meeting will be September 15<sup>th</sup> here in the Credit Union meeting room. He added that has been renewed interest in unidentified logging trucks, and we will discuss that at next meeting, as well as a forest roads EPA topic by Bob Ball.

The meeting was then adjourned.