

**Missouri Forest Resources Advisory Council**  
**March 5, 2014**  
**Farm Bureau Headquarters, Jefferson City**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Welcome & Self-Introductions** - Kelly Smith, MoFRAC Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and the following were in attendance:

Allen, Lisa – Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Baldwin, Donna – Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Becker, Anastasia – Mo. Dept. of Agriculture  
Brown, Marvin, Forest & Woodland Assoc. of Mo.  
Brown, Mike – USDA APHIS PPQ  
Brundage, Scott – The Walnut Council  
Brunk, Gene – Mo Community Forestry Council  
Coggeshall, Mark – Mo. Nut Growers Assoc.  
Dorst, Hank – Eastern Ozarks Forestry Council  
Flader, Susan – L-A-D Foundation  
Garrett, Gene – MU Center for Agroforestry  
Goodrich, Nate – USDA NRCS  
Heckmann, John – Quail & Upland Wildlife Fed.  
Hoffmann, Mike – Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Jones, Shelby – Mo. Consulting Foresters Assoc.

Jose, Shibu – Univ. of Mo. Center for Agrofor.  
Keyser, Ed – Conservation Federation of Mo.  
Landewe, Rebecca – The Nature Conservancy  
Lovelace, Wayne – Mo. Nurseryman's Assoc.  
Merritt, Rick – Missouri Tree Farm Committee  
Miller, Stuart – Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Nightingale, Bill – USFS Mark Twain Nat'l For.  
Palm, Harlan – Missouri Chapter Walnut Council  
Potter, Lisa – Mo. Dept. of Conservation  
Shifley, Steve – US Forest Service  
Smith, Kelly - Missouri Farm Bureau  
Stelzer, Hank – MU Dept. of Forestry  
Thurman, Steve – US Army Ft. Leonard Wood  
Tuttle, John – Mo. Society of American Foresters  
Van Sambeek, Jerry – USFS Northern Res Station

**Review and Approve December 4th Minutes** - Hank Dorst, MoFRAC Secretary, asked if anyone had changes to the December 4, 1013 meeting minutes. With no changes noted, Jerry Van Sambeek made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Gene Brunk seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

**Forestry in the 2008 Farm Bill, NRCS Fiscal Years 2009-2013** – Nate Goodrich gave a presentation on JR. Flores' behalf. He noted that Farm Bill Programs included in this report are the Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP), Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP) and Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). Total obligations to Missouri forest landowners under these three programs was >\$10,000,000 over 5 years.

Total funds obligated to core forestry practices included in EQIP and WHIP is \$6,065,111, broken down as follows:

- forest stand improvement (662 contracts = \$2,782,514 – 27,610 acres)
- access control (723 contracts = \$1,693,729 – 55,873 acres)
- tree/shrub establishment (159 contracts = \$616,885 – 1,766 acres)
- CAP 106 forest management plan (335 contracts = \$456,362 – 54,944 acres)
- woody residue treatment (50 contracts = \$369,120 – 860 acres)
- forest trails and landings (63 contracts for \$110,665 – 902 acres)
- tree/shrub site prep (104 contracts = \$25,658 – 695 acres)
- windbreak/shelterbelt establishment (30 contracts = \$13,178 – 25 acres).

Total funds obligated under CSP from 2010 to 2013 was \$3,066,948, with the total number of contracts at 684 for a total of 181,093 acres enrolled.

Conservation Practice Standards and Specifications can be found at the Field Office Technical Guide website at: <http://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/treemenuFS.aspx> (Go to Section IV in the dropdown located in the pane on the left side of page and open the Conservation Practices folder.) Select the appropriate conservation practice to view the standard.

**Farm Bill Conservation Programs Update** - Lisa Potter, MDC, gave an update on The Agriculture Act of 2014. She reported that after two long years of debate, Congress passed the new Farm Bill in February for 2014-2023. It includes 12 titles, close to \$956 billion over 10 years (2014 to 2023).

#### Conservation Compliance and SodSaver:

- Conservation compliance relinked to crop insurance. Approximately 60% of insurance premiums are covered by the federal government
- To receive federal assistance farmers must meet highly erodible soil and wetland compliance requirements.
- 2-5 reinsurance years to develop and comply with a conservation plan.
- If don't comply will no longer be able to receive federal assistance.

#### Conservation Reserve Program

- National acreage cap reduced from 32 million areas to 24 million
- Currently about 25.6 MM enrolled in CRP
- Increase competition for enrollment?
- Cropping history – 4 out of the 6 years prior to bill enactment
- \$10MM for incentives for thinning, forest management, or to enhance wildlife habitat
- Pay up to 150% of the total cost
- New provision: 2 MM acres of working grasslands
- No cropping history required
- Allows haying, grazing, and seed harvest without penalty
- Annual payment of 75% of the grazing value
- Continuous enrollment (with 1 or more ranking periods)
- Authority to move forward with implementation this year under previously existing rules.

#### EQIP

- Consolidated WHIP into EQIP
- New EQIP purpose: “to develop and improve wildlife habitat”
- Wildlife required to have at least 5% of EQIP funds
- Practices must be reviewed by State Technical Committee
- At least 60% of funds to livestock.
- EQIP funding: \$1.35B in 2014, \$1.6B in 2015, \$1.65B in 2016, \$1.75B in 2018
- \$25 MM in Conservation Innovation Grants (CIG) for each year 2014-2018

- Authority to move forward with implementation this year under previously existing rules.

#### Conservation Stewardship Program

- Enrollment authorized at 10MM acres/year
- Eliminates 10% forest acres enrollment limitation
- At time of enrollment must meet at least 2 resource concerns (used to be 1)
- Must meet 1 additional resource concern by end of contract
- Authority to move forward with implementation this year under previously existing rules.

#### Agriculture Conservation Easement Program (ACEP)

- Combines Wetland Reserve Program (WRP), Grassland Reserve Program (GRP), and Farm and Ranch Protection Program (FRPP)
- Wetlands Reserve Easement (WRE): old WRP
- Agricultural Lands Easement Program (ALE): old GRP and FRPP
- Funding designated in dollars rather than acreage limits
  - \$400MM in 2014, \$425MM in 2015, \$450MM in 2016, \$500MM in 2017, and \$250MM in 2018
- Authority to move forward with implementation this year under previously existing rules.

#### Wetlands Reserve Easement (WRE)

- Essentially the same as the old WRP except:
  - Only 30 year and perpetual easements
  - Removes restoration cost share option
  - Land ownership requirement reduced from 7 years to 2 years

#### Agricultural Easement Program

- Significant change requires land trust or other eligible entity to hold the easement title (previously held by USDA)
- USDA provides 50% of cost
- A cash match required that is at least 50% of the amount contributed by USDA
- The landowner is allowed to provide the remainder in land donation or cash
- USDA can provide up to 70% of the cost for grasslands of special environmental significance.
- Waives cash requirement for land donation

#### Regional Conservation Partnership Program

- “Partner Programs”
- Uses funding from other programs (EQIP, CSP, ACEP, HFRP)
- Eligible partners can propose initiatives but must provide a significant portion of the overall project cost
- Eligible partners can include silvicultural producer associations, unit of local government and many others
- Funded at \$100M per year plus 7% of the funding from eligible programs
- 25% state competitive
- 40% national competitive
- 35% critical conservation areas

## Forestry Title

- Permanently authorizes stewardship end result contracting
- Authorized BLM and USFS to enter into stewardship end result contracting projects for services that achieve land management goals (value of wood removed to offset cost of restoration treatments)
- Adds fire liability provisions similar to common timber sale contracts
- Forest Inventory and Analysis
- Reporting information on renewable biomass supplies and carbon stocks
- Engage state foresters to re-evaluate core data variables
- Inventory of trees in urban areas
- Include inventory and analysis of interior Alaska
- Statewide Assessment and Strategies for Forest Resources
- Reauthorizes \$10MM to carry out Forest Action Plans through FY18
- Encourages cooperation with military facilities
- Healthy Forest Restoration Act
- Requires USDA to designate treatment areas on at least 1 national forest in each state, if requested by the Governor, that USDA determines are experienced declining forest health due to insect/disease infestation
- Authorizes \$200MM to carry out treatments
- Good Neighbor Authority
- Available in all states with National Forest System Lands
- Allows USFS or BLM to enter into agreements with state foresters to carry out projects on NFS lands, including commercial harvesting (excludes road construction)
- Reauthorizes Healthy Forest Reserve Program
- Funding no longer mandatory
- Authorizes \$12MM per year (increase of \$2.5MM)
- Missouri currently does not have funding for this program
- Reimbursement of Fire Funds
- States each have a mutual assistance agreement with the Forest Service for providing and receiving wildfire management and suppression resources and services
- Forest Legacy
- No funding caps
- Reauthorizes International Forestry
- Global Climate Change Prevention Act of 1990

## Energy Title

- Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP)
- Wood material collected outside of BCAP project area is not eligible
- Authorizes program at \$25MM per year – mandatory
- Biobased Markets Program
- All forest products are eligible
- Expands forest product definition so forest products are treated the same as other biobased products
- \$3MM mandatory funding; \$2MM discretionary
- Commodity Wood Energy Program
- Reauthorizes at \$5MM per year

- Allows small grants of \$50,000 or less, with 50% non-federal match to provide seed capital for biomass consumer cooperatives.
- Repeals Forest Biomass for Energy program (USFS)

**Sustainable Forestry Initiative** - Marvin Brown gave the following presentation: The Missouri Sustainable Forestry Initiative Partners Project

- Forest Certification started in the 1990s
- An outgrowth of the Earth Summit in Rio 1992
- Market driven approach to improving forest management
- Improvement is measured in economic, environmental, and social terms – all three are important
- Forest Certification provides an operating model – Plan (policies,) Do (procedures and training,) and Check (monitoring and documentation)
- The operating model focuses on achieving objectives
- There are several various systems whose objectives may be worded differently, but end results are generally similar
  - Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)
  - American Tree Farm System (ATFS)
  - Programme for Endorsement of Certification Systems
  - Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)
- SFI Objectives – Landowners
  - Forest management planning
  - Forest productivity (reforestation, soil protection)
  - Protection and maintenance of water resources
  - Conservation of Biological Diversity/forests with Exceptional Conservation Value
  - Management of Visual Quality and Recreational benefits
  - Protection of Special Sites
  - Efficient use of forest resources
- SFI Objectives – Fiber Sourcing
  - Landowner outreach
  - Use of qualified resource and logging professionals
  - Adherence to BMPs
  - Promote conservation of biodiversity, biodiversity hot spots, et al
  - Avoidance of controversial sources including illegal logging
  - Avoidance of controversial sources including fiber sourced from areas without effective social laws.
- SFI Objectives – Everyone
  - Legal and regulatory compliance
  - Forestry, research, science, and technology
  - Training and education
  - Community involvement in practice of sustainable forestry
  - Public land management responsibilities (for states, which need to have public involvement processes, esp Canada, where states cede land to companies)
  - Communications and Public Reporting

- Management review and continual improvement
- Missouri SFI partners project
- Find innovative approaches for certifying medium and small sized mills and forest ownerships
- Facilitate uptake of fiber from certified lands and promote responsible forestry through fiber sourcing certification
- Grow the SE US certified forestland base by 10MM acres by 2017 (ongoing in several states)
- Funded by customers committed to utilizing certified products (Time Inc., National Geographic, MacMillan, Pearson)
- As a consultant to SFI, Marvin is focused on:
  - Educating and informing Missouri industries, learning how they can benefit, assisting as requested
  - Working with MDC to encourage certification of public lands, gap analysis completed
  - Identifying and informing larger landowners
  - Coordinating with the Tree Farm System
- Missouri Industries:
  - 1 secondary manufacturer intends to certify, others would if certified supply was available
  - Some primary producers considering
  - Many don't feel the market pressure/business need at this point
  - Would like to see MDC take the lead
  - Most interested see certification as a way to sell themselves to landowners

MDC - Gap Analysis shows certification would not be a big reach.

- Some funding for certification is included in the FY '15 Forest Division Budget Request, but not sure they will decide to proceed
- Needs Director approval, perhaps Commission
- Could benefit from MoFRAC endorsement

#### Benefits

- Journal of Forestry recently ran a piece by Fred Cabbage stating '... forest certification is promoting better management ...'
- Performance Measure 10.2 requires monitoring BMPs with a verifiable monitoring system: BMP use has increased in states with large certified acreages
- Marvin has been in field with Price Waterhouse auditors who were checking basal area, width of streamside management zones, and skid trails and road planning
- Europeans (UK, EU) tightening up sustainability requirements for wood sourcing, applicable to US pellet exports, stressing certification 'or equivalent'.
- International appetite is growing, as certification proves:
- Social License to operate, Credibility, Market Access, Competitive Differentiation in market, Appeal to Investors

Marvin's observations on potential MoFRAC responses:

- Understand certification is not going away

- Realize Missouri is behind the curve
- Support MDC to be in a leadership position
- Encourage Tree Farm to progress

Discussion: In response to question "Can National Forests be certified?" Bill Nightingale explained there was a pilot program on the USFS system in '06-08 to see if FSC certification might be possible: obstacles from the FS perspective included cost, and from the FSC perspective lack of road system maintenance funding (which has since been slashed by Congress.)

Susan Flader reviewed Pioneer Forest's ten year experience with FSC certification: Initially positive in that it required developing a written plan that documented their established management system. Had a Chain of Custody with two sawmills and Smith Flooring, but obtaining a market premium was difficult. Eventually frustration with audit focus on office paperwork rather than conditions on the ground, as well as cost, stopped their involvement. Had wanted to be leaders, just wasn't enough support. They consider their certification to be "suspended" and would hope to look favorably on re-certification if conditions become more favorable.

Lisa notes that it's the old chicken and egg situation where mills are hesitant to certify without a land base while landowners are hesitant to certify without certified mills to sell to. If MDC were to proceed with SFI certification, and Pioneer were to get back in, and if Tree Farm was willing and able to bring along its landowners, a critical-mass of certified acreage might jump-start the concept among processors to help bring better management to Missouri woodlands.

Marvin added that he would like to see MoFRAC's endorsement. Discussion further regarding cost benefits as related to Tree Farm. Kelly wrapped up by suggesting Marvin come back to the June meeting for further discussion and clarification. Jerry suggested Marvin draft a resolution so MoFRAC has a better idea of what they are asked to support. Marvin agreed and will come back to the June meeting. Lisa asked Marvin if he would like a couple members of MoFRAC to assist with the draft? Yes, he thought that would be helpful - maybe Brian Brookshire w/ MFPA, and/or someone with Tree Farm. Marvin will solicit input.

**Hardwood Check-Off** - Brian Brookshire with MFPA reported that this program is a USDA effort that was initiated by a Blue Ribbon Committee, which included representation of about 13 large hardwood mills in US. The intent of the program is to generate funds for marketing, research, etc. The MFPA Board of Directors voted to oppose the program in its entirety and is trying to defeat it. The reason they have taken action is because the mills involved with the Blue Ribbon Committee were large mills that came up with rules and did not provide adequate representation of small mills. Assessments will be based on the value of sales, and will be assessed on any mill with annual sales exceeding \$5 million. The USDA or monitoring board will have the right to come look at sales figures to determine assessment. Also written that the referendum will assign votes based on total sales with one vote for every million in sales, and this will allow control by the larger mills. Another

issue is assessment is based on pretty complicated formulas that have been written to clearly benefit the larger companies. For example, the burden is on the back of the primary sawmill - cannot subtract cost of raw materials from sales figures to calculate the assessment. Order was written poorly. Brian has been talking to Washington delegates and meeting with Department of Agriculture, etc. Assessment is done in an unfair way and they are opposed. It's an executive order from President Obama, and ultimately will come down to USDA to develop the rules for implementation. Comment period is over and they are evaluating the comments. Want it completely defeated. If that does not happen, hope is for a fair referendum.

**EPA Boiler Emissions** – Brian reported the EPA has implemented new boiler emission rules for biomass boilers. Mo. Dept. of Natural Resources has not accepted responsibility for conducting checks; EPA will do that in Missouri. How effective it will be is unknown. More information can be found on EPA's main web page at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/boiler/boilerpg.html>

**Legislative** – 1) Introduced resolution on firewood that we are opposed to EPA's proposal to regulate wood stoves. 2) They are involved in looking at updated unemployment law. 3) Also increase weight limits for hauling residuals and green lumber from mills -- increase from 80,000 to 100,000 lbs. to match the limits allowed for local log weights.

**A View of Missouri's Privately-Owned Woodlands Through Forest Inventory Data Analysis: What Have We Learned?** - Steve Shifley, U.S. Forest Service gave the following presentation:

Sustainable Forest Management:

- The practice of meeting the forest resource needs and values of the present without compromising the similar capability of future generations.
- Sustained yield: maintaining in perpetuity a high level of periodic output of nature resources without impairing future productivity.
- Is socially acceptable, economically viable, and environmentally sound.

Forest area by owners group – Private 83%, State and Local 5%, Mark Twain 10%, other federal 2%. Steve reviewed the projected loss of forest land, 2010 to 2060, with the biggest changes expected on private land, especially around the metro areas of St. Louis, Kansas City, Springfield, Joplin. Missouri forest volume growing stock on timberland is projected to increase. 359,000 private owners, average ownership 34 acres, maybe half these have more than 20 acres. Average owner age is 59.

He discussed the annual growing stock change when comparing growth, removals, and mortality. Mortality increased from 1972 to 2012; removals decreased from 1972 to 1989, but increased from 1989 to 2012; growth dropped between 1972 and 1989, but has increased from 1989 to 2012. He also compared growing stock volume by ecoregion as well as by owner group and species group. Volume by tree class: cull vs. growing stock. In 1989, we had #5% cull (national leader); 2003 16% cull, and 2012 19% cull (now second to Iowa at 28%).



Lack of age diversity = lack of forest diversity. It affects wildlife, timber, carbon, climate change, forest health, recreation, etc. The lack of age class diversity is a regional problem; one of our making; one over which we have some level of control.

Discussion: It was noted Steve uses an even age assumption that probably misses younger age classes in uneven aged stands. Also that carbon storage is greatest in old trees. And, given that it is impossible to salvage all mortality, that decline in the red oak group helps reduce overstocking, re-balances species mix, and can help position stands against global warming, which is hitting red oak hardest.

**Trees Work Campaign Update** -- Ann Koenig, MDC, gave an update on the 2013 accomplishments in the Trees Work campaign:

1. Three styles of Trees Work hand-crafted posters are available for public display.
2. 4 million impressions from radio in 2013.
3. Partnered with actor John Goodman to read our radio ads.
4. Readership of 2.4 million for Trees Work print ads in 2013.
5. Handed out literature to 25,000 people.
6. Nine focus groups and three communities surveyed for the campaign.

**The Chiefs' Joint Landscape Restoration Partnership** – US Forest Service and NRCS. Nate distributed a handout.

- Initial request for proposals came out in November of 2013. Due to the very short turn around, it was decided not to pursue for FY2014.
- News release on February 6, 2014 described the new NRCS/USFS Partnership (part of the Obama Administration's Climate Action Plan) and summarized the 13 funded projects. \$30 million for the projects to treat the 3 defined priorities of:
  - Reducing and mitigating wildfire threats to communities and landowners
  - Protecting water quality and supply for communities and industry
  - Improving habitat quality for at-risk or ecosystem surrogate species
- Possible Missouri NRCS "targets":
  - Private land restorations in conjunction with CFLRP based on Ecological Site Descriptions. Natural community restoration in counties that include USFS land (29), with higher priority to counties with CFLRP areas (6)
  - Management plan development and forest health improvement practices to promote active management and address declining forest health, i.e. red oak decline, in counties that include USFS land (29)
  - Invasive species control on private land adjacent to the Cedar Creek district (Boone and Callaway counties).
  - Water quality concerns in cooperation with the Current River Partnership group (USFS, NRCS, TNC, NPS, USFWS, MDC, DNR). TNC has received a 2-year

matching grant to promote sustainable forestry in priority sub-watersheds within the Current River basin.

- Forest management and natural community restoration in counties that have MDC Conservation Opportunity Areas, public drinking water river basins, and USFS land.
- Possible Mark Twain NF “targets”:
  - The MTNF has 25 - 30 agreements in place with private landowners for implementing the CFLRP. These are inholdings and adjacent properties.
  - Ecosystem and water quality improvements in Mill Creek and Current River watersheds
  - Forest health improvement opportunities on intermixed land ownerships with a focus on red-oak decline.
  - NNIS (invasive species control).
- FY15 project solicitation process will take place in the summer of 2014. With MOFRAC support, a working group consisting of key partners will need to be assembled to develop the proposal. Arkansas’s project includes >15 partners.
- Hurdles include working with “non-traditional” NRCS cooperators /landowners, increased workload in certain counties, politics/government.

Nate and Bill are looking for a sub group to review this more closely so we can have the information in place and be ready to move forward when the time comes. Lisa noted that MDC will be willing to contribute to that effort. Kelly asked for volunteers to serve on committee. Those that expressed interested were MDC (forestry and private lands), and the Nature Conservancy. Kelly noted he will visit further with Nate and Bill and provide additional information at the next meeting.

**Amendment 1 - Keep Missouri Farming** - Kelly Smith, Mo Farm Bureau - tabled until June meeting.

### **Partner Updates, Meetings, and Events**

- Missouri Tree Farm Committee – Rick Merritt reported he just went to the national leadership conference in Savannah GA, and the main takeaways were that ATFS is the only recognized certification program in Missouri at this time, and we were one of the 4 pilot states for the paid dues. Missouri had no interest at any level. Gone to another process and by 2019, Missouri will charge \$10 for Mo TFs to remain in the program.
- Soil and Water District - Rick also reported he had some successful workshops for private landowners on forest management. Also researching cost share for erosion control and water quality improvement. Went to Pike County Soil and Water District commissioners to propose a pilot project to improve erosion control via writing and implementing forest management plans. We were challenged to explain why an unmanaged block of woodlands could have more soil erosion than a managed block. Rick is confident we can come back with solid information (documented before and after soil erosion).

- Hank Stelzer reported the MU boiler is up and running. Field Day on Foster Brothers mechanized logging coming up next week. Most chips are mill residuals, but Foster has chipped some trees cut off their own land.
- Scott Brundage – next Wednesday Foster Brothers Wood Products and the Missouri Logging Council will host a field day demo at the Foster Bros operation in Auxvasse that will be opportunity to see mechanized logging. There is concern that the required MU boiler supply contract elements (management and harvest plans written by professional forester, inclusion of WBM BMPs, trained logger on site, 3<sup>rd</sup> party auditing process) have not been set up and implemented yet. How will this be addressed?
- Gene Garrett reported that FWAM has a major membership drive underway. Need members, encourage you to become a member of FWAM. Annual Meeting on March 22<sup>nd</sup> in Jefferson City. We are hoping to host a day with legislators (scheduled for April 2<sup>nd</sup>). Have been working on an updated brochure.
- Ed Keyser noted that Conservation Federation of Missouri has a new executive director – Brandon Butler. He is a great conservation communicator. CFM annual conference in Jefferson City at Capitol Plaza hotel on March 21-23.
- Gene Brunk reported the Missouri Community Forestry’s annual conference will be held next week at the Capitol Plaza hotel in Jefferson City. Good program lined up.
- Rick Merritt added that the Tree Farm Conference will be held at Bill Haag’s farm in Callaway County on Saturday, April 19.
- John Tuttle – New SAF chair since first of year. Biggest thing is working to make SAF what it can be. Working with MU to set up mentoring program. Spring meeting not set yet, and anyone will be welcome (SAF or not).
- Kelly Smith reported Shibu Jose has been appointed to USDA's National Advisory Council as a new member. Kelly also added that Don Crader with Crader Distributing passed away, he was always a great supporter.
- Lisa Allen reported that Brian Schweiss is taking the lead and working with a stakeholder group to look at options on updating the Forest Crop Land program. Many of the stakeholders Brian has engaged are part of MoFRAC. At this time, recommendations being made are modifications to the program that can be enacted by the Conservation Commission - no revision of Missouri statues required, so that may be the best way to move forward.
- Bill Nightingale noted that Steven Best is the new deputy forest supervisor for Mark Twain National Forest.

### **MoFRAC Business Items**

- Dispersal of Checking Account – Kelly noted the money has been donated to trees for Joplin in the amount of \$586.24. Scott added that Bob Ball contacted him that MoFRAC has an EIN. Hank Dorst will file the number.
- Website Update - Rebecca Landewe noted she worked with Hank on updating the website. Decided to work with site where it currently exists. Suggestions are welcome. Kelly suggested posting the presentations that are given here at the meetings. Save as PDF and post that way.

### **Suggestions for Future Meeting Topics**

- Gene Garrett suggested Lisa would give updates on detail assignments and Forest Crop Land revisions.
- Hank Stelzer suggested more on the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project by Bill Nightingale.
- Jerry Van Sambeek suggested an update on the Ecological Site Description by Doug Wallace. Phase 1 is done.
- Scott Brundage noted there is a major difference of opinion with consulting foresters and Missouri Fire Council as to what should be prescribed burned. Possible topic for a meeting? John Burk is head of the Missouri Fire Council.

**Next MoFRAC Meeting** - June 4, 9:00am at the Farm Bureau Headquarters.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.