

## Attendees

### State Cooperators (16 of 20 States represented)

Frederic Miller – IL  
Val Cervenka – MN  
Kyle Lombard – NH  
Don Eggen – PA  
Bob Tatman – MD  
Barbara Burns – VT  
Tim Tomon – WV  
Jill Rose – WV  
Lisa Bowers – OH  
Jane Cummings Carlson – WI  
Ken Gooch – MA  
Ron Murray – MI  
Rosa Yoo – NJ  
Jon Klischies – NJ  
Dave Struble – ME  
Dode Gladders – DE  
Rob Lawrence – MO  
Phil Marshall – IN (phone)

### USFS Staff

Noel Schneeberger – Newtown Square  
Manfred Mielke – Newtown Square  
Mark Buccowich – Newtown Square  
Rob Witmer – Newtown Square  
Jim Steinman – Newtown Square  
Michael Connor – SPFO  
Michael Bohne – DFO

### Other Committee Members

Steve Koehn – State Forester Representative to FH Committee  
Ian MacFarlane – Executive Director NAASF  
Eric Seaborn – Urban Forestry Liaison to FH Committee

March 7, 2011

## Programatic Discussions

Overall Agenda:

- Introductions
- History of group
- Updating business plan
- Issue brief
- Explanation of agenda
- Noel S. explanation of forest health issues from three offices
- 2007 NAASF Forest Health Committee formed / history of committee

Steve Koehn, MD State Forester, liaison to the NAASF Forest Health Committee:

- No Western Forest Health committee
- Past president of NASF
- NASF Liaison to Association of Consulting Foresters
- Steve's role is to prod the State Foresters and we need to tell him what we want
- Continue to meet at regional and local levels
  - o Stressed as important by Struble & Murray
- Start thinking about regional and national strategies
- We don't want to be going back to the old ways of business
- Complying with the 2008 Farm Bill:
  - o Forest health issues figured prominently in the assessment
  - o What are the states critical needs based on the assessments?
  - o Better coordination with APHIS, State Plant Boards, and State Agriculture Departments

- We are the subject experts
- Don't move firewood template came out of Northeastern Area Forest Health Committee
- Disaster response plans template
- 1/3 of 219 RFP submissions were forest health related – leveraging money to foster new partners and ideas
- What is bad about the RFP process, and can we make changes?
- Questions: Core funding for forest health money
  - State and Private Forestry (S+PF) have not taken as hard a hit in the President's budget
  - Forestry and the Farm Bill document
  - There will be a new appropriator (Chris Topic is leaving) for forestry – will he/she be a good advocate?
- Discussion on priorities:
  - Currently have cooperative working relationships with APHIS, Plant Boards, and Agriculture Departments in the Northeastern Area
- We are more strategic in the FHC; more staff is brought in at the Co-op meetings and the focus is more on pest issues.
  - 
  - Someone should examine State Strategies documents and develop a list of common themes occurring in most of the 20 State Assessments
  - Strategies to recommend to NAASF for what needs funding:
    - Best management practices for invasive species
    - Identify a project and the state(s) involved then use a model for working together
    - Disaster response plan for invasive species
  - Given the information in each state's forest health assessment, can the NAASF Forest Health Committee make a determination on what should be funded and for how much?

- Steve's suggestions re. what the FH Committee should do for NAASF:
  - Collaborate between regions
  - Tell NAASF what our priorities are
  - Each of us should talk to our State Forester to see what they think we should be doing
  - Recommend funding levels for different programs/efforts
  - Emergency response templates
  - Firewood issue: we should continue to lead
  - Leverage urban and other funds
  - Communicate better
    - Internal: CT, MD, WV: State Forester does not oversee FH program
    - External: APHIS & Plant Boards

### Pest-specific Discussions

- Asian Longhorned Beetle (ALB):
  - Too early to tell whether eradication in Worcester will work.
  - There's been USFS funding last 2 years for risk-based surveys and lure development
  - Don't give up on eradication – it may not be too late!
  - Continue to support ALB outreach and detection efforts & encourage APHIS to keep funding.
  - A big deal for everyone since all States have maple.
  - Continue to fund eradication efforts.

- Emerald Ash Borer (EAB):
  - Update on MN EAB infestation
  - Silviculture studies
  - First detector program
  - Wisconsin – decision models for when EAB gets into stands of Black Ash. More detailed than FIA data.
  - \$13 million in President's budget for biocontrol production
  - Perhaps S&PF could help compile EAB management models
  
- Sirex:
  - Funding sources are drying up. 2011 APHIS funding is ending.
  - Encourage funding for research on bio-control – nematode
  - Should the southern states be asking for funds?
  - Pilot program to fund stand thinning
  - Threat level to trees in the field?
  - we need some input when APHIS develops host list
  - Keep surveying in DE-MD-NJ
  - Keep funding bio-control

- Southern Pine Beetle (SPB):
  - South of New Jersey – existing SPB problems
  - Existing science should be sufficient but red tape in NJ prevents adequate response
  - Southern researchers could visit NJ and speak to pineland managers re. control
  
- Gypsy Moth (GM):
  - Continues to be a significant forest pest in the east and will repeat itself.
  - Staff and \$ are required for adequate control.
  - 2009 Pennsylvania 221,000 acre suppression project
  - Funding issues – no money for suppression, and lack of staff.
  - Discussion on the timing of money allocations for GM control – present system does not work.
  - Steve suggested a emergency response fund for outbreaks
    - CCC has this but APHIS uses it for all pests
    - Committee felt this was good idea & worth trying
  
- Winter Moth (WM):
  - Significant threat to northeast area forests
  - Promising fly for biocontrol now established in east
  - Also need suppression

- Forest Tent (FT) and Anthracnose:
  - FT is a native insect that when in combination with anthracnose can cause severe mortality.
  
- Hemlock Woolly Adelgid (HWA):
  - HWA Initiative Group
  - Issues: projects already funded are not getting further funding based on the competitive process. HWA suppression should be removed from RFP since it is a national effort.
  - Continued \$ needed for outreach, surveys, tech transfer.
  - Discussion on funding being based on science vs. research. Steve pointed out it is not obvious why predator rearing is not research.
  - Need to develop guidance on how to review grants based on what is research.
  - Move \$ into research and earmark it for predator rearing.
  - Entomopathic fungi help
  
- Thousand Canker Disease (TCD):
  - APHIS – no federal quarantine on TCD
  - 10 states have TCD quarantines
  - Better detection tools inc. pheromone under development.
  - Delineation of boundaries a priority for 2011. 9 States at meeting planning to survey this year.
  - Available treatments

- Value of Walnut in the state. USFS should help with the valuation.
- Sudden oak death (SOD)
  - We may want to declare victory
  - Committee agreed not a top-tier concern any more
  - Don't forget entirely; survey every 3-5 years
  
- Oak Decline Symptoms (Oak Wilt / Bacterial Leaf Scorch):
  - Need for labs that can diagnose forest diseases
  - Diagnostic ability of/for states
  - What is the impact on the Oak resources from all sources?
  - Impact assessment on Oak resources in states due to oak decline inc. growth loss, mortality with or without oak wilt
  - Ask NAASF to support FO development of diagnostic capabilities

For all pests- what is the value \$ of the resources being affected?  
(ALB = Maple, EAB = Ash etc)

- Beech Bark Disease:
  - Strategic Planning – genetic conservation of tree species that are targeted by multiple stressors (Ron Overton = USFS geneticist)
  - What is the plan? – restoration with resistant tree species
  - Developing a plan before species are severally impacted.

- Invasive Plants: Discussion on how the Forest Health Committee can mesh with the Invasive Plants Group
  - Sources of funding
  - Training of staff e.g. Parks
  - Focus on bio-control opportunities (mile-a-minute weed)
  - Invest wisely, focusing on eradicating outliers and biocontrol
  - Cooperative weed management areas, and training opportunities (Steve asked that State Foresters be told where CWAs boundaries came from)
  - Encourage the Forest Service to finalize the Invasive Plant Work Plan.
    - Does it require re-writing?
  - Have a discussion with the different Plant Boards.
  - Consider an invasive plants subcommittee
  - 1-page briefing paper for State Foresters
  - help provide leadership

## Work Plan Discussion

- Deliverables: “We’ll have such and such delivered to State Foresters by date X.”
- firewood
- Disaster Response Plans for states
- Accomplishments report and future objectives for how the committee will deal with and/or options for invasive plants. ID critical partners to provide guidance to NAASF
- Recommend subcommittee to deal with invasive plants to NAASF

- Recommendations for improving RFP process.
- Joint priorities and/or outcomes to work with urban group
- Funding recommendations based on priorities
  - o Steve K. – FHC will make recommendations in a document about how much of the \$ should be spent on what. We’ve had a discussion and the following recommendations are what we’d like to see (2013).
  - o
- How are the state assessments being implemented
- Are we each satisfied with how the FH portion of the state strategic plan came out?
- Review forestry and Farm Bill effort and recommendations to NAASF exec committee → NASF
- Forest health information centralized into a database
- Develop strike response teams
- Standardized value of a particular resource e.g. walnut: stumpage price, industry, value-added products, urban trees
- Consider combining landscape scale planning & CWMAAs
- Collaboration with urban – use an “only you” type message
- Develop website content & make web site subcommittee by late spring
- Carbon sink issues
- Validate risk map via field checks
- Review stewardship plan documents and give input on anything relevant
- Clarify methods vs. research and research priorities
- DC representative now part of the Forest Health Committee
- Formalize a position to be the liaison to the Urban Committee
  - o An ex-officio member to the Forest Health Committee

March 8, 2011

Update on resolutions from Plant Board meeting in Saint Louis (Phil Marshall):

- Discussion on TCD
- Use of new reporting system IPHIS
- RFP needs more people involved in the process from different agencies
- Forest Service exempt Invasive Plants from RFP process

Discussion of RFP process and state assessments and strategies (Rob Witmer):

- State assessments and strategies :
  - o Northeastern Area summary in the works
    - Ranking of proposals may be out by March 14, 2011
  - o Next steps -
    - Summarize the findings
    - Lessons learned
    - Data gaps
  - o Priority areas -
    - Keeping forests as forests
    - Forest health
    - Urban forests
    - Fire
    - Issues
  - o Monitor, research, plan, manage, and communicate
  - o Health is a common theme for forest ecosystems among the states
    - Detect invasives
    - Manage pests

- Prevent new introductions
    - Public awareness
    - Emergency response
    - Training and tools
  - 70 multistate priorities have been identified
    - some states in multi-state priorities did not know they were involved
  - Ecological concerns were common on multistate proposals
  - Zero national funding for assessments
- RFP process:
- State assessments and strategies can be used for future funding opportunities
  - Procedural issues with how grant submissions are made to the individual state forester
  - Prior notification from outside agencies (non-state) to state forester that grants are being submitted
  - Have program personnel based on topic, review grants prior to the state forester review
  - Tighten up on clarification on who can submit, how they can submit, due dates, and partners working with state foresters
  - State Forester's reasons for new RFP:
    - Involvement of the state foresters
    - Transparency
    - Decisions being made on continued funding (multi-year) where state foresters were unaware
  - Going back in not an option. The current system does not work. What can be done to make a competitive process work?

FY 2010 Funding:

- Sudden Oak Death (SOD) = \$50,000
- Early Detection Rapid Response (EDRR) = \$280,000
- Gypsy Moth Slow The Spread (GM STS) = \$6,999,000
- Emerald Ash Borer Restoration (EAB) = \$1,500,000
- Vermont Monitoring Group = \$150,000
- Wood Education Resource Center = \$266,000
- TEOX Assistance Survey = \$1,610,00 (core funding)
- Forest Health Monitoring (FHM) = \$890,000 (core funding)
- Asian Longhorned Beetle (ALB) = \$150,000
- Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) = \$595,000
- Hemlock Woolly Adelgid Initiative (HWA) = \$715,000
- Sirex = \$75,000
- Invasive Plants = \$817,000
- Urban Forest Health Monitoring (UFHM) = \$30,000
- Pest Suppression and Eradication = amount varies
- **Subcommittee to be formed to flesh out priorities for funding and strategic approach to available money**
- Issues related to the 2013 Farm Bill Funding

#### Transportation of Firewood:

- What are the steps forward? How do we keep this moving?
- Continental Dialog can lead. They have a firewood working group. Eggen is on the steering committee and can forward our recommendations.
- APHIS needs to take a more holistic view; national regulations are needed. FH Committee should ask State Foresters to push APHIS on this.
- Enforcing firewood quarantines (WI survey to see how effective their regs are)

- NY, PA, ME, MI, part of NH have their own regulations already.
  - o Enough State quarantines will eventually make APHIS say “enough is enough” and do their own for all States
- Group should draft “model” recommendations on firewood and share with National Plant Board.
- Don Eggen will serve as lead for the FH Committee on this issue.

#### Aerial Survey:

- Look at other options
- No joy rides
- Digital videography (20,000 acres for \$1,500) and/or photography or satellite imagery
- Everyone involved should attend ASM2 training
- Safety plans e.g. OH
- Automated flight following
- Statement from group to advocate for satellite survey from Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team (Disturbance Tracker) (Mike Bohne)

#### State Disaster Response:

- Develop a template for responding to a forest health related issue for States w/o these plans
  - o Describe roles and responsibilities
  - o Use incident command system
- Send copies of the state plans to Dode
- Form a committee to develop the template working with other NAASF committees including urban, fire, and utilization.

### Urban Forest Health Monitoring (UFHM):

- UFHIC: Urban Inventory and Urban Pest Detection compiles data and provides reports
  - o Role for the Forest Health Committee would be to come up with an idea for deciphering data that comes into IPED / ITREE
- Training protocol for tree people out there on the street
- Next steps:
  - o Who trains?
  - o Who collects data?
  - o Who receives data?
- It is agreed that urban pest detection is important

### Other Business:

- Next meeting
  - o Stand alone or in connection with regional cooperators meeting
  - o Tentative plan on meeting in Delaware in October 2011
- Work plan developed and delivered at July State Foresters meeting