

# MPC January Call: Minutes and Notes

Tuesday, January 8, 2019

3:52 PM

## Meeting Minutes

4:00 Welcome and roll call

- Robert
- Shane
- Mark
- Alex
- Amy
- John
- Bruce
- Nancy
- [no Michael]

4:05 Discuss/approve minutes from December 2018 (attached), agenda updates

- Alex moves to approve, Shane seconded, Motion carries

4:10 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

MPC Election results: Congratulations Alex and Bruce; welcome Amy!

Zander: Good process overall, amazing slate of candidates. Need to confirm members in good standing before ballot goes out. Also, is issue for some within jobs about whether or not they can serve in this capacity, e.g. federal employees.

Zander: We looked back and found we had a document with the whole process. For the coming election, we'll have a clearer path for how folks are notified, etc. We hit the highlights, but there will be less wondering next time.

John: Keeping institutional knowledge going forward. Shared drive?

Zander: Internally, have a shared server. Amanda and I will work together to solve it. Also, come August, new candidates, looking at who's run in the past.

Amanda: Colleen working on member portal section for MPC members.

Robert: Improved voting percentage. Should there be an upper limit on the number of candidates?

Mark: All put out a big recruitment effort, more successful than we envisioned. Where's the middle ground?

John: Let's see how it goes this next year.

Mark: Maybe have a primary.

Nancy: Large slate of candidates, additional ad hoc help. Access to additional assistance.

Shane: When members see amazing slate of candidates with amazing backgrounds, looks really good. Challenge will be engaging folks not on MPC.

Zander: Perfect lead-in. Klaus Puettmann working on connection with ProSilva, and OSU student chapter. Christel Kern has been asked to write an article for the next issue of Forest Steward. Justin Hart working through process of perhaps doing a webinar, silvicultural paper.

Robert: I don't see a lot of downsides to having a larger slate. This slate in particular, we achieved what we set out to do, put people of different organizations, gender, geographical distribution.

**Actions:** *Staff will report back on the potential for the MPC to have a sharepoint space.  
Robert will review the process notes and offer possible refinements or additions*

4:20 Council business (A): Election of vice-chair. Keep the meeting date, time and frequency for 2019?

Robert: Last meeting, Nancy nominated Shane for Vice-Chair.

Nancy: Nomination on the floor. Amy: second. No other nominations from the floor. Shane is unanimously approved

Shane: Thank you for the nomination. I guess by 2020, I'll have to move up to the legacy that you, John, and Robert have left.

Robert: Now meet 2nd Tuesday of month, 4:00-5:30 ET. Keep it the same?

Amy: I may encounter conflicts with that. Shane: Yes, it's mid-day for west coast folks.

Robert: We should be willing re-negotiate if necessary

## Committee reports (names in bold are chairs of the committee)

(Briefly...2018 accomplishments, immediate priorities, goals for 2019)

4:25 [Natural Forest Management Policy statement revision](#): **John**, Alex, Mark

Feedback from the board; next steps.

John: In November, we approved the policy statement for natural forest silviculture. Understood that as a courtesy, we'd send it to the Board, and they'd talk about it. Things got more complicated than I was anticipating. Some additional process that got introduced at the Board level that I was not clear on. They wanted to have a more active role in reviewing and approving MPC policy statements.

Zander: I owe a bit of an apology, because I was unaware of this as well. When we approved the connectivity policy statement, presented to the Board as an FYI, and it went fine. Comes down to a couple people on the Guild Board who feel more strongly about this than others.

Background is that we've tread this ground before. Were some ideas from the Board that did not get codified in the organizational by-laws. Board said wanted to change by-laws. John gets a lot of credit about being level-headed about the whole thing. May need to hash this out in more detail. I want to recognize the work of the MPC. I personally see that as a stand-alone activity. But also having feedback from the Board isn't the worst thing. Key for me is having something that doesn't slow you guys down or feel that your authority is being overridden in some way. I thought we had put this to rest, but apparently, we haven't. I'm hoping the comments from the Board still fit with the MPC's vision.

John: Comments from one individual. Robert Turner had brought up as a matter of process, would it be better to have collective input from the Board, versus one individual's perspective? Coming from the board, it should represent the whole, not an individual. The comments are good thoughts from this individual. Reference to why we're revising the 1999 statement.

Mark: I was kind of annoyed by the response from the Board. Not because of what they were talking about, but there was some significant word-smithing done. That's not we're sending it to the Board for. They should be looking at the intent, Guild's mission. Rudimentary corrections almost insulting.

Zander: I hear you, I recognize that; that's what I was afraid of. I'm caught in the middle. Two things going on. Make process clear. Also, get Board consensus around comments. For this particular statement, I'd like the greater membership to see what you've done and be able to vote on it soon rather than let it languish.

Robert: what happens next? Board meets only quarterly.

Zander: I'm happy to move any particular requests or comments to the Board sooner. Exec Committee at least.

Mark: John had suggested an informal peer review.

John: I wanted to have the MPC convene here first, figure out how to move forward

Nancy: I've been thinking about this too. Peer review idea. Brian Palik, Jerry Franklin connection. Invite in as a corroborator?

Mark: I could send it to Jerry. Also, Klaus Puettmann would provide a good peer review.

Amy: I would want to get confirmation from the Board that there are no further comments.

Zander: I can do that.

John: I think he just sent this version to Al Sample, you, and I. Not sure it went to the whole Board.

Zander: My expectation is that we will only have this one set of comments. I will raise issue of was this one individual or Board consensus.

John: Mark, Alex, maybe the three of us should look at marked up version, decide what changes we want to make?

John: Authors of policy statement - myself, Alex, Mark, Stuart. A few reviews by whole Council. In the end, reflects group effort.

Robert: Revision of 1999. Maybe this critic was one of the original authors.

Amy: Coming from outside the process, some of his edits and comments seem at least worth chewing on. Reasonable comments and questions. Would make the document more able to stand up on its own.

Robert: One of his suggestions is, what about a policy for plantations? Seems to be viewing broader context. That's going to be a challenge. We've had discussions over the last year about the triad approach.

John: 1999 footnote said MPC was working on a plantation policy. It makes sense as a follow-up, but could stray into GMO conversation.

Mark: Put on docket for this year. Has to be addressed. Going through FSC certification, has been one of the most confusing topics to field practitioners.

John: Higher-level concern of reconciling process. Board making unilateral decision would create some conflicts down the road.

Bruce: Get some clarification in general on sending it the Board for yay or nay, or specific input. To me, if they have strong opposition, then we ought to reconsider, but if wordsmithing is their role, we need to understand that as well. Procedural question nobody enjoys dealing with.

Zander: I agree 100%. Idea to get interested and available from MPC together with Exec Committee.

Amanda: Can you include Amber Ellering, as a past MPC chair?

Zander: Will include Board and particularly reach out to Amber.

John: Thanks for helping us navigate that, Zander.

**Actions:** *Zander will coordinate between the BoD Executive Committee and our group in January to explore the issues raised today and develop a plan for moving the process forward. The committee will arrange to send a version of the policy statement to reviewers.*

#### 4:40 [Student engagement: Nancy, John and Shane](#)

##### [Membership/outreach: \(Stuart\), Shane, membership committee](#)

Nancy: Recap 2018: one of the things we attempted to do to increase membership and student engagement, looked at finding way to make it easier for students to gain access to joining Guild. Put together a toolkit that laid out how to start a chapter or combine with Guild. Lot of good work. Toolkit ready for launch, need to check in with Colleen. Next, look at where that outreach will take place. Targeted outreach, broad, beta testing.

Shane: One of those beta tests was Oregon State. Their president, a couple weeks ago said they were organizing and wanted to see Guild forester lands, bring people in for speaking. Feels like it stirred up momentum in Northwest. Suggestions for who to reach out to. I sent out two email blasts. Wrote back, totally overwhelmed with their feedback. Students have so much excitement and energy, want to make sure they didn't run through our list of professionals too quickly, space out the different gatherings they can do. Overall, will be very interesting to watch. Personality-based. See if sticking power to keep momentum going. Scaling up, makes sense for us as MPC members to reach out to folks John helped identify in academia whose institutions meet criteria that would make a good host for a new student chapter. We instigate at a grass-roots level.

John: I agree with that approach. Identify low-hanging fruit.

Robert: Shane, are you the OSU contact?

Shane: Klaus is their formal advisor. Criteria, he has been a very strong supporter of the Guild. If we can find more Klaus Puettmanns, good logical next step. We'll meet up for beers and chat. No advisor can do it on their own. Need to be able to hand students to ready and waiting Guild members to show students projects, and come in and speak. Advisor, and active Guild members in vicinity.

Nancy: We need to follow up with Colleen about digital version. Then committee identify prospects.

Amanda: from Regional Coordinators call, Mike Lynch reminded us that student tours with professional members benefit both.

Robert: Merge membership and student engagement sub-committees? Sounds like you have working of a workplan.

**Actions:** *The subcommittee will develop a draft work plan for 2019, for presentation at the February call.*

5:00 [Membership planning and process](#) (Robert)

This subcommittee tries to look at interaction between staff and MPC, ask questions about how membership is changing, asking for information that might be beneficial to processes and progress. Not a whole lot of definition. Example, in 2018, I got info from staff about new members, membership. For February meeting, I intend to update that with 2018 info. Look at aspects of membership and how they might influence what we do as MPC. Also, CRM system at Guild called Neon. Will be some changes in website, how members access their own info, info about Guild. Will try to keep MPC up to date on changes as they continue.

**Actions:** *Robert will submit a request for 2018 members results to compare to 2017 for presentation at the February call.*

5:05 Council Business (B)

Other subgroups: Model Forest, Events, WOW, Membership...Consolidate? Elevate? New groups?

Nancy: I'm happy to continue on student engagement subcommittee. Policy sub-committee almost has a directive to focus on plantations. Amanda engaged in Women Owning Woodlands (WOW).

Shane: Happy to continue on student engagement, interested in broader membership piece. Do think we can lump subcommittees together, consolidate a bit. One thing that came up on Regional Coordinators call, I would personally like to see a greater connection between MPC and our professional members. It feels like we're putting our best foot forward in the spirit of the membership, but also feels like we could connect better. Manifested on call, Amanda said, folks on MPC in your area, connect with them, figure out how to strengthen those ties. Might be a good new initiative for 2019.

Amy: I'd like to learn more about the WOW sub-group. Maybe Nancy and I can talk more offline. Learn more about approach and sub-committee. Also happy to pick up on student engagement efforts. But not inclined to jump onto that subcommittee.

Nancy: Great. For WOW, maybe you, me and Amanda can talk offline.

John: I'll weigh in briefly on policy side. I think we might want to revisit some of the other policy directives, but am interested in pursuing the plantation piece as a follow-on. Also excited to get involved in student engagement. Will create lots of opportunities for ourselves to grow, tap into that student energy. Question for Zander, year ahead. Are there other opportunities, bigger national Guild Gatherings for us to piggyback on?

Zander: We don't have a big attempt at a national gathering on the horizon. Do have some cool events planned. Is a Wisconsin event on bluffs and bottomlands. Learn and burn events in TN and KY. Could be nuclei to build bigger events around and gather people. Also think table is open if there is a subset interested in getting together on a regional level, we can facilitate that. Will be a couple Foresters for the Birds events in OR and maybe WA.

Amanda: Right now, sweet spot seems to be with regional and local meetings.

Zander: Other possibilities. If you're going to TWS meeting or other events, we can organize socials, side-meetings, get out in the woods. Or if you're excited about going to a learn-and-burn event in TN, we can try to build out bringing in Guild members. Even if not a national meeting, I've learned a lot from going to a local meeting in somebody else's ecosystem. The old model of lectures with powerpoints, feeling like that need is maybe being served elsewhere, maybe not the Guild's strong suit. Really getting out in the woods. Bogs and Outwash event was a good one. Try to replicate that, but find ways to bring folks from other places in the country.

Robert: This is the kind of progression of ideas I was hoping would merge us into last discussion section. My personal thoughts, part of meeting agenda where we talk about some really big issues that affect us as Guild members and organization, much bigger, much more important, I would like to make this a part of every one of our monthly meetings. I'd like to push back a little bit about what Amanda and Zander have presented. Meetings I had a hand in organizing, I have felt that all of those have been very successful because they had a very strong field component, organized around a much different model than an SAF meeting. Focused on an area pertinent to membership and region. Still a lot of potential for that. What we danced around in last 10 minutes is a core condition the Guild is facing. I feel like it was a membership organization for most of its life, and in last 10 years, has shifted into a project-based organization. Allowed Guild to persist, but in the process, we've drawn down what I call our social capital of core membership. Guild members want to have those outings. Whether standalone, tied into WOW or FFTB, how we tie to core membership. As a council, we need to find a way to think about this in a much more strategic and organized fashion. For example, each of us on the MPC can decide to tap one person in our region for a one-day Guild Gathering, begin a richer discussion about what might be interesting and helpful to people. Ideas aren't always silviculture. E.g. I'm getting older; how do I transfer that to younger members. Calls aren't getting participation either. If MPC and Board members participate in calls, would be great. I would like to get specific on MPC calls about some of the things we will do.

Zander: I 100% support that. I didn't mean to imply that we weren't interested in Guild gatherings. It's just that the national meetings - you're right that VT meeting was a good one. Any meetings you want to do, staff will find a way to support.

Robert: I don't know if core membership could be supported by a donor.

Zander: A little flexibility, not much. I'm happy to talk either with a sub-group or everybody about the fundraising picture of what we're doing, wish we were doing, etc.

Mark: We have members in the Lake States scattered over large geographical area. I'm willing to do some things in terms of looking at the regions and doing member profiles. E.g. you manage this forest, we'd like to come visit and talk about it, then put it in newsletter. Would make them feel more a part of the Guild. Would take some legwork from people in region. Develop a set of questions consistent. One of the things I hear from MN membership is that they believe in it. 3-4 new members out of a meeting. Asked about next steps. I would like to engage them more. Public forests, wildlife habitat work. Give them a little publicity over time.

Amanda: March is Women's History Month. Looking for daily profiles of women Guild members.

Robert: I will take on more organization for next call. What kinds of things we might do as a group, make the most of great stuff going on. Important that Guild members feel they're part of a family.

New MPC members—Michael and Amy: sign on to a subgroup.

What is our capacity? Where should we invest our energies?

Expanding Capacity: engaging with 2018 MPC candidate slate

(Other possible initiatives: a review and update of the Membership and Policy Guidelines, improved board/Council interaction?)

Robert: ATL Submission—due next Tuesday due a week from today. I will summarize our ideas for 2019 discussed today.

5:10 Discussion (See the FSG Impacts Map in December minutes)

- How do we inspire Guild membership?
- How do we build Guild social capital?
- If the goal is to inspire, what will it take?

5:30 Adjourn

Introductions Robert: Vermont, consulting forester for last 25 years. More technical work in forestry. Last 7 years, forest carbon verifier, projects across the country.

Nancy: County forester in Vermont, extension private lands forester for 11 years. Prior to that, consulting forester for 18 years or so. Involved heavily in Foresters for the Birds in VT with Audubon VT. Ballooned across nation, so cool. A lot of other projects I'm involved with. Very happy to be involved in MPC for last 5 years.

Mark: Mark Jacobs, retired land commissioner from MN. I manage public forestland in Aitkin County, longest run of FSC certification in U.S. for public lands. Recently retired, wanting to get more involved in Guild.

Shane: Trout Mountain Forestry.

John: John Gunn, live in ME, work at UNH as research faculty. Generally interested in forest management, ecosystem services like carbon and water. Before UNH, was in nonprofit and consulting world. Mostly in New England, but also done work around the country.

Alex: I'm the southern VT guy. We're well distributed across a tiny state. I'm a consulting forester with Longview Forests. I run our forestry team and woodland services team. A lot of TSI this fall. Thinking a lot about young forest.

Bruce: Bruce White: consulting forester in both Carolinas. Been a Guild member for a long while. Primarily focus on managing NIPF lands in South. Tend to focus on giving them

alternatives to the traditional southern industrial pine forest landscape. Alternative silvicultural methods.

Michael Leff - ecologist, urban forestry side.

Amy LaBarge: Forest ecologist for the City of Seattle, managing forest ecosystem in municipal watershed that are source drinking water supply and fish and wildlife habitat. Been here since 2002, Guild member since that time. Served on Membership Committee. Now moving into being Watershed Division Director, might be a little more distracted than normal.

**MPC member committees**

Nancy: Student engagement, WOW

Robert: Procedures, Events

John: Student, Policy

Bruce: Model forest

Amy:

Michael:

Shane: student, membership/outreach

Alex: Model forest, Policy

Mark: Events, Model forest, Policy

**Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

1. Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)
2. Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)
3. Alex Barrett – Vermont (1st term 2018)
4. Bruce White – North Carolina (1st term 2018)
5. Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)
6. John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)
7. Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)
8. Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)

**Proposed 2019 Calendar**

Month	MPC discussion topic	ATL topic	ATL due date
January (1/8)	Review of 2018; plans for 2019		
February (2/12)	2019 workplans; review membership renewals from 2018		
March (3/12)			
April (4/9)			
May (5/14)			
June (6/11)			
July (7/9)	Neon after 1 full year		



<b>August (8/8)</b>	MPC candidates, MPC election process review		
<b>September (9/9)</b>			
<b>October (10/8 )</b>			
MPC vote			
<b>November (11/12)</b>			
<b>December (12/9)</b>	2019 review, 2020 look-ahead	MPC election results	

# MPC February Call: Agenda, Minutes, and Notes

Tuesday, February 12, 2019

4:00 Welcome and roll call. Present:

- Robert Turner
- Mark Jacobs
- Bruce White
- Michael Leff
- Shane Hetzler
- Alex Barrett
- John Gunn

[Amy LaBarge], [ Nancy Patch] absent

Quorum present.

4:05 Discuss/approve minutes from January 2019

Shane: Motion to approve minutes, Alex: Second

- Motion carried

4:10 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

- Amanda: Document storage and access for the MPC. Static files will be stored in the new website portal. For live files, go with what works for the majority.
  - Robert: Can I post a static file for review?
  - Amanda: I will ask Colleen.
  - Robert: Other scenario; we've managed with Google Docs, can also email around. Other preferences? Could establish a shared folder on Dropbox.
  - Alex: I'm comfortable with whatever works with Guild system.
  - Michael: Don't care. Had some of the same problems not getting used to something that doesn't stand still.
  - Robert: Things will continue to evolve with corporate platform. Maybe do some testing
- Amanda: Other updates. Stone Fence Farm field tour, June 7-8, Board meeting, funding available for young professionals and not-so-young professionals. The hope is to get as many MPC members to attend. Travel assistance is available. Opportunity for MPC and Board to meet.
  - Bruce: Stone Fence interested in becoming a Model Forest? If they are interested, maybe we could arrange to have the assessment to see if it qualifies. If enough Guild members willing to do that, maybe that part could happen at the same time.
  - Robert: Opportunity for outreach to UVM, UNH?
  - John: I will certainly try to round up some folks. School is out of session, so students will likely be further afield, but that doesn't necessarily have to be a hurdle. I will do my best to get students and faculty there. Will bring my banjo.
  - Robert: Softball game?
  - Mark: I won't be able to make it.

- Bruce: I think that's when my daughter gets out of school. I might be able to make it.
- Robert: As things firm up, I think we can help with transportation to the meeting.
- Amanda: New roles at the Guild. Guild is growing. New org chart will be developed.
  - Robert: Impact on members and member support?
  - Amanda: Still working out details. Bottom line, good thing.
  - Amanda: Quick note that staff are thinking more about diversity and inclusion on the Board.

***Action:** Amanda will update the MPC as the plans for re-organization firm up. We'd appreciate her perspective on how the reorganization may affect the capacity of staff to support Guild outreach to members and events.*

***Action:** revisit efforts on publicity and outreach for the June SFF event during the March call.*

Committee reports (names in bold are chairs of the committee)

4:25 [Natural Forest Management Policy statement revision](#): **John**, Alex, Mark

*Previous: Zander will coordinate between the BoD Executive Committee and our group in January to explore the issues raised today and develop a plan for moving the process forward. The committee will arrange to send a version of the policy statement to reviewers.*

- John: There wasn't movement on this issue until last week when discussion over email involving Rick Morrill and Al Sample. Two fronts; specifically on this policy statement (near term), and longer term, on procedure on how to move forward in interacting with the Board on policy statements. First, looking for clarification of whether comments from Robert Hrubes were only his, or the whole Board's. As surmised, they were basically just his comments without any review or consensus from the Board. Zander was going to try to get the Board to produce a collective move. Holding pattern on that. I will follow up with Zander and try to resolve that quickly so we can move forward and get some kind of endorsement from Board on that statement and get it out to membership for a vote. Also, external review. Mark had offered to contact Jerry Franklin. Tony D'Amato and Brian Palik would be good as well. I'd like to do that with the revised version. I suspect we'll go with the version that addresses Robert Hrubes' edits.
- Robert: Next steps?
- John: If Robert's comments are all we get, for the committee within MPC, if we can decide what aspects of those comments we want to accept and incorporate, and if there's other things we don't think are needed, doesn't need to go back to Board for that.
- Michael: I'm thinking stuff coming from Board ought to first be approved by Board, and they should get back to us promptly. If one guy, we'd consider accepting suggestions, assuming these do not compromise the message. For the future, have them be unanimous on it. Was the nature of the comments substantive?
- John: More wordsmithing. Not substantively changed. But some of us were a little taken aback by wordsmithing after 9 of us on the MPC had already done that.

- Mark: I think too if we had feedback from D'Amato, Palik, Franklin, that would hold a lot of ground too. I don't think Robert would fight it. My sense is that he was involved in the original and has some personal ownership.
- John: I will follow up with Zander right away and try to get to that endorsement review.
- Robert: date of next board meeting?
- Amanda: Next Board meeting day after MPC, March 13.
- John: Leads to clarifying process for future. They need to clarify, and we need to do the same. Maintain our independence here, and also reflect on the fact that we are elected by the membership to play this role.
- John: Next steps toward resolution?
- Amanda: I'd suggest using the in-person meeting in June as a venue for resolving.
- Robert: If 1-2 members of MPC want to dig deeper. The board is always on the lookout for candidates. May want to pilfer MPC candidates for Board members. Also, board/MPC relations is an avenue for revision of Membership and Policy guidelines. MPC-Board joint activity. May be a reason to have a couple MPC members working closely with the Board. Also, Zander felt stuck in the middle of this debate. He's directly supervised by the Board, but appreciates our position.
- Mark: It really surprises me that the MPC goes through an election, and the Board is a seat-of-the-pants function. I'm not trying to bash the board. Really a formal process for that Board. They dictate a lot of what we do. Or they did on this. I had an experience in 2014 with NLEB policy. When it got to Board level, it stalled.
- Robert: Board is not monolithic in its views by any means. A number of Board members would like to see closer collaboration with MPC. I know it's an honest and heartfelt concern by a few that not enough Board attention has been focused on the core membership piece of the Guild organization. They see us as a real asset and appreciate the current strength and commitment of the MPC.
- Robert: next steps: Sounds like we have steps for natural Forest mgmt policy statement...review comments, clarify that these are final, submit for peer review, make any adjustments, re-submit to board.
- Robert: Look at MPC guidelines, think about what's in them. I don't think they need major revision, but some parts are out of date and don't reflect current organizational structure and process. Opportunity to make roles of MPC a little more definite.
- Mark: I'll help.
- John: I'm happy to help, too.
- Amanda: I'll suggest to Zander that Amber be included on the Board side.

**Action:** *John will follow up with Zander and get the Exec Comm to confirm the comments are final. A revised draft will be sent to Franklin, Palik, D'Amato, with expectations that their review will be done by early March. If possible, a final draft will be available for our next MPC call March 11. Assuming we agree and have a quorum, the MPC submits the draft back to the Board for approval on March 12.*

**Action:** *Robert will arrange shared access to a "working draft" of the guidelines for John Mark, Robert to offer comments.*

*Previous: The subcommittee will develop a draft work plan for 2019, for presentation at the February call.*

- Shane: Have toolkit we can share with different potential student clubs and help them get started. Finalized with a lot of work from Colleen. We probably haven't sent a final version around. For 2019, I've received the most recent members list from staff, did a coarse filter looking at university affiliates. Talk with MPC about first round of recruitment. Identify strong partners within colleges and university programs. Specifically looking for professional members and affiliate members on faculty. Kicking around that list between the three of us based on folks we know who aren't affiliated anymore, might be retired. What we were talking about doing is taking that list, getting input from MPC, turn to research on strong forestry or natural resource mgmt programs. Lean on our professional contacts; e.g. university forestry program doing really well with a lot of students enrolled, maybe we have a professional contact who should join the Guild; good opportunity to bring folks into the fold. Ultimately, we're trying to figure out what success looks like in these earlier stages. We don't want to overextend ourselves with a massive push. Maybe a question for you all, what is a reasonable benchmark for success for first round of low-hanging fruit for programs? 3 new student chapters this year, or get on path? More, less?
- Bruce: I tend to agree; wouldn't want to overcommit. See how it's going to work. 3 starting out is appropriate.
- Mark: We have three community colleges here. People come out of there with a technical degree, go on to get a bachelor's at UMN. All getting SAF-accredited. To the point where MN DNR will not hire somebody unless they're from an SAF-accredited school. When I talk to schools, they talk about SAF as bread and butter. Uphill battle here.
- Shane: Something we've wrestled with too. Historic tension between Guild and SAF. Obviously, many more student SAF chapters in various states of being. Maybe Zander had mentioned if clubs have dual membership, what does that look like? Speaking from personal experience at OSU, strong regional forestry program, but students have formed new student Guild chapter were excited because they felt SAF chapter wasn't fitting their needs. I don't think we need to compete with SAF. Just offering other alternative. How many Guild members are SAF-accredited foresters still active in Guild too? How we want to present ourselves in that realm. When we're actively engaging folks, how do we want to portray the Guild? Highlight differences in SAF? More nuanced?
- Mark: If we can get them in the field and look at Guild-style forestry on the ground, would go a long ways to recruitment of people who we would like to be Guild members.
- Shane: Thinking about how this fits in with our 2019 draft workplan, idea is we'd have list of Guild members, sub-category of people that aren't Guild members but should be. Members in professional academic institutions with strong natural resource programs. Taking info and divide and conquer. Look at resources we have on staff and MPC, work alongside that contact within university or college or community college. Will fall beyond our subcommittee as to who's best fit for which potential partners or student groups.

- Also thinking, right now, we have a chapter at MI Tech, OSU. I'm confused if there's one at Auburn or not, Yale or not. Looking for an update on who's official and who isn't. If half-official, what we need to do.
- Amanda: all active, I believe. Need mechanism for staying connected.
- Shane: Room on new website for student chapters. Something as simple as a page that lists current chapters. Room for other people to get engaged now that we're unveiling who's involved.
- John: I think you've hit on it. What you, I, Nancy, others' opinions, what that outreach looks like when we make contact. We had been missing that formal piece with guidance. Need to put some thought into what that looks like, if somebody close by to a prospective school, meeting with student club advisor, offer to make presentation on Guild as an entity, or work with Amanda and others on when June gathering happens, make intentional way to connect. Invite key decision-makers to be part of it. Showcase what Guild forestry is all about.
- Bruce: I'm giving a guest lecture tomorrow at Duke U. They do not have an undergrad forestry degree, but do have graduate degrees in forestry. I guest-lecture once a year in their silviculture class. Student TA had found about Guild learn-and-burn event in TN, and inquired about that with Nick Biemiller. Nick told him about that. A couple of the students had inquired about student Guild involvement, might be interested in a chapter as well. I'll address that after the lecture tomorrow. Is there a date I can tell them when we might have that toolkit developed?
- Shane: At this point, we've gone through edits. It has a final version in place. Might be best to check with Colleen. Should be good to go. Partly opportunistic. Duke program dovetails nicely with Guild. I'm hesitant to say wait. Interact with people, identify somebody on faculty there, students not getting ready to graduate. If those in place, get some names, get some emails.
- Robert 112 student members now, assume many at institutions where there might not be a chapter? Is this useful?
- Shane: Maybe aim for 1 chapter in each region. At regional level, think of academic institutions and how academics network. OSU, Klaus sent out emails to contacts in OR/WA who supported students.
- Robert: Sounds like toolkit is basically ready. Over next couple months, refine 2-3 focus institutions that will be pilot for this toolkit. MPC will be engaged in whatever way it can to make that happen along with any professional members we can drag in. I keep thinking about our MPC candidates, how to engage them more. Great work developing toolkit and thinking this through.

**Action:** *Shane will distribute the draft tool kit for final review by the MPC at the March call.*

5:00      [Membership planning and process](#) (Robert)

*Previous: Robert will submit a request for 2018 members results to compare to 2017 for presentation at the February call.*

- Robert: I just got some data from Colleen today; haven't had time to work in detail. A few numbers. 566 total members. Of that, 300 are professional and 32 are retired

professional. 332 professional. Of that 566, 112 are student members. I don't have exact comparable info from last year, but it looks like our professional member base was 262 in 2017, so gained about 40 professional members, a number of retired professional members - almost doubled - but prof mem category grew, too. I was able to figure out in terms of lapsed members: 45 lapsed professional members in 2018, turnover of ~15%. That is, 15% of prof mems did not renew. That rate about the same as in 2017. That 15% seems like not a big number, probably a fairly natural level. Opportunity to grow this organization without a whole lot of outreach. The kinds of things we're doing now will help. I'll formalize this over next couple days and send it around. Could go on shared link space. I also want to be sure I'm interpreting these data correctly. Having more than half of our members be professional is important. Some members see to recall that number being higher in the past. I will analyze by region. Though we don't have good region data, I can make some assumptions by zip code, roughly assign members to regions. Doesn't work as well with students.

- Mark: There are some really good people on that list. I have recruited some in the last year, wildlife biologists, not necessarily forestry people.
- Amanda: they are welcome. If they have a profession of forest stewardship.
- Robert: I did notice in Aug 2018, quite different numbers on lapsed members. A lot of people didn't renew right away. 20-30 on list I'd identified as people I thought I should talk to in order to encourage them to re-up. I almost couldn't believe it, but didn't see any of those names on most recent list. I hope they'd just forgotten. As Neon gets better, we'll have more information about various aspects, e.g. option to have membership renewal be automatic. I'd be really curious to where those numbers are. I think funding orgs see sustaining support like that as important.
- Amanda: May be people who just don't want to put their data out there for auto-renewal.

**Action:** Robert will finalize year-over-year analysis and post for MPC access.

---

#### 5:10 New Council Business

ATL Submission?—due next Tuesday

- Amanda: March ATL: Maybe reach out to student members, prospective chapters.
- Robert: ATL format...A number of short blurbs, meant to entice readers to pursue links MPC “section” had no intro that made you want to click on it and go to next level. I don't know how many people scan and move on. MPC may have gotten short shrift.
- Mark: I noticed that when I explored a submission I'd written. You have to really dig to get MPC article. It's not prominent.

**Action:** Amanda will take responsibility for the March ATL submission, asking for MPC input or review.

-----

#### 5:25 Updates

- Mark: Just got a sign-on for forest-friendly brewery. TNC is a partner. Offered marketing support. A lot happening in last week.
- Robert: I'm hoping I can learn from you and replicate that.
- Mark: Video, Katie Fernholz working on it. As soon as that's ready, I'll send it to MPC to get feedback.
- Robert: Guild website, space on side for tweets. Who does this? I noticed Katie was presenting at a national mass timber conference. Highlight contributions of our members?
- Mark: I agree. She's my boss now.
- I would like some feedback on Mass Timber stuff, see if we should get involved in policy. Engineers and architects hardest nuts to crack. If we can make an argument that this product comes from Guild-style managed forests, we support that. What can we do to crack that nut.
- Robert: Engineered wood on a lot of peoples' radar. Has real climate implications.

5:30 Adjourn

- Bruce: Motion0
- We're done! Thanks all!

**MPC member committees:**

Nancy: Student engagement, WOW

Robert: Procedures, Events

John: Student, Policy

Bruce: Model forest

Amy:

Michael:

Shane: student, membership/outreach

Alex: Model forest, Policy

Mark: Events, Model forest, Policy

**Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

1. Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)
2. Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)
3. Alex Barrett – Vermont (1st term 2018)
4. Bruce White – North Carolina (1st term 2018)
5. Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)
6. John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)
7. Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)
8. Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)
9. Amy LaBarge--Washington (

## Proposed 2019 Calendar



<b>Month</b>	<b>MPC discussion topic</b>	<b>ATL topic</b>	<b>ATL due date</b>
<b>January</b> (1/8)			
<b>February</b> (2/12)			
<b>March</b> (3/12)			
<b>April</b> (4/9)			
<b>May</b> (5/14)			
<b>June</b> (6/11)			
<b>July</b> (7/9)	Neon after 1 full year		
<b>August</b> (8/8)	MPC candidates, MPC election process review		
<b>September</b> (9/9)			
<b>October</b> (10/8 )			
MPC vote			
<b>November</b> (11/12)	Model Forest		
<b>December</b> (12/9)	2018 review, 2019 look-ahead	MPC election results	

# MPC March Call: Minutes and Notes

Tuesday, March 12, 2019

## Attendees

Nancy Patch  
John Gunn  
Zander Evans  
Shane Hetzler

Michael Leff  
Mark Jacobs  
Bruce White  
Alex Barrett  
Robert Turner

Absent – Amy LaBarge

A quorum of members was present.

## Staff updates

Zander: The Guild is staffing a new position to support program work in Colorado and the Intermountain West. Amanda (NE director) and Eytan (SW director) are being promoted to deputy directors.

New web site being targeted for May 1. Hopefully, Neon member “log-on” feature will be in place for membership renewal (July)

Motion to approve minutes: Shane moves (no second)

Bruce – update the terms of members at the end

Nancy moved to approve with update

Vote: Unanimously approved

## Policy Statement

John Gunn – worked through the changes in the policy statement proposed by R. Hrubes.

Accepted most changes, added end note about why the update occurred

Updated definitions to follow FSC definitions of ‘natural forest’ and ‘plantation’

Discussion – should we send out for peer-review?

Potential for delay; if we get suggestions, we would have to make changes

May not be a benefit

***Motion to approve the policy statement; Nancy moves; Mark 2<sup>nd</sup>***

Vote: Approved unanimously

Zander: Next the board will vote whether to send to the professional members for a vote; then staff will organize a vote and report the results to MPC. Neon likely won’t be used for the voting.

Next step? Plantation statement?

Plantations would be a good companion piece to the natural forest statement, but it could be a heavy lift.

Robert – request that the subcommittee take a look at FSC’s statement on plantations (John, Mark, Alex – Shane would like to join)

Mark – should we have a position or policy statement on mass timber?

Nancy – might it be possible to start on two policy statements?

Mark – or perhaps mass timber as a position statement. We should be out front on mass timber, especially regarding management practices.

Nancy- a position statement needs to refer to a policy statement

Zander—should we poll the members on other policy statement ideas (ATL)?

[No firm actions taken. Committee or MPC will revisit.]

### **Student engagement**

Nancy – the student manual is ready to share with universities, faculty, and students

Shane – sent draft around to MPC 2/14/19 to get feedback. [BW, NP, RT have examined it—no feedback-- seems finished]. Next step: select schools to distribute to...

Shane: Engage regional coordinators for their insights (low hanging fruit)?

Nancy: SAF accredited schools?

John: previously developed a map where things seemed to be “happening.” UNH has a forestry club. Hoping to see some members attend June NH gathering at Stone Fence (despite school being out).

*Action: Shane will send a note to all with SAF Accredited programs to solicit feedback on best candidates.*

Nancy: perhaps we should schedule a call once the list is updated to make final choices.

Robert: plan is to start pretty small? 2 or 3 schools?

Shane: one in every region (5 + CA)?

### **Membership and Policy Guidelines revision**

Robert: conversations have begun between the board (Rick Morrill), the MPC (Robert) and staff (Amanda), starting with a review of the suggestions made by Fred. The board participants (besides Rick) are still indefinite. MPC participants are John, Mark and Robert. We’ve discussed a goal of having a draft available by the June board meeting (NH). This will likely require at least two phone conferences.

### **Open discussion**

Shane: suggests the idea of a Guild pop-up meeting. If members are traveling, try to connect with others at the destination.

John: like we did when Bruce travelled to the northeast last winter.

Robert: headed to Portland OR. Shane will try to set up a meeting with some members.

Zander: document with a photo...good ATL material.

NE SAF conference in Burlington will include a Guild dinner gathering. Alex is involved in the conference planning. Many Guild members presenting.

Michael: March 22—Utilizing Large Woody Debris in River Restoration. Also a topic on the NESAF schedule.

Mark: Forest to Tap update. 9 breweries signed up. First event held. Gearing up for Arbor day. Momentum building.

# MPC April Call: Minutes and Notes

Tuesday, April 9, 2019

4:05 PM

## MPC Call Agenda -- Tuesday, April 9, 2019

4:00 Welcome and roll call

Present: Robert Turner, Michael Leff, John Gunn, Mark Jacobs, Bruce White, Alex Barrett

Absent: Shane, Amy, Nancy

4:05 Discuss/approve minutes from March 2019 (attached)

- Bruce: Motion to approve minutes without changes
- John: Second.
- Passed unanimously.
- Amanda: Has Amy been to any MPC meetings since January?
- Robert: I will reach out to her. 3 meetings missed is a flag.

4:10 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

Amanda reports that this was her first day as co-Deputy Director (with Eytan). The goal is as project activity grows the deputies would carry some of Zander's organizational load. Web page scheduled for May unveiling.

[Committee reports \(names in bold are chairs of the committee\)](#)

4:20 [Policy](#): **John**, Alex, Mark

Status of Natural Forest Management Policy: Board approved, vote scheduled for immediate future.

- John: Looks good.
- Robert: Will be sent out for a vote next week. New policy initiatives? (See minutes from March)
- Where does the committee go from here?
- John: Had a subcommittee on policy statements in general that brought subjects to the table.
- Robert: had talked about revising existing policy statements and see if they are up to date. Also discussion with Board about plantation silviculture. Start back from previous efforts? New list?
- John: Mark had some thoughts on mass timber movement. Maybe fits within existing policy statements. Not sure we need to do a full review again.
- Mark: John, Mark, Alex, Shane. Plantations.
- Robert: Important that subcommittees talk between meetings.
- John: I don't know that we identified a lead on it. Generally, on the subcommittees, we've got a lead at least in name.
- Alex: I know very little about plantation forestry, but important in the world of forest products. Could be valuable to think about Guild principles application. And reach other members that might work in plantations more than natural setting.

- Mark: I'd be willing to look at other policies, FSC specifically. Not sure what we'd come out with for a policy. Don't want to do as an academic exercise. Want to do something that's going to be meaningful.
- Robert: I think I'm remembering that someone on the Board suggested that this plantation piece be a companion piece to the natural forests piece. Big in Southeast.
- John: In 1999 policy statement, footnote that MPC was planning to take it up.

*Action: For next meeting, John, Alex, Mark, Shane touch base via email and develop a perspective on FSC plantation policy and see if anything there can form a basis for a Guild policy. Also look at other topics in preparation for May call.*

#### 4:30 [Student engagement: Nancy, John and Shane](#)

Student tool kit roll-out. Target institutions selected? Plan for outreach?

- John: Need to push forward. Got a sense of low-hanging fruit. Only so much outreach we can do at any time. Start and go from there.
- Robert: I encourage everyone to go back to Shane's email and the list of schools. There may be some opportunities we missed, either for initial or secondary roll-out.

*Action: subcommittee with plan a call to finalize candidates and discuss next steps. Suggest ways that the MPC can support outreach to selected schools.*

#### 4:45 [Membership planning and process \(Robert, John, Mark\)](#)

- Update of the Membership and Policy Guidelines: review of key areas to consider the necessary process within the MPC for input.
- Robert: Have 3 reps from MPC ready to roll. Rick not quite there on board participation. Also idea of at-large member: Robert will contact MPC candidate Robert Northup.
- Robert reviewed some of the "richer" points of discussion in the review to date.
- Michael: Also takes me back to focus group of a few years ago. Now what jumps out at me is the lack of clarity between what MPC does, Board does. Which is able to name committees, working groups. Left me wondering, what is the MPC charged with as opposed to the Board?
- Robert: A number of things have changed, and there's a lot of confusion in the document. A lot won't be controversial; everyone's seen the changes. Some questions. Bear with me and we'll look through these. Time frame, hope 2-3 meetings over next 3-4 months to hammer out most of these issues. E.g. Affiliate member category? Covered ground; didn't have obvious solution.
- John: When Fred was director, a lot of work going on, but no resolution.
- Robert: Alternative under types of membership. History of membership committee. Changed a few years ago to staff responsibility. MPC is suggested we approve any non-professional members. One thing we can discuss as the MPC.
- Professional membership definition - guidelines should evolve to reflect organizational practice. When written, clear intent to restrict membership of Guild to foresters practicing forest management...test of membership. Membership committee approval required: If peers felt you deserved it. Association of Consulting Foresters still expects letters of reference/sponsors. We've gone to a more relaxed set of criteria.

- Item 5. All MPC members elected at large. We've talked about diversifying, gender, affiliation. Proposal : have member from each of the regions. Is this justified as a way to focus more attention on these regions. Bring them into a stronger whole. MPC is the only part of the Guild where members are elected. Important vehicle for people to have representation.
- Michael: Thinking about Society for Ecological Restoration now. What's been going on for New England chapter, idea on Board is to have 1 board rep for each of the New England states. Someone who lives and works in that state. When empty, left open. Other board spots for at large. I live in MA, work in MA, but also work in VT. Board decided to appoint me as VT state rep for the purpose of having someone who is more than just a body in that state. Take on field trip or other outreach. Maybe if mix of at-large and regional reps, and if you can't fill it, it's open.
- Robert: State or regional rep would get some money, if a little more tied to regions. Is SER structure working?
- Michael: Yes. Difference is we're talking about New England, all within a day's drive. Maybe would work the same with regions across continent. Reasonable to expect state reps to do.
- Robert: Shane would probably say geography is a challenge in the PNW
- John: Canadian members?
- Robert: 3-5 Canadian members. I think there's potential. I brought a stack of Guild brochures to a conference in NS, 75-80, and they all disappeared.
- Michael: Until we get more of a critical mass in Canada, maybe recruiting or serving those interests could be an at-large. Have to have critical mass to be worth regional rep.
- Robert: Chicken and egg, regional coordinators promote regional membership. More membership, more support for a coordinator.
- Robert: Provision that 2/3 of MPC be actively engaged in forest mgmt. Comments? Do we benefit from that provision?
- Bruce: I would think if we're concerned about it being limiting, keep requirement, but reduce to 51%.
- Robert: Currently, we're barely at the 2/3 level with the current MPC.
- Michael: Other comments, impossible to define precisely "actively engaged in forest mgmt."
- Robert: More the sense of the organization embodied in this, less hard and fast. Gets complicated if we get candidates that don't have hands-on dirt forestry component.
- Michael: Organizational question.
- [Robert: At the point of final review of the By-laws , we'll submit final proposal from Board and MPC to membership. That document should be accompanied by another document that explains the rationale so members can appreciate the thought that went into why the changes were made. Part of our role as committees here. Some of these philosophical reflections should be articulated.]
- Would different regional or state-level structure contribute to a deeper level of engagement among membership? Suggestion is regional members electing a regional chair. Some responsibilities. Could be an MPC member. Another opportunity to focus structure of the organization more at the regional level. Get more people involved.
- On Process: within a month or so, will have organizing call. Draft proposal of changes to the board in June, at Stone Fence.

Membership analysis (pdf attached)

- Robert: Some analysis used to be done by staff and submitted to the board. I don't believe they've seen any analysis recently. I tried to put some of that together. Two datasets; expired members from last year, 2018 renewals/2019 members. Expired members data is a little loose. Some lapses. 14% turnover of professional members. I guess that's reasonable, but it seems a little high to me. Retired professionals, students. I'm not sure I understand the role of affiliates in financial terms. Dollars add up, but dues not much compared to overall organizational budget. If we look at expired membership as being a reasonable number, we could focus more efforts on retaining people who have enrolled. Certainly, a lot of students come in, and we're trying to get more students in. Perhaps ought to look at retaining students more. If we've got students interested in joining, we ought to be thinking about ways to make them permanent members. Interesting to see what happens regionally. In CA, we had a lot of growth in new professional membership. Was big proportional change, starting from a small, but solid base. Seen pretty solid growth across other regions of the country overall. If we can maintain a 10% growth rate, bringing new blood into organization. Pay attention to that, keep org strong. Affiliate memberships are growing. We've talked about this in the past. Having affiliates, like-minded organizations not actually engaged as foresters, conservation organizations would fall into this category. Important to our overall message. Having them as affiliates makes a statement about Guild principles.
- John: To that point, I was at NESAF and thinking about those meetings 20 years ago with undergrad and graduate work about wildlife and forestry interactions. My connection to the forestry field was from wildlife perspective, but I realized that forestry was the way. SAF 20 years ago messages were against what I stood for. Guild attracted me, like-minded people about forest as a whole. I feel that affiliate membership is really important. A lot of people out there wanting to make that connection to the forestry community. Emphasis important.
- Bruce: I agree with that.
- Robert: To what extent does our event outreach extend to affiliate members.
- Amanda: Project-based outreach events reach all members in our database in the region.
- Bruce: Can we tie in with university or coop extension?
- Robert: Seems to me we tie into a lot of events not coming out of the Guild.
- Amanda: Colleen is swamped with events and job postings coming in from Guild members.
- Bruce: Event where has a Guild flavor, making sure affiliate members would also find out about it.
- Robert: Hoping we can refine this analysis. I see partly as MPC's role. See if there are strategic places where we ought to be looking at membership, for retention, for increases. Will have better access to data after this round of renewals using the Neon system. A good exercise for the January MPC call.
- Mark: I'd thought for a while, could you have a provision of being a member, pay your dues, have to dedicate so many hours on projects? Risk of turning people away. But if they're not engaged enough to go to a couple events in the region, are they valued members anyway? I reached out to Guild members in MN for forests and taps project, got 0 response.
- Robert: Worth thinking about. What do we offer as concrete benefits for members that aren't motivated? CEUs. That's an important motivator for a lot of people. If there's a benefit to them, part of what we offer here.



---

5:10 New Council Business

April ATL submission

- Robert: For ATL in April, Zander suggested we document recent Guild activities. Had a Guild dinner at NESAF, 40 Guild members there. Really pleased.
- Amanda was part of the NESAF program. She led a keynote address on ethics with her old professor, Lloyd Irland. Great exposure for the Guild, very well received topic, excellent delivery.
- Alex: Well-said. It was an awesome session, has inspired more discussion among the three Guild foresters in our company about ethics in forestry.

5:15 General sharing

Guild pop-up gatherings; Forest to Tap developments, other items of interest from MPC members.

- Robert: When I was in Portland recently, I connected with Shane and new Guild board member Peter Hayes, also Shane's wife, Shannon, as well as a friend of mine who's a young forester. Really fun for me to be in a totally different place and share Guild perspective.
- Michael: I would be curious, part of MPC doc redo, about how things stand now. Is there a clear delineation or formal list of Board vs. MPC stuff? Or kind of entangled?
- Robert: I don't think it's as entangled as the documents would lead one to believe. Part of what this revision process will include is clarification. In particular, how the Board interacts with MPC submissions. There are some other areas where not clear what Board's responsibility is, some is in MPC's camp. Document of Board and Organizational Guidelines also exists. The Membership and Policy Guidelines doc is more about what MPC's role is. Hopefully will separate those pretty clearly.
- Mark: I think the Women in Forest Stewardship series was some of the best the Guild has come up with. I'm sending that link to women in forestry in MN. Some have thought about joining.
- Bruce: Stone Fence Farm update?
- Amanda: registration just opened. 11 so far, likely to be crowded. Unlimited camping. Stipend for travel still available.

5:30 Adjourn

- Motion to adjourn, Alex. Bruce: Second ...Approved.

### **MPC member committees**

Nancy: Student engagement, WOW

Robert: Procedures, Events, Membership and Policy guidelines revision

John: Student, Policy

Bruce: Model forest

Amy:

Michael: membership/outreach

Shane: student, membership/outreach

Alex: Model forest, Policy

Mark: Events, Model forest, Policy

**Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)

Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)

Alex Barrett – Vermont (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Bruce White – North Carolina (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)

John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)

Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)

Amy LaBarge –Washington (1<sup>st</sup> term 2021)

Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)

# MPC May Call: Minutes and Notes

Tuesday, May 14, 2019

4:00 Welcome and roll call

- Present: Shane, Mark, Amy, John, Robert, Michael, Alex, Nancy arrived at 4:30
- Missing: Bruce
- Staff--Amanda

4:05 Discuss/approve minutes from April 2019

- Michael motions to accept minutes
- John seconds
- **Minutes approved**

4:10 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

Suggested topics: status of voting on Natural Forest Management Policy. Any interesting comments? --92 votes in out of 311 professional and retired professional members; nearly all favorable.

Status of web site redesign---Amanda: new website coming soon. Colleen working hard. Website will be connected to member portal to database.

Brief recap of Guild events for the season. (status of registration for NH, ME)-- Amanda: 35 registered so far for Stone Fence Farm; more have said they plan to register.

## Committee reports (names in bold are chairs of the committee)

4:25 **Policy:** John, Alex, Mark

- New initiatives for this committee?
- John: Some email discussion around plantation topic. Diversity of ways Guild members might engage in this topic. When Leila was leading MPC, she organized a few speakers to have a webinar focused on some of the questions we were examining. Helpful way to think about issue and see if enough consensus for a direction. In the end, we didn't pursue that, but thinking of that as a model, we could bring in 2-3 regions where plantation forestry is a significant component of the landscape and maybe frame up speakers to respond to some questions as a complement to Natural Forest Policy statement.
- Mark: We did have consensus that we wouldn't banish plantation managers from the Guild. Seriously, so much variation between regions, hard to nail down an approach to this. Still, around U.S., ways to make plantations better for habitat. Someone made comment about Southeast plantations being terrible; someone else said if it weren't trees, it'd be cotton. Have to take a bigger perspective. Good way to engage some Guild members.
- Shane: I have my own opinions of plantations from work out here. Bruce's comment on Southeast aspect, interesting. Bringing in speakers from different regions could be quite valuable. How this policy statement could do extra good is to raise awareness among our members that folks are working in different conditions. Different perspective on forest mgmt. on the ground, natural level.

- John: Some of that context, plantation vs. row crop, some areas there is a definite tradeoff there. Price of wood vs. alternate crops on that land.
- Amanda: will sugarbush be addressed as plantation?
- John: Way we defined it was more from FSC perspective. Don't think sugarbush would meet that definition, but stepping back from that, potentially conflicting with natural forest mgmt. policy, moving those stands in a direction that might not be the best from an ecological standpoint.
- Robert: Very complex issue. I don't feel any need to rush it. I like the idea of a thorough and thoughtful approach. Host of ethical and practical issues involved. I don't see a clear path through these things. E.g. livelihood of foresters involved, wouldn't be able to sustain work on non-plantation lands without plantations. My colleagues and friends down there have a great pride in being able to meet the needs of society. Definitely tricky issue. If we can show thoughtfulness, we'll gain credibility there as well.
- John: Definitely some folks, Royal Martin in MS delta area, FSC-certified with plantations.
- Robert: Next steps, most would be happy to read and learn and provide input, but some idea of what targets we might think about in next few months. We'll expect to hear more in the future.
- John: what about the idea of taking a monthly call or separate webinar?
- Robert: Quite plausible.
- Mark: Maybe ATL article from managers about what they're doing.
- Robert: Forum for online discussion?
- Amanda: I don't believe so on new website. historically, this has proven to require considerable oversight.

- 
- Robert: Wanted to pause to re-welcome Amy and invite to her to share a few words.
  - Amy: First off, my apologies for missing the last few meetings. I'm aware that I'm past the threshold of acceptability. What's going on my end is that I'm in an interim position and have just taken on additional administrative load here in Seattle Public Utilities, so my bandwidth has been more limited to engage on Guild things. I'm in this position through June. What we'd talked about was whether I wanted to continue on MPC or not. I do see that I have limited bandwidth than what is optimal. I'd offer that I think the Guild is an awesome organization that I love, and I also don't feel like I'm doing it justice right now on the MPC. I'm willing to step down and give up my seat if there's someone who's super-excited and close in votes. It won't be any skin off of my back. From my view of the playing field, it was a really rich group of candidates. In particular, some women more in the Midwest who I was very impressed with. I know we want to have geographic representation. I also think it's important to have equitable gender representation.
  - Robert: When Amy and I talked, wanted to maintain representation and diversity on council. Also if this org means a lot to you, you contribute any way you can and we would be grateful for it. If you're willing to stay engaged and feel like you have a commitment to the organization and interest in the issues we're talking about, I'd welcome you to stay on.
  - Mark: This is May. We've got June coming up. If you can be more engaged after that point, I say hang in there.

- Nancy: I say the same as Mark. Backing up what Robert just said, there's different levels of engagement we have at all times. This is a 3-yr commitment, we all have months that don't work. I would welcome you to stay on. Just participate in the phone calls is really valuable.
- John: Same as Nancy
- Shane: Amy, when we first spoke, you were a lapsed member. That kind of engagement is something you want. Frustrating when you're spread too thin. June's just around the corner.
- Robert: Clear we all want you to hang in.
- Amy: Thank you for the support!

#### 4:40 [Student engagement: Nancy, John and Shane](#)

- Update on Student tool kit roll-out.
- Shane: we had some discussions this month between John, Nancy, and myself around our ideal candidates. Narrowed down list of names, Guild member status, institution. Council point-people to reach out to see whether or not traction can be had at the institution, what student situation is like, etc. Definitely still in feedback mode.
- Heidi Bjornson? UNH. John would be likely person to reach out.
- Jessica Leahy, UMaine.
- UMN, Mark provided Sara Kelso from MI Tech. Also Marcella. Mark, good point person.
- Mark Swanson at Washington State U. Not a member. Amy, don't know if you know him or not. I've been on some email chains with Klaus Puettman. We could either tag-team that.
- Amy: Mark would be great to include. He probably would be interested in becoming a Guild member.
- Tony D'Amato, UVM. Nancy.
- Shane: Talked about being methodical. Maybe in powerhouse regions, reach out to a couple different institutions. Additionally, area that I would love some feedback, from my limited knowledge of forestry programs in the South, some powerhouses down there.
- Steven ? from MS State popped up as a member. FSC committee with John.
- Ken Smith at University of the South
- Don? UTN.
- 1-2 people at NC State.
- Amanda: I'll put a bug in Nick Biemiller's ear to get back to you.
- Shane: Intermountain West, other places, think about where we could identify potential candidates for programs as well.
- Amanda: ATL note might help.
- Nancy: Really a one-on-one personal call that will make it work.
- Shane: Next steps, I can send table around with target people to outreach, point people from MPC spearheading that. Sometime in next month, folks can reach out to those university contacts and try to get a sense of what the current status is of forestry program leanings. Student engagement the university contact might feel there might be for a Guild chapter. See what potential is. Who would be a good advisor for this club? What's available, where we should spend our effort.
- Nancy: Would it be appropriate to share our toolkit? Have that document they could look at?
- Shane: Great idea. Outreach tool.

- Robert: Putting myself in shoes of advisor, they really value having connections with professional members who might be available to visit or sit with or talk to potential club or chapter members, or just a gathering of folks getting together to decide if that's something they want to do. Let them know it's not just the national org and MPC, but local members.
- Shane: Works in our favor here in Corvallis having 3 Guild members directly in town. All of us at Trout Mountain have met with students at different times. Klaus as advisor has been great at seeking out professional contacts for these students. Great motivator to show students different perspectives on how to manage forestland. Everyone on this list has been selected because of their geographical closeness to a few other members.
- Nancy: Here in VT, I'm very engaged with the student population with Tony already. Surprised we haven't had more UVM student members. I keep seeing new student members list, wonder where UVMers.
- Robert: If we emphasize that in our contacts, have a number of people and a toolkit that might be additional support, something we could provide.
- Mark: I sent you some info on UMN-Crookston. They have a really good natural resource program, but they're not SAF-accredited. People that graduate from there won't be hired by MN DNR. I hired three people from that school. Are there other programs out there that might be low-hanging fruit for the Guild? SAF is really ingrained in some primary schools.
- Shane: Good question. We're not beholden to SAF-accredited programs. Our focus should be on programs that are doing exactly that, providing good educations, turning out good students that might be receptive to Guild-style management From OR, Kate Holerin (?) works part-time at Mt. Hood Community College as faculty. Once we get this process out there, she's already engaged students. Technical schools, more than a few programs out there that might be a good fit for the Guild, where we could share our perspective, share influence, really be able to engage some good members that are getting overlooked by some of the more traditional programs.
- Robert: If we manage to make connections with 2-4 schools and successfully engage them, and be able to talk to schools, powerful. Great progress.
- Amy: Do you know Monica Paulson-Preeb (?) Green River College? I would add her to the list. She's a real go-getter, recently has taken over natural resource mgmt. program. They've moved from 2 to 4-yr degree. Very technically sound. Moved curriculum from more traditional forest mgmt. to broader ways of thinking. I think she may be a key contact for us. I know Monica pretty well. I think she should be on the list; I'm happy to volunteer.
- Shane: Great; exactly the type of feedback I wanted to capture. Event with EcoTrust this fall would be a great opportunity to have folks out.
- Something keeping me up at night a little bit, we haven't focused a lot on how we maintain our engagement with these student chapters. Their success. At OSU, they hit the ground running, had a bunch of successful events, but I haven't been engaged with them at all. My fear is that they or others coming into forestry club after founders graduate and move on, think about how to prevent that from happening.
- Robert: Even guest lecturing can add up.

5:00 [Membership planning and process](#) (Robert, John, Mark)

- Report on 5/13 initial conference call

- Robert: Rick, Mary Snieckus, Kathy Holian. Rob Northrop, John, Mark, me. Had first call yesterday. Spent an hour partly reviewing history of the guidelines and some of the legacies that are still in the guidelines. Some will need to change because of the way things have changed in the organization. Also timeline, and roles of MPC and Board. Was useful for folks not steeped in that history. We didn't talk much about the nuts and bolts of things. One of the themes that came through pretty clearly to me was that of engagement with members, particularly because the MPC is the one elected body, and also because a number of the items in the guidelines, including annual meeting, were in its origin an attempt to make a place for pretty new ideas fundamental to founding of Guild. Sense of trying to maintain connection to our members was voiced by number of people on the call.
- Two discussion items. First, I proposed that before we vote on revised guidelines, that we consider having robust member engagement process. Not sure what that looks like yet. Could be series of webinars. Could be some very specific meetings within each region to invite people to talk about this. Could be a range of different things. If I were a cynic, I'd say, would anybody show up? On the other hand, it's an opportunity. Members who show up might want to hear background on why MPC and Board feel this would be good for the organization. I'd like to hear any thoughts you have on taking the time we might need to look at ways to engage membership around this. Talking about maintaining a good narrative around this. Capture reason for change, history of deliberations.
- Second, if we have enough time, is idea of taking up some of these major issues within our group. First issue to have folks think about is whether we should restructure the MPC with more regional representation.
- Mark: Based on last MPC election, I think we have a good process. In the past, weighted representation from different regions. Had a lot of good candidates that didn't make the cut. Don't know that we need to change anything.
- Nancy: I support that as well. When we can look at that matrix of skillset, regional distribution, gender balance, I think we exceeded in matter of reaching out to people. Might be harder to do if we broke into specific regions. Really good turnout this time, but has been difficult in the past. We broke that barrier down. I think we should stick with the process we have.
- Shane: Too structured, might lose out in the future. If other regions up their numbers more, pool we have to pull from, don't know if we can support having a specific regional representative.
- Robert: Michael was describing the ESA organization. One idea towards more formal regional representation is to increase engagement, semi-autonomous, potentially more equal. Talk about restructuring our membership as within a region.
- Shane: I wonder if general membership knows how lopsided our numbers are to the Northeast. Not everybody's focused on that.
- Nancy: All on same page. Is this a board initiative to develop a more regional basis? Not sure I think it's a great idea. We need to build our regions for sure, but a different way to do it. We are a full entity; I don't think dividing the entity is a good idea. Good process now. Student engagement, to start building that around the country.
- Robert: Committee initiative. Not coming from the Board. Using this as a vehicle to engage members. Good idea?

- Nancy: My first reaction was your cynical reaction. This is minutiae. Not stuff people are psyched about. To look at details of by-laws. We could reach out as an ad hoc committee to individuals. Mark pointed out we had such great representation of folks running for MPC. We promised we would reach out to them to ask for advice. Would be a great vehicle for talking about this.
- John: In process of identifying potentially controversial issues. Regional representation might be one idea that doesn't make it out of the gate. Some of what Fred was tinkering with and others since, redefining membership categories. Affiliate, what does that mean? Issues like that might draw some strong reaction from some members. Maybe some of the things we need to be out in front of. Not the minutiae.
- Robert: A lot of things that will likely change. A proposal now that any professional member can question whether another member deserves to be a member of the Guild. Proposal for middle ground of censure. That's another change that might be minutiae, but also is an aspect of the organization that protects integrity. I really don't know whether we would be spinning our wheels, or whether people care enough to say. The relevance of this document has grown on me.
- Mark: In my time on the MPC and decades with the Guild, my sense is that we want to be inclusive. We're a small organization, and can't afford to be viewed as elitist. Sometimes we are. If we're talking about our core principle of putting the forest first, a wildlife biologist, environmental educator, should be considered professional members. We need to try to pull people in, rather than push them. I hear that a lot from people I try to recruit, that the Guild is elitist. I try to say, no we're not. We're on the ground people. There are a lot of candidates that I send the information, and they haven't signed on.
- Nancy: I can certainly support what you just said, but do we need to go to the full membership to discuss that?
- Robert: I'm not proposing a process that would search for member-wide consensus, That falls within Board and MPC. Just saying that before a vote, we explain our positions. It's time we would spend saying, this is your organization, reasoning behind changes we want to make. Not necessarily to craft a consensus document. Give members a chance to appreciate the membership and board are working for them.
- Mark: Board recruitment is a mystery. Explanation seemed to be budget and hiring ED. In fact we've seen that this is not the case. Want to understand more of that.
- Robert: Not easy to find people for the Board. Existing Board feels obligation tries to find live bodies. Most nonprofits are looking for a balance of skills. Not a process that members have strong influence or impact on. I appreciate everything that's been shared today. I'll keep you guys informed.
  - o Should this process include a plan to engage membership through some framework of in-person and web meetings before a vote?
  - o Proposal: we identify one topic each month for MPC discussion during the call for the next three months.

## Forest 2 Tap

- Mark: Watershed basin, mostly forested. Excellent water quality, mix of landowners, public and private. Interesting place. Headwaters of MS River. Our governor had a water summit a few years ago. Went through a process of looking at quality of water in the state. Media came out



with impaired waters. Most weren't in our region. In ag area. Bunch of us in natural resource community wanted to get the message out. We should work with craft breweries. Gathering places in small communities, upwardly mobile, younger people with social responsibility. We contacted the 10 craft breweries in basin, talked to them about idea of promoting forest-friendly breweries. All benefits from forest, not just water. Social, economic, ecological. Thought at least we'd create poster of region and where breweries are. Put on wall, be able to talk about water quality connection. Response was, we want to do more. Have trainings for our staff. Be a host of events. We were caught off guard a little bit. Breweries have been very engaged, very excited. Coming up with ideas. We learned a lot from them. Getting together really good way to say, we're forest managers, you're brewers, we have this commonality. One connection between loggers as small business owners and breweries. Some lightbulbs went off in brewery crowd. Kickoff project would be Arbor Day seedling giveaway, Buy One, Get One Tree. Buy a pint, get a tree. Handed out a thousand trees on Arbor Day. Monumental success. Breweries said new people came into visit their place. Gave away all trees without a problem. Biggest town of all these places is like 15,000 people. Not huge breweries; Ma and Pa. I've been getting feedback from volunteers and breweries, 100% positive. Then we started getting – I did a radio spot on public radio; a lot of people were interested by it. After the event, started getting contact from SFI SIC, TNC, economic development, how do we become partners in this program. Katie Fernholz said we weren't prepared for success. Swell of support. So we made some decisions. It's a program of Dovetail Partners now. I'm managing it. We have a team of people. To the point now where putting out sponsorship letters, if you donate this level of money, this level of sponsorship. Have a waiting list of breweries to get involved in the program. Very cool, very rewarding.

- All: Awesome!
- Robert: I thought from the start this had the potential for a Foresters for the Birds—type roll-out. Think about how to translate to other regions.
- Mark: We have specific issues in this watershed. Have to make the projects so you can tailor it to different situations. Zander, Katie, and I have a conference call tomorrow.
- Robert: Would work in VT if we had a leader like you. Whole state is under EPA requirements to clean up Lake Champlain.

---

5:15 New Council Business

May ATL submission topic? Nancy offered to draft a student engagement blurb.

5:20 General discussion/sharing

...Are you ready to “hug your building?” I offer a link to this Yale E360 article on mass timber.

<https://e360.yale.edu/features/as-mass-timber-takes-off-how-green-is-this-new-building-material>

Does this article provide a frame of reference for a policy position?

[not discussed]

5:38 Adjourn

### **MPC member committees**

Nancy: Student engagement, WOW

Robert: Procedures, Events, Membership and Policy guidelines revision

John: Student, Policy

Bruce: Model forest

Amy:

Michael: membership/outreach

Shane: student, membership/outreach

Alex: Model forest, Policy

Mark: Events, Model forest, Policy

### **Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)

Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)

Alex Barrett – Vermont (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Bruce White – North Carolina (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)

John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)

Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)

Amy LaBarge –Washington (1<sup>st</sup> term 2021)

Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)

# MPC June Call: Minutes and Notes

Tuesday, June 11, 2019

## 4:00 Welcome and roll call (100% attendance!)

- Michael Leff
- Bruce White
- Robert Turner
- John Gunn
- Mark Jacobs
- Alex Barrett
- Shane Hetzler
- Nancy Patch
- Amy LaBarge

## 4:05 Discuss/approve minutes from May 2019

- Shane motion to approve minutes. Michael second. Motion carries.

## 4:10 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

- Staff, board, MPC revisiting new ways to get together in person.
- New website, new member database live. Lots of work on Colleen's part.
- Guild's 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary as a membership organization.
- Written history of the Guild by Tom Brendler?
- Who would travel to Asheville, NC in August or September 2020? Michael would, Shane would be interested, Bruce definite, John would,
- Mark: Regional things throughout the year?
- Amanda: Likely that model, as opposed to national meeting format.
- 

Suggested topics: Status of web site redesign, member portals.

## Reflections on Stone Fence gathering

- Robert: 50 people on Saturday. Very diverse group. Younger members. Spouses, kids, dogs. Pretty typical of a small Guild gathering. A lot of camaraderie. Great exchanges. Terrific weather. Perfect host. Amazing place. Michael, Shane, Alex, Nancy, Robert from MPC.
- Michael: Was just awesome. Spectacular. I agree a gathering doesn't necessarily need to have conference-type presentations. A LOT of value on everything they had going on that that location. I'm really glad I was there.
- Shane: Really well-run. We were moving around from site to site, but had plenty of time for discussion. Amanda kept everyone on track. Extremely well-organized.
- Nancy: Another example of why we do what we do. Such a light in the tunnel to hang with Guild foresters. Really is refreshing compared to the forestry community at large. Really spectacular couple of days.

- Shane: Great reminder of what works well, what can be reapplied out here based on geographic nuances. Really nice to get back in the midst of Guild foresters and really get some recharging.
- Robert: One of the highlights for me was getting to meet with staff. They represented themselves extremely well. Really fun to connect with some of these project activities in various places of the country.
- Alex: I echo that. Really cool to meet faces behind names we see. Also building social capital of Guild, that did it. Let's do more of that.
- Robert: somewhat unique to the northeast...we can pull this off with critical mass. Whole 25 years of Guild's history was represented there by many people. A lot of depth to pull from. Definitely harder in other places.

## Committee reports (names in bold are chairs of the committee)

### 4:25 Policy: **John, Alex, Mark**

#### Final debrief on Natural Forest Management Policy

- Robert: Comments were 102 votes overall, 94 in favor, 8 rejected it. Comments that were provided grouped themselves in a couple different areas. Style issues, end notes, how we opted to structure first paragraph as an introduction. Some calls for additional policies on intensive forestry in various forms, invasive species. Some of the negative comments felt like we didn't go far enough. Some comments reflecting on fact that a policy statement on silviculture is good but isn't guaranteed effectiveness. Some confusion about what policy statements are intended to do. Some comments a little off the mark but interesting anyway.
- Mark: Wasn't a lot of substance to negative comments.

#### Background research on plantation policy.

- John: Some interesting things about plantation forestry in this country. [ppt] U.S. ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> among world in area in forest plantation. 9% of total, 20% of South. PNW 3<sup>rd</sup> place in total planet area. FIA plot distribution. Species perspective. SE loblolly-shortleaf, loblolly-slash. Lake States white-red-jack pine. PNW Doug fir. Trend up a lot in South since 1958.
- Robert: South is in a glut of sawtimber at this point.
- Bruce: Absolutely. That (John's graph) did level off pretty fittingly around the time of the recession. A lot of stands still in plantation; harvesting just deferred.
- John: Pellet industry up; anticipate that low-grade demand will generate new conversion from ag land back into plantation.
- Bruce: I've not seen that dynamic play out. Really not encouraged anybody to either afforest or reforest if they weren't going to already.
- Shane: We've been having discussions in our office last week or so. Reading interesting analyses on production in SE and how that's impacting our markets here. 2x4s from SE going to AZ and making money.
- Bruce: Sawmills here not rolling in money, but doing very well. I don't see a huge, new plantations being established. Almost a default for some folks, but I don't see that rate of conversion increasing over what it's been in past few years. Still the thing to do. When you do a final harvest, establish a pine plantation. Hard for me to imagine that graph continuing as it was before 2008. Not saying it's not an issue; it's certainly an issue. What bothers me is that it is the default. So many folks don't even know there's other options.

- John: U.S. Endowment map. Aroostook County, ME 126k ac planted; very tiny amount of that is what anyone would consider a plantation.
- Mark: I think vast majority in Lake States are restoration attempts. Industry. That was my question about the Southeast. Plantations a result of forest conversion? Ag land being put into trees rather than cotton or tobacco?
- Bruce: was a huge afforestation effort in the 80s. Gov't programs, cost-sharing for converting ag land into trees. Nowadays, is mostly – conversion from natural forest to plantation, but not conversion of forest that did not naturally have pine in them. I don't see as much conversion of sites that weren't traditionally part of the pine ecosystem. Status quo is if you have a mixed-pine hardwood stand, gets cut, will be replanted into pure pine. I don't see that changing significantly.
- Mark: When that's done, is it always the intent to do short rotations? Are there opportunities to do intermediate treatments to get hardwood back in there?
- Bruce: Very seldom do people go into that on a short rotation. Hopefully doesn't pay enough. Even with sawtimber prices terrible, still makes sense to hold into sawtimber. 1-3 intermediate cuttings in the meantime. Intermediate cuttings can set the stage for hardwood rotation, if people would do that. My issue is growing sawtimber that's not anything anyone would ever want to have a house built out of.
- Shane: From West Coast perspective, I've got a cable thinning unit on the coast in a 30 yr-old Doug fir plantation. 1<sup>st</sup> commercial thin, they've clearcut close to 130 ac. 38-yr-old final cut. That's what we're seeing here from industry as far as lifespan of those trees. Something we should definitely address in terms of this policy statement. Lifespan of those plantations and what you lose besides structure with frequent entries.
- Bruce: I'm really surprised to hear they're cutting it that soon out there.
- John: Platform for where we could have this discussion in more detail. Maybe set up with southern, northern, PNW perspectives. Get some thoughts from Guild members who are active in these areas and maybe practice plantation silviculture or have experience trying to convert back to natural forest. How a policy statement from FSG could be helpful to members in these regions looking to support changes in practice that more align with the underpinnings of the Guild. Maybe webinar in between regular calls.
- Mark: That's spot-on as far as I'm concerned. Volatile issue in FSC. Marshall Pecore said you can't judge a plantation by an area full of 6" tall seedlings. You have to look at mgmt. plan. Even if started off as plantation, you can flip that through mgmt. plan and bring into natural forest. I know Roy O. Martin...that's what they do. If want to look for something in Lake States, I'm working with TNC and Brian Palik and Ojibway on project with 50 yr-old red pine and will do some interesting thinning regimes not only to create structural diversity, but also Native food sources. I'll do an article on that for Dovetail Partners. Real good example of multiple disciplines, agencies working together towards goals.
- Shane: I can speak with my boss, Matt Fehrenbacher. He'd offer an interesting perspective from NW. Started with industry out of college. Worked for Pacific Forest Trust in CA. All of us up here manage plantations in some form or another, with Trout Mountain twist. One project he's involved in for 10-15 years, client with 7,500 ac on coast that's all Doug fir plantation, forester for conservation easement charged with breaking up plantations and turning into natural forests. Cons easement has confusing directives of being a working forest in perpetuity, but also advancing late successional structure and habitat. Some areas

it makes sense to grow high-quality timber, and some places more LS habitat. All the disturbance that creates that.

- Bruce: One question we should be thinking about, typically a policy statement will be at the ready ultimately for legislatures to be influenced by. In the case of plantations, is a policy statement really what we think is going to be effective? Or should we address the issue in a format other than a policy statement? A guidebook to plantation mgmt.? Similar to bottomland hardwoods. Consensus of ways to manage plantations. They're not going to go away. A few might go away if we give them some guidance, ultimately. How and when would a policy statement be used?
- John: We need to explore a bit more with members. Try to understand what's the most useful product we could produce. If more of a guidance/guidelines document, might need to pursue some external funding to do. If seems to be a need and some demand for it, I'd be happy to try to do that.
- Robert: Maybe can ask Amanda or staff to give us at next call a little review of how some of these non-policy-statement study groups came about.
- Amanda: takes funding, and convincing funders of need. Could be good to start with webinar series.
- Mark: Potential foot in the door of mass timber market. Needs high-quality lumber. A lot of good may come from plantations. If concern about mass timber impacts, might be a natural progression. Might be people out there willing to fund that.
- Michael: I do like idea of webinars. FSG webinar years ago first connected me with the group.
- Amanda: Could put a Note in ATL. Poll might be more complicated.
- John will follow up with Mark, Shane, Alex, Bruce on next steps. MPC internal learning session first before going out to bigger world. Help frame questions we're posing here.

#### 4:35 [Student engagement: Shane, John, Nancy](#)

- o Update on Student tool kit roll-out. Outreach to University contacts?
- Shane: MS State, UW, WA State, ping back from UW contact who put me in touch with their student dean. 30-40 forestry students already practicing what they described as ecologically based forestry. Put a blog post together to gauge student interest. Heard from Nancy about UVM with Tony D'Amato. All in about getting a chapter started there.
- Nancy: Yale? Joe? I can reach out.
- Shane: Southern schools. Nick is a Warren Wilson alum, Dave Ellum felt that might be good low-hanging fruit. Also Duke, U of South. Other contacts down there, institutions come to mind?
- Bruce: Duke students have expressed interest. Have talked offline about that. Is there a Guild member at Duke?
- Shane: Nick might have some contacts there.
- Bruce: I have a few contacts at Duke. Not necessarily professor roles. Some student members, interest among students in formalizing. Staff, maybe 1-2 staff. May not have direct contact.
- Shane: OSU, student feedback: too many time commitments. Students now establishing study groups to be more efficient with their studying so they could have more free time to do Guild events. Proactive response.

- Nancy: Might be valuable for our subcommittee to connect offline to put together a grid of our contacts. Beta testing, identify areas that represent values of the Guild. Pick at low-hanging fruit before going to too many schools.
- Shane: email from May 15 with table in it. University contact, school, whether contact is professional member or not, contact on MPC or staff. Needs to be updated.

#### 4:50 Membership planning and process (Robert, John, Mark)

- Report on 5/30 conference call
  - Robert: Still getting feet under us. Proposed that we didn't want to rush the whole guidelines process. Talked about getting membership engagement, but likely isn't the vehicle. A lot of things in this revision that can be hammered out with pretty straightforward updates to document. Phase two (perhaps decided by member vote) questions about membership organization, other issues that come up and require more discussion. Some of those more challenging issues might take more outreach to get clarification. Haven't really decided whether would be a second vote, or hold off until some of those issues settled. We need to set up a call for our sub-group of 7.
- NH BOD discussion
  - Robert: Heard loud and clear from Robert Hrubes concerns that process wasn't well-defined. Concerns we share. Generally understood that on a policy vote, MPC will put together, submit to board, board will give us yay or nay, go out to vote, then become policy. Board threw out different ideas of how that process might happen. Hard to get a sense from board meeting whether Robert's concerns were shared by others. Felt like we opened door to constructive dialogue to this stuff. Some clean-up to do in this document. Some concern from one board member that we have to undertake this process with care. Can become expensive, cumbersome, difficult to corral.
- Review of MPC vs. BOD roles, relevant to this document.
  - Robert: We've got work to do there. Don't know whether it's time to have that discussion with this group. Work group should hash out at least one solid statement of what some of those roles should be in context of guidelines, and then bring back to this group for input.
  - Nancy: It seemed like Robert H. was the only one that had a concern. Al Sample saw it the way we saw it. Followed history of how these policies have been developed. Nothing ever came out in this fashion until the last policy statement. Seemed to me that the rest of the board did not have the same sentiment as Robert. Also felt to me that by the time we were done, we were really talking about process. A lot Robert H. was concerned about, and once he found out things were falling into a process, he stepped back and thought things were OK. Simply misunderstanding. Comment about coming back to board at very end, didn't get a lot of warmth from many people. If membership voted, would be slap in the face to say they don't really get a say if board gets final say, in a board that doesn't get elected.
  - John: To that point, I think Hrubes wasn't aware that the original guidelines really gave all the power to the MPC in terms of developing the policy statement. No explicit mention of a board review. In light of his dominant personality that seems to be driving a bunch of this, through this process and recognizing that the MPC is

elected by the membership, have to be careful to maintain the power that we do have. Don't want to cede the important role MPC has had in representing members. I understand fiduciary responsibility board has for the Guild, but we ought to maintain a great deal of autonomy.

- Robert: I got the sense that the board's fiducial responsibility was primary for him. Potential legal ramifications. He felt it impacted a lot of the way they could approach funders. I don't want to dismiss his concerns, but agree that they were probably overstated. Policy should be reviewed with this perspective. but issues seem unlikely.
- Bruce: Reading notes. Saw where somebody had said this concern of this being timely enough for legislators.
- Robert: Was probably Amber's statement. Was a bit of confusion in the way the discussion went on. Discussion about the procedure for the revision of the guidelines, and how that would proceed, versus this cross-discussion about how policy statements from MPC would actually get approved by the board.
- Bruce: Can't come up with a process if it will be too late to reach the legislature.
- Robert: She's suggesting that back and forth between board and MPC would become cumbersome.
- Board can have input into our process if it comes in a timely fashion. Happening after we've done all the work is not the way we want to see it happen.
- Nancy: Rick made a comment where we have a MPC liaison to board, and board is supposed to reciprocate.
- Mark: John and Robert are very aware of the input I gave. I got the reaction that I expected to get. I have concerns that we as a small organization should be fluid. We should be able to react, get together, be the lead on these policy discussions. We're being bogged down by this board. I'm still baffled by how the board is selected. Terms? Lifers? Bugs me that we're elected, we come up with a policy statement, but once out to membership and voted, should be a done deal. Almost felt like turf protection. One of the most bizarre set of minutes I've ever read.
- Robert: I don't think Robert's perspective represented the majority.
- Mark: I've heard from board members that he intimidates them. I've known Robert for 25 years. We should have some autonomy in policy. Maybe they should be the fiscal and staffing body, and we should be the member and policy body.
- Robert: We need to articulate the process and make it more formalized. Robert's concerns are reactive, and did not represent the general consensus on board. We have clear ground to stake out.
- Nancy: I agree; it was one person's concerns, which were simply inaccurate. Will be resolved with committee looking at the guidelines.
- Shane: From side conversations, is a real excitement to get past this, recognition that certain characters on the board aren't easy to work with. Pretty gross paraphrasing. Good will and intent there to get back to business. Should be in the back of our minds. A lot of support on board side for what we do.

5:30 Adjourn



### **MPC member committees**

Nancy: Student engagement, WOW

Robert: Procedures, Events, Membership and Policy guidelines revision

John: Student, Policy

Bruce: Model forest

Amy:

Michael: membership/outreach

Shane: student, membership/outreach

Alex: Model forest, Policy

Mark: Events, Model forest, Policy

### **Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)

Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)

Alex Barrett – Vermont (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Bruce White – North Carolina (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)

John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)

Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)

Amy LaBarge –Washington (1<sup>st</sup> term 2021)

Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)

# MPC July Call: Minutes and Notes

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

4:00 Welcome and roll call

Robert Turner, John Gunn, Mark Jacobs, Nancy Patch, Amy LaBarge, Alex Barrett, Michael Leff

Staff: Amanda Mahaffey

Absent: Shane Hetzler, Bruce White

4:05 Discuss/approve minutes from June 2019

Michael motion, Nancy second. Passed.

4:10 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

Suggested topics: membership renewal: status? Implementation feedback?

- Amanda: Who renewed, and how did it go?
- Nancy: easy as could be.
- Mark: I experienced a glitch, it said thank you for joining the Guild. Colleen emailed me right away.
- Robert: I auto-renewed, but then got an email with a reminder that it's time for renewals.
- Amanda: If you haven't renewed, are you seeing enough reminders to keep it on your conscience?
- Amy: Yes. Top of mind.
- Mark: Finding members in my state?
- Amanda: Colleen is working on the Find a Forester.
- Mark: Would be nice to be able to keep track of who's renewed and who hasn't.
- Nancy: List we'd used last time had glitches. No alphabetical opportunity. If looking for somebody, Name was in one field so you couldn't sort by last name.
- Robert: Should be better this year.
- Nancy: Time to start thinking about MPC nominees. Think about location, gender, age, experience, skill set.

Committee reports (names in bold are chairs of the committee)

4:20 **Policy:** John, Alex, Mark

- Follow-up on possible directions for the plantation initiative: policy or study group report?  
Progress on framing the questions.
  - John: Motion behind idea for webinar this fall.
  - Mark: Working on interesting project that involves national forests, planting. Red pine in Chippewa NF. Virtually sterile environment in large tracts. Goal of treating to rekindle native medicinal plants, make into more natural-looking stand over time. Could be good case study of what people are working on in different regions. De-plantationize plantations.

- Other contact with Sustainable Forestry Education Cooperative with UMN. Membership-driven group. Enhanced webinar capabilities, in their wheelhouse. Approached Eli Sagor; he's very interested.
- John: Next step, framing some of the questions we'd want people to weigh in on from a Guild perspective. E.g. Southeast contact managing to FSC standard. Where are there potential disconnects, and how might a policy statement support the kind of work Mark is talking about in the Lake States to move plantations toward more natural conditions? We'd take up enough time we'd want to do the webinar outside of an MPC call.
- Robert: If September-October, probably need to jump on this. Try to frame those questions for the next MPC call? Pass around by email?
- Mark: PNW potential case studies, or New England?
- John: Shane had some thoughts for PNW.
- [subsequent email from Shane- Matt Fehrenbacher is an FSG member in PNW. His most recent work (with one of his clients) entails enacting a working forest easement on ~7k acres of plantations to make them less like plantations (variable density thinning, alternative species planting such as hemlock and cedar, and encouragement of hardwood species and shrub layers), ultimately creating more late successional habitat AND retaining working forest characteristics, with a good majority of that acreage currently in Douglas-fir plantations.]
- Amanda: Are people trying to revert plantations to natural forests.
- Alex: Must be someone in ME managing a plantation in one form or other.
- John: Irving Paper.
- Nancy: In Northeast, we have plantations from CCC days coming to maturity or falling apart. We're de facto bringing to native forest. Can make comments around that.
- Robert: What elements of forest structure and function are we trying to cultivate? Northeast can contribute to that.
- Alex: We have some practical experience managing some 60s-70s-era plantations.
- Mark: We may view this as background info on forming policy. Also an opportunity to engage members. Interest out there. Doesn't have to be large-scale plantation. Northeast examples perfect for people in Lake States. What we are doing in different parts of the country to enhance diversity in these stands. That's really the key.
- Robert: Expected outcomes from this exercise, wide range of potentials. Maybe policy statement, maybe webinars series of talks.
- Amanda: No stance yet, which makes this topic really interesting.
- Robert: Southeast foresters take a lot of pride in being able to grow big trees really quickly, really well. Falls into larger landscape discussion. If we limit plantations, are we limiting production? What about leakage? Range of things we can do, and not every acre will exhibit all attributes. But all can contribute something interesting.
- Nancy: Do you want us to send you thoughts? Around how plantations are being converted.
- John: Those thoughts would be helpful. Questions you might wrestle with when touring plantations in other places.
- Member request for letter of Guild support for Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act (EICDA). (additional background:

<https://energypolicy.columbia.edu/research/commentary/how-bipartisan-energy-innovation-and-carbon-dividend-act-compares-other-carbon-tax-proposals>)

- Alex: Old policy statement has held up really well. I'm interested in the topic, but am not sure why we're talking about this.
- Robert: I can see that, where is the direct connection here? Not anywhere in these large policy pieces.
- John: I was trying to make the direct link, and while I recognize that yes, climate change is broadly a major threat to forests, I feel like in terms of how we interact with the issue, it's not a broad carbon tax kind of question. Other than we're stewards of a system that is impacted significantly by climate change, I'm not sure we've got the professional stake to provide support for something like that. Also, climate change statement was revised in 2015. Question of individual action vs. Corporate?
- Robert: One issue is that we'd be endorsing a specific policy. Not like we support carbon tax or pricing in broad terms; this request is for a very specific item of support for a particular piece of legislation.
- Alex: We could easily say we're supportive of carbon tax for all the benefits to forest management, but the Dividend Act piece is hard to tell how effective this policy proposal would be.
- Michael: We'd probably be supportive if we knew more about the particular act.
- Alex: If initial interest is to say this is something we can support, organizational-level thing. But out of our lane for MPC.
- Robert: Sounds like we could say to Zander, if you as ED want to take lead on this, that's up to you, but MPC isn't prepared to take a particular position on a piece of legislation.
- Nancy: I think Zander seemed comfortable providing support on this legislation. Would be interesting how he would express that. Carbon tax in general, or specific legislation.
- Amanda: Sounds like a good approach to communicate to Zander what you've talked about it. Zander may have been trying to respond quickly to a long-time member's request.

(note: the FSG Climate Change policy was emailed to you on Friday)

4:45 [Student engagement: Shane, John, Nancy](#)

- Update on Student tool kit roll-out.
  - Nancy: Have been contacting schools, trying to find ones to roll out for beta test. Have buy-in from UVM with an advisor, and Yale interest from students directly that had approached Nick. I followed up with Joe Orefice (Yale). Strong interest from two professors to be advisors. Felt toolkit was useful. When school starts up again is when things start happening.
  - John: I reached out to Steve Grado at MS State, but haven't connected here. Faculty advisor at UNH has been away. University a ghost town in summer time.
  - Amy: I've reached out to a couple professors here, one at UW and one at Green River College to see their level of interest in supporting students to form a chapter. Haven't heard back yet.
  - Mark: I contacted UMN. Some interesting interaction. One of the contacts was instrumental in forming student chapter at MI Tech, now at UMN. Marcella, head faculty, both very interested. Would be really good opportunity. Within last year, SAF

club and forestry club joined together, and they can't even elect officers from lack of interest in the concept of a club. But thought there'd be a great opportunity for student Guild members if material in front of them.

- Nancy: At Yale, Joe suggested SAF chapter could be combined SAF-Guild chapter. Very clear about being able to distinguish the two organizations. Would be beneficial for students to connect with both organizations. We could offer some tips as a committee to think about how it would be best from our point of view to differentiate the organizations. Don't think we did that in the toolkit. Could be a thought process we could go through.
- Robert: Sighting our Compass?
- Amanda: presentation Rick and I gave at UMaine 6 years ago.
- Robert: Fall getting busy. Ramping up student chapters, webinars, other projects. Keep in mind that fall tends to get busy.
- Mark: Prioritize some of these things?
- Robert: Maybe don't save everything for September. OK with skipping August meeting, but we may find ourselves in September with a bunch of challenging actions.
- Amy: With vacation schedules, time becomes a little more compressed. I'm available.
- Alex: Out of town.
- John: Out of town.
- Nancy: Available.
- Mark: I'm retired, so every day is a vacation.
- Robert: we'll keep it on for now, but reserve the right to cancel.

#### 5:00 **Membership planning and process** (Robert, John, Mark)

- No subcommittee activity.
  - Robert: Haven't made a lot of progress or activity. We'll be doing more drafting of areas of policy guidelines. Rick and I plan to have conversation about roles of Board vs. MPC. Discussions over last couple months have helped me understand better.

---

#### 5:15 **New Council Business**

- July ATL topic?
  - Robert will draft
- General feedback request: Does the MPC have sufficient exposure to the membership? Are there ways we can better demonstrate our activities and our value to members?

From Colleen: *As far as MPC updates feeling buried [in ATL], I appreciate this feedback. We can certainly try something new. I know Zander has mentioned the MPC update several times in the top E.D. note, to try to get it some up front exposure in the newsletter. Also, we placed it where we did because we know from analytics that people do go to the notes and pubs a lot when reading ATL, and the MPC section is likely to be seen then (vs right under new members or something). I could move the MPC section to just under the events listing and see how that feels. Or, Perhaps there is a way to tie in a message from MPC (and link to the update) into the top E.D. note in each newsletter the MPC has a message to include. Would either of these feel like more exposure? The other option is to think of a way separate from ATL to get the MPC words out. I'd have to think on this a bit more to*

*feel out what would be most successful. I know many people read ATL. I also know many people delete it, and other more specific emails. It's always a bit of a toss-up when considering emails. We could think through how MPC can have a larger presence on the Facebook page as well....*

- Robert: Topic came from concerns that Mark may have raised and I have been paying attention to. Do we feel as an MPC that we have enough exposure via ATL? Colleen's ideas above, but additional idea to have MPC take top spot every few months. Or move up MPC's position to just after articles.
- Amy: I hadn't realized that exposure of the MPC or lack thereof was an issue. I think it sounds like a nice idea to have a rotating message from the different regions as well as from ED and MPC.
- Michael: Sounds fine to me.
- John: We've been trying to contribute material every newsletter anyway, so doesn't necessarily mean additional work for us. Just highlighting more prominently.
- Nancy: Difference is that Zander's comments are longer than what we're asked to contribute. I actually didn't see it as an issue either, but 'm fine to support what everyone thinks.
- Amanda: Doesn't have to be clockwork, just 3-4 times per year when MPC has something pressing to share.
- Robert: September (in the top spot) putting out word for suggestions for nominees. For Colleen, give her idea months in advance. We've got a lot going on; I'd like to see it be highlighted. Could say in July about efforts of most committees here.
- 2020 is the Guild's 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Review activities that may be in the works (events, retrospectives, membership initiatives, editorials?) Are there any particular initiatives this group should take on?
  - Robert: Ideas thrown around at NH gathering, but not a lot of concrete thinking has gone into specific events. Gathering in NC at Warren Wilson. Not likely a huge national meeting. Would be highlighted as a 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary event. Don't believe there are plans for national meeting. Regional meetings. Also heard about possible written history in the works. Board initiative. One thought I had is that we have group of founders. For those that are still members of Guild, I envision a commentary series where we invite those founders to reflect on their 25 years with the Guild, or changes in forestry over that quarter-century. No restrictions to what those comments might be, encourage some reflection. Encourage people to share what they've seen. Encourage all of us to think about our contributions to the organization and to society. Share with student toolkit, discussion at pop-up Guild events. Honoring folks who have spent that much time in this organization, offer positive or not so positive reflections. I mentioned it to Ross Morgan who was willing to contribute. Also mentioned to Zander, Colleen, Amanda. Staff willing to support idea. Effort on our part: frame commentary series, contact people, follow up a little, see if we can get a half-dozen or more people to contribute. Work with those people to move that process along, see if we can't in a few months get some submissions. Colleen would edit, use different parts and pieces of this over next year. What I'm asking is 1) does this sound like something we as the MPC can get behind? 2) Someone or two willing to step up and do outreach and follow-up with support from staff and move it forward.

- Nancy: happy to help, after some pondering over minutes.
- Robert: Colleen would contribute to specifics in terms of content and form, and we would throw together some ideas for reflection. Step 1, put together email to float to founders. Not huge effort, but some commitment.
- Mark: Sounds like a good idea. Would be nice tribute to those that started this organization. I can help.
- Michael: I like the topic and would certainly like to.
- Robert: I'll see if I can pull together a list of initial pieces that might go into this. I'll be in touch.
- 5:20 sharing
  - Mark: August 5-6 we have Lake States regional meeting in WI. As MPC member, I should take a little time to engage group in what we do. If you have suggestions on what we've done in the past.
  - Amanda: Could highlight Natural Forest Silviculture policy statement. Fits with meeting theme.
  - Robert: In past, effort to get students to these meetings?
  - Mark: Typically, lot of students at these meetings. This one will be at Kemp Station. Captive audience of some students there.
  - Robert: Be clear that membership for students is free and we'd love to have them on board. Opportunities for starting a student chapter might be out in front of them.
  - Mark: Thursday, organization called International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO). Meeting in Duluth this weekend. I will talk about Forests2Tap during their dinner. Food truck at one of our member breweries.
  - Mark: This is the field tour portion, maybe 30 going. Interesting audience.
  - John: Theme?
  - Mark: Small-scale forestry.
  - Robert: A brewery in St. Albans, VT started its own Forests2Tap on clean water to focus connection between beer and clean water.
  - Amanda: Southeast gathering for 2020 will be hosted by Warren Wilson.

### **MPC member committees**

Nancy: Student engagement, WOW

Robert: Procedures, Events, Membership and Policy guidelines revision

John: Student, Policy

Bruce: Model forest

Amy:

Michael: membership/outreach

Shane: student, membership/outreach

Alex: Model forest, Policy

Mark: Events, Model forest, Policy

**Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)

Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)

Alex Barrett – Vermont (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Bruce White – North Carolina (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)

John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)

Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)

Amy LaBarge –Washington (1<sup>st</sup> term 2021)

Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)

## Proposed 2019 Calendar

<b>Month</b>	<b>MPC discussion topic</b>	<b>ATL topic</b>	<b>ATL due date</b>
<b>January</b> (1/8)			
<b>February</b> (2/12)			
<b>March</b> (3/12)			
<b>April</b> (4/9)	Policy guidelines discussion		
<b>May</b> (5/14)		MPC guidelines review	
<b>June</b> (6/11)	Role of MPC and BOD v/v Guidelines		
<b>July</b> (7/9)	Neon after 1 full year;		
<b>August</b> (8/8)	MPC candidates, MPC election process review		
<b>September</b> (9/9)	MPC guidelines		
<b>October</b> (10/8 )			
MPC vote			
<b>November</b> (11/12)	Model Forest		



**December (12/9)**

2018 review, 2019 look-ahead

MPC election results

# MPC August Call: Notes

Tuesday, August 13, 2019

Amy LaBarge, Mark Jacobs, Amanda Mahaffey. Tuesday, August 13, 2019, 4:00 ET/3:00 CT/2:00 MT/1:00 ET

Plantation forestry background

Amanda: Plantation forestry policy statement was suggested during revision of 1990s policy statement on natural forest silviculture. MPC sub-group exploring what that would look like.

Mark: In discussions regarding policy statement, clear that wide perspective on plantations depending on region of country. Would be good to put together a policy not too prescriptive, and would transcend regions. Get case studies from different regions from people doing interesting things with plantations, thinnings to create structural and vertical diversity. Ran with it, I happened to be working on a project already to Dovetail Partners, Responsible Forestry Perspectives or something like that. One case study out of 4 happened to be on Chippewa NF. TNC and Ojibway working on huge project on planted pine 50-60 yrs old, thousands of acres of NF. Want to get in, encourage diversity, from tribal perspective, encourage regrowth of traditional medicinal plants in understory. Really cool profile. Partnership. Several others that popped up regionally. Put webinar together, have brief discussion.

Amanda: webinars once a month. Webinar series.

Mark: or one webinar and get everybody to talk. UMN, Eli Sagor has good webinar capabilities. Willing to host.

Maybe two speakers per webinar, from different regions.

Amy: Haven't worked much in managing plantations. We do have a lot of second-growth forest, originally planted as plantations. We've done a little bit of thinning, gap creation, to diversify them, but it's not with a plantation mgmt. approach. Really about diversifying structural complexity and increasing species diversity. Not a focus, but we talk about it.

Mark: Must be something in Southwest.

Amy: Other case studies really not coming to mind. But if pairing with region, Southwest or Midwest.

Mark: Could pair with Lake States example. 2 hours' time difference isn't that big a deal. Start at 1:00 p.m. or 11:00 PT. Or 3:00 Midwest time, 1:00 PT.

Amy: I see more noon and 1:00.

Amanda: so 12:00 PT/1:00 MT/2:00 CT/3:00 ET.

Pairing NW and LS, that would leave us with NE and SE.

Mark: Sounds like they do some pretty interesting things in example John shared. That land down there will produce revenue whether trees or cotton, so trees a better alternative in my opinion.

Amanda: Pair SE and SW?

Mark: Think you'd find something in NE. Old homestead fields planted. Perception was to wipe out plantations. No, thin and maintain as forest. Story worth telling.

Amanda: maybe spruce-fir in northern ME, though not representative of the rest of the region.

Mark: One interesting discussion with John and rest is that in MN specifically, we have a landscape initiative to increase upland conifers and match them to ecologically appropriate sites. Basically done by planting. First few years, they appear to be plantations. Over time, mgmt. plan indicates thinnings. Interesting looking at it and the plans. Plantation is a mgmt. regime, not an assemblage of trees.

Amy: I like that thought process. It's a step in the mgmt. progression of a forest. We can still apply whatever tools we have in the toolbox to meet the objectives. It's what are those objectives behind the mgmt. scenario.

Might be nice in a webinar to frame the series, if we do a series, with some bigger-picture threads, and just make sure we have those front and center on advertising the webinars. Kick off webinars by reiterating those.

Mark: Student member on MPC?

Amanda: Maybe ad hoc member for a year at a time.

# MPC September Call: Minutes and Notes

Tuesday, September 10, 2019

4:00 Welcome and roll call.

- Nancy Patch
- Robert Turner
- Shane Hetzler
- Bruce White
- Mark Jacobs
- Alex Barrett
- John Gunn
- [Amy LaBarge] missing
- Amanda Mahaffey (staff)

Discuss/approve minutes from July 2019 (no August call)

- Motion to approve minutes with amendment to include Michael Leff in roll call.
- Nancy motion. Shane & John second. Motion carried.

4:05 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

Suggested topics: 25-yr anniversary planning

- Amanda: 2 Guild Gatherings planned. Asheville, NC will reflect on past 25 years of Guild; Corvallis, OR will look to next 25 years of Guild and ecological forestry. Forest Steward issue.

Notes re membership renewal from Colleen will be shared. Renewals going well. Also focus on Find-a-Forester instructions, making sure to be clear to members.

New staff being hired in the SE. Program funding very successful.

4:15 MPC nominees

3 seats up for election: Nancy (vacant, term limited), Shane, Robert (not running)  
Currently: 5 members from the NE (2 open), 2 NW, 1 Lake States, 1 SE, 0 SW, 0 InterMT  
2 women (1 is vacant)  
2 government (1 is vacant)  
1 University  
1 retired  
4 consulting foresters (1 vacant)  
Review lists of 2018 nominees – consider re-contacting  
Justin Hart, AL , nominated by Zander (Univ)  
Julius Pasay, OR nominated by Shane (private)  
Klaus Puettmann, OR, nominated by Shane (Univ)  
Michael Mangum, NJ, nominated by Nancy  
Christel Kern, WI, nominated by Mark (not eligible, govt COI)  
Richard Campbell, CA, nominated by Alex

Emily Huff, MI, nominated by John (hadn't renewed at the election)

Robert Northrop, FL, nominated by Robert (Univ)

We need a plan to contact these and any other candidates. Bylaws say we should do this soon. Robert will draft a note for the Sept. ATL regarding nominations.

- Robert: current distribution by region from member list is well represented by the current MPC, with the exception of the southwest region.
- Shane: I nominated 3 people last year; Amy is on, and Klaus Puettmann, and Julius Pasay. Klaus felt really busy. Julius was excited about it, but also clustering 3 of us here in NW.
- Nancy: Michael Mangum?
- Amanda: He had a family illness. Not sure what his current situation is now.
- Mark: Crystal Kern was elected, but couldn't because of Forest Service COI requirements. Hoping Ron Eck will be interested in applying.
- Nancy: Justin Hart.
- Amanda: I think he would be great.
- Alex: Is the MPC the only group of people who nominates people? Or do we make a call to the broader membership?
- Robert: Yes, we do make a call. That will be in this month's ATL, which I will write up in next couple days.
- Alex: How about an Instagram post with a happy MPC member?
- Amanda: Send it to Colleen.
- John: California? A lot of names on the list.
- Alex: I had nominated Richard Campbell; I'll happily nominate him again.
- Nancy: Great. I had 3 people in my list that I don't know, but from CA. All three women. Madison Thompson, Conservation Fund. Laura Lalemond from Save the Redwoods? Tracy Kattleman (sp). Then IMW. Laura Schweitzer. Rachel Wood in NM.
- Robert: Contact Linwood Gill for advice?
- Amanda: Good idea.
- Bruce: Jim Able. If his membership is current in CA, might be one to consider. I might agree with Nancy, we might ought to pursue female options first.
- Shane: Beyond Zander, if some of the staff would have other suggestions in Southwest. Sam?
- Amanda: yes, and cc Zander.
- Nancy: Student members. Can staff reach out? If there isn't a big member representation in that region, a way to start building it.
- Robert: 2 names we haven't talked about; Emily Huff, wasn't renewed at the time of the election.
- John: She's not on the list. (that is, isn't currently a member)
- Robert: Robert Northup, U Florida. Very excited about building the Guild's presence. Extension, further Southeast into FL.
- Nancy: Cold contacts awkward.
- Robert: Let's get feedback from Linwood. And talk to Zander. Commitments from Nancy to reach out to Michael Mangum. Alex will reach out to Richard. I will reach out to Robert Northup. We can ask Zander if he can reach out to Justin Hart in AL. Will have broad notice for people interested in ATL. I intend to highlight things MPC is doing. Interest in maintaining diverse representation. Encourage people from Southwest. Nominating committee?

- Nancy: I'd be happy to take that off your plate. Just means calling people to make sure they've followed up.
- Robert: By-laws might need updating to reflect our current process.
- We should definitely reach out to everyone in the next month. List of candidates by October meeting. That list, requesting bios once we have our list. By October 8, list out. By the 15<sup>th</sup>, packet out to nominees. November vote starts 1<sup>st</sup> week of November.

#### Committee reports (names in bold are chairs of the committee)

4:30 **Policy: John**, Alex, Mark

Plantation Policy: 8/13 Amy, Mark, Amanda joined a call to hash out ideas. (Notes from Amanda are available)

- - John: Mark and others spoke last month.
- Mark: Amy, Amanda, and myself. We hashed around idea of a plantation webinar featuring discussions from different regions of the country. Settled on having a number of webinars, maybe trying to package by pairing regions, timezone-friendly.
- Amanda: New area. Want to do what we're doing to do, well.
- John: Next week, I'll be at FSC standards revision meeting. Royal Martin, loblolly pine, would be great to get his perspective on managing plantations under FSC system, which is challenging to do these days. Want to talk to him about getting him or someone from his staff on the list.
- Shane: I reached out to Matt Fehrenbacher here at Trout Mountain. He started with an industrial background managing plantations. He worked for Pacific Forest Trust, now Trout Mountain. Now a Guild-style spin on how to manage those issues. Typically fall and winter will be best for us. I'm sure he'd appreciate a chance to get in out of the rain.
- Amanda: Interest from FSC controlled wood mitigation measures in plantations and other issues.
- John: Slow but steady would be good. Talk about setting up some framing questions we could use to guide what we want to get out of those webinars.
- ACTION: Between now and our next call, I can convene our sub-group to brainstorm what that might look like.

4:45 **Student engagement: Shane, John**, Nancy

Update on Student tool kit roll-out. With school starting, are there things we should do?

- Shane: Nancy helped us get back on track here. We had a little lull with summertime. Students coming back. Thinking about ramping things up. Nancy working with UVM, Yale. UVM, Nancy's going to meet with student chapter and advisor.
- Nancy: Date scheduled for UVM
- Shane: Yale, Nancy's been in touch with students, as well as two potential advisors, Marlyse and Joe.
- Nancy: Students coming up to look at Cold Hollow to Canada.
- Shane: John reaching out to UNH, contact at MS State. Haven't heard from Amy about Green River. For myself, drafting blog post to students at UW. Potential recruitment tool. Getting some final quotes. Drafted and ready to go out. OSU, 1-2 weeks ago, received annual year in review from student chapter president. I should send it along to everybody. Colleen will do a feature in

ATL. They had a good first year. Getting up on their feet. Paul said he has some good support from other officers. I do want to take a minute to share something that did come up. OSU college forest, was a 16-ac patch or clearcut with 6 tpa retention. Stand was supposed to be between 80-100 years old, community members found a tree that was 420 years old. Blew up from there. OSU had been operating on a 2005 mgmt plan. That plan suspended in 2009 during economic downturn. Foresters up there operating without a FMP. Huge public outcry. Was just brought to my attention through an email from Paul that the vice chair for the student chapter was involved in laying out the harvest. They're having a bit of a crisis within their group about how to address this. Cutting a tree that started in 1599 is against what a lot of us believe at the Guild. Paul is looking for guidance on how to address it within the club. Obviously a huge opportunity for us to at least reach out and share our perspective on how we see forestry being put out on the landscape. Opportunity for this one student in the club, Paul was saying he's pretty much defending the actions. I don't know what the prescription was, was it salvage. At the end of the day, room for some discussion. Opportunity to provide a different perspective for those students as they wrap their minds around what's going on, on their forest. Initial reactions? More details, but putting it out there.

- Nancy: really interesting dilemma. One of those issues we look at when we're foresters making decisions. How we react to it, valuable lesson in dilemma resolution. Are you already in that OSU world?
- Shane: I'm in the world in the sense that I'm in touch with Klaus, and my wife works in a different part of OSU. We have friends on college staff, we know the foresters that OK'd that harvest, the interim dean. I think that the question I have is really thinking about how to engage with the students in a way that will be positive, but also isn't seen as meddling. I don't know how to frame it other than it's a good opportunity, but if not done well, has some repercussions as far as nascent growth of Guild in NW. At Trout Mountain, talked about having a panel come in and discuss different perspectives. There's been enough blame cast in the media on this.
- Mark: what is the media angry about, specifically?
- Shane: media's perspective has been that OSU has been whacking their old growth, got caught red-handed, don't have a mgmt. plan. Some valid points, but also some sensationalization of what's going on up there, too. End of the day, embarrassing whether OSU foresters or not. Anybody in the forestry profession. Timber industry has said it's taking the space for growing new trees. Community response has been OSU needs to not...it's been a pendulum. Opportunity there with students is to show them how to talk it out. Prescription, why was that stand slated to be harvested, when is it appropriate, when is it not? Exercise. That's the opportunity. A lot of emotion going right now. That's the challenge. This was my concern, back when we first started talking about student engagement, is having student chapters representing the Guild, but maybe not understanding what the Guild stood for. I don't know the details of the student involved with this harvest. Need more information, but also need to know what we need to consider. How do we ensure that those student chapters are tied into what we stand for as an organization.
- Bruce; Not really fair to ask your students to lay out a harvest in a stand where there'll be some OG in there. If they were just carrying out orders, that's one thing. If they were making the decisions, that's a lot to put on a student, whether he or she is a Guild member or not.
- Shane: Research forest, opportunity for students to learn boots-on-the-ground forestry. Oversight comes from OSU foresters on staff. If they're not marking the stand, they're

responsible for oversight. Whole debacle was a breakdown up and down the chain from dean's office to implementation level. Wasn't just on the students to design and implement this timber harvest. But that's also a question we all wrestle with.

- Robert: Two clear distinctions: Administrative piece (probably what's really drawing the media into this). Professional and philosophical piece. Probably should leave out administrative piece. Learn from this experience as a professional. PNW is a charged place to do forestry. Tremendous learning experience, framed in idea of how we take a situation like this and talk about it. Without having to engage in blame discussion.
- Bruce: Sounds like the Guild's involvement with student chapter in relation to this would go a long way.
- Alex: Sounds like you're identifying a reputational risk to FSG that you're concerned about. We've been pushing membership and student membership, really good. Will be different things that Guild members will do that others will not agree with. We can help support a group without jumping into blame game too much. 450-yr-old tree, but I'm growing trees now that I hope will be harvested when they're 400 years old. Not be-all across entire Guild membership.
- Shane: Important to put context in mind. A lot of students at OSU are trained to grow timber and fiber. Other question is, politics aside, it's a bit funny to walk into their house, so to speak, and start discussing alternatives that they're not teaching to a greater degree outside of what Klaus is doing. That's the delicate dance. Needs to be an invitation. Will be really interesting to have good discussions and take the electricity out of it. Focus on the forestry as opposed to the repercussions of the community and bad media. A way to do it well, and multiple ways to do it poorly. That's what I'm scratching my head over. How to offer that support that the leadership.
- Robert: Sounds to me like you've laid it out. Ask the student chapter if they'd appreciate your assistance in putting together a variety of views that talks specifically about different options for forestry, and professional implications.
- Bruce: maybe do off-campus. Room at a restaurant.
- Mark: Might be good to drill down to find out what prescription was. In my mind, a lot of difference in setting up a prescription in a 70 year-old stand, and a 400 year-old tree fell between the cracks, or a 400 year old stand. It's unfortunate that an old tree like that would be harvested, but if the intent wasn't to do that, whole different ballgame.
- Shane: That's what I've been asking this whole time. I know the foresters who work on this forest, and I would assume they have a reason for doing what they're doing. How we can tie into ethical and technical discussion. Moving past media blitz, talk about what being a forester looks like in the real world, in the Northwest, how we make decisions.
- Amanda: Learning lab idea.

#### [Membership planning and process](#) (Robert, John, Mark)

No subcommittee activity.

#### 5:00 [Membership and Policy Guidelines subcommittee](#)

Review major areas that were changed. Specifically review additions to define roles of the Board and MPC around Policy Statement development.

- Robert: I made some simple revisions. Changes so far not particularly controversial. However, I added a couple sections in the very beginning. What we saw board's responsibility to be. Those



points will be considered very carefully at the board meeting. I will attend. Give everyone a chance to consider the changes made here. If someone like Robert Hrubes has concerns about role MPC has taken, might be pushback. Should be an interesting discussion. Overall work on policy guidelines moving along really well. Tried to deal with as much as we could that weren't larger organizational issues. Are some cases where we added some things, like idea of censure for members. Fairly straightforward. Will leave it there. Dropped a lot of specifics to annual meeting, various committees. Housekeeping.

- Michael: I do have a bunch of little comments. First, about changing from Board to MPC responsibility, seemed a little weird we could do that because it's the way the board is now, as opposed to the way it should be. Hard to read now with changes, but I did put in a bunch of marginal comments. I could make my marginal comments more meaningful to someone other than myself and send that to you, Robert, if that would be helpful. Things worth thinking about now versus final version.
- Robert: Interesting question about making changes on basis of current practice. Biggest concern I heard was from Hrubes about policy statements. He didn't want them to go out without Board approval first.
- Vote Timing. With policy statement?
- Robert: Plantation policy probably more than a few months off.

#### 5:15 [Founder's commentary series](#)

67 Founders, 33 still members!

Deadlines for founders reflections to be included in a 25th anniversary section of ATLs moving forward are the Tuesday before the third Friday of each month. For Sept, its Sept 17.

We need a plan of attack. Colleen needs a schedule.

- Robert: Idea I came up with. Asked if Ross Morgan would write one of these essays. Ross has completed an essay, and it will appear in this issue of ATL. Serve to get other people psyched. Over 33 founders still active out of original 67. Came together to get this organization going on three different occasions. Santa Fe, Sugar Hill, Asheville. Seems like a really nice opportunity for people to reflect about the value of the Guild. I've drafted an outreach email. 17 of 33 that I knew personally. Happy to direct my outreach to those specifically. Put together an email I haven't sent off yet, but shared with Colleen, saying this is why we're doing this, why you should consider writing this. I'd like if anyone looks at that list of founders, feels comfortable sending something to that person and requesting them to write an essay for this purpose.
- Shane: I don't know if I'd recognize anybody on the list, but anybody that people don't want to contact, I'd be happy to.
- Nancy: You put your name next to all the people I know. I can reach out to Barrie Brusila. I'm also happy to reach out to anyone.
- 5:30 Adjourn
- - Staff updates: Nick Biemiller being promoted to SE Director, hiring SE Coordinator. Also, Kendal Martel moved from SW to OR. Now have staff in PNW.
- Mark: Wrote editorial for Duluth newspaper, Zander shared on Facebook. Commentary on how media blowing up critique of Minnesota forestry public process.

- John: I just got invited to participate in a panel discussion happening during UN Climate Week in NYC. Biomass energy greenhouse gas accounting in the context of IPCC and UN. Little did I know that doing that stuff 10 years ago in MA would lead me down this path.
- Robert: This should be another thing Colleen posts.

### **MPC member committees**

Nancy: Student engagement, WOW

Robert: Procedures, Events, Membership and Policy guidelines revision

John: Student, Policy

Bruce: Model forest

Amy:

Michael: membership/outreach

Shane: student, membership/outreach

Alex: Model forest, Policy

Mark: Events, Model forest, Policy

### **Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)

Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)

Alex Barrett – Vermont (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Bruce White – North Carolina (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)

John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)

Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)

Amy LaBarge –Washington (1<sup>st</sup> term 2021)

Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)

## **Proposed 2019 Calendar**

<b>Month</b>	<b>MPC discussion topic</b>	<b>ATL topic</b>	<b>ATL due date</b>
<b>September</b> (9/10)	MPC guidelines		
<b>October</b> (10/8 )	MPC vote		

**November (11/12)**

Model Forest

**December (12/9)**

2018 review, 2019 look-ahead

MPC election results

# MPC October Call: Minutes and Notes

Tuesday, October 8, 2019

4:00 Welcome and roll call.

- All present - Alex and Nancy joined late
- Robert Turner
- Shane Hetzler
- Bruce White
- Mark Jacobs
- John Gunn
- Michael Leff
- Amy LaBarge
- Alex Barrett
- Nancy Patch
- Michael Lynch (Staff)
- Amanda Mahaffey (Staff)
- Richard Morrill (Board) joined for the document review

Discuss/approve minutes from September 2019

- Motion to approve minutes in roll call.

Shane motion and Michael Leff second. Motion carried.

4:05 Staff update (Michael):

- SE coordinator
- Lake States Guild Gatherings

4:15 MPC Nominations

- Justin Hart, Mark Vander Meer confirmed
- Nancy reached out to three women one was interested.
- Three new southeast nominations from Nick – Arkansas member (Jeff Denman) will be contacted about interest
- Discussion on a minimum number of nominees
- Agreed that four seemed like a reasonable number
- Plan to close nomination end of week
- Ask nominee for bio and statement of candidacy via Colleen.

4:30 Committee Reports

Policy – John will jumpstart process soon

- FSC working group on how plantations are classified
- Planted trees vs plantations

- Company managing 500k in Mississippi/Louisiana willing to do a webinar on managing plantations to FSC standard
- Plan a product in first quarter

#### Student engagement Committee

- Shane – University of Montana, Mississippi State
- Nancy – U Vermont – mostly undergraduate – spoke with students about the Guild – Tony D’Amato advisor – combining SAF and Guild student chapters into one
- Proposed Yale chapter
- Firewood raffle at Oregon State University
- Blog post for U Wash
- Interest at U of MN but trouble filling leadership roles even with current clubs
- Shane – OSU controversy – club largely wanting to disengage from the issue
- Amanda called about women chainsaw

#### Membership

- Robert on board call – did not feel membership was a board focus. Membership is down but board did not seem to have a plan to reverse
- Professional members, down affiliate members up
- Interest in more updated member lists – Mark said Colleen has been very responsive if asked – just need to ask.
- Mark – member sign up bonus—should we do this?
- Make sure to reach out to lapsed members
- Rick Morrill (board) joined call and chimed in on membership issues

#### Robert – Membership Guidelines

- Leave 2/3 ratification in document
- Discussion on position statements and the role of MPC, staff, and Board
- Shane and Nancy second the document as amended to go to membership

5:45 adjourn

## MPC Call -- Tuesday, November 12, 2019

4:00 Welcome and roll call. Discuss/approve minutes from October 2019

- Robert
- Shane
- Mark
- Bruce
- Alex
- Amanda

Minutes weren't sent out; will approve on next call.

4:05 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

- Robert – I have been in touch with Colleen about upcoming election and webinar. Were some questions early on about election, new Neon system. May or may not be more cumbersome, but is less familiar. I ended up feeling we'd best stick with what we know. Buys us time for members to become familiar with new system.

How many have registered for the webinar to date?

- 8 including Robert, Amanda, and Michael Leff.
- Robert: Would like to consider webinar before election in future. Members a chance to interact with their candidates.
- Alex: Would be good, even if we don't get a desirable turnout for the first one.
- Mark: I think it's a good idea, too. Good opportunity for candidates to engage and have some interaction.
- Robert: Nancy's not here, but I was grateful for her willingness to jump and reach out to people.

4:15 MPC election status

Five candidates: Mark Vander Meer (MT), Laura Schweitzer (CO), Justin Hart (AL), Jeff Denman (AR), Shane Hetzler (OR). See bios and statements on the [MPC web page](#).

Since we've scheduled a webinar for the Guidelines discussion, we also invited candidates to introduce themselves (2 minutes each).

- Robert: Potential new candidate from Southeast. May be too late to add at this point.
- Amanda: Who was missing candidate?
- Shane: Charles Faires. Really tight turnaround.
- Bruce: Would be cleaner if we kept it as is rather than introduce last-minute noise to the process. Just be sure we reach out to those folks and encourage them to run for available slots next year.
- Mark: I had someone respond to me October 25 after I'd reached out in August. Just before I left for vacation.
- Shane: I can reach back out to Nick and apologize and to those two guys directly as well.
- Robert: I'd really appreciate that. Reminds me we may want to be more formal next year about a nominating committee.

## Committee reports (names in bold are chairs of the committee)

### 4:30 **Policy:** John, Alex, Mark

- Plantation Policy update
- Mark: John emailed me this morning. He asked me to take over this committee. He hasn't been able to put in enough time to prioritize things. I'll give it a shot. My first update is that we've done nothing since last meeting.
- Robert: I hope there's momentum.
- Amanda: Possible connections with FSC and Foresters for the Birds in Oregon.

### 4:45 **Student engagement:** Shane, John, Nancy

- Update on Student tool kit roll-out.
- Shane: Not too many updates. Nancy's updates from Northeast that she had a two-day event with about 10 Yale Forestry students that went really well. Co-advisors for Yale Student Chapter have official become professional Guild members. She also had a field trip with UVM students. I reached out to U Washington again, haven't heard back. I'll ping them again. Feels like we're losing a little bit of steam focusing on Northeast and maybe the West. Would be interesting to see if new MPC candidates have additional leads and contacts in their respective regions.
- Alex: Was the first day of their tour. They wanted to see active mgmt., I reached out to different foresters, one of whom is a Guild member. Saw two really cool harvests. Very different silviculturally. Restoration work in high-graded hemlock forest, and other one had a really nice red pine plantation component, all CTL harvesting. Amazing group of students, from people who had no idea what a skidder was to people that are really into it. Also took them to a local, off-the-grid sawmill.
- Feels like we could use more coverage in Southeast, Lake States, IMW. But quality over quantity. Some solid chapters building. I haven't heard of anything from the Michigan Tech chapter; wonder if we should keep them engaged. Something our subcommittee can think about.
- Timeline for OSU worked out reaching out at end of school year, recruited a couple key student members, came back in fall ready to get going. Be ready for a fall push.
- Mark: Should we foster established chapters for a year or so and use as a case study to sell the other places? We're kind of taking a shotgun approach, wonder if we'd be better having a half dozen really good examples and use that as a recruitment tool.
- Shane: Good question. Way our subcommittee approached it, we had gone back and forth about what success looked like for us for outreach. Decided to ultimately scale things back and focus on a couple key chapters. Have at least one solid chapter in each region. Nancy-UVM, Yale folks, given concentrations of Guild members out there. Running short on Lake States and IMW. For the most part, don't think anybody's intending to get 20 chapters going this first year. Try to be slow and strategic and go for the quality, and also see how it's all working. Chapters are different; student needs are different. Would like to also reach junior colleges, community colleges, different student demographic.
- Mark: If you have Klaus championing OSU and Tony D'Amato in VT, they both came from U of Minnesota. Some connectivity there. Rather than me talking with Marcella, maybe have Klaus reach out to her.

- Shane: That works a little here in NW. My contacts at UW. I think the challenge with folks in academia is getting them to commit to the time to do so. Those guys in particular are really tough to pin down.
- Robert: SAF national presence? Expose Guild to student chapters. Ways we could leverage our exposure in general through programs to see where interest is in developing student chapters, rather than where could we find kindred spirits. Where is the Guild on an upward spring?
- Shane: What other conferences for gathering critical mass of students besides SAF?
- Robert: I can't imagine very many. But could put some emphasis on regional SAF meetings. Tons of students at our New England meeting.
- Shane: Little bit of a funny process, going to SAF functions to do our own recruiting.
- Robert: At NESAF this year, we hosted a Guild dinner. There were 400 people at meeting and 40 people signed up for this dinner. Blew me away that so many people would spend the evening there.
- Alex: We should totally have a booth. I'd be happy to sit at it for a while. We should recruit some member who wants a cheap registration and have them sit in the booth.
- Mark: Wildlife Society presentations on Guild-style forestry, got a couple signed on as Guild members. They seemed almost more open to it than some of the forestry people I've talked to. Is there an opportunity there? Ecologist group as well.
- Amanda: Student members, or professional members?
- Robert: A bit of both. We probably wouldn't go out of our way to set up at a booth at TWS just to recruit student members. Does shift question, if we are looking to students, where could we do this easily?
- Maybe start setting subcommittee goals in December for 2020.

#### Membership planning and process (Robert, John, Mark)

No activity.

- Robert: There are things that will continue to happen as Guild's efficiency with Neon system improves. Without some press from MPC, not sure the Board will pay a whole lot more attention to membership. Doesn't get any real time on the agenda at their meetings.

#### 5:00 Membership and Policy Guidelines subcommittee

- Webinar will spend 20-30 minutes on a quick review of changes. Feedback and interaction will be through "chat" function or emailed questions.
- Candidates will be allowed 2 min each to introduce themselves.

#### 5:15 Other business

Founder's commentary series

- Email sent to 33 founders still active. 15 responses, all positive. Schedule being developed.
  - MPC follow-up
  - Robert: I will handle follow-up with those people who have made a commitment.
  - Bruce: Note from AI Sample was awesome.
  - Robert: Ross and AI are tough acts to follow.
- ATL topic??  
Member updates



- Mark: Forest2Tap update. Had our bats initiative. Flights for bats, 24-31 October, donated dollars to Bat Conservation International's white-nose syndrome research fund. They were really thrilled to be involved in it. Raise awareness of the issue. A lot of buzz about it in MN. Breweries did see a bump in flight sales that week. People are getting engaged in the process.
- We'll put together a package like PLT of how we've approached it. Other regions can take it and apply it.
- Robert: You've got a bunch of case studies. Amazing how it's grown.
- Mark: Small craft breweries are so community-oriented. Inspiring in a lot of ways.
- Bird passport tour idea.
- Amanda: Give Mike Lynch a call sometime.
- Bruce: Bottomlands learning exchange feedback?
- Amanda: I heard it was a really good event.
- Bruce: I was at a NFWF forestland stewards forum this year. Part of the presentation involved some of what we were doing with the learning exchange. Lots of folks interested. I feel like some of those registrants probably found out about it from that forum. I wish I could've been there.
- Robert: If you ever felt that there was a grant opportunity that might support something like Forests 2 Tap, would you be the one to tell us?
- Amanda: I would totally if I knew of any. Regional or local grants likely your best bet, connection with the project.
- Robert: Policy work here, senate and house came up with different bills attempting to address forest carbon offsets. Bills themselves weren't well-drafted. I got appointed to a study group. We're nearly done with our four meetings. How can any state facilitate what appears to be an opportunity for small landowners to add to their revenue stream? From your perspectives, forest carbon offsets registering with landowners? What kinds of questions do you get?
- Mark: We just had a workshop in MN looking at some case studies. Biggest thing I hear is, are the markets really there?
- Robert: Not comfortable committing for 25 years, or not sure if worth it?
- Mark: My organization went through two carbon evaluations while I was there. John Gunn worked on one of them. Protocols were different.
- Robert: Voluntary market is beginning to get its feet under itself. Interesting that the public is becoming more aware of purchasing options. Companies are getting pressured into identifying the impact of climate change on their programs.
- 

5:30 [Adjourn](#)

### **MPC member committees**

Nancy: Student engagement, WOW

Robert: Procedures, Events, Membership and Policy guidelines revision

John: Student, Policy

Bruce: Model forest

Amy:

Michael: membership/outreach

Shane: student, membership/outreach

Alex: Model forest, Policy

Mark: Events, Model forest, Policy

**Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)

Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)

Alex Barrett – Vermont (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Bruce White – North Carolina (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)

John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)

Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)

Amy LaBarge –Washington (1<sup>st</sup> term 2021)

Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)

## Proposed 2019 Calendar

Month	MPC discussion topic	ATL topic	ATL due date
November (11/12)	Model Forest		
December (12/9)	2018 review, 2019 look-ahead	MPC election results	

## MPC Call -- Tuesday, December 10, 2019

4:00 Welcome and roll call. Discuss/approve minutes from October and November 2019

Attending: Robert, Nancy, Bruce, Shane, John, Alex, Mark

Missing: Michael, Amy

Nancy (Shane 2<sup>nd</sup>): Motion to approve October and November minutes.

Approved. Minutes passed unanimously.

4:05 Staff Updates (Zander/Amanda/Colleen)

Amanda: Staff retreat a success. 20+ staff. Definitely felt the spark, particularly among new staff.

Election votes tallied to date?

- 85 responses. 28% of professional and retired members. 118 last year, but 11 candidates. About 88 responses in 2017. Hopefully will at least get up to 100.

MPC election and guidelines webinar: only two, at large attendees

### Committee reports (names in bold are chairs of the committee)

4:15 **Policy:** **Mark**, John, Alex,

- Plantation Policy update
  - Haven't reconnected on plantations yet. Need to attack in next year.
- FCWG policy : should we be in the loop on these things?
  - John: I've been sort of in the loop with this since the beginning. Useful to stay engaged. Initially formed while serious talk about national cap-and-trade policy that might have included forests. Stayed loosely together. Renewed momentum in last year or so. As part of that, developed policy platform piece they've asked members to sign onto. Generally, I signed onto it on behalf of the non-profit I work with; I support these goals. I did give them some feedback; I take some issue with one of the statements in Goal 3 where they talk about advance markets for forest carbon, forest products, and skilled labor. Statement I see repeated in social media that is kind of aspirational. "robust product markets." I've not seen any studies that document that. Find it hard to imagine where demand for land conversion is high that robust forest markets are going to be the halting factor. Regardless, the policy platform that follows under that goal talks about easements, more effective tools to approach that.
  - Mark: We have that phenomenon here in MN, Potlach Corporation lands. They sold off a lot of their lands; it was converted to potato farms. State had to step in with concerns over irrigation, water quality. Not sure carbon markets would have stopped it. Corporate decision that it wasn't worth owning forestland to supply their mill.
  - Nancy: Does work when it's sugaring. If you're tapping your trees, that's keeping the forest from being converted.
  - John: Unique case where there's annual revenue.
  - Nancy: Big money.

- Robert: And driving the real estate market. What about whether the MPC should get a look at these before the Guild approves?
- John: Great point. What's the difference between the organization signing onto this policy piece where it's transparent for all to see? Seems like if the timeframe is available, which in this case it was, we could have had the opportunity to at least review it and weigh in in some way.
- Nancy: I definitely agree. Flip side of where board was coming with when we were recommending policy. Process seems incomplete.
- Robert: what to do? Mention to both Al and Zander that we'd like to talk about it without slowing down the process.
- Bruce: at least make sure nothing contradicts existing policy statements.
- Nancy: If policy statement, membership might assume it came through MPC.
- Robert: this is an endorsement of somebody else's statement, not a Guild statement.
- Alex: This is something American Forests is putting forward and the Guild is signing off on?
- Robert: Members of FCWG are really the people whose opinion matters. Guild is one.
- John: I know Fred was involved awhile ago. Zander probably took his place.
- Amanda: I believe so. We get these things all the time. Zander likely made a call to support it and didn't find it contrary to the policies of the Guild.
- Is there any way to "tier" these by importance? Any criteria we might assign that says, these we'd like to review, these we can ignore?
- Amanda: no, not easily done.
- Shane: Question is having the opportunity to respond if we want to provide feedback. This is a benign example, but the precedent is scary.
- Nancy: Maybe just that we hadn't seen these, so we don't know. I don't have a problem with staff endorsing these, but not knowing what we didn't know, it's hard to judge this one example.
- Bruce: I feel like if Zander's reviewing them, I feel pretty comfortable with that. If they could just let us know as they come up, that way if we think it's worth pursuing it, we have that option.
- Mark: My experience with Zander is that he's pretty cautious about the Guild signing on to things.
- Robert: I'll take this as an opportunity to raise this with Zander so that on major items, if there's an opportunity, the chair of the policy committee will receive the correspondence and make a decision whether the entire MPC wants to take up, or just ignore.

4:25 [Student engagement: Shane, John](#), Nancy

- Shane: Thankful to Nancy staying on our committee past her term.
- We had discussed having Guild members who could serve as student liaisons. Nancy drew up a Guild members to students info sheet, one-pager. I just reviewed it and put a couple suggested edits on there. Might kick it around a little more. Another tool we're working on to complement the student toolkit.
- Started identifying members. Will be a good time to reassess holes across the nation. Think about incoming MPC members.

- Nancy: I think keeping ad hoc committee to reach out to everyone who's a point person to get updates. The schools will be left out in the dark unless you're actively engaging.
- Shane: Good point on regular updates. I've been pretty fortunate with OSU chapter. Thinking about how we institutionalize that as we're helping to set up these student chapters. Spoken expectation, how often to check in.
- John: Talked about having student chapter visibility on new website.
- Shane: I'm not sure if Colleen was able to incorporate that or not. Was on her radar. It's a good step. With OSU, they're going to be doing a spring field trip up to Cedar River Watershed, Seattle utility watershed that Amy LaBarge manages. I'll talk to Amy and make sure she knows they're a student Guild chapter.
- Mark: Is there a way to track student members into professional members?
- Shane: That might be a nice addition to the webpage; make sure people know that if they're a recent graduate, have a grace period before they need to pay full dues.
- Nancy: Amanda, question – student applications?
- Amanda: I receive professional member applications.
- Robert: Saw SAF newsletter that SAF provided a student grant. Can we do that?
- Amanda: We don't have an official application process, but we do support events for students upon request.
- Robert: Would be nice to see \$500 for students distributed equitably.
- Amanda: For that level of funds, it's easier to respond to individual requests than to create a process.
- Shane: In the future, if there were a way to develop student scholarships, would be a great way to get students engaged more with us as well. Would be cool to see that come back.
- Amanda: I agree.
- Shane:

#### 4:35 **Membership planning and process** (Robert, John, Mark)

No activity. Whether this subcommittee continues will be up to the chair next year.

#### 4:45 **Other business**

Retiring members: Nancy, Robert

- Robert: I'd like to recognize Nancy, who is term-limited out, for her tremendous work and p service on the MPC.
- Nancy: Same back at you! Six years. I'm glad to have done it.
- Robert: And congrats on your Journal of Forestry publication.
- Nancy: Focused on a case study at Audubon VT I was involved with. All the kudos really go to Todd Ontl at NIACS.
- John: Thank you, Robert, for your leadership. I really appreciate all you've been doing in between calls to keep a lot of things moving.
- Mark: Kudos to Nancy and Robert. You made it really easy to come onto the MPC and try to figure out who's who and what's going on. I hope somebody can step up to provide this to new members in the future.
- Amanda: Kudos as well!

- Shane: Speaks volumes to both you guys that you still have initiatives you care about that you want to continue serve in some capacity. Inspiring to see people with such roots of commitment to organization.
- Robert: I've come to see all of us on MPC as embodying idea of ambassadors for the organization. The spirit is there. I think it's important to bring new people on because we can share the wealth.
- John: Was there a succession plan?
- Robert: Policy in past is that vice-chair ascends to chair position. And in January, will identify next vice.

Amy's pending resignation.

- Robert: She's willing to stay or leave as needed. My thought is to use the instant runoff approach. Candidate with the fourth-most votes gets offered the position.
- Shane: I'm not sure how it would work with folks on the ballot. Still thinking about Charles Faires. He'd approached Nick Biemiller several times. Just putting out there to see if there's an opportunity to potentially engage him.
- Nancy: I'm not sure how he didn't get onto the ballot, either. My first inclination was to give it to the runner-up for the members on the ballot because people are actually voting.
- Bruce: I would tend to agree.
- Mark: That would be the cleanest way to do it. They are all running.
- Amanda: Can always see how the year goes; we might have a gap to fill suddenly.
- Robert: We can keep Charles on the list for next year for sure.
- Mark: What would happen if the third candidate decided to decline? Would the next runner-up be in that position?
- Robert: it's essentially what we did last year.
- Mark: Precedent.
- Shane: What happened with Jon Fosgitt?
- John: I think we just waited until the regular election.
- Nancy: Michael Leff came on as an appointee.
- Outside an election process, you have more flexibility to replace someone.
- Robert: What if the diversity we'd hoped for in the group running now didn't materialize? Does the group have a responsibility to reach out to somebody that would perhaps meet those diversity goals?
- Mark: To me, would almost seem like a snub to that number four spot.
- **Nancy: I move to replace Amy's position with the candidate with the fourth-most votes.**
- Shane: second.
- Motion carried.

## 2020 Planning

- Robert: What about this group for next year? E.g. beef up student engagement committee? Create calendar topics?

- Shane: Only policy statement we're working on now is plantations. Kicking around other ideas? Other statements we need to revisit?
- Robert: Natural forest policy statement was last one.
- Mark: And that led us into plantations.
- John: Lead us not into plantations....big lift. With global attention to tree planting, might be time for us to weigh in formally.
- Robert: I re-read an article recently about the triad approach. Talked about how isolating uses doesn't really serve the largest goals of landscapes for biodiversity and wildlife. I was left feeling like this is the kind of discussion communities have to have regarding land use.
- Mark: I, too, have been involved in discussions lately about climate change and planting trees. All of a sudden, competition about which is better for climate. I chime in and say it's both where appropriate. We're talking about a different approach to plantations in my mind.
- Shane: In NW, I didn't plant plantations, but I'm managing them. Others in that situation as well. We're inheriting this situation; how do we interpret ecologically-based forestry in that context.
- Mark: National report on the decline of birds. How many billion in last 50 years. Knee-jerk reaction is because our forests are cleared. To me, there's a story to be told for responsible forestry. Forestry for the Birds is that story. It would almost be nice to provide members with a couple paragraphs so they could respond to those concerns when they're brought up in their region. Not quite a toolkit. Describing what Guild is doing for responsible forestry. Another one locally was MN Impaired Waters list. People crying foul on logging, but if you look at where, they're in the ag region of the state, not the forested reason. Almost a missed opportunity to educate the public while they're paying attention to these different topics.
- Amanda: Not to throw Colleen under the bus, but she's talented on communication outreach on issues like that.
- Robert: Regional coordinators from each state. Might be some ways for us to organize quickly, quarterly calls??

5:30 [Adjourn](#)

- Nancy: Motion to adjourn. Robert: Second.

**Current Members** (term ends last day of the year indicated):

Robert Turner (2019 Chair) - Vermont (1st Term 2019)

Nancy Patch (2018 Chair) - Vermont (2nd term, 2019)

Alex Barrett – Vermont (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Bruce White – North Carolina (2<sup>nd</sup> term, 2021)

Shane Hetzler – Oregon (1st term 2019)

John Gunn – Maine (2nd term 2020)

Michael Leff-- Massachusetts (1st term 2020)

Amy LaBarge –Washington (1<sup>st</sup> term 2021)

Mark Jacobs-- Minnesota (1st term 2020)