



NAPFSC



October 1996

R E P O R T

A report to the members of the National Association of Professional Forestry Schools and Colleges

President's Message

Gregory N. Brown

I have appreciated the opportunity to serve as President of NAPFSC for the past ten months. Even having served in other NAPFSC offices, I have been overwhelmed with NAPFSC's interaction with other organizations, most of which benefit our professional forestry schools and colleges. I would particularly like to thank members of the NAPFSC Executive Committee, many of whom have devoted long hours and many trips in our interest.

This report will focus primarily on summarizing activities with which my office has been involved during the past ten months.

Several current and previous members of the NAPFSC Executive Committee have worked with me through Randy Nuckolls' and Patrick Turner's offices with various congressional offices and the OMB during development of the federal budget under USDA. Our primary focus was on McIntire-Stennis, RREA and NRI, but we have not ignored Hatch and Smith-Lever funds. You are aware of the outcome of the budget cycle which, given the current budget environment, was positive. A generous mark-up in RREA funds has been proposed by CSREES for next year, and we are working with Administrator Bob Robinson's office. On behalf of NAPFSC, I have sent a letter to Senator Cochran's office opposing earmarking of NRI funds which almost occurred this year, and also a letter to Secretary Glickman expressing forestry's interest in participating in the Fund for Rural America.

Working with NASULGC I have had the opportunity to serve on the Natural Resources Board and currently am chair-elect. Also representing NAPFSC, I am serving on the NASULGC-EPA Research Task Force, and on the Board of Agriculture Executive Committee. Through

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

Feature Article

A New Column Of Your NAPFSC REPORT

Differences Between Old-Growth and Managed Forests in the Upper Midwest

(Submitted by Ronald L. Giese)

(Written by Patty Lucas and Eric Wittmershaus)

Old-growth, northern hardwood forests once occupied a large percentage of the northern Great Lakes region. Characterized by tall tree canopies and layered vegetation, these forests were home to a variety of relatively uncommon species, such as the pine marten and pileated woodpecker.

“Public concern has focused on whether forest management practices on public lands are maintaining adequate biodiversity comparable to what would be found in natural, unmanaged stands.”

Heavy logging around the turn of the century and during the first decades of the 1900s decimated the old-growth forests. These forests have since begun their recovery, but the process has been a slow one.

In recent years, public concern has focused on whether forest management practices on public lands are maintaining biodiversity comparable to what would be found in natural,

CONTINUED ON PAGE 9



NAPFSC

REPORT

Bi-Annual Newsletter of the
National Association of Professional
Forestry Schools and Colleges

Executive Committee:

- Gregory N. Brown. . . .President
- Albert R. Vogt. . . .President-Elect
- Richard F. Fisher. . . .Past President
- G. H. Weaver. . . .Secretary-Treasurer
- George W. Brown. . . .Chair, Extension
- Perry Brown. . . .Chair, Western Region
- Jared Cohon. . . .Chair, International
- Donald DeHayes. . . .Chair, Northeast Region
- Daniel E. Keathley. . . .Chair, Education
- James P. Lassoie. . . .Chair, Research
- Robert N. Muller. . . .Chair, Southern Region
- C. P. Pat Reid. . . .Chair, Policy
- Thomas D. Warner. . . .Chair, North Central Region
- G. Bruce Wiersma. . . .Chair, Legislative

Staff:

Arlice K. Banks. . . .NAPFSC Report Editor

Letters, news items, stories,
and photographs
for the

NAPFSC REPORT
may be sent to:

National Association of Professional
Forestry Schools and Colleges
Gregory N. Brown, NAPFSC President
College of Forestry and Wildlife Resources
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University
324 Cheatham Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0324
Telephone: 540-231-5481
Fax: 540-231-7664
E-mail: brownngn@vt.edu

President's Message

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

this latter role I have participated in Agriculture's Futuring Programs. NAPFSC's national committee chairs serve on the four COPS with concentrated activity on the budget committees of ECOP and ESCOP. A joint meeting between ECOP and ESCOP held in Bar Harbor prompted a letter from me on behalf of NAPFSC to Interim Undersecretary Catherine Woteki expressing our concern that forest resources and natural resources are overlooked in the draft USDA/REE strategic plan.

We have maintained frequent dialogue with our colleagues in CSREES. Representing NAPFSC, I am serving on the Governmental Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Council in developing outcomes and performance indicators. We also have been active in nominating individuals to serve on the Forestry Research Advisory Committee (FRAC), and we nominated Larry Tombaugh (who ultimately was selected) to fill the single forestry position on the new National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board (NAREEEAB). Members of our Executive Committee also have been or will be working with the National Leadership Seminar Advisory Committee under CSREES, and with the Environmental Monitoring Initiative Workshop under the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources.

On behalf of NAPFSC, I also have had the opportunity to meet with the US Forest Service Green Team relative to their planning efforts. Several of our forestry school heads have met through the Pinchot Institute with US Forest Service research personnel, AF&PA personnel and others to discuss collaborative efforts.

Under IUFRO, Dick Fisher and I serve as representatives on their International Council.

NAPFSC has maintained continuous dialogue with SAF, particularly relevant to the accreditation process. The agenda of the upcoming NAPFSC General Assembly will include discussion of a proposal from the Western Region relative to accreditation, plus a discussion led by Greg Smith.

NAPFSC's Research Chair and I have had the opportunity to serve on AF&PA's Research Committee. We have worked on the joint proposal effort with the Department of Energy and on creation of a Forest Science and Technology Vision and Priorities. Jim Lassoie also serves on the NCASI committee.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5



NAPFSC

Regional Officers, 1996-97

North Central Region:

Chair Elect
Instruction

Carl Settergen, University of Missouri
Dan Keathley, Michigan State
keathley@msuces.canr.msu.edu

International Research

Pete Schaefer, South Dakota State
hflp@mg.sdstate.edu

Research

Dennis LeMaster, Purdue University
dclmstr@forest1.fnr.purdue.edu

Extension

Bob Romig, Ohio State University
romig.2@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu

Southern Region:

Education

Wayne Smith, University of Florida
whs@gnv.ifas.ufl.edu

Extension

George Hopper, University of Tennessee
ghopper@utk.edu

International

Stan Carpenter, Louisiana State University
scarpen@lsuv.m.sncc.lsu.edu

Research

Arnett Mace, University of Georgia
fordean@uga.cc.uga.edu

Western Region:

Education

Don Arganbright, Northern Arizona University
dga@alpine.for.nau.edu

Extension

Ed DePuit, Washington State University
depuite@wsuvm1.csc.wsu.edu

International

Chuck Hatch, University of Idaho
crhatch@uidaho.edu

Legislative

Terry Sharik, Utah State University
tlsharik@cc.usu.edu

Policy

Al Dyer, Colorado State University
al@cnr.colostate.edu

Research

Bart Thielges, Oregon State University
thielgeb@ccmail.orst.edu

Northeast Region:

Research

Bruce Wiersma, University of Maine
wiersma@maine.maine.edu

Education

Larry Nielsen, Pennsylvania State University
forestres@psu.psu.edu

Extension

William McComb, University of Massachusetts
bmccomb@forwild.umass.edu

International

David Schroeder, University of Connecticut
dschroed@canrl.cag.uconn.edu



Committee Reports

National Extension Committee

George Brown, Chair

Forestry and natural resources extension continues to be a high point in the programs of our nation's forestry institutions. While these programs tend to be funded at levels less than teaching and research and usually less than 5% of agriculture extension programs, they are highly productive and provide an essential link between the university, the public and the broader forestry community.

Our extension programs often set the standard in cooperation between universities and with other agencies and organizations. In the West, for example, extension personnel in Colorado play key roles in two regional, award-winning partnerships that link local, state and federal agencies in programs of forest health and landscape management. In Arizona, extension staff collaborate with colleagues at Iowa State and the National Agricultural Library in development of a World Wide Web program on range management. Idaho, Montana, Oregon State and Washington State extension faculty produced a series of jointly authored publications in forest management.

In a similar vein, extension and non-extension faculty, cooperating in delivery of continuing education programming to University faculty, are engaged in outreach efforts targeted at improving public understanding of forestry and teacher education. Sustainable forestry is also a topic of wide interest.

Finally, extension educators are leading the effort to extend the university campus through distance education. Examples of creative programs using educational television and commercial television abound.

Financially, we lost ground with our federal appropriation in this difficult budget year. The Renewable Resources Extension Act (RREA) appropriation was reduced from \$3.291 million to \$3.129 million for federal fiscal year 1997. While not a major reduction (3%), RREA funds have languished at this very low level for many years in spite of efforts to move the appropriation closer to the authorization level of \$15 million. We will be trying to recruit a champion for this program during the next six months.



National Legislative Committee

G. Bruce Wiersma, Chair

During the early summer of 1996, I visited with staff at the National Research Council (NRC), including the Commission on Geosciences Environment and Resources, Board on Earth Sciences and Resources, and the Office of International Affairs. I encouraged them to consider the NAPFSC schools and faculty represented by those schools. I believe that many of the NAPFSC faculty are already used by the NRC.

When I met with Dr. Robert Huggett, Assistant Administrator for Research and Development, EPA, he told me that EPA's research budget has actually received a small increase in FY 97 of about \$15 million. The total EPA R&D budget is in excess of \$550 million. Bob also pointed out a section of the appropriation language which directs the EPA program offices to work their research and technical support efforts (another very large amount of money) through the Office of Research and Development. However, the actual implementation of this language is very much open to question.

In my meeting with Dr. Sidney Draggan, currently special science advisor to Carol Browner, Administrator of EPA, he told me that in addition to his role as advisor to the administrator, he is heavily involved in the redesign and reorganization of all US Government Environmental Monitoring efforts.



National Research Committee

James P. Lassoie, Chair

Despite constant concern that FY 1997 would prove to be a financial disaster with respect to federal support for research, McIntire-Stennis was funded at the FY 1996 level of \$20.497M. Although the Board of Agriculture's 1997 Budget Committee had recommended a modest increase of about 4% for all formula funds, members declared level-funding a victory given the current conservative fiscal climate in Congress. The NRI's Program in Natural Resources and the Environment was funded at \$94.2M (down 2.6% from FY96). A new initiative that was to provide a competitive grant program for research in the area of soil conservation, including forest soils, generated no interest from either the House or Senate. The new Fund for Rural America was funded outside the NASULGC budgetary process. Guidelines for this three-year program are currently being developed and NAPFSC members should watch for opportunities to use this program to support their research and extension interests.

The budgetary climate for FY98 will continue to be a difficult one for our interests. All of agriculture will be closely scrutinized and current planning activities within NASULGC's Board on Agriculture are focusing on how best to



President's Message

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2

NAPFSC has been invited to serve on two committees under FAO. The Advisory Committee on Forestry Education (ACFE) has a meeting in Santiago, Chile at which we will be represented. Chief of the US Forest Service, Jack Ward Thomas, has asked us to be represented at the FAO North American Forest Commission which coordinates collaborative forestry research and management across North America.

NAPFSC partners with many other organizations. The upcoming General Assembly Meeting will discuss a proposal jointly with the National Woodland Owners Association to present and NIPF Education Award. We continue to sublease office space from the National Association of State Foresters in Washington, and have been represented at their national meeting in Springfield, Missouri. We also have been represented at two of the Forest Products Society Research Administrative group meetings by current and former members of the NAPFSC Executive Committee. I represented NAPFSC at the National Association of University Fisheries and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP) Executive Committee in Tulsa, and we maintain dialogue with that group. We have been interactive with the National Hardwood Lumber Association in identifying our research efforts which relate to their priorities. We also are maintaining dialogue with the American Pulpwood Association which will be represented at the upcoming NAPFSC meetings.

Other activities of NAPFSC include participation in the Seventh American Forest Congress, and development

of a memorandum of understanding for continued activity with FAEIS in collection and compilation of data from our academic programs.

As usual NAPFSC continues to conduct two Executive Committee meetings per year and one General Assembly meeting, and will try to maintain this newsletter (report) as a semi-annual production. Beyond the national NAPFSC activities identified above, the regions have been active in collaborating with many organizations within their respective parts of the country.

My first year as NAPFSC President has been busy, and I am looking forward to perhaps an even busier second year. NAPFSC will be undertaking a Strategic Plan, we are developing collaborative efforts with Canadian Forestry School administrators, we are moving toward development of a CARET-like organization for forestry, we are considering possible coordination of the MINFORS programs in the future, and we hope to increase interaction with the National Association of Consulting Foresters.

I know that the membership of NAPFSC frequently is not kept informed of all of NAPFSC's involvement, and often times questions the target of their dues. Hopefully we can improve communications beyond the newsletters (reports) and the annual General Assembly meeting. We will try to keep the membership further informed of NAPFSC's activities and seek feedback on directions we should be moving. Thank you again for the opportunity to serve as your President. 

You're Invited

The National Association of Professional Forestry Schools and Colleges

*cordially invites you to attend a reception for
friends and colleagues*

*6:30-8:00 p.m.
Friday, November 8, 1996*

*Reception Foyer
Doubletree Hotel
201 Marquette N.W.
Albuquerque, New Mexico*



National Research Committee

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4

describe and support our collective interests (see below). Federal formula funds for both research and extension will likely remain unpopular with many members of Congress and we will be called on to justify the value to the American public of providing such base support to our Land Grant Colleges. Although the Board on Agriculture 1998 Budget Committee has adopted a positive and proactive approach, including the involvement of our various “audiences” in articulating our cause to Congress, the general feeling is that increases in Federal Formula Funds (e.g., McIntire-Stennis) above inflation are highly unlikely given the need to meet budget reduction guidelines related to the National Debt. Increases in competitive research programs such as the NRI may be more feasible. However, a “zero-sum” approach will likely need to be taken requiring cuts elsewhere in the NASULGC’s proposed budget in order to accommodate increases elsewhere, especially those due to any new initiative. Needless to say, past Budget Committees have had difficulty reallocating funds within the NASULGC proposed budgets they develop and 1998 will likely be no exception.

The American Forest and Paper Association and the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement have established the Sustainable Forestry Research Peer Review Task Group as part of AF&PA’s Agenda 2020: A Technology Vision and Research Agenda for America’s Forest, Wood and Paper Industry. G. Brown and J. Lassoie serve on this Task Group representing NAPFSC. Approximately 100 preproposals in the areas of soil productivity, remote sensing, biotechnology, and basic physiology were initially screened in early October and full proposals have been solicited for those determined to be the highest priority for the program. Final proposals will be reviewed in late November and funding recommendations will be forwarded to the DOE.

The National Synthesis Conference was held October 8-10 in Washington, DC. This was a major planning event in the year-long Futuring Activities that are being conducted by NASULGC’s Board on Agriculture. This conference was oriented to helping develop an Action Plan for Agriculture and Natural Resources which would guide both the Land Grant System and the USDA into the 21st century. This conference was part of an extended strategic planning process stimulated by a number of recent studies calling for the reorganization of agriculture and the Land Grant System. About 100 professionals were invited — mostly administrators from agriculture schools and colleges. The forestry/natural resource community was represented by G. Brown (VPI), R. Foil (Mississippi State), L. Forcier (Univ. of Vermont), and J. Lassoie (Cornell). Five focused workshops examined major areas in the draft plan which would assure: (1) agricultural production systems that are highly competitive in the global environment; (2) safe and secure food and fiber systems; (3) healthy well-nourished population; (4) economic development and quality of life; and (5) greater harmony between agriculture and the environment. The results of this conference will be available in draft form on the World Wide Web later this Fall. Once available, NAPFSC members will be contacted and asked to review and comment on recommendations arising from this conference.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 8

Regional Report

Southern Region

Robert N. Muller, Chair

The Southern NAPFSC meeting was held on April 17, 1996 in conjunction with the annual meeting of the newly-named Forest Landowners Association (formerly Forest Farmers Association). The meeting included contributions of co-operators and discussion among members of research directions and collaborations, educational concerns. A committee chaired by Arnett Mace was appointed to evaluate the opportunities for regional forestry research projects to foster increased collaboration among southern forestry schools and increased visibility of forestry research among Experiment Stations of the South. A second committee chaired by Wayne Smith was appointed to evaluate Southern Forest Conclave and consider guidelines to be used by all host and participating schools.

On May 24, Greg Brown, Arnett Mace, Bob Muller, and Larry Tombaugh met with Pete Roussopoulos (USFS Southern Research Station) and Bob Joslin (USFS Region 8) to discuss research directions and common interests. Four areas were defined where direct collaboration and mutual support could be productive:

-  forest inventory and modeling;
-  social and economic resource assessment;
-  sustainable forest productivity, and;
-  forest wetlands.



Cooperator Reports

Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES)

Larry Biles



Ralph A. Otto

I am pleased to announce the selection of Dr. Ralph A. Otto as the CSREES Deputy Administrator for Natural Resources and Environment. His appointment was effective as of September 15, 1996.

Dr. Otto received his M.S. degree from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and his Ph.D. degree from Rutgers University, both with emphasis on the quantitative aspects of wildlife biology. Dr. Otto worked as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Malaysia. From 1980 through 1989, he worked with the Department of Agriculture's Office of International Cooperation and Development, serving as Program Leader for Asia and the Middle East in

the Technical Assistance Division and then as the Director of the International Training Division. He served as the assistant Deputy Administrator for Natural Resources and Rural Development with the Extension Service from 1990 until 1994. With the establishment of CSREES, Dr. Otto has been the Acting Deputy Administrator for Natural Resources and Environment. He served on the steering committee that planned the structure of CSREES and was the co-chair of the CSREES Strategic Plan Committee.

Forest Service

Jerry Sesco

During the FY 1997 Appropriations process for Forest Service Research, the House proposed \$786,000 less and the Senate proposed \$414,000 more than the President's Budget of \$179,786,000. Within the totals proposed, the House earmarked an additional \$2 million and the Senate an additional \$1.5 million of research. These earmarks would offset existing or planned programs

Downsizing is proceeding. The Washington Office is 25 percent smaller now than it was last October. The Research Deputy's office is the smallest it's been since 1980. A vigorous out-placement program and careful management of attrition have been the secrets to downsizing success. Stations are also downsizing. Most Stations used out-placements, directed reassignments, and retirements. However, at least two Stations have issued RIF notices to scientists and support staff.

We are initiating a new round of strategic planning. Our last strategic plan was completed in 1990, about the same time as Forestry Research—A Mandate for Change. We are a different organization now and we have different capabilities. Our clients' information and technology needs are also different. So, it is time to rethink our research priorities. We look forward to NAPFSC participation in the strategic planning process.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 8

National Research Institute

Tim Strickland

The National Environmental Monitoring Initiative

The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), with multi-agency scientific support, has proposed a framework for the integration of Federal monitoring and related research programs. The objective is to develop a comparable set of information, research and reporting criteria that will enhance the utility of current agency mission activities. Language related to this activity has appeared in the 1998 budget guidance from the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

In July of 1995, the National Science and Technology Council's Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR) established an interagency working group and charged it to: "Recommend a framework for an integrated monitoring and research network that allows evaluation of the Nation's environmental resources" (air, water, soil, plants, animals, and ecosystems). This charge was made with the supposition that a fully integrated and coordinated network can provide a better understanding of our environmental resources, the processes which impact their condition, and the management options best suited to long-term sustainability. A further guiding principle was that increased cost effectiveness of monitoring and related research will be attained without compromising individual agency missions if the framework is built upon existing monitoring and related research programs.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 8



Legislative

C. Randall Nuckolls and Patrick Turner

The historic 104th session of Congress ended on October 4, on a much different note than it began in January 1995. At that time, Republicans had taken control of the House of Representatives for the first time in 40 years, and control of the Senate for the first time in eight years. The provisions of the “Contract with America” were hotly debated and the partisan rhetoric rose to levels unseen in many years. By the end of 1995, parts of the US government were shut down because Congress and the President could not agree on funding levels for those agencies.

In January 1996, an agreement was reached to reopen the shuttered agencies, and the Republican leadership recognized that they needed to work with the Clinton Administration if they wanted to achieve any of their goals. The rest of 1996 saw a number of legislative initiatives approved, and the debate over funding levels for the federal agencies was relatively tame. Congress approved funding for all of the federal agencies before the beginning of the new fiscal year. During the last year, Congress also passed an overhaul of the telecommunications laws, new securities regulations, the line-item veto, an increase in the minimum wage, legislation to provide for health insurance portability, new pesticide restrictions, and legislation aimed at curbing illegal immigration.

In the FY 1997 Agriculture Appropriations bill, which President Clinton signed in early August, funding remained stable for the McIntire-Stennis program at nearly \$20.5 million dollars. The Renewable Resources Extension Act (RREA) took a cut of nearly \$100,000, while the National Research Initiatives Competitive Research grants took an overall funding cut of about \$2.5 million. As Congress looked to squeeze all that they could

from the various appropriations bills, it should be considered a success that our experienced team (G. Brown, A. Ek, J. Lassoie, and others) were able to convince the appropriators not to cut McIntire-Stennis.

At this time, it is too close to call as to whether the Republicans will retain control of Congress, or if the Democrats will regain the House and/or the Senate. No matter who the congressional leadership is next year, however, the budget cutting climate will continue, and we will need to work very diligently to increase, or even maintain, the current funding levels. 

National Research Institute

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 7

Peer and agency review of the resulting report have indicated: strong support by federal agencies, state, environmental and conservation stakeholders; that pilot project should be implemented to test the framework; existing monitoring and research programs should be modified only within the pilot regions until feasibility and utility can be evaluated; long-term commitment from participating agencies is essential; the information delivered should be useful to multiple stakeholders; and that a core assessment should be conducted prior to any restructuring of organizations, programs or commitments that would be difficult to reverse.

For additional information, contact:

Mr. Rick Borchelt
Special Assistant
for Public Affairs
Office of Science and
Technology Policy
Executive Office of the President
Telephone: (202) 456-6018
Fax: (202) 456-6019 

Forest Service

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 7

Several major ecosystem assessment reports have been completed, or are nearing completion. Professors and graduate students from NAPFSC institutions have made significant contributions to several of these. These illustrate the benefits of partnerships between Federal and university scientists in studying resource management situations at the landscape scale. Contact Mike O’Connor for copies (202-205-0979). Speaking of partnerships, the Pinchot Institute sponsored a workshop on forestry research partnerships. The workshop focused on using partnerships as a tool to strengthen America’s forestry research. In the same theme of partnership, the National Planning Committee (NPC) for forest products research, consisting of university representatives, works closely with the Forest Service and CSREES to guide forest products research. The primary NPC activity has been hosting an annual Forest Products Research Conference at the Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, WI. NPC also hosts “summit meetings” to discuss important forest products research items. 

National Research Committee

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 6

NASULGC’s International Committee on Policy (ICOP) has formed the Global Agricultural Science and Education Priorities for America (GASEPA) Task Force. Members include administrators responsible for international programs in colleges of agriculture; J. Lassoie has been appointed to this Task Force to represent NAPFSC. Over the next 30 months this group will identify how CSREES and the Land Grant community can more effectively cooperate to prepare faculty, college students, and citizens to participate in the emerging global economy. 



Differences Between Old-Growth and Managed Forests in the Upper Midwest

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

unmanaged stands. In Wisconsin, several teams of scientists are participating in a major multi-disciplinary project to comprehensively investigate 46 old-growth, managed uneven-aged, and unmanaged second growth forests on similar sites.

The overall goal is to understand the differences in species composition and ecological function between old growth and managed forests, and, armed with this information, refine management plans to maintain or enhance biodiversity and economic productivity.

The old-growth project is supported by the WDNR, and by the Department of Forestry and School of Natural Resources in UW-Madison's College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. Additional support has come from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, National Science Foundation, Connor Hardwood Forestry Fund and the National Council of the Paper Industry for Air Stream Improvement.

None of the groups alone could have implemented such a cohesive, well-designed, and large-scale program," says Professor Ronald Giese, chair of UW-Madison's Department of Forestry. "This is the largest interdisciplinary forestry research project ever undertaken in the Lake States. The project promises to provide better information on old-growth versus managed ecosystems than we have ever had available."

Currently, 11 teams are exploring different aspects of north woods biodiversity as part of a coordinated workplan. Topics include:

- * soil nutrient dynamics;
- * lower plants, such as lichens, fungi and mosses;
- * herbaceous ground layer plants;
- * woody plant composition and structure;
- * insects and other invertebrates;
- * reptiles and amphibians;
- * small mammals;
- * birds;
- * aquatic habitats;
- * landscape analysis; and
- * ecosystem/management model.

Two survey projects are nearing completion now—one focusing on bird species diversity and the other on forest structure.

Significance of Hemlock for Breeding Birds in the Western Great Lakes Region

One component of the old-growth project was to describe and compare the composition and abundance of breeding birds in old-growth hemlock stands in the Sylvania Wilderness and Wisconsin State Natural Areas, and in multiple use, second growth forests across the north woods.

The researchers, Professor Robert Howe, of UW-Green Bay's Department of Natural and Applied Sciences, and WDNR wildlife biologist Michael Mossman, conclude that both the loss of conifers and the simplification of forest structure are detrimental to hemlock-associated birds. Converting mixed hardwood-hemlock forest to even-aged hardwoods, as occurred in past logging practices, or failing to manage forests to promote mixed hemlock-hardwood stands leads to measurable reductions in bird species richness and density. Because birds are thought to play an important role in controlling forest insect populations, these changes may have negative consequences for northern forest ecosystems. Of equal importance is the role that birds play in enriching people's outdoor experiences. The research team suggests that careful forest management that retains a mix of conifer and hardwood tree species and uneven-aged forest structure might be an important element of conservation efforts for hemlock-associated species, as well as for declining species of North American songbirds, seed-eating birds and Northern Goshawks.

Comparison of Vegetation Structure in Managed and Unmanaged Northern Hardwood Forests

Another component of the old-growth project that was recently completed was to compare several structural and habitat characteristics of managed and unmanaged northern hardwood forests.

"This forest structure inventory includes most of the habitat factors generally believed to relate to biological diversity," says Craig Lorimer, project leader and faculty member of UW-Madison's Department of Forestry.

Lorimer and team member John Goodburn found that managed, uneven-aged stands are similar to old-growth stands in several compositional and structural features, most notably, tree species composition, overall forest structure, area of canopy gaps, biomass of understory vegetation, and area of pits and mounds caused by uprooting.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 10

Differences Between Old-Growth and Managed Forests in the Upper Midwest

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9

The major differences are primarily in the number of large trees, large snags and large fallen logs," says Lorimer. "This partly reflects the fact that most northern hardwood stands in Wisconsin were heavily cut over after the turn of the century and have not had time to regrow large trees, and partly considerations of merchantability and economics."

In a related project, Lorimer and forestry graduate students Matt Singer and Sally Dahir completed studies on forestry practices designed to accelerate the recovery of old-growth structural characteristics.

The team focused on a method known as crown release, which targets the largest trees in the forest for accelerated growth. The treatment involves removing all or most of the trees in the

canopy layer adjacent to the target trees, allowing them more space, sunlight and nutrients.

The effects of crown release were much more dramatic than expected on mature trees, which are often less resilient than younger trees. "Trees that were given full release nearly doubled their growth rates, regardless of their age," says Lorimer.

The old-growth project is one of the largest and most comprehensive studies that the state DNR has ever funded in relation to forest management," says Ottawa National Forest project coordinator David Mladenoff. "It reflects the recent changes in management philosophy that considers forestry in the larger context of ecosystems and long-term processes."



NAPFSC

1996 Financial Statement, Compiled: 11 October 1996

RECEIPTS

Dues	62,902.00
Transfers	80,302.06
Year-To-Date Interest	645.45
Total Year-To-Date Interest	<u>143,849.51</u>

DISBURSEMENTS

Operating Expenses	39,195.16
Transfer to CD's	60,302.06
Total Year-To-Date	<u>99,497.22</u>

Checking Account Balance as of 09/30/96	44,367.87
---	-----------

CD's

Balance	15,000.00
Interest -- 5.6% at maturity (3 Jan 97) (\$603 at maturity)	

Balance	45,302.06
Interest -- Year-To-Date	
5.6% at maturity (6 Dec 96) (\$1,902 at maturity)	

TOTAL CASH BALANCE AS OF 09/30/96	104,669.93
-----------------------------------	------------



NAPFSC



R E P O R T

A report to the members of the National Association of Professional Forestry Schools and Colleges



National Association of Professional
Forestry Schools and Colleges
Arlice K. Banks, NAPFSC Report Editor
College of Forestry and Wildlife Resources
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
324 Cheatham Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0324