**2007 MESA Spring Meeting**

**Foresters and Loggers:** Myths, Misconceptions, and Common Ground

---

**EVALUATION FORM—RESULTS**

SAF member responses in Dk Blue, Non SAF members in Brown, MLs in Teal.

**Are you a SAF member?**

Yes (45)  No (25) (Master Loggers not included in this group)

(8)

If not, why not?

- Not enough interest.
- Financial concern 2 years ago, I have not joined again though I intend to.
- Laziness.
- (Used to be) – expensive, less important since retirement.
- Value.
- Not an active forester.
- Money constraints.
- $$
- Intend to join.
- Not enough time to benefit/participate.
- Involved in other organizations.
- Too expensive.
- Currently not working in forestry field.
- $$
- Cost too much.
- Lack of time.
- I’m a logger.

**Are you a Master Logger?**

Yes (9) No

**Program:**

Did the program change your opinion of foresters and/or loggers? If yes, how?

- No (27).
- No, positive already.
- Yes, the ones I met here work very well with one another.
- It always depresses me to hear foresters saying the logger can do a better job than me choosing the trees to cut. I well understand the time constraints foresters are usually under, but that does not mean they can’t do a good job marking the harvest? No wonder our profession is disappearing: we have abdicated it to landowners and loggers! (Sorry you asked.)
- Raised esteem higher.
- No, there are good loggers and bad loggers. We saw the good ones today. I’m sure there are many more.
- Yes, strong preference for working with foresters.
No. It did concern me that one forester said give the harvester operator a short training lesson and they are all set to conduct a verbal prescription. Forest management (silviculture, etc.) is separate and completely different than harvesting timber.

My opinion of loggers has changed in that I can see now that much has changed regarding willingness to achieve the desired outcomes/results in harvesting.

Not really.

Not particularly—Good relationships between the two is becoming more important than ever.

Yes, lots more cooperation between than I expected.

In which types of stands and prescriptions should the timber always be marked by a forester?

When logger is inexperienced.

Depends on wood in original stand/site.

No set rule.

When the forester is responsible for the harvest and when landowner is cautious or skeptical.

1 reason—any stand that is not homogeneous.

High value/complex stands.

High value and sensitive areas, in stands where prescription is too complex to explain, when working with “new” loggers.

Stands of high value timber should be at least partially marked so that the loggers know what is wanted.

Mixed stands + high merchantable

Difficult to make judgments—need to adapt to each individual site.

Highly variable with sensitive areas.

High value/quality in residual stand.

Stands that the landowner mandates marking. All others might be able to be approached different ways depending on many factors.

Hi–value pine and northern hardwood.

Everything but clearcut.

High value stands should be marked.

Whenever the landowner is convinced it pays.

Depends on relationship of forester/logger. Perhaps high value stands.

Marking can be used to control the amount of volume harvested. If the forester & logger don’t have relationship of trust, when the volume & products that are to be cut matter for the long-term productivity of the stand/lot.

There are no situations where “always” applies.

Nearly all.

None.

50%

Stage 1 shelterwood.
• All.
• Crop tree release.
• Thinnings.
• Always? Never. However in high value stands it’s a good option.
• Thinning young sawtimber.
• White pine.
• All.
• An that aren’t a simple treatment, such as OSR or cut BF and PO only to a residual basal area.
• None—forester choice.
• When the landowner insists.
• Not enough room here.
• Shoreland zoning, riparian zones.
• Sensitive or extra high value.
• When the landowner insists on it. Resource Protection Districts.
• <blank> (7)

• Near water, with high value trees, with new logger.
• Never say always/never say never/it would depend on my walk through of the stand.
• High value stands or landowner objectives.
• High value stands (2).
• High value stands, sensitive areas, visual areas.
• Depends—hardwood shelterwood, yes. Groups, no.
• Depends.
• When specific goals must be attained & individual tree selection is a priority (crop tree, sp regen requirements, maintaining diameter distributions, etc.)
• Marking should be done in most stands.
• Not “always”; But sometimes; Like when the choices are tough, when high value trees are involved, & when a landowner requires it.
• High value stands that need value left.
• None.
• $$$
• All.
• Highest of high value—I think you can have a stand where forester instructions cover lower value stems/species + some marking can be done in high value.
• As many as possible, depends on site and crew.
• When the landowner desires and highly sensitive areas, examples: around water bodies, buildings.
• <blank> (7).

• None
• Depends on the stand of wood and landowner.
• When forester wants to control the harvest.
• No set rules for me.
• I don’t think wood needs to be marked. But if it is marked, the logger is more productive.
• It depends—I mark most of the wood we cut.
For loggers: What percentage of the harvest areas you work in are marked?

- 85%
- 80% (I am a licensed forester who also logs).
- 20%
- 10%
- 5%
- 0–10%
- None. (3)

For foresters: What percentage of your harvest areas are marked?

- 100% (1) (3)
- All-USFS (2)
- 99.9 (1)
- 90% (1) (2)
- 85% (1)
- 80% (4) (1)
- 75% (2)
- 60–70% (1)
- 50% (2)
- 40% (1)
- 37% (1)
- 30% (1)
- 20–30% (1)
- 20% (1)
- 15% (1)
- 10% (1) (2)
- <5% (1)
- 1% (1)
- <1% (1)
- 0.05% (1)
- Low % (1)
- 0% (2) (7) (one does own cutting)
- N/A (3) (8)
- <blank> (4) (5)
- Any clearcuts and overstory removals.
- Retired.

Arrangements:
Were the snacks and lunches adequate?
- Yes. (19) (30) (8)
- Yes, very good. (2).
- Ok. (1)
- Excellent. (2)
- Very much so.
- VG
- <blank> (1).
- More than (2).
- Yes, nice.
- Yes very good water, water!
- Good.
- Yes, the sandwich was delish!
- My compliments to whoever arranged the lunches!
- Great.
- Very.

Was the meeting worth the registration cost?
- Yes (20). (35) (7).
- No (2).
- +/-
- So so.
- Yes, but please don’t pay full amount to Cyr Bus.
- As a SAF member, yes.
- Yes, but not enough content.
- Yes, but the content/travel time ratio should be higher.
- Yes—for a large group need to have everyones’ attention before presenting begins.
- Yes, but MESA should do theirs at cost.
- Absolutely.
- Definitely.
- Yes, but need to get more licensing credits each day time.
- Ok. (1)
- Yes, very worthwhile.

What was your primary reason for attending this meeting? (please circle one)

**Topic**
- (12) Although the meeting was not on the subject advertised in the flyer. I was misled to believe the discussion would be on certification. (1)
  (17) (7)

**Location**
- (3) (2) (0)

**Licensing Credits**
- (14) (18) (4)

**Networking**
- (6) (17) (2)

**Other**
- (0) (1) further education. (0)
Future Meetings

- Too many people for one group in the woods.
- Speakers should use microphones. Politely ask some to be quiet—too many side conversations.
- How about a map—DeLorme with stops marked on it?
- Thanks very much.

Are there any issues that surfaced at this meeting that should be followed up on with a future meeting?

- (No). (2) (2). (2).
- None that I can think of.
- What control do or should a forester have over the contractor.
- Continued joint meetings with loggers.
- Yes—discuss mark to leave.
- How N. American forestry issues are being affected by the “new” global economy.
- Operating in difficult terrain.
- Certification.
- Stream crossings
- Have a DeLorme map of the stops to assist those that do drive in light of the inevitable separation from the bus.
- Too much bus time.
- More credits in one location.
- Vernal pools.
- Yes, stumpage sales vs. service contract, which is better for the owner of the woodland?
- Only one person talking at each stop, not a dozen.
- Too much drive time.
- More loggers and meetings with loggers.
- Less travel time.
- Generational change in ownership. How to bridge gap between generations.
- Economics of marking/cost–benefits.
- More of the same.
- The emphasis on marking was too much. It masked the real issue of mutual respect. Who pays for the values everyone wants—landowner—logger—society—etc.
- Myths/Misconceptions/Common Ground.

What topics should SAF consider for future indoor meetings?

- <blank> (16). (27). (5).
- Making good silviculture pay.
- Stay outdoors.
Dealing with the “public”.

Yes.

What issues are there between landowners and foresters.

Requirements for Master Logger and other logger training requirements and programs, Wetland identification and vernal pool management.

Current landowner changes.

Silvicultural treatments.

Certification, SFI, FSC, certified markets.

Markets→how this industry changes/adapts. Land ownership & Management trends—would be great to hear from TIMO persons.

Credentialing; ethics—esp. ethics of the forestry business in modern times.

What is going to happen to land belonging to small ownerships?

CEO’s and shoreland zoning.

Policy.

Forester licensing board (Maine).

Zoning, tax and land use policies.

On-line and other digital desktop mapping & gps applications.

Vernal pools & effects of good forestry.

FSC certified tour.

Importance of good boundary lines + its problems + legal consequences?

How do we address the problem logger? Those loggers who run without a forester’s involvement and cause most of the problems in this state—over harvesting, highgrading, BMP violations, etc.

"Planning a timber harvest"→ SFI Training.

Mgmt plans.

Don’t know.

Stumpage sales vs. operated sales.

Environmental

Change from industry forester to TIMO forester, good or bad.

Inside conversations: biofuel, carbon, renewable energy, carbon credits, forestry position on these.

Regulations.

Licensing (in conservation).

Mgt Plans/Harvest Plans

More of the same.

Prescriptions for particular stand types.

No (1).

What topics should SAF consider for future field meetings?

<blank> (14).

How stand prescription can vary depending on various forest ownerships.

Wildlife habitat.

Water quality, job closeout, harvesting Great Pond buffer.

New Equipment.

Invasive plant spread via logging equipment & likely mitigations.

Identification of relative tree pests and diseases for Maine’s forests.
- Explain the Master Logger program more—look at jobs.
- Lot at vernal pools in field and discuss management ideas.
- Technology in the woods.
- Strategies to eliminate/reduce “unwanted” species that have established themselves in understory.
- Hardwood competition control measures.
- The management (and managers) of the changing forest ownerships (i.e. how the foresters are adjusting to the break up of industrial forest land holdings).
- Vernal pools.
- Certification.
- More cuttings.
- What is a selective cut, everything is a selective cut.
- Conservation—TNC, etc.—MNAP
- BMP’s, water quality, urban/suburban forestry.
- Timber harvesting for wildlife, non-timber products, etc.
- With the change in ownership in the state—the long-term effects of not doing PCT/Planting/Herbicide release.
- Don’t know.
- Working with conservation easements.
- Vernal pools & wetlands.
- How do we address the problem logger?
- FSC certified lands.
- Invasive species.
- Zoning, tax and land use policies.
- Sugar maple–Beech Mgt (Bob Wagner’s work & Huber’s work)
- Marking timber to improve growth (genetics and/or outward appearance).
- Beech mgt—CFRU research; Mgt of conservation easements.
- SAF should perhaps not consider future field meetings.
- Controlling unwanted beech in hardwood understories—pre and post harvest.

- No. (1)
- Industrial operations vs. small operations.

**Volunteer Opportunity:** Would you be interested in joining the foresters in our Forestry Education Network who are willing to teach a topic in forestry at a local school if needed?

If so, please provide the contact information below:

- Michael W. Demo: 426–8866
- Cliff Foster: 657–4441
- Jack Wadsworth: 625–2468 wwitrees@verizon.net