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From The President

Continuing education. Doctors do it, teachers do it, loggers do it, plumbers do it, and so must we as landowners. Plus, we must seek opportunities to help others with their continuing education.

Over thirty Master Forest Owner/COVERTS volunteers gathered in Delaware County in mid-July for an annual refresher day. We are grateful to Jerry Michael (MFO'96, and NYFOA director) for arranging use of his hunting club’s facilities. Many thanks also go to MFO director Gary Goff, Cornell's Peter Smallidge, Vanessa Lane and Jamie Wisniewski, and SUNY ESF’s Doug Allen and Kim Adams for the excellent program.

By the time these notes appear in print, refresher programs for MFOs in other parts of the state will have been held as well. We are grateful for the effort that goes into these refresher, and the many professionals who take the time to help us.

As private landowners, we have the responsibility to keep ourselves informed, while being alert to opportunities to help others understand that 85% of New York’s forests are privately owned. These private lands provide much of the open space, scenic vistas, oxygen, fresh air, clean water, wildlife habitat and recreation in New York, while providing the many wood products necessary for our personal convenience and modern day economy.

Our Allegheny Foothills Chapter has perfected one way to help meet this obligation. AFC’s Al Brown kindly sent me the Chapter’s seventh annual special supplement published by the Jamestown Post-Journal. Once a year, each reader of that newspaper sees this attractive, easy to read supplement. This year’s edition, entitled “Who Speaks for the Forest,” responds to the question with informative articles and well-chosen photographs. It is an excellent piece. Thanks Al, and to all who worked on the supplement and the advertisers that made it possible.

As NYFOAers, we take pride in the responsibility that has been bestowed upon us. We like the sound of the word “stewardship,” and don’t mind being called “landholders.” But it hurts to know that the vast majority of forest landowners in New York do not have even the simplest of management plans, and that only about 15% of all timber harvests are conducted with the guidance of a forester. These owners don’t know what they are missing, and in too many cases, their pocket books suffer a serious loss, and clearly, New York’s renewable forest resource suffers as well.

NYFOA members and MFOs play an important role in introducing landholders to sound forestry management for a wide range of environmental, economic, and other ownership objectives. But, there needs to be a continuing public role as well. Department of Environmental Conservation service foresters and Cooperative Extension staff, have traditionally filled an important gap in “continuing” education for many landowners.

When it first dawns on landowners that there are experts on forestland and wildlife management, they need someone to turn to for information and encouragement. It is those first steps toward understanding the merits of professional help that are so critical to owners’ further positive actions to protect open space, encourage wildlife, responsibly sell timber, or achieve other objectives. We once again salute all those in the public sector who work to help fill this gap.

I hope to see many of you at NYFOA’s fall program at Camp Duffield, Delevan, NY, on September 21, 22, and 23.

-Ron Pedersen
President
Response to Professional Foresters

Reading Wendell Hatfield’s letter in the July/August issue of the Forest Owner gave me the incentive to speak out on an issue I think is important to forest owners. As a consultant forester, I am afraid I have to agree with Wendell’s charge that there is a problem with hiring a forester who has a vested interest in the wood being sold. I see all too much high grading in my travels.

Forest owners can help change this problem. Hire a forester by paying for the service rendered, rather than a percentage of the sale. Paying someone by the hour and clearly articulating your goals of management should help you maintain the integrity of your forest. If you are going to own the land and continue to pay real property taxes, you should have each harvest designed to maximize the future growth potential. Commission sales, or dealing directly with the buyer, all too often lead to cutting your best crop trees and leaving the poorer growing stock to serve as your wood factory.

It is worth paying a forester a professional rate to work towards your goals. The forester should have the expertise to mark the trees to maximize future potential. If working on commission, there is great pressure to mark trees that will pay one a commission of $50 or more rather than mark the ones that will yield around $1. You will find many buyers who are supportive of good forestry and will pay a decent price for timber that leaves a good residual stand for another harvest in ten years. Planned well, each successive harvest should provide more income.

-Michael C. Greason
Catskill, NY

I would like to comment on Wendell Hatfield’s letter to the editor regarding professional foresters. I would have to disagree to the extent that I have been advised as to which trees to cull but I have also been advised that including those trees in the harvest would suppress the bid price. I am talking about culls that I would be willing to have dropped and leave to rot. Understandably this would add to the work of the logger and might make it harder to get the good timber out, so he wants to be compensated. Consequently TSI is rarely done. The challenge in our area (Northern Catskills) is made larger given the lack of markets for low quality wood and the damage inflicted to future crop trees when it is extracted. As a consequence, Wendell is correct that our woods are being degraded. I am resigned to the fact that I will have to do a lot of the culling myself. I am currently marking poor quality trees and will drop the smaller ones myself. The larger ones I will save for a time of the year when loggers are hungry and pay to have them dropped. I am hoping that this

continued on next page
will be more economical than including them in a harvest operation. I have received realistic counsel from my professional, however, now that the state is less involved, the free market takes over. Loggers want to get the best, and get it out quickly, damage to what is left can be minimized but again at a price. Just try to find a logger who will buck logs in the woods! The end result will be less work in the future for all loggers - unfortunately they don't seem to be concerned about the long term. I guess that leaves groups like ours to come up with a viable TSI solution.

-Joe Hauck
Leganon, NJ

Dear Editor

It sounds like Wendell Hatfield, Past Chairman of the Cayuga Chapter of NYFOA, has had a bad experience with a Consulting Forester after my reading of his letter to you in the July/August 2001 issue of the Forest Owner. My first thought about his feelings would be "were the forest owner's objectives clearly defined?" So often, after all the forest owner's emotions have been vended, the bottom line in a timber harvest is the dollars. The less work a logger has to do to get the big money, the more they are willing to pay for the stumpage. Removing the culls costs money unless they pay for themselves in fuelwood or pulpwood.

I think we must first define the label "Professional" to get to the heart of this issue. This label in today's society is being used by just about anybody trying to make a living. Looking up the meaning of the work in the dictionary we find "one who has received advanced degrees and specialized training." There are many out there calling themselves Professional Foresters because they are in positions to act as Professional Foresters. Not all NYSDEC Service Foresters, and many more Industrial Foresters, have advanced degrees, but they have been in the business a long time, just as Mr. Hatfield has been, and should be able to address the forest owner's objectives properly. Mr. Hatfield's advice on getting references is good but one must define a "successful sale." Does a successful sale mean getting lots of money or does it mean getting less money and cutting all the culls? To get someone who will properly manage the woodlot for you, insist on a Certified Forester who is in fact a Professional Forester. Certified Foresters do not "high grade" unless they are forced to do so and would turn down such jobs if it be their option!

Mr. Hatfield has made some pretty bold statements in his letter to you and after forty years managing the woodlot he should be able to defend his position. But saying that the NYSDEC foresters are providing a disservice to the woodlot owners of New York State is a false statement. The NYSDEC foresters are doing an excellent job with the resources they have and what is needed in the State are more Certified Foresters.

-Jonathan Raymond, C.F.
Cambridge, NY
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Thieves because, residing outside the area, many do not inspect their woodlots on a regular basis. The state can in many respects can be classified as an absentee landowner and is not immune to timber theft. DEC officials reported at the public hearings that the state loses $100,000 to timber trespass each year.

Under current law, when timber thieves are caught and prosecuted they are generally only required to pay a fraction of the value of the trees taken, and time spent behind bars is often negligible or nonexistent. Hit by timber rustlers and then later frustrated in efforts to seek justice, forest landowners become angry and discouraged from owning forestland. In addition, the timber industry receives a black eye, despite its best efforts to raise professionalism.

Mistakes by legitimate timber harvesters do occur, especially when boundaries, both public and private, are not clearly marked, neighbors fail to communicate with each other prior to a timber harvest, and loggers are not required to verify boundaries or notify abutting landowners. For the unscrupulous, timber theft is just too lucrative to pass up. When a single hardwood tree can be worth anywhere from $200 to $2000 or more at the mill, the current penalty of $10 per tree on public lands, an amount established in 1909, or the all-too-frequent single damages awarded for thefts on private lands, can’t possibly be expected to have much of a deterrent effect.

In contrast, illegally killing a deer under New York’s environmental conservation law will net you a $500 fine and illegally taking a wild turkey or fish, a $300 penalty.

Timber Theft Public Hearings Reveal Weaknesses In Current Laws And Theft Prevention Measures
BY RONALD C. BRACH AND SHEILA D. O’SULLIVAN

In March of 2000, 477 hardwoods were stolen from a 40 acre wood lot in rural Onondaga county, with the thief gaining access through a secluded neighboring property. In 1998, two men stole more than 600 trees and damaged 300 others on New York State Forest Preserve land in Greene County. In a 1996 Washington County incident, every tree was removed from a 31 acre remote private parcel. In Central New York, a thief read an obituary of a woman who owned forest land and stole $20,000 worth of timber while her grieving relatives planned her funeral.

Such cases of timber trespass are committed by a relatively small percentage of harvesters but their actions are largely uncontrolled in New York, causing hundreds of thousands of dollars in property loss and damage each year. The New York Forest Owners Association, Cooperative Extension Offices, New York State DEC, the State Attorney General’s Office and others have urged that increased attention be placed on the problem by state and local policy makers.

For this reason, Senator Patricia K. McGee, chairwoman of the NYS Legislative Commission on Rural Resources, and Senator Nancy Lorraine Hoffmann, chairwoman of the NYS Senate Agriculture Committee, held hearings in Albany, Jamestown and Syracuse in 2000, to obtain ideas from a range of experts and affected parties that would help define the problem and identify solutions. The legislators recently issued a report titled Timber Theft on Public and Private Lands in New York, Its Impact and Control. The report is based on testimony presented by hearing participants and research conducted by staff of the Legislative Commission on Rural Resources. It outlines current deterrence methods and the key players involved, identifies gaps, and proposes possible solutions, to deter and redress timber theft.

Why should state and local policy makers be concerned about timber theft? As the report notes, New York’s forests are a distinguishing feature of its state character, and a working resource benefiting every resident by providing wood fiber, cleaner air, watershed protection, conservation of wildlife habitat, and recreational resources. New York is home to some of the best hardwoods in the world, and timber production and harvesting are important aspects of the state’s economy and tax base.

Victims of timber theft include the sophisticated, knowledgeable forest owner as well as the casual, uninformed owner. Absentee landowners are particularly easy targets for timber thieves because, residing outside the area, many do not inspect their woodlots on a regular basis. The state can in many respects can be classified as an absentee landowner and is not immune to timber theft. DEC officials reported at the public hearings that the state loses $100,000 to timber trespass each year.

Under current law, when timber thieves are caught and prosecuted they are generally only required to pay a fraction of the value of the trees taken, and time spent behind bars is often negligible or nonexistent. Hit by timber rustlers and then later frustrated in efforts to seek justice, forest landowners become angry and discouraged from owning forestland. In addition, the timber industry receives a black eye, despite its best efforts to raise professionalism.

Mistakes by legitimate timber harvesters do occur, especially when boundaries, both public and private, are not clearly marked, neighbors fail to communicate with each other prior to a timber harvest, and loggers are not required to verify boundaries or notify abutting landowners. For the unscrupulous, timber theft is just too lucrative to pass up. When a single hardwood tree can be worth anywhere from $200 to $2000 or more at the mill, the current penalty of $10 per tree on public lands, an amount established in 1909, or the all-too-frequent single damages awarded for thefts on private lands, can’t possibly be expected to have much of a deterrent effect. In contrast, illegally killing a deer under New York’s environmental conservation law will net you a $500 fine and illegally taking a wild turkey or fish, a $300 penalty.
Private landowners victimized by timber theft have two recourses: to pursue criminal and civil actions against the suspected thief. Civil suits can be expensive, and a major hardship for many landowners who do not have the resources to retain an attorney or pay other experts needed to help make their case, especially given the current low level of damages awarded when successful.

In a civil action, treble damages (generally three times the stumpage value and not three times the mill delivered value) are possible, but only if the landowner can prove the logger intentionally carried off trees he knew were not his – a very difficult standard of proof to meet under current law when a timber thief who is caught swears it was all just an honest mistake of crossing an ill-defined property line. To make matters worse, the landowner has experienced timber theft and who is enrolled in the state forest tax program, must also pay the 6% stumpage fee to local taxing authorities on the value of the stolen trees. In a criminal action, in addition to the possibility of jail time or probation, a court can order restitution if requested by the prosecutor as part of sentencing. This does not ensure the landowner will receive compensation for damages, however, and the reality is that many unscrupulous loggers have no assets or are careful to “hide” what assets they own. This is also true in a successful civil action. Although a wronged landowner may receive a judgment, enforcing that judgment may mean a whole new battle, and more attorneys fees, just to get paid.

In some instances the Attorney General will also assist in prosecuting criminal cases involving private lands at the request of DEC, but his office has limited resources to pursue such cases. In the event the local District Attorney or State Attorney General will not take a private case, the landowner is left with only a civil action to pursue against the thief.

In cases of theft on either public or private lands, the first hurdle to overcome is often just finding the thief. For one thing, the theft is typically discovered long after the occurrence. Even if the perpetrator is known, securing enough evidence to prove intent to steal in order to get a conviction or to win in a civil action is a daunting task.

Clearly, changes are needed in both civil and criminal laws in order to enact adequate measures to redress timber theft. Moreover emphasis needs to be placed on the prevention of timber theft, and the successful and meaningful prosecution of the perpetrator so that future or potential theft can be successfully deterred.

In 1997, timber theft laws in New York were changed for the first time in many years because of a growing realization that current statutes were not adequate in controlling timber trespass. Prior to the 1997 changes, timber protection laws had not been updated since the 1920s and were largely ignored. The 1997 changes were an important first step and strengthened the enforcement powers of DEC officials to include the investigation and prosecution of alleged timber trespass cases on private lands.

Solutions to timber trespass require the support and collaboration of many key players – industry, law enforcement, the judicial system, land owners, local governments, state agencies, educational institutions, professional foresters and forest member associations. Also, a range of measures must be employed, including education of landowners, harvesters and law enforcement officials about timber theft; raising public awareness of timber theft as a serious crime; ensuring that property lines are well marked and that neighbors are notified of timber harvesting on adjoining property; increasing the penalties for timber theft; compensating for property damage and lost landscape value; and developing a uniform standard for laws covering thefts on public and private lands.

On the educational front, timber harvester training programs such as the Trained Logger Certification (TLC) program are currently offered to New York loggers. New York State DEC, Cooperative Extension, and the New York Forest Owners Association have brochures and written materials available to forest landowners providing advice on such topics as the proper marking of boundaries and the importance of having written contracts with loggers and foresters. The NYS Forest Practice Board has developed a model local ordinance for local governments to regulate timber harvesting in their communities.

The next step is to look at promising proposals developed at the public hearing, in consultation with the key interests in the timber theft issue. The goals are to promote a vital forest resource and products industry in New York State, to protect the rights of property owners, and to avoid the creation of unnecessary government restriction.

For a copy of the Report, call the Legislative Commission on Rural Resources at 518-455-2544.
What is the National Network of Private Forest Landowners?

JILL CORNELL

Many people have asked that question this year, along with the questions of why is another organization needed, and how is the network different from existing organizations? All are good questions!

First, the Network is a group of private forest landowners who first met in Washington, DC in November, 2000. Nine landowners from across the country were invited by James Malone of the Alabama Treasure Forest Association and the USDA forest Service, to discuss the creation of a national organization to facilitate the sharing of information, program ideas, and perspectives on issues. Participants were selected based on their commitment to good stewardship, state and/or national activities, communication skills and sharing characteristics. The meeting was funded by the USDA Forest Service, and lasted a day and a half.

It didn’t take long to discover that we all shared a love of the land, a commitment to good stewardship, and came from an enormous variety of backgrounds. Each wanted to provide an opportunity for landowners to network in order to inspire, encourage, empower, and educate other landowners, the general public, our government officials and our children about sustainable forest management and the positive role private forest landowners play in the environmental and economic future of the United States. To put it simply; we want to connect people, trees and information. We also want to be represented when federal programs and policies are being developed that will impact forest landowners. We want to participate in the decisions, not have them made for us.

How could that be done without competing with existing national and regional organizations? The group opted to become a clearing house and intermediary for technical support, sharing information, program ideas and to provide a forum and grassroots voice for private forest landowners. A worthwhile goal, but again, how to accomplish it? There are 10 million private landowners in this country who own 60% of the nation’s forested land (370+ million acres)!

Contemporary technology provided the best solution: create a web site with links to national and state forestry related agencies and to national, regional and state landowner organizations. Such a vehicle could enable quick, easy, stewardship information access for landowners. In addition to the web site, there is a need to establish a mechanism for collecting grass roots opinions on federal forestry programs and issues. An e-mail system is currently being piloted to provide feedback on issues which will be posted on the site, and eventually disseminated from an email group system.

How is the Network different?

To begin with the Network is not a membership organization. It will be a collection of landowner liaisons from each of the states who will serve as experts about their state’s forestry information sources, landowner organizations, and current issues. A liaison has an ear to the ground, and good communication with other landowners, groups and agencies. Each liaison will be able to post information about meetings, programs and state issues on the link site for his or her state. An annual Network Council Conference will give the liaisons a chance to network with others.

How will the Network identify landowners to be state liaisons?

This summer representatives from the governing board of the Network spoke at regional meetings of the National Association of State Foresters. They described the Network’s mission, goals and objectives, and requested that each State Forester identify a landowner liaison candidate, if their state does not already have a person on the Network Board of Directors. The State Foresters were also asked to identify an agency person to serve as a web site link resource.

Representatives on the Network Board of Directors are from the following states: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Texas, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.
How will the Network be funded?
Principle funding will be sought from national foundations for the long run, and “seed/start up” funding will come from the USDA Forest Service.

What about the landowner who doesn’t have Internet access?
Over 70% of landowners do have access, and hopefully more are coming on board every day. Meanwhile, we hope that sons, daughters and friends with access will look up information for those that are not connected to the Internet. (What did our grandparents do before they had their first telephone?).

Where does the Network go from here?
Network board members are committed to being passionate, demanding and tenacious in:
✓ Providing information and educational opportunities to landowners who want it;
✓ Making sure service foresters are there to help;
✓ Providing grassroots land owner perspectives on assistance and regulatory policies;
✓ Speaking out, collectively, on issues that matter to forest landowners.

As soon as the web site is up and running, there will be an announcement. Jill Cornell is past president of NYFOA, current President of New York Woodland Stewards, Inc., Member of the National Coalition for Sustaining America’s Non-federal Forests, and is Vice Chairman of the National Network of Private Forest Landowners.

BOOK REVIEW


In most forestry colleges two of the most important courses that students must take are Silvics, or Forest Ecology, where they learn about the dynamics of forest ecosystems. This will then be followed by Silviculture, the art and science of manipulating forest stands towards desired objectives. For the layperson interested in these two subjects, there are several excellent books on the market today that give insights into these two topics. I have previously reviewed the book, “Working With Your Woodland,” by Beattie, Thompson, and Levine, an excellent volume that tends towards the management, or silviculture side of things. I would now like to review another book, “The Eastern Deciduous Forest, Ecology and Forest Conservation,” by Richard Yahnner, which is oriented to the forest ecology side of things. The author is an associate dean of the graduate school and professor of wildlife conservation in the School of Forest Resources at Penn State University. This book is an excellent introductory overview about the ecology and wildlife of the eastern deciduous forest, of which the forests of New York State are a part. The book begins with a history of the eastern forest, and then is followed by a chapter on ecological processes. The next chapter tells about forest and animal interactions, and is followed by a chapter on forest succession and management.

There are several chapters that discuss current issues affecting the eastern forests, such as forest fragmentation, forest corridors, and biodiversity. A chapter on atmospheric conditions and their effects on the forest follows, with discussions on global climatic change, acid deposition, and effects of pollution on the ozone layer. The final chapter delves into forests of the future, its challenges and opportunities.

This book results in a timely and useful tool for anyone who wants to know or hopes to help one of North America’s greatest natural resources, the Eastern Deciduous Forest. I heartily recommend this book for anyone wanting to learn about forest ecosystem dynamics. You can find it through all of the online book services, such as Amazon.com and Barnes and Nobles. It retails for $19.95. This review was done by Richard Taber, editor of the NYFOA CNY chapter newsletter.
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Controlling Interfering Vegetation
A User-friendly Method for Woodlot Owners

DAVID L. STURGES

The big payoff — the sale of timber from a mature northern hardwood stand — is a red-letter event to forest owners. Besides putting cash in the landowner's pocket, it triggers the birth of a new stand of trees that will occupy the site for the next 100 years. The composition of the tree community being removed and the presence or absence of interfering vegetation are key factors in governing the nature of the new stand. The presence of fern beds and beech thickets for example, are warnings that white ash, sugar maple, red oak and black cherry will not establish in adequate numbers to form a fully stocked stand. These are the desirable species in central New York where my woodlot is located. I have discovered some ways of controlling interfering vegetation that may be of interest to other forest owners. The elimination of undesirable species preceding timber harvest will create forest-floor conditions favorable for establishing desired species.

The Problem
My experiences with interfering vegetation began with a 1994 timber sale comprised of four small patch clearcuts as a test of harvest practices aimed at increasing the black cherry and red oak component of the replacement stand. The patches were located within a 43-acre northern hardwood stand comprised primarily of sugar maple and white ash trees about 80 years old. The stand needed regenerating within 10 years because many trees had severe basal decay initiated by poor logging practices in 1981 when the stand was thinned. Portions of the stand contained dense thickets of American beech with stems less than an inch in diameter (Fig. 1), or an understory of young ironwood trees that developed in response to increased light levels following the 1981 thinning. There were also clumps of striped maple and patches of fern. Pole and sawtimber-sized beech and ironwood were scattered throughout the stand. These shade-tolerant species readily sprout when cut and the sprouts quickly respond to an increase in light levels on the forest floor when overstory trees are removed.

The control of fern within patch clearcuts was straightforward. Before logging I bought a backpack sprayer and applied Roundup herbicide. But what to do with beech thickets and small ironwood stems? For lack of knowing anything better to do, I simply trimmed off the stems at ground level, figuring that at least everything would have an even start. Of course this assumption was false as I observed in the first two postharvest years.

Figure 1. Untreated American Beech thicket in the fall. The dense shade under beech thickets prevents seedlings of desirable species from establishing.
Beech and ironwood sprouts developing from established root systems quickly outgrew small advanced regeneration less than 1 foot tall, let alone newly germinated sugar maple and white ash seedlings.

What now? The battle for control of the site was quickly tipping towards low-value but shade-tolerant species. The herbicide worked well on the fern, so why not use it on beech and ironwood sprouts? I did some spraying, but mostly around the perimeter of the patches. Moving within the patch cuts carrying 4 gallons of spray over logging slash was not an easy task! Spraying also uses a lot of water which had to be carried uphill, a task not suited to a middle-aged forest owner. By the third summer, abundant blackberry and raspberry canes made the patch cuts virtually inpenetrable. Clearly, a better way of dealing with interfering vegetation had to be found.

The experience with the patch clearcuts taught five valuable lessons: (1) interfering vegetation must be controlled prior to timber harvest, (2) low-tech equipment suitable for a one-person operation is needed, (3) the method must minimize physical exertion, (4) the method must be feasible to use on trees ranging from 0.25 inch in diameter to sawtimber-size, and (5) the method must pose no health risks to the operator or to the environment.

In searching for methods to control woody vegetation, I inquired of practicing foresters, DEC personnel, and searched in the forestry literature. I found no "cookbook" method that met my treatment criteria. I did find studies that compared the ability of several herbicides to control hardwood trees when applied in frills cut through the bark. Roundup appeared to be an effective herbicide when placed in frills located around the trunk of a tree.

**Roundup**

Several attributes of Roundup, which is manufactured by the Monsanto Company, make it an attractive herbicide to use for controlling interfering vegetation. It does not require a pesticide applicator's license to use and it is readily available in garden or farm-supply stores. Glyphosate, the active ingredient in Roundup, is transported to the leaves and roots of a plant and disrupts normal physiological functioning. The herbicide can be introduced into woody plants by spraying it on leaves, or by cutting through the bark and dripping it onto outer layers of wood. Only small quantities of herbicide are required when placed in woody tissue and because it is applied only to targeted trees, introduction of the chemical into the environment is minimized compared to foliar spraying.

Glyphosate binds to soil particles if it enters soil where it is degraded by soil microflora. Glyphosate has no residual toxicity to plants once in the soil, nor is it transported through soil by water movement. Roundup users should observe general safety precautions applicable to any chemical — avoid direct contact, wash hands before eating, drinking, or smoking, wear a long-sleeved shirt and long pants, and use hot water and detergent to wash clothing contaminated with the chemical.

**Treatment Procedures**

**Frill Application**

Dispensing a precise quantity of Roundup into outer growth rings of a tree provided the low-tech, inexpensive method of controlling interfering trees that I desired. The herbicide is effective for trees of all sizes. A hatchet is used to cut through the bark and into phloem and xylem tissue; my hatchet has a 3-inch cutting edge. The

![Figure 2. Plastic tubing connects the herbicide gun to a reservoir holding the Roundup/water mixture. The reservoir is attached to a belt worn by the applicator.](image)
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- **Appraisals**
- **Deed Research**
- **Timber Inventory**
- **Watershed Management**
- **Boundary Line Location**
- **Tax Savings Plans**

No property is too small or too large to benefit from experienced professional assistance when you are faced with important decisions regarding its use.

Contact Lake George Forestry today to arrange a free initial consultation.

Christian Gearwear, President
LAKE GEORGE FORESTRY, INC.
50 Hendrick Street
Lake George, New York 12845
Phone/Fax: 518-668-2623
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Controlling Interfering Vegetation (continued from page 11)

cutting edge. The cut is angled into the bark at 45 degrees to make frills that are spaced at intervals of 4 inches around the tree trunk. A comfortable working height for making frills is 3-4 feet above the ground. After cutting through the bark, the hatchet is left in place and wedged outward to create a small reservoir that holds the herbicide until it is absorbed. The barrel of the herbicide gun is placed in the frill and the required amount of fluid is dispensed by squeezing the trigger (Fig. 2). The correct amount of fluid is drawn into the dispensing chamber upon release of the trigger. Plastic tubing connects the herbicide gun to a 1 quart reservoir that fits into a canvas pouch worn on the applicators belt. The herbicide gun can be adjusted to emit from 1 to 10 ml of fluid each time the trigger is pulled. I bought the herbicide gun for $32 from Ben Meadows Company, Canton, Georgia.

This method of controlling unwanted trees is based on precisely dispensing 0.20 ml of glyphosate contained in 2.25 ml of fluid each time the trigger of the herbicide gun is pulled. Roundup is marketed with varying concentrations of active ingredient; the most concentrated formulation contains 41% glyphosate and 59% inert ingredients (water and spreading agents). Depending upon the formulation, Roundup must be diluted with varying quantities of water to provide the correct dosage of 0.20 ml of active ingredient in the 2.25 ml of fluid dispensed by the herbicide gun. Table 1 contains cost information for three formulations of Roundup that I have purchased. The amount of water that must be added to each formulation to make 1 cup (8 fluid ounces) of mixture ready for frill application is shown in the Table. The proportion of Roundup and water required to prepare any volume of mixture for each formulation is also shown in Table 1.

**Foliar Application**

Roundup is an effective herbicide for controlling ferns, grasses, and herbaceous weeds as well as low growing shrubs when it is sprayed onto foliage. Since Roundup is a contact herbicide, tree seedlings or other desirable plants intermixed with undesirable vegetation will also be killed if contacted by spray. Spraying should not begin until leaves of target species are fully developed; thereafter, it can be done until vegetation starts to become dormant. The treatment interval for ferns is usually similar to trees since both enter dormancy at about the same time in the fall. Directions that come with Roundup containing 41% active ingredient indicate that the spray solution should contain 1 to 2% of Roundup to control bracken fern. I have found a 0.7% solution works well for killing ferns as well as beech and ironwood sprouts.

It can be confusing to know how much herbicide to mix with water when reading the instructions that come with various formulations of Roundup since an assortment of measurement units are commonly used. The instructions may specify adding Roundup to 1 gallon of water in

---

**Figure 3.** American beech thicket treated the prior year. Frill application of Roundup is effective in controlling both small and large trees.
units of fluid ounces, tablespoons, or as a percent of the spray mixture. Differing glyphosate levels in Roundup formulations add further to the complexity. Table 1 provides information about the quantity and the cost of Roundup needed to make 1 gallon of spray.

Discussion

There is a long interval of time in which trees are susceptible to Roundup applied in frills. Treatment should not begin until leaves have fully expanded; thereafter trees can be treated at any time until leaves begin to color in fall. If stems are less than 2 inches in diameter, I make two ax incisions on opposite sides of the trunk. It is not possible to actually put 2.25 ml of fluid into frills of small trees. Only enough fluid to fill a frill should be dispensed for small trees, but this amount which is often less than 1 ml, contains sufficient herbicide to kill the tree. On larger trees, the fluid may need to be dispensed slowly over a few seconds of time to prevent overfilling a frill, depending upon the rate that fluid is absorbed into severed phloem and xylem tissue. The 1 quart reservoir worn on the applicators belt supplies 400 doses of herbicide. It is necessary to refill the reservoir once or twice a day if sawtimber-sized trees are being treated, but the reservoir holds sufficient fluid for 1 day of work when treating small stems. The correct Roundup concentration can be mixed at the job site if Roundup, water, and a measuring cup are taken to the field. Alternatively, only a single container of premixed fluid need be taken to the job site if mixing is done beforehand.

It takes 2-3 weeks for a visible response to appear in trees following treatment. The leaves first yellow and then are shed (Fig. 3). I have seen no evidence of Roundup translocation between stems that share a common parent root as is common in beech thickets. All stems in the thicket must be treated. Stems that are not treated are readily apparent after a month because of their green leaves. Species I have found to be easily controlled are American beech, white ash, yellow birch, ironwood, American hornbeam, striped maple, thornapple and the exotic invasive shrub, common buckthorn. Sugar and red maple trees are more difficult to kill. Some trees die soon after treatment while others are weakened and take several years to die, or they may eventually recover. Double girdling with a chain saw or retreatment with herbicide is necessary for stubborn trees.

Conclusion

Seven years have passed since the experimental patch clearcuts were made in 1994. Based on experience gained from the patch cuts, a two-cut shelterwood method rather than clearcutting is being used to regenerate the large 43-acre stand. The interval between the seed cut and the final cut will allow time for new trees to establish in areas where interfering vegetation had prevented seedlings from establishing. Prior to implementing the seed cut, I was able to eliminate interfering vegetation in an efficient manner by applying Roundup to frills cut into unwanted trees and by spraying fern patches. The cost of equipment (herbicide gun, hatchet, backpack sprayer) and herbicide was quite affordable. Only small amounts of herbicide are required for frill application and by dispensing it directly into targeted trees, contamination of the environment is minimized. Unwanted vegetation can be treated throughout the summer and early fall as a landowner’s time allows.

Few tasks that forest owners do in their woodlot will have such a positive and long-lasting effect as eliminating interfering vegetation prior to timber harvest. It is at this time that species composition and stocking levels in the new stand are largely determined. Insuring that seedlings of desirable species can establish in adequate numbers to develop into a fully stocked stand provided me with immense satisfaction.

David Sturges resides in Steamboat Springs, CO. He is a member of NYFOA’s Southern Tier Chapter and owns a woodlot in Cortland County.

Table 1. The cost and glyphosate content of four forms of Roundup with their equivalent per gallon cost of glyphosate, mixing directions for frill and foliar application of Roundup, and unit dosage costs. Glyphosate is the active ingredient in Roundup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roundup Size</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Glyphosate Content</th>
<th>Glyphosate Cost/Gallon</th>
<th>Frill Application Roundup</th>
<th>Foliar Application Roundup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>1 Cup Mixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roundup</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Quart</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$666.67</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Quart</td>
<td>$28.49</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$422.07</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gallon</td>
<td>$136.95</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$334.02</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Gallons</td>
<td>$184.99</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$180.49</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Unit = 2.5 ml Roundup/water mixture containing 0.20 ml glyphosate
**1 Unit = 1 gallon Roundup/water mixture containing 0.52 ounces glyphosate
In recent decades, private forests in the United States have been fragmenting into smaller ownership parcels at rates above those attributable to more people needing more space—about 1.6 times faster than population growth. Unlike fragmentation—where the forest is physically subdivided into smaller, disjointed forest patches—parcelization directly affects the potential for forest management by reducing the size of the management unit. For example, a 50-acre woodlot is subdivided into 10 five-acre parcels. The process is subtle: signs may not be evident on the ground until the landowners begin to alter the forest or change management strategies.

Subdividing large, singly-owned land parcels into smaller pieces owned by diverse owners with different land-use objectives reduces the effectiveness of coordinated management strategies dealing with wildlife habitat, recreation, and timber production.

What are the trends? The Forest Service reported that in 1994 the average nonindustrial private forestland (NIPF) owner’s holding in the United States was 24 acres. By 2010, experts predict the average size of NIPF ownerships will be about 17 acres. In New York State, approximately one-half million NIPF owners control 14.4 million acres of the state’s 15.5 million acres of commercial forests. Over 90 percent of the half million private ownerships have fewer than 100 acres and control about half of the 14.4 million acres. As these smaller parcels (< 100 acres) are further subdivided, forest managers and logging contractors are confronted with shrinking management units.

The Deer Run Housing Development in Deerfield Township, Oneida County consists of 39 multi-acre parcels that were carved out of two, 100 acre NIPF holdings. Following the parcelization in the early 1990s, the average parcel size in Deer Run became 4.5 acres.
A growing number of homeowners are seeking the privacy and aesthetic values offered by large rural lots. Studies performed in Massachusetts, New Jersey and New Hampshire demonstrated that forest parcelization is occurring in neighboring states. During the mid-1990s, the average private timber sale in Massachusetts took place on slightly more than ten acres of land—talk about small management units. In northern New Jersey, 70% of NIPF owners hold tracts less than nine acres in size, and the number of people owning forests of that size increased by 107% between 1972 and 1988. Similarly, New Hampshire's average NIPF parcel size declined from 114 acres in 1948 to 47 acres in 1983 to 37.5 acres in 1997.

Population growth is often cited as the cause of forestland parcelization, but even minimal or negative population trends lead to parcelization when people purchase second homes or investment properties in forested regions. Future changes in New York’s population will result in NIPF ownership change and subsequent subdivision of forestlands to accommodate new residential and commercial growth.

These trends towards smaller woodlots will result in declining economies of scale for forest managers and logging contractors. For instance, is a logger likely to purchase and harvest timber on a five-acre woodlot? It depends on the volume of timber in question. If the prescription calls for a thinning from below, yielding mostly pulpwood, then the logger has little economic incentive to re-locate his equipment and crew. There are no economies of scale. In this case, the landowner may actually have to pay the logger to thin the forest, not unlike a professional tree service. On the other hand, if the woodlot in question is facing a land conversion in which all merchantable trees are harvested, the logger gains economies of scale and is more likely to purchase and harvest the timber. The minimum acreage threshold to conduct sustainable forest management will fluctuate based on a long list of variables such as location and access to the woodlot, timber species and timber volume—to name a few.

SUNY-ESF researchers are currently conducting studies to document NIPF parcelization in New York. Once we better understand the forces affecting parcelization, it will be easier for land managers, planners, and policy-makers to develop management strategies to ensure that our NIPF continue to provide forest values such as wildlife habitat, soil and water conservation, recreation, scenic beauty and timber production into the future. The issue is not whether parcelization is good or bad, but rather how we adapt our forest management strategies to accommodate smaller parcels.

Rene Germain is an Assistant Professor and Kevin Brazill and Seth LaPierre are graduate students at SUNY ESF in Syracuse, NY.
A Word on Behalf of American Beech

DOUGLAS C. ALLEN

All too often I encounter forest owners who are on a crusade to eliminate American beech from their northern hardwood stands. I think this is wrong and in this article will argue for retaining some of this species in all stands where it is reasonable to do so.

Anxiety about beech centers on the aftermath of an introduced pest complex known as beech bark disease (BBD). The latter results from the interaction of an insect, the beech scale, and canker fungi known as Nectria ("neck-tree-ah"). Fungi responsible for canker diseases are parasitic on living plant cells beneath tree bark. Some are also able to exist on dead plant cells; that is, they can be saprophytic as well. The scale feeds by inserting its minute, straw-like sucking mouthparts into cells beneath beech bark. This feeding has little impact on the host until the other half of the "disease" complex enters the picture. The latter occurs when Nectria spores gain access to the tree through tiny cracks in the bark. These minute openings are created when small areas of living tissue die and desiccate as a result of scale feeding. Also, an actively feeding scale inhibits a tree's normal defensive response to injury. Once it has penetrated the bark, the spore germinates and the resulting structure is able to take advantage of this weakness as well. The end result of this interaction is a small patch of dead bark. When scale populations are extremely high, fungus infections in the inner bark-cambium region expand and quickly coalesce. An infected tree may be killed (essentially girdled) in as few as two years. When scale populations and Nectria infections are sparse or slow to expand, it may take many years for a tree to succumb.

A second scale that often occurs in conjunction with the BBD complex is Xylococcus betulae ("xye-low-cock-you-luss betch-you-lee"). I am not aware of any evidence that associates this insect with the disease, but its feeding on inner bark cells often results in small roughened areas on the exterior of the bark. When large trees are desired for wood products of one type or another, this is of little consequence because this potential lumber defect is removed with the slab. If this damage is overgrown and included in the wood as a small diameter tree enlarges, however, these inclusions may degrade the lumber.

The smooth, tight-fitting, light gray bark of American beech, coupled with its long, thin, sharp-pointed buds (Thoreau's "spearheads of Spring"), make this tree an easily recognized member of our northern hardwood forests. Beech should not be thought of as a weed! It can provide many benefits to the forest owner. Its presence adds to tree diversity in many forest types. Encouraging and maintaining tree diversity can be a hedge against widespread insect outbreaks in some stands. Much of our northern hardwood landscape has become a sea of maple stands over the last 40 to 50 years as a result of selectively removing the more valuable shade-intolerant hardwoods, coupled with loss of overstory beech as a result of BBD. This reduced diversity should concern forest owners (see Forest Owner, Using Forest Service Inventory Data, 1996, vol. 34, no. 2).

An additional benefit derived from beech is its fruit, which constitutes the...
uses. Beech wood makes a short-fibered pulp that can be used to produce a paper of satisfactory strength when mixed with longer fibered pulps.

Its foliage contributes splashes of bright yellow and yellow-orange to our fall colors. The latter adds significant aesthetic value to the landscape.

**Beech bark disease** was introduced into North America over a century ago. During the 1920s and 1930s, heavy mortality of overstory beech swept through northern New England. Eventually the disease and attendant tree mortality spread to New York State. Remnants of dead trees, the existence of beech thickets that have sprouted from their root systems, and the presence of beech scale in many of our northern hardwood stands today are all testimony of this invasion.

The **beech scale** is easily identified on beech bark by the small spots or “puffs” of cotton-like wax that cover each insect (Fig. 1). This substance affords protection for the wingless, immobile scale (Fig. 2) and the eggs deposited beneath (Fig. 3). The most readily visible evidence of the *Nectria fungus* is patches of small, pouch-like red fruiting bodies that may cover large areas of bark. In some instances, infected areas of bark look as if they have been sprayed with dark red marking paint.

The **second scale** (*X. betulae*) is more difficult to see because its orange, sac-like body is usually concealed in a bark crevice. It gives itself away, however, because it produces a long, hair-like wax tube that protrudes from its posterior (Fig. 4). This tube can be as long as two inches and is used to eliminate excess water and sugar from the insect’s gut.

Beech bark disease is now permanently established in most of our northern hardwood forests. Understandably, forest owners are concerned about how to manipulate stands that contain infected trees. Managing northern hardwood stands that include beech and evidence of BBD is a difficult task. Salvage of dead and dying beech is often a priority when management objectives include timber production. As many forest owners have discovered, however, this can disrupt stand development and distort the distribution of diameter classes. Anything that can be done to remove diseased beech slowly so as to discourage sprouting or to encourage more valuable species will help.

One recommendation that appears in many research papers that address BBD and/or management of stands that have been hit by the disease, continued on next page
however, is not to completely discriminate against beech in the disease’s “aftermath zone.” That is, retain overstory trees that survived the initial invasion of the disease and its “killing front.” Many of these trees may have natural resistance to BBD or for other reasons may remain only lightly infested with beech scale. Just because the scale is present on a beech stem does not mean it has or will get BBD! For wildlife benefits particularly, though, it is important to try and maintain a component of beech in our northern hardwood forests. Certainly its presence adds beauty and biological diversity to these ecosystems.

A paper by Barbara Burns (Vermont Department of Forests and Parks) and David Houston (retired pathologist, U.S. Forest Service) in a 1987 issue of The Northern Journal of Applied Forestry made the following recommendations for managing beech in stands long affected by BBD:

1.) Small beech (i.e., ≤10 inches in diameter) with patches of blocky bark (Fig. 5) or that have bark with significant numbers of sunken areas or dead spots should be removed. These trees will most likely suffer reduced value and volume as these defects are overgrown.

2.) Larger beech with rough or blocky bark, however, can be kept because the wood behind this type of bark defect is usually sound and unlikely to be overgrown. I offer a word of caution here. Even though value and volume may not suffer, this rough bark is an ideal habitat for the scale. If retained, these trees should be examined periodically for the presence of the beech scale and Nectria.

3.) Assure tree vigor by maintaining appropriate stand density. Vigorous, smooth-barked boles are not a high quality habitat for the beech scale, and vigorous trees with full crowns close wounds quickly.

4.) Beech with little or no evidence of the beech scale may be resistant to the insect and should be favored.

5.) When beech regeneration (either sprout or seedling origin) becomes established in stands where beech is or has been highly susceptible to BBD, it is very likely to develop into trees that also will be highly susceptible. If this is of concern to the forest owner, herbicide treatment is the best solution.

(Figures 2 and 3 courtesy of Phil Wargo, U.S. Forest Service, Hamden, CT)

(Figure 4 Wax “tail” of Xylococculus betulae (black arrow). The insect’s body is hidden in a crevice created by the roughened bark.

Figure 5 A patch of roughened, blocky bark typical of some beech.)
Ginseng Proceedings

Ginseng Enthusiasts, the Proceedings from the International Ginseng Conference entitled “American Ginseng Production in the 21st Century” held September 8, 9 and 10 in Greene County, NY are now available. If you would like to purchase a copy send a check or money order (U.S. funds only) to Cornell Cooperative Extension of Greene County, 906 County Office Bldg., Mountain Ave, Cairo NY 12413. The charge of $35 (US), $40 (non-US) includes shipping.

Make the check out to Cornell Cooperative Extension and note “Proceedings” on it.

Christmas Tree Grower Website

Here’s a handy website for Christmas Tree Growers (and others with conifer problems). This page has a menu of pests and diseases commonly observed in NYS with links to detailed information. http://ppathw3.cals.cornell.edu/Trees/Treepests.html

A New Approach to Timber Theft...

A Chinese court sentenced two men to life imprisonment for cutting trees from a state forest and stealing the timber, the Workers’ Daily said. The lumber thieves were among nine people in the remote western province Qinghai who chopped down 205 cypresses more than 100 years old. It did not say how long the accomplices’ sentences were. The ancient evergreens fetched some 30,000 yuan ($5,226), the newspaper said.

And still Another Approach...

Timber thieves will soon have to face a unique kind of forest rangers in Bengkulu: elephants trained to detect and stop their illegal activities. Around 31 wild elephants are currently being trained at the elephant taming and training center in Seblat to recognize the sound of chainsaws and seek out locations of ongoing timber theft, said Ir Sujatno, chief of the Natural Conservation and Wildlife office in Bengkulu.

He said half of the number were clever elephants which had a sharp instinct to identify certain sounds.

“Actually, most elephants dislike irritating noises. But at the Seblat training center they are being conditioned not to avoid certain kinds of sounds and even to approach the source of such sounds and to drive away those who made the sounds,” said Sujatno.

“If in other countries elephants can be trained to do many kinds of jobs, why can’t we do the same in Bengkulu,” he said. Elephants would be more effective than humans to chase timber thieves away as they could not be tempted to collude with humans or receive bribes, he claimed.

LANDOWNERS

Maples, Cherry & Red Oak are in strong demand, if you are interested in selling some of your standing Timber consider...

- Each tree to be sold is marked according to YOUR specifications.
- We send notices to reputable log producers & exporters
- Sealed bid opening determines the highest bidder
- Payment is made in advance to any harvest operation
- All harvest operations are supervised by our foresters
- We retain a security deposit until owner is completely satisfied.
- Guaranteed to net YOU the highest price for your timber.

Write or Call For A Free Pamphlet

Robert Synowiez - Professional Forestry Consultants

timberland

117 W. Beecher Hill Rd., Owego, NY 13827
607/687-0460
Woodlot Calendar

September 21-23, 2001 (Friday-Sunday)

NYFOA Fall Membership Meeting
This year’s meeting is sponsored by the Allegany Foothills and Niagara Frontier chapters. It will be held at Camp Duffield in Delevan, NY. See the July/August issue of the Forest Owner for more details.

September 29&30, October 6&7, October 13&14

Harvest Days
The Cumming Nature Center located at 6472 Gulick Road, Naples, NY 14512, along with NYFOA will host three weekends of Forestry related events including Forest Equipment Demonstration, Silvicultural Techniques, Guided Walks, and Static Exhibits. Also included in the events will be demos of horse drawn logging, feller buncher, skidders, tree climbing, and tree felling. Food will be available.

The dates include: September 29 & 30, and October 6 & 7 from 9:00am – 4:30pm and October 13 & 14, (Timber Sports Competition only) from 10:00am – 4pm. Admission is $4.00 for adults, $1.50 for K-12th grade, and Seniors are $3.00. Admission for preschoolers and members of the Rochester Museum and Science Center are free. NYFOA Members receive $1.00 off admission.

Call (716) 374 - 6160 for information and directions. See page 22 for more details.

October 2-4, 2001 (Tuesday-Thursday)

Northeast Agroforestry & Carbon Conference
The Binghamton Regency Hotel in Binghamton, New York will be the site of a three day Northeast Agroforestry and Carbon Conference, October 2-4, 2001. The conference will bring together natural resource professionals, academics and landowners from throughout the region to share information and explore new opportunities for balancing interests in income generation, local community development and forest health.

The conference will feature a tour of Cornell University’s Arnot Teaching and Demonstration Forest to view agroforestry test plots containing ginseng, goldenseal, mushrooms and ornamentals. The tour also will demonstrate crop tree management and the use of goats in controlling understory vegetation.

The conference is hosted by the Hudson Mohawk Resource Conservation and Development Council (RC&D), the Central New York RC&D, the Mid State (Pennsylvania) RC&D and the New York Federation of Resource Conservation and Development Councils. Additional sponsors include the USDA National Agroforestry Center, Cornell University’s Department of Natural Resources, Penn State University’s School of Forest Resources and the Center for Agricultural Development and Entrepreneurship, USDA - Natural Resources Conservation Service and Watershed Agricultural Council. For further information contact Mark Grennan at (518) 828-4385 extension 105, mark.grennan@ny.usda.gov or Phillip Metzger at 607-334-3231, x 4, phil.metzger@ny.usda.gov.

September 29, 2001 (Saturday)

Chainsaw Safety Class For Landowners
Cornell Cooperative Extension of Schuyler County and the Southern Finger Lakes Chapter of the New York Forest Owners Association (NYFOA) are sponsoring the annual chainsaw training class for novice chain saw users known as the “Game of Logging® for Landowners” on Saturday September 29, 2001. The class begins at 8:30 AM and lasts until 4:00 PM. The hands-on class will cover the basics of owning and using a chain saw including saw parts and maintenance, chain sharpening, safety issues, and basic tree felling. All participants will have a chance to fell a tree using correct techniques under the guidance of the instructor. The instructor Bill Lindloff is a local timber harvester who makes his living felling trees. The class will be held at the Cornell University Arnot Forest, 611 C.R. 13, Van Etten, NY. The group will meet at the lumber shed near the south entrance to the forest. This is an all day outdoor class that runs rain or shine and is limited to 12 people. The cost for NYFOA members is $120, non-NYFOA members $135.

To register for the class please mail a check for the proper amount to: Cornell Cooperative Extension of Schuyler County and send to Rural-Urban Center, 208 Broadway, Montour Falls, NY 14865. Please include your address, phone number, and whether you are a member of the New York Forest Owners Association. The class will be filled on a first come first served basis.

Any questions please contact Joan Scott at (607) 535-7161 or email at jec23@cornell.edu

October 15-19, 2001 (Monday-Friday)

Game of Logging®
Game of Logging® Levels 1-4 Chainsaw Training, Instructed by Dan Hartranft in the Hudson Valley region, New York. This training is open to landowners, foresters, loggers and all other chain saw users. For more information, contact Tom at the Catskill Forest Association, (845) 586-3054.
At recent chapter leadership meetings, discussion has arisen about interest in thinning young woodlots. By young forest, this discussion will involve what are called pole sized stands, a woodlot where most of the trees range between six and eleven inches in diameter. Seedling/sapling stands are too young to work with and remain cost effective. Those very young stands need to compete naturally, thus forcing height growth and clean stem development. Older stands that are in timber sized classes (11 + inches) may provide an opportunity to manage through a harvest. A forester’s guidance should be used in these stands. While enlisting the help of a forester is always helpful, a backlog at DEC or the forest owner's own doubts about hiring a consultant may discourage many people. In these cases, the owner can select the trees to cut using some basic guidelines.

Tree Selection
The first entry into a stand to thin usually offers fairly easy choices for tree selection. Think in terms of acceptable and unacceptable growing stock. Acceptable growing stock includes trees of valuable species which are straight, have clear boles (stems), strong crowns and no visible rot. These are the trees to favor over unacceptable growing stock of low value species with weak forks, seams, evidence of decay, crooked stems, heavy knots or limbs showing on the bole and other signs of defects or poor quality. The best stems should have room to grow without opening up the stand so much that sunscald or windthrow becomes a problem.

Arlyn Perkey, forester with the USDA Forest Service in Morgantown, West Virginia, has published a book on crop tree release. For most landowners, the concepts Arlyn describes in his book are much easier to grasp than trying to regulate stocking density or basal area (the square foot stump surface at four and a half feet above the ground per acre). Walk through your stand with flagging tape, pick out the best trees and flag them. Then look up at the crowns and decide which trees are touching the crowns of the flagged trees. Cut the trees whose crowns touch those of the flagged trees on at least two sides, preferably three. This will give the "crop" trees room to grow, thus increasing individual tree growth and vigor. Always remember that vigorous forests tend to be healthier than stagnating ones.

This brief article cannot replace education and experience in silviculture, but it may serve as an initial guide to those who want to thin a stand and harvest a little firewood. For those uncomfortable with selecting crop trees, consider obtaining Arlyn Perkey’s book or contact a DEC or private consultant forester.


Michael Greason is a Consulting Forester in Catskill, NY, a board member of NYFOA and a member of the Capital District chapter. This article originally appeared in the CDC newsletter.
PONDS UNLIMITED INVITES YOU....

to think of all of the benefits you could enjoy from having a pond or a lake on your own property. This idea could become a reality if the right conditions prevail. From our experience it normally requires favorable watershed conditions, good site conditions, owner commitment to stewardship for enhancement of forest land values, appropriate engineering planning and design, and good construction practices.

PONDS UNLIMITED CAN EVALUATE the site of your choice. We can provide all of the engineering services needed to plan, design and oversee the construction of a dam to create a handsome pond or lake on suitable property. You can get additional information by calling or sending a letter of inquiry to:

PONDS UNLIMITED
225 No. Washington Street
Rome, NY 13440
315/336-4222
Fax: 336-4224

WOODSMAN’S FIELD DAYS
October 13th - 14th

Area colleges will be competing in different timber sports categories at the Cumming Nature Center. Saturday from 10AM to 4PM will be demonstrations. Sunday from 10AM to 4PM will be live competition.
NYFOA member Norman E. Murray has recorded a musical cassette, *I'm a Tree and We're the Forest Families of this Country*, which has been used for enjoyment and teaching in elementary schools around the country. It is a non-profit undertaking, with any profits going to Project Learning Tree. For more information or to request an order form, write U*C Music Division, PO Box 1066, Buffalo, NY 14215. Cost is $3.00 per tape (reduced rates available for multiple tape orders).

**NYFOA Merchandise**

Display your support of NYFOA—Purchase one of these CLEARANCE items!

- **50/50 Blend T-Shirts**
  - Ash – Sizes: XXXL (2), XXL (1) or Small (2)  
  - Price: $3.00

- **100% Cotton Collared Short Sleeve Shirts**
  - Sizes: XL (1)  
  - Price: $8.00

- **100% Cotton T-Shirts**
  - Ash – Sizes: 14/16 Child (1) and Small (2)  
  - Price: $5.00
  - White – Sizes: 14/16 Child (1) and Small (2)  
  - Price: $5.00

All prices include Shipping and Handling

Send your orders to: NYFOA, P.O. Box 180, Fairport, NY 14450

**Introducing TREE PRO's**

**Miracle Tube**

A seamless Tree Shelter

- Flared top.
- No assembly required.
- 100% recycled materials.
- Manufactured in the USA.
- Reusable ties are available.

Call us when you need weed mats, mycorrhizal and controlled release fertilizer.

**TREE PRO's original design is still available.**

Free sample 800-875-8071

3180 W. 250 N. West Lafayette, IN 47905
treepro.com

**Future Forest Consulting, Inc.**

DEC Cooperating Forest Consultants
Corey Figueiredo and Scott Graham

- FOREST PRODUCT MARKETING & MARKETING
- MANAGEMENT PLANS
- FOREST ROAD CONSTRUCTION AND DESIGN
- FORESTRY APPRAISALS
- NON-COMMERCIAL FOREST IMPROVEMENT FOR TIMBER, WILDLIFE, F.I.P. & S.I.P
- TIMBER APPRAISALS
- SUGARBUCH MANAGEMENT
- BOUNDARY MAINTENANCE
- TREE PLANTING
- WETLAND DESIGN
- TIMBER TREPASS APPRAISALS
- ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION

Providing “Quality Forest Management” to Western and Central NY including the Adirondack Region.

Main Office: 716-367-2250
Fax: 716-367-8274

5752 Middle Road
Hemlock, N.Y. 14466

E-mail: futureforest@aol.com

**ADVERTISING RATES**

Display Ads (per insert)

- Full Page: $210 (30 column inch)
- Half Page: $105 (15 column inch)
- Quarter Page: $52.50 (7.5 column inch)
- Eighth Page: $26.25 (3.75 column inch)

Marketplace:

- $10 minimum for 25 words
- Each additional word: 10 cents

For More Information Contact:
Mary Beth Malmsheimer, Editor
(315) 655-4110
mmalmshe@syr.edu
Don’t forget the Fall Membership Meeting on September 21-23 at Camp Duffield in Delevan, NY!

More Valuable Logs ... More Valuable Lumber
- Stop End Splits on Logs
- Prevent End Checking Losses

Use the Best Known Products in the World

ANCHORSEAL®
End Sealer for Logs & Lumber
- eliminate up to 90% or more of end checking
- give customers a more valuable product
- "s-irons" made from recycled plastic
- saw thru with no damage to saws or veneer knives
- no more iron stains in valuable veneer logs

LogSavers®
- Manufactured right here in New York State - Shipped World-wide

For samples or more information, contact:
FAX: 716-833-0120 716-833-9366
U-C COATINGS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 1066 • Buffalo, NY 14215 • U.S.A.
website: www.uc coatings.com  email: nyfoa@uccoatings.com US/CN Toll Free: 1-888-END-COAT