

BOARD OF FORESTRY
PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS REGISTRATION
P.O. BOX 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
TELEPHONE: (916) 445-6843
445-3014



LICENSING NEWS

Vol. 8 No. 3

JULY-SEPTEMBER 1989



WHAT'S NEW WITH FORESTERS LICENSING

LICENSE FEE INCREASE PROPOSAL for next fiscal year is noticed for a hearing in February. The notice presents budget information and disciplinary case data. For a copy contact Board of Forestry, P.O. Box 944246, Sacramento, CA 94244-2460, or Betty Bechtel at (916) 445-2921. The PFEC will discuss the fee increase at their December 13, 1989 meeting.

TWO NEW SETS OF REGULATIONS AFFECTING RPFs

1) CHANGE OF POLICY TO REGULATION - Numerous Code sections relating to qualifications to take the professional foresters examination, deadlines, appeals, and other matters in policy were recently changed to regulation. For a copy, contact Sandra Crumley at (916) 445-3014 or write to: Professional Foresters Registration, P.O. Box 944246, Sacramento, CA 94244-2460.

2) CHANGE IN RPF RESPONSIBILITIES - New regulations, Title 14, California Code of Regulation, (14 CCR) Sections 1035 through 1035.3, effect a change in responsibilities for those RPFs who prepare Timber Harvesting Plans pursuant to the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973. The CDF will mail the complete regulation language soon, and RPFs should read them carefully so they are fully aware of their new liabilities under this one law. The changes also affect LTOs and submitters.

AGREEMENT WITH DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE - A written confirmation now exists that silvicultural treatment of tree pests is exempt from the Pest Control Advisor (PCA) license controlled by the California Department of Food and Agriculture for chemical treatments. This exemption has been the interpretation for years, but not formally written. The confirmation was finally achieved by Ken Delfino and David Burns, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF). Legislation was enacted this year requiring CDF to have a PCA sign for chemical treatment recommendations on California Forest Improvement Program (CFIP) and other forest protection projects.

ROLES OF QUALIFIED EXPERTS REGARDING BARK BEETLES - The following information was recently provided to a County's Counsel regarding a proposed ordinance regarding the bark beetle infestation. Several existing laws are involved and understanding of each is important for compliance.

Example Ordinance - The proposed ordinance stated "the purpose ... is to assure removal of trees that pose a danger to life and property..." The proposed ordinance appropriately dealt with tree evaluation during any "permitting" process. However, to have county employees without a professional foresters license or arborist certification assess such risk invites tremendous liability should they evaluate a tree on a permit site and approve that there is no danger.

The ordinance noted that insect attack must "be promptly identified, felled and removed ..." Identifying insect attack in stages early enough to control the emerging insects can be difficult for even highly-trained professionals. It also addressed "dead, dying or diseased trees." Dead trees are relatively simple for lay persons to identify, but it is then too late to effectively control bark beetles; however, lay persons may not be able to determine hazard risk. Some trees which appear to be dying may instead be suffering from a multitude of defoliating insects or other non-lethal causes. Disease presents the most significant exposure to liability by county employees because it is doubtful they will be able to identify even extensive internal decay because the external signs may be minimal, if present at all.

Qualified Experts - Certified arborists are qualified for hazard tree evaluation and maintenance (tree trimming or pruning). This is a voluntary certification by the International Society of Arboriculture and not controlled by the State; this standard could be required by an ordinance. Certification provides some accountability for qualifications. Without some standard, the public may pay for inappropriate advice. Professional Foresters Registration accepts the certified arborist as qualified to evaluate, and care for, individual trees. Non-forestry tree activities are tentatively described by the Professional Foresters Examining Committee as those occurring within close proximity or immediate vicinity to commercial, administrative, institutional, or industrial sites, and residences or structures with related improvements, or scattered and landscaped park-groves of trees. Such trees may be associated with the presence of "urban fabric" such as lawns or gardens, irrigated ground cover, pavement, and would include street trees, landscaped urban parks, golf courses, cemeteries, or planted windbreaks mitigating the factors of heat, chill, or sound.

The Registered Professional Forester (RPF) may also be individually qualified to provide tree condition evaluation, and the RPF is the only expert that can evaluate the condition trees or groups of trees further away from "urban fabric". Such situations may involve treatment by felling a tree, and burning and/or peeling the bark. Where more than one tree is involved, the practices may be called silviculture where reforestation is intended, or called sanitation/salvage in regard to harvesting where reforestation is not necessary. The RPF activities include management of road right-of-way trees except for hazard tree maintenance.

A Pest Control Advisor's (PCA) license with the State Department of Food and Agriculture is additionally required if recommendation of a chemical is involved in the treatment by a arborist or RPF. A licensed PCA cannot provide the services of a RPF.

A licensed timber operator (LTO) is qualified to carry out the commercial felling or removal of trees. A LTO is not qualified to prescribe forestry practices, even though a LTO can file an "Exemption" from a Timber Harvesting Plan. Also, LTO's can work under the supervision of a RPF as an unregistered assistant, because the RPF is fully responsible for their forestry prescriptions. It would be best to have this authorization from the RPF in writing to avoid misunderstandings.

Ordinance Approaches - To avoid liability risk and action by a licensing agency, the permittee can provide a report by the expert appropriate to the situation as noted above. If the Board of Supervisors considers this too restrictive, they could proceed with the concept that the owner can do their own survey, realizing that they will likely not be able to identify the problems. The only benefit the county might achieve is a written statement that the owner has refused professional input, and are fully responsible for their decision and any related liability. This takes the unnecessary risk away from a county and its employees. This latter choice does not solve the insect infestation dilemma, but neither would non-qualified employee evaluation.

Perhaps the greatest potential benefit of a tree insect and hazard evaluation ordinance is in disseminating information on the problems and risks to the owners, and giving them guidance to the appropriate expert to help them solve their problem.

A similar situation that would benefit from clarification in an ordinance is Title 14, California Code of Regulation, Section 15151. Professional Foresters Registration can and will take action against persons for not complying with this code. This Section states that "only registered professionals can prepare a technical study which will be used in, or which will control the detailed design, construction, or operation, and which will be prepared in support of an EIR." An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) itself is not a technical study, and need not be prepared by a registered professional. For example, an EIR for project development on land with trees and woody plants does not require a RPF. However, the County would benefit by requiring a technical study for forested open-space which proposes management standards or implementation (design and construction), and maintenance (operation); a Registered Professional Forester would be required. This would enhance long-term retention and restoration of the county's forest resources. This provides far more benefits than just short-term preservation of existing trees, which is the focus of most county ordinances.

"OUT ON A LIMB" THE LICENSING LAW AND ITS APPLICATION

ARCHAEOLOGY - (Disclaimer: The following hypothetical scenario is presented for raising awareness and does not substitute appropriate legal advice).

Situation: Ira Rpf was hired by timberland owner, Ms. Common, to prepare a Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) on 320 acres that involved tractor yarding and building a road near a meadow and in an area that had many rock outcroppings.

In preparing the plan, he had to respond to three questions. These questions were:

1. Are there any recorded (listed) archaeological sites for the 320 acres in the California Archaeological Inventory? This responds to Title 14, California Code of Regulation (14 CCR), Section 1034(t) in the forest practice rules.

2. Has an archaeological survey been made of the harvesting area? This provides the information to respond to 14 CCR 1034(s).
3. If there are any sites, what protection is prescribed for them? This provides information to respond to 14 CCR 1034(t) and to respond to the requirements for any archaeological special treatment areas as described in 14 CCR 895.1 (definition of special treatment areas) and 14 CCR 913.4(a), 933.4(a), and 953.4(a) on special harvesting methods for special treatment areas.

Evaluation - To start addressing these questions, Ira had a record search from the Information Center of the California Archaeological Inventory made. The Information Center had two sites listed for the area where logging was planned. Both sites were immediately adjacent to the meadow. Ira did not feel these sites would hamper the timber operation because they could be avoided. He found that where possible, avoiding the sites in the operation eliminated the need to discuss the significance of sites. Ira thus determined that he would have to locate the sites on-the-ground and identify them in some manner to ensure the timber harvest would not disturb them.

The identification of sites is needed to address the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requiring protection of significant archaeological resources, and does not distinguish between recorded or unrecorded sites. This is a requirement that supplements those described in the forest practice rules. The Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21083.2 describes this requirement, and Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines provides background on understanding this statute.

In the process of locating the known archaeological sites and THP field preparation process, Ira also checked the likely places where unrecorded sites might be located. Ira felt that the training provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), coordinated with the California Licensed Foresters Association, gave him the basic knowledge to make this assessment and help determine the assistance of an archaeologist is needed. He did not identify any unrecorded sites in his field survey.

In the original plan submitted to the CDF, Ira indicated how the sites were to be protected, but noted that the map included with the THP was confidential since the landowner did not want the sites disturbed by trespassers (the map would be provided to the timber operator).

After logging commenced, Ira met with Ms. Common to explain the THP and describe her responsibilities for compliance with the Forest Practice Act and rules. During the discussions, Ira discovered that Ms. Common previously found an arrowhead (projectile point), an unrecorded native rock art site, and a suspected burial site. Ira chided himself for not having talked to Ms. common about valuable information she might have before he started preparation of the plan. Ira realized his field inspection missed some important archaeological features.

Ira made another on-site inspection with Ms. Common to examine where the arrowhead was found, and to determine how the rock art site might impact

the timber operation. In examining the location where the arrowhead was found, Ira felt the site was not significant because it was located in the middle of a steep slope. The rock art site was likely "significant", so he amended this area out of the plan. This area was flagged as an equipment exclusion for protection. Ira knew he could not excavate any of the burial ground because PRC, Section 5097.99 makes it a felony to obtain or possess Native American remains or grave artifacts.

Ira knew that if an archaeological resource is found during the timber operation, the timber harvesting plan has to be amended (14 CCR 1036) because the rule requires amendment for changes that could affect the conduct of timber operations. These could be changes requested by the timber operator, or identification of previously unknown natural constraints, such as archaeological sites or unstable areas, for example.

Ira submitted the amendment describing what he found. The CDF, asked Ira to clarify some concerns for the record. The first question was not sufficiently addressed in the plan and the amendment raised two more questions.

1. What experience and training did Ira have in evaluating archaeological resources?
2. Why was the arrowhead site determined not to be significant?
3. Would the information about the rock art site and burial ground be submitted to the appropriate Archaeological Information Center to help in develop knowledge of native Americans?

Preventative Solution - The PRC, Section 15151 states that Environmental Impact Reports need not be prepared by a registered professional (meaning a variety of licensed professionals). Even though there is no license involved for archaeology, recognition deemed "qualified" by that profession includes at least a B.S. degree in anthropology, 4 years of archaeology practice in California, and recognition by peers of reports reviewed by the Society for California Archeology. A RPF should use caution and judgment in the degree they represent themselves in any document as to their qualifications to do archaeology evaluations. A two day course on archaeology does not qualify one as an expert on that subject. The CDF must make the determination of the adequacy of the RPF's survey. Ira must recognize when his expertise is exceeded, or when he is taking on more liability risk than he is willing to accept. Practices by RPFs which do not meet a standard of prudent conduct are subject to disciplinary action.

NOTICE - The Board of Forestry has been notified that as of January 1, 1990, the Information Centers will increase their record searches on THPs to \$60.00 minimum.

WHAT'S NEW WITH THE PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS EXAMINING COMMITTEE?

NEXT PFEC MEETING - The next PFEC meeting will include discussions on license fee increase proposal, updated PFEC policy, and the status of the examination review and the proposed clarification of the RPF's role. The meeting is scheduled for December 13, 1989, at 1:15 pm, in Room 1506-12, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento. The public is invited.

NOTICE OF CALL FOR NOMINATIONS TO APPOINT TWO MEMBERS TO THE PROFESSIONAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE (PFEC)

Nominations from all interested persons or groups are requested for two appointments of the PFEC. A nominee must be a current Registered Professional Forester (RPF) as provided by Public Resources Codes, Section 763. Nominations should be submitted in writing to the Board office no later than December 15, 1989, using the form on the back of this newsletter. The appointments will be made at the January Board meeting, and extend through January 15, 1994.

The PFEC reviews applications for registration as a professional forester and recommends to the Board the granting of a license for persons found qualified by examination. The Committee is also advisory to the Executive Officer, Foresters Licensing, on disciplinary matters pertaining to RPFs and on legal actions regarding non-licensed persons.

Four meetings per year are required (usually in Sacramento). Additional meetings may be required to carry out the disciplinary process. Periodic review of documents and occasional response is necessary between meetings. Members may request \$25.00 compensation for each day of service in addition to reimbursement for travel and per diem expenses at State rates. Appointees will need to file a conflict-of-interest statement as required by regulations of the Fair Political Practice Commission within 30 days of appointment. Appointees serve at the pleasure of the Board. Staggered four-year terms are used to provide periodic membership review.

Chairman Pete Passof, UC Forestry Extension, is stepping down at the end of his second term. A replacement from education or extension service is desired. Vice-Chairman, Jim Asher, Consultant, is also stepping down after his second term. Representation from the categories of education, consulting/private industry, or agency directly dealing with timber sales. No one presently represents this "other" category. This category was initiated four years ago to complement the public Board member representation except this person must be a RPF. This category was filled by Tim Treichel who changed employment from the State Lands Commission to industry.

The current members of the PFEC are:

*Pete Passof, RPF, Chairman	- Education/Extension
*James Asher, RPF, Vice-Chairman	- Consulting
Nancy Drinkard, RPF	- Agency/CDF
Janice Carthew, RPF	- Agency/USFS
Bob Kerstiens	- Public Member/BOF

Roy Richards, RPF
Tim Treichel, RPF

- Consulting
- Industry

(* denotes expiring term)

The Board will appoint a new Chair and Vice-Chair at their January meeting.

DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

Case 115 ALLEGATION: A proposed fictitious business name could be interpreted as providing "forestry" services with no Professional Forester responsible.

AUTHORITY: Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 766, Title 14, California Code of Regulation (14 CCR), Section 1602 and 1602.1, and Business and Professions Code, Section 17200, et seq.

ACTION: From several options offered, the company chose to change its name to clarify the kind of services it intended to provide without a professional forester.

Case 120 ALLEGATION: A company was representing professional forester services with no responsible registrant's name or license number.

AUTHORITY: Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 766, Title 14, California Code of Regulation (14 CCR), Section 1602 and 1602.1, and Business and Professions Code, Section 17200, et seq.

ACTION: The person was not aware of the law, and agreed to comply with the law. From several options offered, the person chose to make any proposal to perform forestry work clear that the firm was not qualified to do the "consultation, evaluation or planning" phases of vegetative management in fire prevention on timberland with wildland characteristics. In regard to professional forester activities that may arise, the person agreed to comply with 14 CCR 1602.1 stating the name and license number of the RPF who would be responsible for such work.

EVALUATION: In the Professional Foresters Law, "Forestry ... refers to the science which treats wildland resources in general, and of lands bearing associations of trees and other woody plants in particular; investigation of wildland soils, plants, and animals, and the ecology thereof; and the application of scientific knowledge in the fields of wildlands protection, timber growing and utilization, forest resource inventories, watershed management, forest economics and finance, air and water pollution control on wildlands, outdoor recreation, and the preservation of natural scenery" (PRC, Section 753). The law applies to "wildland" characteristics

which may include some interspersed homes or limited improvements on conifer forestlands, foothill-woodlands, and brush lands.

Regulations expand on the law stating that "acting in the capacity of a professional foresters refers to any person who, for personal gain, compensation, or otherwise ... performs services applicable to 'forestry' as defined in [PRC] Section 753 when providing advice to, or management for, employers, clients, or others, through consultation; through conduct of investigations in forestry matters; through evaluation of forest properties..." (14 CCR, Section 1602).

Work in the immediate vicinity or close proximity of structures is not covered by the professional foresters law and may rest with non-wildland fire experts or licensed landscape architects. A RPF is not required to do actual clearing, cutting or disposal. If any wood products are sold, the landowner may come under the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act, and should be so advised.

Twenty-eight cases are in different stages of investigation or action. Twenty-four are against RPFs; one of these involves monitoring a contractual probation of a RPF. The appropriate information will be reported at the conclusion of each case.

WHAT'S NEW WITH THE BOARD OF FORESTRY?

NOTICE OF CALL FOR NOMINATIONS TO APPOINT TWO MEMBERS TO THE RPF LIAISON COMMITTEE

Nominations from all interested persons or groups are requested for two appointments on the Board's RPF Liaison Committee. A nominee must be a current Registered Professional Forester (RPF) and have experience in working with the Forest Practice Act in California. Nominations should be received in writing to the Board office no later than December 15, 1987 using a form available from this office. The incumbent members have requested reappointment.

The RPF Liaison Committee provides input to the Board on issues affecting licensed foresters, implementation of the Forest Practice Act, regulations and Board policies. The Committee is composed of seven RPF's and serve at the pleasure of the Chairman of the Board. Staggered terms are used to provide periodic membership review. The appointments are presently filled by Paul Caster, RPF 737, and Pete Ribar, RPF 1766, both from the private industry/consulting category. The other two member categories are "agency" and "education/other".

The appointments will be made at the January Board meeting in Sacramento and extend through December 31, 1993. The RPF Liaison Committee meets as situations necessitate and on the average of three times each year. Members may request reimbursement for travel and per diem expenses at State rates.

The present members are:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Scott Wall, RPF #2223	Consulting
Jon Rea, RPF #1025	Agency
Paul Caster, RPF #737	Consulting
Lennart Lindstrand, RPF #624	Consulting
Peter Ribar, RPF #1766	Industry
Bill Snyder, RPF #1760	Industry
Charles Scheondienst, RPF #1917	Agency

SEPTEMBER FIELD TRIP TO SANTA BARBARA - Fire risk for existing subdivisions surrounded by wildland vegetation was increased by lack of strategic planning regarding road and structure placement. Fire risk in some areas is so significant that the County has told several rural communities that they cannot be protected from wildfire conflagration. Some of these communities are forming their own fire brigades and arson patrols. Chaparral in the area is in advanced successional decline, and controlled burning is important to protecting the urbanized wildlands. The County Planning Department is voluntarily complying with the Fire Safe Program.

Vegetation management concerns by local residents exist from their perceptions that visual landscape values will be degraded similarly to avocado orchards or mining, etc., from prescribed burning. Prescriptive fire management within mixed ownerships has been accomplished between the USDA, Forest Service and County/City ownerships. Concepts of tunneling into mountains to create water seepage, and having down-stream users pay for up-stream uses to provide increased water supply, are in various stages of application. The concept of "harvesting of water" and related markets were of much interest to the Board.

An existing County Ordinance is designed to preserve hardwoods, but it does not include long-term management guidance. This is also the case where some "natural preserves" which are established on a "preservation" basis and are not managed for fuel build-up and wildland fire safety. The Land Trust for Santa Barbara County is approaching the matter differently, using conservation easements where the landowner can achieve personal management or development goals in return for protection of view sheds, productive soils, riparian zones, etc. The riparian corridor concept is supported by the County Resource Management and Planning, Division of Environmental Review. Santa Barbara is a "Contract County" whose fire stations serve the functions of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. As a result, the County has not had much interaction at a State level, and sought input on how to effect further liaison.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS: FRANCIS RAYMOND AWARD - There are no restrictions on who may be nominated. Examples of those qualified and eligible to be nominated include journalists, conservation organizations, non-profit groups promoting forest management, service clubs, professionals, educators, volunteers, legislators, corporations, and so on.

The Award - In honor of the many contributions to forestry in California, the State Board of Forestry established the Francis H. Raymond Award for an individual, group, company, agency, or association selected as making the most significant contribution to the advancement of forestry California over the preceding five-year period. The award consists of three parts: 1) an individual plaque for the recipient, 2) a perpetual plaque displayed at the Board of Forestry office in Sacramento, and 3) a stipend which varies in amount depending on the current interest generated in the endowment fund. When the goal of \$30,000.00 is reached, the stipend should be approximately \$1,500.00 each year. The stipend is used to further California forestry. It may consist of a professional display for fairs, service clubs, or Cal Trans rest stops; slide tapes for local service clubs, the purchase of trees for a conservation-education centers, development of brochures, assistance in putting on press tours, or other worthwhile projects.

Two recipients were selected for the 1989 award. They were Dr. James L. Jenkinson, of the Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Experiment Station and Mr. Wayne Miller, representing the Redwood Region Conservation Council.

OTHER POINTS OF INTEREST

FORESTRY STRESSFUL WORK - Jobs that require high responsibility but offer little control have long been thought to be the most stressful. A recent study of heart patients suggests work that demands vigilance over the well-being of others causes the most stress.

Examples:

Bus Driver	Locomotive Engineer
Preschool Teacher	Biological Scientist
<u>FORESTER</u>	Restaurant Manager
Physician	Sheriff
Airline Stewardess	

FOREST GRAZING - Research results indicate that cattle grazing reduced shrub and herbaceous canopy cover to only 18 percent six years after harvesting, and 31 percent eight years after harvesting on two mixed conifer clearcuts. These cover levels were within timber management objectives for tree growth. No significant trampling damage occurred. Browsing damage to white and Douglas-fir seedlings was primarily caused by deer. Tree seedlings showed no significant differences in height or basal diameter growth under any treatment. Thus, cattle grazing appears to be a viable tool for meeting brush/grass objectives in forest plantations. Research on deer-brush response to grazing and clipping indicates that livestock cannot effectively reduce and maintain deerbrush cover unless the animals are allowed to graze plantations in the first year of plantation establishment.

Forest and range managers must evaluate the potential forage mix; examine the physiographic situation including the distribution and juxtaposition of water, roads and future harvesting units; determine potential sources for browsing damage to conifers and be able to tell which source(s) cause

the damage; and communicate with potential permittees to determine if timber management objectives can be met while meeting permittee and grazing animal requirements.

Sound guidelines for successful use of animals are: 1) do not unload animals directly onto the plantation, 2) ensure adequate water, 3) ensure proper animal distribution through herding riding or making use of prior livestock distribution patterns, 4) cull animals that feed on conifers, 5) do not bed animals on the plantation, and 6) adjust season of grazing as needed to minimize forage use and minimize damage to conifers and riparian areas. Finally, livestock grazing, is a management practice that is highly compatible with other practices and can be a cost effective, efficient means of reaching management goals in forest plantations.

The preceeding is a summary of an article which appeared in the "Forestry Newsletter", Department of Forestry and Resources Management University of California at Berkeley.

EXPERT WITNESS SEMINAR - Those of you who are interested in being expert witnesses, there is a two-day seminar designed to teach environmental professionals how to work effectively with lawyers in legal and litigation environments. Just a few of the areas of discussion are as follows:

- * Work effectively with lawyers and other professionals as a cohesive trial team.
- * Tailor your work to fit the needs of any dispute resolution process whether it is negotiation, mediation, arbitration or litigation.
- * Present clear and convincing testimony, even concerning highly intricate or technical matters.
- * How will media, managerial, public and governmental oversight affect the case?
- * How will you and your people cope with simultaneous negotiation and litigation?

For information: Call or write to Chuck Knutson, 3400 College Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95818, Telephone: (916) 445-6294 (7:00 am to 3:45 pm on weekdays).

OAK TREE HAZARD EVALUATION - A practical system for evaluating hazards landscape trees is an important element of any tree maintenance program. An evaluation system was developed in California for two species of native oaks, Quercus lobata and Quercus wislizenii. The system uses eleven separate components which can be grouped into the four larger categories of environment, structure, vigor and target. A Summary Rating (SR) is generated for each tree from component ratings using a database management computer program. The SR has been useful in prioritizing and scheduling corrective tree work. The evaluation system has now been adopted by other public agencies responsible for maintaining urban oaks.

For more information write to: University of California, Cooperative Extension, 420 S. Wilson Way, Stockton, CA 95205

PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

JACKSON DEMONSTRATION STATE FOREST NEWSLETTER - Recent articles include "Timber Harvest Planning Methods", by Thomas W. Sutfin and Dr. Richard L. Barber, and "Impacts of Stream Clearance on a Small Channel", by Fay A. Yee. Copies are available by writing to the Jackson Demonstration State Forest, Dept. of Forestry, P.O. Box 1185, Fort Bragg, CA 95437

RECENT PUBLICATIONS: The following topics now have recent publications that are available from the Forest Research Laboratory at Oregon State University. Single copies of these publications are available free of charge; multiple copies can be purchased at the Laboratory's cost for production and mailing.

"Evaluation of Forest Uses, Practices, and Policies"
"Integrated Protection of Forests and Watersheds"
"Forest Ecology, Culture, and Productivity"
"Wood Use and Product Performance"

Write to: College of Forestry, Oregon State University, Peavy Hall 154, Corvallis, OR 97331-5704.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF OAK WOODLANDS - The following U.C. Agricultural Publications are available:

Living Among the Oaks - Available from Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program, 163 Mulford Hall, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, CA 94720, (415) 642-2360.

Deer-Resistant Plants for Ornamental Use (2167)
Erosion control on Bare Slopes Around Your Home (21137)
Landscape for Fire Protection (2401)
Planning for Your Mountain Property (21360)
Poison Oak Control in the Home Yard (2573)
Protecting Your Home Against Wildlife (21104)
Saving Water in Landscape Irrigation (2976)
Direct Seeding Woody Plants in the Landscape (2577)
Fertilizing Wood Plants (2958)
Landscape Trees for the Great Central Valley of California (2580)
Mistletoe Control in Shade Trees (2571)
Native California Plants for Ornamental Use (2831)
Oaks on Home Grounds (2783)
Oakworm (Oak Moth) and Its Control (2542)
Plant Your Own Oak Tree (21334)
Staking Landscape Trees (2576)
Pit Scales on Oak (2543)
Resistance or Susceptibility of Certain Plants to Armillaria Root Rot (2591)
Planting Landscape Trees (2583)
Protecting Trees when Building on Forested Land (21348)

Sources where the above publications are available:

- Hardesty, N.M. 1984. Oak Woodland Preservation and Land Planning: Portola Valley Ranch. Hardesty Assoc., 855 Oak Grove Ave., Ste. 205, Menlo Park, CA 94025
- Heritage Oak Committee. 1976. Native oaks, our valley heritage. Sacramento County Office of Education, Sacramento, CA
- Beatty, R.A. 1977. Trees for Lafayette: The Master Tree Plan of Lafayette, CA. Russell A. Beatty. NCC/ASLA Publications Group. Oakland, CA
- Tom Smith Associates. 1985. Landscape Design Guidelines: The Southeast Roseville Specific Plan. Coker-Ewing and Tom Smith Associates. Sacto., CA
- Dept. of Water Resources. 1979. Plants for California Landscapes: A catalog of Drought Tolerant Plants. State of Calif., Dept. of Water Resources. Bulletin 209. Sacto., CA.

Newsletters:

- Oaks and Folks. U.C. Cooperative Extension.
- Growing Thoughts. Valley Crest Tree Company. 13745 Sayre Street, Sylmar, CA 91342 (Vol. 3, No. 2 dedicated to California Oaks: Rhythm of the Oaks, Oak Relocation, Oaks from Acorns, Rx for Plants: Oak Health)

CONTINUING EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

CALIFORNIA COURSES

Workshop on Sugar Pines & Blister Rust	Oct - Nov	UCCE
Forest Vegetation Mgmt. Conference	Nov 7-9	UCCE
Wildlife Habitat Relationship Workshop	Dec, 1989	UCB
Forestry Education in the Golden State	Dec 9	UCB/NCSAF
RPF Exam Seminar	Feb 16, 1990	CLFA
Roads and Landings	March 1	CLFA
CLFA Annual Conference	March 2-3	CLFA
20th Anniversary of Earth Day	April	UCCE
THP Preparation Field Workshop	Sept	CLFA
Insect & Disease	Unknown	CLFA
Conflict Resolution Workshops	Unknown	UCCE

Summer - Mt. Shasta/McCloud
True Fir Mgmt. Coop.

Unknown

UCCE

Further information on UCD, contact Noreen Dowling, or Marcia Kreith, at Public Service Research and Dissemination Program, UCD, Telephone (916) 757-8820.

Further information on UCCE, regarding October and November courses, contact: Gary Nakamura, (916) 224-4902.

Further information on UCB, contact: Rick Standiford, UCB (415) 642-2360.

Further information on UCCE, April 1990, contact: Richard Harris, UCCE, telephone (707) 445-7351.

Further information on CFPC, Animal Committee, contact Lans Thornton at (916) 246-5037 or Greg Giusti at (707) 263-2281.

Further information on CFPC, Insect Committee, contact Jack Marshall at (707) 462-0506 or Tom Koerber at (415) 420-8877.

Further information on CFPC, Pest Committee, contact Fred Krueger at (714) 383-5588.

Further information on CLFA, contact: Hazel Jackson, CLFA, P.O. Box 1516, Pioneer, CA 95666, (209) 293-7323.

Further information on UC/SAF: (415) 642-0469

OREGON COURSES

Engineering with Wood	November	OSU
Monitoring Forest Resources	November	OSU
Managing Oregon's Riparian Zones A COPE Program	Dec 12-13	OSU
Recreation Economics	December	OSU
Lumber Drying	Dec 11-15	OSU
Current Perspectives on Silvicultural Management of Riparian Areas for Multiple Resources	Dec 12-13	OSU
SWO-Oregon: A Forest Growth & Yield Model for SW Oregon	Dec 14-15 & 19-21	OSU
Western Forestry Conference	Dec 3-6	WFCA

1990

Forest Engineering Institute	Jan 3-Mar 9	OSU
Resource Policy, Values & Econ.	Jan 16-26	OSU
Sawing Technology Workshop	January	OSU
Plywood Manufacturing Workshop	Mar 12-15	OSU
Photogrammetry & Aerial Photo Interpretation	Mar 12-16	OSU
Economics & Problem Solving Silviculture Inst. XII	Mar 12-23	OSU
Variable Probability Sampling- Variable Plot and Three-P	Mar 26-30	OSU
Forest Engineering Institute	Mar 28 & June 1	OSU
Managing Forest Structure and Composition	Late April	OSU
Reforestation Alternatives with Constraints on fire & Herbicides	Spring	OSU
Forest Engineering Institute	Mar 28- June 30	OSU
Regeneration & Stand Mgmt./ Silviculture Inst. XII	May 14-15	OSU
IUFRO Working Parties on Biochemical Genetics and Population and Ecological Genetics	July 31-Aug 2, 1990	OSU

Further information on OSU: Conference Assistant, Oregon State University, Peavy Hall 202, College of Forestry, Corvallis, Oregon 97331, (503)737-2329.

Further information on OSU/COPE contact: Marcy Berg, COPE Program, Hatfield Marine Science Center, Newport, OR 97365. Phone: (503)867-3011.

Further information on WFCOA, contact: Western Forestry and Conservation Association, 4033 S.W. Canyon Road, Portland, OR 97221, (503)226-4562.

**BOARD OF FORESTRY
RPF LIAISON COMMITTEE MEMBER NOMINATION FORM**

Please use a separate sheet for each nominee. Additional sheets are available upon request. Mail to: Board of Forestry, P.O. Box 944246, Sacramento, CA 94244-2460.

1. Name of Nominee: _____

2. Address: _____

3. Telephone: Work: () _____ Home: () _____

4. Check the appropriate representation of nominee:
Private Industry/ _____ Agency _____ Education/ _____
Consulting _____ Other _____

5. Brief resume of the nominee's background and qualifications which qualify him/her for the Committee (If needed, attach separate sheet of additional information or resume.)

6. Why do you think the nominee should be selected for the RPFLC?

7. PRINT Name of Nominator: _____

Signature of Nominator: _____

8. Address: _____

9. Telephone: Work: () _____ Home: () _____

10. Group you represent, if any: _____