

Foresters Dealing With Aftermath of Fire

For the past 11 months, foresters in Adams County have been dealing with the aftermath of a June 2004 tornado. A salvage operation is now underway on the Quincy Bluff State Natural Area and most of the timber salvage on private lands has been completed. Tree are being replanted on the impacted lands and a lookout tower is being replaced. Now, just as they were beginning to see progress on that, these same foresters are faced with another major, unplanned workload.

On May 5, 2005 a fire started by an Adams County landowner to clear a small area got out of control and created one of the largest Wisconsin wildfires in recent history. By the end of the incident, the Cottonville Fire, as it has been named, had burned approximately 3,410 acres, destroyed 30

homes (nine permanent and 21 seasonal) and damaged or destroyed about 60 other outbuildings and contents. Thanks to the good work of the firefighters, an estimated 300 additional structures that were threatened or within the burned area were saved.

For more details

about the fire, visit <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/forestry/CottonvilleFire.pdf> (it's a large file so be patient while it loads on your computer screen).

Other than a few acres of fields and yards, the 3,400+ acres burned by the fire were forested. Approximately 2,000 of the acres were enrolled in the Managed Forest Law (see story about this program on page 6 of this newsletter) – half owned by 20 individual forest landowners and the other half owned by Plum Creek Timber Company. The rest of the forestland lost is owned by 150 other nonindustrial private landowners. So foresters from a variety of agencies and companies have sprung into action.

continued on page 7



Wisconsin SAF News is produced quarterly for the members of Wisconsin Society of American Foresters.

Articles and photos are welcomed. Submit them to Kirsten.Held@dnr.state.wi.us. The deadline for the next issue is August 30, 2005.

Visit Wisconsin SAF online at <http://wisaf.org> and submit updates for the Website to Paul.Pingrey@dnr.state.wi.us

Questions about Wisconsin SAF can be directed to:

Chair John DuPlissis

715-346-4128

Chair-elect Gary Vander Wyst

715-762-4684 ext 130

Chippewa Chapter Chair

Jay Gallagher

715-372-8539

Fox Valley Chapter Chair

Greg Rebman

920-733-1575 ext 117

Midwest WI Chapter Chair

Robert Fisher

608-788-5828

Northeast WI Chapter Chair

John Scott

715-732-7525

Southeast WI Chapter Chair

Julie Peltier

262-670-3404

Southwest WI Chapter Chair

Ray Guries

608-262-0449

WORDS FROM THE CHAIR

SAF's Volunteer Organization Structure Task Force ... Taking a look at our future

By John DuPlissis

"Although enhancing structural effectiveness is the Volunteer Organization Structure Task Force's (VOS TF) main goal, we believe it is essential to recognize that the forestry profession and the scope and complexity of forest resource management are undergoing the most profound changes in scope in its history."

This is the opening sentence from the Volunteer Organization Structure Task Force Report. The VOS Task Force was commissioned by SAF's Council in 2003 to examine SAF's structure and the way we function. According to SAF President John Helms *"The timing of the Report couldn't be better. The profession of forestry is undergoing substantial change. Societal and landowner expectations and values associated with forest lands are increasingly diverse."* The purpose of this report is to encourage a Society-wide conversation on what we do, how best to do it, and whether a structural change in our organization would enable us to function better or as the authors of the report put it, *"If we were to create the SAF today, what would it look like?"*

Among the 15 recommendations in this report from the Task Force to the SAF Council are:

- The creation of a Regional House of Society Delegates (RHSD) with a chair that is elected from the members of the RHSD. While the tasks of this RHSD chair have not yet been delineated, their tasks may include organizing regional conferences and assisting the Regional Council Representative with their task of "carrying all concerns, issues and recommendations from the RHSD to Council for deliberation, consideration, discussion, or action as appropriate."
- Expanded role for student members of the Society including
 - o Student representation on the RHSD
 - o Council Student Representative added to the SAF Council as a non-voting member.
 - o National Student Congress be established to replace the present National Student Assembly.

- The concept of the Forest Science and Technology Board be expanded and renamed the national Science Committee
- SAF "working groups" be changed to "interest groups" in order to preserve the integrity of existing functional working groups and to enhance the probability of greater success in the future.

You can view the report in its entirety on SAF's website at www.safnet.org/who/VOS1204.pdf or you can request a copy from the National Office.

SAF Council is encouraging all state societies, working groups, and individual members to take some time to look through this report and to discuss the recommendations from the Task Force. SAF's Council, which has responsibility for acting on the Report, wants to hear from all segments of the Society prior to taking action later this year at its December meeting. At that time each recommendation will be considered separately and different changes or alternative approaches may be identified based on member suggestions.

According to President Helms *"Our collective goal is to ensure that SAF is a dynamic, effective organization that stimulates and involves all members and enhances our profession. We must strengthen the voice of our members, reinforce our foundation on science, and create a Society that is viewed as a 'must join' organization by all forestry professionals, especially students."*

I would like to encourage each member of the Wisconsin Society to take some time to look through this report. It contains excellent information about the current status of the Society of American Foresters as well a complete discussion of the recommendations and the reasoning behind each. Each Chapter is encouraged to take some time at your next business meeting to discuss this report. Each member is welcome to send comments directly to me or you can post your comments online at a special webpage that National has established to facilitate a conversation on the report. Look for "VOS Comments" in the Members Only section of the national SAF website (www.safnet.org). Use your SAF membership number as the Username and your last name (with the first letter capitalized) as the password to get in.

CHAPTER REPORTS

Northeast

By David Czysz

NE chapter sponsored tree plantings at four Habitat for Humanity homes in Wasuau on May 24 and one in Land O' Lakes area on May 26. The trees and shrubs were donated by Tim Gutsch at Great Lakes Nursery in Gleason and Clear View Nursery in Rothschild. The project was spearheaded by Bill Klase with the cooperation Tom Lovelin in Wasuau and Larry Stevens in Eagle River. Other workers were Doug Brown, Dave Czysz, Brian Spencer, John Gagnon and Dale Rine.

Our spring meeting on June 16, titled "It's All About Aspen", will be a field trip to look at some innovative management of aspen on the state forest near the Willow Flowage and Oneida County Forest near Nokomis. A summer picnic is planned for Saturday, August 23. The tentative site is at the Silver Lake Park near Laona in Forest County. We will have a cook out and possible fishing and horseshoe tournaments. There is a golf course next door. Look for more information about both events on the Wisconsin SAF web site.

The fall meeting is scheduled for December 8. The proposed topic is the new DNR Hardwood Management Guidelines that will be coming out soon. We hope to explore some of the changes/additions to the guidelines. Watch the web site for more details.

Below: Tom Lovlien talks with the news media about the Northeast Chapter Habitat for Humanity tree planting. Right: Dave Czysz, Larry Stevens and John Gagnon plant one of the trees.



Southeast

By Julie Peltier

The fall statewide meeting went well. Having the hotel change their name a week prior to the meeting made for an interesting topic. More than one person said, "oh gee-whiz" when they could not find the Country Inn Hotel and Conference Center. But everyone found the place without too much confusion. Sixty-eight people registered for the session. The chapter even made a little money and \$578.00 was made and donated to the Foresters' Fund.

The most recent chapter meeting was held at Mader's on February 10th. Jeff Kante has agreed to serve as chair-elect with the stipulation that he has lots of assistance from the rest of the chapter next year.

The chapter members present thought it would be a good idea to assist with Ag-Venture Day (Kids' Day) at the state fair again if the state communications committee is willing to be the primary contact. Members present at the meeting who assisted with Ag-Venture last year said they had a nice time visiting with the kids and answering questions.

The next chapter meeting is June 16 at the Mineshaft in Hartford. Spouses and significant others also invited. A discussion on state forest certification with a possible tour of the Northern Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest may be in July or August. Tentative chapter meeting in late October with the date, place and time to be determined.



COMMITTEE REPORTS

Communications

By Jim Kerkman

WSAF will host a booth during Childrens' Day (August 9) at the Wisconsin State Fair. This will be the second year the Communications Committee and the Southeast Chapter are partnering to provide forestry information to fair goers. The day long AgVenture program is designed to bring children in contact with the agriculture industry through "hands on" exhibits. Last year the coliseum was filled with displays from many agriculture industries. In addition to live animals, there was information about ag crops and equipment.

The WSAF booth will be similar to last year with a display featuring forest products, forest insects and handouts on forestry. The children will have the opportunity to color drawings of tree leaves and make buttons from the drawings.

If you would like to help staff the booth you can call Jim Kerkman at 608-388-2102 or Julie Peltier at 262-670-3404. If you are planning to be at the State Fair on August 9th, stop by and visit us.

Membership

By Dave Czysz

National SAF Membership

April 2005	April 2004	April 2003
15,976	16,606	17,229

Wisconsin Membership

April 2005	April 2004	April 2003
520	521	515

New Members

We welcome the following new and transfer members to WSAF since the last newsletter.

Chippewa Chapter:

Nancy Lynn Wilson, Andy Branch, Any Harder, Jeanne Higgins

Fox Valley Chapter

Christopher Plzak, Lucas Schmidt, Gerold Grosenick

Mid Wisconsin Chapter:

Erik Olson

The state society has 10 scale sticks available for members to use in forestry education and outreach projects. Each stick is a combination Merritt hypsometer, Biltmore stick, ruler, tree scale stick (Scribner rule) and log scale stick (Scribner rule).

WSAF bought the sticks to help with the Wisconsin Science Olympiad competition at UW-Stout. The competition challenged the best science students from around the state in their understanding of math and science. The forestry exam consisted of questions about the identification and ecology of important tree species in Wisconsin along with the economics and management of the forest. The scale sticks were needed to let the students estimate board feet in a standing tree. Information on the Wisconsin Science Olympiad can be found at:
<http://wisconsinso.uwstout.edu/>.

If anyone is interested in using the scale sticks, contact Jim Kerkman at 608-388-2102. Please ask far enough in advance so a convenient method of delivery can be worked out.

Northeast Chapter:

Heather Berklund, Chad Gottbeheit, Ryan Severson, Gordy Mouw, William O'Brion, George Stolze Jr.

Southeast Chapter:

Paul Strong

Southwest Chapter:

Renae Paulson

UW – Stevens Point:

Peter Erlandson, Thomas Lentz, Zach Engelking, Adam Felts, Troy Kuehn, Joshua Lehnen, Dustin Summer, Nathaneil Runke, Robby Teske, Matthew Schultz, Jesse Sebero, Lucas Vold, John Wendorski, Lars Helleolid, Marc Marshall, Dan Reynolds, Sam Williams

UW-Madison:

Rebecca Gass, Nathan Kraftcheck, Kaitlin Schott



Awards Committee

By Paul DeLong

The John Macon Award is unique to our state and recognizes an outstanding member from the Wisconsin Society of American Foresters for their outstanding contributions to forestry in Wisconsin. The award, established in 1979, is funded by an endowment from the estate of John W. Macon, a former Timberlands Manager for Consolidated Papers.

A listing of past recipients is included below. Note the high caliber of past award recipients. We certainly have a number of other high caliber members that also deserve recognition. Please take the time to nominate someone you believe is worthy of this honor.

To nominate someone for this award, you need to send to Paul DeLong, State Awards Chair, a biographical sketch of the individual and the reason why you're nominating them for the award. Nominations need to be submitted by December 31, 2005. The sketch should outline the career of the nominee and anything else that will help distinguish him or her for the award. Once the recipient is chosen, a plaque and certificate will be presented at the Spring 2006 statewide meeting.

Past recipients of the John Macon Award

1981	Bill Sylvester
1982	Bob Petry
1983	Frank Fixmer
1984	Jay Cravens
1985	Ralph Swanson
1986	Milton Reinke
1987	—
1988	James Hovind
1989	—
1990	—
1991	John Seaman
1992	—
1993	Christy Hauge
1994	—
1995	—
1996	Al Nelson
1997	Charlie Higgs
1998	Al Barden
1999	John Kotar
2000	John Grosman
2001	—
2002	Miles Benson
2003	—
2004	Gene Francisco
2005	It's up to you!

Francisco Receives Macon Award

The 2004 John Macon Award was presented to Gene Francisco. Gene was proud of being a "dirt forester" but he also made an impact in the forest policy arena in his leadership positions. In presenting the award, Wisconsin SAF Chair John DuPlissis said, "Wisconsin's forests will reflect Gene Francisco's work for decades to come because 'it is what is accomplished on the ground that matters' as Gene would often say."

Before retiring from his post as Wisconsin's Chief State Forester in 2003, Gene held a number of positions during his 34-year career with the state's forestry program. He earned his bachelor's degree in forestry from Michigan Tech in 1968. Gene started as a fire dispatcher in Mercer, moved to Antigo for a forester/ranger position and then moved up to a forestry supervisory position in Oshkosh before moving to Madison as Deputy Bureau Director in 1990. He was appointed State Forester in 1998.

Gene galvanized support behind the concepts of sustainable forestry and broadened the dialogue to include everyone in the forestry community. Gene believed that professional foresters must team with professional loggers to enable us to be most effective in on-the-ground forest management. His belief in developing the logging profession continues as he helps lead the WI Professional Loggers Association.

Gene helped bring forestry issues to the forefront within the DNR, in the media and in the legislature. The DNR forestry program became a Division under his leadership. He presented a vision of forestry that held forestry as part of the solution to environmental, economic and social problems. He helped lead the codification of a Wisconsin Council on Forestry to represent broad interests and advise the Governor about critical forestry issues.

Protecting Wisconsin's working forests was among Gene's top concerns. To this end, he increased private forestry field staff and support for fire management as well as strengthening the partnership with the consulting forestry community in the state. He also helped lead the creation of the Peshtigo River State Forest, Vernon County Forest and the State's first Forest Legacy easement. He advocated for the sustainable management of Wisconsin's forests in innumerable ways.

Forest Tax Law Program Undergoes Changes

The State's Managed Forest Law (MFL) program has undergone a number of changes recently, many as a result of 2003 Wisconsin Act 228 signed into law by Governor Doyle on April 13, 2004.

For those not familiar with the Managed Forest Law, it is the third program in Wisconsin to encourage good forest stewardship of private forest lands through property tax incentives. Early property tax policy in Wisconsin placed a financial burden on forests that, in many instances, caused the landowners to overcut their timber to pay their tax obligation. The negative effects of this prompted state authorities to enact the Forest Crop Law (FCL) in 1927, with a focus on long-term protection from development and subdivision for larger properties. A second program, the Woodland Tax Law, was established in 1954 to provide a forestry incentive program for owners of farm woodlots not large enough for FCL participation. While present contracts under the FCL will continue until expiration, several years ago the remaining woodlots in the Woodland Tax Law program were rolled into the third program – the Managed Forest Law.

The Managed Forest Law (MFL), established in 1985, remains a very attractive program for forest landowners due to ever increasing property rates and also because of the flexibility and many benefits it offers. Landowners have the option to choose a 25 or 50 year contract period. Enrollment is open to all private landowners owning ten or more acres of woodlands. Today over 29,000 forest landowners, owning more than 2.9 million acres, are enrolled in the FCL and MFL (only the MFL program is open to new enrollments).

Act 228 replaces the former January 31 deadline for new MFL applications with a July 1 deadline (18 months prior to the effective date of entry) for owners of less than 1,000 acres. Beginning in 2006, complete applications submitted with a completed management plan package by May 15 will be considered for entry effective the very next January. This provides an opportunity for landowners to have a shorter period between the application deadline and the effective date of entry if they can supply a completed management plan package.

Some fee changes were also part of the recent MFL updates. Since April 27, 2004 all transfer applications require a \$100 processing fee, all withdrawal application require a \$300 processing fee and the application fee for new MFL applications that are submitted without a management plan increased to \$300. However, if the new application includes an approved management plan, the fee is \$20. The Act also allows for a \$250 non-compliance penalty when an owner fails to carry out mandatory forestry practices covered in the MFL management plan.

Effective January 1, 2005, Act 228 allows anyone entering land into MFL to close up to 160 acres per municipality to public access. The Act also establishes a new formula to calculate MFL rates as well as a waiver for the 5% yield tax on timber harvested from MFL lands for the first five years on new entries.

One of the biggest ways Act 228 changed the program is the requirement that all MFL plans must be prepared by a plan writer certified by DNR or by a DNR forester beginning November 1, 2005. DNR has developed a program and process for certifying plan writers. About 75 Cooperating Foresters have begun the certification process by attending one of seven training sessions held so far. Other certification requirements include submitting two plans for review and approval and being part of the DNR's Cooperating Foresters program. A directory of these foresters is at <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/forestry/Private/Assist/index.htm>

If you have questions about these or other changes to the Managed Forest Law, contact Carol Nielsen (608-266-8019) or Gary Steffen (608-264-6294) in the Forest Tax Section of the DNR-Division of Forestry. Since newsletter space only allowed us to introduce part of the MFL changes, you're invited to read a fact sheet about Wisconsin Act 228 that details all of the changes at http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/forestry/ftax/2003_Wis_Act_228_Fact_Sheet_8-2-04.pdf

If you know of landowners who may be interested in enrolling property into MFL, please refer them to this site for more information about the program <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/forestry/ftax/managed.htm>

Fire: continued from page 1

The DNR Forestry staff is busy answering landowner questions and working on salvage issues, stewardship plans, grant applications and various fire reports and documentation. The Adams County LCD is working on riparian issues in the affected area and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is helping with landowner assistance.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program offers technical and financial assistance to landowners who voluntarily restore wildlife habitat on their land. The agency provides up to 100% funding for restoration to landowners who agree to maintain the restoration for a minimum of ten years.

That program partnered with Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association (WWOA) and the Sand County Foundation to stage a salvage logging and wildlife habitat restoration demonstration project on May 26th. During the demonstration, charred timber planted by forest landowner and WWOA board member Nancy Livingston and her family in the 1950s was salvaged. In the areas where trees were too small to be salvaged, they used a forestry mulcher to grind the standing charred trees. Organizers hope that the management strategies demonstrated on the Livingston property will provide a positive direction for other landowners affected by the fire.

Affected landowners who have merchantable wood are being directed to local DNR foresters Nina Stensberg and Bruce Djupstrom. They are planning a Saturday, June 11th meeting for landowners to provide the following salvage and reforestation information and more.



While the burnt trees can't be utilized for pulpwood, pines larger than 8 inches dbh can be salvaged for bolts. The foresters are hoping that markets for the smaller diameter pines and oak will develop, but at this time there is no economical way to utilize those.

A sign-up for the Wisconsin Forest Landowner Grant Program will help with reforestation of the burned area. The grant will reimburse 65% of the costs of site preparation and reforestation as well as firebreak seeding and other practices for landowners with a minimum of ten acres. Applicants need a Forest Stewardship Plan to be eligible for the grant.

The landowners are being encouraged to plan ahead for reforestation by doing site preparation this year and purchasing seedlings from the state nursery program, the Adams County Land Conservation Department or a private nursery. And the foresters are encouraging the landowners to consider allowing for access lands and firebreaks as they design their planting – a proactive step to help avoid another similar disaster!

Note from the editor: Thanks go to John Schwingel, DNR Forestry Team Leader in Friendship, for providing the content for this article and to DNR Forester Bruce Djupstrom for the photos.



A May 26th demonstration helped landowners who had forests burned in the May 5th Cottonville Fire learn about salvage of their charred timber. The event included a demonstration of a timber mulcher to grind standing charred trees that were too small to be salvaged.

Editor's Note: If you were not at the spring statewide meeting, you missed an excellent training conference titled "Managing for Timber and Wildlife." This was a joint session, held on March 16-17, 2005 in Stevens Point, between the Wisconsin Society of American Foresters (SAF) and the Wisconsin Chapter of The Wildlife Society (TWS). On this page and the next are excerpts from the two keynote addresses - Ron Eckstein for The Wildlife Society and John Kotar for SAF.

Landscape Ecology and Forest Management

By John Kotar

When managing forests as a timber or fiber resource, foresters place most attention on site quality or habitat type, because productivity and successional dynamics (the primary concerns of forest managers) are most strongly affected by physical site properties. Although landscape configuration sometimes affects plant community composition to some extent (e.g. type of seed availability and dispersal), it is usually considered as a minor factor. However, when dealing with other organisms, particularly wide ranging ones, landscape characteristics can be very important. In recent years landscape ecology has emerged as a discipline of its own.

However, it is not always clear what we mean by it, or how and when to apply it to natural resource management. Therefore, a brief look at the evolution of landscape ecology as a discipline, and some of its basic concepts may be useful.

The term "landscape ecology" originated in Germany (Troll 1968). The concept was popular in Europe, but with very different connotation from its current use of the term. It was more closely related to landscape architecture, land use and zoning, than to natural resource management. Until the 1980s practically all literature relating to landscape ecology was in German or Dutch languages. In North America such terms as landscape unit, patch, corridor, and matrix appeared in the vegetation science literature. These terms were most closely associated with fire ecology and landscape restoration efforts. Another concept that strongly influenced the development of landscape ecology, particularly in North America, was "island biogeography" introduced by MacArthur and Wilson in the 1960s. They developed a model that explained the relationships between size of an island and distance from mainland and probability of colonization and rate of extinction of animal species.

Many attempts were made to apply this model to terrestrial animal populations that were isolated by physical or climatic barriers. Over time it became

apparent that this model does not fit most terrestrial situations. The concept of "metapopulation" (set of local populations within some large area where typically migration from one local population to at least some other patches is possible) has since replaced the island biogeography as a framework for discussing landscape fragmentation.

Perhaps the greatest stimulus for the development of landscape ecology as a discipline came from advances in satellite and computer technologies e.g. satellite imagery and geographic information systems (GIS). These technologies facilitate overlaying, spatial statistics and other techniques. Perhaps the main use of these techniques today is to attempt to predict the effects of socioeconomic activities on the environment. However, considerable knowledge has been gained about the role of landscape in population dynamics of many organisms. It has been shown that spatial patterns could affect both the sustainability of populations and the total population size that could be supported.

While the discipline of landscape ecology is clearly providing new knowledge about population dynamics of many species, there are serious obstacles to its application to natural resource management. These obstacles can be summarized as follows:

- Problems with scale – ecological trends and processes operating at one scale do not necessarily transfer to another scale.
- Land ownership patterns – mosaic patterns of ownership do not yield themselves to coordinated management activities.
- Mutually exclusive management goals and objectives – related in part to ownership patterns, but also to a lack of integration methodology. In other words, in manipulating ecosystems, it is difficult to achieve "win-win" situations. Ecosystems are still too complicated for truly holistic management. That is, to manage in a way that one could control all ecosystem components simultaneously.

Forests, Wildlife and People

By Ron Eckstein, DNR Wildlife Biologist

I was asked to address this question: “How can our two societies work together to manage the same resources in ways that meet the goals of both professions?”

Science and education are central themes and management and harvest are central philosophies of both organizations. Core to the SAF is timber harvest. Core to TWS is harvest through hunting and trapping.

However, there are differences. SAF focuses on forests and their favorite public agency is USDA Forest Service. TWS focuses more on wetlands and grasslands (forests are somewhat secondary in importance) and their favorite federal agencies are the farm programs at USDA and USDI Fish & Wildlife Service.

I looked at the position statements at the national level of the SAF and TWS. The position statement is the basic tool used to influence decisions on resource management issues. Of the 60 total position statements of the two societies, 4 or 5 are very close in meaning and 4 or 5 are far apart. One of the closest position statements between the two societies is the one that covers biodiversity. The meanings are almost identical. The SAF position on biodiversity is long and very nice. SAF also has excellent position statements on clearcutting and loss of forest land. There are at least 50 position statements on a wide variety of subjects where the two societies could agree and accept each other's positions.

Given the many common core values and common position statements, how can the two societies influence natural resource decisions? One way would be to influence decision-makers by collaborating on the science and education aspects of our common core philosophies of management and harvest. We could double our effectiveness by having common policy and position statements on the many issues where we agree. We could work together to influence politicians and the media to make sure natural resource discussions are based on sound information. We could support research that gives us the sound, science-based information.

Not all people support our core philosophies of management and harvest. Our two societies do have image problems with the general public. If management and harvest are central philosophies then loggers

and hunters are central constituents. The media can portray loggers and hunters in a way that causes image problems. To repair our image with the general public we must work to convince our core constituents, hunters and loggers, and their organizations, to stay in the middle and not take on “no win” causes. If hunters take on animal rights activists in the media or if loggers take on no harvest activists in the media then the general public perceives hunters on one extreme and animal rights people on the other extreme. Likewise, the general public would perceive loggers on one extreme and anti-harvest people on the other extreme. The problem is hunters and loggers appear to be extremists...just the opposite of their intent. So, I recommend we stay in the middle where we take an approach that is reasonable and leave unreasonableness to the extremes. Hunters must not only value game but also value endangered species and nongame wildlife. Loggers must not only value logging but also value Natural Areas and other areas where timber harvest is restricted.

What about this people thing? I often hear folks from TWS say “the resource comes first”. When we say this we give the impression that people come second and that just makes many people mad. We have to play the semantics game. We must put people first. People do matter most. However, by “people” we mean the common good; we mean the public interest. In that sense, people do come first and we firmly believe that it is in the best interests of “people” that we do a good job of managing and conserving our natural resources.

During this workshop, speakers have identified four big problems in resource management that are of concern to both societies. These problems are:

1. Land parcelization. Management options are severely limited on land held in small ownership parcels. We must work to keep large land ownerships intact.
2. High deer populations severely impact forested ecosystems. We must work to manage deer populations at goals and demand science-based information on deer management issues.
3. Erosion of science-based management. Many decisions in the legislature and stories in the media on resource management are now based on poor or wrong information, and most regrettably, on sometimes purposefully wrong information. We must demand science-based information be used.
4. Uninformed land management. Only 20% of non-industrial private forest landowners make land use decisions with the help of a forester or a resource

TWS - Continued on page 12

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Wisconsin SAF Fall Meeting

“Looking Beyond the Forest Stand: High Conservation Value Forests”

November 1-2, 2005

Chula Vista Conference Center, Wisconsin Dells

Mark your calendar now and plan to attend. This will be an interesting and thought-provoking look at “high conservation value forests” that you won’t want to miss! On day one, expert speakers will define this importance of these forest lands, provide various perspectives on management implications and share case studies highlighting different ecological, social and economic objectives on high conservation value forests. Day two will feature tools for evaluating high conservation value forests and various monitoring programs.

“Sustaining Wisconsin Forests and Woodlands to Strengthen Our Economy”

June 30, 2005; 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.

UW-Baraboo / Sauk County in Baraboo

Meet with key forest stakeholders to learn the latest on Wisconsin forest trends and how to help communities maintain the benefits of their forests for the future. Sponsored by UW-Extension Center for Land Use Education. Featured speakers will be Mark Rickenbach (Assistant Professor in the Department of Forest Ecology and Management at UW-Madison), John Exo (Lower Wisconsin River Basin Educator), and Bobbie Webster from the Center for Land Use Education. For a copy of the registration form, e-mail bwebster@uwsp.edu

“Wisconsin School Forest Summit: Reaching New Heights”

December 1-2, 2005

DC Everest School Forest in Mosinee

A networking and learning opportunity for school forest educators and school administrators from across the state. Session will include speakers on emerging issues, education planning and programs, outdoor education activities and natural resource management. Jeremy Solin, Wisconsin School Forest Education Specialist, says, “If you have a school forest, you won’t want to miss this first-time event!” Please encourage your local school forest leaders to attend. More details are available at <http://www.uwsp.edu/cnr/leaf/sf>

Mark the national SAF meeting on your calendar now and make plans to attend. It will be on October 19-23, 2005 in Fort Worth, Texas!

Fort Worth

Society of American Foresters

TEXAS ROUNDUP
OCTOBER 19-23, 2005

Driving changes in forestry

Wisconsin SAF Assists Two Woodland Owners Conferences



By Will Kiefer

WI SAF and Chippewa Chapter provided funding through the Foresters Fund to co-sponsor two private woodland owners conferences along with the Northwest Chapter of Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association, UW-Extension, WDNR-Division of Forestry and Barron County Woodland Owners Association. Financing was also provided by Johnson Timber Corp., Midwest Forest Products Co., StoraEnso North America, SAPPI Fine Paper, Louisiana Pacific Corp. and Pri-Ru-Ta RC&D.

The attendees rated the two conferences as extremely good. The most popular take-home messages were about the Managed Forest Law (MFL), invasive exotic species and log grading. The most highly rated sessions were timber sale contracts and MFL -- both for beginners and "changes" for those in MFL (see story on page 6). From the evaluation sheets returned and general comments from the attendees, these two conferences were a success.

The goal was to provide family forest owners with the knowledge and tools available to help them manage their forest land and to conduct timber harvests in a sustainable manner.

Landowners in ten northwestern Wisconsin counties with 40 or more acres were targeted. Speakers were public, private and industrial foresters along with a retired DNR wildlife manager, master loggers, hardwood log graders and private woodland owners.

Several SAF members were involved in these conferences which were held April 16th at Rice Lake and April 30th at Hayward. Attendance was good with over 173 private landowners in attendance. All together, there were over 200 people at the two events.





Wisconsin Society of American Foresters
1900 Franklin Street
Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 165
Stevens Point, WI
54481-3897

TWS - Continued from page 9

management plan. We must work to encourage private forest landowners to base their land management decisions on the best possible information.

We need to try to gather information and make land-use decisions based on the larger landscape. This is critical because communities of plants and animals are organized at the landscape scale. So, land management must look at the landscape scale to make informed decisions about resource management at smaller scales. In the upper Great Lakes there are some 350 species of native terrestrial vertebrates. We can not manage them one at a time. What we need to do is insure they all have enough suitable habitat to survive. Each species does best in a somewhat different habitat - from grassland to clearcuts to old growth. So, we need to manage for areas with large-scale pine barrens...with clearcuts...with pole timber...with mature timber...and with old growth. We currently have a lot of the middle (clearcuts through mature forests) but need more on the ends (pine barrens and old growth forests).

I'll end with two basic rules for managing forests to benefit wildlife:

1. Composition: Whenever possible, and it is sometimes not possible, but whenever possible, manage for the maximum tree species diversity. Worry about rare and uncommon trees in stands and think about the conifer component in deciduous stands.
2. Structure: Whenever possible, and it is sometimes not possible, but whenever possible, manage for a complex vegetative structure. Manage for reserve trees in clearcuts (oak, white pine). Manage for many levels of vegetation in northern hardwood stands (seedling, sapling, mid-canopy, canopy, and super canopy) and manage for snags and den trees. How many snag and den trees are enough? The answer is just as many as you can...keeping in mind operator safety, disease, and overall productivity (big snag and den trees are better than small trees).