

Private Lands Management Team

Minutes from February 10, 2015

Schmeckle Reserve, Stevens Point

Not in attendance: Drew Feldkirchner and Ron Gropp

Chris Martin in attendance instead of Ron Gropp

- Agenda Repair—
  - Took out #7 “life of a stand” definition
  - If time at the end of the meeting at “northern long-eared bat”
  
- 1. Update on MFL Task Efficiency Concept #1: Informational purposes and provide comments at this time for FOT to consider
  - Comments/concerns:
    - Clarified Supervisors need to approve if all the bullet points met then go into the field
    - Discussed item #5—communicate early on
    - Who is a DNR reviewer?
      - Concerned raised that a person with a Forestry degree should be reviewing a cutting notice.
        - This would mean no Technicians and Area Specialists, if no forestry degree
        - Discussed generally a technician’s role in DNR.
        - To meet certification standards, a DNR Technician must be tree farm inspectors.
        - General theme: manage the forest as a resource overall
        - **Recommended** REVISION: remove “DNR Reviewer” and mention forestry degree
    - “Strive to get to an approvable notice within 30 days.”
      - Intent—approve as soon as possible
      - Goal to approve in 30 days; we do not want things to sit for 30 days.
      - Should this statement match manual code?
      - **Recommended**: consider making this statement match manual code or at least have the same “theme.”
    - **PLMT agreed/recommended with these themes being added to the concept language: Sentences and/or statement on document— Field review is expected**

**to be completed unless all the criteria are met listed below. Also, if landowner makes a request, then a field forester should be able to do a field review. (Goal of this statement is to make sure we have communication and education of landowner.) Another situation that should be addressed is a new forester getting time in the field to build relationships.**

- PLMT feels addressing these priorities should be discussed at FOT.
  - What does time in the field involve was discussed?
    - Do you need to take plots?
    - What should be documented in the field?
  - Discussion that the TE concepts are all folded in together. PLMT would like to see a reference to when a review is done there is written documentation. This could be a place to add into the TE selection tool, if this tool gets approved.
  - Suggestion: Work with a co-worker if a question about a cutting notices.
  - Compare version of TE 1 concept PLMT reviewed in Nov and difference in current document
    - Discussion about #3 on TE Concept 1 document—Is the language after the first sentence appropriate in this third number?
      - Covered in 6. The language is not needed to place.
      - Discussion if this should be reiterated in Private Forestry Handbook.
    - Discussion about two list being better than one.
  - Recommended: Communicate this list with partners-internal and external.
2. Update on MFL Task Efficiency Concept #5: Carol presented summary
- Keep everything in ch. 20.
  - Appendices are referenced where needed
  - Carol talked with authors of CN Videos. There is not much more to add, but Carol added in a reference to videos.
    - She did add information about dealing with “lump sum” sales. This is in the videos as well.
  - PLMT approved the information presented.
  - Next steps: go through guidance team; plan for FOT to electronically
3. Cooperating Forester Renewal Process proposed: Chris Martin presented.
- Reviewed documents on this item.
  - Nancy question: Coop in one firm and moves to another—these individuals would not have to serve the 12 months of not entering into another agreement.
    - Fred had the same question.

- We allow someone to shift to a different firm.
    - Carol this happen occasionally, but often.
  - Questions raised: CPW and effect on CPW status if lose cooperating forester status no longer CPW
    - Nina had a comment about this to provide Ron.
    - Others agreed.
    - Put this information up front because important issue and it applies to all the reasons that if someone is no longer a cooperating forester then they can no longer be a CPW.
      - Recommended location: item above item #2 on page 2. Before #3 “All reports are due on or before July 1”
      - Statement just needs to be clear that it applies to all situations.
    - There will be discussion of this and the DRP at the coop forester meeting in March and a listening/comment booth potentially.
  - Dispute resolution statement in yellow:
    - Chris this statement is a clarification that DRP not used for administration of coop forester program (e.g. education requirements.)
    - Add in word “landowner before compliance” to help clarify the situation.
    - Coop Sub-team is in agreement on this item as well as coop forester agreement changes.
4. Cooperating Forester Training Needs Assessment Chris presented the results of a training needs assessment survey Ron sent to Cooperating Foresters.
- Recommendation to share with SFA and WCF (others concur); use to help design topics and agendas for SFA and cooperating forester meeting.
  - Discussion about training needs for coop foresters and depending on the level of their experiences.
  - Share with all coop. foresters
  - Share with FOT.
  - Share with University wide and technical colleges—Stevens Pt, Madison, extension, etc.
  - Survey could be sent to DNR Foresters too—recommendation for a future item
    - This would allow us to find cross-training.
  - Share with Sue C.
  - Still need to id the right person to work on the task of gauging training needs of DNR FRS.

5. Cutting notice website presented by Dennis
  - Members are directed to review the site and provide feedback to Kristin by [February 13](#).
  - The team building this is going to run the site by some landowners and industry folks to get their thoughts on the site before it goes live. Members are asked to send Kristin names of folks who would be good candidates for reviewing the site.
  - The group recommends that language be included about recommending that landowners utilize a cooperating forester in regards to filling out the cutting notice.
  - The development team will meet again in May to review the feedback and have a report for PLMT at the May meeting.
  
6. Identify leaders/co-leaders for PLMT Work Plan items
  - 1.a. Work Plan items related to Strategic Direction
    - PF-2 will be led by Ron Gropp
    - PF-3 FY15 step 1 (see below) Dennis Hutchison, lead
    - PF-3 FY15 step 2 Identify priority areas for use in targeted NIPF E&O campaigns (focused efforts) **hold off or drop from PLMT work plan**. A second project is started in Lake Superior basin (Lake Superior Landscape Restoration Partnership) and results of budget request for funding unknown.
    - PF-5 FY15 Step 1 – Develop a process for setting priorities based on Strategic Direction and resource needs using the flexibility provided in 2013 WFLGP rule changes including buckets of funding by practice(s), variable (%) rates or a combination. **Kris Wimme, lead**.
    - PF-5 FY15 Step 2 – Develop a process for periodic review/revision of WFLGP not-to-exceed rates for components. **Tom Piikkila, lead** and Cathy Burrow can help with current numbers.
  
  1. b. Full review of WFLGP **on hold until PF-5 FY15 step 2** is completed
  
  1. c. Develop a forester tool kit – **not assigned**
  
  1. d. Update Forestry Assistance Locator – **Ron Gropp and Chris Martin, co-lead**
  
  2. a. Establish a consistent/efficient process for incorporating changes for the handbooks this team is responsible for. **On hold**
  
  2. b. Develop sample consultant forester contract (or guidance on what to include in a contract) similar to the sample timber sale contract. Consider what is already available in existing publications (e.g., UW-Extension Forestry Fact #75 Hiring a Consultant Forester and Forestry Fact #105 How to Hire a Contractor for Land Management Activities). **Bill Klase, lead**

7. WFLGP funding for management plans
  - Agreed that this should be considered as the team works on PF-5 step 1 above (Kris Wimme, lead).
  
8. Strategic Direction PF-3 FY15 Step 1 - Develop and share list of all partners providing services to private landowners
  - PLMT believes that many local offices have these lists already. PLMT recommends the creation of a template of agencies/partners that DNR Foresters should look into finding and getting to know. Local representatives of resource providing agencies/entities including but not limited to: FSA, NRCS, DNR staff (forest industry support, wildlife, water resources, etc.), WWOA, land trusts, county staff, etc.
  - Some counties maintain a resources list on their websites, and that may be a place to find all these resources easily.
  - This list would not include fee-for-service/vendor entities like loggers, tree planters, etc., and could include those resources that are appropriate for each locale.
  - Carol will run this idea by leadership for their blessing, and PLMT will work to get this on FOT agenda for their review.