

**From:** j treu [Jeff Treu]

**Sent:** Friday, May 02, 2014 8:08 PM

**To:** Wyatt, Laura A - DNR; Witthun, Olivia J - DNR

**Subject:** RE: Response requested\_DNR Div of Forestry Education & Outreach Strategic Plan, comments due May 20th

**Importance:** High

Hello Laura, Olivia,

I reviewed the attachment you sent and came up with some thoughts as attached. I hope they are helpful to you and if I wasn't clear enough on any of the points, please feel free to contact me. I didn't read the whole report, but I did look at much of the content.

Keep safe, Jeff

\*[attachment with comments provided by Jeff Treu]

Private forestry: (P12)

Do foresters who are conducting management plans on state or private lands reach out to adjacent property owners to engage them in planting and harvesting in conjunction with operations on the adjacent lands? This would seem like an ideal time to engage non-participants to join in on combined management opportunities. I realize they would need to reach out and communicate more to educate non-participating property owners, but it would be a great opportunity to get more bang for the buck on a larger management operation.

Urban Forestry: (P13)

The partners should be expanded upon. Who are the current and intended partners?

The Urban Forestry Program works **through partners** to provide education and outreach to the landowner audience.

Reforestation Program: (P15)

When the youth are engaged with the seedling program, "Right Tree in the Right Place" concept should be emphasized along with the need to prune and maintain trees (Not just planting trees).

Urban Forestry (P20)

To help achieve this, the DNR's Community Tree Management Institute (CTMI) should be continued. It may be mentioned later in the report, but I didn't see it yet. **(If increased outreach is considered, the program could be expanded to include elected officials in a separate. They have more influence of local budgets)**

Arbor day future recommendations (P34)

Urban partners could be solicited to participate in media event or public service advertisements to show their partnerships Municipal/Utility/Commercial Arborists could all participate and show a united front educating the public.

Urban Forestry (P92) Logic Model The following sentence is crossed out in the Logic Model. Should it be crossed out?

~~The Division will increase investment to help create and support a statewide inventory and assessment of the urban forests of Wisconsin to provide best available data for program planning and prioritization of efforts. (UF-4)~~

If the Division plans to decrease investment in outreach and education, how much will that impact the actual programs that we now value?

- ~~The Division will decrease investment in outreach and education initiatives.~~ The Division will focus on partnerships that can provide services and tools to local governments

**From:** Don Merkes

**Sent:** Friday, May 09, 2014 4:30 PM

**To:** Wyatt, Laura A - DNR

**Subject:** Re: Response requested\_DNR Div of Forestry Education & Outreach Strategic Plan, comments due May 20th

Laura,

the report reads well and has a clear mission

Its good that it is looking to have measurable outcomes, and looking for educating the next generation

I also believe that the section on elected officials is important, our officials are generally supportive however it is after much belabored educational efforts and one on one talk

Don

**From:** [Schuller, Susan](#)  
**To:** [Diebel, Rebecca J - DNR](#)  
**Cc:** [Robinson Klug, Colleen B - DNR](#); [Held, Kirsten L - DNR](#); [Solin, Jeremy](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Review requested: Div of Forestry Education & Outreach Strategic Plan, comments due May 20th  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 2:35:10 PM  
**Attachments:** [Div of Forestry EO Strategic Plan April 2014 prog guidance review-LEAFComments.pdf](#)

---

Hello Rebecca,

LEAF reviewed and discussed the division's report. We are really excited to see a document like this that can help everyone better understand each other's roles. We have just a few comments/suggested changes. I summarized them here and marked changes in the document attached.

Page 37 – Typo in first paragraph under “Recommendation” and change bullet four under LEAF/PLT partner role with the DNR. Replace with “Upon receiving a request from a school or teacher, refer to the decision tree. When in doubt, refer the teacher directly to LEAF staff or contact LEAF staff to address the request.”

Page 38 – Please define “forest team.” Who are the ‘forest teams?’ How many people make up a forestry team? Where are they located? How many teams are there statewide?”

Page 46 – Include a LEAF representative as a potential standing team member instead of being included on an “as needed” basis.

Page 96 – In the Youth Logic Model – say LEAF “Program” instead of lessons.

Please contact me if you would like to discuss any of these suggested changes.

Thank you,

*Susan Schuller*

LEAF

Program Coordinator

WI Center for Environmental Education

Office Phone: 715-346-4150

Cell: 715-340-4877

Web: [www.uwsp.edu/wcee](http://www.uwsp.edu/wcee)



Date: 22 May 2014

From: Mark Rickenbach, Professor & Extension Specialist

To: Rebecca Diebel, WDNR-Division of Forestry

RE: Review of Division of Forestry, Education & Outreach Strategic Plan

Thank for the opportunity to review the Division's Education and Outreach Strategic Plan. It is encouraging that the Division recognizes and strategizes with respect to the educational arena, wrestles with logic models, and defines measurable impacts. To help the Division think through its activities in this area, I would offer the following three broad comments for consideration.

**Maintain and increase:** While there is a near limitless demand for education and outreach, the document does little to articulate a strategic focus to the Division's activities moving forward. I constructed a matrix of the audiences and the key service units within the Division (see attachment). In all cases, where future commitments are specified, it is either to maintain (11 times) or increase (17 times) support. Moreover, my review indicates that the only possible program that *might* face cuts is the "Big Trees Inventory." *Is this realistic? Does the Division have the capacity moving forward to effectively meet such goals?* Strategy is as much about saying what an organization won't do as it is about what it will. *How will programs prioritize audiences?* For example, Reforestation, Urban Forest Protection, Reforestation, and Urban Forestry each plan to increase effort for three or more audiences. A more strategic perspective, particularly selection criteria (i.e., guiding principles), is warranted.

**Reforestation as marketing:** While there may be many worthy educational goals associated with reforestation, "...greater seedling sales to more landowners" is not among them. Education and outreach is not a marketing strategy to boost sales. Those seeking to boost sales should develop a marketing strategy that reflects it's overall business plan and long-term solvency. *Without a realistic market analysis, any effort to increase sales will flounder because it doesn't recognize and account for the real market factors that drive sales.* If demand isn't there, no amount of education will increase sales.

**(Financial) partnership:** In the "working with partners" section, the emphasis appears to be on those with which the Division has a supporting financial role. Yet, in reviewing the logic models and other parts of the document, there are both explicit and implicit references to other, non-financial partners. An in-depth treatment of all potential partnerships is likely out-of-scope. However, some discussion of other partners and guiding principles for engaging them is needed. Currently, the plan suggests that only a limited of number of partnerships are essential, which sends a strong signal to others.

Lastly, I reviewed several of the logic models at the back of the document and they vary in depth and refinement. This is understandable for a first time round, but this is an area where the partners noted above could greatly contribute to helping the Division think through what is viable and likely to have the desired impact.

If you have any questions or would like additional feedback, please contact me.

---

**Forest and Wildlife Ecology**

Russell Laboratories University of Wisconsin-Madison 1630 Linden Drive Madison, WI 53706  
608-225-2477 — mgrickenbach@wisc.edu — <http://notcountingtrees.org>

Attachment -- Level of effort associated with key Division audiences by Division unit ('=' = maintain; '+' = increase)

<b>Program</b>	<b>Audiences</b>						
	Landowners	Youth	Industry	Professionals	Electees	Fire Depts	Recreationalists
HEALTH	=		=	=	=		+
PROTECTION	+	=		=	+	+	+
REFOREST	+	+		+			
PRIVATE	+			+			
STATE LANDS	=			=	=	=	+
URBAN	+		+	+	+		
PRODUCTS			+	=	+		

Prepared by Mark Rickenbach, based on text in plan.



# Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association, Inc.

P.O. Box 285, Stevens Point, WI 54481-0285

[www.wisconsinwoodlands.org](http://www.wisconsinwoodlands.org)



May 20, 2014

WVOA OFFICE  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Nancy C. Bozek  
P.O. Box 285  
Stevens Point, WI 54481  
715-346-4798  
[wwoa@uwsp.edu](mailto:wwoa@uwsp.edu)

WVOA OFFICERS  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
2013-2014

PRESIDENT  
Charles R. Wagner  
E1934 Cty. Rd. S  
Luxemburg, WI 54217  
920-837-7712  
[wagnerc50@yahoo.com](mailto:wagnerc50@yahoo.com)

VICE PRESIDENT  
Jan L. Lehrer  
N10811 Co. Hwy. P  
Iola, WI 54945  
715-677-3850  
[leejlehrer@wi-net.com](mailto:leejlehrer@wi-net.com)

SECRETARY  
Marilyn Steele  
P.O. Box 1758  
Valparaiso, IN 46384  
219-462-6421  
[msteelelrn@comcast.net](mailto:msteelelrn@comcast.net)

TREASURER  
Arlene Roehl  
159 Lakeview Ave.  
Long Lake, MN 55356  
952-473-3036  
[arcpliance@bigplanet.com](mailto:arcpliance@bigplanet.com)

DIRECTORS  
Joe Arington  
2935 Evergreen Dr.  
Cambridge, WI 53523  
608-575-9673  
[joe@aringtontreefarm.com](mailto:joe@aringtontreefarm.com)

David Congos  
N51562 Harriman Rd.  
Osseo, WI 54758  
715-597-2272  
[dlcongoss49@gmail.com](mailto:dlcongoss49@gmail.com)

Paul Kienitz  
500 S. Center Avenue  
Merrill, WI 54452  
715-536-6823  
[paul.kienitz@riversideathletic.com](mailto:paul.kienitz@riversideathletic.com)

Steven Raether  
4530 CTH K  
Chippewa Falls, WI 54729  
715-723-9736  
[raethertrees@gmail.com](mailto:raethertrees@gmail.com)

Steven J. Ring  
W7004 Detention Rd.  
Shiocton, WI 54170  
920-735-9702  
[sring@utilityssi.com](mailto:sring@utilityssi.com)

Richard Wagner  
E5861 Clark St.  
Weyauwega, WI 54983  
715-281-7032  
[richardwagner@centrytel.net](mailto:richardwagner@centrytel.net)

Randy Williams  
N1896 Cozy Lane  
Antigo, WI 54409  
715-623-5660  
[willir2456@gmail.com](mailto:willir2456@gmail.com)

Rebecca Diebel  
WI DNR  
[rebecca.diebel@wi.gov](mailto:rebecca.diebel@wi.gov)

Dear Rebecca,

The Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Division of Forestry's Education & Outreach Strategic Plan. The Division obviously spent significant time and resources developing this proposed plan.

As the document states, the Division felt this "work demanded a separate focus and period of time to strategically plan." and "the plan focuses mainly on internal efforts and strategy." with very limited input from forest community partners. It also states, "Future planning steps include working with partners on how best to implement this plan in coordination with their education and outreach efforts."

In reviewing the document provided, it is disappointing to note that there isn't much of substance to provide comments on. We note that the Division's Strategic Plan was completed in 2011 with data from 2008-10. We wonder how many more years will it be before the implementation plan is created and acted upon?

Here are some of our concerns with the document:

- The vision statement does not even mention Wisconsin's landowners - woodland owners, farmers, and other property owners - who own and manage the trees and forests.
- The Division challenges discussed at the beginning of the document are significant.
- What is the definition of a "Landowner"?
- When listing programs that identify Landowners as one of their primary audiences we question:
  - Why forest health efforts will just be maintained when studies have shown that forest health is an important way to reach and encourage more landowners to become active managers of their woodlands?
  - Why the "unengaged landowner" is defined as someone who has not contacted the WI DNR?
  - Why does Private Forestry only focus on the unengaged landowners? There is no mention of continuing to educate active landowners on the newest scientific information so that their forest management practices will continue to be sustainable. Transfer of updated scientific information to the landowner is vital.

- In the proposed plan, there is very limited discussion on improving partnerships vs the creation of new expensive initiatives. We believe that if the Division was willing to invest more time and effort in existing partnerships many more engaged and “unengaged” woodland owners could be reached.
- Logic models frequently leave out private woodland owners or existing WWOA partnerships.
- Private Forests strategic direction intent statement says that the Division will increase investments in programs that utilize conservation easements to secure private lands. We note that the Division currently provides Gathering Waters with \$80,000/year in their annual budget (this is not mentioned anywhere in this document). This is far more than it provides to any other conservation organization annually. WWOA members have repeated told us that they do not support conservation easements because they “tie the hands of the next generation.” WWOA does not support increasing Division investments in this program.
- Private Forests strategic direction intent statement says that the Division will refocus financial incentive programs away from woodland owners participating in the MFL program to requesting assistance with management practices and those who currently do not receive professional assistance. WWOA does not support giving priority to landowners based on whether or not they are in the MFL program.

We appreciate the work the Division put into this document and the logic models. We hope that future plans will do more to enhance existing partnerships and current outreach and educational efforts that could be greatly improved with more consistent financial and staff support by the Division.

Sincerely,



Nancy C. Bozek  
Executive Director



## Diebel, Rebecca J - DNR

---

Sloan

**From:** Ken & Laurel [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 30, 2014 1:15 PM  
**To:** Diebel, Rebecca J - DNR  
**Cc:** thesloans  
**Subject:** Comments: Division of Forestry Education & Outreach Strategic Plan.

Hi Rebecca,

As an OLD retired forester, it was my painful experience last weekend to take the Grandkids to see the new movie **RIO 2**. Yet another slickly done story about "saving our hero from the evil loggers and their money hungry bosses out to destroy their habitat". And they *were* definitely evil, money grubbing dudes. (Loved the part about the big bloody looking X's used to designate the trees for harvest). My grandkids cheered when they finally did them in.

Based on MANY years of watching the cumulative outcome in the propaganda battle, my sense is we are faring about as well as those stalwart individuals in the Ukraine, who, armed with a hard hat and a baseball bat, are taking on the Russian Army.

My senile mind wanders back to my experiences in the "Quality Management" wars....The hardest thing to understand was that "Quality" cannot be added on...it has got to be built in.

Forestry is based on science. It is hard to talk "science" to kids. Ever try to explain "shade tolerance", for example, to an 8 year old? (Like, who cares Dude?), or high school kids - (Sure, this is all very interesting, but will it be on the test?)

These same kids HAVE to take biology, math, history, economics, science, social studies, current events, and other subjects that relate to "forestry" and the role of "sound forest management" as it relates to the environment, human needs, and quality of life. Seems to me we need to figure out specific examples and build them into the larger, on-going learning/awareness gaining processes that currently exist.

I still remember the day I "bought in" to the whole "forestry" deal back in college. We went out and actually measured shoot growth on understory seedlings at various light levels and compared results by light level and species. (remember "shade tolerance?") Kids can do that. It could be a math exercise, or a biology lesson.

How about going around the school room and identifying everything that came from a tree, and figuring out what we could replace it with and what it would cost? As part of an economics class.

How about a discussion about all the peoples homes washed away this summer in the West? How did the forest fires the year before relate? Why did those fires happen? As part of a current events or social studies discussion.

How about declaring a "wood free day" at school. No paper (toilet, or otherwise,), no wood (tables and chairs included), no books....can it be done?

The existing public attitude seems to be: "trees seem to grow by themselves don't they, why should I care about forestry? If we really believe that sound forestry practices are important to the overall human condition, then we should be able articulate specific examples that affect the lives of each particular audience.

I ramble. (Seems like more and more as time goes by) Goes with being a codger. Figure out how to build it in. That's the hard part.

Hang in there,

Ken Sloan.  
Class of 1970