

WFPS Seasonality Accomplishment Report

Topic: Oak Wilt

WFPS Recommendations:

1. Request that the DNR provide training to all DNR foresters, by January 1, 2018, on the changes to the Oak Wilt restrictions and support their implementation. DNR also to make training available to Cooperating Foresters.
2. Request that WCFA provide training to all County foresters, by January 1, 2018, on the changes to the Oak Wilt restrictions and support their implementation.
3. Request that FISTA and WOOA provide similar training for Loggers and Landowners.

WFPS Assignments:

- 8.1 The WDNR Forest Health Team in partnership with the UW-Extension will develop an oak wilt guidelines training program which reviews current guidelines and changes since the previous recommendations. This training should also aid conversations about risks associated with management. It will be open to WDNR Foresters (required), consulting & industrial foresters, and County forestry staff.

Assigned Party: WDNR Forest Health Team/UW-Extension

Estimated Delivery Date: December 2018

Implementation Note: This is meant to address a goal of educating land managers on the cumulative effect of restrictions and barriers on forest management. Though not referenced here, follow up to gauge success will be needed. Note: this training could be delivered in MFL Recertification meetings, regional meetings, webinars, etc. Note: The Team working on this should review the Demchik et al WFPS report or have it presented to them by authors - for background and scale of seasonality topic.

- 8.2 The WDNR Forest Health Team in partnership with the UW-Extension will develop an oak wilt guidelines training program which reviews current guidelines and changes since the previous recommendations. This training should also aid landowner understanding of risks associated with management. It should be open to any attendees.

Assigned Party: WDNR Forest Health Team/UW-Extension

Estimated Delivery Date: December 2018

Implementation Note: Similar to training proposed for foresters and forestry staff, the goal is a better understanding of current oak wilt management guidelines. Note: this training could be delivered in diverse ways (FISTA class, WWOA Statewide Meeting, misc. meetings, webinars, etc.).

Ties to July 2014 WFPS Economically Burdensome Topics:

- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – Oak Wilt

Context

The oak harvesting guidelines were revised in 2015 and implementation began on January 1, 2016. On March 23, 2017, the Oak Harvesting Guidelines (OHG) Advisory Committee met. Among the things asked of the Advisory Committee was how things were going from the field, from their perspective. The main points made by Advisory Committee members related to implementation and training of the guidelines were:

1. Even though it's been a year since implementation, that's still "new" in the forestry world so it hasn't sunk in out in the field yet.
2. We need to do a better job of getting this information out to the loggers.
3. Many public and private foresters aren't comfortable using the exceptions and modifications and just want to err on the side of caution.

One of the follow-up actions from this meeting was for the Forest Health Team to reach out to GLTPA to determine how they could work together to provide more training opportunities for loggers.

Training

Since the guidelines were revised in 2015, over 65 presentations/trainings have been given by DNR Forest Health staff to DNR foresters and external partners. These trainings have included:

2015:

- 3 DNR Forestry

teams 2016:

- 17 presentations to DNR Forestry teams including a session at the Statewide Meeting
- 26 presentations to external partners including SAF/GLTPA, CPW annual refreshers, Kretz Lumber field day, WWOA Central Sands, NE WWOA, NC WWOA, Women of WWOA, Sustainable Forestry Conference, Walnut Council, 6 FISTA trainings, Cooperating Foresters Annual Meeting, WCFA, UMISC, UW-Extension and Learn About Your Land, Forest Service and neighboring states, and the NW Forestry District Annual Partnership Meeting

2017:

- 8 presentations to DNR Forestry teams
- 19 presentations to external partners including Bayfield County Forestry, WWOA, NE WWOA, NW WWOA, Fox Valley Woodland Owners, Monroe County Board, UW Extension, Lake Koshkonong Wetland Association, Hunt Hill Audubon Sanctuary, Long Lake Town Board, WCFA, 3 FISTA trainings, Cooperating Foresters Annual Meeting, Riveredge Nature Center and Douglas County Forestry

2018:

- 1 session for DNR foresters at the Statewide Meeting
- 5 presentations to external partners including Douglas County Forestry, Lake States Lumber Association, Bayfield County Forestry, and NE WWOA
- Two specific oak harvesting guidelines trainings will be offered with FISTA in 2018: 7/17 in Spooner and 8/14 in Waupaca

Training Content:

An OHG presentation was developed for staff that they could then tailor to their specific audience.

The presentation covers:

- Biology of oak wilt
- Guideline revision process
- Guideline provisions that didn't change
- A chapter by chapter summary with the scenarios to include all the exceptions and modifications and how to use them.

Not all of the presentation listed above provided this level of detail, but many did, depending on the ask of coordinating group and audience needs.

Next Steps

1. Evaluate past training content to determine what is still needed
2. Determine what training and information is needed for a technical audience (foresters) versus a general audience (landowners)

3. Work with UWEX to determine what a “training program” could entail
4. Evaluate which mediums are the most effective and cost efficient to deliver the needed information
5. Coordinate with Public Lands Team on their assignment related to prescription writing
6. Develop and implement training programs

WFPS Seasonality Accomplishment Report

Topic: Rutting

WFPS Recommendations:

4. Recommend that research is performed (by University or other) into the ecological effects of rutting and develop new guidelines and rutting definition based on the most recent science. (Perhaps based on soil types).

WFPS Assignments:

- 9.1 The Wisconsin Council on Forestry (COF) will ask The WDNR Division of Forestry to include rutting as a research priority. The COF will also commission a small panel to review current and past research on ecological effects of rutting and the WDNR definition of rutting (i.e. sensitive to the difference between soil disturbance and rutting).

Assigned Party: Wisconsin Council on Forestry

Estimated Delivery Date: December 2018

Implementation Note: This could also benefit from a check in with the WDNR BMP Advisory Committee.

Ties to July 2014 WFPS Economically Burdensome Topics:

- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – Summer vs. Winter
-

Context

Mechanized harvesting operations have long been recognized to potentially cause rutting, among other soil disturbances, such as compaction, during timber harvesting activities. Rutting, one type of soil disturbance, has been shown to negatively affect tree growth causing the DNR to list rutting as a concern on timber sales. One of the ways to reduce the potential for rutting to occur on state lands was for DNR foresters, using their professional judgement, to limit timber harvesting to dry or frozen ground. Historically, there were few guidelines for DNR foresters to follow when it came time to determine whether to restrict sales to dry or frozen ground, and there were no quantifiable guidelines for DNR foresters to follow with regards to halting forestry operations when rutting did occur or when mandating repair.

During the 2004 forest certification audits from *Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)* and *Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)*, state land managers were asked by SFI and FSC auditors what was considered “excessive rutting”. The auditors found that the Department did not have written guidelines regarding what level of soil disturbance that would be considered “acceptable” during forest management activities. This resulted in the state receiving a *Corrective Action Request (CAR)* from FSC and an *Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)* citation from SFI. Because of these citations, the DNR and WCFA worked with the *Wisconsin Professional Loggers Association* and *Timber Producers Association*, while using the most up-to-date published research – to develop quantitative guidelines which defined what would be considered excessive rutting and soil disturbance. By exceeding the thresholds (Table 1), the forester would be required to address the excessive soil disturbance by working with the logger on site.

To ensure that the guidelines for excessive soil disturbance were being adhered to, the Soil Disturbance Study (SDS) was developed to monitor soil disturbance on county and state lands. The SDS was conducted on state lands in 2006 and on both state and county lands in 2011 and 2016. Most recently, the 2016 SDS was published in February 2017 (PUB-FR-705-2017) which goes into the soil disturbance found on state and county lands during the monitoring of 2016.

Infrastructure	Soil disturbance is excessive if:
Roads, Landings, Skid Trails and General Harvest Area	A gully or rut is 6 inches deep or more and is resulting in channelized flow to a wetland, stream or lake
Roads, Landings and Primary Skid Trails	In an RMZ or wetland, a gully or rut is 6 inches deep or more and is 100 feet long or more. In an upland area (outside of RMZ), a gully or rut is 10 inches deep or more and is 66 feet long or more.
Secondary Skid Trails and General Harvest Area	A gully or rut is 6 inches deep or more and is 100 feet long or more.

Table 1. Excessive Soil Disturbance

In addition to the soil disturbance study and the excessive soil disturbance guidelines, the DNR keeps a running record of primary research articles on the multitude of topics relating to soil disturbance and timber harvests. The first list, coined “*rutting white paper*”, was developed in December of 2004 and aided in the establishment of excessive rutting guidelines. This included nine papers ranging from 1985 to 2004. More recently, this *rutting white paper* was expanded to include the years from 2005 to 2013 and added an additional 25 research papers. These papers help keep the Department up to date with the most recent scientific information regarding soil disturbance on timber sales.

For personnel outside of the DNR, the Best Management Practices (BMP) for Water Quality Field Manual (PUB-FR-093-2010) addresses many potential avenues for soil disturbance on timber sales, how to address these concerns, and how to minimize its effects. Along with the BMP Field Manual, landowners are monitored periodically (approximately once every five years) with the results published and made available to the public. The three most recent monitoring reports are regarding monitoring on:

- County and State lands (PUB-FR-555-2015) conducted in 2013
- Federal and Large Landowners (Industrial) lands (PUB-FR-554-2015) conducted in 2014
- Non-Industrial Private Lands (NIPFs) (PUB-FR-605-2016) conducted in 2015

Definitions

A **rut** is an elongated depression caused by the dragging of logs, or from the movement of wheeled or tracked harvesting machinery and equipment. A **gully** is an erosion channel that cuts into the soil, forming a concentration of preferential water flow. Excessive rutting and soil disturbance is defined above in Table 1. and is listed in all Timber Sale Contracts (2400-005) under section 19. In Section 19, purchaser (logger/operator) must take all steps to avoid and minimize soil disturbance and work cooperatively with the Seller (state DNR timber sale administrator) should soil disturbance occur. Also, the purchaser must contact the seller in the event of excessive soil disturbance along with mitigate and repair soil disturbance to the Seller’s satisfaction. If any of these are not met, the performance bond may be used to repair soil disturbance under Section 5. (f)3.

Next Steps

1. Continue monitoring and reporting on Forestry BMPs for Water Quality (County and State lands monitored fall 2018 -report 2019)
2. Conduct FISTA trainings for loggers, foresters, and other resource professionals every year – five 1 day training sessions in different areas of the state during the growing season (April-September)
3. Offer DNR new forester training for DNR staff and County staff in July 2018 on BMPs
4. Update the *rutting white paper* in summer 2018 and any significant findings presented at BMP Advisory Committee Meeting in the fall/winter of 2018
5. Identify specific soil disturbance and rutting research needs to include in the Division of Forestry's 2019-2021 research agenda
6. Coordinate with the Public Lands Team on their assignment related to prescription writing

WFPS Seasonality Accomplishment Report

Topic: Prescription Writing

WFPS Recommendations:

5. Review (DNR?) the resources that are most commonly used when writing timber harvest prescriptions and revise them where appropriate to align with most current guidelines and science - AS WELL AS modify them to avoid being too specific. (i.e. – must make sure these documents do not dictate ‘frozen’ ground – when ‘firm’ or ‘dry’ would also be suitable). It is very important to modify these resources – otherwise – it will be very difficult to drive change.
6. Similar to ‘Oak Wilt’ recommendation - after the Review/Revise from step 1 is complete – then re-train DNR, County and Cooperating Foresters on the changes and the need for flexibility in prescription writing.

WFPS Assignments:

- 10.1 The WDNR Public Lands Specialist Team will review what resources foresters use to determine seasonal restrictions (ex. frozen ground only). The Team will also review the concept of outcome based specifications in order to enhance harvesting flexibility while protecting site productivity.
Assigned Party: WDNR Public Lands Specialist Team
Estimated Delivery Date: March 2018

Implementation Note: The WFPS Implementation Team discussed vetting any modifications through GLTPA and/or including timber producers in review efforts. It also discussed the concept of a contract scorecard based on restrictions to assess impacts of cumulative restrictions. This could be piloted on public or private land.

- 10.2 The WDNR Silviculture Program will review and revise prescription writing as a part of silvicultural training classes. As necessary, WDNR staff will amend training to review the impact of cumulative restrictions on forest management. If possible, it should be offered as a stand-alone class or open to WDNR Foresters, consulting & industrial foresters, and County forestry staff.
Assigned Party: WDNR Silviculture Program
Estimated Delivery Date: June 2018

Implementation Note: See 5.1 for additional considerations in prescription writing training. Training can vary in duration and complexity depending upon context and audience

Ties to July 2014 WFPS Economically Burdensome Workshop Topics:

- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – Summer vs. Winter
- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – Oak Wilt
- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – T&E Species
- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – Leaf-off Restrictions
- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – Recreational Restrictions
- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – Annosum
- MFL Administration – Silvicultural Flexibility
- MFL Administration – Consistency of DNR Forester
- General Harvesting Restrictions – T&E Species Limitations

Context

Two WFPS studies evaluated seasonal restrictions to identify the common types and their effects on the timber industry. The studies looked at the kinds of restrictions and their applications to harvest management, harvest costs, and ecological impacts. In addition, a review and analysis of seasonal restrictions was completed by the Division for SGT in 2015.

Author	Types of Sales	Total Sales with Seasonal Restrictions	Sales with Soil/Water Restrictions	Sales with Access/Transportation Restrictions	Sales with Oak Wilt Restrictions	Sales with T&E Restrictions
Demchik	State, County, Private	67%	44%	18%	18%	8%
Forest Stewards Guild	State, County, Private	95%	35%			
DNR/Herrick	State, County	69%	47%	6%	29%	4%

WI SGT recognized seasonal harvesting restrictions as a priority; however, did not engage on the issue because many of the applicable guidelines are beyond the scope of silviculture.

Resources

The resources used by foresters to evaluate sale conditions and requirements when writing stand prescriptions on public lands are primarily based on WDNR Handbook guidance. Examples are the Timber Sale Handbook (HB2461), WDNR Silvicultural Handbook as well as the BMP Manual for Water Quality, Forest Biomass Harvest Guidelines and other resources such as NHI elemental occurrences, NRCS Soils mapping, property Master Plans specifics, integrated expert consultations and public input.

Currently there is not a checklist of all resources required to consult with for each public land timber sale write up. The formal approval process is designed to review the 2460 and narrative and recommend any sale provision that is necessary or may influence the quality of the timber sale. Public land sale establishment requires a format that is detailed in the Timber Sale Handbook (TSH). Sections in the TSH detail skidding and seasonal restriction considerations as well as aesthetics, water quality, wildlife, and recreational considerations. This is where foresters would cite sale conditions and restrictions.

In cases where road hauling limits were applied, wetland crossings were required to access the sale area, or endangered species are present, restrictions are required. Other times, the application of professional judgement based on experience was cited as a reason that some restrictions were applied. This allows for more flexible application of guidelines; however, the interpretation of the guidelines by prescription writers could vary.

Timber sale establishment training is required of all new DNR foresters and forestry technicians. It is an intensive course that teaches all aspects of the establishment process. Seasonal sale restrictions are specifically addressed in this class and reinforced in others.

Contract enforcement is the follow through for the restriction application on each timber sale. Contract provisions to suspend or continue a sale operation are detailed. Restoration requirements and damage provisions are articulated to ensure the sale special condition details are carried through correctly by sale administrators.

Next Steps

1. Coordinate with the Forest Health, Silviculture, Forest Hydrology, and NHC programs on their assignment related to prescription writing and flexibility in guidelines
2. Identify and evaluate opportunities to increase flexibility in guidelines
3. Evaluate training offerings and curriculum for DNR and county staff and private consulting foresters to ensure flexibilities within guidelines are understood as well as cumulative impacts of guidelines
4. Evaluate feasibility of working with private landowners to increase understanding of effects on restrictions on timber harvests for sale marketability

WFPS Seasonality Accomplishment Report

Topic: Natural Heritage Inventory

WFPS Recommendations:

7. Again – an education (training/communication) is needed on the procedures for compliance in regard to NHI (i.e. If hit exists – still have option to determine if ‘hit’ exists and then have additional option to determine if harvest will impact ‘hit’). We did not specifically ID who provides this training but most likely similar to ‘Oak Wilt’ where it is combination of State, County and FISTA.
8. Request new legislation that mandates a review and update of the NHI & Archeological database. (purpose here was to remove outdated items. Example at the meeting was the ‘glass lizard’ that was seen almost 100 years ago – therefore NHI hit still exists - is that really warranted?)
9. Request new legislation that would allow access to the NHI and Archeological / Historical databases by Cooperating Foresters.
10. Request that a DNR Forester or other forestry professional be assigned as part of the ‘team’ that develops guidelines for NHI hits.

WFPS Assignments:

- 11.1 The WDNR Natural Heritage Conservation Program will review NHI Assessment as a part of WDNR forestry classes. These classes will also be provided to County forestry staff and consulting foresters. As necessary, WDNR staff will alter training to review how to assess hits using the public portal as well as strategies to mitigate hits, in addition to recognizing the impact of cumulative restrictions on forest management.

Assigned Party: WDNR NHC Forestry

Liaison Estimated Delivery Date: March 2018

Implementation Note: Foresters in general need a better handle on how we handle NHI / archeological hits and understanding both how to assess hits using the public portal as well as strategies to mitigate hits.

- 11.2 The WDNR Tax Law NHI Subcommittee will assess options for improving access to The NHI database, what reviews of NHI data have occurred or are occurring, and what role the WI Forestry Community has and should play in this. The review will identify components of the current NHI review process that impact the ability to update and maintain the database and limit user access. If necessary, The WI Council on Forestry, with this review in hand, can assess advocating legislation to address desired efficiencies.

Assigned Party: Wisconsin Council on Forestry, WDNR NHC Forestry Liaison, WDNR Tax Law NHI Subcommittee

Estimated Delivery Date: June 2018

Ties to July 2014 WFPS Economically Burdensome Topics:

- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – T&E Species
- MFL Administration – Approval of Cutting Notices
- General Harvesting Restrictions – T&E Species Limitations

Context

An Endangered Resources Review uses the best available data from within one-mile of a project to evaluate whether 1) there might be rare species present and 2) whether there might be habitat for those species. Most of the state has never been surveyed for rare species, especially private lands, so all available records are utilized when conducting a review. However, NHC has worked to refine the NHI database in several ways to assist foresters in interpreting NHI data and implementing species guidance:

- All “General Precision” records (location of the species known only to a 5-mile radius) have been removed from the NHI Portal – this resulted in hundreds of the oldest records being removed.
- Pre-1970s aquatic records were reviewed by experts and removed and/or revised when appropriate.
- NHC has provided tools and training to allow foresters to determine if they have habitat for the rare species in question – this often avoids unnecessary restrictions.
- Seasonal restrictions related to rare species were dramatically reduced by the development of the Wood Turtle Broad Incidental Take Permit. In addition, Blanding’s turtle was delisted in 2014. These two species were the most reported on cutting notices by the Demchik (2016) study, and the current guidance for both is simply to avoid nesting areas (and these are generally not found in forests).
- A new Karner Blue Butterfly Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) is under development. The new HCP will be streamlined wherever possible to reduce inefficiencies for everyone involved.
- Wisconsin was instrumental in organizing the states to develop proactive recommendations to USFWS for developing the Final 4(d) rule for the northern long-eared bat. The department is now involved in developing an HCP for several bat species. The HCP will be critical in coming years since bat numbers have continued to plummet, and a 4(d) rule will not be an option in the future.
- The program increased the number of Field Ecologists available to provide technical assistance for rare species questions. Often prescriptions are modified and restrictions are lessened through these consultations.
- The department conducts monitoring for some species to provide the most up-to-date information for forestry and other stakeholders. An important example is the bald eagle flights that continue to be done annually to determine whether nests are active since they are protected by federal law.

In general, records are only removed from the NHI Portal in cases where the element was either misidentified or is no longer being tracked. Records (element occurrences or EOs) in the NHI database include a “last observation” field, which indicates the date the element was most recently observed at the site. A record with a “last observation” date of 1955 indicates an element was last recorded at that site in 1955, but it does not mean that the site has been surveyed since 1955 without relocating the species.

ER “Hits” – What does they mean and what to do?

The department works to provide guidance to avoid unnecessary restrictions whenever possible and understands that this a concern. Before conducting endangered resources reviews, DNR staff must attend the Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) Training and pass a 25-question exam with a score of 70% or greater. This training is required every five years per manual code. In 2014, NHC provided an in-person, forestry-specific version of the NHI Training to nearly 250 state and county foresters throughout the state. The NHI training provides information on the NHI data, the state and federal endangered species laws, avoidance measures for various species, and how to conduct a review using the web-based NHI Portal. In the past, NHC has partnered with the Division Forestry to provide additional training on a

variety of topics related to NHI reviews and species guidance to foresters, loggers, consultants, and others.

In response to the WFPS request, NHC and the Division of Forestry will work to identify any remaining training gaps and discuss the best approach for addressing them going forward. Some possible topics include evaluating suitable habitat within the project area, timber sale design, and requirements for Federal vs. State listed species as they are sometimes confused. Possible avenues for delivering additional training include:

- New forester training
- Regional forestry in-services
- Forestry Section & Bureau meetings
- FISTA training sessions
- Topic-based training videos

When is ER Review Required?

Any action that the DNR conducts, funds, or approves and has the potential to impact endangered resources gets reviewed. This includes all activities that require a DNR permit or oversight. For forestry projects, this generally means harvests on state, county, and MFL lands. The Forest Service has their own more involved review process.

Stakeholder Involvement

The Bureau of Natural Heritage Conservation is often called upon to help internal and external stakeholders avoid illegal “take” of listed species and comply with state and federal rare species laws. This is done through written guidance, online tools, and direct consultations. The bureau developed a series of guidance documents following requests from the forestry community and others several years ago. These documents were developed using the best available science and included extensive review including numerous forestry staff within the department and a 21-day public comment period. Further, stakeholders are encouraged to submit additional feedback at any time.

NHC frequently utilizes stakeholder advisory groups in policy and guidance development to ensure that stakeholder concerns are identified and considered. Also, stakeholders provide important technical input in their areas of expertise that are needed to work through possible alternatives. A few examples of participation by the forestry community in NHC guidance development include:

- Development of the Wood Turtle Broad Incidental Take Permit (BITP) – this project included an advisory group with members selected, in part, by the Council on Forestry.
- Development of the American Marten Best Management Practices - a stakeholder advisory committee included all interested forestry partners.
- A new Karner Blue Butterfly HCP is under development and HCP partners, including numerous forestry professionals, will have many opportunities to provide input.
- Forestry partners along with WDNR were active in providing feedback to the FWS for developing the Final 4d rule for northern long-eared bats, and the department participated in and/or facilitated a number of these meetings.
- The three-state HCP being developed for several bat species includes numerous opportunities to provide feedback which is actively solicited through the department website, GovDelivery, and other email lists.

NHI Access

NHC maintains an Endangered Resources Certification Program that allows external (non-DNR) individuals who complete certified reviewer training and get an NHI data sharing agreement to conduct

Proposed ER Reviews. The program requires training and successful completion of an exam demonstrating the skills and knowledge to conduct Proposed ER Reviews under DNR oversight, as well as biennial training updates. The Certification Program is mostly self-funded through fees for certified reviewer training and annual data sharing agreements. The program has submitted several budget initiatives to fund this work over the years, but they have been unsuccessful.

In recent years, the department developed a “Public Portal” that allows public users such as Cooperating Foresters to pre-screen projects. This has greatly facilitated the process of getting information to and from DNR foresters since the system stores the stand boundaries drawn by the cooperator making the review a much quicker process. NHC has continued to make additional upgrades to the portal since then. These upgrades, along with the use of BITPs and other tools, are increasing efficiency and resulting in fewer requests for full reviews.

Next Steps

1. Identify training gaps in current offerings
2. Revise, refine, and/or develop training offerings to address training gaps
3. Continue to solicit involvement from the broader forestry community on NHC-related items

WFPS Seasonality Accomplishment Report

Topic: EAB

WFPS Recommendations:

12. **(Completed)** Request that DATCP implement EAB Quarantine to Waupaca, Waushara and Green Lake counties.
13. Request that EAB transport restrictions are reviewed and modified so that Ash/HW can be hauled from a Quarantined county to a Quarantined County AND pass through non-Quarantined counties with allowance for emergency or refueling stops only in the non-quarantined county.
14. Request that a Cost/Benefit study is performed that evaluates the benefit of not-Quarantining the entire state at this time – vs the potential costs. (i.e. a case study could be done to ID the costs associated with the current county by county approach where EAB is found on opposite ends of major transport corridors – with a non-quarantined county in the middle of that corridor (i.e. Hwy 13, I-29, etc.)

WFPS Assignments:

13.2 Request that EAB transport restrictions are reviewed and modified so that Ash/HW can be hauled from a Quarantined county to a Quarantined County AND pass through non-Quarantined counties with allowance for emergency or refueling stops only in the non-quarantined county

Assigned Party: Wisconsin Council on

Forestry Estimated Delivery Date: June 2018

13.3 COF will approach WDNR and UW-Madison to determine if a cost/benefit study is feasible and/or should be performed to evaluate the benefit of not-quarantining the entire state at this time

Assigned Party: Wisconsin Council on

Forestry Estimated Delivery Date: February 2018

Ties to July 2014 WFPS Economically Burdensome Topics:

- Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions – Invasive Species

Context

EAB was confirmed in the Wisconsin in 2008. Quarantines are handled by DATCP at the state level and by APHIS at the federal level. Quarantines regulate the movement of wood products with the intent of preventing the spread of pests.

Status of EAB Quarantine

Effective March 30, 2018, DATCP is quarantining the entire state. This will allow the free movement of wood products within the state. APHIS has not yet followed with a federal quarantine, so this means the quarantine only applies to movement of wood products within Wisconsin – not across state lines.

Campgrounds in state parks and forests and in Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest will continue to restrict firewood brought into the sites (purchased within 10 miles for state lands and 25 miles for national forests), and will continue to allow DATCP-certified firewood. DATCP will continue to certify firewood dealers.

Research

The Division of Forestry and the Department produce a two-year research agenda. The last agenda was prepared for 2015-2017. With alignment efforts underway, the Department delayed developing a new research agenda and has continued to operate under the 2015-2017 agendas. The 2015-2017 Division of Forestry research agenda was presented to the Council on Forestry. The Division expects to develop a new research agenda for 2019-2021 pending guidance from the Department.

In addition to the research priorities and needs identified through the WFPS, the Division will continue to ask Advisory Committees to identify research needs as the work on reviewing, revising and developing guidelines. Currently, the EAB Silviculture Guidelines are under review and the Advisory Committee has a goal of completing their task by early summer. The Advisory Committee will be asked, as a final assignment, what information and research was unavailable for this review that they would foresee needing for the next guideline review. The Division will incorporate these needs into the 2019-2021 research agenda.

Next Steps

1. Request direction on whether the remaining recommendations and assignments are still needs in light of the statewide quarantine for EAB