

The Scale and Cost of Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions in Wisconsin

Recommendations

Topic	Recommendation	Basis for Recommendation	Anticipated Impact to Forest Industry	Anticipated Impact to Social/Ecologic Benefits of the Forest
All Seasonal Restrictions	Segregate winter units from summer units during timber sale preparation on county, state, and MFL lands. Encourage risk evaluation and flexibility in the planning and implementation of restrictions and guidelines. Bring awareness to the cumulative costs/benefits of guidelines and restrictions. Conduct cost/benefit analysis when developing new guidelines.	See "Recommendations" section of report (Page 44, 1 st recommendation) See "Recommendations" section of report (Page 44, 1 st and 2 nd recommendations). The greater the risk aversion the greater the cost. The greater the risk aversion the greater the cost. See "Recommendations" section of report (page 45).		

The Scale and Cost of Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions in Wisconsin

Recommendations

Topic	Recommendation	Basis for Recommendation	Anticipated Impact to Forest Industry	Anticipated Impact to Social/Ecologic Benefits of the Forest
All Seasonal Restrictions	Promote communication between public sector, consulting, industrial foresters, and landowners.	See "Recommendations" section of report (page 45). See also, page 6 of the report; table 6, page 20; table 7, page 21.		
	Monitor/study the effectiveness of restrictions, guidelines, policies.	See "Recommendations" section of report (page 45).		

Additional Information Needs

Practice/Restriction	Information Need	Basis for Need	How will additional information help to improve the dialogue on the economic and ecological impacts of forest practices and harvesting restrictions?
General	Quantifying the value of ecosystem services.	Lack of good information on the long-term cost of <u>not</u> implementing these guidelines/restrictions.	Study states that WI is losing \$22.2 million per year in reduced stumpage prices due to seasonal restrictions, what are the long-term costs ecologically/socially of not having seasonal restrictions. Not within the scope of the study, but Important for assessing the bigger picture.
	Are there opportunities to increase availability of restricted stands while avoiding sensitive areas?	Incremental improvement of wood availability during April-August.	

The Scale and Cost of Seasonal Harvesting Restrictions in Wisconsin

Additional Questions/Clarifications for Principal Investigator

1. Would it be possible to breakdown Table 1 and Table 2, page 10, by forest type, independent of ownership class?
 - a. Break down of restriction type by month and by ownership.
2. Page 10, Table 1: If the Non-MFL sales were on MFL lands, would additional restrictions have applied? What accounts for the large difference in spring/summer sale access between Non-MFL private and the other ownerships (state, county, MFL Page 14, Table 3: Could this data be broken down by ownership or by forester (consultant, industry and public))?
3. Page 23 & 36: Please clarify the statement about oak/hickory forest being the most common forest type.
4. Does access/transportation, the 2nd most important restriction, refer to road and bridge closures by towns, seasonal postings, load limits? Please clarify what specifically is meant by this.
5. The study indicates that seasonal restrictions impose the cost of satellite wood yards on industry, but geographic location of industry and yard space at mills is also a factor. Is the total cost of satellite wood yards attributed solely to seasonal restrictions?
6. Please provide a copy of the questionnaire that was sent to the wood consuming mill.

Sub-committee would like to acknowledge

1. Seasonal restrictions may harm disturbance dependent cover types by reducing disturbance.

Economic and Ecological Effects of Forest Practices and Harvesting Restrictions On Wisconsin's Forest Resources and Economy

Recommendations

Topic	Recommendation	Basis for Recommendation	Anticipated Impact to Forest Industry	Anticipated Impact to Social/ Ecologic Benefits of the Forest
Recreational Restrictions	Educate landowners about the economic/ecological/social consequences of seasonal harvesting restrictions.	Many landowners may not understand what it is costing them to implement some seasonal restrictions – especially recreational restrictions (i.e. deer hunting)		
All Seasonal Restrictions	Educate forestry professionals about <u>communicating with</u> landowners about the economic/ecological/social consequences of seasonal restrictions. Continue and expand statewide training of public, cooperating and consultant foresters on forestry economic issues.	Landowners need more information about costs and benefits of restrictions so they can make an informed decision. Field foresters need to understand the economic implications of harvesting restrictions.		
	Educate property managers about the economic/ecological/social consequences of seasonal restrictions.			

Economic and Ecological Effects of Forest Practices and Harvesting Restrictions On Wisconsin's Forest Resources and Economy

Recommendations

Topic	Recommendation	Basis for Recommendation	Anticipated Impact to Forest Industry	Anticipated Impact to Social/ Ecologic Benefits of the Forest
Forest Management Guideline Monitoring	Evaluate effectiveness of guidelines (similar to WQ BMP monitoring)	Are current guidelines effective?		

Additional Information Needs

Topic	Information Need	Basis for Need	How will additional information help to improve the dialogue on the economic and ecological impacts of forest practices and harvesting restrictions?
Certification	Economic cost/benefit of certification to landowners, industry, public and private foresters....	Certification related to restrictions	Are restrictions implemented due to certification?
	Which restrictions are driven by forest certification?	Restrictions may be a response to Corrective Action Reports	
General	Follow-up survey to respondents – be clear who is responding (i.e. private foresters – consulting, industry etc.; public foresters – state, county, USFS; loggers).	Forester using professional judgement to implement guidelines	If foresters knew how much restrictions cost – would they still make the same decision?

Economic and Ecological Effects of Forest Practices and Harvesting Restrictions On Wisconsin's Forest Resources and Economy

Additional Information Needs

Topic	Information Need	Basis for Need	How will additional information help to improve the dialogue on the economic and ecological impacts of forest practices and harvesting restrictions?
General	How is increased wood production on National Forest related to limitations discussed in these studies?	Assuming that seasonal restrictions are having a negative impact? What are the actual impacts of increased production?	Will help evaluate impacts of changes the sub-committee may recommend.

Additional Questions/Clarifications for Principal Investigator

1. If it is possible, please breakdown forester and timber professional survey by respective sub-group (i.e. public, industry, consulting, logging and timber purchasing). As a reference please see page 22, the beginning of last sentence and page 23 the last sentence before Figure 7.

Sub-Committee B would like to acknowledge

1. While other factors outside the scope of this study also create forest management constraints, oak wilt and frozen ground constraints affect the largest area and generally cause the greatest impact by creating prohibitions on harvesting.
2. The ability to influence natural factors that create forest management constraints such as frozen ground is limited. Thirty five percent of timber sales reviewed in this study limited harvesting to frozen ground. Conversely, other constraints can be altered.
3. Study suggests that foresters, timber producers, and landowners generally support forest management that protects forest health, forest productivity, and other conservation values.
4. Adjustments to forest management constraints should be made so that they better balance positive and negative impacts; however, any adjustments must be based on sound science.

Fred Souba

From: Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 6:22 AM
To: Ballweg, Julie M - DNR; Gary Zimmer; Herrick Sarah (sarah.herrick@wisconsin.gov); Mark Huempfer (wildrivers@centurytel.net); Matt Dallman (mdallman@tnc.org); Ring Steven (sring@utilityssi.com); Robert Peterson (robert.peterson@domtar.com); smargitan@packagingcorp.com; Smith Patrick (psmith@co.florence.wi.us); Tom Hittle
Cc: Henry Schienebeck (henry@gltpa.org); wcfa@frontier.com; Mark Rickenbach (mgrickenbach@wisc.edu); Darrell.Zastrow@wisconsin.gov
Subject: WFPS Sub-Committee B
Attachments: Forests Guild Study 6-9-16 with Edits.docx; UWSP Study 6-9-16.docx

To: Members of the Wisconsin Forest Practices Study Sub-Committee B-Effects of Forest Practices and Restrictions

From: Fred Souba, Jr – Wisconsin Forest Practices Study Project Manager

Attached is the list of Recommendations and Additional Information Needs following our meeting on June 9th. Please review these and provide me with any of your edits by COB Friday, July 15th.

I have received a response from Mike Demchik regarding breaking down the information in Table 2 page 10 of the report by landownership type, restriction, and month. These are excerpts of his response “... I cannot do that with the data as it is now; however, I can go through all of the prospectuses and try to figure it out for any that have more than one restriction...it should not take more than a day or two of work to do so. With that said, because this will require me to guess what the forester was thinking for the sale for which months are for which restriction, in the case of any sale with more than one restriction, the committee will have to understand that the data will be somewhat subject to interpretation, as it will be me literally guessing.” Based on this I told Mike not to proceed. His follow-up response “I am always conscious of interpreting beyond my data and that would really have been pushing the margins of what I could do.” Based on this there will be no additional information coming on this request.

In regards to the question on the possibility to prepare breakout of Figure 7 page 23 of the Forest Guild report.... As you may recall Zander Evans response was “ We sorted results from timber professional survey based on whether the respondent self-identified as independent logger contractor (“logger”) or as a primary wood user/mill (“purchaser”)... Because the Forester survey was coordinated separately through UWSP we recommend working with Joe Conrad directly for analysis of the Forester survey.” I checked in with Joe Conrad and he responded, “The information in figure 7...was from the Forest Guild’s survey of loggers and timber professionals, not from the forester survey, and so I have no data to report on that. With regard to the frequency with which the different types of foresters reported applying seasonal restriction for rare species (and other motivations), please see figure 2 of the UWSP report.” Based on these responses it appears that the information in Figure 7 cannot be breakdown any further so there will no additional information coming on this request.

The next step is to meet with all Sub-Committees to finalize WFPS recommendations to COF. More information on the date and location of this meeting will be forthcoming.

Thanks.

Fred Souba

From: Demchik, Michael <Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu>
Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2016 2:50 PM
To: Fred Souba
Subject: Re: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

Thank you. I was frankly not looking forward to that because I am always conscious of interpreting beyond my data and that would really have been pushing the margins of what I could do.

Have a good weekend
MCD

Sent from my iPad

> On Jul 2, 2016, at 1:51 PM, Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com> wrote:

>

> Hi Mike,

>

> Thanks for the quick response.

>

> No need to put any more work into this. I will explain to the

> Committee your response.

>

> Enjoy the rest of the weekend.

>

> Thanks.

>

> Fred

>

> Fred Souba, Jr.

> WFPS Project Manager

> Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.

> 715.213.4833

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Demchik, Michael [mailto:Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu]

> Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2016 1:21 PM

> To: Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com>

> Subject: Re: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

>

> For the reason stated before, I cannot do that with the data as it is

> now; however, I can go through all of the prospectuses and try to

> figure it out for any that have more than one restriction...it should

> not take more than a day or two of work to do so. By happenstance, I

> have 4 days of next week available for research/vacation, so I can do it relatively quickly.

>

> With that said, because this will require me to guess what the

> forester was thinking for sale for which months are for which

> restriction, in the case of any sale with more than one restriction,

> the committee will have to understand that the data will be somewhat
> subject to interpretation, as it will be me literally guessing.
>
> Also, can I please roll the categories of site access and
> soil/hydrologic disturbance together, because I really have no
> mechanism to separate those out at all, as many site had both, and I
> have no way to guess how the timing of a frozen only sale should be
> sorted relative to access and soil/hydrologic disturbance except to count the same time period for both.

>
> Thank you
> MCD

>
>
> Sent from my iPad

>
> On Jul 2, 2016, at 12:24 PM, Fred Souba
> <fred@provisionforestry.com<mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com>> wrote:

>
>
> Hi Mike,

>
>
>
> I hope all is well.

>
>
> After further reviewing your email below and my notes, I believe the
> Committee would like to see the number of sales broken out by
> restriction type by month. I have tried to capture how to display the
> data in the table below.

>
>
>
> <image001.png>

>
>
>
> Does this make sense? Would preparing a table like this be possible ?

>
>
> Thanks.

>
> Fred

>
> Fred Souba, Jr.
> WFPS Project Manager
> Provision Forestry LLC <<http://www.provisionforestry.com/>> - Helping
> you see the forest through the trees.
> 715.213.4833

>
>

>
>
>
>
> Fred
>
>
>
> Fred Souba, Jr.
>
> Principal | Senior Consultant
>
> Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.
>
> 715.213.4833
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
>
> From: Demchik, Michael [mailto:Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu]
>
> Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 10:14 AM
>
> To: Fred Souba
> <fred@provisionforestry.com<mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com>>
>
> Cc: Conrad, Joseph
> <Joseph.Conrad@uwsp.edu<mailto:Joseph.Conrad@uwsp.edu>>;
> Vokoun, Melinda
> <Melinda.Vokoun@uwsp.edu<mailto:Melinda.Vokoun@uwsp.edu>>
>
> Subject: RE: Additional Questions - WFPS Project
>
>
>
> Fred
>
> After spending about a half hour messing with this, I have decided it
> is not doable as asked, and I should have been mentally fast enough to
> figure that out before I started cursing at Excel's pivot tables, but...
>
>
>
> Here is the issue, many of these sites have more than one reason for
> restriction (this is particularly common with the access one, and the
> soil/hydrology one and this was the source of my cursing at Excel, and
> why I ended up feeling stupid after I said...."Well then, you darned
> program, I will just do it one at a time then..." turns out Excel knew
> exactly why it would not do it).
>
>

>
> So, then the question is how do I sort it...if I compress it to just
> total restriction, I already sent that...If I put sites with multiple
> restrictions as a category, then it makes the results biased for the
> ones with only one restriction...if I double count (i.e. if it has two
> restrictions, I count the sale in each category), then I end up with
> longer time restriction than is applied for each restriction (i.e. if
> it has an access restriction and a soil/hydro restriction, how do I
> decide which dates apply to each). I hope what I am typing makes sense here.

>
>
>
> I get what you are going for....is one class of ownership more likely
> to give a restriction that is "overly" long...but, I do not know how
> to get at that from the data...

>
>
>
> Do you have suggestions on how you would like this sorted?

>
>
>
> MCD

>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: Fred Souba [mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com]

>
> Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 9:18 AM

>
> To: Demchik, Michael

>
> Subject: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

>
>
>
> Hi Mike,

>
>
>
> After the Sub-Committee reviewed your answers to questions it prompted
> an additional question.

>
>
>
> The Committee was wondering if it would be possible to provide the
> number of sales broken out by restriction type by month and by
> ownership? The Committee believes that having the information
> displayed in this format will aid them to determine those restrictions
> most appropriate for the Council of Forestry to address.

>
>
>
> If you could please provide this information within the next couple of
> weeks that would be great.
>
>
>
> Thanks Mike.
>
>
>
> Fred
>
>
>
> Fred Souba, Jr.
>
> WFPS Project Manager
>
> Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.
>
> 715.213.4833
>
> -----Original Message-----
>
> From: Fred Souba [mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com]
>
> Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2016 1:14 PM
>
> To: 'Demchik, Michael'
> <Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu<mailto:Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu>>
>
> Subject: RE: Media Response Request to Principal Investigators of the
> WFPS
>
>
>
> Hi Mike,
>
>
>
> I think we are good. If additional questions arise I'll be in touch.
>
>
>
> Thanks.
>
>
>
> Fred
>

>
>
> Fred Souba, Jr.
>
> WFPS Project Manager
>
> Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.
>
> 715.213.4833
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
>
> From: Demchik, Michael [mailto:Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu]
>
> Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 1:15 PM
>
> To: Fred Souba
> <fred@provisionforestry.com<mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com>>
>
> Subject: Re: Media Response Request to Principal Investigators of the
> WFPS
>
>
>
> Fred
>
> I am just making sure you got everything you need in the emails from
> me and Joe.
>
>
>
> MCD
>
>
>
>
>
> Sent from my iPad
>
>
>
> On May 30, 2016, at 10:14 PM, Fred Souba
> <fred@provisionforestry.com<mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com><mailto:
> fred@p
> rovisionforestry.com>> wrote:
>
>
>
>

> Wisconsin Forest Practices Study Principal Investigators,
>
>
>
> Henry Schienebeck and Jane Severt have asked me to pass on to you the
> attached document.
>
>
>
> If you have any questions, please contact Henry or Jane.
>
>
>
> Thanks.
>
>
>
> Fred
>
>
>
> Fred Souba, Jr.
>
> WFPS Project Manager
>
> Provision Forestry LLC <<http://www.provisionforestry.com/>> - Helping
> you see the forest through the trees.
>
> 715.213.4833
>
>
>
> <Final media request document B.PDF>
>
>
>

Fred Souba

Subject: FW: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

From: Fred Souba [mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2016 12:23 PM
To: Demchik, Michael <Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu>
Subject: RE: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

Hi Mike,

I hope all is well.

After further reviewing your email below and my notes, I believe the Committee would like to see the number of sales broken out by restriction type by month. I have tried to capture how to display the data in the table below.

Ownership/Restriction	Month												Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
State - 100 Sales													
Soil/hydrologic disturbance			15	8	8	8	9	10	10	10	10		88
Access/Transportation		2	7										9
Oak wilt harvest season restriction			8	10	8								26
Rare/threatened/endangered species				1			1						2
Recreation Conflict											6		6
Hunting									1		1		2
All Reasons	0	2	30	19	16	8	10	10	11	10	17	0	133
Same as above for County, MFL, Non-MFL													

Does this make sense? Would preparing a table like this be possible ?

Thanks.

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.
WFPS Project Manager
[Provision Forestry LLC](#) - *Helping you see the forest through the trees.*
715.213.4833

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.
Principal | Senior Consultant
Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.
715.213.4833

-----Original Message-----

From: Demchik, Michael [mailto:Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 10:14 AM

From: Demchik, Michael [mailto:Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 10:14 AM
To: Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com>
Cc: Conrad, Joseph <Joseph.Conrad@uwsp.edu>; Vokoun, Melinda <Melinda.Vokoun@uwsp.edu>
Subject: RE: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

Fred
After spending about a half hour messing with this, I have decided it is not doable as asked, and I should have been mentally fast enough to figure that out before I started cursing at Excel's pivot tables, but...

Here is the issue, many of these sites have more than one reason for restriction (this is particularly common with the access one, and the soil/hydrology one and this was the source of my cursing at Excel, and why I ended up feeling stupid after I said...."Well then, you darned program, I will just do it one at a time then..." turns out Excel knew exactly why it would not do it).

So, then the question is how do I sort it...if I compress it to just total restriction, I already sent that...If I put sites with multiple restrictions as a category, then it makes the results biased for the ones with only one restriction...if I double count (i.e. if it has two restrictions, I count the sale in each category), then I end up with longer time restriction than is applied for each restriction (i.e. if it has an access restriction and a soil/hydro restriction, how do I decide which dates apply to each). I hope what I am typing makes sense here.

I get what you are going for....is one class of ownership more likely to give a restriction that is "overly" long...but, I do not know how to get at that from the data...

Do you have suggestions on how you would like this sorted?

MCD

-----Original Message-----

From: Fred Souba [mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 9:18 AM
To: Demchik, Michael
Subject: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

Hi Mike,

After the Sub-Committee reviewed your answers to questions it prompted an additional question.

The Committee was wondering if it would be possible to provide the number of sales broken out by restriction type by month and by ownership? The Committee believes that having the information displayed in this format will aid them to determine those restrictions most appropriate for the Council of Forestry to address.

If you could please provide this information within the next couple of weeks that would be great.

Thanks Mike.

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.
WFPS Project Manager
Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.
715.213.4833

-----Original Message-----

From: Fred Souba [mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2016 1:14 PM

To: 'Demchik, Michael' <Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu>

Subject: RE: Media Response Request to Principal Investigators of the WFPS

Hi Mike,

I think we are good. If additional questions arise I'll be in touch.

Thanks.

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.

WFPS Project Manager

Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.

715.213.4833

-----Original Message-----

From: Demchik, Michael [mailto:Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 1:15 PM

To: Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com>

Subject: Re: Media Response Request to Principal Investigators of the WFPS

Fred

I am just making sure you got everything you need in the emails from me and Joe.

MCD

Sent from my iPad

On May 30, 2016, at 10:14 PM, Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com<mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com>> wrote:

Wisconsin Forest Practices Study Principal Investigators,

Henry Schienebeck and Jane Severt have asked me to pass on to you the attached document.

If you have any questions, please contact Henry or Jane.

Thanks.

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.

WFPS Project Manager

Provision Forestry LLC <<http://www.provisionforestry.com/>> - Helping you see the forest through the trees.

715.213.4833

<Final media request document B.PDF>

Fred Souba

From: Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2016 4:38 PM
To: Mark Rickenbach (mgrickenbach@wisc.edu)
Subject: Sub-Committee C - 2nd Meeting Template
Attachments: OOR Study w-Edits and Input_6.23.16 Fred Edits.docx; Rotation Lengths w_Edits and Inputs_6.23.16 Fred Edits.docx

Hi Mark,

Attached as the template from last week's meeting. The new stuff is in red. Please review and let me know if this makes sense to you or you need some clarifications.

I have also reached out to Forrest to respond to the additional clarifications/questions. He said he would have something to me by the July 8th.

Also...

Below is the response from Joe Conrad regarding if it was possible to breakdown further the survey of the Forest Guild.

-----Original Message-----

From: Conrad, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Conrad@uwsp.edu]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 8:03 AM
To: Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com>
Subject: RE: WFPS Study Project Question

Hi Fred,

I am happy to help with this if I can. In our report, we reported results by forester type (i.e. consultants, industry, and public sector). For example, figure 6 from the attachment corresponds to table 7, page 21 in the UWSP report "The Scale and Cost of Seasonal Timber Harvesting Restrictions in Wisconsin". The information highlighted yellow in the scanned document appears to be from the Forest Guild's survey of loggers and timber professionals, which I and UWSP were not a part of. The forester survey did not include questions about downtime and so forth because this generally would not apply to the forestry firms that we surveyed. We expected that most of the respondents, with the exception of industrial foresters, would have limited knowledge of loggers' downtime. The information in figure 7 (see page 23 of the Forest Guild Report) from the attached was from the Forest Guild's survey of loggers and timber professionals, not from the forester survey, and so I have no data to report on that. With regard to the frequency with which the different types of foresters reported applying seasonal restrictions for rare species (and other motivations), please see figure 2 of the UWSP report.

I hope this helps. If you need additional information, please call me on my cell phone (715-340-0683). I have several errands to run today, so please leave a message if I do not answer. I should be available tomorrow morning as well.

Thanks.

Joe

As you recall Zander Evans response was as follows:

-----Original Message-----

From: Alexander Evans [mailto:zander@forestguild.org]

Sent: Monday, May 30, 2016 4:32 PM

To: Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com>

Cc: 'Fred Clark' <fred@forestguild.org>; Mark Rickenbach <mgrickenbach@wisc.edu>; Mike Lynch <mike.lynch@forestguild.org>

Subject: Re: WFPS Study Project Question

Fred,

We sorted results from our timber professional survey based on whether the respondent self-identified as an independent logging contractor ("logger") or as a primary wood user / mill ("purchaser") in the attached spread sheet.

Because the Forester survey was coordinated separately through UWSP we recommend working with Joe Conrad directly for analysis of the Forester survey. We're glad to discuss this with the folks at UWSP and make sure we're in agreement on their results if that is helpful.

It is important to highlight that when separating results in this way the sample size likely becomes too small to have high confidence in the results, and we recommend caution in drawing conclusions based on differences between these categories.

Thank you,
Zander

Based on the responses from Zander and Joe I believe the answer is the category of Timber Professional and Wood Purchases cannot be breakdown any further. If you agree, then I will notify the Sub-Committee B.

Thanks.

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.

WFPS Project Manager

Provision Forestry LLC - *Helping you see the forest through the trees.*

715.213.4833

Fred Souba

From: Demchik, Michael <Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu>
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 10:14 AM
To: Fred Souba
Cc: Conrad, Joseph; Vokoun, Melinda
Subject: RE: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

Fred
After spending about a half hour messing with this, I have decided it is not doable as asked, and I should have been mentally fast enough to figure that out before I started cursing at Excel's pivot tables, but...

Here is the issue, many of these sites have more than one reason for restriction (this is particularly common with the access one, and the soil/hydrology one and this was the source of my cursing at Excel, and why I ended up feeling stupid after I said..."Well then, you darned program, I will just do it one at a time then..." turns out Excel knew exactly why it would not do it).

So, then the question is how do I sort it...if I compress it to just total restriction, I already sent that...If I put sites with multiple restrictions as a category, then it makes the results biased for the ones with only one restriction...if I double count (i.e. if it has two restrictions, I count the sale in each category), then I end up with longer time restriction than is applied for each restriction (i.e. if it has an access restriction and a soil/hydro restriction, how do I decide which dates apply to each). I hope what I am typing makes sense here.

I get what you are going for....is one class of ownership more likely to give a restriction that is "overly" long...but, I do not know how to get at that from the data...

Do you have suggestions on how you would like this sorted?

MCD

-----Original Message-----

From: Fred Souba [mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 9:18 AM
To: Demchik, Michael
Subject: Additional Questions - WFPS Project

Hi Mike,

After the Sub-Committee reviewed your answers to questions it prompted an additional question.

The Committee was wondering if it would be possible to provide the number of sales broken out by restriction type by month and by ownership? The Committee believes that having the information displayed in this format will aid them to determine those restrictions most appropriate for the Council of Forestry to address.

If you could please provide this information within the next couple of weeks that would be great.

Thanks Mike.

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.
WFPS Project Manager
Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.
715.213.4833

-----Original Message-----

From: Fred Souba [mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2016 1:14 PM
To: 'Demchik, Michael' <Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu>
Subject: RE: Media Response Request to Principal Investigators of the WFPS

Hi Mike,

I think we are good. If additional questions arise I'll be in touch.

Thanks.

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.
WFPS Project Manager
Provision Forestry LLC - Helping you see the forest through the trees.
715.213.4833

-----Original Message-----

From: Demchik, Michael [mailto:Michael.Demchik@uwsp.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 1:15 PM
To: Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com>
Subject: Re: Media Response Request to Principal Investigators of the WFPS

Fred

I am just making sure you got everything you need in the emails from me and Joe.

MCD

Sent from my iPad

On May 30, 2016, at 10:14 PM, Fred Souba <fred@provisionforestry.com<mailto:fred@provisionforestry.com>> wrote:

Wisconsin Forest Practices Study Principal Investigators,

Henry Schienebeck and Jane Severt have asked me to pass on to you the attached document.

If you have any questions, please contact Henry or Jane.

Thanks.

Fred

Fred Souba, Jr.
WFPS Project Manager

Provision Forestry LLC <<http://www.provisionforestry.com/>> - Helping you see the forest through the trees.
715.213.4833

<Final media request document B.PDF>

Fred Souba

From: Conrad, Joseph <Joseph.Conrad@uwsp.edu>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 8:03 AM
To: Fred Souba
Subject: RE: WFPS Study Project Question

Hi Fred,

I am happy to help with this if I can. In our report, we reported results by forester type (i.e. consultants, industry, and public sector). For example, figure 6 from the attachment corresponds to table 7, page 21 in the UWSP report "The Scale and Cost of Seasonal Timber Harvesting Restrictions in Wisconsin". The information highlighted yellow in the scanned document appears to be from the Forest Guild's survey of loggers and timber professionals, which I and UWSP were not a part of. The forester survey did not include questions about downtime and so forth because this generally would not apply to the forestry firms that we surveyed. We expected that most of the respondents, with the exception of industrial foresters, would have limited knowledge of loggers' downtime. The information in figure 7 from the attached was from the Forest Guild's survey of loggers and timber professionals, not from the forester survey, and so I have no data to report on that. With regard to the frequency with which the different types of foresters reported applying seasonal restrictions for rare species (and other motivations), please see figure 2 of the UWSP report.

I hope this helps. If you need additional information, please call me on my cell phone (715-340-0683). I have several errands to run today, so please leave a message if I do not answer. I should be available tomorrow morning as well.

Thanks.

Joe

From: Fred Souba [fred@provisionforestry.com]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 4:49 PM
To: Conrad, Joseph
Subject: FW: WFPS Study Project Question

Hi Joe,

I hope all is well.

The Sub-Committee reviewing the Forests Guild-Zander report have a question regarding the forester/logger survey.

I contacted Zander to answer the following question: