

WI SAF – Forest Economic Summit, Goal 7

July 23, 2014 Committee Meeting

Stevens Point, WI



MEETING NOTES

Attendees: Jim Kerkman (SAF, Council on Forestry (CoF)), Nancy Bozek (WWOA), Tom Hittle (SAF, CoF), Ryan Medo(NewPage), Keith Lindner(DNR), Steve Kariainen(LP), Brian Kuhn(Dept Ag, Trade & Consumer Protection), Max Ericson(Ericson Logging, GLTPA), Laura Giese (Consultant, SAF), Joe Kies(Domtar), Collin Buntrock(DNR), John DuPlissis(UW-Ex, UWSP). Other committee members not in attendance: Henry Sullivan(DNR), Forrest Gibeault(Consultant), Scott Sawle (Rockbridge Sawmill).

Goal 7 Topic: *Build and foster a coordinated working relationship between primary wood manufacturers and public and private forest management professionals with regards to economic and ecological considerations and the role and impacts of guidelines, policies and regulations.*

1. After introductions, Kerkman and Hittle provided background on the origins of this effort and specific topic, including reference to the goal actions catalogued from the summit and survey.
2. A discussion of why participants considered this goal a priority followed. The ideas that came forth included:
 - a. Concern about future industry – regulations painting ourselves into a corner
 - b. Drop in harvest levels
 - c. Cumulative effects, unintended consequences of policies, guidelines, regulations
 - d. Risk of loss of forest based industry
 - e. Deterrent to new investments
 - f. Rules, regulations etc. place us at disadvantage in global markets
 - g. Need to evaluate regulations – are they worth it?
 - h. Careful analysis needed for any new regulations
 - i. Voluntary guidelines becoming mandatory
 - j. Worry over certification audit results driving regulations
 - k. No recognition of cumulative loss of manageable acres
 - l. No recognition of \$ cost of regulations
 - m. Certification creep
 - n. Seasonality restrictions, becoming only a winter industry, doesn't work for mills or loggers
 - o. Note made regarding haul load restrictions being relaxed for Ag but not forestry
 - p. Lack of big picture of all regulations; need broad understanding by all of the opportunities that exist to work to meet goals with economic considerations included
 - q. Desire for more understanding of issues and dialogue
 - r. Forest certification driving regulations but needed to keep paper industry in WI
 - s. WI has great story to tell regarding forestry successes as evidenced by certification audit results – but not being told

- t. MFL is too burdensome for landowners, new rules and regulations constantly being added. Reaching tipping point where MFL not a viable consideration for those considering enrolling/re-enrolling
- u. Need to take cumulative big picture approach given magnitude of topic
- v. Need more understanding and common sense – need to install early stages of professional development(students, new hires)
- w. DNR staff has obligation to enforce rules and regulations handed down
- x. Impression that DNR committees don't have field experience representation and lack understanding
- y. Need to prevent guidelines from becoming regulations, need flexible standards but enforceable limits
- z. Invasives are an issue, need energy/tools towards pushing landowners to control invasives and completed sound forest management rather than doing nothing
- aa. Harvesting companies size their operation to the summer wood availability, this reduces the raw market supply
- bb. New foresters need more “real world” experience/education before inspecting timber sales and enforcing rules and regulations

3. The group discussed Committee objectives and expectations and developed four action items summarized as follows:

a. Action Item 1 – Survey

- i. Develop and circulate a survey for stakeholders to document by stakeholder group and region the issues (policy, regulations, and guidelines) impacting ability to practice sound forestry that result in economically produced forest products available to our industry. The survey is meant to catalogue and prioritize topics that can be focused on through efforts related to Topic 7 and feed into the balance of the action items described below.
- ii. The survey is anticipated to identify issues (policy, regulations, and guidelines) that hinder the forest industry and also identify issues (policy, regulations, and guidelines) that are viewed as beneficial.
- iii. May include a part of the survey to ask for impacts (consequences) to the industry that can be measured, such as the increase in cost to complete a sale or the number of days taken out of production, increase in hauling, etc.

b. Action Item 2 – Regional, Multi Stakeholder Forest Management Sessions.

- i. Sessions (one-day) must be relevant to regional issues and include the appropriate stakeholders and individuals capable of affecting change.
- ii. Sessions generally should be single or related topic focused with the goal of an end-of-the day consensus on how to mitigate/resolve the issue or otherwise move forward proactively.
- iii. Sessions should be built around actual situations that can be examined at each step of the process.
- iv. Sessions should include continuing ed credits (SFI, CF etc)

- v. Sessions should revolve around building trust levels through listening and information exchange
- vi. This will include the following tasks:
 - 1. Develop a map/database of all stakeholders (groups/organizations, private/public forest managers, industry representatives etc.) with a regional component, individual names and contact information
 - 2. Develop a template that can be used to plan and carryout a stakeholder meeting/field session.
- c. *Action Item 3 – DNR Team Documentation*
 - i. Develop and distribute a catalogue of DNR teams/groups/committees involved in examining and/or developing policy, regulations, and guidelines including leaders, team members, and any outside stakeholder representatives.
 - ii. Develop recommendations to facilitate communication between these teams and the forestry sector.
- d. *Action Item 4 – Analyze the Need/Potential for a Forestry Association in WI*
 - i. Determine if WI is unique or lacks a collective forestry organization comprised of members from the varied stakeholder groups. (Review CoF reports on educational efforts.)
 - ii. Determine what exists in other states, US regions etc.
 - iii. Evaluate potential to increase the collective voice of existing organizations or develop a new organization.
- 4. The committee also discussed the possibility of a Forestry Technology Fair, held alternate years with logging congress in WI. Multiday, multi discipline sessions.
- 5. The comment was made that there is a large amount of existing information relative to many of the items discussed today so there seems to be a significant lack of communication, perhaps a one-stop-shop / clearinghouse is needed – ideas to be discussed further, relevant in part to the dissemination of outcomes of this specific Topic 7 effort.
- 6. The committee also discussed a message to be presented to the WI Council on Forestry regarding the concerns related to the growing burden of certification and inability to address the pattern that more regulations in the future are inevitable with added costs and impacts on the industry. Kerkman to present to the CoF.
- 7. Next steps:
 - a. Kerkman to present findings and seek input at next CoF meeting in September.
 - b. DuPlisses to lead effort to begin to develop survey with assistance from Giese, Medo, Kerkman, Buntrock (others?) to be eventually circulated amongst committee members
 - c. Bozek to begin to organize a work plan for the development Action Item 2.
 - d. Need leaders for Action Items 3 and 4 efforts.
 - e. Develop next meeting, call, steps etc., following September CoF meeting

Notes Compiled and
Respectfully Submitted by:
Tom Hittle,
WI SAF State Chair