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ABSTRACT

In February 1994, a 10-page written survey instrument was mailed to 666 private, non-profit conservation organizations (NCOs) operating in Wisconsin, to identify those involved with private land protection efforts. The response rate was 44.3%. Of the 295 respondents, 91 (30.8%) are directly involved with land protection efforts, 154 (52.2%) are indirectly involved, and 47 (16%) would like to be directly involved. The NCOs directly involved with land protection all indicated that they own land or hold easements for conservation purposes. At the very least, there are 111,087 acres in Wisconsin protected by 83 NCOs. The most commonly used land protection methods by the survey recipients were fee-simple ownership and land-transfers. A small percentage of the NCOs are responsible for protecting the majority of this land; The Wisconsin Nature Conservancy alone accounts for 55%. NCOs indirectly involved with land protection efforts most commonly work to educate the public about land and water resources. NCOs directly and indirectly involved with land protection are distinct sub-populations with regard to their activities, financial support, needs, and relationship to the Stewardship Program administered by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR). They are, however, a rather homogeneous population with a common goal to improve environmental quality, a shared desire to work with the DNR, and the same preference for a newsletter as a means of communication between NCOs and the DNR. The NCOs hoping to become directly involved with land protection efforts are currently involved indirectly. Most of the NCOs surveyed are region-specific, with 75% focusing on a one- or two-county area.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The ways in which people use land are determined by its inherent features, such as soil properties, geography, natural communities, as well as the undeniable variable humans make in determining land-use. Just as it is crucial to further study the natural functions of ecosystems, it is necessary to identify human trends so that we may predict and modify trajectories of land consumption and protection [Turner et al. 1993, 5].

The public sector is the most visible player involved with land-use planning. The combined federal, state, and local governments own just over 40% of the land in the United States. The remaining 60% is privately owned [National Research Council 1993, 1]. Private land-use is regulated in a variety of ways, with numerous drawbacks and deficiencies [Fenner 1980, 1042; Whyte, 1968, 36]. Due to the deficiencies, Fenner (1980) recognizes a need for "an auxiliary, if not alternative, device to conserve land for the public benefit." Land trusts are one non-governmental mechanism which Fenner (1980) proposes be used for land protection [Fenner 1980, 1042].

The National Research Council (1993) recognizes that public and private values can not be divorced from one another. "Just as federal lands host a broad array of private uses and ownership rights, private lands are shouldering an increasing public responsibility in the areas of conservation, environmental protection, and public-interest health and recreation" [National Research Council 1993, 49]. Federal, and some state laws, are in place to encourage conservation-based land-use decisions by private non-profit organizations. National surveys reveal increasing activity by private organizations devoted to protecting land in perpetuity [Land Trust Exchange 1989; Land Trust Alliance 1991]. This chapter reviews literature on the history of private, non-profit organizations involved with land-use decisions and outlines the legal framework in which they work. Within the context of the federal Constitution,¹ some aspects of property law are state law and thus vary widely. Wisconsin is spotlighted, as a

¹ While land-use planning and property taxes are controlled by the individual states, the Fifth Amendment in the US Constitution is the common backbone for land ownership and property rights for all states.
state which has been a leader in the conservation movement and environmental policy\textsuperscript{2} [Scott 1967 as cited in Cannon 1993, 2].

**Importance of This Study**

Brenneman and Bates (1984) and Foti and Jacobs (1989) both recognize an absence of research about non-profit organizations involved with land protection—more specifically, land trusts. Mainly anecdotal and thus spotty literature exists, but comprehensive research on private land protection efforts and methods is still limited [Brenneman and Bates 1984; Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317]. The Committee on Scientific and Technical Criteria for Federal Acquisition for Land Conservation (hereafter the "Committee") could not identify a comprehensive resource to categorize land that had been acquired by all the federal agencies for the purpose of conservation, much less by the private sector [National Research Council 1993, 24].

Foti (1987) looked at the role local and regional land conservation organizations (LRLCOs) played in the provision of outdoor recreation in the Great Lakes states [Foti 1987]. The results of her research were revealing, raising many more questions. After surveying 75 LRLCOs, Foti (1987) acknowledged that indeed, they were providing outdoor recreation; 98\% of the land owned by these private groups is open for various leisure activities [Foti 1987, 184]. However, further investigation into the missions of the LRLCOs revealed that the predominant goal was land protection, and that the provision of outdoor recreation was generally a by-product [Foti 1987, 189]. Of the Great Lakes' LRLCOs, 56.5\% indicated that their organization's primary philosophy was oriented toward land preservation; 35.5\% were

\textsuperscript{2} In 1929, Wisconsin became the first state in the nation to establish rural zoning laws [Carstensen 1958, 1; Dresen 1992, 4; Aplin 1986, 3; Cannon 1993, 2]. In 1967, Wisconsin became the first state in the nation to combine the management of forests, fisheries, and game-species with air and water pollution control into one "super-agency" [Haskell and Price 1973 as cited in Thomas 1990, 446]. While criticisms of the re-organization abounded, the intent was to foster a "systems approach" to natural resource management for increased efficiency and responsiveness [Trainer 1992, 8 as cited in Cannon 1993, B29]. Between 1968 and 1969, Madison, Wisconsin provided the first forum for environmentalists to present scientific evidence to an impartial arbiter about DDT and its threat to natural biological systems. This unique forum, (allowed under obscure state statutes), led to a statewide ban on DDT as well as a national trial of the chemical and other persistent pesticides [Dunlap 1978, 4]. Wisconsin is also noted for its stringent laws regarding groundwater pollution (established in 1983), acid deposition (established in 1986) and ozone layer depletion (established in 1992) [Cannon 1993, 12].
for land preservation and use; and 4.8% were primarily oriented toward use of the land [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 318].

Foti's (1987) research took the approach of labeling a set number of groups, as specifically listed by the Land Trust Alliance [Foti 1987]. From that list, her goal was to gather information on a specific issue—the provision of outdoor recreation by the private sector [Foti 1987]. This research operates in the opposite direction. Instead of starting with a list of land trusts and looking for a specific reason why they buy land or easements, this project has a broader, more basic agenda. The goal is to sift through nearly 700 non-profit land trusts, nature centers, sports clubs, environmental advocacy organizations, lake associations, archaeological/historical groups, conservation biology organizations, recreation clubs, agricultural conservancies, and camps in Wisconsin to identify and describe whatever private land protection initiatives there may be, along with the problems and needs associated.
Statement of the Question

What is the role private, non-profit conservation organizations (NCOs) play with regard to protecting land in Wisconsin for aesthetic, cultural, ecological, educational, historic, recreational, resource, social or purposes?

Sub-questions

1. The Who Question

Which are the organizations directly and indirectly involved with private land protection in Wisconsin?

2. The Land Resource Question

What is the acreage, legal status, use, access, management, and methods of land protection for the land NCOs own or have partial interest in?

3. The Problems and Needs Question

What are the problems and needs facing NCOs which directly and indirectly protect land?

4. The Partnership Question

Are NCOs working with organizations or agencies?

5. The Stewardship Program Question

Do NCOs know about the Stewardship Program? What are their ideas and problems regarding it?

Delimitations

1. This study will not attempt to define appropriate amounts of land to be protected.

2. This study will not attempt to define appropriate uses of land.

3. This study will not attempt to evaluate the ecological impact of land protected by NCOs.

4. This study will not attempt to compare the role of NCOs in Wisconsin to any other state, or the nation as a whole.
Definition of Terms

land trust: a private, non-profit organization whose ability or inclination is to conserve, preserve or protect land for aesthetic, agricultural, cultural, ecological, educational, historical, social, and recreational purposes [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 17; Emerson 1985, 44-47 as cited in Foti and Jacobs 1989, 31; Poole 1992, 53; Pierce 1984, 18].

non-profit conservation organization (NCO): a non-profit corporation, or charitable trust which is directly and/or indirectly involved with the natural environment through conservation, education, advocacy, protection, restoration, and recreation activities. This definition differs from that used by the state legislature in the rules for the Stewardship Program. An NCO eligible for matching grants from the Stewardship Program must be tax-exempt under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Service code and have as one of its primary purposes, the acquisition of property for conservation purposes [Stewardship 2000 1994, 2].

protection (of land): a generic category for land which has been intentionally guarded, in varying ways and for various purposes, by private non-profit organizations.

region-specific: a locational characteristic regarding natural, geographic and ecological—but not exclusively political—boundaries.

Assumptions

1. Land is a limited commodity, with unlimited demands for various uses.
2. Development pressure, urban sprawl, and exurbia exist—to varying degrees.
3. Land protection efforts by NCOs are ecologically benign.
CHAPTER II

Early History of Land Trusts

Land protection originally and traditionally has been a responsibility of the public sector, beginning with the establishment of Yellowstone National Park by Congress in 1872 [Endicott 1993, xiii]. Two decades later, the first private non-profit conservation organizations began to protect land as well, and over time assumed an increasingly prominent role in land protection [Brenneman and Bates 1984, xi; Myers 1992, 7; National Research Council 1993, 139]. The activities of these organizations have influenced the composition of the public estate over the past century [Myers 1992, 7]. Organizations protecting land became generically known as "land trusts."³ While exact wording differs, a "land trust" is understood in the literature to be a private, non-profit organization whose ability or inclination is to conserve, preserve or protect⁴ land for agricultural, aesthetic, ecological, educational, historic, cultural, social, and recreational purposes [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 17; Emerson 1985, 44-47 as cited in Foti and Jacobs 1989, 31; Poole 1992, 53; Pierce 1984, 18].

The concept of land trusts in America dates back to the 19th century, with the noted activity of several early groups. Sources disagree in identifying the first land trust. The oldest land trust identified by the Land Trust Alliance (1991) is the Cincinnati Museum of Natural History in Cincinnati, Ohio, established in 1818 with a mission to "preserve land and wildlife in their natural state..." [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 121]. Davis and Duffus (1987) suggest this might be the first land trust, indicating only that it was one which originated in Ohio [Davis

³ Brenneman and Bates (1984) use the term "land trust" in place of the more cumbersome term, "local land conservation organization." Foti (1987) and Foti & Jacobs (1989) use the term "local or regional land conservation organization" (LRLCO), when referring the the groups in their study. The term "land trusts" will be used broadly in this study, to refer to private, non-profit, region-specific organizations concerned with land protection [Fenner 1980, 1042]. For the purpose of clarification, The Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Land, and Land Trust Alliance will be referred to specifically by name, and therefore not included under the heading of "land trusts."

⁴ Throughout the literature the terms "conserve," "preserve," and "protect" are used interchangeably, often without clarification [National Research Council 1993, 4] [Meisner 1994, 75]. To minimize confusion, this paper will use the term "protect" as a generic category for land which has been intentionally guarded (in varying ways and for various purposes) by private non-profit organizations.
and Duffus 1987, 2]. Still in existence today, the Cincinnati Museum of Natural History protects 2,710 acres of wildlife habitat [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 121]. If the Cincinnati Museum of Natural History is considered the first land trust, a sixty-five year gap exists before the next established land trust. The next land trust, according to Land Trust Alliance (1991) is the Duxbury Rural and Historic Society, established in 1883 in Duxbury, Massachusetts, which currently protects 150 acres of general open space [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 75].

Most sources however cite the Trustees of Reservations as the world’s first land trust, founded in 1891 in Boston, Massachusetts [Poole 1992, 54; Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317; Knickerbocker 1990, 15; Metzger, 1983, 1; Fenner 1980, 1042; New Weld 1990; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 150; Abbott 1989, 15]. This first land trust was just one drop in a bucket of conservation and preservation initiatives that defined the times. In the 1890s Yosemite National Park was established, John Muir organized the Sierra Club, and Gifford Pinchot became the nation’s first chief forester [Petulla 1977; Strong 1988]. In the decade that followed, the Lacey Act was passed, the US Forest Service was created, the National Audubon Society was formed, and President Theodore Roosevelt doubled the amount of protected forest lands in America [Petulla 1977].

New Weld (1990) and Abbott (1989) identify Charles W. Eliot, a landscape architect [Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 150] as the founder of the Trustees of Reservations. Eliot’s claim to fame is two-fold; he was a partner with Frederick Law Olmsted5 [New Weld 1990; Abbott 1989, 15], and the son of one of Harvard University’s most revered presidents, Charles W. Eliot Sr. [James 1930, 1:vii ]. In 1890, the younger Eliot wrote that:

"Within 10 miles of the State House there still remain several bits of scenery possessing uncommon beauty and more than usual refreshing power...each of these scenes is, in its way, characteristic of primitive wilderness of New England, of which, indeed, they are surviving fragments. At Waverly (Massachusetts) is a steep moraine set with a group of mighty oaks. At the Upper Falls of the Charles River the stream flows darkly between rocky and broken banks, from which hang rank upon rank of graceful Hemlocks...."

[Elliot 1902 as cited in Abbott 1989, 15]

5 Frederick Law Olmsted, one of the two planners for New York City’s Central Park, [Swerdlow 1993] is labeled an early forerunner in American conservation history for his contributions to city planning and landscape architecture [Strong 1988, 16].
Abbott (1989) reveals that Eliot knew the aforementioned "bits of scenery" were privately owned and were "in daily danger of destruction [Abbott 1989, 15]. The Trustees of Reservations was formed by "nature lovers" of the city to protect "precious lands" [Poole 1992, 55] for "the refreshment of the spirit" [New Weld 1990] so that "crowded populations....should not be deprived of opportunities of beholding beautiful natural scenery" [Metzger, 1983, 1]. Originally this organization was named the Trustees of Public Reservations, but eliminated "Public" in 1954 to avoid misperceptions as a public sector agency [Metzger, 1983, 1; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 150]. In the mid-1950's, the United States was in the throws of the Cold War [Litwack et al. 1987]. Given the political climate of the time, the land trust's name change is not surprising; land acquisition by the government would likely have had Socialistic or Communistic overtones.

Now based in Beverly, Massachusetts, the Trustees of Reservations has protected 27,659 acres of land for ecological, scenic and cultural purposes [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 88] and land for public use [New Weld 1990]. The Trustees of Reservations is still an active organization with 8,500 members, 500 volunteers, 60 paid staff members and a $4.5 million annual operating budget [New Weld 1990]. The Trustees of Reservations also helped establish the Massachusetts Farm and Conservation Lands Trusts in 1980 in response to the rampant loss of farm land in Massachusetts [Metzger, 1983, 4].

Recorded as another early land trust is the Massachusetts Audubon Society in Lincoln, Massachusetts. Established in 1896, it now protects 20,400 acres of wetlands and wildlife habitat [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 79].

In 1900 the Sempervirens Club was formed in California to protect redwood trees of the state [Poole 1992, 55; Land Trust Alliance 1991, 13]. Still in existence today as the Sempervirens Fund, this land trust has protected 6,725 acres of forests and trails [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 13]. Also established in 1900 was the New England Wildflower Society, in Framingham, Massachusetts which today protects 450 acres of wetlands and forest [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 82].

Another turn of the century land trust was the Society for the Protection of the New Hampshire Forests, established in 1901 [Poole 1992, 55; Land Trust Alliance 1991, 103]. Early
efforts of the Forest Society, as it is commonly known, to protect forest lands resulted in the eventual creation of the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire [Bates and Brenneman 1984, 57] in 1911 [Adams 1986, 5]. This was a controversial idea because until then, federal forest reserves had never been created by purchasing private lands [Adams 1986, 12]. The Society for the Protection of the New Hampshire Forests is still active, having protected a total of 895,401 acres of forest, greenways, and general open space [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 103].

The land trust concept as introduced by the Trustees of Reservations in the US in 1891 was well received abroad and sparked land trust activity in Great Britain [Metzger, 1983, 1; New Weld, 1990]. The National Trust of Britain, established in 1895, was modeled after the Trustees [New Weld, 1990; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 151]. National trusts in Scotland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, New Zealand, India, Australia, Ireland, Canada and various European countries also trace their origins back to the Trustees of Reservations [Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 151]

Growth of Land Trusts in the 20th Century

Estimates have differed regarding the number of land trusts in the US. A possible explanation for the discrepancy arises from varying definitions of a "land trust." Poole (1992) and Davis and Duffus (1987) cite that in 1965 there were 132 land trusts throughout the country [Poole 1992, 55; Davis and Duffus 1987, 2]. However Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader (1982) cite just 95 existing local land conservation organizations by 1965 [Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 180] and Foti and Jacobs (1989) cite only 79 at that time [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317].


---

6 There had been virtually no studies of land trusts until the early 1980s, when the Land Trust Exchange, (now the Land Trust Alliance) initiated biennial nationwide surveys of the groups. Therefore, discrepancies in numbers of groups, acres preserved, and supporting members is an expected phenomena.
trusts were functioning [Land Trust Exchange 1989, iv]. The most recent nationwide survey of land trusts conducted in the summer of 1990 by Land Trust Alliance identified 889 land trusts in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands [Land Trust Alliance 1991] [See Fig. 1].

Fig. 1
Number of Land Trusts in the United States, 1965-1990

Currently, an estimated 640,000 - 800,000 members support land trusts, which in turn have protected 2.7 million acres\(^7\) [Poole 1992, 54; Hayes 1992; Martens and Peterson 1992, 41; Myers 1992, v; Land Trust Alliance 1991]. Between 1988 and 1990, the numbers of land trusts and supporting members have increased 20%, and the number of acres protected has increased 35% [Land Trust Alliance 1991, iv] from 2 million acres 1988, and up from approximately 1.5 million acres in 1984 [Land Trust Exchange 1989] [See Fig. 2].

Methods for calculating acreage protected by land trusts vary. It is unknown if earlier figures included land that had been transferred by existing land trusts to other organizations or public agencies; therefore double-counting may have occurred. For example, in 1983, Metzger cited that nearly 3 million acres had been protected by land trusts [Metzger 1983, 2]; a comparable number to totals given ten years later in the early 1990s. Metzger (1983), however,

\(^7\) This number does not include over 7.78 million acres protected by The Nature Conservancy. [The Nature Conservancy-WI Chapter 1994] The noted growth in land trusts documented by the Land Trust Alliance refers to those locally organized and geographically oriented to the respective region, as opposed to national organizations.
did indicate that over half of those 3 million acres had been transferred to public agencies [Metzger 1983, 2].

Professionals in the field believe the growth of land trusts in recent years to be a significant trend [Brenneman 1984, xi; Davis and Duffus 1984, 2; Myers 1992, v]. Increased land trust activity has been most intense in areas where development is most pressing; the northeast, northwest, mid-Atlantic, the California coast, Florida, and midwestern cities [Poole 1992, 55; Hays 1992, B1]. Currently in the US, 42% of the land trusts are located in the New England states, 17% in Mid-Atlantic states, 13% in the Far West, 11% in the Great Lakes, 8% in the South, 3% in the Plains states, 3% in the Rocky Mountain States, and 2% in the Southwest [Land Trust Alliance 1991, v].

After researching land trusts in the Great Lakes region (Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio) in the mid-1980s, Foti and Jacobs (1989) predicted that "the recent dramatic growth of land trusts is expected to continue" [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317]. Of the local or regional land conservation organizations (LRLCOs) they surveyed, over 95% anticipated their membership to increase or remain stable [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 318].
The Big Four

Four specific non-profit organizations are particularly noteworthy in that they are nationally focused land trusts and/or they provide technical and financial assistance for the many small, region-specific land trusts. These four organizations are:

- **The Nature Conservancy**  
  1815 North Lynn St  
  Arlington VA 22209  
  (703) 841-5300

- **Land Trust Alliance**  
  900 17th St NW Ste. 410  
  Washington DC 20026  
  (202) 785-1410

- **Trust for Public Land**  
  116 New Montgomery St 4th Fl  
  San Francisco, CA 94105  
  (415) 495-4014

- **American Farmland Trust**  
  1920 N St NW, Ste 400  
  Washington DC 20036  
  (202-659-5170)

[Conservation Directory 1993]

The Nature Conservancy


In the 1970s, TNC expanded its efforts to protect biodiversity, taking new steps to work with government agencies in order to achieve their goals [Myers 1992, 7] and have subsequently saved American tax-payers millions of dollars [Endicott 1993, 19]. TNC also works with educational institutions and private conservation agencies, in managing its system of over 1600 nature sanctuaries worldwide [Conservation Directory 1993, 111]. With assets totaling $728 million in 1989, TNC is one of the ten largest non-profit organizations in the country [Klintberg 1991, 14].

---

8 The group membership and acreage numbers given of these four groups are not included in figures for local land trusts.
In 1990, 78.7% of TNC's funds were contributed by individuals, 11.6% came from corporations, and 9.7% was received from foundations [National Research Council 1993, 153]. By 1990, TNC's budget was $223 million, [Myers 1992, 7; Klintberg 1991, 14] and as of 1994, TNC is supported by 812,145 members, having protected 7.78 million acres in the United States [WiTNC 1994].

The Nature Conservancy stands apart from "localized" land trusts not only through its sheer size, but also in regard to its narrower mission. TNC's efforts focus on protecting unique ecosystems and rare or endangered species on global, national, and statewide bases [Hays 1992; Burkart 1991, 15]. While localized land trusts generally have smaller geographical regions of focus, they are likely to have a broader mandate, including protection of recreation areas, the aesthetics, community, resource lands, and natural habitat [Hays 1992; Poole 1992, 55]. The Nature Conservancy has been known to give land to local land trusts, if the parcel was not on TNC's own priority list [Hays 1992, B8].

**Trust for Public Land**

Another significant national organization is the Trust for Public Land (TPL) [Endicott 1993; National Research Council 1993; Myers 1992]. Established in 1973, TPL was designed not to function as a permanent land trust per se, but rather as a clearinghouse, facilitator, financier, and logistical helper [Myers 1992, 8; Poole 1992, 8; Burkart 1991, 15; Mother Jones 1987, 66; National Research Council 1993, 139]. With a broader mission than The Nature Conservancy, TPL works to create and protect public parks, recreation areas, urban open spaces, historic and cultural sites, community gardens, and natural areas [Myers 1992, 8; Klintberg 1991, 14; Conservation Directory 1993, 116; Endicott 1993, 62]. TPL does not aim to permanently own land or easements like TNC, but rather to serve as an intermediary for the government [Myers 1992, 8; Klintberg 1991, 14; Endicott 1993, 61]. TPL provides expertise on tax planning, financial strategy, and real estate law to landowners and land trusts through its National Land Counselor Program [Endicott 1993, 69]. As of 1991, TPL had a $17 million annual budget funded primarily through proceeds from land acquisitions which had been transferred to the government, and from private donations [Myers 1992, 8; Klintberg 1991, 14; Endicott 1993, 61]. TPL has been involved with 751 projects in 39 states, helping to protect 526,000 acres of now
publicly-owned land and has assisted in establishing 170 new land trusts [TPL Land and People, Annual Report 1991 as cited in Myers 1992, 8; Endicott 1993, 61].

**Land Trust Alliance**

The Land Trust Alliance (LTA), was established in 1982 as the Land Trust Exchange [Land Trust Alliance 1991; Land Trust Exchange, 1989]. With the mission to "serve as a vehicle of communication, assistance, and interchange in private land conservation" [Land Trust Exchange, 1989] by providing services and programs for local and regional land trusts to increase their skills and competence [Conservation Directory 1993, 95]. LTA provides a quarterly journal and informational services, holds conferences, conducts research and fosters public policies pertinent to the land trust community [Poole 1992, 86; Land Trust Alliance 1991; Land Trust Exchange, 1989; Conservation Directory 1993, 95].

**American Farmland Trust**

American Farmland Trust (AFT) is a national organization providing public education and technical assistance in policy development to "stop the loss of productive farmland and to promote farming practices that lead to a healthy environment" [Conservation Directory 1993, 49]. AFT has protected tens of thousand of acres since it was founded in 1980 [Gaining Ground 1993, 2; Endicott 1993, 44]. Hundreds of farmers have been helped by AFT in acquiring or retaining farmland during financial trouble [Endicott 1993, 46]. AFT also researches and advocates sustainable agriculture practices [Endicott 1993, 58]. AFT has over 21,000 members and a $3 million budget, funded by membership fees, foundation, and corporate grants [Gaining Ground 1993, 2; Conservation Directory 1993, 49].

**Growth From the Roots**

Considerably different from the four national organizations, (TNC, TPL, LTA, AFT) the notable growth in land trusts in the 20th century has come from local grassroots efforts [Brenneman and Bates 1984, xi; Poole 1992, 54; Hays 1992; Myers 1992, 8; Metzger 1983, 2; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 9]. Burkart (1991) identifies local land trusts' strength as the inherent foci on their communities to "increase public awareness and support for land conservation" [Burkart 1991, 16]. The Lincoln Institute study cites 68% of the land trusts
surveyed had geographic foci of no more than one town or county, while the remaining 32% had foci ranging from two counties to a multi-state region [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 18]. Areas of focus tend to be smaller for eastern land trusts, and larger for those in the West [Davis and Duffus 1987, 5]. Suggesting land trust emphases in rural areas, the Great Lakes survey in the mid-1980s revealed 64% of the acres protected to be in rural areas, with 26% and 8% respectively in suburban and urban areas [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 318].

Myers (1992) cites that the formation of many new grassroots land trusts was spurred by the examples of, and in some cases with assistance from, the four national organizations [Myers 1992, 8]. Many communities have established local land trusts specifically to serve as receptacles for conservation easements [Small 1992, 18; Metzger 1983]. Local land trusts are often established in crisis situations to protect a specific, threatened parcels [National Research Council 1993, 140; Abbott 1989, 13].

Jean Hocker, director of the Land Trust Alliance in Washington DC, attributes the trend of locally-focused land trusts to the fact that, "Individuals sense that this is a way they can make a difference. By acting locally they can see results. They know who they're giving money to and what their money is doing" [Poole 1992, 55]. While there are often shared goals among these localized land trusts, they are diverse, in size, budget, goals, and holdings [Myers 1992, 8]. Some land trusts may protect a few acres, while others are responsible for hundreds of thousands [Poole 1992, 55]. Professionals in the field believe that localized, land trusts coming from the grassroots play an important role in the conservation movement given the variety of their missions, abilities, and sizes [Brenneman and Bates 1984, xii; Myers 1992, 7; National Research Council 1993, 139].

**Explanations for the Growth of Land Trusts**

Explanations for the growth of land trusts vary. The prevailing explanation of land trust growth is that the private non-profit sector is providing a service that the public sector can not or will not fulfill, due to financial and/or political constraints [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317; Hays 1992; Martens and Peterson 1992, 41; Myers 1992, 7; Endicott 1993, xiii]. Foti and Jacobs (1989) point to poorly planned cities, undefined urban edges and the lack of sustainable
agriculture and forestry belts as evidence that the public sector generally does not efficiently or
equitably manage land resources [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317]. Marten and Peterson (1992) cite
that, "Many land trusts start in high growth areas where environmentalists and residents feel
government or developers are being insensitive to conservation needs" [Martens and Peterson
1992, 41]. Therefore, the marked growth in land trusts can be seen as an avenue for the private
sector to "compliment and supplement" the actions of the public sector [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317;
Abbott 1984, 13]. Peter Borelli, vice-president of the Open Space Institute in Ossining, New
York, said that "...the real force behind the formation of so many land trusts may be that local
planning boards have failed to adequately regulate development" [Hays 1992].

These opinions are numerically supported, given the decrease in federal funds
appropriated through the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LAWCON) for land
acquisition. In 1978, $800 million out of a possible $900 million per year of LAWCON funds
were appropriated for federal land acquisition [National Research Council 1993, 43; Endicott
1993, 224]. That amount steadily declined, reaching its lowest point in 1982 at $200 million and
remained below $400 million per year until 1991 when it just reached that amount, only to
decline again the following year [National Research Council 1993, 43; Endicott 1993, 224].

Another explanation of land trust growth is tied to public awareness of environmental
issues. With the assumption that the general public's sensitivity to environmental issues has
increased, the protection of open space and habitat, (the general goal of land trusts) has become
more widely understood and thus, more popular [Hays 1992; Poole 1992, 55; Myers 1992, 7].
Inversely, Martens and Peterson (1992) suggest that the "Enormous growth in the land trust
movement is signalling a new environmental movement" [Martens and Peterson 1992, 41].

Foti and Jacobs (1989) attribute the emergence of land trusts to the very nature of
pluralistic politics [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317]. Given that the public sector must appease many
constituencies with land-use policy, the result is generally the lowest common denominator
[Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317; Myers 1992, v]. Land trusts however, do not necessarily need to be
concerned about satisfying anybody except their own financial supporters [Foti and Jacobs 1989,
317; Foti 1987, 191]. Even so, Hays (1992) and Brenneman and Bates (1984) suggest that
amicable relations with the community in which land trusts operate are advantageous [Hays
Yet in general, as private non-profit entities, land trusts have the freedom to advocate more creative ideas and ambitious plans than can the public sector [Foti 1989, 191].

**Private Land Protection Methods**

Land trusts use a wide variety of tools and processes that are generally lumped into the category of land-protection methods [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 21]. The variety of methods thus results in a spectrum of protection. Of the 387 groups which responded to the Lincoln Institute's survey, the traditional, most widely-used method (82%) of land protection was fee-simple land acquisition [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 21]. Whyte (1968) identifies the fee-simple method as "the best way to save land" [Whyte 1968, 54]. Fifty-three percent (53%) of the land trusts serve as third-party facilitators, transferring land ownership to another entity, ie. government or another non-profit. Conservation easements or deed restrictions were used by 41% of the groups to protect land and 20% used limited development agreements. This ratio of utilized methods applies to all regions of the country except the Rocky Mountain states, where conservation easements are used more widely (75%) than fee-simple (67%) [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 21].

**Conservation Easements**

While easements are an "ancient" concept, [Whyte 1968, 79] the use of conservation easements became popular starting in the 1950s, and are now a commonly used tool for land protection [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 150; Martens and Peterson 1992, 42; Small 1992, 11; Poole 1992, 55]. In the broadest sense, a conservation easement is a legally binding, recorded restriction on the development of a property, for current and all future owners [Small 1992, 11; Brenneman and Bates 1984, 5; Poole 1992, 55; Last, 1993; National Research Council 1993, 158; Sagal 1993, 8; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 66; Whyte 1968, 79]. Most states have codified some variation of the Uniform Conservation Easement Act to statutorily authorize conservation easements [National Research Council 1993, 158]. While most easements are recorded in "perpetuity" to travel with the land, that does not necessarily mean forever [Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 66; Whyte 1968, 83]. Most easements include a reverter
clause such that if the purpose for the easement no longer exists, the rights are returned to the owner of the fee-simple. Even so, Whyte (1968) concludes that conservation easements "...are very binding indeed....This is why they work" [Whyte 1968, 82].

The desired result of restricted development is usually to protect habitat, open space, scenic views, resource lands, and areas of cultural or historic significance [Small 1992, 15; Last, 1993; National Research Council 1993, 158; Sagal 1993, 8]. Conservation easements may either be sold or donated by the land owner (the "grantor") to a grantee. If a federal income tax deduction is desired from donating a conservation easement, the only bodies legally allowed to receive them are an approved, tax-exempt non-profit organizations or the government [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 5; Last, 1993; National Research Council 1993, 158; Sagal 1993, 8; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 66; Youngman 1994]. Brumbach and Brumbach (1988) estimate that 2 million acres of land in the US have recorded conservation easements, held between 500 nonprofit organizations and government agencies [Brumbach and Brumbach 1988 as cited in [National Research Council 1993, 159].

Conservation easements can be advantageous for landowners because an individually tailored easement can allow the grantor desired privileges [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 150; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 71; Whyte 1968] while reaping financial advantages [Small 1992, 11; Martens and Peterson 1992, 42; Last 1993; National Research Council 1993, 158; Sagal 1993, 8; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 71; Whyte 1968, 82]. When a conservation easement is donated to a charitable organization, the value of the easement may allow the grantor a federal income tax deduction [Small 1992, 11; Last, 1993; Sagal 1993, 8; Whyte 1968, 82]. The value of the deduction equals the value of the conservation easement. The value is figured by subtracting the value of the land with the easement in place, from the highest value before the easement [Small 1992, 20; Whyte 1968, 87]. The grantor can deduct the value of a conservation easement (up to 30% of their current year's income) from their federal income taxes, and then spread any remaining easement value over the next five years [Martens and Peterson 1992, 42].

Small (1992) advocates conservation easements as a way to reduce the "extra value" of land, which thereby reduces estate taxes [Small 1992, 9]. "Extra value" accumulates when the
value of the land is more valuable to potential developers than to the current conditions preferred by the land owners [Small 1992, 9]. If the development potential is removed by recording a conservation easement, the assessed property value decreases and future estate taxes accordingly [Small 1992, 9].

In the same manner, reduced property value may also lower or stabilize a grantor's property taxes [Small 1992, 11; Martens and Peterson 1992, 42; Brenneman and Bates 1984, 15; Last 1993; Sagal 1993, 8; Whyte 1968, 82]. Because property taxes are state law, such provisions vary state to state [Small 1992, 11; Martens and Peterson 1992, 42; Brenneman and Bates 1984, 15; Last 1993; Sagal 1993, 8].

Not all conservation easement donations, however, qualify for tax reductions [Sagal 1993, 8]. To do so, the easement must be recognized as serving conservation purposes which include protection of habitat, watershed, public recreation and scenic areas and historic or cultural buildings [Small 1992, 16; Mother Jones 1987, 66].

From the perspective of land trusts, conservation easements are a logical land protection tool, because they are generally less expensive to acquire and maintain than a fee simple transaction [Martens and Peterson, 1992, 42; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 71]. The key to successfully protecting land via conservation easements is monitoring and enforcement [Poole 1992, 5; Brenneman and Bates 1984, 58]. Ward and Benfield (1989) recognize that conservation easements are often granted through philanthropic motives of the landowner [Ward and Benfield, 1989 as cited in National Research Council 1993, 158] and therefore few problems with enforcement arise in the short-term [National Research Council 1993, 160]. Since easements travel with the title of the land in perpetuity, it is important that land trusts survive, in order to enforce their land protection efforts [Poole 1992, 57]. To fund enforcement and monitoring efforts, land trusts may require a monetary donation to accompany a donated easement [Poole 1992, 58].

Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader (1982) provide conflicting information, explaining that the easily overlooked disadvantages of conservation easements are making them the "most misused and overused tool for land protection in the United States." The flexibility that makes conservation easements attractive makes them unreliable. Conservation easements can
potentially be much more expensive to hold then might be expected due to monitoring and legal costs if enforcement is necessary [Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 71].

**Funding and Operations of Local Land Trusts**

Like The Nature Conservancy, local land trusts derive most of their support from private contributions [Poole 1992, 55; Hays 1992, B8; National Research Council 1993, 153]. Land trusts in Great Lakes region received 91.9% of their funding from membership dues and 87.1% of the groups rated their financial health as good or very good. Of these groups, 83.9% maintain staffs, two-thirds of which were paid, full-time employees [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 318].

According to the 1981 Lincoln Institute survey, 60% of the responding local land trusts in the US operated on an annual budget of less than $20,000 at the time [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 20]. By the early 1990s there were twice as many local land trusts in the United States, with about half of them operating on an annual budget of less than $10,000 [Poole 1992, 55]. The Lincoln Institute survey also found that the best funded land trusts are those located in the Mid-Atlantic and southern regions, or those which focus on farm and forest-land protection [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 19]. Besides membership dues, financial support for land trusts may come from a variety of fund-raising events, ranging from bluegrass festivals to pig roasts, annual dinners to direct solicitation. Land trusts have found the most successful events to be sales of T-shirts and native plants [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 21].

**Laws and Legislation**

**Land and Water Conservation Fund**

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF or LAWCON) is a significant piece of national legislation with regard to land protection [Myers 1992, 8; National Research Council 1993, 1]. In 1965 Congress established LAWCON in recognition of the need for public investment in parks and open space at the federal and state levels. LAWCON is funded with user-charges and off-shore oil receipts [Myers 1992, 8]. Originally, the states were to receive 60% of the funds, with 40% to the federal agencies. The ratio requirements were altered in 1976 to favor
federal agencies and remain a point for debate. Since that time, the states have received 26%, of the funds on average [US Government 1993, 4].

LAWCON is authorized for $900 million annually, although Congress must appropriate the funding each year. Since LAWCON's inception, federal agencies have spent over $5 billion, acquiring approximately 4 million acres of land and water [US Government 1993, 1]. State governments have received $3.2 billion in matching grants to acquire over 2 million acres of land to address conservation, recreation, historic preservation and wildlife habitat protection objectives [National Research Council 1993, 2; US Government 1993, 1].

During the 1970s, Congress appropriated nearly all of the authorized funds for LAWCON [US Government 1993, 1; Endicott 1993, 224; National Research Council 1993]. After 1978 however, LAWCON appropriations dropped 75% to reach an all time low in 1982 [National Research Council 1993 43; Endicott 1993, 224]. Appropriations have since increased but are still less then half the amount originally authorized in 1978 [National Research Council 1993 43; Endicott 1993, 224]. Since the 1980s, annual LAWCON appropriations have averaged less than one-third of the authorized ceiling [US Government 1993, 2] [See Fig. 4]. The unused authorized funds do not accumulate. They have since been used for other programs or for deficit reduction [US Government 1993, 2]. The Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee recommended that $218,550,000 be appropriated for fiscal year 1995 [Interior Subcommittee, 1994].

In 1992, two bills were introduced to Congress to increase LAWCON allocations to the states, and to allow direct grants to non-profit groups [Exchange 1992, 2]. Neither bill passed Congressional committee [Barton 1994]. In 1993, Senator J. Bennett Johnston introduced legislation (S.721) to increase LAWCON authorization from $900 million to $1 billion annually. While the bill made its out of committee, [US Government 1993, 1], it has not received any further attention as of July 1994 [Energy and Natural Resources Committee, 1994].

Alternative Minimum Tax

In 1993 the federal government repealed the alternative minimum tax (AMT) rule. Given this change in the tax codes, tax-exempt non-profit organizations predict an increase in their charitable donation revenue. Previously, the AMT rule reduced the allowable income tax
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deduction for donated property or conservation easements that had appreciated in value from the time the owner acquired it. With the AMT rule repealed, donors may receive higher income tax deductions for charitable donations [Common Ground 1994, 2]. Deductions had previously been limited in 1986, which according to land trusts, resulted in losses of donated land and conservation easements [Exchange 1992, 2].

Estate Tax

Small (1992) proclaims federal estate tax policy to be the "...biggest single threat to the protection of farmland and forest land, watershed, open space, wildlife habitat, and scenic vistas." He attributes this threat to the rapidly increasing land values, consistently high estate taxes (some exceeding 50%), and the failure of people to understand the changing value of their land. For example, if a parent wills land to a child, the child will be faced with estate taxes. If the beneficiary cannot afford to pay the estate taxes, the property is often subdivided and sold. This is a common situation if the family has failed to realize and prepare for the appreciating value of their land [Small 1992, 7].
Opposition to Local Land Trusts

Despite the rapid growth of land trusts in recent years, opposition to them does exist [Hays 1992, B1; Klintberg 1991, 13; Land Rights Letter, 1991 as cited in National Research Council 1993, 98]. One fear is that land trusts will alienate public officials or undermine town planning [Hays 1992, B8]. Concern about economic impact of protected land is two-fold. First of all, depending on local jurisdiction, land trusts' parcels may have reduced or waived property taxes, reducing a community's property tax base [Hays 1992, B8; Small 1992, 11; Klintberg 1991, 13; Marten and Peterson 1992, 42; Brenneman and Bates 1984, 15; National Research Council 1993, 98]. In some cases however, land trusts pay the property taxes of their protected parcels even if they are not required, in order to "build good will" with the community [Hays 1992, B8; Brenneman and Bates 1984, 57].

Another economic concern over increasing amounts of protected land is that development or resource extraction may be restricted on protected land and thus contribute to a community's decline [Hays 1992, B8]. The opportunity cost of protecting open-space varies by location [Hays 1992, B8]. Tom Whyatt, executive director of the Westchester Land Trust in New York, points out that, "In rural areas, open space pays more in property tax than it costs in services, like garbage collection and schools. Residential development costs more in town services than it pays in taxes" [Hays 1992, B8]. Research by the American Farmland Trust (1994) concurs. The average ratio of dollars generated by residential development to services required was $1: $1.54. In contrast, the ratio for farm, forest land and open-space to services required was $1: $0.34 [American Farmland Trust 1994].

Dissent toward land trusts is found to generally be the exception rather than the rule. Most documentation of questionable or negative actions of land trusts are anecdotal, not inherent. The general consensus of land trusts is that they are an important tool in land-use planning [Brenneman and Bates 1984, xii; Myers 1992, 7].

Problems Facing Land Trusts

As with virtually any non-profit organization, land trusts face a variety of problems specific to their cause. The Lincoln Institute survey indicates financial challenges as the most
common problem among land trusts [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 21]. The Land Trust Alliance also recognizes that the primary need of land trusts is money, and a salaried executive director. Anecdotal information suggests that hiring an executive director can be a turning point for local land trusts to increase their membership and to become self-sustaining [Burkhart 1991, 25].

Other problems revealed in the Lincoln Institute survey include lack of administrative continuity; no paid staff; the need for better education among board members; indifference and occasional hostility of the public; problematic relationships with local officials; and an inability to compete financially and politically with developers [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 21]. A feasibility study of land protection strategies in North Carolina revealed similar problems. This study concluded that when the private non-profit sector in North Carolina has attempted to "fill in the gap in land protection" in North Carolina "there is an obvious lack of expertise and mentorship in organizational dynamics....Further, there is a lack of training in real estate negotiating and financing..." [Burkhart 1991, 27].

**Public-Private Partnerships for Land Protection**

Metzger (1983) acknowledges that land trusts "are often most effective when they are in partnership with the government" [Metzger 1983, 2]. Foti (1987) found one-third of the Great Lakes land trusts to be involved with the public sector for protection efforts in some capacity [Foti 1987, 199] and predicted continued cooperation [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 319]. The National Research Council (1993) acknowledges that:

"A new conservation paradigm may come to rely more on property partnerships and management agreements between federal and local agencies and between public and private non-profit conservation interests and private landowners than on strict federal ownership and control of the landscape."

[National Research Council 1993, 6]

The foundation for public-private partnerships in land protection was laid with the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LAWCON) in 1965 [Metzger 1983, 2] from which ad hoc partnerships formed as the need arose [Myers 1992, 9].
Beneficial Partnerships

General consensus deems partnerships between the public and private sectors in land protection efforts to be beneficial [Martens and Peterson 1992; Myers 1992, xvi; Metzger 1983, 2; Vilms 1988, 1; Coffin 1992, 2; Gaining Ground 1991, 1; Burkart 1991, 16; National Research Council 1993, 9; Endicott 1993, xiii]. Endicott (1993) indicates that public-private partnerships, which were a novelty in the 1970s, are now commonplace. In the 1990s it is "almost the exception if significant land acquisition is accomplished without a partner from the private sector and one from the public sector, if not more than one from each side" [Endicott 1993, 3].

While most partnerships are informal or work on an ad hoc basis, an increasing number are formalized relationships [Myers 1992]. A 1991 study by Myers (1992) for the Land Trust Alliance, (hereafter referred to as the "Myers' study") found 14 land protection programs in 13 states9 which are "statutorily providing for partnerships with non-profits" [Myers 1992, x]. Most formal partnerships require financial contributions from the non-profit organization, ranging from one-fifth to three-fourths of the project cost [Myers 1992, xii]. Over 400,000 acres have been protected through the states' formal, public-private partnerships [Endicott 1993, 3]. Since Myers' study, two more states10 have adopted similar programs [Barton 1994]. Myers (1992) concludes that the question is no longer whether or not to create public-private sector partnerships to protect land, but rather how to improve them [Myers 1992, xiv].

The marked expansion in land trusts during the last few decades, as described earlier, has been attributed to the inability of the public sector to satisfactorily protect land [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317; Hays 1992; Martens and Peterson 1992, 41; Myers 1992, 7]. It then seems ironic that people and organizations involved with land trusts have been acknowledging and advocating mutually beneficial partnerships between the public and private non-profit sectors [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 19; Foti and Jacobs 1989, 319; Foti 1987, 199; Myers 1992, ix; Exchange 1992, 12; Brown 1992, 5; Davis and Duffus 1987, 13; Low 1993, 3; Nature Conservancy 1993, 28].

---

9 The 13 states are California (2 programs), Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin [Myers 1992, 15].
10 Pennsylvania and Colorado [Barton 1994]
Two Models for Partnerships

Myers (1992) classifies public-private partnerships for land protection into two main models—proactive and reactive. The pro-active model for partnerships involves the creation of a small, new agency which actively seeks and fosters public-private land protection project. As a separate agency, the pro-active model allows greater freedom for implementing projects, with a minimum of formal rules. Myers' (1992) declares the pro-active model to be the approach "best able to capitalize on the strengths of non-profits." However, a political problem can arise in allocating funds to establish a new agency.11 She labels California's and Vermont's public-private partnerships as pro-active models for statewide land protection [Myers 1992, xiii].

The reactive model for statewide public-private land protection efforts is designed to fit into an already established land management agency, where the agency officials respond to projects brought forward by non-profit groups [Myers 1992, xiii]. An advantage in a reactive model is that little change in necessary in the already-existing agencies. A disadvantage is that this model is more constraining in terms of rules and regulations. Additionally, the reactive model as less responsive to the non-profit groups than the pro-active model. She cites Rhode Island's and Iowa's public-private partnerships for land protection efforts as examples of the reactive model [Myers 1992, xiii].

Benefits of Partnerships-The Agencies' Perspective

From a public agency's perspective, advantages to working with the private non-profit sector are many. Private land trusts have better potential for obtaining lower land prices [Myers 1992, ix; Metzger 1983, 2; Harper 1985, 10; Coffin 1992, 2; Endicott 1993, 4]. Land trusts are more likely to have the necessary expertise in easements and bargain sales than government staffs [Martens and Peterson 1992, 44; Gaining Ground 1991, 1; Endicott 1993, 4]. Also, a land trust may already have some funding available for a project and may be in the position to rally community support for it [Myers 1992, ix; Vilms 1988, 1; National Research Council 1993, 99; Endicott 1993, 4]. Given that the land trust growth has come mainly from local, grassroots

11 Funding for public-private land protection partnerships is likely to come from a variety of avenues, including user fees, oil and gas exploration taxes, real estate transaction surcharges, and public bonds. [Myers 1992, 14]
efforts [Brenneman and Bates 1984, xi; Poole 1992, 54; Hays 1992; Myers 1992, 8; Metzger 1983, 2; Rusmore, Swaney, and Spader 1982, 9], the members inherently have high personal incentive to succeed in their efforts. If politically sensitive land is involved, landowners may not want to work with the government, but may communicate with land trusts as intermediaries or facilitators [Lee 1992, 5; Martens and Peterson 1992, 44; Foti and Jacobs 1989, 319; Myers 1992, ix; Burkart 1991, 17; National Research Council 1993, 9; Endicott 1993, 4]. A land trust can move faster than a public agency in the private market for land acquisition [Metzger 1983, 2; Endicott 1993, 4; Coffin 1992, 2; Burkart 1991, 15; National Research Council 1993, 9].

The National Research Council (1993) recognizes that The Nature Conservancy, a private non-profit organization, has "the largest and most extensive data base for rare species, communities and ecosystems in the world" [National Research Council 1993, 153]. This information could therefore be a valuable resource for the public sector agencies [National Research Council 1993, 153]. While this situation of a private non-profit organization having a resource above and beyond that of the public sector is an anomaly, it demonstrates another potential benefit for public-private partnerships.

Benefits of Partnerships-The Land Trusts' Perspective

From the land trusts' perspective, working with the public sector is advantageous in that it greatly increases the pool of funds, [Endicott 1993, 4] technical knowledge and legal assistance for land protection [Myers 1992, ix; Metzger 1983, 2]. Also, involvement with the public sector virtually guarantees long term land stewardship [Myers 1992, ix]. Lastly, land trusts have acknowledged that the added visibility and credibility afforded them from working with government agencies helps in raising private funding without sacrificing private funding [Myers 1992, ix].

Myers (1992) concluded that state programs are a catalyst for spurring land protection activity within the private non-profit sector. While the cause and effect is yet undocumented, states with formalized partnerships do in fact lead in land trust growth [Myers 1992, xiii].

Citizen Involvement

Myers' (1992) case studies of formalized public-private partnerships in California, Iowa, Rhode Island, and Vermont revealed that they all include voting citizens on the
partnership review boards. These partnership review boards exist to provide flexibility in awarding grants to non-profit organizations; they can decide on a case by case basis how much money should be contributed from both parties. The boards are composed of governor-appointed citizen representatives, agency officials, and in some cases, legislators. To assure citizen involvement in allocating public funds, the number of non-agency board-members either equals or out-numbers agency board-members in all four states [Myers 1992, 52].

Federal Agencies' Role

The National Park Service (NPS) and the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) have recently enacted programs to provide funds to non-profit organizations to purchase land which is then frequently turned over to the agency [Coffin 1992, 1; Klintberg 1991, 13; Endicott 1993, 83; Myers 1992, ix; Common Ground June 1992, 3:4]. Between 1985 and 1991 land trusts sold properties worth $170 million to public agencies below-cost, saving taxpayers over $32 million [Endicott 1993, 4; Coffin 1992, 2]. The Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Land, Conservation Fund, and National Audubon Society are non-profits who have served as intermediaries for public agencies most frequently [Coffin 1992, 2]. The Nature Conservancy, Ducks Unlimited, and Trust for Public Land have helped the government protect over 4 million acres [Endicott 1993, 4].

Evolving Partnerships

The National Research Council (1993) acknowledges that new forms of public-private land ownership are making the distinction between the public and private roles less and less clear [National Research Council 1993, 49]. Besides traditional work with land trusts, other forms of partnerships include intergenerational lease-back mechanisms, less-then-fee management options, covenants between private owners, transferred or purchased development rights, compensatory zoning, reserved and dedicated rights [National Research Council 1993, 49].

As ecosystem- and landscape-based approaches to land management evolve in the 1990s, there are subsequent implications for land protection methods and policies [Endicott 1993, 4; National Research Council 1993, 5]. The new understanding of ecosystems as dynamic rather than steady-state models also has "profound consequences for conservation efforts" [National
The Nature Conservancy applies new ecological perspectives in its "Last Great Places" campaign. This campaign is designed to protect bioreserves consisting of entire watersheds, deserts, and forests in ecological and economic terms [Endicott 1993, 41]. With increasing importance placed on spatial and temporal aspects of ecosystem structure, function, and processes, larger natural areas must be considered for protection [National Research Council 1993, 5; Endicott 1993, 11; Newmark 1987, 430]. Strategic island reserves are not enough to achieve conservation goals; connectivity [Davis and Duffus 1987, 8] and larger areas must be considered [National Research Council 1993, 5; Endicott 1993, 4]. As the area for conservation increases, so too does cost and number of political jurisdictions involved [Endicott 1993, 4]. Hence, public-private partnerships and innovative partial-interest acquisitions are likely to be used more commonly than fee-simple acquisition in the 21st century conservation efforts [National Research Council 1993, 5; Endicott 1993, 4].

As partnerships and new techniques for land protection become institutionalized, Endicott (1993) cites the key to their success as "a common vision." Yet the important distinguishing factors of both sectors must be preserved in order to maintain their "complementary strengths" which makes the partnerships symbiotic in the first place [Endicott 1993, 9].

**Criticisms of Partnerships**

Whenever public funds are allocated, there will be discussion among the legislature, agencies, and tax-payers as to the need, value, effectiveness, and equity of the end product. Not surprisingly, this dialog is just as obligatory when the decision to fund public-private land protection projects must be made [Myers 1992, 4].

**Ideological Concerns**

Besides the issue of diverting limited public funds to land protection, concern has been raised among some publics that non-profit organizations could drive the public sector's conservation agenda [Myers 1992, 4]. Fear exists also that government funds will be misused and that land will be mismanaged [Myers 1992, 4; Klintberg 1991, 14]. There is some discontent with the idea that non-profits organizations are "sneakily" purchasing land under the guise of an
innocent special interest, only to turn it over to the government, and thus circumnavigate public
comments [Klintberg 1991, 14].

With ad hoc partnerships in particular, priorities and visions between partners tend to be mixed, authority unclear, and the guidelines for compensation confusing [Myers 1992, 9]. A controversial 1992 report suggested that the Department of the Interior paid private non-profit organizations $7.1 million above fair market value when acting as middlemen in land acquisition [Coffin 1992, 1]. Other reports, however, indicated a savings of $32.3 million from 1986 to 1992 between the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service [Coffin 1992, 2]. The disparity between both figures are unreconciled because the land values are averaged out; some parcels may be donated while others may be purchased for an amount higher than fair-market value [Coffin 1992, 2].

**Impromptu and Statutory Partnerships**

While the benefits of impromptu, or "ad hoc" partnerships are virtually the same as formalized ones, the weaknesses differ. The very shortcomings of ad hoc partnerships incidentally paved the way for statutory, formal agreements. Newer, formalized partnerships were designed to minimize the previously described problems and concerns [Myers 1992]. With formalized partnerships, standard calculations and policies are statutorily approved to avoid the financial confusion found in earlier projects, and established mechanisms are used to insure proper land management and use. Some states require that from the start, they hold the title to land they help purchase. Other states design agreements with the non-profit groups which turn land over to the state if there is a breech of contract [Myers 1992, xiv].

**Concerns of Land Trusts**

Concern regarding aspects of public-private partnerships exists within the land trust community as well. One fear is that financial support from the public sector will stunt private donations, weaken the land trust community, and make the non-profit groups dependent on infamously erratic public funding [Myers 1992, 4; Metzger 1983].
Private Land Protection in Wisconsin

Foti's (1987) findings on local and regional land conservation organizations (LRLCOs) in the Great Lakes states provides the only known research on land trusts of the region. In several instances, Wisconsin has led the nation in progressive policy and ideas with regard to land. Given this, along with Wisconsin's significant natural resource base, the state may well be an indicator of trends to come for other midwestern states.

Acres and Organizations

Land Trust Alliance (LTA) (1993) currently recognizes 24 land trusts in Wisconsin, not including the Wisconsin Chapter of The Nature Conservancy (WiTNC) or Trust for Public Land [Land Trust Alliance 1993]. In 1988 there were just 18 land trusts in the state, suggesting a nearly 28% increase between 1988 and 1993. The national growth rate between 1988 and 1990 was 20% [Land Trust Alliance 1991, iv].

Excluding acres protected by The Nature Conservancy, Land Trust Alliance data indicates an increase in number of acres protected by local land trusts in Wisconsin [Land Trust Exchange, 1989; Land Trust Alliance, 1991]. Based strictly on LTA data, the number of acres protected by local land trusts in Wisconsin has increased 121.6% between 1988 and 1990 [Land Trust Exchange, 1989; Land Trust Alliance, 1991]. This growth rate however must not be taken out of context. The land trusts listed by LTA are only those which received and returned a

---

12 Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin
13 In 1923 Wisconsin became the first state in the nation to adopt county zoning laws [Carstensen 1958, 1; Cannon 1993, iii; Dresen 1992, 4; Aplin 1986, 3]. Wisconsin was also one of the first state's to mandate shoreline and floodplain zoning when it passed its Water Resources Act in 1966. [Chapter 614, laws of 1965 as cited in Dresen and Vollbrecht 1986]. The decision to uphold the constitutionality of shoreline zoning was decided in Just v. Marinette County [56 Wis. 2d 7, 201 N.W.2d 761, 1972 as cited in Large 1973, 1075]. In its decision, the Wisconsin Supreme Court distinguished that shoreline zoning did not constitute a taking or eminent domain because it simply maintains the status quo of the natural environment [Large 1973, 1076]. By 1981, wetland zoning was mandated in Wisconsin for counties, cities, and villages was mandated by 1981 [Dresen 1992].
Wisconsin was home to two of the most famous figures in conservation history; John Muir and Aldo Leopold [Strong 1988]. After leaving Wisconsin, Muir later established the Sierra Club in 1892 [Strong 1988, 97]. Leopold wrote A Sand County Almanac in which articulated the concept of the land ethic [Leopold 1949]. Sand County Almanac is commonly cited as the cornerstone to ecology and environmentalism [Callicott 1987, vii] [Strong 1988,135].
14 This percent is based on the "Total Acres Protected" figures provided from 10 Wisconsin organizations in 1988 (3,646 acres) [LTA 1989, 157-160] and 13 organizations respectively, only the 10 and 13 organizations respectively provided information as on Total Acres Protected.
survey. A specific land trust may not be included in one of the biennial directories, but then appear in a later edition, suggesting that a new organization has been formed. This can be misleading. For example, the Sand County Foundation in Madison, Wisconsin was not listed in LTA’s 1989 directory [Land Trust Exchange 1989]. It was however included in the 1991 directory, with 1,190 acres listed as protected [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 159] Yet the Sand County Foundation was not newly formed; it had been established in 1960 [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 159]. With such considerations in mind, complete information from the same 10 organizations reveals a 57.6% increase in acres protected in Wisconsin\(^\text{15}\) [Land Trust Alliance 1991, 159].

**Wisconsin Chapter-The Nature Conservancy**

The Wisconsin Chapter of TNC, (WiTNC) was established in 1959 by a small group of university scientists, conservationists and volunteers [WiTNC 1991]. Between 1992 to 1994, the Chapter increased the number of acres it has protected in the state by 7%, now totalling 48,041 acres among 126 projects, with an additional membership increase of 10.9%, to 19,215 [WiTNC 1993, 6; WiTNC 1994, 12].

**The Stewardship Program**

In 1989 the Wisconsin State Legislature created one of 14 existing statewide public-private land protection partnership programs as part of the Stewardship Program [Myers 1992]. Included in this 10-year, $250 million program, among other things, is funding earmarked specifically for collaborative land protection efforts between the DNR and non-profit conservation organizations (NCOs) [Natural Resources Administrative Codes, Chapter 51, 1990]. The Stewardship Program, funded by public bonds, was authored by Representative Spencer Black “to preserve Wisconsin’s natural beauty and biological diversity” [Black 1992, 1].

Under the Stewardship Program codes, NCOs with 501(c)3 tax exempt status may apply for funding of various projects [Natural Resources Administrative Codes, Chapter 51, 1990]. While the Stewardship Program funds much more than NCOs, the categories below

---

15 The national rate of increase for acres protected by local land trusts is approximately 35%. [Land Trust Alliance 1991, iv]
include only those which provide grants to NCOs as described in the Natural Resource Administrative Codes, Chapter 50 and 51.

**Natural Areas (Subchapter II, NR 51.20)**

The Natural Areas (NA) category provides $1.5 million per year in the form of grants for land acquisition. The grants are intended "to protect outstanding biotic communities and habitats with rare species and highly significant geological and archaeological sites..." [Stewardship 2000, 1994].

**Habitat Restoration Areas (Subchapter III, NR 51.40)**

The Habitat Restoration Area (HRA) category provides $1.5 million per year in the form of grants for land and easement acquisition, and for cost sharing of land management practices. The grants are intended "...to restore grasslands and wetlands to increase wildlife habitat" with "emphasis on management of large, landscape scale areas" and "also for scattered sites..." [Stewardship 2000, 1994].

**Stream Bank Easement Protection (Subchapter IV, NR 51.60)**

Stream Bank Easement Protection (SBE) category provides $1 million per year in the form of grants for land and easement acquisition. The grants are intended "to protect surface water quality and fishery habitat by reducing agricultural and urban run-off" [Stewardship 2000, 1994].

**State Trails (Subchapter V, NR 51.70)**

The State Trails (TR) category provides $1 million per year in the form of grants for land and easement acquisition, as well as for maintenance of the Ice Age Trail. The grants are intended to "provide a comprehensive state trails system with recreational opportunities for hikers, equestrians, bicyclists, and cross-county skiers" [Stewardship 2000, 1994]. In addition, $500,000 per year is designated specifically for the expansion of the Ice Age Trail.

**Urban Green Space (Subchapter 1, NR 51, NR 50)**

The Urban Green Space (UGS) category provides $750,000 per year in the form of grants for land acquisition. The grants are intended "to provide open green space, protect scenic,

---

16 The Ice Age Trail will eventually be a continuous 1,000-mile system of parks and trails tracing the Ice Age formations across Wisconsin.
ecological, and other natural features or to provide land for non-commercial gardens [Stewardship 2000, 1994].

**Acquisition and Development of Local Park Aids (Subchapter I, NR 51, NR 50.16)**

The Acquisition and Development of Local Park Aids (ADLP) category provides grants for land acquisition for local parks [Stewardship 2000, 1994].

**Lake Protection Grants, (NR Administrative Codes, Chapter 191)**

A second avenue for public-private partnerships in Wisconsin is found in Lake Protection Grants [Natural Resources Administrative Codes, Chapter 191, 1991]. Established in 1991, matching grants are available to NCOs to purchase property, to restore wetlands, and to develop local ordinances to protect the water quality of lakes [Natural Resources Board, 1993]. Maximum grants of $100,000 each are available to towns, villages, counties, lake management districts, and sanitary districts, as well as qualified private non-profit lake associations [Natural Resources Board, 1993].

**Conclusion**

As stated earlier, land trust activity in Wisconsin appears to be growing at least as quickly as other regions of the country [Land Trust Exchange 1989; Land Trust Alliance 1991]. The statistical data available about "land trusts," however, provide only a limited overview of private land protection efforts in Wisconsin. While LTA conducts biennial surveys of land trusts, it is believed that there are numerous other established groups with goals parallel to those of land trusts.

As Turner (1993) suggests, it is crucial to identify and understand human trends in order to predict and modify trajectories of land consumption and protection [Turner et al. 1993, 5]. Such insight will be provided by examining the trends in Wisconsin, a state acknowledged for a history of progressive land policy.
CHAPTER III

Methodology - Three-Phase Approach

A three-phase methodology was devised to determine the role private non-profit conservation organizations (NCOs) play with regard to protecting land in Wisconsin for aesthetic, agricultural, cultural, ecological, educational, historic, or recreational purposes. The phases were: (1) issue scoping, (2) interviews, and (3) written surveys. Scoping was conducted by contacting pertinent agency and NCO professionals to determine the most helpful issues to explore. Because so little was known about the subjects, interviews of a sample population were conducted prior to creating the written survey instrument. Information from the interviews was then used to design the written survey instrument.

Phase 1: Scoping

Before the project goals and objectives were established, the issue of land protection by NCOs was scoped by contacting professionals directly involved. In the spring of 1993, Ms. Janet Beach Hanson (Director of NCOs for the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources) sent memos to 95 Department of Natural Resources (DNR) district staff and NCO directors of her choice. They were briefed as to the idea of the project and asked what issues they would like explored. Twenty (20) written responses and several verbally expressed comments were received. Their concerns and questions were incorporated in setting the project objectives and designing interview questions to insure useful information for the DNR and NCOs.

The Population

From February 1993 to June 1993, names and addresses of NCOs in Wisconsin were collected from a variety of sources, including Ducks Unlimited, Land Trust Alliance (LTA), National Audubon Society, Pheasants Forever, Ruffed Grouse Society, Sierra Club, Wisconsin Center for Environmental Education (WCEE), Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS), and Wisconsin Lakes Association (WLA). The pursuit for NCO names and addresses ceased when repeat listings were frequent and new ones were rare.
The addresses were entered on Macintosh software program Panorama®. Each entry included the organization's name, contact person, address, city, state, zip code, county, and an assigned category of its presumed mission. The categories assigned were from the following list: (1) agriculture organization, (2) camp, (3) conservation biology organization, (4) environmental advocacy organization, (5) environmental/nature centers, (6) historical organization, (7) hunting/fishing club, (8) lake association, (9) land trust, (10) miscellaneous, and (11) recreational organization. With the aid of the software program the organizations could be ordered or categorized according to any of the pieces of information listed. The list of organizations totaled 796.

**Phase 2: Interviews**

From the list of 796 NCOs, 16 organizations believed to be involved with land protection were hand-selected to be interviewed. The NCOs were hand-selected to insure a representative sample with regard to the NCOs' geographic location, age, and mission.

Letters requesting interviews were mailed in mid-August 1993 [See Appendix F]. One week later, phone calls were made to set a date, time and location for the interview. In-person interviews were conducted in order to foster the most forthright and complete answers possible. All individuals contacted agreed to be interviewed in-person between September 3, 1993 and October 8, 1993.

Written permission was obtained from the interviewees to record each interview on a hand-held tape recorder. A list of 17 open-ended questions was compiled by the researcher and Ms. Beach Hanson and approved by project advisor Dr. Christine Thomas (Professor of Resource Management, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point) [See Appendix D]. The interviews were designed to last 45-90 minutes and were flexible enough to be conversational and generally free-flowing. If information was given that answered a forthcoming question, that question was not asked.

---

1 If a contact person was unknown, "Executive Director/President" was entered.
2 The assigned categories were often based on the name of the NCO, making these initial labels highly subjective.
Verbatim transcriptions of the interviews were made and information extracted. A matrix was designed with the 16 NCOs on the vertical axis and the questions on the horizontal axis. From the multi-page matrix, the spectrum of answers could be seen and used to design the written survey instrument.

**Phase 3: Written Survey**

The written survey instrument was designed by the researcher and Ms. Beach Hanson [See Appendix E]. Dr. Thomas and Mr. Ed Nelson (DNR Research Sociologist) reviewed the survey instrument and offered suggestions to improve effectiveness and response rates.

The survey was sent to 796 NCOs via first-class mail on February 21, 1994. One week prior to mailing the surveys, letters from the Ms. Beach Hanson, the DNR NCO Manager, were sent to the NCOs alerting them to the survey and explaining its intentions. Fourteen days after the surveys were sent, postcards were mailed to non-responding NCOs to re-encourage their responses [See Appendix L]. The expected response rate was 50%-60%.

Efforts were taken to improve the response rate by publishing articles about the project prior to the survey. "A Study of Wisconsin's Land Protection Efforts by Private Non-Profit Organizations" appeared in Wisconsin Wildlife Federation's October 1993 issue of *Wisconservation* (Vol. 20 No. 10) and DNR's October 1993 issue of *The Voice*. "Land Conservancies on Rise Across United States: UW-SP Study focuses on efforts in Wisconsin" appeared in the Stevens Point Journal, October 23, 1993 (S2).

One-hundred and thirty (130)$^3$ surveys were undeliverable or not able to be forwarded and therefore were subtracted from the total, leaving 666 NCOs to have presumably received the survey [See Appendix K]. Of those, there were possibly 286 lake associations, 88 environmental advocacy organizations, 75 sports clubs, 49 miscellaneous organizations, 37 historical organizations, 36 environmental/nature centers, 35 conservation biology organizations, 34 recreational organizations, 33 land trusts, 16 camps, and 4 agriculture organizations. It must be noted that the categories to which the NCOs were originally

---

$^3$ This number is rather high due to the fact that there was no up-to-date list of NCOs. List of addresses were obtained from a variety of sources. Many addresses were old, and not able to be forwarded.
assigned are highly subjected, based mainly on the organizations' names. More accurate categories were assigned by the NCOs themselves in the written survey.4

Results

Results from the survey will be entered in to a Paradox© database. This database will be used to create a directory of NCOs involved with land protection in Wisconsin. Summations from the database will be used to answer the thesis questions and sub-questions in conjunction with the interview analysis.

4 Information about a specific NCO or category of conservation efforts can be obtained from the NCO Directory; contact the NCO Manager in the DNR's Bureau of Community Assistance.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

While the information about private land protection efforts by non-profit conservation organizations (NCOs) from this survey is the most comprehensive known to date for Wisconsin, it should not be extrapolated to perfectly represent all NCOs in the state. As with any poll or survey, the results of this study should not be taken out of context. The forthcoming information represents 295 NCOs in Wisconsin—44.3% of the 666 NCOs who received the written survey, which is not the universe of NCOs. Indeed there are some trends revealed by the responding NCOs which can be inferred as representative positions. However, after interviewing the directors of 16 NCOs it is believed that each organization is very much a function of its community, land base, leaders, and members.

The results from this survey are presented here in a descriptive fashion, comparing three sub-categories of respondents, to provide baseline information of land protection efforts for some of the NCOs in Wisconsin. A computerized NCO Directory has also been created to incorporate the information provided by the respondents to the written survey. To obtain information from the NCO Directory, contact the NCO Manager in the Bureau of Community Assistance of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

---

1 The survey was mailed to 796 presumed NCOs, of which 130 were undeliverable, inactive, or not actually an NCO, but rather a for-profit business or a sanitary/lake district with tax-collecting powers.
2 PO Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707-7921
Sub-question 1: Which are the organizations directly and indirectly involved with private land protection in Wisconsin?

The responding NCOs involved with land protection were divided into three exclusive categories; Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the 295 respondents fell into one of these three categories, each of which are described below. The "Directs" include land trusts as explored in the preceding literature review, along with other types of NCOs, because they directly protect land by owning it or holding conservation easements. The "Direct Hopefuls" are not currently protecting land directly, but indicated that they hope to. The "Indirects" do not own land or hold conservation easements, nor do they plan to. Nevertheless, they are an important segment of the state's NCO population because they indirectly protect land through other means. All three segments of the NCO population are important to identify when determining the role these organizations play in Wisconsin [See Fig. 1].

The Directs

Of the respondents (N=295), 30.8% (n=91) are directly involved with protecting land in Wisconsin [See Appendix A]. "Direct" involvement, as distinguished from "Indirect" and "Direct Hopeful" involvement was determined from responses to Question #2 in the written survey [See Appendix E]. If an NCO indicated that it currently "owns land or holds easements for conservation or recreational purposes," it was labeled as a "Direct." Besides owning land or easements for conservation purposes, the responding Directs are also likely to be involved with educating the public about land/water resources (66%), assisting other organizations or agencies

---

3 See Chapter III for a complete methodology.
4 One percent (1%) of the respondents fell into the category of "Other." They did not indicate in any way that they were involved or would like to be involved in any conservation activity. None of these three "Others" provided information beyond name, address and written goal. The three "Others" are: Kenosha County Archaeological Society, Historic Monroe, and LaCrosse Area Archaeology.
with the management/restoration of their land (44%), and participating in resource surveys, research, and species counts (44%) [See Fig. 2, Column 1].

![Pie chart showing the distribution of NCOs: Directs, Direct Hopefuls, Indirects, and Other.]

The Direct Hopefuls

Of the respondents (N=295), 16% (n=47) indicated in Question #2 that they would like to "own land or hold easements for conservation or recreational purposes," but currently do not [See Appendix C]. The responding Direct Hopefuls are likely to be involved with educating the public about conserving land and water resources (66%), political advocacy and lobbying on conservation issues (64%) as well as assisting other organizations or government agencies with the management/restoration of their land (64%) [See Fig. 2, Column 3].

The 47 responding Direct Hopefuls could also be counted as Indirects, because they too participate in at least one conservation activity [See Question #2 in Appendix E]. They are, however, grouped in an exclusive category because they hope to directly protect land. This distinguishes them from the Indirects who have no intention of protecting land directly. In other words, a Direct Hopeful is an Indirect, but an Indirect is not always a Direct Hopeful.
The Indirects

Of the respondents (N=295), 52.2% (n=154) are indirectly involved with protecting land [See Appendix B], as determined by responses to Question #2 in the written survey [See Appendix E]. If an NCO did not indicate that it currently "owns land or holds easements for conservation or recreational purposes," or that it wants to, but that it does, or would like, to participate in, at least one of a number of other activities, it was labeled as an "Indirect." The responding Indirects were likely to be involved with educating the public about conserving land and water resources (57%) and political advocacy and lobbying on conservation issues (43%) [See Fig. 2, Column 2].

Fig. 2
Current Conservation Activities of NCOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Directs N=91</th>
<th>DH6 N=47</th>
<th>Indirects7 N=139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own land, hold easements for conservation or recreational purposes</td>
<td>100% 91</td>
<td>0% 0</td>
<td>0% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate the public about land/water resources</td>
<td>66% 60</td>
<td>66% 31</td>
<td>57% 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist other organizations or gov. agencies with management/restoration of their land</td>
<td>44% 40</td>
<td>64% 30</td>
<td>35% 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in resource surveys, research, species counts</td>
<td>44% 40</td>
<td>62% 29</td>
<td>40% 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on land-use planning and growth management issues</td>
<td>36% 33</td>
<td>43% 20</td>
<td>29% 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide financial assistance to other groups or agencies for their conservation efforts when those efforts coincide with your mission</td>
<td>35% 32</td>
<td>30% 14</td>
<td>40% 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide education for landowners on how to preserve natural areas on their property</td>
<td>33% 30</td>
<td>45% 21</td>
<td>34% 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide technical assistance or expertise to other groups</td>
<td>33% 30</td>
<td>45% 21</td>
<td>29% 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political advocacy/lobbying on cons. issues</td>
<td>29% 26</td>
<td>64% 30</td>
<td>43% 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Adopt&quot; a natural area, park or wildlife area</td>
<td>23% 21</td>
<td>26% 12</td>
<td>13% 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Adopt&quot; a river, stream, watershed</td>
<td>21% 19</td>
<td>17% 8</td>
<td>9% 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Adopt&quot; or help maintain a state/local trail</td>
<td>13% 12</td>
<td>17% 8</td>
<td>11% 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Fifteen (15) respondents did not answer Question #2, the one by which Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls were discriminated. By default, the researcher used the written missions provided by these respondents to determine "Indirect"as the most appropriate category for them.
6 DH= Direct Hopeful
7 139 = 154 - 15
8 Although 100% of the responding Direct Hopefuls indicated that they would like to own land or hold easements for conservation purposes.
Categories of Land Trusts

The NCOs were asked to identify themselves using no more than three descriptive categories from a list of 16 options [See Question #3 in Appendix E]. Among the respondents, (N=291), the most commonly identified categories were lake associations (34%), environmental advocacy organizations (28%), and environmental education/nature centers (25%) [See Column 1 in Fig. 3]. Examining the Directs, Direct Hopefuls, and Indirects separately, the leading categories show a disparity [See Columns 2 and 3 in Fig. 3]. Considering just the Directs (N=90), the leading categories are environmental education/nature centers (44%), land trusts (21%), and fishing organizations (21%). If just the Indirects (N=137) are considered, the leading categories are lake associations (38%), environmental, environmental advocacy organizations (34%) and organizations involved with rivers, streams, and watersheds (18%). The two leading categories for the responding Direct Hopefuls are identical to those of the Indirects, 43% and 38%, respectively, then followed by conservation biology organizations (28%) [See Column 4 in Fig. 3].

9 If the respondent mistakenly answered more than three categories, the following actions were taken: (1) the response was omitted if six or more categories were indicated; or (2) the answer was recorded with a random selection of three categories if four or five categories were indicated.
### Fig. 3

**Categories in Which NCOs Place Themselves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Column1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Column2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Column3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Column4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=291</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=90</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=137</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake association</td>
<td>34% 99</td>
<td>18% 16</td>
<td>38% 52</td>
<td>43% 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental advocacy org.</td>
<td>28% 80</td>
<td>18% 16</td>
<td>34% 46</td>
<td>38% 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental ed/nature ctr</td>
<td>25% 73</td>
<td>44% 39</td>
<td>17% 23</td>
<td>17% 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation biology org.</td>
<td>19% 54</td>
<td>19% 17</td>
<td>15% 21</td>
<td>28% 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River, stream, watershed org.</td>
<td>6% 46</td>
<td>12% 11</td>
<td>18% 25</td>
<td>21% 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing organization</td>
<td>14% 41</td>
<td>21% 19</td>
<td>11% 15</td>
<td>15% 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational group</td>
<td>14% 41</td>
<td>12% 11</td>
<td>14% 19</td>
<td>19% 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/historic preservation org.</td>
<td>9% 26</td>
<td>11% 10</td>
<td>7% 9</td>
<td>9% 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting organization</td>
<td>8% 24</td>
<td>12% 11</td>
<td>5% 7</td>
<td>13% 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8% 23</td>
<td>9% 8</td>
<td>8% 11</td>
<td>4% 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land trust</td>
<td>7% 21</td>
<td>21% 19</td>
<td>0.7% 1</td>
<td>2% 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp facility</td>
<td>7% 20</td>
<td>20% 18</td>
<td>0.7% 1</td>
<td>2% 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance or coalition</td>
<td>7% 21</td>
<td>3% 3</td>
<td>11% 15</td>
<td>4% 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of state, park, forest, trail</td>
<td>7% 21</td>
<td>3% 3</td>
<td>9% 12</td>
<td>11% 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland Preservation org.</td>
<td>4% 12</td>
<td>6% 5</td>
<td>4% 5</td>
<td>4% 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of non-DNR unit of gov.</td>
<td>3% 10</td>
<td>2% 2</td>
<td>3% 4</td>
<td>9% 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reasons for Conservation Activities

Two-hundred and fifty-five NCOs (N=255) provided information as to *why* they participate in the conservation activities they do [See Question #4 in Appendix E]. From a list of 12 potential reasons, the NCOs were asked to select no more than three. Overall, the leading reasons given by the respondents were to: provide environmental education (51%), protect and restore water quality and aquatic habitat (48%), and to protect or restore wildlife habitat (39%) [See Column 1 of Fig. 4].

---

10 The total percentages may not equal, or may exceed 100% because each organization was asked to choose up to three categories. The sum of the n's for each type of organization may total less than N in Column 1 due to the 16 Indirects whose responses are counted in the "Total" in Column 1, but not as Indirects in Column 3.

11 If the respondent mistakenly answered more than three categories, the following actions were taken: (1) the response was omitted if six or more categories were indicated; or (2) the answers were recorded with a random selection of three categories if four or five categories were indicated.
Considering the Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls individually, the reasons for participating in conservation activities are similar [See Columns 2, 3, and 4 of Fig. 4]. For the Directs (N=80), the leading reasons are: to provide environmental education (53%), to protect natural areas for ecological reasons (44%), to protect or restore wildlife habitat (43%). For the responding Indirects (N=127), the leading reason is also to provide environmental education (52%), followed by the protection and restoration of water quality and aquatic habitats (49%) and to provide recreational opportunities for the public (38%). The responding Direct Hopefuls (N=43) incorporate the leading responses for both the Directs and Indirects, although with different proportions: to protect and restore water quality and aquatic habitat (60%); to provide environmental education (47%); to protect and restore wildlife habitat (37%); and to provide recreational opportunities for the public (37%) [See Column 4 in Fig. 4].

Fig. 4
Reasons Why NCOs Participate in Conservation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Column1 Total N=255</th>
<th>Column2 Directs N=80</th>
<th>Column3 Indirects N=127</th>
<th>Column4 Direct Hopeful N=43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide environmental ed.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect/restore water quality &amp; aquatic hab.</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect/restore wildlife habitat</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect natural areas for ecol. reasons</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide recreational opportunities for the public</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve aesthetic areas</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve open-space</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve cultural, historic, community features</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide rec. opportunities. for members only</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve farmland</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain woodlands for harvesting</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 The total percentages may not equal, or may exceed 100% because each organization was asked to chose up to three categories.
**Organizational Profile**

**Tax-exempt Status**

Nearly two-thirds of the respondents (66%, N=265), are non-profit organizations with 501(c)3 tax-exempt status as approved by the Internal Revenue Service. For the responding Directs (N=86) and Direct Hopefuls (N=47), the percent with tax-exempt status is higher (77% and 68% respectively), and lower for Indirects (57%, N=131) [See Figs. 5, 6, 7, 8].

---

**Fig. 5**
Tax-Exempt Status of NCOs, N=265

- 66% Tax-Exempt
- 32% Not Tax-Exempt
- 2% Other

---

**Fig. 6**
Tax-Exempt Status of Directs, N=86

- 77% Tax-Exempt
- 23% Not Tax-Exempt
Financial Status

Of the respondents (N=238), the sum of their annual operating budgets is $20,623,503.00. Of that, $16,029,115.00 belongs to Directs (N=81), $1,050,435 belongs to the Direct Hopefuls (N=37), and the remaining $3,543,953.00 belongs to Indirects (N=120).

The range of operating budgets is $0.00 - $2.3 million for responding Directs, $300 - $400,000 for Direct Hopefuls, and $0.00 - $1.75 million for Indirects. A relative frequency table for three ranges of operating budgets is displayed in Figure 9.

13 If a range was given by a responding NCO, the midpoint was used. This sum represents only some of the NCOs in the state.
Fig. 9
Relative Frequency of NCOs' Operating Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Directs N=81</th>
<th>Indirects N=120</th>
<th>Direct Hopefuls N=37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00-$20,000</td>
<td>43% 35</td>
<td>86% 103</td>
<td>81% 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$100,000</td>
<td>22% 18</td>
<td>10% 12</td>
<td>14% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+$100,001</td>
<td>35% 28</td>
<td>4% 5</td>
<td>5% 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The financial disparity between responding Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls can best be seen by comparing their average operating budgets: $197,890.00 per Direct per year, $28,390 per Direct Hopeful per year, and $29,533.00 per Indirect per year.

Endowment Fund

Of all respondents (N=271), 8% have endowment funds, ranging from $500 - $200,000. Seventeen percent (17%) of Directs (N=89) have an endowment fund, compared to 4% of Direct Hopefuls (N=45) and 1.5% of Indirects (N=137).

Land Acquisition Fund

Of all the respondents (N=274), 7% have a separate land acquisition fund. Seventeen percent (17%) of Directs (N=89) have a land acquisition fund compared to 7% of the Direct Hopefuls (N=45) and less than 1% of Indirects (N=140).

Funding Sources

Despite the disparity of funding between Directs, Direct Hopefuls, and Indirects, they share the same primary funding sources, but with different proportions. The NCOs were asked to identify their primary funding source from a list of eight possibilities [See Question #36 in Appendix E].

For the responding Directs (N=90) the top primary-funding sources are: special events (23%), fees and sales on products (22%), and membership dues (20%) [See Fig. 10].
The same top four primary-funding sources support Indirects, but with different percentages; membership dues (57%), special events (17%), fees and sale of products (10%), and individual donors (8%) [See Fig. 11].

For the responding Direct Hopefuls, membership dues (39%), special events (36%), and individual donors (20%) are the most common primary funding sources [See Fig. 12].
Fig. 12
Primary Funding Sources of Direct Hopefuls, N=44

![Bar chart showing funding sources for Direct Hopefuls]

To determine what percentage of responding NCOs utilize each source, the relative frequency for their primary, secondary, and tertiary funding sources was tallied. For Directs (N=90), Direct Hopefuls (N=44), and Indirects (N=140), the leading funding sources utilized are membership dues, individual donors, and special events [See Fig. 13].

Fig. 13
Relative Frequency of Utilized Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>N=90 Directs</th>
<th>N=140 Indirects</th>
<th>N=44 Direct Hopefuls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual donors</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, sale on products</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government funds</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each NCO could indicate up to three of its top funding sources. Therefore, the total percentages may not equal, or may exceed 100%.*
Members

Of the respondents (N=269), 58% of the NCOs have more than 100 members\(^ \text{15} \) [See Fig. 11]. Considering the Directs (N=77), Direct Hopefuls (N=43) and Indirects (N=133) separately, the percent of NCOs with more than 100 members is 70%, 49%, and 57%, respectively [See Figs. 14, 15, 16, 17].

---

**Fig. 14**
Relative Frequency of Members, N=269

- 0-100 Members: 17%
- 101-500 Members: 42%
- 501+ Members: 41%

**Fig. 15**
Relative Frequency of Members for Directs, N=77

- 0-100 Members: 27%
- 101-500 Members: 30%
- 501+ Members: 43%

---

\(^{15}\) If a range was given by an NCO, the midpoint was used.
Boards of Directors

Based on information from 270 responding NCOs, the size of their boards of directors ranges from zero to 48, with a mean size of 10.

Volunteers

Based on information from 218 responding NCOs\(^\text{16}\), the number of volunteers for each group ranges from zero to 3200, with a mean of 84. For responding Directs (N=71), the range is zero to 1,500, with a mean of 94. The number of volunteers for responding Indirects (N=114), ranges from zero to 2,500, with a mean of 66. For Direct Hopefuls (N=33), ranges from five to 3,200, with an average of 125.

\(^{16}\) A response required a numeric answer to the question; a blank was considered to be a non-response as opposed to a zero.
Age of NCOs

Two-hundred and sixty (N=260) NCOs provided information on the year in which they were each established. Seventy-eight percent (78%) were established since 1960; \(^{17}\) with 40% of the total since 1980. Among the Directs (N=82), the oldest NCO was established in 1896, \(^{18}\) and the newest in 1993. \(^{19}\) Sixty-six percent (66%) of the Directs were established since 1960, with 29% of them since 1980. Among the Direct Hopefuls (N=42), the oldest one was established in 1894 \(^{20}\) and the newest in 1993. \(^{21}\) Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the Direct Hopefuls were established since 1960, with 52% since 1980. Among the Indirects (N=136), the oldest one was established in 1890, \(^{22}\) and the newest in 1994. \(^{23}\) Eighty-five percent (85%) of the Indirects were established since 1960; 42% since 1980.

Sub-question#2:
- What is the acreage, legal status, use, access, management, and methods of land protection for the land NCOs own or have partial interest in?

Acres and Legal Status

Eighty-three (83) of the responding NCOs indicated that they either own, hold conservation easements for, or have transferred land [See Appendix H]. Of those, 80 are classified as Directs, two as Indirects and one as a Direct Hopeful. \(^{24}\) The number of acres

---

\(^{17}\) 1960 and 1980 were chosen as landmark years into new phases of the preservation/conservation/environmental movement. Following 1960 was a decade of social activism and heightened environmental awareness by the general public. In 1980 and the decade that followed, Earth First! was established, expanding the ideological spectrum of environmental groups, and membership of older national environmental groups swelled noticeably.

\(^{18}\) YMCA Camp Phantom Lake

\(^{19}\) Chequamegon Area Mountain Bike Association

\(^{20}\) Lake Beulah Protective & Improvement Association

\(^{21}\) Kinnickinnic River Land Trust

\(^{22}\) League of American Wheelmen

\(^{23}\) Spruce Grouse Society

\(^{24}\) Due to the fact that these NCOs already oversee land, they would be most accurately classified as Directs. However, according to the information they provided in Question #2 regarding their activities, they fell into the Direct Hopeful, or Indirect categories. The term "Directs" will still be used when referring to these 83 land-protecting Directs.
protected\textsuperscript{25} by these 83 NCOs totals 111,087 acres. This figure is the sum of the 49,518 acres owned by 71 NCOs, the 10,539 acres for which 24 NCOs hold conservation easements, and 51,030 acres which 19 NCOs had transferred to other non-profit organizations or government agencies\textsuperscript{26} [See Fig. 18].

Fig. 18
Acres and Legal Status of Land Protected by NCOs, n=83, 111,087 acres

![Diagram showing the distribution of acres owned, easements, and transferred]

A high percentage of the land protected is done so by a small percentage of the responding 83 NCOs. Sixty percent (60\%) of the 83 NCOs account for 99\% of the 111,087 protected acres, and even more skewed, 11\% account for 86\% of the acres protected.\textsuperscript{27}

Access

The Directs were asked if there was public access to the land they own\textsuperscript{28} [See Question #25 in Appendix E]. Of the responding Directs (N=69), 39\% encourage use and publicize access to

\textsuperscript{25} The term protected is a generic category for land which has been intentionally guarded, in varying ways and for various purposes, by NCOs.

\textsuperscript{26} The total number of land-protecting Directs exceeds 83 because several organizations own land and/or hold easements and/or transfer land.

\textsuperscript{27} 11\% accounted for by 9 NCOs: Dane County Conservation League, Gordon Bubolz Nature Preserve, Ice Age Park & Trail Foundation, Madeline Island Wilderness Preserve, Natural Lake Owners Advancement Association, Society of Tymanuchus Cupido Pinnatus, The Nature Conservancy, Ridges Sanctuary, and Trust for Public Land

\textsuperscript{28} This excludes land for which Directs hold conservation easements, or that they have transferred to another party,
their land; 22% allow access but do not publicize the fact; 22% allow access for their members only; and 17% allow very little or no access [See Fig. 19].

Restrictions

Directs were asked to indicate what type(s) of restrictions are in place on their land [See Question # 26 in Appendix E]. Of the responding Directs (N=60), 77% indicated one or more restrictions. Banned motor vehicles, disallowed hunting and limiting access to trails were the most common restrictions, by 32, 28 and 22 NCOs, respectively [See Fig. 20].
Land Management Plans

Of the responding NCOs which directly protect land, 52 have land management plans and 26 do not [See Question #23 in Appendix E; See Fig. 21].

With regard to land management plans, the Directs were asked who provided assistance in developing them [See Question #23 in Appendix E]. Based on 52 respondents, the DNR, in-house staff, and volunteers were the leading sources of assistance by 31, 30, and 29 Directs, respectively^29 [See Fig. 22].

^29 Respondents were asked to indicate all forms of assistance that applied.
Directs (N=78) were asked who assists them with actual "hands-on" land maintenance. Volunteers, permanent staff, and seasonal employees/interns topped the list, for 59, 35, and 28 Directs respectively [See Question # 24 in Appendix E; See Fig. 23].

**Fig. 23**
Sources of Assistance with Hands-On Maintenance, N=74.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Assistance</th>
<th># of Directs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Conservation Corps</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate volunteer groups</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little management is done</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NCOs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Conservation Corps</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school groups</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal employees/interns</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent staff</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methods of Land Protection**

The Directs were asked to indicate the land protection methods they have used or would use in the future [See Question #21 in Appendix E]. Based on information from 75 Directs, the leading methods used are to purchase land and to accept donations of land, as done by 44 and 41 Directs, respectively [See Fig. 24].

**Geographic Coverage**

Of the respondents, (N=287), 63% of the NCOs operate exclusively within one county, 11% in strictly two counties, 5% in three counties, 4% in four counties, 5% in five to 71 counties. Eleven percent (11%) indicated that they operate in all 72 counties of Wisconsin on a statewide basis [See Fig. 25].
Fig. 24
Methods of Land Protection, N=75

- Ltd. development rights
- Development rights
- Land exchanges
- Facil. dedication rts
- Voluntary agreements
- Purchase easements
- 3rd party facilitator
- Accept donated easements
- Accept land donations
- Purchase land

Have Used
Would Use

Fig. 25
Geographic Range of NCOs, N=287

- 1 County: 11.15%
- 2 Counties: 5.23%
- 3 Counties: 4.18%
- 4 Counties: 4.88%
- 5-71 Counties: 11.50%
- All 72 Counties: 63.07%

Counties of Land Protection

Nine of the 83 land-protecting NCOs operate on a statewide basis. The other 74 land-protecting NCOs responding to this survey are county- or region-specific. They protect

land in 57 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. The following counties have the highest number of responding NCOs operating in them which protect land: Walworth (7), Kenosha (7), Waukesha (6), Oconto (5), and St. Croix (5). Sixty-two (62) counties, including the five just listed, have at least one NCO which is considering acquiring (more) land in the next three years (1994-1997). A different set of five counties have at least one NCO operating in it which does not currently protect land, but might like to in the future.

**Plans to Acquire More Land in the Future**

Of the responding Directs, 83 are known to currently own, hold easements for, or to have transferred land. Of these 83 NCOs, 67% (n=56) are planning to, or are interested in, acquiring more land in the next three years (1994-1997). Thirty percent (30%, n=25) do not plan to acquire any additional land in the next three years, and 2% (n=2) did not respond to the question. In addition, 19 other NCOs indicated that they are planning to, or are interested in acquiring land in the next three years (1994-1997).

---

31 The county or counties of operation for the NCOs which currently protect land were tallied to find the number of NCOs protecting land per county. For example, Audubon Society-Madison Chapter owns 180 acres, holds conservation easements for 74 acres, and operates in Sauk, Dane, and Columbia Counties. Each of these counties would be tallied as having an NCO protecting land within it, although it is unknown precisely which county or counties contain the protected land.

32 Lafayette County (Pheasants Forever-Sugar River Valley Ch.), Green County (Green-Rock Audubon Soc), Rock County (Green-Rock Audubon Soc), Ozaukee County (Cedar Creek Restoration Cov, WI's Ethnic Settlement Trails.), Kewaunee County (Alaska Lake Assoc.), Price County (Rib Lake Fish & Game Organization)


34 Alaska Lake Association, Arbutus Lake Association, Big Lake PO Association, Pheasants Forever-Kenosha Chapter, Pheasants Forever-Sugar River Valley Chapter, Wisconsin's Ethnic Settlement Trails

35 Chequamegon Area Mountain Bike Association and Rib Lake Fish & Game Organization are not currently responsible for protecting land and would be better classified as Direct Hopefuls.
Fig. 26
Geographic Area in Which the Responding Directs protect Land, and the Location of Those Considering Land Acquisition in the Next Three Years (1994-1997), N=83

**KEY**

( ) 0 responding NCOs protecting land*
( ) 1-2 responding NCOs protecting land*
( ) 3-4 responding NCOs protecting land*
( ) 5-8 responding NCOs protecting land*
( ) 1-3 NCOs planning to protect (additional) land*
( ) 4-6 NCOs planning to protect (additional) land*

* Not including the 9 NCOs which operate and protect land statewide.
**Sub-question #3**

What are problems and needs facing NCOs which directly and indirectly protect land?

The Directs were asked to identify the seriousness of 11 potential problems facing them with regard to land protection [See Question #27 in Appendix E]. They responded (N=89) indicating that problems, and degrees of those problems vary widely from NCO to NCO. Most commonly identified as either moderate or large concerns are property taxes (n=32), lack of public understanding (n=20) and trespassing (n=19) [See Fig. 27].

![Fig. 27 Problems of Directs, N=89](chart)

**Organizational Needs of NCOs**

The responding NCOs [N=277] ranked a list of 23 organizational needs as "OK, a small need," a moderate need," a or large need" for their respective NCOs [See Question #28 in Appendix E]. Increased financial support (34%), more volunteers (31%), and larger
memberships (26%) were most commonly indicated as "large needs" of the responding NCOs [See Figure 28].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased financial support</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More volunteers</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger membership</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater public awareness</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased staffing</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better qualified volunteers</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to good ecologist</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More active Board of Dir</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with DNR</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better trained Board of Dir</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opp. for training/ed</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with local gov</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking statewide</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking regionally</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More diverse Board of Dir</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor land mngmt assistance</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition expertise</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical land mngmt expert</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with other groups</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36The percentages are based on N, the total number of NCOs which responded to any part of Question #28. Therefore, adding numbers horizontally for each "need" may total less than 100%. and because each NCO could respond to as many "needs" as they wanted, each vertical column many exceed 100%.
When the Directs, Indirects, Direct Hopefuls, and self-labeled "land trusts" are analyzed separately, the results are slightly different. For Directs (N=89), increased financial support\(^{37}\) (48%), an endowment fund (42%), and more volunteers (31%) were most commonly indicated as a "large need" [See Figure 29].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Large Need</th>
<th>Moderate Need</th>
<th>Small Need</th>
<th>OK As Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased financial support</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An endowment</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More volunteers</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater public awareness</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better qualified volunteers</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger membership</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased staffing</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better trained Board of Dir</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor land mgmt assistance</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical land mgmt expert</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More active Board of Dir</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking statewide</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking regionally</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition expertise</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More diverse Board of Dir</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opp. for training/ed</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to good ecologist</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with DNR</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with local gov</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. w/ other groups</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*^{37}\) "Increased financial support" refers to the general need for any type of funding. The need for an endowment fund refers more specifically to long-term, non-liquid investments which most generally are not used for operating budgets.

\(^{38}\) The percentages are based on N, the total number of NCOs which responded to any part of Question #28. Therefore, adding numbers horizontally for each "need" may total less than 100%, and because each NCO could respond to as many "needs" as they wanted, each vertical column many exceed 100%.
For Indirects (N=138), more volunteers (33%), a larger membership (25%), and increased financial support (24%) were most commonly indicated as "large needs" [See Figure 30].

Fig. 30
Organizational Needs of Indirects, N=138

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Large Need</th>
<th>Moderate Need</th>
<th>Small Need</th>
<th>OK As Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More volunteers</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger membership</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased financial support</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater public awareness</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with DNR</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to good ecologist</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with local gov</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An endowment</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More active Board of Dir</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opp. for training/ed</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased staffing</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better qualified volunteers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking statewide</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking regionally</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better trained Board of Dir</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More diverse Board of Dir</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. w/ other groups</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor land mngmt assistance</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition expertise</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical land mngmt expert</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Direct Hopefuls (N=46), increased financial support (37%), greater public awareness (35%), and a larger membership (33%) were indicated as "large needs" [See Fig. 31].

39 The percentages are based on N, the total number of NCOs which responded to any part of Question #28. Therefore, adding numbers horizontally for each "need" may total less than 100%. and because each NCO could respond to as many "needs" as they wanted, each vertical column many exceed 100%.
Fig. 31
Organizational Needs of the Direct Hopefuls, N=46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Large Need</th>
<th>Moderate Need</th>
<th>Small Need</th>
<th>OK As is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased financial support</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater public awareness</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger membership</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased staffing</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anendowment</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More volunteers</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to good ecologist</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with DNR</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better qualified volunteers</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition expertise</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking statewide</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with local gov</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking regionally</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opp. for training/ed</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical land mngmt expert</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor land mngmt assistance</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. w/ other groups</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better trained Board of Dir</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More active Board of Dir</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More diverse Board of Dir</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages are based on N, the total number of NCOs which responded to any part of Question #28. Therefore, adding numbers horizontally for each "need" may total less than 100%, and because each NCO could respond to as many "needs" as they wanted, each vertical column many exceed 100%.
Below, is even closer analysis of those NCOs which labeled themselves as land trusts, most of which are Directs. Leading organizational needs of land trusts include increased financial support (81%), an endowment fund (52%), and a larger membership (43%) [See Fig. 32].

Fig. 32
Organizational Needs of Land Trusts, N=2141

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Large Need</th>
<th>Moderate Need</th>
<th>Small Need</th>
<th>OK As Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased financial support</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An endowment</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger membership</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater public awareness</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More volunteers</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased staffing</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor land mgmt assistance</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical land mgmt expert</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More active Board of Dir</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to good ecologist</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking statewide</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition expertise</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better qualified volunteers</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better trained Board of Dir</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More networking regionally</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opp. for training/ed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More diverse Board of Dir</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with DNR</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. with local gov</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better comm. w/ other groups</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 The percentages are based on N, the total number of NCOs which responded to any part of Question #28. Therefore, adding numbers horizontally for each "need" may total less than 100%, and because each NCO could respond to as many "needs" as they wanted, each vertical column many exceed 100%. 
Useful Information

The NCOs (N=265) were asked to indicate what kinds of information would be most useful to their respective NCOs [See Question #29 in Appendix E]. The top ranking types of information indicated to be most useful for the responding NCOs are handbooks on state/federal assistance programs (43%), fundraising strategies and techniques (42%), and information on water protection efforts in their areas (42%) [See Fig 33].

![Fig. 33](image)

NCOs Rank Usefulness of Information, N=265

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handbk of fed/state asst. programs</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising strategies &amp; techniques</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on water protection</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of nat res</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Stewardship Program</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on DNR land acq. priorities</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on local gov land acq priorities</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective land mngmt practices</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR and Marketing</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax aspects of real estate trans.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document models of real estate trans.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to's or real estate trans/negotiation.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls are considered separately, the leading types of useful information vary somewhat. For the responding Directs (N=86), fundraising techniques and strategies (56%) and a handbook of federal/state assistance programs (47%) still lead as the most useful information. In addition, Directs indicate that information about DNR land acquisition priorities (40%) as the most useful information [See Fig. 34].
### Fig. 34
Directs Rank Usefulness of Information, N=86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Type</th>
<th>Most Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising strategies &amp; techniques</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbk of fed/state asst. programs</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on DNR land acq. priorities</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Stewardship Program</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of nat res</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective land mngmt practices</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on local gov land acq priorities</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on water protection</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax aspects of real estate trans.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR and Marketing</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document models of real es. trans.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to's or real estate trans/negot.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the Indirects (N=128), the types of information they indicated to be most useful for them differs from the Directs. The only overlapping type found to be most useful by both Directs and Indirects is a handbook on state/federal assistance programs. The other leading types of information for Indirects are on water protection efforts (48%) and inventories of natural resources in their areas (41%) [See Fig. 35].

### Fig. 35
Indirects Rank Usefulness of Various Types Information, N=128

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Type</th>
<th>Most Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Info on water protection</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of nat res</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbk of fed/state asst. programs</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising strategies &amp; techniques</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on local gov land acq priorities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on DNR land acq. priorities</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Stewardship Program</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective land mngmt practices</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR and Marketing</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax aspects of real estate trans.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to's or real estate trans/negot.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document models of real es. trans.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The leading types of information for the responding Direct Hopefuls (N=44) overlaps those of both the Directs and Indirects: handbooks on federal/state assistance programs (55%), information on water protection efforts (50%), and assistance with organizational development (50%) [See Fig. 36].

Fig. 36
Direct Hopefuls Rank Usefulness of Various Types Information, N=44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Most Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handbk of fed/state asst. programs</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on water protection</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising strategies &amp; techniques</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of nat res</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info about Stewardship Program</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR and Marketing</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on DNR land acq. priorities</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on local gov land acq priorities</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective land mgmt practices</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to's or real estate trans/ negot.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document models of real es. trans.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax aspects of real estate trans.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means of Communication

The NCOs (N=260) were asked what would be the most effective and efficient means to share information among them and government agencies which have similar priorities and common goals [See Question #30 in Appendix E]. Seventy-three percent (73%) said newsletters were the most effective means, 48% indicated handbooks/technical bulletins, as well as regional get-togethers for sharing information [See Fig. 37].

Fig. 37
Preferred Methods of Sharing Information Among NCOs and Government Agencies, N=260

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Most Effective</th>
<th>Less Effective</th>
<th>Least Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbk/technical bulletins</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional get-togethers</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism for referrals</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several 1-day workshops/yr</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual 2-day conference</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling consultant</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide coalition of groups</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Communication</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-question #4

Are NCOs working with other organizations or agencies?

Past Partners

Directs, Direct Hopefuls, and Indirects were asked to identify organizations, groups, and government agencies with whom they had worked on a conservation project in the past two years. If an NCO had in fact worked with any of the 10 possibilities listed, they were asked to characterize the experience as either a positive or negative one [See Question #5 in Appendix E]. Sixty-three percent (63%) of the responding Directs (N=82) identified the DNR as a conservation partner with whom they had had a positive experience, and 51% identified other NCOs [See Fig. 39].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Experience</th>
<th>Negative Experience</th>
<th>No, have not Work with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another NCO</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of high sch. students</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/county gov</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of non-profits</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/college</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agency in area</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/corporation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of college students</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of the responding Indirects, (N=125) 66% also identified the DNR as a conservation partner with whom they had had a positive experience. Forty-seven percent (47%) of the Indirects ranked their local/county governments and other NCOs as positive partners [See Fig. 40].
In the case of the responding Direct Hopefuls (N=44), 70% identified the DNR as a positive conservation partner, followed by other NCOs (59%) [See Fig. 41].

Future Partners

Not withstanding past conservation partnerships, the Directs and Indirects were then asked with whom they would be most interested in working to accomplish common goals [See Question #6 in Appendix E]. Sixty-four percent (64%) of the Directs, (N=84) indicated that they are very interested in working with the DNR. Sixty-three percent (63%) are very interested in working with their respective county or local government [See Fig. 42].
Fig. 42
Directs' Interests for Future Partnerships to Accomplish Common Conservation Goals, N=84

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/county gov</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another NCO</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of non-profits</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of high Sch. students</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of college students</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agency in area</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/college</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/corporation</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-four percent (64%) of the Indirects, (N=139) indicated that they are very interested in working with the DNR to accomplish common goals. Forty-eight percent (48%) are very interested in working with their respective county or local governments [See Fig. 43].

Fig. 43
Indirects' Interests for Future Partnerships, N=139

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/county gov</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another NCO</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/college</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agency in area</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of non-profits</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/corporation</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of college students</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of high Sch. students</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 The sum of the columns may exceed 100% because the NCOs were asked to provide information for each organization, group, or agency. The horizontal rows may total less than 100% because all respondents to the question (N) may not have provided an answer for a specific organization, group, or agency.

43 The sum of the columns may exceed 100% because the NCOs were asked to provide information for each organization, group, or agency. The horizontal rows may total less than 100% because all respondents to the question (N) may not have provided an answer for a specific organization, group, or agency.
Seventy-four percent (74%) of the Direct Hopefuls (N=43) indicated that they are very interested in working with the DNR to accomplish common goals. Seventy percent (70%) are very interested in working with their respective county or local governments [See Fig. 44].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/county gov</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another NCO</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/college</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agency in area</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of non-profits</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/corporation</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of college students</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of high Sch. students</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-question#5
Do NCOs know about the Stewardship Program? What are their ideas and problems regarding it?

The NCOs were asked if they had heard of Wisconsin's Stewardship Program45 (Program) which is administered through the DNR [See Question #8 in Appendix E]. Sixty-nine percent (69%) had heard of the Program. In breaking down the categories into Directs, Direct Hopefuls, and Indirects, Program name recognition was 62% (N=90), 80% (N=46), and 70% (N=133), respectively [See Fig. 45].

44 The sum of the columns may exceed 100% because the NCOs were asked to provide information for each organization, group, or agency. The horizontal rows may total less than 100% because all respondents to the question (N) may not have provided an answer for a specific organization, group, or agency.

45 A 10-year (1990-2000) $250 million state bond-funded program which has, among other things, earmarked funding for collaborative efforts between the DNR and NCOs. [Register NR 51, 1990]
If the NCOs had heard of the Program, they were asked two more questions: Were they aware that NCOs can apply for grants under the Program? And had they ever applied for one? [See Questions #9 & #10 in Appendix E]. Eighty-six percent (86%, N=198) of the responding NCOs which had heard of the Program knew that they may be eligible to apply for grants under it, and 16% (n=30, N=182) said they had.

Eighty-three percent (83%, N=60) of the responding Directs which had heard of the Program know that they may be eligible to apply for grants under it and 35% (n=19, N=55) said they had.

Ninety-five percent (95%, N=37) of the responding Direct Hopefuls which had heard of the Program know that they may be eligible to apply for grants under it and 16% had (n=6, N=37).

Eighty-five percent (85%, N=96) of the Indirects which had heard of the Program know that they may be eligible to apply for grants, and 6% (n=5, N=81) said they had [See Fig. 46].

---

### Fig. 45
Stewardship Program Name Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All NCOs</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Hopefuls</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirects</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Fig. 46
Awareness of, and Application to the Stewardship Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Awareness of Possible Eligibility</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Have Applied</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All NCOs</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHs46</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirects</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 DHs=Direct Hopefuls
If the NCOs indicated that they had applied, or were in the process of applying for a Program-grant, they were asked if there were any barriers or problems which made it difficult for them to take full advantage of the Program [See Question #13 in Appendix E]. Seventy-seven (N=77) NCOs responded to the question, of which 74% indicated that they had not experienced problems with the Program, and 26% said they had. Thirty-one (N=31) Directs answered the question, of which 65% (n=20) said they had not experienced problems with the Program, and 35% (n=11) said they had. Fourteen (N=14) Direct Hopefuls answered the question, of which 64% had not experienced problems with the Program and 36% said they had. Thirty (N=30) Indirects answered the question, of which 87% (n=26) said they had not experienced problems with the Program, and 13% (n=4) said they had [See Fig. 47].

Fig. 47
Experienced Barriers and Problems to the Stewardship Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All NCOs, N=77</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs, N=31</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Hopefuls, N=14</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirects, N=30</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the NCOs indicated that they have not applied for a grant under the Program, they were asked to identify factors which prevented them from doing so [See Question #11 in Appendix E]. They were asked to indicated all reasons that applied from a list of 10 possibilities. Overall, the most common reason for not applying was because the responding NCOs (N=131) did not purchase land or hold conservation easements (62%). This leading reason held true for Indirects (80%, N=70) and Direct Hopefuls (67%, N=27). For Directs however (N=30), the most common responses were that they plan to apply in the future when a parcel is decided on (n=9), or they have not applied due to the absence of matching funds necessary to purchase land (n=9) [See Fig. 48].

47 Two similar reasons are combined in tallying the results, making a total of nine.
Fig. 48
Reasons Why NCOs, Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls Have Not Applied for Matching Stewardship Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>NCOs N=131</th>
<th>N=30</th>
<th>Indirects N=70</th>
<th>N=27</th>
<th>DHs&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt; N=213</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCO does not protect land</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't have matching funds</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't have necessary staff</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't have 501c3 status</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to apply in the future</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property doesn't qualify</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know how to acq. land</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to rely on private funds</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to get info about Prog.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written Comments

Written comments were solicited from NCOs which have experienced barriers or problems with the Stewardship Program. The experienced problems from six NCOs follow:

- "Rules have been reinterpreted regularly; very little predictability in how a particular provision will be administered; receive different answers from each person a question is posed to. (DNR) holds appraised value to date of sale, but takes up to two years to pay grant--interest costs mount in interim."
- "Time from application to disbursement of funds."
- "Applied for Stewardship (grant) in 1991--no one at the Regional DNR office offered assistance to further this effort; result was no Stewardship funding."
- "Seems like any government agency--there's way too much paperwork involved. Also seems the more populated areas is where the money goes."
- "The categories are very specific; in southeastern Wisconsin it is difficult to find 'acceptable lands' yet the large population base needs open- and natural-space close to home."
- "'Tight' categories restrict some good projects from funding. Time-frame for response is slow, eg. getting approval, review, reimbursed."

Requested Information and Regional Meetings

In space provide on the survey, 33% of the NCOs (N=293) requested information on the Stewardship Program and 40% (N=213) requested that the DNR hold a regional meeting in their area about the Program.

<sup>48</sup> DHs= Direct Hopefuls
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The Who Question

Which are the non-profit conservation organizations directly and indirectly involved with private land protection in Wisconsin?

Introduction

The non-profit conservation organizations (NCOs) involved with private land protection in Wisconsin are comprised of at least three distinct groups: those which are directly involved with protecting land (the "Directs"); those who would like to be directly involved (the "Direct Hopefuls"); and those which are indirectly involved in protecting land and do not intend to do otherwise (the "Indirects") [See Fig. 1 and Fig 2. in Chapter IV]. The Directs and Indirects particularly, are distinctly different groups with regard to their conservation activities, financial support, needs, and relationship to the Stewardship Program. Their general intentions however, i.e. reasons for engaging in conservation activities, are very similar. In terms of a means-ends hierarchy, the two groups most commonly share the same goals of protecting habitat and providing environmental education, and differ with regard to their specific objectives, i.e. their means to the end [See Fig. 1].

While the Directs (n=91) and Indirects (n=154) are the most numerous among the three defined groups, the Direct Hopefuls (n=47) are an important segment of NCOs to acknowledge. Marked growth in the number of region-specific non-profit organizations involved with land protection, (e.g. land trusts) has been a noted trend for the last 25 years across the US [Land Trust Alliance 1991, iv]. Although this baseline information from a portion of the NCOs in Wisconsin can not presume to definitively support this trend--it certainly does not debunk it. The presence of at least 47 NCOs hoping to be directly involved with land protection suggests a potential increase in land trust-like activity in Wisconsin.

---

1 The results in the previous chapter used to frame this discussion represent only 44.3% of the survey recipients, which did not represent the entire universe of the population. Inferences to all NCOs are unintentional and/or represent semantic struggles.
Differences and Similarities Between Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls

Goals and Objectives

The leading categories for NCOs directly involved with protecting land (the "Directs) are environmental education/nature centers, land trusts, and fishing organizations [See Fig. 3 in Chapter IV]. While the first two categories are predictable, it is somewhat surprising that fishing organizations are so common. One interpretation is that such NCOs were established for, and are predominantly oriented around, fishing activities. Then, in a quest to ensure access and/or to improve water quality to better the fisheries, the members recognized the need to literally protect riparian areas. The latter explanation would suggest that NCOs understand, and are practicing integrated resource management.

Oddly enough, among the Directs, half of the presumed hunting organizations did not identify themselves as such.2 Had they, hunting organizations would have rivaled fishing organizations as one of the most common categories of NCOs directly involved with land protection. This oddity may have been the result of a survey instrument oversight. The list of possible categories for the respondents to select included (in alphabetical order) "conservation biology organization," "fishing organization," and "hunting organization." Most likely, hunting and fishing clubs not familiar with the relatively new discipline of conservation biology, interpreted that option to best represent their organizations, and hence, did not select the others. Another possible explanation is that hunting and fishing organizations are trying to avoid labels which evoke a wide variety of often controversial impressions toward them.

That hunting organizations still emerged as a near-leading category of Directs (and Direct Hopefuls) involved or interested in land protection was surprising. Only a small sample of hunting clubs received the survey due to a mistaken preconception that most are privately incorporated rather than tax-exempt non-profit organizations. Such a blanket generalization

2 Izaak Walton-Bill Cook Ch., Izaak Walton League-Sheboygan Ch., Izaak Walton League-Green Lake Area Ch., Izaak Walton League of America-WI Division, Merrimac Conservation Club, Pheasants Forever-Kinnickinnic Ch., Rib Lake Fish & Game Organizations, and Watertown Conservation Club did not identify themselves as hunting organizations.
however does not appear to be accurate. For a more comprehensive overview of the NCOs directly involved with land protection, a broader survey of non-profit hunting clubs is advised.

In comparison, the leading categories for Indirects are lake associations, environmental advocacy organizations, and organizations involved with rivers, streams and watersheds [See Fig. 3 in Chapter IV]. These are predictable results given that the largest category of survey recipients (286 of 666) was lake associations.

The Direct Hopefuls' most common categories, like the Indirects', include lake associations and environmental advocacy organizations, and uniquely, conservation biology organizations\(^3\) [See Fig. 3 in Chapter IV]. Categorically analogous to the Indirects, the results of this survey suggest that the Direct Hopefuls are Indirects in a transition toward becoming Directs.

While the Directs and Indirects differ somewhat in their objectives, they have virtually the same reasons for doing different conservation activities. The leading reason for both Directs and Indirects is to provide environmental education. In addition, both categories of NCOs cite similar leading reasons such as the protection and restoration of natural areas, water quality, aquatic habitat, and wildlife habitat [See Fig. 4 in Chapter IV]. Again, that water quality is a leading reason for conservation activities is a function of the large number of lake associations which received and returned the survey.

The two least common reasons for participating in conservation activities by all three groups of NCOs is for the preservation of farmland and woodland. This suggests that the responding NCOs are oriented more toward protecting the less tangible aspects of the natural world than the harvestable resource base. Lack of interest in farmland preservation from Wisconsin's NCOs is surprising since the Madison-Milwaukee metro area has some of the most threatened farmland in the country [Payne, 1994; Wisconsin Rural Development Center 1993, 5].

The Wisconsin Farmland Conservancy (WFC) is one of the very few NCOs which works for farmland protection. Located in Menomonie, WI, it is possible for WFC to operate statewide,

\(^3\) That several single-species oriented NCOs (including Direct Hopefuls) identified themselves as conservation biology organizations again raises the question as to the accurate use of the label.
but it chooses to focus on just the northwestern part of the state where the Minneapolis and St. Paul metropolitan area from Minnesota is expanding into Wisconsin [Quinn 1993]. The vast majority of NCOs in Wisconsin have found niches in providing education, protection, and restoration with regard to water quality and natural areas, but very few identified in this survey provide support for conserving farmland or woodland resources.

Finances

The identified Directs, Direct Hopefuls, and Indirects differ significantly in the diversity of sources for their financial support and their average operating budgets [See Fig. 10, 11, 12 in Chapter IV]. On average, for every dollar in an Indirect's or Direct Hopeful's operating budget, a Direct in this survey has over $6.00. Even though there are almost twice as many Indirects as Directs in this survey, over five times as many Directs than Indirects indicated operating budgets over $100,000 [See Fig. 9 in Chapter IV]. And despite this disparity, a higher percentage of the Directs than Indirects identified increased financial support as a large organizational need [See Figs. 29, 30 in Chapter IV]. Leading needs cited by the Indirects are for more volunteers and larger memberships. These are indeed related somewhat to the need for increased financial support, but primarily as lake associations and environmental advocacy organizations, the Indirects derive much of their strength from numbers of people for political clout and as a volunteer workforce. For Directs, however, cold, hard cash is of the essence, to cover both the expected and unexpected expenses of land acquisition and management, appraisal and legal fees, insurance premiums, and property taxes. The self-labeled land trusts provide further support that money may be an even more important concern to Directs than Indirects. Although the sample size of land trusts is very small (N=21), increased financial support is far and away their leading need [See Fig. 32 in Chapter IV]. Land protection quite literally requires money. It is fitting then, that the Directs have more, and will always need more money than the Indirects.

With regard to their primary funding sources, the Directs in this study are more heterogeneous than the Indirects, which are rather homogeneous. Approximately one-fifth of the Directs depend on each of the four following categories as their primary funding source:
special events, fees or sales on products, individual donors, and membership dues [See Fig. 10 in Chapter IV]. In contrast, over half of the Indirects rely on membership dues as their primary funding source [See Fig. 11 in Chapter IV]. The primary funding sources relied on by Direct Hopefuls appear to be a hybrid of Directs and Indirects [See Fig. 12 in Chapter IV]. Increased funding levels for Indirects and Direct Hopefuls will be difficult if so many organizations continue to rely on membership dues as their primary means of support. To do so, they are much more likely to compete directly with each other, national conservation organizations, as well as other non-profit causes.

Because Directs require significantly more funding to support past efforts (land management and property taxes) and to accomplish future goals, they can not afford to constantly compete with each other. Therefore, a wider variety of financial sources for a larger pool of possible donors is necessary. The Directs in this survey were more likely to utilize government funds, foundation grants, fees and sales on products, and interest income than the Indirects or Direct Hopefuls [See Fig. 13 in Chapter IV]. These are avenues for funding which the Direct Hopefuls must pursue if they plan to directly protect land.

Land Trusts: A Comparison to Land Trust Alliance's Records

According to Land Trust Alliance (LTA), there are 24 "land trusts" in Wisconsin [Land Trust Alliance 1993]. All 24 LTA-recognized land trusts, along with 642 other NCOs received the DNR survey instrument [See Appendix E]. Of the 24 LTA-land trusts, 14 responded. Nine other NCOs in Wisconsin labeled themselves as "land trusts" in the DNR survey, although not recognized by the LTA. All but two of them fell expectedly into the Direct category. One LTA-recognized land trust did not classify itself as a land trust in the results from this survey. Therefore, if one compares LTA's list of land trusts in Wisconsin to that of the DNR, they

---

4 See Chapter III for complete methodology.
5 Audubon Society-Madison Chapter, Merrimac Conservation Club, Perkins Wildlife Area, Philadelphia Community Farm, Riverside Fishing and Hunting Club, Spruce Grouse Society, Madeline Island Wilderness Preserve (listed as an LTA-recognized land trust in Minnesota), TNC, and Trust for Public Land (TPL) all identified themselves as land trusts. TNC and TPL, however are national organizations and would not have been included in LTA's survey population.
6 The remaining two are the Kinnickinnic River Land Trust (Direct Hopeful) and Spruce Grouse Society (Indirect).
7 Lac La Belle Environmental Foundation
predictably overlap, but each with a handful of "land trusts" exclusive to its own records. This is simply due to inevitable differences in survey methods and response rates.\textsuperscript{8}

With all the "land trusts" uncovered by both LTA and this survey combined, the list of NCOs directly involved with land protection is still incomplete. Most of the Directs in this survey did not label themselves as land trusts, but have served, or are serving the role of land trusts. A land trust is only one possible category for NCOs which protect land. Just as books should not be judged by their covers, neither should NCOs be categorized by name alone. Less than 25% of Directs describe themselves as "land trusts" and less than 10% of have the word "Trust" or "Conservancy" in their names. The more complete description comes in an organization's actions rather than its name, or even categorical label.

\textbf{Plans for Future Land Acquisition and Protection}

Results suggest that at least 20 more NCOs than the current 91 will be involved with land protection in the next three years. Of the respondents, 70% of the Directs (n=76) are planning to, or may consider acquiring (more) land in the next three years (1994-1997).\textsuperscript{9} In addition, 12 of the 47 Direct Hopefuls and eight of the 154 Indirects also are considering land acquisition in the future [See Appendix G]. For Indirects to become involved in directly protecting land suggests that they, like Direct Hopefuls, are considering different or additional means to improve environmental quality. Whether or not these NCOs' plans to protect land ever come to fruition poses an unanswerable question. A survey of them in 1997 would provide valuable insight as to the true commitment, abilities, and expansion or decline of these groups.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{8} It should be noted that of the nine land trusts exclusive to the DNR list, one is The Nature Conservancy and one is the Trust For Public Land. Neither of these national organizations would be included in LTA's survey population because they are national organizations.

\textsuperscript{9} The other 30% gave no indication that their current involvement as Directs would end or diminish.

\textsuperscript{10} Future research possibility
The Land Question
What is the acreage, legal status, access, use, management, and methods of land protection for the land NCOs own or have partial interest in?

Acreage

Based strictly on the information provided from written surveys, the bare minimum of land protected by NCOs in Wisconsin is 111,087 acres, as of February 1994.11 The vast majority of the land protected is done so by a small handful of NCOs. Sixty percent (60%) of the 83 Directs which currently own land, hold conservation easements, or have transferred land are responsible for protecting 99% of the 111,087 acres; 11% of the Directs with land account for 86% of the land [See Appendix H]. The Wisconsin Chapter of The Nature Conservancy (WiTNC) alone is responsible for protecting 55% of all the land accounted for in this study. Parallel figures on the national level are even more skewed. Nationally, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has protected approximately 7.78 million acres [WiTNC 1994], and 889 LTA-recognized, region-specific land trusts have protected 2.7 million acres [Land Trust Alliance 1991, iv]. The result is a 74%/26% split (TNC/ 889 land trusts) nationally, as compared to 55%/45% (WiTNC/ 83 Direct NCOs) in Wisconsin. The number of acres protected by LTA-recognized land trusts is undoubtedly low, due to missing information and unrecognized organizations. In Wisconsin alone there are at least seven more region-specific, self-labeled "land trusts" which are not currently recognized by LTA but have protected nearly 4,000 acres.12 Beyond that, dozens more NCOs in Wisconsin, which do not label themselves as land trusts, have protected at least 36,000 acres [See Appendix H]. And beyond that, there could be hundreds more NCOs in Wisconsin which were probably not included in this survey.

11 Total acreage was based on information from 83 of the 296 survey respondents. Through interviews by the researcher, 1,050 acres are protected by two NCOs which did not return the survey. Des Plaines Wetlands Conservancy owns 700 acres in Kenosha County and Lakeland Conservancy owns 30 acres and holds conservation easements to 320 acres in Oneida County. A slightly more accurate figure of privately protected land which can be accounted for in this project is 112,137 acres.
12 AudubonSociety-Madison Chapter (254 ac), Merrimac Conservation Club (42 ac), Perkins Wildlife Area (650 ac), Philadelphia Community Farm (20 ac), Riverside Fishing and Hunting Club (632 ac), Spruce Grouse Society (?), Madeline Island (2200 ac)
13 This does not include the 9,429 acres and 93,000 acres protected by TPL and WiTNC, respectively.
Information about privately protected land in Wisconsin is still incomplete, even after combining results from LTA's survey, the DNR's survey (including WiTNC), and the researcher's case studies. Combining information from all three sources (without doubling) raises the amount of privately protected land in Wisconsin to 113,880 acres.\textsuperscript{14} While this figure, even doubled, accounts for less than 1% of the 36,752,640 acres of land in Wisconsin, it is premature to consider the role of NCOs as politically or ecologically insignificant. Small parcels\textsuperscript{15} of land protected by NCOs may in fact be ecologically significant, possibly harboring rare, threatened or endangered species, or ecosystems. They may provide watershed protection, serve as a buffer zone or constitute a biological corridor between publicly protected lands. This is pure speculation however, because excluding WiTNC's land, nothing is known as to the actual ecological significance of land protected by region-specific NCOs. In contrast, land protected by WiTNC is well inventoried and heralded for its ecological significance on state, national, and often global bases.

Even if land protected by region-specific NCOs is not "ecologically significant" on a statewide basis, it is likely important to a local community in the form of greenspace or recreational areas. It is highly unlikely that a parcel would be protected if it did not have some significance. NCOs do not routinely purchase or accept donations of land that are insignificant, only to pay property taxes on them. Funds are limited and threatened areas are increasing. Land protecting organizations inherently take a triage approach in selecting parcels to protect. For example, TNC sticks rigidly to its priority list of lands to protect. According to Ms. Kimberlee Wright, Director of Land Protection for WiTNC, the organization regularly gets offers from landowners who want to donate land or conservation easements. But more often than not, WiTNC can not accept parcels if they are not on their priority list of globally or nationally significant lands due to the long term management costs associated with

\textsuperscript{14} This figure, 113,880, is the sum of the following: 111,087 acres (83 NCOs from DNR survey) plus 700 acres (Des Plaines Wetland Conservancy, from researcher's interview) + 350 acres (Lakeland Conservancy, from researcher's interview) plus 161 acres (Friends of Dane County Parks, from LTA 1991 Directory) plus 371 acres (Riveredge Nature Center, from LTA 1991 directory) + 1,190 acres (Sand County Foundation, from LTA 191 directory) + 21 acres (The Prairie Enthusiasts, from LTA 191 directory).

\textsuperscript{15} Parcel sizes vary widely, from less than an acre to a couple thousand acres.
any land [Wright 1993]. Wright indicated that when possible, they refer the landowner to a local NCO which might be able to serve as a receptacle for land or easement donations [Wright 1993]. If a donated, non-priority parcel is accepted by a Direct, it is usually sold as a "trade land," with the proceeds used to acquire priority land.

From a political perspective it is important to note that as shown in this survey alone, over 50,000 people support the efforts of NCOs which directly and indirectly protect land. At the very least, $16 million annually finds its way to the Directs' operating budgets.16 Based on Wisconsin's 1990 population, $3.28 per capita17 comprises the Directs operating budgets, yet it is unknown how this figure compares to previous years or other states.

The value of Directs' assets, i.e. the land they protect, is entirely unknown. Further research in these areas could determine changing ecological, economic, or political significance of NCOs directly involved with land protection and could answer important questions: Is the niche of Directs expanding, declining, or static? Is there a correlation between private land protection activity and public policy decisions? The literature suggests that an increasing number of private non-profit organizations (specifically, land trusts) have been established to provide a service that the public sector can not or will not fulfill due to financial and/or political constraints [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 317; Hays 1992; Martens and Peterson 1992, 41; Myers 1992, 7; Endicott 1993, xiii]. According to this explanation then, an increasing role of NCOs to protect land in Wisconsin would indicate a diminishing role or ability of the public sector to do so. But during the time that Land Trust Alliance-recognized land trusts in Wisconsin increased, the state initiated the $250 million Stewardship Program "to preserve Wisconsin's natural beauty and biological diversity" [Black 1992, 1]. To explain the rapid growth of land trusts across the nation during the Reagan-Bush-Watt administration of the 1980s, the explanation in the literature is fitting. In the 1990s however, when the National Research Council (1993), Myers (1992), Endicott (1993), and others are advocating public-private partnerships as

---

16 In addition, 19% of the Directs have endowment funds ranging from $500 to $200,000. The bare minimum of secured endowment funds, as accounted for in this survey, is $968,500; this does not include the amount of WiTNC's and six other Directs who did not enumerate the actual amount of their endowment. WiTNC's endowment is sure to exceed $200,000.
17 $16,029,115 divided by 4,849,1769 people
obligatory for land protection, a corollary to explain increased private land protection activity is necessary.

_Acreage Comparison: Great Lakes' States in 1981 v. Wisconsin in 1994: Increased Acres Protected or More Comprehensive Surveys?_

The Lincoln Institute's survey revealed 25,988 protected acres _in all_ of the Great Lakes states as of 1982 [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 22]. The figure stands in stark contrast to the 1994 figure of 111,087 protected acres in just Wisconsin—even if WiTNC's 61,500 acres are subtracted. However, it must be noted that not all NCOs as surveyed here are "land trusts," which was a prerequisite for the Lincoln Institute study. As discussed earlier, there are more than just land trusts protecting land to be considered. A crucial point to be noted as well is that the total protected acres accounted for in this study represents only a 44.3% response rate of 666 NCOs which is not presumed to be the universe of NCOs in the state. At best, the results provide one possible cross-section of NCOs in Wisconsin at a particular time.

_Legal Status and Methods of Land Protection_

For the remainder of the discussion, "total acreage" will refer to the 111,087 acres protected by the 83 NCOs which provided information in the DNR survey in February 1994. Of the 111,087 acres protected by NCOs, 44.5% (49,518 acres) is owned in fee-simple. Forty-six percent (46%) of the land (51,030 acres) has been transferred from the responding NCO to another non-profit or government agency, which in turn holds it in fee-simple.18 Nine and one-half percent (9.5%, 10,539 acres) are acres for which NCOs hold conservation easements. As demonstrated by these respondents, Wisconsin's use of land protection methods at this time most closely parallels the Plains' states as described in the 1981 Lincoln Institute study, rather than the Great Lakes' states [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 22]. This disparity may be due to inadequate sampling or may represent a change in preferred land protection methods which has taken place in the last 10 years. Like land trusts in the Plains' states, Wisconsin's NCOs in this survey have been just about as likely to transfer land to another entity (46%) as to own the

---

18 Some acres may be double-counted because land transferred from one NCO to another may be counted in two places. It is believed however, that most transferred land from NCOs goes to the DNR or local/county governments.
land in fee-simple (44.5%) [See Fig. 18 in Chapter IV]. The Lincoln Institute’s 1981 figures for the nation as a whole, however, suggest that land purchases are more common than transferring the land [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 21].

Also according to the Lincoln Institute’s study, conservation easements were used to protect only 4% (1,019 acres) of the land protected by Great Lakes’ land trusts [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 22]. This comparison initially suggests that conservation easements are increasingly being used in Wisconsin. What can more safely be inferred from this survey is that the use of conservation easements will increase in Wisconsin along with other means to secure partial interests in land. Other methods of securing partial interest (less-than fee-simple acquisition) in land exist on a spectrum of protection. The least binding protection is in the form of a voluntary agreement with a landowner. Toward the other end of the spectrum is the acquisition of development rights. In between those two points is the use of limited development options and dedicated land by a developer. While most Directs indicated that they have purchased land, or received it as a donation, most have not received conservation easements, or utilized other less-than fee-simple land protection methods. Nevertheless, a consistent number of Directs in the survey express interest in alternative land protection methods, suggesting increased use in the future [See Fig 24 in Chapter IV]. Endicott (1993) and the National Research Council (1993) predict that in the 21st century, innovative partial-interest acquisitions will be more common than fee-simple acquisition [Endicott 1993, 4; National Research Council 1993, 5]. Results here suggest that responding Directs are willing to explore land protection methods other than the traditional, and usual fee-simple acquisition. The highest ranking methods of land protection that NCOs expressed interest in are conservation easements (40%), development rights (35%) facilitating dedicated land by developers (28%), and land exchanges (28%) [See Fig. 24 in Chapter IV]. NCOs however, need to be aware that less-than fee-simple protection methods can be legally complex, requiring more than general counsel to see a project through to completion. In addition, land monitoring and enforcement are crucial to successfully protect land with less-than fee-simple means.
Location

The highest numbers of responding Directs are located near Milwaukee, and Green Bay Wisconsin, as well as Minneapolis, and St. Paul, Minnesota\textsuperscript{19} (See Fig. 26 in Chapter IV). With growing population concentrations in southeastern Wisconsin and the Twin Cities of Minnesota, further research would presumably show that in those areas, farmland conversion, strip development, suburban and exurban sprawl are spreading faster than other areas of the state.

Research as to the geographic area covered by each NCOs gave findings very similar to those from the Lincoln Institute survey. Sixty-three percent (63\%) of the NCOs in this survey (N=287) indicated geographic foci of only one county (See Fig. 25 in Chapter IV). This compares to the 68\% figure from the 1981 survey. So indeed, most of these groups are going to be very small, with shoe-string budgets and a miniscule staff, if any.

Use and Access

Over 60\% of the Directs surveyed which own land\textsuperscript{20} allow public access to it, although it may not always be a publicized fact (See Fig. 16 in Chapter IV). Failure to publicly advertise that protected land is available to the public likely has at least two explanations. First of all, allocation of time and money for advertising land access may be low on the list of priorities for a Direct, especially if subsequent clean-up and human management chores result. Or, failure to advertise accessible land may be intentional. The NCO can minimize human impact without officially restricting it and thereby supporting any existing elitist impressions.

Results from this survey can not debunk all elitism traditionally associated with private land protection, as 22\% of the Directs surveyed allow access only for their members (See Fig. 19 in Chapter IV). Yet, nearly as many, 17\%, do not allow any (or very limited) access to even their members. These restrictions are generally applied to ecologically sensitive areas where constant human impact may threaten the integrity of the land. The personal benefits reaped by supporters of such organizations may be a sense of biocentric satisfaction, and/or

\textsuperscript{19}This does not represent the highest number of acres protected near the midwestern cities, but rather the number of Directs which protect land in those counties
\textsuperscript{20}This does not include land for which Directs hold conservation easements.
flank protection from encroaching development near their homes and communities. Conventional wisdom suggests that protected natural areas results in appreciated property values for adjacent landowners. But again, minimal empirical data is available to confirm this.  

The use of land protected by the Directs surveyed is consistent with the reasons for its protection, and generally leans toward non-consumptive users. Motor vehicles are commonly banned, and less frequently, bicycles. Particularly sensitive areas are protected, and often access is limited to trails [See Fig. 20 in Chapter IV]. Hunting is not allowed in many cases except for occasional deer management. 

Management 

Of the 83 surveyed Directs known to protect land, 52 are known to have management plans for their property [See Fig. 21 in Chapter IV]. This means that at least 8,600 acres of land protected by the other 26 Directs does not [See Appendix H]. Fortunately, this is a very small fraction of the protected land accounted for thus far, mainly because WiTNC, the largest player involved, does indeed have management plans for its land. Over half of the Directs surveyed cite some need for technical land management expertise, labor assistance with land management, or access to the advice of a good ecologist [See Fig. 29 in Chapter IV]. These needs are functions of money, but creative networking may be able to help meet them. One possibility for Directs in need of land management advice and labor is to utilize university students from the College of Natural Resources (CNR) at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point or the Institute for Environmental Studies (IES) at UW-Madison. There could be symbiotic partnerships established, providing a student with hands-on experience, and free or inexpensive assistance for NCOs. For example, all wildlife majors in the CNR are required to design a land management plan, and according to Dr. Lyle Nauman, Professor of Wildlife, some students have trouble finding study sites for their projects. Or, graduate students in water resources at the IES are able to do group managements projects in lieu of theses. Also, The 

---

21 According to Joan Youngman, Senior Fellow with the Lincoln Institute for Land Policy, little research has been done in this area because it is not in anyone's vested interest to prove that the cost of protecting land is shifted to adjacent property owners in the form of higher property taxes [Youngman 1994].
Wildlife Society and Fire Crew are CNR-student groups trained and available to provide land management assistance. These are just a few possible avenues for Directs to get current management advice and inexpensive manual assistance.

The Problems and Needs Question

What are the problems and needs facing NCOs which directly and indirectly protect land?

A discussion of NCOs' problems and needs must be prefaced with the fact that such groups are inherently diverse. Sub-populations of NCOs can be defined based on size and age characteristics which most often dictate problems and needs. The needs of newer NCOs are likely to be initially centered around fundraising, public awareness, and networking with other groups. In contrast, larger, more established NCOs have generally mastered those areas and are more likely to need assistance in managing land, re-invigorating their boards of directors, or establishing endowment funds. With this in mind, it is not surprising that no one problem or need blatantly stands out from the rest [See Figs. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 in Chapter IV].

Problems

As landowners, the most serious problem facing Directs as of February 1994 was property taxes [See Fig. 27 in Chapter IV]. It is fortuitous then that as of April 14, 1994, some property held in trust by non-profits will be exempt from property taxes [Wisconsin Act 307, 1993]. That Wisconsin had up until recently required property taxes on privately protected land offers one explanation as to why Wisconsin's Directs in this study have been as likely to transfer land to another entity then to own it—to avoid property taxes. Because universities are

---

22 This caveat stands in addition to the fact that the results from this survey represent only a fraction of all NCOs in the state.
23 Presumably, the Directs which indicated that property taxes are "no problem" own little if any land.
24 Stipulations for exemption are the following: (a) the property is used to preserve native wild plant or native animal life, Indian mounds, or other works of ancient persons or geological or geographical formations of scientific interest; (b) the property is open to the public subject to reasonable restrictions; (c) no pecuniary profits accrue to any owner or member of the organization or to any associate of any such owner or member from the use or holding of the property; (d) the county board of the county where the property is located has not determined that the property is not owned by, or held in trust for, a non-profit organization and has determined that at least one of the requirements under pars. (a) to (c) has not been fulfilled. [Wisconsin Act 307, 1993]
exempt from property taxes [O'Conner 1993] as was the Department of Natural Resources until recently, it has been cheaper for Directs to turn the land over to them. In the New England states, where land trusts have been exempt from property taxes [O'Conner 1993], land ownership has predictably been the leading method of land protection [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 21]. This suggests that Wisconsin's NCOs may become more likely to hold the land they purchase than to transfer it.

Property-tax exemption could now liberate NCO-funds for other activities and/or further land acquisition. Or, as indicated by Brenneman and Bates (1984) and Hays (1992), property tax relief may not change land trusts' expenditures; they may still pay the taxes of their protected parcels, in order to "build good will" with their communities [Brenneman and Bates 1984, 57; Hays 1992, 88].

In interviews with two Madison, Wisconsin attorneys, Mr. Bill O'Connor, board member of the Land Trust Alliance and Ms. Kimberlee Wright, of WiTNC, both described property valuation problems with regard to conservation easements. The state's Conservation Easement Act of 1985, directs property tax assessors to take conservation easements into account when valuing land [Wright 1993; O'Conner 1993]. But in fact, conservation easements on land in Wisconsin are often not properly considered, if at all, leaving land owners and NCOs with excessive tax burdens [Wright 1993; O'Conner 1993]. Such problems occur due to the newness of the law, too much dis-uniformity and too little knowledge by assessors about conservation easements [O'Conner 1993]. Even though the public policy was set in 1985 to provide a subsidy for private land protection in the form of property tax relief, enforcement of that law inhibits increased land protection activity as intended. During the deliberations for property tax reform, this matter should be studied and corrected. Ideally, enforcement of the Conservation Easement Act would come from the Department of Revenue rather than through re-assessment requests and law suits filed by NCOs. If NCOs are the ones to push for enforcement, to reduce their property tax burden, they run the risk of creating disgruntled landowners in their communities who might in turn have their tax burdens increased. Negative public relations for
the NCOs would be unfortunate, especially since the Conservation Easement Act is already law, and they simply seek its enforcement.

Other commonly identified problems of Directs included trespassing, vandalism, and a lack of public understanding. The least commonly cited problem was locating a quality appraiser. WiTNC was one of the 10 Directs which indicated it to be a problem, noting that it is a moderate problem for them. Similarly, land speculation was indicated to be a large problem by nine Directs, including WiTNC. While the actual number of Directs experiencing these problems is small, the notable problems of the state's largest Direct must not be discounted. WiTNC is responsible for protecting nearly half of the land protected by all Directs identified in this survey. The problems that WiTNC faces now are likely indicators of things to come for maturing Directs, and any that are alleviated could provide a smoother road for land protection efforts in the future.

**Needs**

The most consistently indicated needs of all NCOs are increased financial support, more volunteers, greater public awareness, and a larger membership [See Figs. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 in Chapter IV]. As discussed under Sub-question 1, it is expected that the Directs place increased financial support and the need for an endowment fund at the top of the list. They need money now, and indefinitely, to continue to protect and manage land.

Surprisingly, Directs ranked the need for legal assistance very low. At least two explanations for this finding exist: (1) In being Directs, they have already had to retain legal counsel; (2) Few Directs are actually in the process of, or are planning to acquire land or conservation easements due to some other reason then the absence of legal assistance.

The needs of the NCOs which labeled themselves as land trusts provide more definitive results than the Directs, but again, this is considerably smaller sample size (N=21) [See Fig 32 in Chapter IV]. Some of the same leading needs of Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls hold true for land trusts alone--increased financial support and greater public awareness--both of which are more definitively indicated than with Directs or Indirects.
Unique to Directs—and land trusts—is a leading need for an endowment fund. The leading needs of Directs distinguishes them from NCOs who are not directly involved with land protection.

Analogous to Maslow’s Needs Hierarchy for people, a hierarchy of needs for NCOs exists as well. For the Directs in this survey, the most pressing, most immediate need is money; without it, nothing else can happen. In order to obtain increasing financial support, NCOs need a growing number of members, volunteers, and increasing public awareness. These are needs common to all NCOs, and probably to other types of non-profit organization as well. As these needs are fulfilled, the NCO can increasingly focus and specialize on its intended objectives. For Directs, this involves steps to protect land. At this point, Directs need to know how to most efficiently protect land and how to manage it. They need trained volunteers to help with hand-on land management, contacts with similar organizations, advice from knowledgeable ecologists, and further training for board members. After a Direct has moved through this stage, its legal and land management situations become increasingly complex. If in-house staff are not available to meet the needs of a more highly evolved Direct, it will look for help from state or national organizations and agencies. Less-experienced organizations can probably not help the more advanced organizations, but the reverse is indeed true. As long as the more established NCOs do not stagnate and whither, they are sources of advice and information from the immature organizations.

An entity or agency which aims to meet the needs of Directs, or land trusts specifically, must recognize this hierarchy of needs. Not all organizations will need, or be ready to use the same services, information, and training. For example, the service of a well-trained assessor means little to a Direct which is working on its first fundraising campaign. On the other hand, land-rich Directs may be able to thankfully save thousands of dollars a year by having their holdings properly assessed. Before blanket-assistance to Directs is provided, the target population(s) must be determined. The only clear thing all NCOs need is money. Beyond that, the needs are bifurcated along many lines.

Useful Information
An NCO hierarchy of needs is demonstrated again by the types of information indicated to be the most useful for the Directs researched [See Figs. 33, 34, 35, 36 in Chapter IV]. Information on fundraising strategies, assistance programs, and matching-grants rank highest, followed by land inventory, management practices, acquisition priorities, and lastly real estate transactions and negotiations.

There is however, at least one other explanation to this trend besides an organizational needs hierarchy. Because each Direct has its own distinct population, its leaders and members bring with them their skills and expertise. The Directs which were interviewed commonly have lawyers and real estate specialists on their boards of directors. If this is the case, they are not likely to need legal advice, land acquisition expertise, or information on tax aspects of real estate transactions. Likewise, NCOs naturally attract biologists, botanists, and zoologists, who can provide land management expertise, diminishing that as an organizational need. Just as age and size of an NCO can determine its needs, so can its membership--an extremely unpredictable variable. So predictably, the types of useful information for Indirects is notably different from the Directs. Information on water protection and an inventory of the area's natural resources ranked above fundraising strategies, matching grants, and assistance programs.

Methods to Share Information

Given the ambiguity in identifying black and white needs of Directs, it is little consolation that the preferred methods of communicating are more easily identified. A newsletter is the most popular method of communication [See Fig. 37 in Chapter IV]. Especially for the Directs in this survey, 77% of whom ranked it as most effective, a newsletter is an efficient means to communicate rapidly changing circumstances in the realm of land protection.

A four to six page bi-monthly newsletter, similar to The Conservation Fund's Common Ground could provide Wisconsin's NCOs information about recent acquisitions, pertinent legislation or policy decisions, upcoming DNR research and workshops, and services available from universities, the DNR, and each other. "Snip-its" of information such as Common Ground provides, along with phone numbers and contacts for more details, are quick and easy to ingest,
and still a resource tool. Handbooks/technical bulletins were also ranked highly as a popular method of communication. After written communication, the responding NCOs prefer regional get-togethers, with one-day workshops preferred over two-day conferences.

The least popular methods of communication are a statewide coalition of groups and electronic communication. While much of the world is connected through e-mail, Wisconsin's NCOs in this survey are not. When asked what type of e-mail they accessed, many listed "fax" instead of the expected "Internet," "Bitnet," or "Econet."

Support for regional get-togethers exceeds that for a centralized service center and a statewide coalition of groups. Based on interviews conducted throughout the state, NCOs in the western half of the state feel more commonality with groups from Minnesota than they do with groups in southeastern Wisconsin. NCOs in the rural Oneida and Vilas Counties face very different issues surrounding land protection than do the densely urbanized Racine, Waukesha, Walworth, and Kenosha Counties.

**The Partnership Question**

Are NCOs working with other organizations or agencies?

In 1987, Foti indicated that one-third of the local and regional land conservation organizations (LRLCOs) in the Great Lakes states\(^\text{25}\) were involved with the public sector in some capacity [Foti 1987, 199]. Seven years later, roughly two-thirds of the Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls surveyed have had positive working partnerships with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) alone, on a conservation project between 1992 and 1994.\(^\text{26}\) All three categories of respondents are more likely to have worked with the DNR in the last two years than any other agency or organization [See Figs. 40, 41, 42 in Chapter IV]. Foti's (1987) figures however, represent a larger geographic region than the new results, although her population of LRLCOs was more restricted than this study's population of NCOs. Comparing the two data sets can yield at least two possible conclusions: (1) From Foti's (1987) study, frequencies of public-private partnerships in the other four Great Lakes states were low

\(^{25}\) Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin

\(^{26}\) Small percentages of NCOs revealed having had a negative experience with the DNR as a conservation partner; Directs (5%), Indirects (5%), Direct Hopefuls (9%)
bringing down a possibly then already-high frequency in Wisconsin. So in looking at just Wisconsin now, the results create an illusion of growth in partnerships in the state; (2) the frequency of public-private conservation partnerships in Wisconsin has increased between 1987 and 1994. The latter interpretation is supported in the literature, which indicates that nationwide, public-private partnerships for conservation efforts are becoming more common [Foti and Jacobs 1989, 319; National Research Council 1993, 6; Endicott 1993, 3; Myers 1993, xiv].

If in fact there are more public-private conservation partnerships in Wisconsin in 1994 than in 1987, it may well be a result of the state's Stewardship Program, established in 1990. Wisconsin is one of only 16 states that has a statutorily established partnership-role for NCOs and its natural resource agency. Administered through the Department of Natural Resources, one aspect of the Stewardship Program is to facilitate joint conservation efforts between the DNR and NCOs. This involves the DNR awarding matching-grants to DNR-approved NCOs, for DNR-approved land or conservation easement acquisition projects, with DNR-approved management plans.

The literature concludes that public-private partnerships are beneficial in furthering similar land conservation missions [Martens and Peterson 1992; Myers 1992, xvi; Metzger 1983, 2; Vilms 1988, 1; Coffin 1992, 2; Gaining Ground 1991, 1; Burkart 1991, 16; National Research Council 1993, 9; Endicott 1993, xiii]. Through matching-grants to NCOs, the public sector is able to "double its money," and be assured of strong support for its efforts, from at least the conservation community. As of January 1994, the Stewardship Program had established formal partnerships with nine NCOs to protect 3,365 acres for the total cost of $4.9 million [See Appendix J]. The DNR's share of that amount was $2.3 million, while the NCO partners provided the remaining $2.6 million.

---

27 Myers (1992) concluded that state programs (such as the Stewardship Program) are a catalyst for spurring land protection activity within the private non-profit sector [Myers 1992, xiii]. While the cause and effect is yet undocumented, states with formalized partnerships do in fact lead in land trust growth [Myers 1992, xiii].

28 In the statutes, NCOs are defined as a "non-profit corporation, charitable trust or other non-profit association whose purposes include the acquisition of property for conservation purposes and that is described in Section 501(c)3 of the Internal Revenue Code as being exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c) of that code. See page 5 in Chapter I for the less restricting definition of an NCO used throughout this paper.

29 21 projects/parcels ranging in size from two to 1,524 acres.
Additional savings for taxpayers may result from public-private partnerships, because NCOs are often able to obtain land for lower prices than a state agency [Myers 1992, ix; Metzger 1983, 2; Harper 1985, 10; Coffin 1992, 2; Endicott 1993, 4]. In some cases, NCOs have more favorable footing with landowners who begrudge involvement of natural resource agencies, or the state in general. As third-party intermediaries, NCOs have been able to facilitate land acquisitions in politically difficult situations [Lee 1992, 5; Martens and Peterson 1992, 44; Foti and Jacobs 1989, 319; Myers 1992, ix; Burkart 1991, 17; National Research Council 1993, 9; Endicott 1993, 4].

Again, all three categories of respondents indicated that that they are still very interested in working with the DNR to accomplish common goals [See Figs. 42, 43, 44 in Chapter IV]. The Directs and Direct Hopefuls also indicated strong interest in working with local/county governments. This is predictable given that the public sector is more likely to have the necessary resources to protect land than most other possible partners.

As Wisconsin's NCOs become increasingly involved with the DNR and other public sector entities, advantages and disadvantages accrue on a double-edged blade. On the positive side, by working together, land acquisition priorities can be coordinated, management plans can be designed and implemented on a larger scale, transactions costs may be less, and land may be protected that might never have been without the service of NCOs. This last benefit, afforded by a unique ability of NCOs, risks being lost if their their role as private, non-governmental organizations becomes indiscernible from the public sector's role. To the general public, it is a fine line that defines the identities and "allegiances" of NCOs from the state. If an NCO establishes more and stronger ties to public sector agencies, it is the NCO's responsibility to acknowledge this line and to be aware of possible repercussions.

Less formally binding partnerships than the Stewardship Program are common among both the Directs and Indirects surveyed. About half of the Directs have worked with other NCOs. From the interviews conducted, the few relationships mentioned between NCOs were generally mentor-student relationships. As region-specific Directs, they were generally not working with others as "peers" to accomplish a goal, but rather with as a mentor providing
advice, services, and contacts to a younger NCO. As conveyed in interviews with 16 NCO directors, The Wisconsin Nature Conservancy (WiTNC) is the ultimate mentor—a valued source of information for Directs in the state which is more commonly contacted than the Land Trust Alliance (LTA). LTA, a Washington DC-based organization was established to address the needs of land trusts across the county. [See Chapter 3 for an overview of LTA and WiTNC]. Despite the intentions of LTA to be a resource for land trusts, this research suggests that it is WiTNC, the largest NCO in Wisconsin, that is better informed about, and connected to Wisconsin's NCOs and land protection priorities.

The Directs surveyed were much more likely to have worked with groups of high school students than Indirects [See Figs. 39, 40 in Chapter IV]. This is an odd disparity given that both categories of NCOs identified the provision of environmental education as the leading reason for engaging in conservation activities. That the distinguishing characteristic between Directs and Indirects surveyed is land ownership provides a clue. Directs are able to provide more educational opportunities to high school students with their own environmental education/nature centers, camps, and trails. Also, high school students may provide land management assistance for the protected land, an avenue for partnerships not necessary and therefore not present with Indirects.

The Stewardship Question
Do NCOs know about the Stewardship Program? What are their ideas and problems regarding it?

Stewardship Program Awareness

NCOs' name recognition of Wisconsin's Stewardship Program approached 70%, but surprisingly, the Directs lowered the average for all the respondents rather than raise it. This is ironic, because it is for Directs that there is earmarked funding for matching grants under the Stewardship Program.

Further questions about the Stewardship Program were answered by fewer and fewer respondents, thereby limiting accurate interpretation of the data. Most likely, the respondents that did not answer the more specific questions about the Stewardship Program were not familiar with it beyond name recognition. Therefore, those NCOs which did answer questions
about possible eligibility and past applications skewed the data to over-represent those most familiar with the Program, and under-represent the percentage that is not.

Thirty (30) respondents indicated that they had applied for a matching grant under the Stewardship Program. As expected, three times the number of the responding Directs have applied for the grants as either Indirects or Direct Hopefuls [See Fig. 46 in Chapter IV]. However, this number is highly questionable. According to Ms. Janet Beach Hanson, the NCO Manager for the DNR and administrator of the Stewardship Program, she has processed applications for only 18 NCOs [Beach Hanson 1994]. The most likely explanation for conflicting information is that some NCOs are mistaking other grants or DNR programs with the generically labeled "Stewardship Program."

Reasons for Not Applying

Only 35% of the responding Directs supposedly have applied for matching-grants from the Stewardship Program [See Fig. 47 in Chapter IV]. Such a step is a very formalized process, and with the expenditures of public funds, there is understandably a quid pro quo; there must be public benefit, i.e. access, to all DNR-NCO partnership projects. In some circumstances then, Stewardship Program funds may not appropriate. Three Directs did indicate that they have not applied for a Stewardship Program grant because they prefer to rely on private funds. This is not however, the leading reason which has prevented the responding Directs from applying. With a very small sample size of 30, the most common responses from Directs was that they lacked the matching funds necessary to receive grants and/or they lacked the staff necessary to manage (additional) land [See Fig. 48 in Chapter IV]. Both of these reasons are consistent with the Directs' leading need for increased financial support. In contrast, the leading reason for Indirects and Direct Hopefuls not to apply for a Stewardship Program grant is because many are simply not organizations which protect land. This offers further support to the fact that Directs, Indirects, and Direct Hopefuls are indeed distinct categories of NCOs.

30 Seven of the 9 NCOs which have received Stewardship Program grants are included in this survey's results.

31 Eighteen (18) NCOs have completed Part I (Organization Application) of the Stewardship Program application process as of June 1994. Of those 18, only 14 have completed Parts II and III (Project and Parcel Applications) of the application process [Beach Hanson 1994].
Problems and Barriers

Twenty (20) NCOs indicated that they had experienced barriers or problems which made it difficult for them to take full advantage of the Stewardship Program. Written comments reveal problems and of a slow moving bureaucracy, rigid categories for acceptable project proposals, and the equity of grant distribution around the state.

The rigidity of the six categories under which NCOs are eligible for matching grants was specifically cited as a problem by two NCOs. Since the time of the survey, the Habitat Restoration Area category of the Stewardship Program has been broadened under Wisconsin Act 343 by re-labeling it as the Habitat Areas category to include more types of projects. The topic of broadened or additional categories was discussed by DNR officials and NCO directors at the 1994 Wisconsin Land Trust Conference. Opinions were mixed with regard to altering an existing category or installing an additional one, given that no additional money would result. Some conference members suggested that the time spent revising the existing Program codes could be better spent in gearing up for the Program's hopeful renewal—necessary before 2000.

Juxtaposed opinions by two NCOs make an interesting, yet conflicting point with regard to awarded grants and population density. A west-central NCO proposed that more grant-money goes to the more populated areas of the state, i.e. the Southeast. At the same time, an southeastern NCO indicated that it is difficult to find projects "acceptable" for Stewardship Program grants, i.e. large parcels, in the more populated areas, suggesting that the less populated areas have the advantage. The legislation establishing the Stewardship Program makes no reference as to where or how the funding to qualified NCOs should be allocated, other than for DNR-approved projects. Currently, the DNR Bureau of Community Assistance is in the process of establishing an advisory committee which would award the NCOs grants. On

32 The categories originally were: Acquisition and Development of Local Parks; Urban Greenspace; Natural Areas; Habitat Restoration Areas; State Trails; Streambank Easement Protection;
33 Wisconsin Act 343 also changed the name of the Stewardship Program to be the Warren Knowles-Gaylord Nelson Stewardship Program.
this committee, the NCOs would have representatives to provide input on what have been exclusively DNR decisions.

A goal of the proposed advisory committee should be to help ensure renewal of the Stewardship Program, with an expansion of the grants program to NCOs. The literature is replete with the need for, and advantages to public-private partnerships to further conservation goals in the 1990s and beyond [National Research Council 1993, 9; Martens and Peterson 1992; Myers 1992, xvi; Metzger 1983, 2; Vilms 1988, 1; Coffin 1992, 2; Burkart 1991, 16; Endicott 1993, xiii]. The Stewardship Program of 1990, with grants to NCOs, reinforced Wisconsin's position at the helm of progressive land conservation policy. To lose this status by weakening or eliminating this avenue for public-private partnerships would be a backward step for the conservation movement in Wisconsin.
Conclusion

From just a sample of NCOs in Wisconsin, it is clear that they represent a diversity of interests, objectives, abilities, and needs. So what then is the role of NCOs involved with land protection in Wisconsin? They play at least two distinct roles; that of direct and indirect land protectors. NCOs which literally own and manage land, or hold partial interests, play a direct role analogous to that of a public sector agency. These NCOs, however, have the unique ability to garner support for common goals which are not always popular among the larger populous of the state or nation. Rather than having to work toward the lowest common denominator for agreed upon land protection, NCOs can be more creative and progressive.

By providing a less tangible aspect of environmental quality, such as public education and awareness, NCOs indirectly involved with land protection efforts occupy a niche that the public sector does not completely fill. Additionally, they play the role of a watch-dog for natural resources and environmental quality through political advocacy and lobbying.

In general, the NCOs surveyed are oriented to protect the traditionally "non-resource" components of the natural world, such as aesthetics, non-consumptive natural areas, and open-space. The public sector has traditionally been charged with protecting human health and safety, and only recently been pressured to provide more and better recreational and wilderness opportunities. NCOs in Wisconsin represent the contemporary demands of a smaller segment of the population, which reach beyond human health and safety.

The legal framework is in place for private land protection efforts in Wisconsin to increase. With the Conservation Easement Act passed and amended in the 1980s, the Stewardship Program created in 1990, Lake Protection Grants established in 1993, and tax-exemption for property held in trust by non-profits as of 1995, the Directs and Direct Hopefuls have obvious support from the public sector to privately protect (more) land.

Partnerships with the DNR are already common among the NCOs, who are very much interested in continuing this trend. As new understandings of ecosystem functions imply the need for more broadly scaled land management, private land increasingly holds more public benefits
and responsibilities. For this reason, the DNR should posture itself to regularly work with NCOs directly involved with land protection. It is important that the DNR and partnering NCOs share a common vision to accomplish their goals, while at the same time allow for the complementary strengths of both partners to operate.

A commonly perceived cause of environmental degradation is that an increasing number of people each cause incremental impacts which culminate in a tragedy of the commons. It seems at times an unmanageable situation, never to be altered since incremental degradation makes an increasingly detrimental difference. Along those lines then, the same logic must apply to the planned, incremental efforts of small, region-specific NCOs. While miniscule in comparison to the DNR, Environmental Protection Agency, and even a fellow NCO such as The Wisconsin Nature Conservancy, region-specific NCOs aim to incrementally protect and restore land, both directly and indirectly. If we conclude that incremental damage results in large-scale degradation, we must also conclude that positive, incremental efforts will culminate in large-scale improvement. As can be told from this study, the role of NCOs in Wisconsin is incremental, but not negligible.

Recommendations

After reviewing literature about private land protection efforts in the United States, and then interviewing and surveying the directors of non-profit conservation organizations (NCOs) in Wisconsin, there are several recommendations to be made. Because this research is the first of its kind in the state, it probably raises more question than it answers.

1. In 1990 the Stewardship Program created one the few opportunities for public-private partnerships for land protection in the country. It must however be renewed and refinanced by 2000. One of the goals of the upcoming Stewardship Program Advisory Board should be to insure the Program’s renewal with an expanded role for NCOs. As of January 1, 1995, NCOs, but not the DNR, are eligible to be exempt from property taxes. Given this new development, increased land trust activity is likely and the DNR should capitalize on it through means of an extended and expanded Stewardship Program.
2. The DNR needs to view NCOs as allies with missions similar to its own. NCOs face misunderstanding from the general public, just as the DNR does, and are likely to be more sympathetic of the DNR, than the general public. Most of the NCOs surveyed have worked with the DNR on various projects in the past and overwhelmingly want to continue. For the DNR not to recognize or take advantage of the many grassroots initiatives across the state would be unfortunate.

3. The Bureau of Community Assistance should generate a brief newsletter\(^1\) (four to six pages) for NCOs on a bimonthly or quarterly basis. Because there are two distinct types of NCOs (Directs and Indirects), as well as well-established and newly emerging NCOs, it is important to determine the target population of the newsletter, or have regular columns devoted to the sub-categories of NCOs. A non-focused, blanket approach would not be particularly helpful. Information helpful for the Directs (and Direct Hopefuls) would be summaries about pertinent legislation (pending and past); descriptions of successful projects completed or being conducted by NCOs and/or the DNR; resources available from the DNR, UW-Extension, or other NCOs; featured volunteers or NCOs; featured land protection tools; announcements of state and national workshops and conferences; fundraising suggestions; management advice; noteworthy books, articles, or studies.

4. The DNR and/or UW-Extension should co-sponsor an annual one and a half day conference for the Directs and Direct Hopefuls.

5. Stewardship Program grants to NCOs, (as well as municipalities) should have a more specific, distinguishable name. There are other national, state and local programs with similarly vague titles. The NCOs in this survey were confused as to whether or not they had applied for a Stewardship Program grant. This suggests that they are unable to distinguish it from other programs and grants. As efforts begin to focus on renewing the Stewardship Program, it will be important for the public and legislators to associate a specific bond-funded program with specific benefits.

---

\(^1\) A newsletter should be in printed form, as opposed to electronic mail [See Fig. 37 in Chapter IV].
6. Opposition to an increased amount of protected land includes concern for the economic well-being of the affected community. While protected land may indeed slow development, does it actually hamper a community's economic well-being? The American Farmland Trust has developed a testing instrument (Cost of Community Service Study) for communities to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of preserving farmland and open-space. Results have consistently favored open-space and farm land protection over development. Such a survey should be conducted on town and/or county bases in Wisconsin.

7. University of Wisconsin-Extension or a private non-profit organizations in Wisconsin should take it upon itself to increase the general public's knowledge of state property law, estate tax planning, conservation easements, and the abilities (and inabilities) of NCOs involved with land protection.

8. While 295 NCO directors were able to provide information about their organizations goals and objections, little is known about the thousands of members who support them. A brief but far-reaching survey should be conducted to determine why Wisconsinites support private land protection efforts and other NCO activities in order to evaluate the political clout they do or could have regarding environmental policy at the state level.

9. We assume that people with good intentions achieve their goals. With regard to the time and money being invested by NCOs which directly protect land, does it truly lead to improved environmental quality? Further research should be conducted as to the ecological significance of parcels protected by county- or region-specific NCOs.

10. Increasing numbers of land trusts and protected acres have been documented across the country. Little is known, however, about the longevity of these organizations and implications for their protected land if they should become inactive. Therefore, research should be conducted to determine the best means for land-protecting NCOs to avoid any costly, controversial situations should they become inactive.
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Appendix A

Non-profit Conservation Organizations Directly Involved with Protecting Land in Wisconsin (The "Directs")

1. 1000 Islands Environmental Center
2. Audubon Society-Kettle Moraine Ch.
3. Audubon Society-Madison Ch.
4. Bayfield Heritage Assoc.
5. Bethel Horizons Nature Center
6. Bjorklunden-Lawrence University
7. Burlington Conservation Club
8. Cable Natural History Museum
9. Camp Five Museum Foundation
10. Camp Lake Oaks Improvement Assoc.
11. Camp Nan A Bo Sho
12. Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation
13. Center Lake Woods PO Assoc.
14. Chequamegon Area Mountain Bike Assoc.
15. Chihwauke Prairie Preservation Fund
16. Circle Sanctuary
17. Covenant Harbor Bible Camp
18. Dane Co. Conservation League
19. Dane Co. Natural Heritage Foundation
20. Door County Land Trustees
21. Dutch Hallow Lake PO Assoc.
22. Edwards YMCA & Conference Center
23. Esadore Area Lake Assoc.
24. Flora Dell Lake Assoc.
25. Friends of Bay Beach Wildlife Sanctuary
26. Friends of Beaver Creek Reserve
27. Friends of Havenwoods
29. Geneva Lake Conservancy
30. Gordon Bubolz Nature Preserve
31. Green Bass Lake Association
32. Halsey Lake Association
33. Hunt Hill Audubon Sanctuary
34. Ice Age Park & Trail Foundation
35. International Crane Foundation
36. Izaak Walton League of America
37. Izaak Walton League-B. Cook Ch.
38. Izaak Walton League-Green Lake Area
39. Izaak Walton League-Sheboygan
40. Izaak Walton League-Watertown
41. Kelly Lake Advancement Assoc.
42. Kishwauketoe Nature Conservancy
43. Lac La Belle Environmental Foundation
44. Lake Arrowhead Association
45. Lakeside Estate Improvement Assoc.
46. Lauderdale Lakes Improvement Assoc.
47. Living Water Bible Camp
48. LR Head Nature Center
49. Madeline Island Wilderness Preserve
50. Marsh Haven Nature Center
51. Merrimac Conservation Club
52. Natural Lakes Owners Advancement Assoc.
54. Norskedalen Nature & Heritage Center
55. Outdoors Forever
56. Outdoors Inc.
57. Perkins Wildlife Area
58. Pewaukee Lake Sports Club
59. Pheasants Forever-Kinnickinnic Ch.
60. Philadelphia Community Farm
61. Pigeon Lake Sportsman Club
62. Racine County Conservation League
63. Rib Lake Fish & Game Organization
64. Riverside Hunting & Fishing Club
66. Silver Lake Sportsmens' Club
67. Sinsinawa Mound
68. Spring Bank Association
69. The Clearing
70. The Hyslop Foundation
71. The Nature Conservancy
72. The Prairie Enthusiasts
73. The Ridges Sanctuary
74. Timber Wolf Preservation Soc.
75. Timber-Lee Christian Center
76. Trout Unlimited-Antigo Ch.
77. Trout Unlimited-Oconto River Ch.
78. Trout Unlimited-Ojibleau Ch.
79. Trout Unlimited-Shaw-Paca
80. Trust for Public Land
81. Wisconsin Farmland Conservancy
82. Watertown Conservation Club
83. Waukesha Land Conservancy
84. Webb Lake Property Owners Assoc.
85. Wisconsin Lions Camp
86. Woodland Dunes Nature Center
87. YMCA Camp Anokijig
88. YMCA Camp Minikani & Wowitan
89. YMCA Camp St. Croix
90. YMCA Camp Unahliya
91. YMCA Camp Phantom Lake
Appendix B

Non-profit Conservation Organizations Indirectly Involved with Protecting Land in Wisconsin (The "Indirects")

1. Alaska Lake Association
2. Amacoy Lake Property Owners' Assoc.
3. Arbutus Lake Association
4. Arkdale Lake Association
5. Audubon Society-Chequamegon Ch.
7. Audubon Society-LaCrosse Ch.
8. Audubon Society-Lakeland Ch.
10. Audubon Society-WI Metro Ch.
12. Bear Lake Assoc.
13. Berry Lake PO Association
14. Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin
15. Big Bass Lake Owners Assoc.
16. Big Bearskin Lake Assoc.
17. Big Cedar Lake PO Association
18. Big Lake PO Association
20. Black Earth Creek Watershed Assoc.
22. Cedar Creek Restoration Cov.
23. Chain O'Lakes Property Owners' Assoc.
24. Chippewa Wildlife Society
25. Citizens for a Better Environment
26. Citizens' Natural Resources Assoc.
27. Citizens' Natural Resources Assoc. of WI
28. Citizens to Save Neenah Wetlands
29. Clark Lake Advancement Assoc.
30. Clover Leaf Lake Protective Assoc.
31. Coalition for Safe Environment
32. Concerned Citizens for Random Lake Assoc.
33. Concerned Citizens of Rochester
34. Couderay Lakes Resort Assoc.
35. Door Property Owners
36. Ecology Association of New Berlin
37. Elbow Lake Property Owners
38. Elroy-Sparta National Trail
39. Elwood May Environmental Park Assoc.
40. Elwood Lakes Association
41. Emerald Valley PO Assoc.
42. Environment Wisconsin
43. Forest Co. Silver Lake Assoc.
44. Fox Lake Property Owners Assoc.
45. Fox Valley Bird Club
46. Friends of the Arboratum
47. Friends of Harrington Beach State Park
48. Friends of the Kettle Moraine
49. Friends of Kohler-Andrae State Park
50. Friends of Perrot State Park
51. Friends of the Recreational Trail
52. Friends of the Round Lake Dam
53. Future Milwaukee

54. Geneva Lake Assoc.
55. Gibraltar Historical Association
56. Greater Whitewater PO Assoc.
57. Green Bay Bird Club
58. Green Lake Preservation Society
60. Harper Lakes Assoc.
61. Hasbroook Lake Assoc.
62. Hidden Springs PO Assoc.
63. High Cliff State Park Assoc.
64. Horseshoe Lake Improvement Assoc.
65. Hoy Nature Club
66. Jackson County Wildlife Fund
67. Jungle Lake Property Owners
68. Kettle Moraine Nordic Ski Club
69. LaCrosse Co. Conservation Alliance
70. LaCrosse River Trail
71. Lac Vieux Desert & Lake Assoc.
72. Lake Gilmore PO Assoc.
73. Lake Holcombe Improvement Assoc.
74. Lake Nokomis Concerned Citizens
75. League of American Wheelmen
76. Little Green Lake Assoc.
77. Long and Bass Lake Assoc.
78. Long Lake Fishing Club
79. Kettle Moraine Lake Association
80. Knollwood Association
81. Maiden Lake Club Assoc.
82. McDonald Lake PO Association
83. Mississippi Val. Archaeology Ctr.
84. Navarino Nature Center
85. Newport Wilderness Society
86. Nordic Ski Club of Milwaukee
87. Northwoods Conservation Assoc.
88. Northwoods Wildlife Center
89. Oshkosh Bird Club
90. Owen J. Gromme Bird Club
91. Pelican Lake PO Association
92. Petenwell-Castlerock PO Assoc.
93. Pheasants Forever
94. Pheasants Forever-Dane Co. Ch.
95. Pheasants Forever-Kenosha Ch.
96. Pheasants Forever-Rock Valley Ch.
97. Pheasants Forever-Sauk County Ch.
98. Pheasants Forever-Sugar River
99. Pipe Lake Property Owners' Assoc.
100. Plymouth Bird & Nature Club
101. Point Lake Association
102. Portage Canal Society
103. Post Lake Env. Improvement Assoc.
104. Prinel Owners Organization
105. Rangeline Lake Association
106. Red Lakes Association
107. River Alliance of Wisconsin
108. Round River Alliance
109. Riveredge Bird Club
110. Round Trade Lake Improvement Assoc.
111. Sierra Club-Algonquin Shores Gr.
112. Sierra Club-Coulee Region Gr.
113. Sierra Club-Four Lakes Gr.
114. Sierra Club-Fox Valley Gr.
115. Sierra Club-John Muir Ch.
116. Sierra Club-St. Croix Valley Interstate Gr.
117. Sierra Club-WI River Country Gr.
118. Sigurd Olson Environmental Institute
119. Silver Lake PO Association
120. Spirit Reservoir Assoc.
121. Soc. for Conservation Biology-A. Leopold Ch.
122. Soc. of Tympanuchus Cupido Pinnatus
123. Soil and Water Conservation Society
124. Solberg Lake Association
125. Spider Lake Improvement Assoc.
126. Spruce Grouse Society
127. Stormy Lake Association
128. Sugar River Trail
129. The Lake Katherine Association
130. The Wildlife Society-UWSP Ch.
131. The Wildlife Society-Wisconsin Ch.
132. Three Lakes Association
133. Three Lakes Waterfront Homeowners' Assoc.
134. Teal, Lost Land & Ghost Lakes Improvement
135. Trout Unlimited-Aldo Leopold Ch.
136. Trout Unlimited-Fox Valley Ch.
137. Trout Unlimited-Frank Hurnberg Ch.
138. Turtle Lake PO Association
139. Waterfowl USA-So. Wisconsin Ch.
140. White Lake Property Owners' Assoc.
141. Wilke Lake Advancement Assoc.
142. Windfall Lake Association
143. Winnebagoland Conservation Alliance
144. Wisconsin Archaeological Society
145. WI Assoc. for Environmental Education
146. Wisconsin Association of Lakes
147. Wisconsin's Ethnic Settlement Trails
148. Wisconsin Horse Owners' Alliance
149. Wisconsin Morgan Horse Club
150. Wisconsin Sharp-Tailed Grouse Soc.
151. Wisconsin State Horse Council
152. Women Outdoors Inc.
153. Wood Lake Property Owners' Assoc.
154. YMCA River Bend Nature Center
Appendix C

Non-profit Conservation Organizations Hoping to be Directly Involved with Protecting Land in Wisconsin (The "Direct Hopefuls")

1. Antler Lake Association
2. Anvil Lake Association
3. Archibald Lake Association
4. Audubon Society-Green Rock Ch.
5. Brillion Nature Trails
6. Calumet Nature Studies
7. Citizens to Protect the West Twin River
8. Delavan Historic Preservation Society
9. Door County Environmental Council
10. Ducks Unlimited
11. Friends of Ahnapee State Trail
12. Geneva Lake Environmental Agency
15. Green Lake PO Assoc.
17. Kinnickinnic River Land Trust
18. Lake Beulah Protective & Improvement Assoc.
19. Lake Ellen Assoc.
20. Lakeshore Owners Conservation Advocates
21. Little Bearskin Lake Assoc.
22. Machickanee Flowage Advancement Assoc.
23. Minocqua Township Improvement Assoc.
24. Minong Flowage Lake Assoc.
25. Mirror Lake Assoc.
26. Neighbors for Black River Trails
27. Neillsville Area Trail Assoc.
28. Pheasants Forever-Central WI Ch.
29. Pheasants Forever-Indianhead Ch.
30. Pheasants Forever-Racine Co. Ch.
31. Pheasants Forever-Red Grass Ch.
32. R.I.D.E.-Southern WI Ch.
33. Richter Lake Association
34. Sierra Club-Chippewa Valley Gr.
35. Silver Lake Environmental Assoc.
36. Silver Lake Protective Assoc.
37. The Naturist Education Foundation
38. Trout Unlimited-Kiap-Tu-Wish Ch.
39. Trout Unlimited-Lakeshore Ch.
40. Trout Unlimited-Marinette Co. Ch.
41. WI Off-Road Bicycle Assoc.
42. Weyauwega Lake Conservation Club
43. White Clay Lake Sportsmen Club
44. Wisconsin Wetlands Association
45. Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
46. Wisconsin’s Environmental Decade
47. Yahara Fishing Club
Appendix D

Interview Format for Non-profit Organizations
Believed to be Involved with Land Protection in WI

Introduction:

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me. The research I am conducting is intended to outline the efforts of private, non-profit groups with regard to land protection in Wisconsin. With that information, I will make suggestions to the groups, as well as the DNR on how to make the most efficient use of the resources available. The questions I'll be asking you are in 5 main categories: (1) info/background on your group; (2) your land protection efforts/interests; (3) your organizations problems & needs; (4) partnerships/networking; (5) a state program. Do you mind if I tape record this interview? The transcripts would be accessible to me, my graduate committee of the CNR (3 professors) and Janet Beach Hanson in the Bureau of Community Assistance of the WI DNR.

If so, please sign this form.

Consent Form for Audial Recording of Interview

I, ______________________ give permission to Andrea M. Freeman of the College of Natural Resources to audio-tape record the proceeding interview.

I understand that the transcripts of the interview will be made available to Dr. Chris Thomas, Dr. Baird Callicott, and Dr. Lowell Klessig of the College of Natural Resources at UW-SP, as well as Ms. Janet Beach Hanson of the Bureau of Community Assistance at the WI Department of Natural Resources.

Signature ______________________ Date ____________

1. Tell me about your organization—mission, activities, size, age, region of focus.
2. Has your group taken efforts to directly protect land?
   If no, are you interested in helping other groups agencies manage land?
   If yes, in what capacity?
3. How is land used?
4. How is the land cared for?
5. What are some of the obstacles you have faced, both in acquiring land (or easements) and also in managing it?
6. What impact, if any, does your groups' land ownership have on the surrounding community?
7. Do you have any plans to protect additional lands in the future?"
8. Is your group interested in land use issues and land use planning?
9. What are some of your group's biggest needs?
10. Have there been any federal, state, or local laws or regulations that have had an impact (good or bad) on your organization?
11. Have you had connections with other non-profits?
12. Do you see need for strengthening ties among non-profits?
13. Have you had interactions with the local government?
14. Have you had any experience with the DNR?
15. What specifically could the DNR do to help you?
16. Do you know about Wisconsin's Stewardship Program?
17. What is the best means of communication for the DNR, or other non-profit to make information and announcements available to you and your members?
Survey of Nonprofit Organizations
February 1994
Your answers to questions marked with an asterisk (*) may be included in a directory.

SECTION I: MISSION

1.* Please explain the mission of your organization.


2.* Which, if any, of the following conservation activities does your organization do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Already doing</th>
<th>Not doing, but would like to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own land or hold easements for conservation or recreational purposes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist other organizations or government agencies with management/maintenance or restoration of land they own</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Adopt&quot; a river, stream or watershed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Adopt&quot; a natural area, park or wildlife area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Adopt&quot; or help maintain a state or local trail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate the public about conserving land/water resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide education specifically for landowners on how to preserve the natural resources on their property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide financial assistance to other groups or agencies for their conservation efforts when those efforts coincide with your mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political advocacy and lobbying on conservation issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on land use planning and growth management issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide technical assistance or expertise to other groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in resource surveys, research or species count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List types:
3.* In which categories do you place your organization? Please circle up to three categories.

- Camp facility
- Conservation biology/science organization
- Cultural or historic preservation organization
- Environmental advocacy organization
- Environmental education/nature center
- Farmland preservation organization
- Organization focusing on rivers, streams or watersheds
- Fishing organization
- "Friends of" - state park, state forest, state trail, etc.
- "Friends of" - (unit of government other than DNR)
- Hunting organization
- Lake association
- Land trust or land conservancy
- Recreational group (hiking, skiing, etc.)
- Alliance or coalition of groups with common interest
- Other (list)

If you did not circle any of the activities listed in Question 2, please skip to Question 37.

4. For what reason(s) does (or would) your organization participate in any of the activities you circled in Question 2? Please circle your top three reasons.

- Provide environmental education
- Preserve cultural, historic, community features
- Preserve farmland
- Preserve open space in developing areas
- Preserve aesthetic/scenic areas
- Protect or restore wildlife habitat
- Protect natural areas for ecological reasons
- Protect or restore water quality and aquatic habitats
- Maintain woodlands for harvesting
- Provide recreational opportunities for the public
- Provide recreational opportunities for members only
- Other (list)
SECTION II. BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS

5. Has your organization worked with any of the following groups or agencies on a conservation project in the past two years? If so, please indicate if it was a positive or negative experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, have not worked with</th>
<th>Yes, positive experience</th>
<th>Yes, negative experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another conservation organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of nonprofit group, such as service group, garden club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of college students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of high school students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/corporation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/county government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agency in your area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (list)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Are you interested in working with any of these groups to accomplish common conservation goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very interested</th>
<th>Somewhat interested</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another conservation organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of nonprofit group, such as service group, garden club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of college students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of high school students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/corporation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/county government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agency in your area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (list)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Is there anything you would like to see the DNR do to support or strengthen conservation organizations or foster the development of partnerships?
SECTION III: THE STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM

8. Have you heard of Wisconsin's Stewardship Program which is administered through the DNR?
   Yes _____
   No _____ (If no, go to #14)

9. Are you aware that nonprofit organizations can apply for grants under the Stewardship Program?
   Yes _____
   No _____ (if no, go to #14)

10. Has your organization ever applied for a grant through the Program?
    Yes _____ (go to #13)
    No _____

11. If not, which of the factors listed below have prevented your organization from applying for a Stewardship grant? Circle all that apply.

    Our organization does not purchase land or hold easements for conservation purposes
    a

    After learning about the Program, we decided the property we are interested in does not qualify for any of the Stewardship categories
    b

    We were told by the DNR that our organization or property does not qualify
    c

    We do not have the matching funds necessary to purchase land
    d

    We do not have the staff or volunteers necessary to manage land
    e

    We do not have 501(c)(3) tax exempt status from the IRS
    f

    We do not know how to acquire land
    g

    We have been unable to get information about Stewardship from the DNR
    h

    We prefer to rely solely on private funding sources
    i

    We plan to apply in the future, as soon as we decide to make an offer on a property
    j

12. Are there any reasons not listed above that have prevented you from applying for a grant?


13. If you have applied or are you in the process of applying for a Stewardship grant, are there any barriers or problems that have made it difficult for you to take full advantage of the program?

No
Yes If yes, please take a moment to explain the problems you have experienced (be as specific as possible).

14. If you are interested in acquiring land for conservation purposes and would like us to send you information about Stewardship, please check here.

15. Would you like the DNR to offer a regional meeting in your area about the Stewardship Program?

Not necessary__ Yes (week night)__ Yes (weekday)__ Yes (Sat. a.m.)__

If you do not own property or hold easements for conservation purposes, or intend to in the future, please skip the next section and go to Question #28

SECTION IV: LAND OWNERSHIP

16.* How many acres does your organization currently own in Wisconsin? ________

How many separate non-contiguous projects does this represent? ________

17.* How many conservation easements does your organization currently hold on land you do not own? ________ Number of acres? ________

18. Has your organization transferred ownership of land to other private nonprofit groups or government agencies?

No
Yes How many acres? ________

19. Do you recall how many acres you owned or had easements on in these years?

1990 ________ 1988 ________ 1986 ________
20. Does your group plan to acquire additional land in the next three years?

Yes_____ No_____ Depends on what situations arise_____

21. Which of the following methods would you use to protect land? Please circle all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Have used in past</th>
<th>Would use in future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept donations of land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase conservation easements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept donations of conservation easements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase or accept donation of development rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate dedication of land by developer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct land exchanges (trades)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use &quot;limited development&quot; options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act as third party to facilitate transfer to another nonprofit or government agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make voluntary, revocable conservation agreements with landowners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. If you have received donations of land or conservation easements, do you think that most of your donors have realized any financial benefit? Circle one.

We have not received any donations of land or easements.... a
Do not know. .................................................................. b
Do not think so ......................................................... c
Yes, income tax deduction.......................................... c
Yes, property tax reduction or stabilization ................... d
Yes, gift or estate tax reduction.................................. e

23. Do you have a management plan for most of the properties you oversee?

Yes_____ No_____ 

If yes, please indicate who provided assistance in developing your management plan(s). Circle all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNR...........................................</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension agent................................</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house staff person........................</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government................................</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid private consultant.....................</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional planning agency....................</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/college...........................</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer....................................</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (list)..................................</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Who has assisted with any "hands-on" maintenance, management or restoration of your land? Circle all that apply.

We do very little or no active management of our property. a
Corporate volunteer groups. b
DNR. c
High school student groups. d
Local government. e
Other conservation organizations. f
Other types of nonprofit groups such as service clubs. g
Permanent staff. h
Seasonal employees and interns. i
Volunteers. j
Wisconsin Conservation Corps (WCC). k
DNR Youth Conservation Camp (YCC). l
Other (list). m

25. Is there public access to the land you oversee? Circle one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land you own</th>
<th>Land you have easements on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, publicized and encouraged. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but not publicized. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, for member use only. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (or very limited access permitted). 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. If there is public access, are there any restrictions on that access? Circle all that apply.

No restrictions exist. a
Access is limited to guided tours. b
Access is limited to trails. c
Access to ecologically sensitive areas is restricted. d
No fishing is allowed. e
No hunting is allowed. f
Only deer hunting is allowed. g
No motorized vehicles are permitted. h
No bicycles are permitted. i
Other (explain). j
27. How serious is each of the potential problems listed below for your organization? Please circle one number on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Small Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Large Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism, dumping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass (for activities not allowed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property taxes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public awareness/understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community opposition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition by local government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in finding a qualified appraiser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land speculation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (list)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION V: ORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS

28. What are your organization's most pressing needs? Please circle one number on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>OK As Is</th>
<th>Small Need</th>
<th>Moderate Need</th>
<th>Large Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater public awareness about our group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased financial support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An endowment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased staffing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger membership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more active Board of Directors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more diverse Board of Directors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better trained Board of Directors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for training/education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More volunteers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better qualified or better trained volunteers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for networking regionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for networking statewide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the advice of a good ecologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication with other groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication with the DNR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication with local government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition expertise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land management expertise (technical advice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land management assistance (labor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (list)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. What information would be most useful to your organization? Please circle one number on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Most Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information on water protection efforts in your area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of natural resources in your area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about DNR land acquisition priorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about land protection priorities of local governments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising strategies and techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about the Stewardship program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook on state/federal funding assistance programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Organization&quot; development (Board of Directors, strategic planning, volunteer and membership development, financial planning, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations and marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax aspects of real estate transactions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document models for real estate transactions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How to's&quot; of real estate transactions/negotiations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective land management practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (list)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. What do you think would be the most effective and cost efficient ways to share information among nonprofit groups and government agencies who have similar priorities and common goals? Please circle one number on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Most Effective</th>
<th>Less Effective</th>
<th>Least Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual 2 day conference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several one day workshops each year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbooks/technical bulletins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized service center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional &quot;get-togethers&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mechanism for making referrals to resource people or regional resource teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide coalition of groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you have access to? (List)

31. When you have questions, who (or what) do you turn to for advice?
SECTION VI: GENERAL INFORMATION

32. Type of organization (circle one)
   501(c)3 tax exempt nonprofit............................... a
   Nonprofit, but without 501(c)3 tax exempt status........ b
   Quasi-governmental........................................ c
   Other (please explain).................................... d

33. What is your annual operating budget? $____________________

34. Do you have a separate land acquisition fund?
   No _____ $____________________
   Yes _____ $____________________

35. Do you have a separate endowment fund to maintain land?
   No _____ $____________________
   Yes _____ $____________________

36. Please rank your top three sources of funding (1st, 2nd, 3rd)
   Corporations
   Foundations
   Government funds
   Individual donors
   Interest income
   Membership dues
   Special events
   Fees, sale on products, etc.

37.* Name of Organization________________________________________
    Contact person and title________________________________________
    Street or P.O. Box Number_______________________________________
    City____________________ County________________________ State____Zip____
    Phone ( )___________________ Fax ( )____________________

38.* Please list the counties where you operate:_______________________

39.* Number of members________________________ 40. Size of Board of Directors________

41.* Number of paid staff: Full time_______ Part time______

42.* Number of volunteers__________ 43.* Year group was established________

43. Name of person completing this questionnaire_____________________

THANK YOU!
Dear

I am writing to ask for your assistance with a research project that will be of benefit to non-profit conservation organizations in Wisconsin. I am a Master's candidate studying natural resource policy and planning at the College of Natural Resources at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. For my thesis, I am examining roles that private, non-profit groups play in land protection and management in Wisconsin. Dr. Christine Thomas, professor of natural resource management, is my academic advisor.

For one part of the study, I am taking an in-depth look at 16 of the several hundred non-profit conservation groups in Wisconsin. I would like to include The Nature Conservancy in this phase of the study because of your geographic location and mission orientation. It would require approximately sixty to ninety minutes of your time for an interview in August or September.

The questions will be focused on your group's goals and activities, land protection interests, needs, and any partnerships you may have with non-profit groups or public sector agencies. If you do not mind, I would like to tape record the interview, for the sake of accuracy during the analysis.

This project is partially funded by grants from the Department of Natural Resources and the UW-Stevens Point Student Research fund. Besides the interviews, I will be sending written surveys to approximately 1100 groups in the state. Results of the study, including a directory of organizations involved with land protection and management will be made available in the Fall of 1994.

I would greatly appreciate your participation. Your insights will be valuable, not only to me, but also to other non-profit conservation groups in the state. I will be calling you in the next week to set a time for an interview. If you have any questions, you may reach me at (715) 346-2209, or Dr. Thomas at (715) 346-4165.

Sincerely,

Andrea M. Freeman
Policy & Planning Graduate Program
## Appendix G

Non-profit Conservation Organizations Which Will of Possibly Will Acquire (Additional) Land in the Next Three Years (1994-97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will Acquire</th>
<th>Possibly Will Acquire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1000 Islands Environmental Center</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alaska Lake Association</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Antler Lake Association</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arbutus Lake Association</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Audubon Society-Kettle Moraine Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Audubon Society- Madison Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Audubon Society-WI Metro Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Big Lake PO Assoc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Brillion Nature Trails</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cable Natural History Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Calumet Nature Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Camp Lake Oaks Improvement Assoc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Camp Nan A Bo Sho</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Chequamegon Area Mountain Bike Assoc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Chippewa Prairie Preservation Fund</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Circle Sanctuary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dane Co. Natural Heritage Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Door County Land Trustees</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Edwards YMCA &amp; Conference Center</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Friends of Bay Beach Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Friends of Beaver Creek Reserve</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Geneva Lake Conservancy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Green Lake Association</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Halsey Lake Association</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Hunt Hill Audubon Sanctuary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Ice Age Park &amp; Trail Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. International Crane Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Izaak Walton League of America</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Izaak Walton League-B. Cook Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Izaak Walton League-Watertown</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Kinnickinnic River Land Trust</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Lac La Belle Environmental Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Lake Arrowhead Association</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Lauderdale Lakes Improvement Assoc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Madeline Island Wilderness Preserve</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Mirror Lake Association</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Natural Lakes Owners Advancement Assoc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Neighbors for Black River Trails</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Outdoors Forever</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Outdoors Inc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Perkins Wildlife Area</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Pewaukee Lake Sports Club</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Pheasants Forever-Indianhead Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Pheasants Forever-Kenosha Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Pheasants Forever-Kinnickinnic Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Pheasants Forever-Red Grass Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Pheasants Forever-Sugar River Val. Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Acquire</td>
<td>Possibly Will Acquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Philadelphia Community Farm</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Racine County Conservation League</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Rib Lake Fish &amp; Game Organization</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Riverside Hunting &amp; Fishing Club</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Soc. of Tympanuchus Cupido Pinnatus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. The Hyslop Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. The Ridges Sanctuary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Timber-Lee Christian Center</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Trout Unlimited-Antigo Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Trout Unlimited-Kiap-Tu-Wish Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Trout Unlimited-Marinette Co. Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Trout Unlimited-Oconto River Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Trout Unlimited-Ojiblou Ch.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Trout Unlimited-Shaw-Paca</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Wisconsin Farmland Conservancy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Watertown Conservation Club</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Waukesha Land Conservancy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. WI's Ethnic Settlement Trails</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Wisconsin Lions Camp</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Woodland Dunes Nature Center</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. YMCA Camp Anokijig</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. YMCA Camp Minikani &amp; Wowitan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Non-profit Conservation Organizations Which Protect Land in Wisconsin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th># of Acres Owned</th>
<th># of Acres Under Easement</th>
<th># of Acres Transferred</th>
<th>Management Plan?</th>
<th>Planning to Protect More Land, 1994-97?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1000 Islands Environmental Center</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Audubon Society-Kettle Moraine Ch.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Audubon Society-Madison Ch.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Audubon Society-WI Metro Ch.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bayfield Heritage Assoc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bethel Horizons Nature Center</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Brillion Nature Trails</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cable Natural History Museum</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Camp Five Museum Foundation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Camp Lake Oaks Improvement Assoc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Camp Nan A Bo Sho</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Center Lake Woods PO Assoc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Chiwaukee Prairie Preservation Fund</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Circle Sanctuary</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Covenant Harbor Bible Camp</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dane Co. Conservation League</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dane Co. Natural Heritage Foundation</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Door County Land Trustees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dutch Hallow Lake PO Assoc.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Edwards YMCA &amp; Conference Center</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Esadore Area Lake Assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Flora Dell Lake Assoc.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Friends of Bay Beach Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Friends of Beaver Creek Reserve</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Friends of Havenwoods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Geneva Lake Conservancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Gordon Bubolz Nature Preserve</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Halsey Lake Association</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hunt Hill Audubon Sanctuary</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ice Age Park &amp; Trail Foundation</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>International Crane Foundation</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Izaak Walton League of America</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Izaak Walton League-B. Cook Ch.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Izaak Walton League-Green Lake Area</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Izaak Walton League-Watertown</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td># of Acres Owned</td>
<td># of Acres Under Easement</td>
<td># of Acres Transferred</td>
<td>Planning to Protect More Land, 1994-97?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Kelly Lake Advancement Assoc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kishwauketoe Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lac La Belle Environmental Foundation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lake Arrowhead Association</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lakeside Estate Improvement Assoc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lauderdale Lakes Improvement Assoc.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Madeline Island Wilderness Preserve</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Marsh Haven Nature Center</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Merrimac Conservation Club</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Natural Lakes Owners Advan. Assoc.</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>New Richmond Preservation Soc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Norskedalen Nature &amp; Heritage Center</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Outdoors Forever</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Outdoors Inc.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Perkins Wildlife Area</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Pewaukee Lake Sports Club</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Pheasants Forever-Kinnickinnic Ch.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Philadelphia Community Farm</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pigeon Lake Sportsman Club</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Racine County Conservation League</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Riverside Hunting &amp; Fishing Club</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Silver Lake Sportsmen's Club</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Sinsinawa Mound</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Soc. of Tympanuchus Cupido Pinnatus</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Spring Bank Association</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>The Clearing</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The Hyslop Foundation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>The Ridges Sanctuary</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Timber Wolf Preservation Soc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Timber-Lee Christian Center</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Trout Unlimited-Antigo Ch.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Trout Unlimited-Oconto River Ch.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Trout Unlimited-Ojibou Ch.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Trout Unlimited-Shaw-Paca</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>9429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Wisconsin Farmland Conservancy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Watertown Conservation Club</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Waukesha Land Conservancy</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Wisconsin Lions Camp</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Acres Owned</td>
<td>Acres Under Easement</td>
<td>Acres Transferred</td>
<td>Management Plan?</td>
<td>Planning to Protect More Land, 1994-97?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Woodland Dunes Nature Center</td>
<td>991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>YMCA Camp Anokijig</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>YMCA Camp Minikani &amp; Wowitan</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>YMCA Camp St. Croix</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>YMCA Camp Unahliya</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>YMCA Camp Phantom Lake</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>YMCA River Bend Nature Center</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,518</td>
<td>10,539</td>
<td>51,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix I

Stewardship Program Projects with Non-Profit Conservation Organizations (As of 15 January 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stewardship Project</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Stewardship Program Category</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>DNR Cost Share</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cedar Lakes</td>
<td>Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>Acquisition &amp; Dev. of Local Parks</td>
<td>$223,470</td>
<td>$111,735</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cedar Lakes</td>
<td>Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>Urban Greenspace</td>
<td>$447,300</td>
<td>$223,650</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chiwaukee Prairie</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$327,000</td>
<td>$9,175</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goose Pond</td>
<td>Audubon Society-Madison Chapter</td>
<td>Habitat Restoration Area</td>
<td>$141,600</td>
<td>$70,800</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Green Bay Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>Friends of the Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>Acquisition &amp; Dev. of Local Parks</td>
<td>$232,300</td>
<td>$116,500</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Green Circle Trail</td>
<td>Green Circle Committee</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ice Age Trail</td>
<td>Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$674,425</td>
<td>$337,213</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Logan Creek</td>
<td>Ridges Sanctuary</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$147,150</td>
<td>$73,575</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lulu Lake</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$200,056</td>
<td>$100,028</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lulu Lake</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$235,914</td>
<td>$117,957</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mink River Estuary</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$353,200</td>
<td>$176,600</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mink River Estuary</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$73,700</td>
<td>$36,850</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Quincy Bluff</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$13,575</td>
<td>$6,787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Page Creek Marsh</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$309,227</td>
<td>$127,114</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Point Sauble</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$296,626</td>
<td>$48,313</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Quincy Bluff</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$563,604</td>
<td>$281,802</td>
<td>1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Quincy Bluff</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$101,102</td>
<td>$50,551</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Thompson Prairie</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>Habitat Restoration Area</td>
<td>$22,275</td>
<td>$11,137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Token Creek</td>
<td>Dane Co. Natural Heritage Found.</td>
<td>Streambanks</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Woodland Dunes</td>
<td>Woodland Dunes Nature Center</td>
<td>Natural Areas</td>
<td>$68,407</td>
<td>$34,204</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>DNR Cost Share</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>3365 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Results of Interviews Conducted by Andrea Freeman,
UW-Stevens Point, College of Natural Resources
for Janet Beach Hanson, WI Department of Natural Resources
(Interviews Conducted September 3-October 8, 1993)

Date: January 14, 1994
To: Janet Beach Hanson DNR, Bureau of Community Assistance
From: Andrea Freeman, UW-SP, College of Natural Resources
Re: Summary, NCO Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCR = Beaver Creek Reserve</th>
<th>MIWP = Madeline Island Wilderness Preserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCLT = Door County Land Trustees</td>
<td>NNHC = Norskedalen Nature/Heritage Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPWC = Des Plaines Wetland Conservancy</td>
<td>PCF = Philadelphia Community Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLCF = Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>RS = Ridges Sanctuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLC = Geneva Lake Conservancy</td>
<td>STCP = Soc. of Tympanuchus Cupido Pinnatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAT = Ice Age Park &amp; Trail Foundation</td>
<td>TNC = The Nature Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWL = Izaak Walton League</td>
<td>WFC = Wisconsin Farmland Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC = Lakeland Conservancy</td>
<td>WLC = Waukesha Land Conservancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ecological Concern—The Common Thread

These non-profit conservation organizations (NCOs) represent a wide spectrum of interest. From water quality, to hunting, to biodynamic farming, the recurring theme from all these organizations is the concern for ecological wellness. They all embrace the newer concept of ecosystem management, as opposed to the more dated species approach. These organizations clearly recognize the connection of how we use the land, to issues of water quality, biodiversity, and the quality of life.

14% Increase in Acres Protected

Based on information from Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation, Door County Land Trustees, Geneva Lake Conservancy, Lakeland Conservancy, and Ridges Sanctuary, the amount of land protected from 1990 to 1993 as increased 14.3%. While the national rate of increase between 1988 and 1990 was more than double this, the majority (59%) of land trusts are on the East Coast, versus 11% in the Great Lakes states.

Most of the NCOs interviewed (11 of 16) have completed a land transaction since 1992. Of the 5 remaining groups, 4 are not actively seeking land transactions and one is aggressively pursuing its first transaction, 120 acres along the St. Croix River.

Land is Money

Money is cited as the biggest need of these NCOs—even for the most financially sound organizations. On the surface many of these NCOs would appear to be "shoe-string organizations," but wealthy, generous supporters, and members dedicated to the mission keep them in operation. Four (4) of the 16 NCOs have endowment funds (4 of the 9 that rate their financial status as good) and two recognize the need for an endowment.

Fee-simple Ownership Dominates

All of the NCOs interviewed either have used or would use the fee-simple transaction to protect land. Slightly less popular is the use of conservation easements. A few groups confessed a lack of understanding for conservation easements (Waukesha Land Conservancy, Izaak Walton League) while others indicate solid proficiency, (Door County Land Trustees, Lakeland Conservancy, TNC, Geneva Lake Conservancy, Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation).

These NCOs are also participating as third-party negotiators, transferring land to the DNR, county governments, and other NCOs. Hand-shake agreements, trade-land ownership, development right acquisition, and bargain sales are methods also utilized to protect land.
Support or Opposition?

As described in the literature, these NCOs are in fact taking efforts to protect land that the public sector either can not or will not. The NCOs actively seeking land and conservation easements are trying to walk a fine line between community support and opposition, as they look to achieve a higher or stronger level of land protection.

Most of these NCOs acknowledge support from their communities. Only a few, (not surprisingly in the rapidly developing Door and Walworth Counties) cite any notable opposition.

Obstacles

The most repeated (5 of 16) obstacle for these NCOs was a misinformed or uninformed public. They most often experience a public which fears that land trusts will remove from tax roles (not possible in WI) and in some cases fear that land trusts have the power to condemn land (not possible in any state).

Other obstacles include property tax assessment for land with conservation easements. While WI statutes advise tax assessors to consider an existing conservation easement, they generally do not. Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation, Norskedalen Nature & Heritage Center and The Nature Conservancy have all run into problems with this.

Involvement With Other Organizations

While the degree of involvement with other organizations was not measured, the most common relationship for NCOs (10 of 16) is with a governmental department or agency. The next most common (8 of 16) relationship is with The Nature Conservancy. National environmental organizations and Land Trust Alliance rank next (6 of 16), followed by other land trusts in WI (4 of 16).

Strengthen Ties

Thirteen (13) of the 16 organizations indicated a need to strengthen ties among NCOs. Three groups were indecisive. A state-wide effort was the most preferred boundary in which to strengthen ties.

Conferences are most preferred (8 of 16) as a way to strengthen ties, followed by having a central clearing house/coordinating unit (4 of 16), a newsletter (3 of 16) and a travelling liaison/resources person (3 of 16).

Stewardship Program

All of these NCOs had heard of The Stewardship Program, although one vaguely, and one somewhat misinformed—believing the land purchased would come off the tax roles. Three organizations have received funds from the Program, five are in the application process, four might apply, three will not apply (due to stipulations in the rules) and one was discouraged from applying by DNR district staff.

Six (6) of the 16 NCOs had positive overall impressions of the Stewardship Program, with three openly praising the staff involved. Two NCOs had negative impressions, two were mixed and six have had no experience on which to base any impression.

Seven (7) of the 16 describe the application process as too time consuming and cumbersome. Sentiment from four groups suggests that either as a result of the rules or the implementation, Stewardship is "missing the boat" on what the legislation intended. They feel that the spirit of the legislation is not being followed, when certain groups or projects can not get funding.

Two NCOs in the Southeastern District expressed concern that larger parcels are favored over smaller ones. One group feels that the Program is geared too much for recreation and not enough for education.

The DNR's Role and Image

Eight of 16 NCOs do not see that the DNR should be doing anything more for non-profits. Their perspective is that the DNR already has more work than they can do, and/or that the DNR is prevalent enough.

Six (6) NCOs suggest that the DNR work to educate the public about land issues and the role of land trusts, provide more grants, management advice, and help identify areas in
need of protection. Workshops on real estate issues and the Stewardship Program application process would be valued by these organizations. They see the DNR as a possible vehicle for jump-starting NCOs and educating the general public—thereby limiting an obstacle in land protection.

Most NCOs were quick to compliment efforts of individual DNR staff, both in the Districts and in Madison. They were equally quick to express frustration with a bureaucratic machine which is inefficient and seemingly ineffective. The directors are very cognizant of the fact that DNR staff as individuals have good intentions, only to get tangled up with institutional webbing.

NCOs essentially are allies of the DNR. The NCOs face misunderstanding from the general public just as the DNR does. The NCOs are generally sympathetic toward the DNR, not the general public.

Future Plans

Most of these NCOs (11 of 16) are actively pursuing land to protect. Of the remaining five, two are gradually considering buffer areas to their respective properties and the remaining three are concentrating on existing properties or projects.

Mission & Purpose

- Ecological
  - (includes concern for biodiversity, watershed protection, buffer zones, endangered species)
  - Social/cultural/historic
  - Educational
  - Recreational
  - Agricultural
  - Aesthetic

Membership

0 - 19,000+               Age  1 year - 55 years
Total: 27,580

Area of Operation

- Multi-county area or smaller: 12 of 16
- County or smaller: 8 of 16
- Watershed area: 3 of 16
- State: 3 of 16

Land Protection

Currently seeking land and/or easements to hold: 14 of 16

Type of Land Sought to Protect:

- wetlands, woodlands, prairie, “sensitive areas,” open space
- Avoiding water front acreage due to cost: 2 of 16
- Seeking water front: 3 of 16

Protected Land:

Fee-simple = 62,397.85 acres + 460 miles of trail
  (includes any land that has been transferred)
Conservation easement = 923.5 acres + highway corridor bill board easement

Last transactions

- In 1993: 7 of 16
- In 1992: 4 of 16
- In 1990: 1 of 16
- Longer ago: 3 of 16
- None yet: 1 of 16
### Methods Used or Likely to be Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Count of 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee-simple, donation &amp; purchase</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation easement, donation &amp; purchase</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd party transfer/facilitator</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade lands</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargain sales</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase development rights</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handshake land-owner agreements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Leasing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex from County Forest land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated lands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Type</th>
<th>Count of 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable, easements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Type</th>
<th>Count of 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active management or monitoring</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less active management or monitoring</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With input, help, or approval from DNR</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Obstacles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Count of 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public’s misinformation, lack of awareness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling sellers, changing minds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassers, vandalism, dumping</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax assessments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy/Politics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-conservation sentiment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Speculation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public support and opposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Count of 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General support</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General lack of support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opposition/confusion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Count of 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/easement acquisition information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Volunteers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational help</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land management/inventory help</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations help</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising help</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan fund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID areas in need of protection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well trained assessors, lawyers, ecologists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Plans
- To actively pursue land or easements: 11 of 16
- Status quo, or expanded services: 6 of 16
- Seek adjacent land or easements only: 2 of 16

Financial Status
- Good: 9 of 16
- Fair: 5 of 16
- Poor: 2 of 16
- Have endowment funds: 4 of 16

Sources of Income
- Members & Donations: 12 of 16
- Fees, products, sale of resource: 5 of 16
- Foundations: 5 of 16
- Public funds: 4 of 16
- Corporations: 3 of 16
- Friends group: 1 of 16
- Interest: 1 of 16
- National Park Service: 1 of 16

Policies & Laws Effecting Efforts
- None cited: 6 of 16
- Positive Effect:
  - Stewardship Program: 3 of 16
  - Conservation Easement Act: 1 of 16
  - Property tax reduction Statute: 1 of 16
  - ESA, CWA, CAA: 1 of 16
  - Special maintenance Program Fund: 1 of 16
  - Town board proclamation of support: 1 of 16
  - Dept of Agriculture programs: 1 of 16
  - Alternative Minimum Tax: 1 of 16
- Negative Effect:
  - Property tax assessment policies: 3 of 16
  - Farmland Preservation Program: 2 of 16
  - Managed Forest Law: 1 of 16
    - MIWP: 1 of 16
    - Wetland Delineation: 1 of 16

Stewardship Program
- Name recognition of Program: 16 of 16
- Received grant: 3 of 16
- In application process: 5 of 16
- Might apply: 4 of 16
- Won't apply: 3 of 16
- Presumably rejected: 1 of 16
- Overall positive impressions: 6 of 16
- Overall negative impressions: 2 of 16
- Mixed impressions: 2 of 16
- No experience on which to base impressions: 6 of 16
Comments:
• Too time consuming, cumbersome 7 of 16
• "Missing the boat" at times 4 of 16
• Good staff involved 3 of 16
• Categories too rigid 3 of 16
• Not enough money 2 of 16
• Focuses too much on large parcels only 2 of 16
• Need provision for legal fees 1 of 16
• Aimed too much at recreation, not enough for education 1 of 16
• Requests info 1 of 16

Involvement with other Organizations and Agencies
State Government Departments or Agencies 10 of 16
TNC: 8 of 16
National Environmental Organizations: 6 of 16
Misc. 6 of 16
Land Trust Alliance: 6 of 16
Other Land Trusts in WI: 4 of 16
Out of State Land Trusts 3 of 16
TPL: 3 of 16
National Recreation Organizations 3 of 16
Other WI Environmental Organizations 1 of 16
None: 1 of 16

Tie Strengthening Among Non-Profits?
Yes: 13 of 16
Maybe: 3 of 16
No: 0

How to Strengthen Ties
Conferences: 8 of 16
Central clearinghouse/coordinating unit 4 of 16
Newsletter 3 of 16
Travelling liaison/resource person: 3 of 16
Mentor Program 2 of 16
Collective Lobbying voice: 1 of 16
E-mail: 1 of 16
UW-Extension workshops 1 of 16

Geographic means to strengthen ties:
By state: 6 of 16
By Midwest-national 3 of 16
By regions within the state 2 of 16
By interest, not geography 1 of 16

Interact with Local Government
Yes: 14 of 16
No: 2 of 16
More DNR services to NCOs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No: 8 of 16</th>
<th>Yes: 6 of 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For more money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To educate the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For management advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops on real estate issues, legal terminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops on Stewardship (application process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More plant survey resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To help identify areas worthy of protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help with ecosystem management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UW-Extension workshop on successful boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To jump-start NCOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Count (of 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Members</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill O'Conner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst. for Comm. Econ.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI Natural Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI Wildlife</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI Conservationist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommonGround</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Forty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Non-profit Orgs:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA Natural Heritage Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Black</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easement Hndbk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to Appraising Easements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Written Survey Recipients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Location/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp Bird Youth Center</td>
<td>Conservancy Comm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Luther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castel Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek Restoration Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Lake Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Lake Landmarks</td>
<td>Preservation Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Lake Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Lake Woods</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Wisconsin Sportsmen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain O Lakes Bass Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain O'Lakes PO Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chequamegon Area Mt Bike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chequamegon Bay Birders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chequamegon Bird Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chequamegon Birders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Outing Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa Wildlife Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiwaukee Prairie</td>
<td>Preservation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lake Shore Citizens</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chute Pond Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Sanctuary Nature</td>
<td>Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco Beach Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco Chain Riparian Owners Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Action Group</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens For A Better Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens For A Better Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens For A Better Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens For The Future Of Durand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Natural Resource Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Natural Resources Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Regional Environment Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens To Protect West Twin River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens To Save Neenah Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens United To Preserve Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Natural Resources Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glam Lake Sportsman's Club Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Lake Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverleaf Lakes Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition For Safe Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County Environment Protection League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Citizens Of Random Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Citizens Of Rochester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon Valley Conservation Council Of Sport Fishing</td>
<td>Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Harbor/Snake Road Adventurer Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Conservation League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Environmental Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Natural Heritage Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Boone Conservation League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenders Of Animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delavan Historic Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Raines Wetland Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Co. Environmental Council Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door County Land Trustees</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Peninsula Property Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driftless Bioregional Network Ducks Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durward Glen Retreat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Hollow Lake Association Eagle Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Lake Wood Association Eagle River Chain PO</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth First!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Association Of New Berlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow Lake Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhart Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elroy-Spart National Trail In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwood Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Valley Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This lists 693 NCOs as survey recipients, although only 666 are known to have received it. The difference of 27 NCOs is the result of counting undeliverable or unforwardable surveys, but discarding them prematurely. Therefore, their names are unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Location or Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Lake Management Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Lake Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esodore Area Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.A.R.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Timber Environmental Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers/Sportsmens Conservation Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Lake Area Improvement Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishes' Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora Dell Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Lakes PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox River Dells PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Bird Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Ananapine Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Cray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Dane County Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Harrington Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Havenwoods C/o Havenwoods Forest Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Kettle Moraine Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Kohler-Andrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Lake Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Lake Wissota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Lapham Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Lower Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Mackenzie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Merrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Petoskey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Riverside Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Sauk Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of The Arboretum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of The Lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of The Rec Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of The Round Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of The Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Whitefish Dunes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Of Wyalusing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Of Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Of Eden Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Lake Cedar Point Par Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Lake Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Lake Watershed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltor Historical Assoc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Lake Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmore Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodhue-Pierce Archaeological Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bass Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Whitewater Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay Bird Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay West Shore</td>
<td>Archaeological Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green County Conservation Council</td>
<td>League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green County Ice Age Trail Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lake ROA Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lake PO Association</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace USA</td>
<td>Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Hemlock Lake</td>
<td>Protection Association Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hales Corners Ecology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Lake Association</td>
<td>Sanctuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasbrook Lake Association</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn Hollow Nature</td>
<td>Sanctuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River Community Land</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward Lakes Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Springs PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cliff Equine Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cliff Park &amp; Forest Ass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Monroe Inc</td>
<td>Foundation Of Eau Clai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Lake Improvement</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Rock Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honcon Marsh Wildlife Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsehead Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoe Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoe Lake Improvement Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoy Nature Club Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt Hill Audubon Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Age Park &amp; Trail Foundati</td>
<td>Waypost Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imago Dei Ministries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Crane Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Interpretive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton Lane Of Jackson County Wildlife Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Lake Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Moraine Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killarney Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnewsicnic River Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koenings Conservati Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse Area Archeological Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse County Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse County Conservati Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Courte Oreille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Courte Oreilles Property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Du Flambeau Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac La Belle Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac LaBelle Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Vieux Desert Property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse River Trail Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Alpine Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Arborutus Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Beulah Protection And</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Eau Claire Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Ellen Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Five Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Holcombe Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jacqueline Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Jorden PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Katherine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Keesus Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Knolls Civic Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Lawrence PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Lucerne Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Mallalieu Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Metonga Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Michigan Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Minnesuing Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Minocqua Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Muskiego Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Nakomis Concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Nomeagunon Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Noquay Lake Sportsman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Of The Falls Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Patten PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Sherwood PO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Shiekogama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Sinisippi Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Thompson Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tomahawk Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Wauau Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Weyauwega Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Windsor PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore Owners Conservat Advocates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Estates Improvetment Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND Ed. Association</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Ethics Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land O'Lakes Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale Lakes Improvement Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League Of American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledgewood Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Lake Conservation Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipsett Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Bearskin Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Cedar Lake Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Green Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Long Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little St Germain Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Waters Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long And Bass Lakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Lake Fishing Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Lake P&amp;R Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loon Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loon Lake Property Owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Marsh Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Nemohin Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Turtle Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Wisconsin River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynx Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'uchican Flowage Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline Island Wilderness Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Trust For Historic Maiden Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitowakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitowish Waters Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Hills PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marah Haven Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayflower Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood Environmental Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford/Preston Trail Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimac Conservation Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Lake Management And Protection Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Pond Lake Dist/Associati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee River Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnow Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minocqua Township Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minga Flowage Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miroir Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Arts &amp; Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montell Lake &amp; P&amp;O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moose Lake Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moose Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito Hills Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Nature Corp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Lake Homeowners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukwonago Lakes Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskego Lakes Land Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskeg Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagawicka Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashotah Shores Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wild Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Plant Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Lake Owners Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturist Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarino Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Hollister Bird Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors For Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neillsville Nordic Ski Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Richmond Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Wildernes Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic Ski Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic Ski Club Of Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norskeland Nature/Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Thunder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwoods Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwoods Wildlife Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nugget Lake Horse Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O J Grone Lake Bird Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Conservation Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oconomowoc-Waukesha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Copper Culture Historical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshkosh Bird Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors Forever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee Land Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pane Art Center &amp; Arboretum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelican Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesobic Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petenwell/Castle Rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pewaukee Lake Sportsman Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Central WI Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Southeast WI Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Racine County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Jefferson County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Kenosha County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Walworth County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Sugar River Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Dane County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Sauk County Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Indianhead Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Kinneinnickei Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Northeast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Upland WI Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Tri State Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Red Cedar Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever - Fox River Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Community Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickeral Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon Lake Sportsman Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasent Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Lake Riparian Homewn Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Bird &amp; Nature Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Nanongabee Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Conservation Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage County Pres. Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Landmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potawatomi Skii Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation - Racine Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Alliance Of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinel Lake Owner's Associatin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owners Of McDonald Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Association For</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rac-Ken Citizens For The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine Zoological Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Lake Shore Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeline Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cedar Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cedar Riders Saddle Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lakes Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir Pond Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retzer Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib Lake Area Fish And Game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richter Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridges Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riveredge Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Bird Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Hunting &amp; Fishing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Horse Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock River Koskionong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock River Landowners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooney Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rost Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round River Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round-Trade Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffed Grouse Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush County Citizen Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Oaks Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand County Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Lake Shore Owners' Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save Lake Superior Associati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save Our Soil Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiltz Audubon Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Section Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE WI Coalition for Clean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Wisconsin Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaws Lake Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaws Lake Property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheboygan Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheboygan County Landmarks Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>John Muir Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Southeast Gateway Gr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Rock Valley Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Four Lakes Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Coulee Region Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Chippewa Valley Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Fox Valley Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>St Croix Valley Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>WI River County Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigurad Olson Environmental</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake Protective</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lake Sportsman Club</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinsinawa Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilafuers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokey Lake PO Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society For Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society Of American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Society</td>
<td>Biological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Society Of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solberg Lake Association</td>
<td>America -WI Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Kettle Morane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern WI Trail Biking Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaulding's Pond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Reservoir Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports For Active Seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread Eagle Chan 'Lakes</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Lake Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbreak Lake Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grouse Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Croix Horse &amp; Carriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormy Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton Conservation Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar River Trail Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar River Watershed</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Wilderness Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Lake Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy Lake Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanter/Menomini Lake</td>
<td>Improvement Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teal Lake Association</td>
<td>Improvement Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teal, Lost Land and Ghost Lake</td>
<td>Improvement Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Clearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ruffled Grouse Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Islands Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Lakes Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Wolf Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Wolf Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberlee Christina Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomah Bass Masters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomahawk River Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Of Red Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Oaks Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevors Oaks Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Lakes Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Property Owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Southeastern WI Chap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Blackhawk Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Harry Nohr Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Southern WI Chap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Aldo Leopold Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Kip-Tu-Wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Oconto River Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Maninette Co Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Lakeshore Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>WI River Valley Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Antigo Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Frank Homborg Chap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Wolf River Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Goulee Region Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Ojibbeau Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Wild Rivers Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Fox Valley Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 21, 1994

Dear Nonprofit Organization Leader,

Here is the survey I told you about in my last letter. Others who have filled it out say that it takes about 15-20 minutes to complete (sometimes more, sometimes less). I hope you can sit down and fill it out as soon as possible.

To refresh your memory, the purpose of the survey is to provide both the DNR and the nonprofit sector with information about the activities, needs and interests of nonprofit organizations, and also to develop a comprehensive database and directory of conservation groups which will be available to both the DNR and nonprofits.

Your work is important and we'd like to include your organization. Please take some time now to complete the survey and return it in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for participating in this project.

Sincerely,

Janet Beach Hanson
Nonprofit Program Manager
Bureau of Community Assistance